SOME OF THE CHIEF ARTICLES

IN THE DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY, ETC., VOL. IV.

NEOPLATONISM	J. R. Mozley, Esq.
NESTORIANISM	Professor Stokes, D.D.
OPHITES	Professor Salmon, D.D.
ORIGEN	Professor Westcott, D.D.
ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSIES . .	A. W. W. Dale, Esq.
PAPIAS	Professor Salmon, D.D.
PATRIARCHS OF ALEXANDRIA, ANTIOCH, JERUSALEM, AND CONSTANTINOPLE .	Canon Bright, Precentor Venables, Rev. W. M. Sinclair.
PATRICK	Professor Stokes, D.D.
PAULINUS OF NOLA	Canon Phillott.
PELAGIUS	Professor Ince, D.D.
PERSON OF CHRIST	Professor Stokes & Rev. C. J. Ball.
PHILO	Dr. Edersheim.
POLYCARP	Professor Salmon, D.D.
POPES	Rev. J. Barmby.
PREDESTINATION	Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes.
PRISCILLIAN	Rev. M. B. Cowell.
PRUDENTIUS	Rev. W. Lock.
QUICUNQUE VULT	Dr. Cazenove.
SIBYLLINE ORACLES	Rev. J. H. Lupton.
SIMON MAGUS	Professor Salmon, D.D.
SOCRATES AND SOZOMEN	Professor Milligan, D.D.
TATIAN	Professor Fuller.
TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES . .	Professor Salmon, D.D.
TERTULLIAN	Professor Fuller.
TESTAMENTS OF THE XII. PATRIARCHS	Rev. R. Sinker.
THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA . . .	Professor Swete, D.D.
THEODORE OF TARSUS	The Bishop of Chester.
THEODORET	Precentor Venables.
THOMAS HARKLENSIS	Rev. Dr. Gwynne.
THE HOLY TRINITY	Archdeacon Cheetham, D.D.
VALENTINUS	Professor Lipsius, D.D.
VERSE WRITERS	Rev. W. Lock.
WILFRID	Canon Raine.

A DICTIONARY

OF

CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY,

LITERATURE, SECTS AND DOCTRINES;

DURING

THE FIRST EIGHT CENTURIES.

BEING

A CONTINUATION OF 'THE DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.'

EDITED BY

WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D.

AND

HENRY WACE, D.D.

PREBENDARY OF ST. PAUL'S; PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON; PREACHER OF LINCOLN'S INN; HON. CHAPLAIN TO THE QUEEN, AND CHAPLAIN TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

VOLUME IV.

N—Z.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1887.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.

PREFACE.

It is with much thankfulness that the Editors issue the final volume of a work so extensive as this Dictionary of Early Christian Biography, and liable to so many contingencies. No scholar, they think, will be surprised that it has taken somewhat longer to complete this volume than was requisite for the second and third. Not only is it larger; but the changes and chances of life expose the conduct of such a work to increasing difficulties as it proceeds. Too many of those whose names are recorded in the following List of Contributors have passed away since the work was commenced, and many others have advanced to more distinguished and more laborious positions. From these various causes not a few difficulties and disappointments have been encountered; but they have been surmounted by the generosity and enthusiasm with which the enterprise has been pursued by the contributors, especially by some of the most learned and at the same time the most closely engaged in other duties. The plan of the work, as explained in the Preface to the Second Volume, has been maintained, the only exception being that it has not been found practicable to give the names of all the Bishops who are known only by their signatures at Councils and by nothing more. But it is hoped that the endeavour to give some account of all names directly or indirectly connected with Christian Literature has been substantially carried out. One other explanation may be desirable in reference to a doubt expressed by some critics, on the publication of the third volume, whether a single volume would be sufficient to do justice to the names in the letters from N to Z. As near a calculation, however, as was possible had been made of the space requisite for this purpose, and a reference to the more important names at the close of the volume will show that this Dictionary is not liable to the charge, to which many biographical works are open, of scamping the treatment of the later names of the alphabet. A fair test of the equality of treatment in this respect may be afforded by examining the space occupied by names in any Index to Patristic Literature and Ecclesiastical History, such as the Index to Ceillier's work, or Chevalier's invaluable *Bio-Bibliographie*. An Index is a mere witness to the material contained in the work or series of works to which it applies,

and is equally impartial throughout. It is satisfactory, therefore, to find that the proportionate space occupied by the letters contained in this volume—about three-sevenths of the whole—is very nearly the same as is occupied by the same letters in both those indices. The Editors must also express their sense of the liberality with which the publisher has facilitated this completeness of the work.

The contingencies and anxieties, to which the Editors have referred, render them the more bound to record their grateful thanks to the contributors and advisers who have continued their support to them, notwithstanding their own varying and increasing burdens. More especially are they bound to express their warm gratitude to the Bishop of Chester and to Dr. Salmon, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Dublin, for the kindness with which they have continued to read through the proofs of the work to the very last, and to assist the Editors with their learned counsel. A special acknowledgment is also due from them to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, notwithstanding his arduous responsibilities, has found time to complete, even to the smallest name, his treatment of the persons connected with St. Cyprian. They find it difficult to single out other names where so many have been generous and unwearied; but one other colleague claims a peculiar tribute of gratitude. The devotion, the accurate and thoughtful learning, the generous labour and the unwearying care, of the Rev. Charles Hole, Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History at King's College, London, have conferred incalculable advantages on this work, and have, it is hoped, rendered a degree of accuracy practicable which, without such help, would have been scarcely attainable in so large a work, conducted under such conditions. With all these efforts, there must remain much to be desired in this first effort to furnish a complete Biographical Cyclopaedia of Christian Antiquity. But the Editors venture to hope that, by the combined efforts of the contributors, a great advance has been made in this direction, and that the work may materially promote, both here and abroad, a fuller comprehension of Church History.

LIST OF WRITERS

IN THE DICTIONARIES OF CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY AND ANTIQUITIES.

INITIALS.	NAMES.
A. H. D. A.	ARTHUR HERBERT DYKE ACLAND, Esq., M.A., M.P., Of Christ Church, Oxford.
S. A.	SHELDON AMOS, Esq., M.A., Late Professor of Jurisprudence in University College, London.
M. F. A.	The late Rev. MARSHAM FREDERICK ARGLES, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, and Member of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta.
H. T. A.	Rev. HENRY THOMAS ARMFIELD, M.A., F.S.A., Rector of Colne-Engaine, Essex; late Vice-Principal of the Theological College, Salisbury.
F. A.	Rev. FREDERICK ARNOLD, B.A., Of Christ Church, Oxford.
T. A.	THOMAS ARNOLD, Esq., M.A., Of University College, Oxford; Fellow of the Royal University of Ireland.
W. T. A.	WILLIAM THOMAS ARNOLD, Esq., M.A., Of University College, Oxford.
C. B.	Rev. CHURCHILL BABINGTON, D.D., F.L.S., Disney Professor of Archaeology in the University of Cambridge; Rector of Cockfield, Suffolk; formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
G. P. B.	Rev. GEORGE PERCY BADGER, D.C.L., late Chaplain, Bombay Presidency.
H. B—Y.	Rev. HENRY BAILEY, D.D., Rector of West Tarring and Honorary Canon of Canterbury Cathedral; late Warden of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, and formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
C. J. B.	Rev. CHARLES JAMES BALL, M.A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, and Master in Merchant Taylors' School.
J. B—Y.	Rev. JAMES BARMBY, B.D., Vicar of Pittington, Durham; formerly Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Principal of Bishop Hatfield Hall, Durham.

INITIALS.	NAMES.
A. B.	Most Rev. ALFRED BARRY, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sydney.
S. A. B.	S. A. BENNETT, Esq., B.A., Of Lincoln's Inn.
E. W. B.	Right Hon. and Most Rev. EDWARD WHITE BENSON, D.D., Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
T. S. B.	Rev. THOMAS S. BERRY, B.D., Trinity College, Dublin.
W. B. (in *Dict. Ant.*)	WALTER BESANT, Esq., M.A., Secretary of the Palestine Exploration Fund; late Scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge.
E. B. B.	Rev. EDWARD BICKERSTETH BIRKS, M.A., Vicar of St. Michael's, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
C. W. B.	Rev. CHARLES WILLIAM BOASE, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford.
H. B. (in *Dict. Biog.*)	The late HENRY BRADSHAW, Esq., M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; Librarian of the University of Cambridge.
W. B.	Rev. WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford.
H. B. (in *Dict. Ant.*)	The late Rev. HENRY BROWNE, M.A., Vicar of Pevensey, and Prebendary of Chichester Cathedral.
I. B.	ISAMBARD BRUNEL, Esq., D.C.L., Of Lincoln's Inn; Chancellor of the Diocese of Ely.
J. B.	JAMES BRYCE, Esq., D.C.L., M.P., Of Lincoln's Inn; Regius Professor of Civil Law in the University of Oxford.
T. R. B.	THOMAS RYBURN BUCHANAN, Esq., M.A., Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.
D. B.	The late Rev. DANIEL BUTLER, M.A., Rector of Thwing, Yorkshire.
J. M. C.	Rev. JOHN MOORE CAPES, M.A., Of Balliol College, Oxford.
J. G. C.	Rev. JOHN GIBSON CAZENOVE, D.D., F.R.S.E., Subdean and Chancellor of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh; formerly Provost of Cumbrae College, N.B.
C.	Ven. SAMUEL CHEETHAM, D.D., Archdeacon of Rochester; Canon of Rochester; formerly Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.
C. G. C.	The late Rev. CHARLES GRANVILLE CLARKE, M.A., Vicar of Langley Fitzurse, Wilts; formerly Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford.
E. B. C.	EDWARD BYLES COWELL, Esq., M.A., Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Cambridge, Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

INITIALS.	NAMES.
M. B. C.	Rev. Maurice Byles Cowell, M.A., Vicar of Ash-Bocking.
F. D.	F. H. Blackburne Daniell, Esq., M.A., Of Lincoln's Inn.
G. W. D.	Rev. George William Daniell, M.A., Chaplain of Dulwich College; formerly Chaplain and Censor of King's College, London.
T. W. D.	The late Rev. T. W. Davids, Of Upton.
L. D.	Rev. Lionel Davidson, M.A., Rector of Chedburgh.
J. Ll. D.	Rev. John Llewelyn Davies, M.A., Rector of Christchurch, Marylebone; Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
C. D.	Rev. Cecil Deedes, M.A., Rector of Wickham St. Paul; formerly Chaplain of Christ Church, Oxford, and Vicar of St. Mary Magdalen, Oxford.
J. De S.	Rev. John De Soyres, M.A., Curate of St. John the Baptist, Great Marlborough Street.
W. P. D.	Rev. William Purdie Dickson, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow.
A. B. C. D.	Miss A. B. C. Dunbar.
S. J. E.	Rev. Samuel John Eales, M.A., Formerly Principal of St. Boniface's Mission House, Warminster, and Head Master of the Grammar School, Halstead, Essex.
A. E.	Rev. A. Edersheim, D.D., Ph.D., Formerly Vicar of Loders, Bridport, and Warburtonian Lecturer at Lincoln's Inn.
J. E.	Rev. John Ellerton, M.A., Rector of White-Roding.
C. J. E.	The late Rev. C. J. Elliott, M.A., Vicar of Winkfield, Windsor; Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; formerly Crosse and Tyrwhitt Scholar in the University of Cambridge.
E. S. Ff.	Rev. Edmund Salusbury Ffoulkes, B.D., Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford; formerly Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College, Oxford.
A. P. F.	The late Right Rev. Alexander Penrose Forbes, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin.
W. H. F.	Hon. and Rev. William Henry Fremantle, M.A., Canon of Canterbury; Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford; formerly Rector of St. Mary's, Marylebone, and Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.

INITIALS.	NAMES.
J. M. F.	Rev. JOHN MEE FULLER, M.A., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King's College, London; Vicar of Bexley and Rural Dean; formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
J. G.	Rev. JAMES GAMMACK, M.A., LL.D., Aberdeen.
C. D. G.	Rev. CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG, LL.D., British Museum.
C. G.	Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A., Librarian of the Pusey Library, Oxford; Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.
W. F. G.	The late Rev. WILLIAM FREDERICK GREENFIELD, M.A., Master of the Lower School, Dulwich College.
R. S. G.	The late Rev. ROBERT SCARLETT GRIGNON, B.A., Formerly Rector of St. John's, Lewes.
J. Gw.	Rev. JOHN GWYNN, D.D., Archbishop King's Divinity Lecturer in the University of Dublin; formerly Dean of Derry.
A. W. H.	The late Rev. ARTHUR WEST HADDAN, B.D., Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath; Hon. Canon of Worcester; sometime Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.
C. E. H.	Rev. CHARLES EDWARD HAMMOND, M.A., Rector of Wootton, Northampton; formerly Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford.
E. H.	Rev. EDWIN HATCH, M.A., Rector of Purleigh; formerly Vice-Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxford; Bampton Lecturer, 1880.
E. C. H.	Rev. EDWARDS COMERFORD HAWKINS, M.A., Vicar of St. Bride, City of London; formerly Head Master of St. John's Foundation School, Leatherhead.
L. H.	Rev. LEWIS HENSLEY, M.A., Vicar of Hitchin, Herts; Hon. Canon of St. Alban's; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
C. H.	Rev. CHARLES HOLE, B.A., Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History at King's College, London; formerly Rector of Loxbear.
H. S. H.	Rev. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A., Senior Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford; Canon of St. Paul's.
H.	Rev. FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT, D.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Cambridge; Chaplain to the Bishop of Winchester.
H. J. H.	The late Rev. HENRY JOHN HOTHAM, M.A., Vice-Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.
J. H.	The late JOHN HULLAH, Esq., LL.D., Honorary Fellow of King's College, London.

INITIALS.	NAMES.
W. I.	Rev. William Ince, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.
W. J.	Rev. William Jackson, M.A., F.S.A., F.R.A.S., Formerly Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford; Bampton Lecturer for 1875.
G. A. J.	Rev. George Andrew Jacob, D.D., Formerly Head Master of Christ's Hospital, London.
D. R. J.	Rev. David Rice Jones, B.A.
W. J. J.	Rev. William James Josling, M.A., Rector of Moulton, Suffolk; formerly Fellow and Tutor of Christ's College, Cambridge.
C. F. K.	C. F. Keary, Esq., Of the British Museum.
R. J. K.	Rev. Richard John Knowling, M.A., Chaplain, Censor, and Lecturer of King's College, London.
S. L.	Rev. Stanley Leathes, D.D., Professor of Hebrew in King's College, London; Prebendary of St. Paul's; Rector of Cliffe-at-Hoo, Rochester; Bampton Lecturer, 1874.
L.	Right Rev. Joseph Barber Lightfoot, D.D., Bishop of Durham.
R. A. L.	Richard Adelbert Lipsius, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Jena.
W. L.	Rev. Walter Lock, M.A., Fellow of St. Mary Magdalen College, and Sub-warden of Keble College, Oxford; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Lichfield.
J. M. L.	John Malcolm Ludlow, Esq., Of Lincoln's Inn; Registrar of Friendly Societies.
J. R. L.	Rev. John Robert Lunn, B.D., Vicar of Marton-cum-Grafton, Yorkshire; formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
J. H. L.	Rev. Joseph Hirst Lupton, M.A., Surmaster of St. Paul's School; formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
G. F. M.	Rev. George Frederick Maclear, D.D., Warden of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury.
A. C. M.	Arthur Cornwallis Madan, Esq., M.A., Senior Student of Christ Church, Oxford.
F. W. M.	Frederic W. Madden, Esq., M.R.A.S., Brighton College.
S. M.	The late Rev. Spencer Mansel, M.A., Vicar of Trumpington; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

INITIALS.	NAMES.
W. B. M.	The late Rev. WHARTON B. MARRIOTT, M.A., Formerly of Eton College, and sometime Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.
A. J. M.	Rev. ARTHUR JAMES MASON, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Canon of Truro; Rector of All Hallows, Barking.
G. M.	Rev. GEORGE MEAD, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Netley.
F. M.	Rev. FREDERICK MEYRICK, M.A., Rector of Blickling, Norfolk; Prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral; Chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.
W. M.	Rev. WILLIAM MILLIGAN, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen.
G. H. M.	Rev. GEORGE HERBERT MOBERLY, M.A., Master of St. Nicholas's Hospital, Sarum; formerly Principal of the Theological College, Lichfield, and Prebendary of Lichfield; Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.
T. D. C. M.	Rev. THOMAS DANIEL COX MORSE, Vicar of Christ Church, Newgate, City of London.
H. C. G. M.	Rev. HANDLEY CARR GLYN MOULE, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
J. R. M.	JOHN RICKARDS MOZLEY, Esq., M.A., Formerly Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.
J. B. M.	J. BASS MULLINGER, Esq., M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge.
A. N.	ALEXANDER NESBITT, Esq., F.S.A., Oldlands, Uckfield.
P. O.	Rev. PHIPPS ONSLOW, B.A., Rector of Upper Sapey, Worcestershire.
F. P.	Rev. FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology, and Canon of Christ Church in the University of Oxford.
G. W. P.	Rev. GREGORY WALTON PENNETHORNE, M.A., Vicar of Heathfield, Sussex; formerly Vice-Principal of the Theological College, Chichester.
W.G.F.P.	WALTER G. F. PHILLIMORE, Esq., D.C.L., Of the Middle Temple; Chancellor of the Diocese of Lincoln; formerly Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.
H. W. P.	Rev. HENRY WRIGHT PHILLOTT, M.A., Rector of Staunton-on-Wye; Praelector of Hereford Cathedral; formerly Student of Christ Church and Master in Charterhouse School.

INITIALS.	NAMES.
A. P.	Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham.
E. H. P. (or P.)	Very Rev. EDWARD HAYES PLUMPTRE, D.D., Dean of Wells; formerly Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford.
DE PRESSENSÉ.	Rev. E. DE PRESSENSÉ, Of Paris.
J. R.	Rev. JAMES RAINE, M.A., D.C.L., Rector of All Saints, York; Canon of York; formerly Fellow of the University of Durham.
W. R.	Right Rev. WILLIAM REEVES, D.D., Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore.
H. R. R.	Rev. HENRY ROBERT REYNOLDS, D.D., Principal of Cheshunt College.
G. S.	Rev. GEORGE SALMON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S., Chancellor of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin.
P. S.	Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., Bible House, New York.
F. H. A. S.	Rev. FREDERICK HENRY AMBROSE SCRIVENER, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Prebendary of Exeter and Vicar of Hendon, Middlesex.
W. E. S.	The late Rev. WILLIAM EDWARD SCUDAMORE, M.A., Rector of Ditchingham; formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
J. S.	Rev. JOHN SHARPE, B.D., Rector of Elmley-Lovett; formerly Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.
B. S.	The late BENJAMIN SHAW, Esq., M.A., Of Lincoln's Inn; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
H. C. S.	Rev. HENRY CARY SHUTTLEWORTH, Lecturer on Pastoral Theology in King's College, London; Rector of St. Nicholas Cole Abbey, City of London.
W. M. S.	Rev. WILLIAM MACDONALD SINCLAIR, M.A., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Westminster; Chaplain to the Bishop of London.
R. S.	Rev. ROBERT SINKER, B.D., Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge.
I. G. S.	Rev. ISAAC GREGORY SMITH, B.D., Vicar of Great Malvern; Prebendary of Hereford Cathedral; formerly Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford; Bampton Lecturer for 1873.
R. P. S.	Very Rev. ROBERT PAYNE SMITH, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.
R. T. S.	Rev. R. TRAVERS SMITH, D.D., Canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Dublin.

INITIALS.	NAMES.
J. W. S.	Rev. JOHN WILLIAM STANBRIDGE, B.D., Rector of Bainton; formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford.
W. S.	Rev. WILLIAM STEWART, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Glasgow.
G. T. S.	Rev. G. T. STOKES, D.D., Vicar of All Saints, Blackrock, Dublin, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin.
J. S—T.	JOHN STUART, Esq., LL.D., Of the General Register House, Edinburgh.
S.	Right Rev. WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D., Bishop of Chester; formerly Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford.
C. A. S.	The late Rev. CHARLES ANTHONY SWAINSON, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge; Canon of Chichester Cathedral; Master of Christ's College, Cambridge.
H. B. S.	Rev. HENRY BARCLAY SWETE, D.D., Rector of Ashdon; Professor of Pastoral Theology in King's College, London; formerly Fellow and Divinity Lecturer of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.
E. S. T.	Rev. EDWARD STUART TALBOT, M.A., Warden of Keble College, Oxford.
C. T.	Rev. CHARLES TAYLOR, D.D., Master of St. John's College, Cambridge.
R. ST. J. T.	Rev. RICHARD ST. JOHN TYRWHITT, M.A., Formerly Student and Rhetoric Reader of Christ Church, Oxford.
E. V.	Rev. EDMUND VENABLES, M.A., Canon Residentiary and Precentor of Lincoln Cathedral.
H. W.	Rev. HENRY WACE, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's: Principal of King's College, London; Preacher of Lincoln's Inn; Hon. Chaplain to the Queen, and Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury.
M. A. W.	Mrs. HUMPHRY WARD.
F. E. W.	Rev. FREDERICK EDWARD WARREN, B.D., Rector of Frenchay; formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford.
H. W. W.	Ven. HENRY WILLIAM WATKINS, M.A., D.D., Archdeacon of Auckland; Canon of Durham; Professor of Hebrew in Durham University, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham.
E. B. W.	Rev. EDWARD BARNETT WENSLEY, B.A., Vicar of Hoo-Allhallows, Rochester.

INITIALS.	NAMES.
B. F. W. or W.	Rev. BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., Canon of Westminster; Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge; Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; formerly Fellow of Trinity College.
G. W.	The late Rev. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D., Vicar of Ringwood; Hon. Canon of Winchester; formerly Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.
H. A. W.	The Rev. HENRY AUSTIN WILSON, M.A., Fellow of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford.
CHR. W.	Rev. CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, M.A., Rector of Glaston, and Prebendary of Lincoln; formerly Fellow of Peterhouse, and Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge.
J. W.	Right Rev. JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Salisbury; formerly Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose College, Oxford; Bampton Lecturer, 1881.
W. A. W.	WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT, Esq., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
E. M. Y.	Rev. EDWARD MALLET YOUNG, M.A., Head Master of Sherborne School; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
H. W. Y.	Rev. HENRY WILLIAM YULE, B.C.L., B.D., Rector of Shipton-on-Cherwell and Vicar of Hampton Gay.

A
DICTIONARY
OF
CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY.
LITERATURE, SECTS, AND DOCTRINES.

N

NAAMANES, a chief of the Scenite Arabs, son of the chief Alamundarus. His life was spared by the emperor Maurice, and he eventually became a Christian. (Evag. *H. E.* vi. 2, 22.) [C. H.]

NAAMATUS, Nov. 17, twenty-fifth bishop of Vienne, who died A.D. 567 in his 73rd year. An ancient metrical account of him is quoted in the *Gallia Christiana*, xvi. 26. [C. H.]

NAASSENES. [See OPHITES.]

NABOR (1), a saint honoured with St. Felix at Milan (Ambros. *Ep.* 22). He is believed to have been martyred there in 304 (Boll. *Acta SS.* 12 Jul. iii. 291; Tillem. ii. 79, v. 267). See also for this and others of the same name, Alcuin, *Carm.* 104; *Gall. Chr.* xiii. 709; and *D. C. A.* NABOR. [C. H.]

NABOR (2), Donatist bishop of Centuriones, a place of unknown site in Numidia (Böcking, *Not. Dig. Occ.* p. 644), present at the council of Cirta A.D. 305. (Opt. i. 14; Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 30.) [H. W. P.]

NACHLAN, saint. [NATHALAN.]

NAILTRIM, saint in Kidwelly, co. Carmarthen, in the time of St. David: in the Latin *Life of St. David* his name is Maitrun (Rees, *Camb. Brit. SS.* 123, 406). [J. G.]

NAINNIDH (NENNIDIUS), son of Eochaidh of the race of Niall of the nine hostages by Ligach Bredmainech, was bishop of Kiltoom, co. Westmeath. His feast is Nov. 13 (*M. Don.*; Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 172–3). There are also Nainnidh of Cruach, April 21, Nainnidh of Cluain h-Uinnsenn, June 2, and Nainnidh of Inis Cais, Oct. 12 (*M. Don.* 107, 143, 275; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4 ser. iii. 47 sq.) [J. G.]

NAITAN, king of the Picts. [NECTAN (2).]

NAMAEA, a female correspondent of Chrysostom's, who wrote her a playful letter from Cucusus in 405. (Chrys. *Ep.* 47.) [E. V.]

NAMATIUS (1), Oct. 27, ninth bishop of Clermont in Auvergne, 446–462. He built the cathedral church, the dimensions and architectural details of which, rather fully given by Gregory of Tours, are of considerable interest. He was married, and his wife built another church in the suburbs in honour of St. Stephen, but in course of time it was called after St. Eutropius. (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* ii. 16, 17, 21; *Glor. Mart.* cap. 44; Savaron, *Orig. de Clairm.* pp. 48, 353, ed. 1662; *Gall. Chr.* ii. 230; Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. xii. 254; Tillem. v. 316, xv. 36, 409.) [S. A. B.]

NAMATIUS (2) (NAMACIUS), addressed, along with his wife Ceraunia, in a consolatory letter by Ruricius bishop of Limoges, whose son was married to a daughter of Namatius. (Rur. lib. ii. epp. 2, 3, 4, 5, 61, in *Pat. Lat.* lviii.; Tillem. xvi. 270; Ceill. x. 608.) [NAMMATIUS.] [C. H.]

NAMATIUS (3), nineteenth bishop of Orleans, present at the first and second councils of Mâcon in 581 and 585 (Mansi, ix. 936, 957). He was sent by king Guntram on an embassy to the Bretons, and on his return journey died in 587 (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* ix. 18; *Gall. Chr.* viii. 1415). [C. H.]

NAMFASIUS, Nov. 21, a hermit of Marcillac, Aveyron, cir. 800 (Mabill. *AA. SS. O. S. B.* Saec. iii. 2, p. 405 ed. 1734). [C. H.]

NAMMASIUS, an advocate who pleaded the cause of the party of Primian against the Maximianists before the proconsul of Africa, A.D. 394 (vol. ii. 475; Aug. *c. Cresc.* iv. 4, 5). [H. W. P.]

NAMMATIUS (NAMATIUS), celebrated in Gaul for his eloquence, and addressed in 471 by

Sidonius Apollinaris, who sent him the works of Varro and the *Chronicle* of Eusebius. He may have been the Namatius addressed by Ruricius. (Sidon. lib. viii. ep. 6 and *note*, in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 593; Ceill. x. 393; Tillem. xvi. 269, 270.) [NAMATIUS (1).] [C. H.]

NAMPHAMO (or NAMPHANIO, *Mart. Rom.* Jul. 4). He with his companions, Lucitas, Mygdon or Miggin, and Samae or Saname, were apparently the first martyrs who suffered in Africa, and therefore, according to Aubé, suffered under the proconsul Saturninus, A.D. 180, who, as Tertullian states, first attacked the Christians. Namphamo enjoyed the local title of archimartyr. He is only known to us by the correspondence between Maximus of Madaura and St. Augustine (cf. August. *Opp.* t. ii., *Epp.* 16 and 17). From this correspondence we conclude that these martyrs were of Punic blood and not Roman colonists. Augustine expounds the name Namphamo as a Punic one. See SCILLITAN MARTYRS for other authorities. [G. T. S.]

NAMPULUS, Numidian bishop addressed by Cyp. *Ep.* 62, and in synodical letter (*Ep.* 70) of *Syn. Carth. de Bap.* i. The name is thoroughly African, as evinced by inscriptions. [E. W. B.]

NANNANUS, mentioned by Giraldus Cambrensis as an ancient saint in Connaught, who in a plague of fleas expelled the insects from the locality "per excommunicationem et imprecationem suam." (Girald. Camb. *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, distinct. i. cap. 53, *Topographia Hibernica*, dist. ii. cap. 31 in *Works*, ii. 160, v. 119, ed. Dimock, 1867.) [J. G.]

NANNIDIUS or NANNIUS. [NENNIUS.]

NANNYD LAMDERE, Irish saint, "vir sanctus et virtutibus plenus," A.D. 540. (Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c. 18, wks. vi. 473, 590.) [NINNIDH (1).] [J. G.]

NANTECHILDIS (NANDECHILDIS, NANTHILDIS, NANTILDIS), wife of Dagobert I. and mother of Clovis II., kings of the Franks. Notices of her occur in Fredegarius (*Pat. Lat.* lxxi.) and in the following authorities contained in Bouquet, t. iii., Aimoin, *Chron. S. Denys*, *Chron. Marcianense*, Hermannus Contractus, Hucbald's *Life of St. Rictrude.* She was married to Dagobert at Paris in 628, the year he became sole king of the Franks, Dagobert deserting queen Gomatrudis in the villa Romiliacum (Reuilly, now a suburb of Paris) where he had married her, and taking Nantechildis, "unam ex puellis de ministerio," as Fredegar (p. 635 where see note) describes her, or "quandam puellam a monasterio raptam," as Aimoin puts it after a corrupt reading (Bouq. 127 D and note). Aimoin here says Dagobert forsook Gomatrudis on account of her sterility. Fredegar (637) blames Dagobert's luxuriousness in having three queens, Nantechildis, Wlfegundis, Berchildis, besides numerous concubines. In 630 her brother Landegiselus died and was buried at St. Denys's (*Chr. S. Den.*, Bouq. 292 D). In 633, Dagobert's 12th year, she became the mother of Clovis II. (Fred. 648). She is mentioned in a diploma of Dagobert I. in 633 (Breq. num. 261). In 637 she stood sponsor for Eusebia [EUSEBIA (7)] daughter of duke Adalbald and Rictrude (*Chron. Marcianense* and Hucbald's *Life of Rictrude*, Bouq. 523 B, 538 B). Early in 638 Nantechildis and her son Clovis were committed by Dagobert, shortly before his death, to the guardianship of his minister Aega or Aeganes (Fred. 651; Aimoin, Bou. 134 C; *Chr. S. Den.*, Bou. 298 E). At the accession of Clovis II. to the throne of Neustria and Burgundy the government was in the hands of Nantechildis in conjunction with Aega as mayor of the palace (Fred. 651; Aimoin, *Chr. S. Den.*, Herm., in Bouq. 135 D, 301 B, 328 C). The *Chr. S. Den.* makes Nantechildis then residing at Venete (Vannes). In 638 she and Clovis received at Compiègne the Austrasian nobility sent from Metz by king Sigebert, headed by Chunibert archbishop of Cologne and the Austrasian mayor Pippin, when by the advice of Aega the treasure of Dagobert there stored was divided equally between the two brothers Sigebert and Clovis, Nantechildis having reserved for her one-third of what was amassed by Dagobert after his marriage with her (Fred. 655; Aimoin and *Chr. S. Den.*, Bouq. 136 A B, 301 C). In 638 she subscribed a diploma of Clovis II. to the monastery of St. Maur-des-Fossés (Bouq. iv. 634 A; Brequigny, *Diplomata*, ed. Pardessus, vol. ii. num. 291). In 640, after Aega's death, she had his son-in-law Ermenfred [ERMENFREDUS (1)] heavily mulcted for the murder of count Aenulph (Fred. 654). The same year, according to Brequigny's date, she subscribed a praeceptum of Clovis II. to the monastery of St. Denys (Breq. num. 294; Bouq. iv. 638 A undated). Her name occurs in a spurious charter of Blidegisillus assigned to 640 (Breq. num. 293). In 641 she accompanied Clovis from Orleans to the capital of Burgundy (so the passage of Aimoin reads in Bouquet, "Aurelianis caput regni Burgundiae petiit," and Fredeg. 658 similarly), where she received the bishops and nobility of that kingdom, who came to make their submission to her son, with marked consideration, appointing Flaucatus, to whom she gave her niece Ragneberta in marriage, mayor of the palace for Burgundy (Aimoin and *Chr. S. Den.*, Bouq. 136 E, 301 E). The *Chr. S. Den.* here cited places the event at Orleans. She died in 641 (Fred. 659), after bequeathing many rich legacies to various churches, including that of St. Denys (*Chr. S. Den.*, Bouq. 302 A), where she was interred with Dagobert. (Aimoin and *Chr. S. Den.*, Bouq. 137 B, 302 A; *Diploma* of Landeric, Breq. num. 320; *Diploma* of Clovis II., Breq. num. 322, and *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 1198 A.) [C. H.]

NANTHARIUS (1) I., seventh abbat of St. Bertin, cir. 744–754. In this monastery during his rule, Childeric III., the last of the Merovingian kings, was immured, A.D. 752, and died the same year (Laplane, *Les Abbés de Saint-Bertin*, i. 29; *Gall. Chr.* iii. 487). For a deed of gift to the monastery during his abbacy and dated July 25, 745, see *Pat. Lat* cxxxvi. 1187. [S. A. B.]

NANTHARIUS (2) II., eleventh abbat of St. Bertin, cir. 804–820. In 808 or 809 the

emperor Charles sent him and another abbat to Britain in company with the papal legate, with a view to procure the reinstatement of Eardulph the exiled king of the Northumbrians (Einard, *Annales*. ap. Pertz, *Script.* i. 195; Bouquet, v. 57, 255, 355). He was probably the abbat Nantharius present at the council of Noyon in 815. (Mansi, xiv. 142; Laplane, *Les Abbés de Saint-Bertin*, i. 43; *Gall. Chr.* iii. 488.)

[S. A. B.]

NANTINUS, count of Angoulême, cir. 578, who robbed the church, quarrelled with Heraclius the bishop, was excommunicated, and perished in an epidemic (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* v. 37).

[C. H.]

NARCISSUS (1), bishop of Jerusalem, at the close of the 2nd century. Clinton (*Fasti Romani*) accepts the date A.D. 190 for the commencement of his episcopate. He was the 15th of the Gentile bishops of Jerusalem, reckoning from Marcus A.D. 136, πεντεκαιδεκάτην ἄγων διαδοχήν, and the 30th in succession from the Apostles, τριακοστὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἑξῆς διαδοχήν (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 12). According to the *Synodicon*, Narcissus presided over a council of 14 bishops of Palestine held at Jerusalem A.D. 198, on the Paschal controversy, and took part in that held at Caesarea on the same subject under the presidency of Theophilus, bishop of the city (Labbe, *Concil.* i. 600). Eusebius speaks of the synodical letter of these bishops as still extant in his time (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23). Narcissus occupied a conspicuous position in the church of his day, standing forth "as one of the more prominent heroes of those early times" (Neale, *Patriarch. of Antioch*, p. 34). ὁ παρὰ πολλοῖς εἰσέτι νῦν βεβοημένος (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 12). Eusebius records a miracle traditionally ascribed to him among many others (πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα παράδοξα), to the effect that one Easter Eve, the oil for the lamps required for the great illumination usual at that festival having failed, and the people being grievously disheartened at so unfavourable an omen, Narcissus commanded the deacons to draw water and bring it to him, and after he had prayed over it, to pour it, with hearty faith, into the lamps, on which it was converted into oil. A small portion of this miraculously produced oil, Eusebius tells us, was preserved among the treasures of the church in his own day (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 9). The rigid sanctity and holy consistency of Narcissus raised against him a band of slanderers among those who, conscious of their own evil life, dreaded conviction and punishment. He was accused of some heinous crime—probably a sin of impurity—and three witnesses came forward to substantiate the charge. Finding the people incredulous, they imprecated on themselves terrible curses if their accusation was not true—one, that he might be burnt alive; another, that he might become leprous; the third, that he might be struck with blindness. But not even so were they able to convince their hearers of the truth of their story. Narcissus, however, stung by the calumny, and fearing that his influence for good would be destroyed by a charge, which some would be certainly found to give credence to, abdicated his bishopric, and retired to the remotest part of the desert, where for several years he lived the ascetic life, τὸν φιλόσοφον βίον, which he had long coveted, no one knowing the place of his concealment.

Having been sought for in vain, the neighbouring bishops declared the see vacant, and ordained Dius as his successor [DIUS]. Dius was succeeded by Germanicus, and he by Gordius. During the episcopate of the last named, Narcissus reappeared, as it were rising from the dead, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀναβιώσεως ἀναφανείς. Shortly after his disappearance the falsity of the charges brought against him, Eusebius tells us, had been proved by the curses imprecated by the false accusers having been fearfully made good. This having eventually reached Narcissus's ears probably induced him to return to his see, the oversight of which he at once resumed at the earnest request of all. [GORDIUS.] (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 9, 10.) We are not told what became of Gordius. In the second year of Caracalla, A.D. 212 (Euseb. *Chronicon*), Alexander, a Cappadocian bishop, a confessor in the persecution of Severus, visiting the holy city in fulfilment of a vow, was selected by the aged prelate as his coadjutor and eventual successor. Eusebius records the tradition that this was done in obedience to a nocturnal vision vouchsafed first to Narcissus himself, and afterwards to the leading members of the church. Eusebius preserves a fragment of a letter written by Alexander to the people of Antinous, in which he associates Narcissus with himself in beseeching them to be of one mind. In this letter he speaks of Narcissus as being then in his hundred and sixteenth year, and as having virtually retired from his episcopal office. [ALEXANDER.] (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 11.) Epiphanus states that he survived ten years after Alexander became his coadjutor, to the reign of Alexander Severus A.D. 222 (Epiph. *Haer.* lxvi. 20). This, however, is very improbable. Nicephorus calls him a martyr (*H. E.* iv. 19), but the authority of the martyrologies, which commemorate him, October 29th, without any such designation, negatives this. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* iii. 177 ff.)

[E. V.]

NARCISSUS (2), Mar. 18, bishop and martyr. He was born in the East, preached the gospel in Rhaetia; converted S. Afra from a life of sin at Augsburg, and then departing to Spain, taught there with great success. He suffered with his deacon Felix, an African, in the Diocletian persecution. (*AA. SS.* Boll. Mar. ii. 621.) For other martyrs see NARCISSUS in *D. C. A.*

[G. T. S.]

NARCISSUS (3), bishop of Neronias (Irenopolis) in Cilicia (Le Quien, ii. 898). In and about 314 he attended the councils of Ancyra and Neocaesarea (Mansi, ii. 534, 549). He was of the party of Arius before the council of Nicaea in 325 (Athan. *De Syn.* § 17). He attended the council of Nicaea (Mansi, ii. 694, 699, 818; Theod. *H. E.* i. 7) and professed the Catholic doctrine (Nicet. Chon. *Thes. Orth. Fid.* v. 7). In 332 he was one of the bishops at Antioch who put forward Eusebius of Caesarea for that see (Euseb. *V. C.* iii. 62). In 335 he must have been one of the eminent Cilician bishops at the Jerusalem dedication (Eus. *V. C.* iv. 43). In 341 he was at the dedication council of Antioch (Mansi, ii. 1308), and in 342 (Tillem. vi. 326, 759) was deputed, with bishops Theo-

dore of Heraclea, Maris of Chalcedon, Marcus of Arethusa, from the emperor Constantius to his brother Constans (Ath. *De Syn.* § 25; Soc. ii. 18; Soz. iii. 10). About the same time he and Flacillus bishop of Antioch conducted Eusebius Emesenus [EUSEBIUS (35)] to Emesa (Soc. ii. 9). In 342 (al. 341) he was one of the Eusebians addressed by pope Julius (Ath. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 20). In 343 he formed one of the Eusebian party at Philippopolis (Mansi, iii. 140; Hilar. *Frag.* ii. § 7, § 8, § 14 here called of Jeropolis, iii. § 29 here of Anapolis, in *Pat. Lat.* x. 637, 638, 642), and was deposed by the council of Sardica (Ath. *Hist. Ar.* § § 17, 28, *Ap. c. Ar.* § 36, *Ep. ad Episc.* § 7). Athanasius, writing cir. 350, calls him one of the then prominent Eusebians (*Ap. c. Ar.* § 48). In 351 he was one of the authors of the Sirmian creed (Hilar. *Frag.* vi. § 7 in *Pat. Lat.* x. 692; Tillem. vi. 351; Hefel. *Counc.* ii. 193). In 356 (Tillem. vi. 394) he was one of the synod of Antioch which ordained George bishop of Alexandria (Soz. iv. 8 and note of Vales.; Mansi, iii. 23). Athanasius, writing in 357 or 358, hears that Narcissus is charging him with cowardice for his flight (*Ap. de Fug.* § 1 init.), and declares (§ 28) that Narcissus has been accused of many offences, has been degraded three times by various synods, and is the wickedest of all the Eusebian party. In 358 Narcissus complains to Constantius of Basil of Ancyra. (Philostorg. iv. 10; Tillem. vi. 442.) [C. H.]

NARCISSUS, catholicos of Armenia. [NORSESES.]

NARDACIUS (Sulp. Sev. ii. 50), a bishop, and persecutor of the Priscillianists. [M. B. C.]

NARICUS, acolyte of Cyprian, sent by him from his retirement with a second relief for sufferers by Decian persecution. (Cyp. *Ep.* vii.) [E. W. B.]

NARSES (1), martyr. [LAZARUS (3).]

NARSES (2) (BARDA, BARSA), bishop of Edessa, occurs as Narses among the eastern bishops who addressed a letter to the Italians and Gauls, A.D. 372 (Basil. *Opp.* iii. 263, Par. 1839; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iv. 446), but is better known as Barsa, friend and correspondent of St. Basil of Caesarea, who has left two letters written to Barsa in A.D. 377 (Basil. *Opp.* iii. 590, 599, *Epp.* nos. 264 or 326, 267 or 327). [J. G.]

NARSES (3), an adherent of Gratian, for whom St. Martin interceded with the successful Maximus at the same time that he pleaded for the condemned Priscillianists, A.D. 385 [MAXIMUS (2)]. (Sulp. Sev. *Dial.* iii. 11 in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* xx. 218 [MARTINUS (1)].) [G. T. S.]

NARSES (4), priest, syncellus of Eutyches, was called as witness against Eutyches in the 6th session of the council at Constantinople, Nov. 20, A.D. 448, but there is no account of his testimony: the minutes were read at the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon (Binius, *Conc. Gen.* ii. 86; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 672). [J. G.]

NARSES (5), twenty-fifth catholicus of the Chaldaeans (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 1116), succeeded Silas but was opposed by Elisaeus. The schism continued twelve or fifteen years till Narses's death, A.D. 535, when Elisaeus also was deposed. (Greg. Barhebr. *Chron.* ii. 82 in Assem. *B. O.* ii. 409, iii. 166, 614–5.) [J. G.]

NARSES (6), bishop of Ascalon, commended in a poem of Sophronius patriarch of Jerusalem (carm. xvii. in *Pat. Gr.* lxxxvii. 3801; Ceill. xi. 709). [C. H.]

NARSES (7), the eunuch, sent, in A.D. 551, to take the command against the Goths in Italy, where he had previously served under Belisarius. For a short account of his successes in Italy, see JUSTINIANUS I., Vol. III. 542, and for a detailed account of his career, see NARSES, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*. He took part in the ceremony at St. Peter's, when pope Pelagius cleared himself of the charge of being implicated in the death of his predecessor (Anastas. *Vita Pelagii*). Pelagius subsequently asked him to assist his legates in their proceedings against certain schismatic bishops, and more than once requested him to arrest and send the bishops of Milan and Aquileia [PAULINUS ( )] in custody to the emperor, and to use force against the other bishops of Northern Italy and Istria, who refused to accept the fifth general Council. Apparently the only consequence of these exhortations was the excommunication of Narses himself, by the schismatics. (Pelagii *Epp.* 1–4, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxix. 393–397.) In A.D. 567 he was superseded by Longinus in consequence of the complaints of the oppressiveness of his administration, and he is accused of having, in revenge, invited the Lombards into Italy. According to the well-known story, the empress Sophia said she would charge him with parcelling out the wool for spinning to the women of the palace, to which Narses replied that he would spin her such a thread as would last her her lifetime (Paulus Diac. ii. 5). At any rate, he retired to Naples, from which he was induced in A.D. 568, by the entreaties of pope John III. to return with him to Rome, where he died soon afterwards (Anastas. *Vita Joannis III.*). [F. D.]

NARSES (8), patrician, sometimes confounded with the preceding, is addressed in several letters by Gregory the Great. The first (i. 6) is written immediately after his election, which he regrets; in the second (iv. 32), from which it appears that Narses was then in bad health, and the third (vi. 14) he refers to the case of the priest JOANNES (471); and in the last he also decides that Athanasius, a priest, had fallen into Manichaeism, and makes some remarks on the Pelagian heresy. Though a fourth letter (vii. 30) is addressed "Narsae religioso," he appears to be the same as the person to whom the other three are written, as a number of persons to whom Gregory sends salutations in the first letter are again mentioned. In this letter Gregory endeavours to console him under the misfortunes and calumnies from which he is suffering, and commends to him the deacon Anatolius, whom he is sending to Constantinople. He may perhaps be the same as the Narses, the famous general of the emperor Maurice (Theoph. Sim. v.), on whose fall, in A.D. 602, he rebelled against Phocas, occupied Edessa, and incited the Persians to declare war. Two years afterwards, he surrendered to one of the generals of Phocas, on condition that his life should be spared, but

Phocas, in violation of the promise, burnt him alive. (Theophanes, *Chron.* 245, 6, in Migne, *Patr. Graec.* cviii. 616.) [F. D.]

NASAD (NASADH, NASSADIUS, NAZADIUS), a Briton at Lough Bricren, co. Down, companion of St. Bevan and St. Meldan; he was commemorated Oct. 26. (*Mart. Tall.*; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 113, 380; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 90, n. [19]; Boll. *Acta SS.* 26 Oct. xi. 893, where is a sylloge on the three saints of Lough Bricren, but nothing decisive; *Ib.* 21 Oct. xii. 413, 414.) [J. G.]

NASARAEI. Under this title Epiphanius classes two distinct sects; one Jewish, the other Christian. The Jewish sect is numbered by him with the Pharisees, Essenes, and Herodians. He calls it the fifth heresy of Judaism. The Christian sect is placed by him next after the Cerinthians and before the Ebionites, and is numbered the ninth heresy of Christianity.

Epiphanius spells the names of these sects differently. The Jewish he names Νασαραῖοι, the Christian Ναζωραῖοι. (1) Nasaraei (Νασαραῖοι) then was, according to Epiphanius, a purely Jewish heresy. They dwelt in the region across the Jordan. They practised circumcision, and reverenced the feasts and sabbaths of the Jews. They rejected, however, animal food and sacrifices, and regarded the Pentateuch as a forgery. Epiphanius vindicates the historical accuracy of the Pentateuch by pointing to the localities where the events there recorded took place; Mount Sion, for instance, where Abraham had sacrificed the ram; and the oak of Mamre, where he had entertained the angels. Mamre, indeed, down to the 4th century, continued to be a place of pilgrimage at certain times, whither Jews, Pagans, and Christians resorted, and had a kind of fair, like the great Tara or Telltown assemblies among the ancient Irish, or the great autumnal meetings at Lyons of the ancient Gauls. The abuses of it became so great that Constantine abolished it by an edict (Sozom. *H. E.* ii. 4). Epiphanius points out also other corroborations of the Pentateuch. The Egyptians retained traces and memories of the passover in the red paint which they marked in spring on trees and cattle. In the region of the Cardyaei relics of the ark were still shown, and he was sure the remains of the altar built by Noah could be discovered by the diligent enquirer in the same region. Philaster, on the contrary, represents the Nasaraei as quite orthodox about the scriptures, but as trusting in the luxuriance of their hair for salvation (*lib. de Haeres.* cap. viii.).

(2) Nazoraei (Ναζωραῖοι). Epiphanius occupies a large part of his notice of the Christian sect with a discussion concerning the descent of our Lord from David, and the fulfilment of the prophecies involved in Ps. cx. 4 and cxxxii. 11. His theory is that the Christians were at first called Jessaei, from Jesse, the father of David, or from the name Jesus, under which name Jessaei, he thinks, he discovers mention of them in the writings of Philo on the Egyptian Therapeutae. Epiph. accepts these writings as authentic, a view which some modern critics reject (cf. *Rev. Archeol.* t. xxii. p. 268, t. xxvi. p. 12), regarding them as a Montanist or Gnostic production of the 2nd century. The Christian Nazoraei were the followers of those earliest Christian Jews who observed the law and believed in Christ. Epiphanius seems not to have been very well acquainted with them. They were scattered throughout Coele-Syria, Decapolis, Pella, whither they fled to avoid the destruction of Jerusalem, the region beyond the Jordan, and as far east as Mesopotamia. He was uncertain as to the view they took of Christ's person, whether they regarded him as a mere man or believed in his supernatural conception. They were well skilled in Hebrew, read the Old Testament in that language, and possessed a Hebrew version of St. Matthew; but Epiphanius knew not whether it contained the genealogies. They carefully observed circumcision and the Sabbath. They were known to other writers of that age. Augustine (lib. i. *Cont. Cresconium*, cap. xxxi.) mentions a Nazarene sect, by some called Symmachiani, who used both Jewish circumcision and Christian baptism. Jerome seems to have been better acquainted with them than anyone else. Writing to Augustine, he tells him that they were universally execrated by the Jews under the name MINEI. When commenting on Matt. xii. he gives the renderings of the Gospel which the Nazarenes use, which he had lately translated out of Hebrew into Greek; and tells us when treating of St. Matthew in his *Scriptt. Eccles.* that this Hebrew version of St. Matthew was preserved in the library at Caesarea. (On this point see more in GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL, Vol. II. p. 709, and Dr. Salmon's *Introd. to the New Test.* p. 215.) There were many points of contact between this sect and other branches of the Ebionite and Gnostic heresies. Epiphanius, indeed, expressly asserts that the Cerinthians, Nazarenes, Ebionites, Sampsaeans and Elcesaeans agreed on many points. They seem all to have delighted in the same localities—Syria, the Hauran, and Mesopotamia. Traces of them have been discovered in the Hauran. Waddington discovered at Zorava in Trachonitis, a monument commemorating a saint, Μαρθίνη, whom the Sampsaeans worshipped. (*Voy. Archéolog.* t. iii. Ins. 2502.) The Nazoraei still exist, and under the same name, though they prefer in public the name Sabians. They now live in the marshes of Southern Babylonia, in the neighbourhood of Bussorah, where they have been visited by several modern travellers. The latest accounts of them and their doctrines will be found in Petermann, *Reisen im Orient*, t. ii. p. 447; Kessler's article in Herzog *s.v.* Mandaer; an article by the same writer in the new *Encyclop. Britann.* t. xv. p. 467, on the Mandaeans; and in Siouffi, *Études sur la religion des Soubbus*, Paris, 1880; cf. also Chwolson's *Die Sabier.* Their doctrines are now practically identical with those of the ancient Manicheans [MANES]. They retain, however, traces of the sacraments in the religious use of bread and wine and of baptism. Their sacred books are interesting relics of Gnosticism. They were published by Norbey in the early part of this century, under the title of *Codex Nasaraeus.* A critical edition is much required. See also Dr. Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 22, for his theory about the Ebionite communities which were identical with the Nazarenes of whom Epiphanius speaks; cf. also Bishop Lightfoot's *Galatians*, p. 306. [NAZARAEI.]

[G. T. S.]

NASAS, a Sicilian Jew, who in 593 had erected an altar in the name of the prophet Elijah, and seduced many Christians to worship at it. He had also purchased several Christian slaves. (Greg. Mag. lib. iii. ind. xi. ep. 38 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxvii.; Jaffé, *R. P.* num. 878.) [C. H.]

NATALIA, Dec. 1, wife of the martyr Hadrianus, who suffered at Nicomedia in the Diocletian persecution (Boll. *Acta SS.* 8 Sept. iii. 209; Adon. *Mart.* Sep. 8). She ministered to the martyrs in prison clad in male attire, and after their passion departed to Byzantium, where she died in peace. [G. T. S.]

NATALIS (1), CAECILIUS. [MINUCIUS FELIX, p. 924.]

NATALIS (2), of Oëa (Oea; Oeensis civitas Offenses Tac. *Hist.* 4, 50, corrected by Lipsius, *hod. Trablus, Tripoli*), the famous colonia on coast near Leptis in Prov. Tripol. (*suffr.* 83. in *Syn. Carth.* sub Cyp. vii.) [E. W. B.]

NATALIS (3) (NATTAL), abbat of Kilmanagh, co. Kilkenny; commemorated July 31. He is chiefly known in connection with his pupil St. Senan, in whose metrical Life he is called Natalus celebris (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 170). He belongs to the 6th century, but his tradition is undecided as to exact date or identity (Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. c. 9, § 4; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 450 sq. iii. 222; Joyce, *Ir. Names of Places*, 139–40, 3rd ed.). Giraldus Cambr. (*Top. Hib.* dist. ii. c. 19) tells a curious story of the transformation of a man and woman in Ossory into wolves, "per imprecationem sancti cujusdam Natalis scilicet abbatis," that is, of Kilmanagh. (Conf. *Irish Nennius*, by Todd and Herbert, 204–5.) [J. G.]

NATALIS (4), bishop of Cesena, 590–614, mentioned in 603 by Gregory the Great (lib. xiv. ep. 6, in *P. L.* lxxvii.; Ughelli, ii. 445; Cappelletti, ii. 530, 554; Jaffé, 1538). [C. H.]

NATALIS (5), bishop of Salona, addressed in four letters of Gregory the Great (i. 19, 21; ii. 18, 52), and mentioned in others (i. 20; ii. 19, 20), which chiefly relate to his quarrel with HONORATUS (28). He was also charged with having uncanonically deposed and banished his suffragan FLORENTIUS (30), bishop of Epidaurus (*Epp.* iii. 8, 9; viii. 10). Natalis died about the end of A.D. 592 (*Epp.* iii. 22). [F. D.]

NATALIS (6), ST., bishop of Milan, c. 740. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 13 Mai. iii. 241; Ugh. iv. 70; Cappelletti, xi. 133, 302.) [C. H.]

NATALIUS, confessor at Rome, at the beginning of the third century. Our knowledge of him is derived from an extract given by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 28) from an anonymous 3rd-century work, which we have ascribed to Caius (vol. iii. p. 98, *b*). The story told is that Natalius allowed himself to be persuaded to undertake the office of bishop in the heretical sect of which THEODOTUS the banker was a leader, receiving in that capacity a 'salary' of 150 denarii, monthly; that our Lord did not wish one who had braved martyrdom for His sake to perish out of the church, and warned him in visions to return; but that when Natalius, blinded by ambition and by covetousness, gave no heed to the visions, angels were sent who scourged him severely for a whole night. Thereupon he rose early, put on sackcloth and ashes, and with strong supplications and tears besought Zephyrinus, the bishop, for restoration to communion; rolling at the feet not only of the clergy, but of the laity, and showing the weals of the stripes he had received. Thus, with great difficulty, he obtained his pardon. [G. S.]

NATERAS. [NATHYRAS.]

NATHALAN (NACHLAN, NAUCHLAN, NETHALENUS, NETHELMUS, NOTHLAN), bp. and conf., Scotch saint, whose legend is given at Jan. 8 in *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. SS. p. hyem. f. 25), from which it is translated by Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 417. See O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 128; Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 504, ascribing to him certain writings now lost. He is said to have been born in the parish of Tullicht on Deeside, devoted himself early and entirely to religion, been made bishop in Rome by the pope, and returned to the north of Scotland, where he built churches, of which he was afterwards the patron. He died at Tullicht, A.D. 452, according to King (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 141). But it is supposed by Skene (*Celt. Scot.* ii. 170) and Bp. Forbes that Nathalan is the same as Nechtan abbat of Dun-Geimhin or Dungiven, co. Londonderry, who died A.D. 679 (*Ann. Tig.*). [J. G.]

NATHALIA, Aug. 27 (Us.) Jul. 27 (Baron). Martyr under the Arabs at Cordova in Spain. His relics were found in that country by Usuard when he was collecting materials for his martyrology. (Ceill. xii. 611.) [G. T. S.]

NATHANAEL, a solitary of Nitria, whose history is told us by Palladius in his *Historia Lausiaca*, cap. 18 (cf. Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. col. 1107). He entered the desert as a monk about the year 338, and continued there till his death about A.D. 376, some fifteen years before Palladius came to Nitria. Nathanael adopted the anchorite life, but, like the rest of the monks, fancied that he was specially pursued by a demon. His enemy wished to drive him from cell to cell. At the beginning of his monastic career, the demon rendered him so uncomfortable in his first cell that he moved to another. In his second cell the devil appeared again to him, mocking him, and saying that he would drive him from this cell too. Nathanael at once perceived that he had made a capital mistake in yielding a step to his opponent; so he at once returned to his original abode, which he never again left for the space of thirty-seven years. In fact some of these solitaries never left their cells even to receive the Holy Communion. Thus Sophronius tells us of St. Mary, an Egyptian recluse, who never received the Holy Communion for forty-seven years, during which period she had lived in the Egyptian desert (cf. Bingham's *Antiquities*, lib. xv. cap. v.; Card. Bon. *Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. cap. xviii. n. ii.). Nathanael's demon ceased to trouble him for the last nine months of his life after he failed in the following attempt. He assumed the appearance of a young boy of twelve driving an ass laden with bread. He caused the ass to

fall, towards eventide, just outside Nathanael's cell, whose ears he at once assailed with the most lamentable cries for assistance, saying, "Father Nathanael, have pity on me, and stretch forth a hand to help." The monk opened his door, and surveyed the scene; asked who the suppliant was, and was told that he was servant to another monk. He urged too that his master was celebrating an agape or love feast, and that the next day being the Sabbath, oblations would be required, wherefore he asked help to raise the fallen load of bread. The boy appealed to his compassion also; wild beasts were about, and if he left him unassisted, the hyenas will devour him. The poor recluse was in a difficulty. He pondered for a while, reflecting upon the various tricks the demon had played upon him. Then he said, "Listen, boy, I worship God, whose rule is over all. If you really want help He will send it without causing me to break my vow; and He will not permit hyenas or anything else to hurt you. But if you are a tempter God will reveal you," and he shut his door. Whereupon the demon with a howl was resolved into a whirlwind, and Nathanael was left to die in peace. [G. T. S.]

NATHANIEL ( ) (NATHANAEL), the sixth reputed abbat of St. Augustine's, Canterbury (*Mon. Angl.* i. 120; Elmham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 4, 184, 199–201; Thorn, ap. Twysden, cc. 1768, 1769, 2232). According to the history of St. Augustine's, whether legendary or fictitious, Nathaniel was one of the Roman missionaries who accompanied Justus and Mellitus to England; was elected abbat by the brethren on the death of Petronius in 654, after obtaining a licence of election from Ercombert, king of Kent; he was then blessed by archbishop Deusdedit, and held his office until the year 667, when he died. The exact place of his burial was unknown. Nathaniel is not mentioned by Bede, as he probably would have been, if he had known of his existence, in connexion with the history of Benedict Biscop and abbat Adrian. The detailed circumstances of the licence and election, probably drawn by Elmham from the usage of his own time, are not mentioned by the earlier writer. [S.]

NATHCHAEIMHE (NATHCHAOIMHE, NATCAEIMHE, NACOEMIUS, NAITCHAINN, NATHCHEIMHE, NATHCOMEUS, MOCHOEMA, MOCHOEMIUS), abbat of Terryglass, co. Tipperary, was son of Coemioga of the Dal Messincorb, and Caemell of the Hy Lugair. His feast is May 1, and he died A.D. 588. (*Ann. Tig.*; *M. Doneg.* 117 et al.; *Four Mast.* by O'Don. A.D. 584.) [J. G.]

NATHI (NATHIAS, NATHINEUS, NATHYUS, DATHI, DATHYUS, DAVID), surnamed Conrach and Cruimther, one of the most famous saints of Connaught, yet the details of his life are obscure. He is said to have received Achonry, co. Sligo, from St. Finnian of Clonard about A.D. 530, to have been a contemporary of St. Attracta, and to have educated, and perhaps instituted, St. Fechin at Fore, but this is doubtful. In the Kalendars and old Lives he is always called cruimther or priest; but Ware and later writers call him first bishop of Achonry, Luigny, or Leyney (Cotton, *Fast.* iv. 97–8; Gams, *Ser. Ep.* 204), a see joined to Killala in the 17th century. His feast is Aug. 9, and he flourished in the second half of the 6th century. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 140, 396; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* ii. 190; iii. 39; Ussher, wks. vi. 538, 600.) [J. G.]

NATHYRAS (NATORAS, NETRAS), bishop of Pharan. He was previously a monk of Sinai and a disciple of Silvanus, the superior of the Anchorites of Sinai. He exercised greater austerities as a bishop than as a monk, on the ground of the greater danger of his position. (Rosweyd. *Vit. Patt.* v. 10; Coteler. *Eccl. Graec. Monum.* i. 579; Tillem. *Mém.* x. 453, xiv. 191; Le Quien, iii. 748.) [G. T. S.]

NAUCELION, a person to whom Alypius and Augustine wrote A.D. 402 in reply to a statement made by Clarentius, probably the Donatist bishop of Tabraca (*Carth. Coll.* i. 187), to the effect that Felicianus of Musti was condemned in his absence by the original Donatist party, but, having cleared himself from blame, was afterwards received by them. To which they replied that if he was innocent he ought not to have been condemned, but if guilty, he ought not to have been received afterwards. Maximian had been condemned at the same time by the Donatists, yet they did not re-baptize Maximianists who came over to them. (Aug. *Ep.* 70.) [FELICIANUS (4).] [H. W. P.]

NAUCHLAN, saint. [NATHALAN.]

NAUCRATIUS (1), the brother, next in age, of Basil the Great. He was born c. 330 A.D., and was the only one of the four sons who did not take holy orders. According to his brother Gregory's account he was equally remarkable for mental and physical endowments. His beauty of person, strength and agility of body, were thrown into the shade by his intellectual gifts and eloquence (Greg. Nyss. *de Vit. S. Macr.* ii. 182). At the age of two-and-twenty, after having given a public proof of his rhetorical powers, which had called forth the applause of a crowded theatre, under a strong conviction of the vanity of all earthly honours and pleasures, he retired from the world (θείᾳ τινὶ προμηθείᾳ), accompanied by a single servant, Chrysaphius, leaving all his property behind him, and settled on the wooded slope of a hill above the river Iris, three days' journey from the monastery of his sister Macrina, which was also his mother's abode. Here he gathered about him a little handful of sick and destitute old men, whom he tended lovingly in their sickness, and supported by the produce of the chase, of which he was passionately fond. He proved himself at the same time a dutiful son, fulfilling his mother's desires with a glad and ready will. After about five years spent in this manner, he and his servant Chrysaphius lost their lives by an accident in hunting, c. 357. (Greg. Nyssen, *Vit. S. Macrinae*, ii. 182–183.) [E. V.]

NAUCRATIUS (2), addressed by Nilus (lib. i. epp. 259–263, in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix.). [C. H.]

NAUSTIANUS, bishop of Dumium and Braga, and a writer under the Moorish domination in Spain, A.D. 790–830. (H. Florez, *España Sagrada*, xv. 170.) [G. T. S.]

NAVATUS (NOVATUS), bishop of Sitifa or Sitifis, an important town and colony of Maure-

tania (*Setif*), Ant. *Itin.* 24. 7; Ptol. iv. 2. 24. Shaw, *Trav.* p. 52. He was present at the Conference, A.D. 411, about which time St. Augustine wrote to him, asking his forgiveness for not sending to him at his request his brother, a deacon named Lucillus, to serve in the diocese of Sitifi, as he was the only one that he had who could speak Latin. Navatus appears to have attended the council of Carthage, A.D. 419, and he may have been the same man as one of whom we hear in a letter from Augustine to Darius, A.D. 429, though Ruinart thinks that there were two bishops of Sitifi of the same name (Carth. *Coll.* i. 2. 143; Hardouin, *Conc.* i. 1249; Aug. *Ep.* 84, 229; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 283). [H. W. P.]

NAVIGIUS, brother of St. Augustine. He was one of the party assembled at the country-house of Verecundus in 386, and an interlocutor in the dialogues held there, *Contra Academicos, De Ordine, De Beata Vita.* He was present at Monnica's death at Ostia in 387, on which occasion his affectionate wish that his mother could have died in her own country met with her silent reproof. (Aug. *Conf.* ix. 11; *c. Acad.* lib. i. c. 2, § 5; *Beat. Vit.* cap. i. § 6, ii. §§ 7, 12, iii. §§ 19, 20; *Ord.* lib. i. cap. 3, § 7.) [H. W. P.]

NAVVIAS, a Saracen king at Damascus, who dedicated a basilica for his own people there, leaving the Christians the church of St. John Baptist, according to a work attributed to St. Jerome, but belonging to a period not earlier than the seventh century. (Hieron. *Loc. in Act. Apost.* in *Pat. Lat.* xxiii. 1298, 1300; Tillem. xii. 634.) [C. H.]

NAZARAEI. [NASARAEI.]

NAZARAEI, a name given by St. Gregory Nazianzen to the monks in allusion to the Nazarites of the old dispensation. (Greg. Naz. *Carm.* lib. I. sec. 2, in Migne's *Pat. Graec.* t. 37, col. 745.) [G. T. S.]

NAZARIUS (1), June 12, a soldier and martyr at Rome in the persecution of Diocletian with three others (*Mart. Rom.*, Adon.; Ceill. x. 527). [G. T. S.]

NAZARIUS (2), July 28, a martyr, whose body was found by St. Ambrose in a garden outside the city after the death of the emperor Theodosius in 395. He transported the body to the Basilica of the Apostles, which was near the Roman gate of Milan, and treated it after the manner of the bodies of Gervasius and Protasius [GERVASIUS (1)]. Paulinus tells us in his *Vita Ambrosii*, num. 32, which is the primary authority for this martyr's history, that he had there seen the body uncorrupted, and with hair fresh as if buried but a day or two. In the works of St. Ambrose (Migne, *P. L.* xvii. 715) there is a sermon, *Serm.* lv., falsely ascribed to him, on the natal day of Nazarius and Celsus. It is evidently of a later date, as it speaks of his martyrdom under Nero, whereas Paulinus tells us that no one knew when he suffered. The Bollandists have, however, devoted more than thirty pages to a recital of his perfectly fabulous acts (*AA. SS.* Boll. Jul. vi. 503–534.) Paulinus Nol. mentions him, *Poem.* xxvii., cf. Migne, *P. L.* lxi. 658. Ado, Usuard and *Mart. Vet. Rom.* confound him with another Nazarius, and celebrate his memory on June 12. (See also Tillem. ii. 75, 86, iv. 255, 586). [G. T. S.]

NAZARIUS (3), an abbat of Lérins in the 5th century. He is said to have been a disciple of St. Honoratus, afterwards bishop of Arles, and may have succeeded Faustus as abbat when the latter became bishop of Riez (circ. A.D. 462). According to old MSS. of the monastery he destroyed a shrine of Venus Impudica, situated on a little hill on the mainland called Arlucus (Arluc), and there founded the nunnery which is believed to have flourished till the invasion of the Saracens, who destroyed Lérins, in the time of St. Porcarius (circ. A.D. 730). He was succeeded by a Eucherius, and was commemorated at Lérins, Nov. 18 (Barralis Salerna, *Chronologia Lerinensis*, ii. 79–80). [S. A. B.]

NEACHTAIN (NECTANUS), of Cill-Uinche and Fennor on the Boyne, nephew of St. Patrick by Liemania, from whom he bore the name Mac-Leamhna. By Ussher (*Brit. Eccl. Ant.* vi. 382) he is called "Nechtain Episcopus," and Colgan follows him (*Acta SS.* 717–18). His feast is May 2. (*M. Doneg.*; *Four Mast.* by O'Don. i. 414, n. *.) [J. A.]

NEADIUS (Νεάδιος), a monk, addressed with others by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 77 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix.). [C. H.]

NEAMUS (Νεαμός) (Niceph. Call. *H.E.* xviii. 56 *fin.*), bishop of Jerusalem. [AMOS.] [C. H.]

NEARCHUS, a soldier in Armenia, by whom St. Polyeuctus was converted c. 251; martyred c. 260 (Boll. *Acta SS.* 13 Feb. ii. 652, 22 Apr. iii. 12; Tillem. iii. 425, 427). [C. H.]

NEBRIDIUS (1), husband of Olympias, the celebrated deaconess of Constantinople. At the time of his marriage, which Tillemont places towards the close of 384 A.D. (*Mémoires*, tom. xi. p. 419), he was young, but already high in official rank. In 382 and 383 A.D. he was count, or intendant of the imperial domain, and in 386 A.D. prefect of Constantinople (see for references *Cod. Theod.* tom. vi. p. 874, ed. Gothofred). He died within twenty months of his marriage (Pallad. p. 163), soon after June 29, A.D. 386. [E. V.]

NEBRIDIUS (2), a Roman statesman and prefect of Gaul, then of the East, in the later part of the 4th century. He married the sister of Aelia Flacilla the wife of Theodosius, and was well known to Jerome. (Jerome, *Ep.* lxxix. 1, ed. Vall.; Ammianus Marc. xxi. 5, xxvi. 7, xxix. 5.) [W. H. F.]

NEBRIDIUS (3), son of the foregoing, by a sister of the empress Flacilla, first wife of Theodosius the Great. His father had been an intimate friend of St. Jerome —"intima necessitudine copulatus"—(Hieron. *Ep.* 9). He was brought up by his aunt the empress—"materterae nutritus sinu"—in his uncle's palace—"nutritus in palatio"—as the companion and fellow pupil of his young cousins, the future emperors Honorius and Arcadius—"contubernalis et condiscipuslu Augustorum"—

"iisdem studiis eruditus" (*ib.*)—by whom he was much beloved. Jerome draws a charming picture of the young man's modesty, humility, and virginal purity, which never gave the smallest ground for scandal, as well as the kind consideration by which he bound his inferiors to him. Nebridius was married at an early age, somewhere about 390 A.D., by his uncle Theodosius, to Salvina, the daughter of the Moorish chieftain, Gildo, count of Africa, who had been brought up at the court of Constantinople, as a pledge for the loyalty of her father and of the province of which he was governor. High official dignities were lavished on the young man—"honores quae aetatem anteibant"—which Jerome says he bore with a humility and moderation which seemed to shew that he foresaw that he should soon leave them all to depart and be with Christ (*ib.*). He was (probably) proconsul of Asia, 396 A.D., and died soon afterwards, leaving two children, a boy bearing his name—"Nebridius pusio"—and a daughter, the darling of her imperial relatives. His loss was severely felt, not only in Constantinople, where he had been the friend and reliever of the destitute and afflicted, but throughout the churches of the East, the bishops of which had been in the habit of addressing to him their petitions for cases of suffering in their dioceses, relying upon his influence with the emperor and those in chief authority. Jerome elaborately applies to him the character given of Cornelius the centurion in Acts x. (Hieron. *Ep.* 9.)

[E. V.]

NEBRIDIUS (4), an intimate friend of St. Augustine, and probably of about the same age as he was, described by him as very good and of a very cautious disposition. While Augustine was at Carthage, and still under the influence of Manichean doctrine, it was partly through his influence and that of Vindicianus that he was induced, though with some difficulty, to give up his belief in astrology, or, as this science was then called, mathematics. Nebridius had already abandoned Manicheism and delivered lectures against the system A.D. 379. (Aug. *Conf.* iv. 3, vii. 2, 6.) When Augustine removed from Rome to Milan, and undertook there the office of a lecturer in rhetoric, A.D. 384, Nebridius, in the fulness of his love for his friend, determined to leave his home and his mother, who declined to accompany him, and to take up his abode with Augustine and Alypius at Milan, "for no other reason," says Augustine, "than that he might live with me in most ardent pursuit of truth and wisdom. With me he sighed, with me he wavered, an eager enquirer after the life of happiness, and a most keen examiner of perplexing questions. There we were, three hungry mouths, each of us in turn sobbing out to himself his tale of destitution, and waiting till Thou, O God, shouldest give him meat in due season. And in all the bitterness which, in Thy mercy, followed us in our secular pursuits, while we were striving to discern the purpose for which we were made subject to these trials, a cloud of darkness would rise up against us, and groaning we would turn away and in agony exclaim, 'How long is this to last?' And as we said this we determined not to abandon our search, because if we were to let this go, nothing certain appeared of which we might take hold. (*Conf.* vi. 7, 10.)

By and by Nebridius undertook to assist Verecundus, who was a teacher of grammar, in his lectures, not for the sake of gain, but at the earnest request both of himself and of Augustine. This duty he performed with great care and discretion, avoiding opportunities of acquaintance with persons of superior rank in the world, in order to secure for himself more complete freedom in his inquiries after true wisdom (*ib.* viii. 6). Soon after this Verecundus offered his country-house, *Cassisiacum agrum*, to Augustine for himself and his friends to occupy, an offer which they accepted with great pleasure and advantage to themselves, and for which Augustine was deeply grateful [LICENTIUS]. Nebridius, however, did not join the party, and it was probably during the time of his friend's sojourn there that most of the letters passed between them which are preserved in the general collection. During this time also he appears to have taken up the notion of the Docetae, that our Lord took human nature not in reality but only in outward appearance, an error of which in course of time, though we cannot fix the date, he was convinced, and soon after the conversion of Augustine he died, but not until he had become a true Catholic, and had induced his household to join him in the change. "He is now," says Augustine with confidence, "in the bosom of Abraham" (*ib.* ix. 3, 4).

Though a much loved and highly valued friend, Nebridius was a troublesome correspondent, for, as Augustine says, being most intelligent and persevering in his enquiries, which were sometimes very difficult to answer, he was not satisfied with brief replies, and did not always make sufficient allowance for his friend's occupations and want of leisure (Aug. *Ep.* 98, 8). Of the letters which passed between the two friends many are lost, and some never reached their destination. Of the twelve which remain, two only are addressed by Nebridius to Augustine. The rest are by Augustine, who mentions several by Nebridius which he had not received. These replies are very long, and chiefly on metaphysical subjects of extreme subtlety, and in some cases Nebridius seems to have been more anxious to provoke his friend to discourse than the latter was to reply, for Augustine sometimes manifests a friendly impatience of the speculative nature of his questions. Among the subjects thus treated are the nature of happiness, the difference between memory and imagination, and the different provinces of these two faculties (*Epp.* 3, 4, 6, 7, 13), the nature of dreams (*Epp.* 8, 9). Some are concerning the Incarnation (*Epp.* 11, 12, 14). One (14) contains an answer by Augustine to a question from Nebridius, in which he shews the fallacy committed by him in confounding sameness in the case of different objects with similarity. At the end of this letter he endeavours to reply to another question of Nebridius respecting the position held by the intellect of the Son of God towards those of men, whether it contains in itself the elements of human intellect in general, or those which belong to each man one by one. By way of reply Augustine says, when we think of an angle we think of one only, but when we think of a quadrangle we think of four angles at

once. Each man is created with one intellect, but if a nation is created, the intellect is not that of one, but of many. Each man is a part of the universe; God, the Creator of each part, contains in Himself the intellect belonging to each part. The first letter from Augustine to Nebridius is curious in a literary point of view, for in the course of it he asks his friend whether the verb *fugio* makes *fugi* or *fugiri* in the pass. inf., *cupio*, *cupi* or *cupiri*, and whether the *i* in *fugitum*, *cupitum*, and *capitum* is long or short; a question which, coming from a professor of rhetoric, seems to argue either an unsettled state of the Latin language at the time, or an imperfect degree of grammatical knowledge on the part of the provincial professor; of which alternative suppositions, the latter is perhaps the true one. [H. W. P.]

NEBRIDIUS (5), bishop, but his see in Spain and his writings are unknown; he was brother of JUSTINIAN (4), bishop of Valentia, ELPIDIUS (17), and JUSTUS (19) in the 6th century: he may have been Nebridius bishop of Egara, at the 2nd council of Toledo, A.D. 527 (Hefele, *Conc.* ii. 701; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 265), and Gams (*Ser. Episc.* 13) suggests that he may have been translated to Barcelona before A.D. 540. On Nebridius of Egara see Henschen in Boll. *Acta SS.* 9 Feb. ii. 301. [J. G.]

NEBRIDIUS (6) (NEFRIDIUS, NIFRIDIUS, NIMFRIDIUS, NIMBRISIUS), abbat of Crassa (La Grasse) and afterwards the sixteenth bishop of Narbonne, a prominent opponent of Felix of Urgel and the Adoptionists [FELIX (176)]. In 799 he was at the council of Urgel (Mansi, xiii. 1033). In 813 he was the emperor Charles's missus dominicus at the sixth council of Arles (Mansi, xiv. 57 E), and he can be further traced down to 822. (*Gall. Chr.* vi. 15; Alcuin, *Opp.* i. 148, 267, 268 ed. Froben.) [C. H.]

NECTAN (1) (NACTAN, NEACHTAN, NECTU, NETTHAD), surnamed Morbet, Morbrec, and Morbreac, son of Erip, Irb, &c., and king of the Picts, A.D. 455–480 (Innes, *Crit. Ess.* i. 101 sq.), or A.D. 458–482 (Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 32). He touches ecclesiastical ground in the legends of St. BRIGIDA at Abernethy in Scotland, and of St. BOETHIUS of Monasterboice, who is also brought to Scotland. In honour of the former he is said to have dedicated Abernethy and given it to her pupil St. DARLUGDACHA; and St. BOETHIUS is represented as restoring him to life. (Skene, *Chron.* 6, et al. and *Celt. Scot.* i. 134–5; Innes, *Crit. Ess.* ii. 778–9; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 115–6.) [J. G.]

NECTAN (2), son of Derelei, king of the Picts, succeeded his brother Bridei or Brude, who died A.D. 706 (*Ann. Tig.*), but seems to have been driven from the throne and made prisoner by Drust about A.D. 725, and again restored for a short time on a defeat of Angus, son of Fergus, who afterwards reigned, however, for about thirty years. He is believed to be the Eactain or Echtain, king of the Picts, who was clericated A.D. 724 (*Ann. Tig.*), and the Nechtan mac Derile who died A.D. 732 (*Ann. Tig.* See Skene, *Chron.* pass.). Though the general events and dates of his reign are uncertain, he was the centre of a most important movement in the Pictish church, which had commenced to feel the Roman influence through Northumbria. The paschal controversy was at its height, and St. Wilfrid had already for half a century secured the observance of the Roman Easter to the south of the Firth. St. Adamnan had striven in vain to procure the like observance in Iona among the Dalriadic Scots; but St. Egbert the monk (A.D. 716–729) was about to succeed where the abbat had failed. Enquiry and discussion must thus have been rife among the Picts and Scots when Nectan ascended the throne, and was disposed to adopt the Roman usages. Bede (*E. H.* v. c. 21) has preserved an account of his application to Ceolfrid abbat of Jarrow [CEOLFRID], for instruction as to the arguments necessary for explaining and upholding the new rules for the observance of Easter among his people, and for the shape of the Roman clerical tonsure; he also wanted architects for the building of a church after the manner of the Romans, promising at the same time to dedicate it to the honour of St. Peter the prince of the apostles, and to have himself and his people always following the custom of the holy Roman and apostolic church "in quantum dumtaxat tam longe a Romanorum loquela et natione segregati hunc ediscere potuissent" (*M. H. B.* 275). This and Ceolfrid's reply appear to have been written A.D. 710; and Bede's account of the action of Nectan is peculiarly striking, when, on receipt of Ceolfrid's letter, he had it read and interpreted in the assembly of his nobles, and on bended knee gave thanks to God for the gift, formally adopted the new Easter and tonsure, and took measures for the universal reception of the new cycle and suppression of the old among his clergy. But Bede's account of the harmonious settlement under the royal influence must be qualified by the statements of the Irish annals, which reveal a determined opposition between the Roman and the national parties to be put down only by the force of royal authority — "expulsio familiae Iae trans Dorsum Britannie a Nectano rege" (*Ann. Tig.* A.D. 717). Nectan drove the Columban clergy, and those who favoured their views, from Pictavia into Scotia, where there was still a strong leaning to the old traditions [DUNCHADH, FAELCHU (1)], and thus left the Roman party in undisturbed possession (Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* iii. 158 sq.; Skene, *Chron.* pp. clviii. 74, 354, and *Celt. Scot.* i. 134 sq. et al.; ii. 176 sq. et al. and *Fordun*, ii. pp. xlviii. sq.; Grub, *E. H. Scot.* i. 114 sq.; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 114 sq.). It is in connection with this change that the legend of St. Bonifacius Kiritinus, or Queretinus, is interpreted as belonging to the introduction of a Roman mission into Pictavia in the time of king Nectan, who is said to have been baptized by St. Bonifacius at Restennet. (Skene, *Chron.* 423, and *Celt. Scot.* ii. 230.) [BONIFACIUS QUERETINIUS.] [J. G.]

NECTAN (3), ST., the eldest of the children of Brechan, king of Brecknock in Wales, i.e. one of the Welsh devotees who settled on the opposite coast of the Bristol Channel, where his relics were preserved at a sanctuary on the promontory of Hartland. Githa, Harold's mother, founded a college of secular canons here in honour of the saint by whose intercession

she believed her husband Godwin had been preserved from shipwreck (Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, ii. 358; Kerslake's *Damnonia*, 415); 'Hertitone' is called her property in Domesday. A notice of his legend is given in Leland's *Collectanea*, iv. 153, and in William of Worcester (104, 106, 125, 130, 131, 134). He had a sacred spring, and the marks of his blood were to be seen on the stones. (Whitaker's *Cathedral of Cornwall*, ii. 94, 99.) His day was the 17th June (Hampson's *Kalendarium*, i. 454, but Nicolas's *Chronology* gives 14th Feb.). The name was common among the Picts (Skene's *Chron. of Picts*, p. cii.) and possibly occurs in the Natanleod, or king Nectan, who fell in battle against Cerdic, A.D. 508, and whose name survives at Netley (Earle's *Saxon Chronicle*, p. 281); Forbes (*Kalendars of Scottish Saints*, xvii. 417) mentions an Irish saint of the name, whose day was 8 Jan. The Welsh saint was commemorated at other places in Devon as far as the ancient Celtic kingdom of Damnonia extended (Oliver's *Monasticon*, Exon. 204, 207, 444, 445, 455; Kerslake's *Damnonia*, 415), and at a chapel in St. Winnow near Lostwithiel ('Withiel's palace') in Cornwall. All visitors to Tintagel will remember the romantic chasm whence the water falls into the circular basin called St. Nighton's Keive (Saxon cyf, a vat; keeve is a western word still for a brewing tub). [C. W. B.]

NECTARIA, a deaconess (Soz. iv. 24 *fin.*; Tillem. vi. 494.) [ELPIDIUS (5).] [C. H.]

NECTARIUS (1), martyr in Auvergne c. 265 (Savaron, *Orig. de Clermont*, 46; Till. iv. 474). [C. H.]

NECTARIUS (2), May 5, bishop of Vienne cir. 337–364. (Ado, *Chron.* in *Pat. Lat.* cxxiii. 92 D, 95 B; *Mart. Hieron.*; Boll. *Acta SS.* 5 Mai. ii. 9, 1 Aug. i. 51; *Gall. Chr.* xvi. 13; Tillem. iii. 624, xv. 69.) [C. H.]

NECTARIUS (3), a layman of noble birth and high official position, to whom Basil addressed a consolatory letter on the death of his only son, a young man of great promise (*Ep.* 5 [188]). Basil also addressed a letter on the same occasion, in a somewhat turgid rhetorical style, to Nectarius's wife, in which he speaks of the death of their son as a common blow to the provinces of Cappadocia and Cilicia (*Ep.* 6 [189]). There is another letter of Basil's (*Ep.* 290 [323]), addressed to a man of high official rank bearing the same name, and perhaps the same person. There was an election of chorepiscopi at hand, and Nectarius had evidently been writing to urge the claims of a friend of his own. Basil courteously tells him that he is glad to receive testimony regarding the candidates from trustworthy sources, but that he alone was to be the judge after prayer for divine direction, and that no one should urge the cause of his friend with unseemly vehemence, remembering that the office was a very responsible one, and that one ought to wish and pray not for the success of a friend, but that the fittest man might be chosen. Tillemont is inclined to identify Basil's correspondent with the future bishop of Constantinople, but without sufficient grounds. [E. V.]

NECTARIUS (4), archbishop of Constantinople, 9th from the foundation of the see, A.D. 381–397 or 398, successor to St. Gregory of Nazianzus. During the Second General Council (Constantinople, A.D. 381) died St. Meletius, bishop of Antioch. Gregory of Nazianzus had been persuaded to accept the see of Constantinople, partly in hope to heal the schism at Antioch through the agreement that Paulus, its other orthodox bishop, should be universally acknowledged on the death of Meletius, or Meletius on the death of Paulus. These hopes were now dashed to the ground by the election of the presbyter Flavianus in succession to Meletius, on the ground that the recognition of Paulus would be too great a concession to the Latins. Archbishop Gregory was so much grieved that he quitted the council and the episcopal palace. Many of the most influential men urged him not to resign; but his resolution was confirmed on the arrival of the Egyptian bishops, who professed themselves unsatisfied with his election, probably because he had been preferred to their countryman, Maximus. The archbishop appeared one day in the council and announced his resignation, on which he had finally determined for the sake of peace. The majority of the synod accepted this step, many even gladly. Besides the Egyptians there would be amongst his opponents those who refused to carry out the agreement about the succession at Antioch. The Emperor was most unwilling to lose the archbishop; but nothing remained except to choose a successor. The bishops were quite at a loss. Each had a candidate amongst his own friends. Who could have thought it was to be an unbaptized layman?

The praetor of Constantinople was a senator named Nectarius, of noble family, born at Tarsus in Cilicia, an elderly man, widely known for his admirable character in every relation of life, especially for his perfect good temper, the excellence of his heart, and his strict integrity. It was not generally known that he was still a catechumen, and had never been baptized.

The praetor was at this moment preparing for a journey to Tarsus, his own town. Before starting he called on the bishop of Tarsus, Diodorus, who was attending the council, to ask if he could serve him by taking letters home. Like others, the bishop's mind was full of the election. The reverend appearance and gentle manners of his visitor struck him so forcibly, that he at once determined that he should be his candidate. He said nothing, and alleging some other business took the praetor to call on the bishop of Antioch. The bishop of Antioch laughed at the idea of such a competition with the many famous names which had been suggested. However he asked Nectarius to put off his journey a short time. The day came when the emperor Theodosius asked the bishops at the council to hand him in their lists of candidates, reserving to himself the right of choosing one from the whole number of names. The bishop of Antioch with the rest gave in his list, at the bottom of which he had in compliment to the bishop of Tarsus written the name of the praetor. The emperor, reading over the lists, came to the bishop of Antioch's paper. He stopped at the name of Nectarius. Fixing his eyes on the paper and his finger on

the name, he paused awhile in deep thought. He began again, and read the list through; then he declared his choice. It was Nectarius. The fathers were amazed. Who was this Nectarius? Whence did he come? What was his character? It began to be said that he was not even baptized. Astonishment at the emperor's unexpected choice was redoubled. Even the bishop of Tarsus seems not to have known this disqualification. The startling information did not move Theodosius. The grumbles gradually ceased. The people of Constantinople were delighted at the news. The whole council agreed. Nectarius was baptized. The dress of a neophyte was changed for the robes of the bishop of the imperial city. The praetor, a few days ago a catechumen, stepped at once to the presidency of the Second General Council. He ruled the church upwards of sixteen years, and made an admirable prelate.

The name of Nectarius accordingly heads the list of the 150 signatures to the canons of the Second General Council. The 3rd Canon declares that "the bishop of Constantinople shall hold the first rank after the bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome."

The bishops of the west were not disposed to accept the election. Synods had been held the year of the great Council of Constantinople at Aquileia, at Rome, and at other places, and letters had been exchanged with the emperors. At a synod held in the autumn of A.D. 381 either at Milan or Aquileia, a letter was written to Theodosius which upheld Maximus the cynic in his claims to the see of Constantinople, repudiating alike Gregory and Nectarius. They asked for a common synod of east and west to settle the question of the succession.

In accordance with this request, the emperor Theodosius, soon after the close of the Second General Council, summoned the bishops of his empire to a fresh synod—not, however, as the Latins had wished, at Alexandria, but at Constantinople. He also twice invited St. Gregory, the retired archbishop, but he excused himself on account of weak health, and said that in his opinion such assemblies promised very little good. There were assembled here, in the beginning of the summer of 382, very nearly the same bishops who had been present at the Second General Council. On their arrival they received a letter from the Synod of Milan, inviting them to a great General Council at Rome. They replied that they must remain where they were, because they had not made preparations for so long a journey, and were only authorized by their colleagues to act at Constantinople. They sent three of their number—Syriacus, Eusebius, and Priscian—with a Synodal Letter to pope Damasus, archbishop Ambrose, and the other bishops assembled in council at Rome. The letter, which is long and interesting, is preserved by Theodoret. It is sometimes printed in the Acts of the Second General Council. At the end of it, the Greek Fathers defend, by appealing to a canon of Nicaea, the elevation of Nectarius to Constantinople and of Flavian to Antioch. It has been disputed whether this appeal is to the seventh canon of Nicaea or to the fourth of Sardica; probability inclines to the former.

The Roman synod to which this letter was addressed was the fifth under Damasus. No certain account of its proceedings remains, nor does it appear how its members treated the question of Nectarius. Theodosius, however, sent commissaries to Rome in support of the statements of his synod, a fact which we learn from the letters of pope Boniface. In his fifteenth letter (to the bishops of Illyria) he shews that the church in Rome had finally agreed to recognise both Nectarius and Flavian. And St. Ambrose, in his sixty-third letter, adduces the election of Nectarius as an approval of his own by the east.

The good terms which subsisted between Nectarius and his illustrious predecessor are clear from six graceful letters which remain in the collection of the correspondence of Gregory. In the first he expresses his hearty good wishes for his episcopate. In the second he commends to him a certain friend of his named Pancratius, whom Nectarius can serve. In the third he asks him to obtain the interest of the Count of the Household for one Georgius who has suffered great losses and misfortunes. The fourth is about the case of bishop Bosporius, by which Gregory obtained from Theodosius a law that bishops should only be tried by bishops. The fifth commends to Nectarius a young niece or cousin who is visiting the capital on business, and is unskilled in affairs. The last is of great importance, urging him not to be too liberal in tolerating the Apollinarians.

In the first year of the episcopate of Nectarius (or 388?), Theodosius was away fighting Maximus in the west. A false rumour coming to Constantinople of the victory of Maximus, the Arians burnt the episcopal palace.

In 383 the capacity of Nectarius was to be tried by a third synod at Constantinople. In spite of the decrees of bishops and emperor, the Arians and Pneumatomachians continued their efforts to spread their doctrines. Theodosius summoned all parties to the imperial city for a great discussion in June, hoping to reconcile all differences. Before the proceedings began, he sent for the archbishop and told him of his intention that all questions should be fully debated. Nectarius returned home, full of profound anxiety at this communication, and consulted the Novatian bishop Agelius, who agreed with him in doctrine, and was held in high esteem on account of his personal piety. Agelius felt himself unsuited and unskilled for so grave a controversy; but he had a very clever reader, Sisinnius, remarkably eloquent, a brilliant scholar alike in philosophy and theology, and to him he proposed to entrust the argument with the Arians. Sisinnius, however, thought that the suggested disputation might only increase the divisions. He stated his opinion before the archbishop, adding that it would be better to produce the testimonies of the old fathers of the church on the doctrine of the Son, and first to ask the heads of the several parties whether they accepted these authorities or desired to anathematize them. So bold an innovation would of course be rejected by the people; but if the sectaries should admit the testimonies, it would then be for the orthodox to produce their proofs.

The archbishop unfolded the scheme to the emperor, who gladly agreed to it. When the

bishops met, the emperor put this question: Did they respect the teachers who lived before the Arian division? They said yes. He then asked: Did they acknowledge them sound and trustworthy witnesses of the true Christian doctrine? The divisions which this question produced shewed that the sectaries were bent on disputation. The emperor was extremely displeased, and he now ordered each party to draw up a written confession of its doctrine. When this was done, the bishops were summoned to the imperial palace, Nectarius and Agelius for the orthodox, Demophilus (formerly bishop of Constantinople) for the Arians, Eleusius of Cyzicus for the Pneumatomachians, and Eunomius for the Anomoeans. The emperor received them with kindness, took from them their written confessions, and retired into a room alone with these documents. After praying God for enlightenment, he rejected and destroyed all except that of the orthodox, because they introduced a division into the Holy Trinity.

Of these creeds only that of Eunomius has come down. He called only the Father God, and placed the Son among creatures as the First-born of all creation, denying Him all share in Divine Being and Glory. The Holy Ghost he placed still lower, as created through the Son and subject to the Son in everything: the greatest, best, and most beautiful creation of the Only-begotten. Eunomius threatened his opponents with the judgment of God.

At this resolute conduct of the emperor, the sectaries sorrowfully returned home, and tried by letters to their adherents to comfort them, chiefly as to the fact that so many now went over to the Nicene faith. Many were called, they said, but few chosen. The emperor now forbade all sectaries, except the Novatians, to hold divine service anywhere for the future, to publish their doctrines or to ordain clergy, under threat of severe civil penalties. Gregory of Nazianzus wrote two letters about this council, one addressed to the praetorian prefect Posthumianus, the other to the consul Saturninus.

In 385 died Pulcheria, the emperor's daughter. The archbishop, diffident of his own rhetorical powers, asked Gregory of Nyssa to preach the funeral sermon. In the same year Theodosius lost his wife Placilla. Nectarius again asked the same celebrated preacher to undertake the sad duty. Both orations remain. In the latter, Gregory speaks with great respect of the primate.

In 394 a number of bishops were invited to Constantinople to the consecration of a magnificent church built across the water at a place called "The Oaks" by a praetorian prefect Rufinus in honour of St. Peter and St. Paul. Advantage was taken of their presence to hold a synod for settling the affair of Agapius and Gebadius, who both had claimed the bishopric of Bostra. Gebadius had been deposed in his absence by only two bishops. Arabianus of Ancyra asked if this was right? Nectarius supported the view of Arabianus. Another bishop, Theophilus, reminded his reverend brothers that both the disputing bishops were now dead. For the future, if any bishop must be tried, let all the bishops of the province be present, and nothing be done in the absence of the accused. To this Nectarius, Flavianus, and all the others present agreed.

Towards the close of his episcopate, Nectarius abolished the office of presbyter penitentiary, whose duty appears to have been to receive confessions before communion. His example was followed by nearly all other bishops. The presbyter penitentiary was added to the ecclesiastical roll about the time of the Novatian schism, when that party declined to communicate with those who had lapsed in the Decian persecution. The presbyter penitentiary was a public official in each diocese to reconcile penitents to the church with greater comfort than could be secured by confession before the whole multitude of the church. Gradually he had fewer of the lapsed to reconcile, and his duties became more closely connected with preparation for communion. An interesting account is given by Sozomenus of the penitential ceremonies of the church in Rome, which were conducted by the bishop himself. At Constantinople a matron of rank had been confessing to the presbyter penitentiary and had been ordered by him to fast and to entreat God for forgiveness. She afterwards declared that while she was staying in church for this purpose she was violated by one of the deacons. Socrates says that she confessed to habitual sin on these occasions. The whole city was roused to angry indignation by the story; the disgrace of an individual was cast upon the whole order. Nectarius would do nothing in a hurry. He long deliberated, but at any rate expelled the offender from the diaconate. A presbyter named Eudaemon, a native of Alexandria, and others, advised him to leave the participation in holy communion entirely to individual consciences. The archbishop agreed with them, and abolished the office of presbyter penitentiary.

In collections of the Greek fathers a sermon is attributed to Nectarius on the subject, "Why the memory of the great saint and martyr Theodorus is celebrated on the first Sunday in Lent; and on fasting and almsgiving." The death of Theodorus happened in the Julian persecution, perhaps as much as thirty-five years before Nectarius might be preaching about it. The preacher mentions that some of his hearers had been eye-witnesses of the scene. The sermon is given in Latin in the works of Chrysostom, by Surius and Lipomann. In Greek it occurs in several manuscript collections.

There are two letters of St. Basil belonging to 358 or 359, addressed to Nectarius and his wife on the death of their only son. This Nectarius is thought by some to have been the archbishop before his consecration. [NECTARIUS (3).]

Nectarius died in 397 or 398, and was succeeded by St. John Chrysostom. (Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* v. viii. &c.; Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* v. viii. &c.; Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* vii. viii. &c.; Theoph. *Chronogr.* 59, &c.; Nectarii Arch. CP. *Enarratio* in *Patrol. Graec.* xxxix. p. 1821; Mansi, *Concil.* tom. iii. p. 521, 599, 633, 643, 694, &c.; Hefele, *Hist. Christ. Councils*, tr. Oxenham, Edinb. 1876, vol. ii. p. 344, 347, 378, 380, 382, &c.; Bonif. Pap. *Epist.* xv. Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* xx., p. 779; Ambros. *Epist.* lxiii.; Greg. Nyss. *Oratio in funere Pulch.*, *Oratio Funeb. de Placill.*; Greg.

Naz. *Epist.* lxxxviii., xci., cli., clxxxv., clxxxvi., ccii.; Basil. *Epist.* v. vi.) [W. M. S.]

NECTARIUS (5), decurion of Calama, a pagan though the son of a Christian. (Aug. *Ep.* 91. 2.) Notwithstanding the edict of Honorius, forbidding both pagan and other celebrations, contrary to the Catholic faith (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. tit. v. 40, 41, A.D. 407), the people of Calama celebrated a pagan festival on June 1, A.D. 408, and when the procession passed ostentatiously in front of the door of the church, and the clergy endeavoured to prevent this insult, the mob broke out into riot and pelted the church with stones. This outrage was repeated a week later, and again a third time, notwithstanding the divine punishment, in Augustine's view, of a violent hail-storm. Churches and houses were set on fire; one Christian lost his life, and others suffered injuries, being maltreated by the mob in their endeavours to discover the hiding-place of the bishop, Possidius. The disturbance lasted until late at night. The whole, says Augustine, might have been prevented if the magistrates had only done their duty. Hearing of what had taken place, Augustine went to Calama to enquire, and some of the people, alarmed for the consequences of their misconduct, came to him and entreated him to pardon them. In this petition Nectarius, who was absent at the time of Augustine's visit, joined, and in a letter to him acknowledged the fault of the Calamese, but expressing his own love for his native place and his anxiety to leave it in a flourishing condition, requested him as a Christian bishop of distinguished eminence, to intercede for the people, and prevent severe punishment, asserting that the pecuniary loss was not great. (Aug. *Ep.* 90.) Augustine in reply speaks in dignified language of the real enormity of the outrage, and disclaims any wish for severity, but puts the question to Nectarius whether for example's sake it ought to remain entirely unpunished. In an earlier part of his letter he had taken the opportunity of shewing how the practice of pagan worship led almost necessarily to excess and immorality, and was therefore justly suppressed by civil authority, that in order for the country to be really prosperous the people ought to adopt the true religion, which he hoped that Nectarius himself might be led to do. (*Ep.* 91.) To this letter, after eight months' delay, Nectarius replied. He offers to his friend some high-flown compliments, thanks him for his wish to lead him to the heavenly country, but must ask him to be forgiven for taking a primary interest in his own earthly one, for, he says, philosophers believe that those who do so will deserve places hereafter in the other. He proceeds to endeavour to bespeak the favour of Augustine for the Calamese offenders without distinction, and to shew that a punishment by fine was really worse than death itself, and that if faults, as some philosophers think, are all alike, so also remission of punishment ought to be extended to all alike. He asks him to imagine the probable misery of the people, and his own anxiety on their behalf, if punishment should be enforced; and entreats him in the name of God and of his own high character to shew favour towards them. (*Ep.* 103.) To this letter of ostentatious, though long-delayed, intercession, Augustine replied at once, expressing in highly polished and courteous sarcasm his own opinion concerning the delay, asking whether Possidius the bishop of Calama, who in his opinion shewed much more real concern for the people than Nectarius, could in the interval make any demand for greater severity than at first had been intended, and called on him to state publicly whether he had heard any report of this being the case. As to the hardship of inflicting some pecuniary loss on people who have still the means of living luxuriously and spending money on embellishments of their public worship, those who were parties to the injuries inflicted on Christians in the riot ought not to complain of being made to pay for the damage done, and Nectarius, who has the welfare of his native place so strongly at heart, ought rather to rejoice at some curtailment of the superfluous means which the citizens possess for displaying their contempt for the law. With a sort of parody Nectarius had spoken of the value of repentance in removing guilt, but Augustine endeavours to set before him and the people of Calama the true nature of Christian repentance, with the earnest hope that they may be led to see its necessity, and to aim at reaching the heavenly country which Nectarius says is the aim of all religious systems, but to which there is only one true way. The Stoic doctrine that all offences are equal, a doctrine which leads to the conclusion not only that all are equally pardonable, but that all are equally punishable, is plainly absurd, and inconsistent both with the other Stoic doctrine which excluded mercy from the list of virtues, with the more amiable opinion of Cicero (*pro Ligario*, 37, 38), and still more with the doctrine of the church, which is really more merciful than Nectarius himself. He begs him to desist from the line of patronage which he has adopted, and to be content with the course which the church is pursuing, in the hope of ultimately bringing the people to Christ. (Aug. *Ep.* 104; Tillemont, xiii. 172; Fleury, *H. E.* v. 22, 17.) We are not informed distinctly as to the result of this controversy, but it is certain that in 409 and subsequent years stringent edicts were issued against opponents of the Catholic faith, especially Jews and pagans. (Cod. Theod. *u. s.* 46, 51.) [H. W. P.]

NECTARIUS (6), perhaps a bishop, to whom the *Commentary on the Book of Job*, attributed to Philippus, is addressed [PHILIPPUS]. (Tillem. xii. 351; Ceill. vii. 565). [J. G.]

NECTARIUS (7), believed to be the third bishop of Digne (Gassend. *Notit. Eccl. Diniens.* 129; *Gall. Chr.* iii. 112; Tillem. xv. 65, 68, 84, 93, 94, 407), whose name appears in various Gallic synods and in the letters of pope Leo the Great. He was at the councils of Riez in 439, and Orange in 441 (Mansi, v. 1196, vi. 441); at Arles under Ravennius in 451 (vi. 162, 181; Leo, *Epp.* 99 al. 76, 102 al. 77); at Arles in 455 (Mansi, vii. 907). In 445 he was deputed by Hilary bishop of Arles to Leo (*Vit. Hil.* § 17 in *Pat. Lat.* l. 1258). In 449 he was one of the bishops of the province of Arles who addressed Leo on the election of Ravennius (Leo, *Ep.* 40 al. 36), and in 450 one of those addressed by Leo (*Ep.* 66 al. 50). [C. H.]

NECTARIUS (3), Sept. 13, sixteenth bishop of Autun, mentioned by Venantius Fortunatus in his Life of Germanus of Paris (§ 3 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxviii. 456), and present at the council of Orleans in 547 or 549. (Mansi, ix. 136; *Gall. Chr.* iv. 343; Boll. *Acta SS.* 13 Sept. iv. 59.) [C. H.]

NEFRIDIUS, of Narbonne [NEBRIDIUS (6)].

NEFYDD (NEVYDD) ap Rhun Dremrudd ap Brychan, Welsh saint in the end of the 5th century, was bishop in North Britain, and slain by the Picts and Saxons (Rees, *W. SS.* 145 sq.; Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 519 sq.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* i. 160, ii. 36). Perhaps has given his name to Neveth or Nevay, co. Perth (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 420). [J. G.]

NEMERTIUS (1) (Νημέρτιος), a public advocate (ἔκδικος) addressed by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 210 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix.), in reply to an enquiry as to whether the Holy Ghost were to be considered as of the same nature as the Father and the Son. [C. H.]

NEMERTIUS (2), a monk who being in much fear and despondency is addressed by Nilus (lib. ii. epp. 129–132; Tillem. xiv. 197). [C. H.]

NEMERTIUS (3), a silentiarius, exhorted by Nilus (lib. ii. epp. 12, 13) to diligence in religious duties. [C. H.]

NEMESIANUS (1), bp. of Thubunae (*Tobna*). Numidian bp. addressed in Cyp. *Ep.* 62 (see JANUARIUS) A.D. 253, addressed in Cyp. *Ep.* 70 (*Syn. Carth.* sub Cyp. *de Bapt. Haer.* 1) Suffr. v. in *Sentt. Epp. Conc. Carth.* sub Cyp. *de Bapt.* 3. One of the nine sent to Sigua into the mines soon after the council (addressed by Cyp. in *Ep.* 76, and with three others replying in *Ep.* 77). These nine commemorated as martyrs in the African Calendar on 10th Sept. (Morcelli, vol. i. p. 226, vol. ii. 372; Boll. *Acta SS.* 10 Sept. iii. 483). [E. W. B.]

NEMESIANUS (2), boy martyr in Africa, mentioned by Augustine (Serm. 286, § 2 and note, in *Patr. Lat.* xxxviii. 1297; Tillem. iv. 174). [C. H.]

NEMESINUS (1), (Νεμεσῖνος), an official at court of Jovian at Antioch in 363, when the Arians of Alexandria came to secure his favour and the emperor recommended them to subscribe the orthodox faith; "Here are bishops," he said, "and here also is Nemesinus" (Athan. *Ep. ad Jov.* § 4 in *Pat. Gr.* xxvi. 821 B). Tillemont (viii. 223) supposes him a registrar ("un greffier"), as though to receive and record their subscriptions. [C. H.]

NEMESINUS (2), a friend for whom Cyril of Alexandria wrote his *Dialogues* and *Thesaurus*. (*Pat. Gr.* lxxv. 1, 657; Ceillier, viii. 268, 273; Tillem. xiv. 665, 670.) [C. H.]

NEMESION (1) (Νεμεσίων), an Egyptian, martyred at Alexandria in the reign of Decius, by being burnt between two thieves. (Euseb. vi. 41; Tillem. iv. 252.) [C. H.]

NEMESION (2), elected bishop of Dioclea in the province of Scodra in the room of Paulus, who had been deposed, but who kept him out by force. He appealed in person to Gregory the Great, who gave him two letters, A.D. 602, in support of his claims, addressed to Constantine the metropolitan of Scodra, and to John bishop of Prima Justiniana, the representative of the Roman see in the East. (Greg. lib. xii. ind. iv. epp. 30, 31; Jaffé, *R.P.* num. 1463, 1464.) [C. H.]

NEMESIUS (1), governor of Cappadocia, a friend and correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen. He shewed the aged bishop much kindness towards the close of his life, which he gratefully records in a long poem of between 300 and 400 hexameters (*Carm.* 62, tom. ii. pp. 140–146). Nemesius was still a pagan, and Gregory devotes the greater part of his poem to an exposure of the folly of idolatry and exhortations to embrace the elevating and purifying doctrines of Christianity. Nemesius is described by the grateful Gregory as a man of considerable literary eminence, whose eloquence as a pleader had gained him distinction in the law courts. Cappadocia was his first province, and he does not seem to have held it very long, as he was once more his own master and was setting out on a journey when Gregory wrote to him his 184th letter. In a short subsequent letter (*Ep.* 185) Gregory upbraids him for having passed by his place of residence without apprising him or visiting him. Gregory wrote to Nemesius in favour of a certain Theodosius, who was extremely anxious to be relieved from a commission involving a long journey and protracted absence from his family (*Ep.* 79); and of a kinsman of his own named Valentinian, who (though the letter is obscure) appears to have had an accident by no fault of his own with a public vehicle and to have killed the horses, himself being thrown out and injured. Gregory begs that Nemesius will be content with reprimanding him, and not make him pay the price of the horses (*Ep.* 183). Nemesius was favourably inclined to Christianity. After quitting office he visited Gregory for the purpose of discussing the subject of religion. His arguments appear to have had some influence with Nemesius, and to have inspired the hope that the future interview which he promised would result in the conversion of one to whom he owed so much for the considerate kindness manifested towards him (*Ep.* 184): whether these hopes were verified is not known. We may safely reject the suggestion favoured by Tillemont (*Mem. Eccl.* ix. pp. 541, 607) that the governor of Cappadocia is the same with the bishop of Emesa, the author of a work *De natura hominis*, the second and third chapters of which appear by mistake among the works of Gregory Nyssen, under the title *De anima* (tom. ii. pp. 157–201 ed. Migne). (Cf. Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* lib. v. c. 14, § vi.) [E. V.]

NEMESIUS (2) (Νεμέσιος), various persons addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (*Patr. Gr.* lxxviii.); one on Ps. xlix. 20, and Prov. xiii. 16 (lib. ii. ep. 135, iv. 39); another on the love of riches (v. 36); a magistrianus on Deut. v. 27; Matt. vii. 18: 1 Cor. ii. 14 (iv. 81); a praetor warned against arrogance and severity (i. 47). [C. H.]

NEMESIUS (3), Aug. 1, confessor in the Pagus Lisuinus (Usuard. *Mart.*), thought to be Lisieux. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Aug. i. 46.) [C. H.]

NEMESIUS (4), bishop of Emesa in the latter half of the 4th century, of whom nothing is certainly known but that he was the author of a rather remarkable treatise, *περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου*, *De Natura Hominis*, of which chapters ii. and iii. appear as a separate work, entitled *περὶ ψυχῆς*, *de Anima*, among the writings of Gregory Nyssen, being erroneously ascribed to that father. Tillemont and Galland are inclined to identify him with the governor of Cappadocia, friend of Gregory Nazianzen (No. 1). But he was certainly a heathen when Gregory addressed him, and though (as Galland holds, *Bibl. Patr.* tom. vii.) it is not impossible that he may have subsequently become a convert to Christianity and have attained the episcopate, it is hardly probable, and there is not the least evidence in favour of such an hypothesis, which is decidedly rejected by Fabricius (*Bibl. Graec.* viii. 448; and Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* ix. 541, 607). Le Quien (*Or. Christ.* ii. 839) places Nemesius fifth among the bishops of Emesa, between Paul I., who attended the council of Seleucia, A.D. 359, and Cyriacus, the friend of Chrysostom. Cave throws unfounded suspicion on the fact of his having been bishop of Emesa, and says that all is uncertain about him (*Hist. Lit.* i. 276). The date of his writing may however be determined with tolerable certainty by his mentioning the doctrines of Apollinaris and Eunomius and the Origenists, but not those of Nestorius, Eutyches, or Pelagius. The last named he could hardly have avoided mentioning if his teaching had been known to him, in the portion of his treatise relating to free will. That he was bishop of Emesa is stated in the title of his treatise in the various MS. copies, and by Maximus (ii. 153, ed. Combefis) and Anastasius Sinaita (*Quaest.* xviii. and xxiv.) in their quotations from his work. He is also quoted, though without his name, by Joannes Damascenus, Elias Cretensis, Meletius, Joannes Grammaticus, and others. The treatise of Nemesius is a pleasing and interesting little work, which will well reward perusal, and has received much praise from able judges of style and matter. Brucker (*Hist. Crit. Philosoph.* iii. 530) writes of it thus: "Si lectionis varietas, verborum delectus, rationum pondus, judicii tenor, methodi ordo, disputandi acumen, argumenti demum dignitas tractatum aliquem lectoribus suis conciliare poterit, utique hic fuerit longe commendatissimus." Nemesius establishes the immortality of the soul against the philosophers, vindicates free will, opposes fatalism, defends God's providence, and proves by copious examples the wisdom and goodness of the Deity. As a natural philosopher Nemesius has obtained celebrity by indications given in his book that he was not ignorant of the circulation of the blood and the functions of the bile (cc. xxiv. xxviii. pp. 242, 260, ed. Matthaei).[1] The book was first published in a Latin translation by G. Valla, Lugd. 1538. The first edition of the Greek text was by Nicasius Ellebodius, Antv. 1565. It also appeared in the *Auctarium Duceanum*, Paris, 1629, ii. 466; and in the *Bibl. Patrum*, Morell. xii. 748; also in the *Bibl. Vett. Patr.* of De la Bigne, 1609, tom. viii. in the *Magn. Bibl.* 1618, tom. v. pars 3, and 1654, tom. xii.; and the *Maxima Bibl.* 1677, tom. viii. It was published at Oxford, 1671, with copious notes, by Dr. (afterwards Bp.) Fell. The best edition is that by C. F. Mathaei, Halae, 1802. Nemesius's treatise has been translated into most modern European languages, into Italian by Pizzimenti (no date), English, G. Wilkes, 1636 and 1657, German by Osterhammer, Salzburg, 1819, and French by Thibault (J. R.), Paris, 1844. [E. V.]

NEMESSIANUS (*Νεμεσσίανος*), a scholasticus addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. iii. ep. 339 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxviii.), censuring the too exclusive application of the Old Testament to Christ. [C. H.]

NENNITA, mother of St. David of Menevia (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 6). [NONNA.] [J. G.]

NENNIUS, British historian, presents a study akin to that of Gildas, alike in the indecisive results but unlike in the breadth of historical enquiry and traditionary material. Nennius is uniformly spoken of as author of the *Eulogium Britanniae sive Historia Britonum*, but this is ascribed to others besides Nennius. Unless as author, compiler, or editor of this work, he has no existence, and this ascription of authorship rests upon a late and doubtful basis, yet for convenience and from long-established usage he will probably continue to be quoted simply as the author. At the same time, to quote Stevenson (*Nennius*, p. v.): "The information which is extant concerning Nennius, the presumed author of the work entitled 'Historia Britonum,' is so scanty, and the literary history of that production, external and internal, is so obscure and contradictory, that we may despair of being able to decide, with any degree of accuracy, either as to the age, the historical value, or the authorship of this composition." It will be most convenient to consider (a) The work itself, (b) The authorship, (c) The time, (d) The editions.

(a) The *Historia Britonum*, contained in at least thirty-three MSS., which date from the 10th to the 17th century, and presenting great variety in matter, arrangement, and dates, professes to give a history of Britain to the arrival of the Saxons. It gives the usual Celtic traditions in a confused form, traces the Britons to Brutus, the Scots to the immigration under the Spaniard Partholomaeus, and ends with the foundation of the kingdom of Northumbria, A.D. 547, or its establishment on Penda's defeat and death in the year 655. It is of no special historical value, and is of even less interest than the *Historia et Epistola Gildae*, to which it bears a certain relation, as well as to the *Historia Britonum Galfredi Monemutensis*.

(b) If we accept the two prologues as genuine and conclusive, we must believe that Nennius was disciple of Elbodus (d. A.D. 809), and under a priest Beulanus whom he styles master, and to whom he inscribes a copy of his work with some verses to his son Samuel; that he was member of some religious community, compiled his history "seniorum jussu," and finished it in the year 858, being the twenty-fourth year of Mervin king of the Britons; and that he

gathered his materials from the traditions, writings, and monuments of the ancient British inhabitants, from the Roman annals, from the chronicles of the holy fathers Jerome, Prosper, and Eusebius, and from the histories of the Scots and Saxons. But both prologues are of late and very doubtful authority, being not older than the 12th century, and therefore usually held as spurious, while the date 858 cannot synchronise with the twenty-fourth year of Mervyn, which would probably be 843. If a later writer was only embodying an earlier tradition with regard to the authorship, we could understand the anachronism through ignorance, but not feel otherwise supported by the authority. But the weight of earlier tradition is to attribute the *Historia Britonum* to Gildas without mention of Nennius, and Stevenson (*Ib.* xiii.) says: "It is an important fact, that one of the earliest manuscripts, if not the earliest, extant, ascribes it neither to Nennius nor to Gildas, but to one whom it styles Mark the Hermit." This Mark was an Irish bishop who became an anchorite at St. Medard's at Soissons about A.D. 870. The real author is thus unknown; but Nennius, if more than a name, probably lived in the first half of the 9th century. The works ascribed to Nennius as the monk of Bangor in the 6th or 7th century are evidently either feigned, or, if they ever existed, spurious and based upon the *Hist. Brit.* (For lists see Balaeus, *Brit. Script. Sum.* f. 36; Pitseus, *De Ill. Angl. Script.* i. 106; Cave, *Hist. Lib.* ii. 217; Tanner, *Bibl.* 542; Wright, *B. B. Lit.* 135 A.-S. per.; Nicolson, *Eng. Hist. Libr.* 33, 3rd ed.)

(c) The date assigned to Nennius, when considered as the author of the *Historia Britonum*, has varied from A.D. 620 (Gale, *Praef. ad Lect.*) to 858 (*Prol.* i.), and even as late as 946, the 5th year of Eadmund king of the Angles (*M. H. B.* 53 n.). The cause of this is the difficult question of the chronology of the work itself, and hence that of its composition. There appears to be no room for doubt, amid the endless corruptions and interpolations of the extant manuscripts, that it is a compilation which dates from the 7th or beginning of the 8th century, if not even a century earlier, in the time of Gildas, and has received additions at the hands of unknown authors, whose work can be but guessed at in the attempt to disentangle the original form from the later recensions. But the editor of *Mon. Hist. Brit.* (Introd. Rem. Chron. p. 107 sq.) traces five editions (A.D. 674, 823, 858, 907, 977), distinguishable by their chronology; while Dr. Skene (*Four An. B. Wales*, i. 37 sq. and *Chron.* xxiv. sq.) supposes a Welsh original translated into Latin, and prints separately the *Saxon and Welsh Additions to the Hist. Britonum*, A.D. 974 (*Chron.* 11), and the *Irish and Pictish Additions*, A.D. 1040–72 (*Ib.* 23). The Irish version of Nennius, *Hist. Brit.*, is a translation made by Gilla Caemhain (d. A.D. 1072), into which he has introduced many purely Irish matters without apology for interpolation. (See this version published by Ir. Arch. Society, 1848, with translation and notes by Todd and Herbert; O'Curry, *Ir. MS. Mat.*)

(d) Editions of Nennius, *Hist. Brit.*, are by Gale (*Hist. Brit. Script.* xv. 1691); Gunn (Nennius, *Hist. Brit.*, with English version and notes, 1819); Stevenson (Nennii *Hist. Brit.* 1838); Giles (*Hist. Anc. Brit.* ii. 1847); and *Mon. Hist. Brit.* 1848 (*Eccl. Brit. sive Hist. Brit.* auct. Nennio), and under the name of Marcus Anachoreta, by Cardinal Mai, *App. ad Opera*, pp. 99–111. Dr. Giles has translated Nennius, and followed Gunn's Latin (Bohn, *Six Old Eng. Chron.*).

(See on Nennius, Gale's *Nennius*, Pref. ad Lect.; Stevenson, *Nenn.* Pref.; *Mon. Hist. Brit.* Pref. and Introd.; *Irish Nennius*, by Todd and Herbert; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* 185 sq., A.S. period; Gunn, *Nenn.* Pref.; Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. pt. i. 318–37, pt. ii. 852; Lappenberg, *Engl. under A.-S. Kings*, ed. Thorpe; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* x. 261.) [J. G.]

NENNOCA, ST. (NINNOCA, NENOOC), daughter of king Brechan, migrated to Brittany, and founded the nunnery of Lan Ninnok, in 6th century. Her day was 4th June. (*Acta Sanctorum*, June, i. 407 to 411; Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 83, 86; *Proceed. of Roy. Irish Acad.* vii. 373.) [C. W. B.]

NEO, of Seleucia. [NEONAS.]

NEO (1) (NEON), Jan. 17, martyr at Langres. [SPEUSIPPUS.]

(2) A child martyr, c. 257 (Baron. ann. 259, xv. xvii.; Tillem. iv. 29, 33, 34).

(3) A martyr at Aegae. [CLAUDIUS (4).] (Baron. ann. 285, iv.; Tillem. iv. 414; Ceill. ii. 465, 466.) [C. H.]

NEO (4), bishop of Laranda, in Lycaonia, probably at the beginning of the 3rd century, permitted the layman Euelpis to preach in his presence. His example is cited as a precedent by Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistus of Caesarea to justify their having given similar permission to Origen (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19). [G. S.]

NEO (5), a Pamphylian bishop, an antagonist of the Messalian heresy at the end of the 4th or beginning of the 5th century. (Phot. *Cod.* 35; Ceill. viii. 572; Tillem. xii. 432.) [G. T. S.]

NEOM (NEON, NEONAS), archbishop of Ravenna, received from pope Leo (*Ep.* 135) a reply upon the case of those who had been carried into captivity and did not know about their baptism in infancy (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. liv. 1191; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 8). As a contemporary of St. Leo (A.D. 440–461), he was later than A.D. 425–430 as given by Agnellus (*Pont. Ep. Rav.* ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. cvi. 451, 764), and probably succeeded Petrus Chrysologus in A.D. 454 [CHRYSOLOGUS], which would allow the letter to be in the year 458 as given by Ceillier (*Ib.*) and Fleury (*H. E.* xxix. 11), but Gams (*Ser. Episc.* 717) gives A.D. 449–452. He built the church of St. Peter the Great, and founded one called Tricolis, but in Agnellus, *Vita S. Neonis* (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. cvi. 517) there is no history of him: he died 11 Feb., and was buried in the church of St. Peter. [J. G.]

NEONAS (NEO), bishop of Seleucia in Isauria at the time of the synod of 359, when he allowed his church for the ordination of

Anianus to the see of Antioch. At the close of the year he signed the letter of the deputies of the synod of Seleucia to those of Rimini (Hilar. *Frag.* x. in *Pat. Lat.* x. 705). In 360 he was deposed by the Acacian synod of Constantinople. (Soc. ii. 42; Soz. iv. 24; Le Quien, ii. 1011; Ceill. iv. 578; Tillem. vi. 477, 486, 493.) [C. H.]

NEOPHYTUS (1), a martyr at Nicaea, aged fifteen, under Diocletian (Boll. *Acta SS.* 20 Jan. ii. 297; Tillem. v. 159). [C. H.]

NEOPHYTUS (2) (Νεόφυτος) a monk upon whom Nilus (lib. iii. ep. 301 in *Pal. Gr.* lxxix.) urges that the very least precepts ought not to be disregarded [C. H.]

NEOPLATONISM. This profound and most remarkable system of philosophy took its rise in Alexandria, in the person of Ammonius Saccas, about the beginning of the 3rd century A.D. Its most celebrated master, and by far the most powerful of all those whose treatises have come down to us, was Plotinus, the pupil of Ammonius Saccas. Next to him in reputation comes the last great master of the school, Proclus, in whose time philosophy had receded from all other places where it had once flourished, and taken refuge in its first cradle and most congenial home—Athens; in which place, more than forty years after the death of Proclus, the philosophic schools were at last suppressed by the zealously orthodox Justinian, A.D. 529. Between Plotinus and Proclus lie Porphyry and Jamblichus, some of whose treatises have come down to us; Amelius, of whom we possess only fragments; the celebrated and unfortunate Hypatia; the emperor Julian, with his friends and advisers, Sallustius, Aedesius, Maximus, Chrysanthius; the estimable and intelligent Hierocles; and Syrianus, the master of Proclus. The duration of the school in its separate identity was thus about three centuries and a quarter, though individual Neoplatonists are found even in the latter half of the 6th century A.D.

What is the central character of Neoplatonism? It is known as a philosophy, as a Platonic philosophy. And, indeed, it does in great part consist, and especially in the pages of Plotinus, of that penetrating research into first principles, into our own nature, bodily and spiritual, and the nature of the universe around us, and that attempt at systematic exposition, which is what we understand by philosophy. But mingled with this is another element. Neoplatonism seeks not merely to give men clear knowledge, but also to make them enter into a certain high state of feeling, not without kinship to religious emotion, a state which Plotinus himself termed "ecstasy" (ἔκστασις), and of which no better description can be given than that contained in the final and culminating words of his great treatise: "Such is the life of the gods; such also is the life of divine and happy men; detachment from all things here below, disdain of earthly pleasures, the flight of the soul towards God, on whom it gazes face to face and alone."

Now, in so far as Neoplatonism is pure theory, its origin can be traced with very fair, though not absolute, certainty. It is a kind of summing up of the results of all previous Greek and Roman metaphysics; it would be too much to say, of all previous philosophy; for natural science and political philosophy are alike left out of its range, the former, doubtless, by reason of the defectiveness of the school in accurate external observation, the latter from the circumstances of the time. But in metaphysics there is scarcely any preceding theory (unless the Epicurean atomic theory be considered an exception) to which Neoplatonism is not in some way or other affiliated; in particular it sought with great diligence to reconcile Plato and Aristotle, though always preserving the supremacy of the former. Nor was it content with inquiring into the Greek and Roman systems. It is generally conceded that the principal philosophers of the school knew and were influenced by the works of Philo; and there is reason to think that a still wider influence, foreign to Greece and Rome, extended to them. As to this point, indeed, there is no agreement among critics. Vacherot boldly says that the Alexandrian philosophy is "essentially and radically oriental." This is one of those broad assertions which is seldom left in peaceful possession of the field of inquiry; and Zeller, in criticising it, goes so far to the other extreme as to consider all the elements which contributed to form Neoplatonism, apart from the recognised classical sources, of insignificant weight. It is, he thinks, quite in the normal line of development of Platonic, Aristotelian, and Stoic thought (Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, vol. v. p. 394). This is a conclusion which, in the judgment of the present writer, cannot stand; though Zeller's great learning, and the care which he has bestowed on this question in particular, entitle his opinion to most respectful consideration. It may be conceded that Vacherot goes too far when he affirms that Neoplatonism teaches a theory of the emanation of all things from the Deity manifestly derived from some oriental source. The question is not one of technical language, and any conclusion about it based merely upon some one specific doctrine, such as that of emanation, is necessarily unsatisfactory. When, however, we consider the entire tone and character of Neoplatonism, it is perfectly impossible to consider that it merely continues the line of which Stoicism was the immediately preceding link.

In fact, in so far as Neoplatonism was derived from Greek sources, it was not, in its main bias, the natural development of any then existing philosophy, but was a retrocession, as its name implies, to the original Platonic philosophy; a retrocession, however, in which, while many elements are omitted, others, and especially the religious side, are pressed with a force, a fervour, and a comprehensiveness excelling anything that we find in Plato himself. We have then to inquire why the Alexandrian philosophers were thrown back for their principles to the first seminal ground of all Greek ethical philosophy; why they were forced out of the natural developments of their own age; and why, being so forced back, they resumed the original Platonic impulse so exclusively in the religious line, and resumed it in this line with such force and enthusiasm.

It must be observed that Zeller himself lays great stress on this religious side of Neoplatonism, and he attributes it partly to the example

of Stoicism, partly to the general spirit of the time: "a time," he says, "in which the nations had lost their independence, the popular religions their power, the national forms of culture their peculiar stamp, in part, if not wholly; in which the supports of life on its material, as well as on its spiritual side, had been broken asunder, and the great civilised nations of the world were impressed with the consciousness of their own downfall, and with the prophetic sense of the approach of a new era; a time in which the longing after a new and more satisfying form of spiritual being, a fellowship that should embrace all peoples, a form of belief that should bear men over all the misery of the present, and tranquillise the desires of the soul, was universal" (*Die Philosophie der Griechen*, vol. v. pp. 391–2). It has already been intimated that the narrow, stern, practical religion of Stoicism cannot rightly be held to be the parent of the enthusiastic, idealistic religion of Plotinus. And with respect to what Zeller says of the general spirit of the age, it is true, no doubt, that there was a general feeling of depression, unrest, and dissatisfaction in the world at this time; it is not true that the remedy was by any means universally looked for in religion, still less in such a religion as Plotinus taught. For instance, no one, perhaps, expressed the sense of dissatisfaction and depression here referred to so powerfully as the great critic Longinus at the close of his treatise "On the Sublime;" but Longinus, notwithstanding his intimate friendship with the leading Neoplatonists, had not imbibed their spirit; and accordingly we find that he looked for the restoration of his age and the removal of its ills, not through the means of a religious revival, but by a return to the ancient republicanism of Athens. Not only did he entertain this opinion theoretically, but he endeavoured to realise it practically under Zenobia at Palmyra, an attempt which led to his own death, a heroic martyr to an ideal of less permanent value than in his enthusiasm he believed. It is needless to say that many had recourse to less worthy remedies, in the way of superstition and magic, or of keen and cold satire, as in the case of Lucian. But if we want to find any religious spirit in that age strong enough and broad enough to be considered as in any way the actuating source of Neoplatonism, we shall find it in Christianity alone.

And it is to Christianity that Vacherot would seem naturally to refer (though whether he intended the reference is uncertain) in the following passage, which goes to the heart of the matter: "It is known by authentic testimony that Platonism was, of all Greek doctrines, the one which obtained least success in the Museum [of Alexandria]. When Ammonius appeared, the schools of the Museum had fallen into the most miserable impotence; no sign of life, no symptom of change announced that a new philosophy would arise there. The impulse came from without. It was the spectacle of the great religious schools of the East in contrast with the pitiable state of Greek philosophy; it was, above all, the inspiration of a new spirit that aroused the Neoplatonism of Alexandria. Far from being its origin and guiding principle, one can scarcely say that the Museum was even the cradle of Neoplatonism" (vol. i. p. 341). Of the "great religious schools of the East," which Vacherot here mentions, it is undeniable that Christianity was by far the most powerful, by far the most likely to have influenced Neoplatonism.[a] And when we find that Ammonius, the founder of Neoplatonism, was born a Christian; when we remember the great mutual intercourse between Christian theologians and heathen Platonists at Alexandria, and find that men of such power as Origen and Clement were deeply influenced by Platonism, and could hardly have been so influenced without exercising a reciprocal influence in return; when we find Amelius, the pupil of Plotinus, speaking in highly respectful terms of the doctrine contained in the opening verses of the fourth gospel, it is hardly possible to avoid the conclusion that the influence here indicated was a real and effective one. But we must be careful not to mistake its nature. How far Ammonius or Plotinus borrowed doctrinal elements from Christianity is uncertain. To the present writer it seems probable that the character of the Supreme Deity in the Neoplatonic system, the emphatic unity attributed to him, and the fatherly relation in which he is said to stand towards men, were suggested—certain that they were strongly promoted—by the kindred elements in Christianity. No one surely can doubt that the strong religious bias in the philosophy of Fichte (a philosophy so much resembling that of Plotinus) was due to Christianity; though Fichte, like Plotinus, appears to seek to found religion on a system of intellectual abstraction which, in truth, it is not easy to reconcile with religious feeling.

Still, as has been said, the amount of direct borrowing which took place on the part of the Neoplatonists from Christian doctrine is an uncertain point. The belief that the trinity of the Neoplatonists was derived from the Christian doctrine of that name, though assumed by Cousin, is an unsafe supposition. It is the indirect influence of Christianity on Neoplatonism which is so important, and which has hitherto been too little noticed. The nature of this influence is indicated precisely by Vacherot in the passage above quoted. The philosophers were kindled by a sense of rivalry; they felt, present in the world and actually working, a power such as they themselves sought to exercise, moralising and ordering the hearts of men; and this stirred them to find a parallel power on their own side, and the nearest approach to it, both in character and degree, was found in Plato. To Plato they attached themselves with the fervour of pupils towards an almost unerring master; but they selected from Plato those elements which lay on the same line as that Christian teaching whose power elicited their rivalry.

At all events, this seems by far the most

[a] It has been suggested that Buddhism may have been an originating cause of Neoplatonism. But the similarities between the two systems are rather superficial than deep: Buddhism, while far more full of moral teaching, is far less hopeful and enthusiastic than Neoplatonism. And India was too remote from the Roman world to be able to affect it with any powerful impulse, though the Hindoo systems were not unknown in it: they were, however, objects rather of curiosity than of knowledge.

probable account of the religious bias of Neoplatonism, and of the way in which that religious bias overflowed into theoretical philosophy. It is impossible quite certainly to know the whole truth about influences in so remote a past, which must often have been so apt from their nature to be buried in secrecy. But alternative accounts of the matter do not easily suggest themselves. Though, for instance, we might attribute something to the personality of Ammonius or of Plotinus in themselves, some power parallel to that which was exerted by the heroic life and death of Socrates; yet, were this an influence of sufficient force to create by itself a philosophy such as Neoplatonism, it could hardly have helped leaving a mark on history of a kind that we do not now find there. It is to be observed, as an indication that the Alexandrian philosophers were not altogether likely themselves to be able to penetrate into the roots of their own teaching, that, with all their reverence for Plato, the true significance of the personality of Socrates was in a singular degree ignored by them; the great master of Plato is to them nothing more than Plato's dramatic mouthpiece.

In Plotinus, we find Neoplatonism at its very best. It is a system which, in his hands, is far from deserving the disparagement with which it is sometimes mentioned. It is a most unjust accusation against Plotinus to affirm, or imply, that he preferred obscurity for obscurity's sake. A system that deals strenuously with first principles is not often (to judge by the philosophies that have hitherto appeared in the world) easy reading: but it may be questioned if Plotinus, when the true key to his meaning is found, is so difficult as Plato. The comparison is seldom fairly made; the incidental advantages of Plato are so many, in his exquisite dramatic art, in the historical interest which surrounds his personages, in the familiar light which the researches of many generations have shed upon his principal theories, that questions respecting the real meaning of his philosophy are apt to be regarded as in a more subordinate position than is possible in the case of a writer who, like Plotinus, has nothing but his philosophy to depend upon. However this may be, the sincerity and intellectual energy of Plotinus are not to be questioned; and it is impossible, in any account of Neoplatonism, not to give some statement, however brief, of his philosophical position.

God, the highest principle of the universe, is, according to Plotinus, known to us through self-reflection; not indeed through every kind of self-reflection, but through such alone as shews to us the dignity of the spiritual part of our nature as compared with external things. When we know and feel our own worth in respect of our soul, the spontaneous reflection is forced upon us—What is that universal soul which breathes life not only into ourselves, but into all nature, penetrating through all regions of earth, sea, and sky? But next, says Plotinus, when we through our own soul have attained to a right esteem and reverence for the universal soul, the next necessary thought is this—What is that mind and intelligence by which the universal soul receives and preserves its own divine life-giving power? And the last and highest step is this—What is that first single cause, that absolute unity and goodness, from which, in the Divine nature, even mind and intelligence have their birth? These are the three constituent elements in the Divine nature, as regarded by Plotinus:—first, absolute unity and goodness; secondly, mind or intelligence; thirdly, the life-breathing soul. The whole universe is set in motion, and receives its power from the Divine Being, each member in the hierarchy of existences receiving strength from those above it. (See especially the beginning of the 5th Ennead, and for what follows, the 4th and 5th books of the 3rd, and the 3rd and 4th books of the 4th Ennead.) Between God, or the absolute First Cause, and man, intervene, first, the high heavenly powers, which, on their spiritual side, come nearest to the pure Divinity, and on their material side are known to us as the starry constellations; and next, the powers (not very satisfactorily defined by Plotinus) which have a superhuman nature, but yet are in part mixed with sensuous elements. There can be little doubt that Plotinus was led to include these superhuman or demonic powers in his system through a leaning to the popular heathen religion, which, however, would not have prevailed with him if it had not been for the great example of Plato. After the demonic powers comes man; lower again than man are the brutes; till true or spiritual existence dwindles into feebleness, and at last vanishes in the realm of mere earthy matter. All spirit, and the human soul among other spirits, is, according to Plotinus, essentially immortal; but it may rise or fall in the scale of existent beings in proportion to its own excellence. Moreover, in every link of this great chain, the higher is perpetually giving strength to the lower, and raising it to its own level; and the highest state to which any being can attain is that intimate union with the supreme God, in which thought and sense are alike swallowed up in a spiritual state more noble than either—a state which Plotinus designated by the name of ecstasy. To this state Plotinus did not think that man could attain, except transiently and occasionally, while he remained in this fleshly life.

Perhaps, even from so brief and imperfect a sketch as the above, it may be seen that the philosophy of Plotinus was one of remarkable power and symmetry. More than that; though it cannot be said to be quite free from fanciful elements, there is a real soberness in the mind of its author; the difficulties connected with the divine self-subsistence and universality, in relation to the individuality of men, though they cannot be said to be solved, are presented in a manner to which little objection can be taken intellectually, and against which no serious charge of irreverence can be brought. Again, though Plotinus was deeply penetrated with the sense of the inferiority of material things to spiritual, he did not allow this sense to blind him to the beauty of the world even on its material side, as is powerfully shewn in his criticism of the Gnostic theories (*Ennead.* ii. 9).

It must be said, however, that Plotinus was by no means so strong on the practical side of his philosophy as he was on the theoretical side. In the inculcation of practical conduct he is as inferior to the Stoics as he is superior to them in enthusiasm and in theoretical completeness. His relation to them was very similar to the

relation of Origen to Augustine, and of the Greek mind to the Roman mind generally. His practical defects reach their climax when he comes to the central point of his whole system, the "ecstasy," or union of the soul with God. When once the possibility of such a state is granted, the question, how to attain it, becomes of transcendent importance. But into this question Plotinus never enters with any seriousness. He tells us, indeed, that we are to retire into ourselves, into the silence of our own hearts. But when this is said, other considerations imperatively press for an answer: How is such a retirement into ourselves to be distinguished from indolence and vanity? How is it related to our conduct in external matters? Is it to be considered an intercourse with God, and if so, is it the same as prayer? For prayer is not unrecognised in his system, though his treatment of this subject too is of the slightest and most theoretical kind. Is it a duty to cultivate this "ecstasy" directly, or is it a reward that comes to us in the fulfilment of our duty? Practical questions of this sort are ignored by Plotinus; and yet the vivifying power of his whole system depends on their answer. And the fact is, that while far from any conscious purpose of undervaluing morality, he yet regards the whole material scene in which we are cast as so low a region, as to think that our conduct in that region needs scarcely any detailed or careful scrutiny from a philosopher. The guidance of feeling, when questions of conduct are put aside, necessarily assumes a bare and abstract form; and bare and abstract the ethical teaching of Plotinus undeniably is. Here it was that Neoplatonism, even at its very best, was so vitally inferior to Christianity. It is in the ground of daily practical life that the most sublime spiritual excellence has its root; this the Neoplatonists never knew; of this Christianity as a whole has never been ignorant.

Perhaps, indeed, the inferior minds among the Neoplatonic philosophers had more discernment of this truth than Plotinus himself, though in the most celebrated of them, such as Porphyry and Jamblichus, the discernment of it was not merely partial, but distorted by an unworthy bias. The practical morality of Neoplatonism, after the death of Plotinus, tended more and more to centre itself in the polemical advocacy of the pagan worship. Nor can there be any mistake as to the reason why this was the case. If it were possible to doubt that the nobler elements of Neoplatonism were kindled by a desire to emulate Christianity, it would still not be possible to entertain a similar doubt with respect to this, its worst side. The alliance of paganism with the Neoplatonic philosophy culminated, as is well known, in the time and in the person of Julian. It is wholly out of the question to suppose that the extraordinary development of ceremonialism which Julian introduced for the honour of Jupiter and Apollo was occasioned by any sudden access of genuine fervour for those deities, or in fact was the result of anything but a resolution to outshine Christianity in religious enthusiasm. Nor is this merely a deduction from the general nature of the case: it is supported by remarkable specific points, both as exhibited by Julian himself and by other more philosophic minds. We know that Julian ardently desired, not merely philosophic insight, but supernatural power; this led him to take for his ally and counsellor that arrogant dealer in magical arts, Maximus, rather than advisers who professed nothing more than the teaching of wisdom. (See Art. MAXIMUS OF EPHESUS.) Long before Julian, the attempt to bring the supernatural into close connection with the daily life of man appears in well-known writings of Neoplatonist philosophers; in the lives of Pythagoras by Porphyry and Jamblichus respectively, to which should be added the life of Apollonius of Tyana by Philostratus (for though Philostratus is rather known as a Pythagorean than as a Neoplatonist philosopher, the two schools were closely connected. See Art. on APOLLONIUS OF TYANA). In all these biographies are found two elements, never seen in Greek or Roman philosophy till Christianity became a power that forced itself on the attention of men: first, the setting up of some individual philosopher, not merely as a teacher however great, but as divinely inspired and exercising command over men by supernatural influence; and secondly, the attribution to such philosopher of miraculous powers. No tenable account has ever been given of such biographies as those here referred to, except that which regards them as composed with the purpose (conscious or unconscious) of intimating, that heathenism could equal Christianity in points in which Christians appealed to the popular mind with a force which no mere exhibition of reasoning powers could pretend to equal. Nor did the tendency here spoken of ever leave Neoplatonism; we find it in the biography of Jamblichus by Eunapius; in the life of Proclus by Marinus.

But though an unworthy rivalry was the original incentive to such representations as those just noticed, and also to the excessive ceremonialism of Julian, it would be incorrect to suppose that the Neoplatonic philosophy was putting any severe or unnatural strain on itself in taking into its system elements such as these. The teaching of Plato himself was so rich in sympathetic power, that it allied itself naturally to cravings of the popular mind which colder reasoners despise, such as the desire for religious association and for ceremonial worship. Thus when Neoplatonism proceeded to press these points on the notice of men, and to treat them as an integral part of its own theory, it had plenty of sanction in its inherited doctrines for such a course, though the immediate impulse came from an external quarter. The following passage from Vacherot puts the natural affinities of Neoplatonism for mystic ceremonial religion very strikingly, though it must not be taken as exhibiting the whole case.

"The Alexandrian philosophy soon allowed itself to be drawn into extravagance and superstition. . . We of this age can scarcely comprehend how a philosophical school could lend itself seriously to such a part. But our surprise is due to our judgment of oriental philosophy being framed on the lines of the modern spirit. That philosophy bridged over the gulf which separates the world of sense from the world of intellectual truth by an innumerable multitude of powers of every nature and rank, and supposed an intercourse more or less intimate to exist between man and these powers. Why then

should it not have accepted, with the necessary reserves, the belief in the gods? Was it so difficult for it to see in the apparition of a God the communication with such or such a power? The soul of man, in the teaching of the Alexandrians, is distinct but not separate from the divinity; it touches the divinity on all sides of its nature. It possesses the faculties which enable it to communicate with the divine in every degree of the intervening scale. By ecstasy, it unites with the supreme God; by pure thought it enters into relations with the world of intellectual truth; by the soul and the imagination, it has communion with deities, genii, heroes and all the intermediate powers which transmit life and light to the natural world. What then is there surprising in the fact that the philosopher sacrifices, invokes or evokes supernatural powers at his need, just as the priest does? . . . . The creed of the Alexandrians bases itself on the identity of religious belief with philosophic doctrine. . . . Its extravagances and superstitions have their origin entirely in the philosophy itself." (Translated from Vacherot, vol. ii. pp. 147–9.)

True it is, as Vacherot here states, that the Neoplatonic philosophy was invoked to aid, and naturally did aid, the Neoplatonic theurgy, with its splendid ritual and its vaunted miracles. But it is going too far to say, as Vacherot does, that the philosophy was the parent of the theurgy and the ritual. The tokens are not those of true parentage. The philosophy had subtle affinities for the ritual; but those affinities would not have been brought into active manifestation had not a grosser and more powerful motive come into play. And that motive was, the desire to maintain the imperial supremacy of Rome on the spiritual as well as on the material side, and the consequent jealousy of Christianity, and attempts to rival the peculiar power which Christianity exerted. It is impossible of course not to treat this aspect of Neoplatonism (which is remarkably absent from Plotinus) as one much to be regretted.

It would, indeed, be unjust to judge of the whole series of Neoplatonic philosophers after Plotinus by these points of their practice. They have this merit, that they preserved the good elements of philosophy, as well as its lapses; its free spirit of inquiry, its tolerance, the sense of duty and reverence for the past inspired by it. Yet, if they preserved much of this, they added nothing; the whole substance of Neoplatonism is contained in Plotinus, and in Plotinus alone. The additions and expansions of Jamblichus, and the much more elaborate ones of Proclus, contain no new element; if they are not purely arbitrary, they rest at all events on quite superficial grounds. It may be suspected, as Zeller suggests, that a religious motive, namely a desire to introduce some stronger support for polytheism than any which Plotinus had given, was what induced Proclus to frame in his philosophy the hypothesis of the independent unities, which are subordinate to the supreme unity.

But if Neoplatonism had no fresh developments (in the true sense of that word) after Plotinus, it had an important history; and it is necessary briefly to sketch the leading elements of this, and the characteristics of the chief members of the school. Porphyry (about A.D. 233 to A.D. 305), the ablest pupil of Plotinus, was the first in whom the bias of antagonism to Christianity appeared, and the philosopher in whom of all others it appeared most keenly. It is indeed in this relation that Porphyry is chiefly known; and though we cannot tell what effect his attack on Christianity had in the way of actually promoting the cause of paganism, the manner in which he is mentioned by the Christian fathers proves that his treatise *Against the Christians* possessed more than ordinary learning and acuteness. The treatise itself, however, does not survive, and what we know of it is mainly derived from the references made by Jerome and Eusebius. We may infer from what Augustine tells us (*De Civ. Dei*, xix. 23. 2) that Porphyry would not have been unwilling to set Christ on a level with such a philosopher as his own hero, Pythagoras; this is in the ordinary eclectic manner which prevailed so largely at that epoch, both in philosophy and religion. In respect of his own philosophy, Porphyry is rather to be considered as the populariser of Plotinus; not that he was equal to his master in comprehensiveness or real soberness (as of course he fell far short of him in originality); but he had the advantage in clearness of style, and he knew what ordinary men would understand. When he expresses his own feelings of religion and duty, as in the epistle to his wife Marcella, he does it not without dignity and simplicity.

It is a descent from Porphyry to his pupil Jamblichus; for in Jamblichus we first find definitely that admixture of the crudities of the pagan religion with philosophic research of which so much mention has been made above. The extraordinary reputation of Jamblichus in his own and succeeding ages, is not justified by any of his extant writings; but where so much has been lost, it would be unfair to insist too much on the weakness of that which has been preserved.

But it is in the emperor Julian (A.D. 331 to A.D. 363) and his philosophic friends that Neoplatonism goes down to its nadir. The, in many respects, strong and admirable character of Julian cannot disguise from any one the fact that he lent an enthusiastic aid to a religious system of the most contemptible kind; and that his philosophy shared in many respects the faults of that religion.

When paganism was finally overthrown, and incapable of developing on any large scale into that system of theurgic, mystic, and magical rites in which Julian delighted, there is a certain revival of excellence among the philosophers of the Neoplatonic school. This is most pleasingly shewn in Hierocles, who lived in the first part of the fifth century, and whose adherence to the pagan religion is supposed, with some reason, to have subjected him to persecution. But, to judge from his extant writings, the paganism of Hierocles had in it very little of superstition or even of excessive ceremonial; his religious doctrines are of an extremely pure character, and his morality is of that benevolent, self-sacrificing, yet not ascetic type which we are accustomed to think of as the natural product of Christianity.

Of a different spirit was Proclus (slightly later than Hierocles, A.D. 412 to A.D. 485), though he too appears to have suffered for his adherence

to paganism (less severely, however, than Hierocles). Of all the Neoplatonic school Proclus was the greatest and most persevering systematiser, the writer most determined to let no element drop which his predecessors had insisted on. If those elements had been universally trustworthy, such systematisation could still not have been satisfactory without the most penetrating insight. But when it is remembered that the Neoplatonic system had before his time been subjected not merely to arbitrary philosophical accretions, but also mixed and entangled with the follies of a decaying religion, the task which Proclus set himself may well be thought a hopeless one. Nevertheless, modern critics have not spoken unfavourably of Proclus; though no one has been found to second the bold opinion of Cousin, that in Proclus all the rays of ancient philosophy, from Orpheus to Zeno and Plotinus, are concentrated and re-emitted. But that Proclus was a laborious and conscientious student there can be no doubt; as also that the asceticism which he practised (though like the monastic asceticism it does not meet the approval of the present age) was the proof of a sincere and self-denying spirit. He closes the line of important Neoplatonic philosophers; of Simplicius and Olympiodorus it will suffice to mention the names. Nevertheless, a last ray of the philosophy lingered in the celebrated and unfortunate Boethius; whose undeserved death, noble character, and touching treatise *De Consolatione*, form a not uninteresting or unworthy close to a philosophy of mixed though striking character.

Though almost all the names connected with the Neoplatonic philosophy are heathen, and though the philosophy itself was turned into one of the great bulwarks of falling paganism, the names of Boethius, and long before him, of Proaeresius (the instructor of Eunapius) are probable exceptions; that of Synesius, the well-known bishop of Cyrene, a certain exception.

The connexion of Neoplatonism with Christianity may be summed up in the following way. About the beginning of the third century, ancient philosophy was kindled into new and sudden life in Alexandria, through influences of which it is reasonable to believe that Christianity was an important part; and was thus led to strike backwards into regions which had been long ago left behind, the original Platonic channel, which of all ancient philosophies had most of that freshness and enthusiasm, that feeling after a higher world, which the heathen saw among Christians. For some time, Christianity and Platonism went side by side in peace. It might have been hoped that with men like Clement and Origen on the one side, and Ammonius and Plotinus on the other, religion and philosophy might have been reconciled and coalesced. But that did not happen; on both sides a recession took place; and philosophy became the bitter rival and opponent, with more and more deepening antagonism, of the rising religion. The crisis took place in Julian's time; it ended in the thorough defeat of philosophy, which had attached itself to paganism. After that time philosophy, though not without writers worthy of esteem, has no fresh or original spring; and it at last succumbs without a struggle, partly to arbitrary despotic suppression, partly to the growing darkness of the middle ages.

The principal recent authorities on Neoplatonism are Jules Simon and Vacherot, in their respective histories of the Alexandrian school, and Zeller, in his fifth volume of *Die Philosophie der Griechen.* See also Bouillet's translation of Plotinus into French (Paris, 1859). Richter's *Neuplatonische Studien* (Halle, 1867), and Kirchner's *Die Philosophie des Plotin* (Halle, 1854). See, further, the articles on AMMONIUS SACCAS, PLOTINUS, PORPHYRY, JAMBLICHUS, HIEROCLES, PROCLUS, and EUNAPIUS in the present dictionary. [J. R. M.]

NEOPTOLEMUS, a gentleman of rank to whom Theodoret wrote a consolatory letter on the death of his wife. (Theod. *Ep.* 18.) [E. V.]

NEOTERIUS (1) (NEOTHERIUS), identified as the praefect in A.D. 385 (Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* i. 508–510; *Cod. Theod.* i. pp. cxx. sq.), who in vain urged upon St. Ambrose the giving up of the church of Portiana, in Milan, at the order of the empress Justina for the Arians. (Ambrosius, *Ep.* xx. ap. *Pat. Lat.* t. xvi. 995; Tillemont, x. 168; Ceillier, v. 384.) [J. G.]

NEOTERIUS (2), count, addressed by Meletius of Mopsuestia from his exile at Meletina, A.D. 436 (*Synod. adv. Tragoed.* cap. 141, Baluz. *Conc.* 842). [J. G.]

NEPHALIUS, an abbat of a monastery near Gaza, one of the heads of the moderate Eutychian party. In 487 he went to Constantinople and complained to the emperor Zeno of the violent proceedings of Peter Mongus in Egypt. He was sent to Alexandria in company with the governor Arsenius to promote healing measures, but with no result (Evag. *H. E.* iii. 22). Nephalius afterwards deserted the Eutychians and held a dispute with Severus, who was then in his monastery. Nephalius and his party triumphed and Severus was expelled. (Evag. iii. 33; Tillem. xvi. 378, 684.) [C. H.]

NEPOS (1), an Egyptian bishop in the latter part of the first half of the 3rd century. He was the leading champion of the Millenarians in that country, and wrote a book called a "Refutation of the Allegorists," in which he confuted those who gave an allegorical interpretation to the passages in the book of Revelation which seem to speak of a reign of our Lord upon this earth for a thousand years. Soon after the death of Nepos, the influence which his book had gained caused it to be made the subject, first of a *vivâ voce* discussion, afterwards of a formal treatise by DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA (see that article). Dionysius, though combating the views of Nepos, speaks of him with the highest respect for his piety and his knowledge of the Scriptures, and in particular gratefully acknowledges the service he had rendered the church by the composition of hymns, in which many of the brethren took great delight (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 24). [CHILIASTS.] [G. S.]

NEPOS (2), JULIUS, the last but one of the Roman emperors of the West. He was the nephew of Marcellinus the patrician, and apparently inherited the whole or part of his uncle's Dalmatian principality. The emperor Leo gave him in marriage the niece of the empress Verina (Jornandes, *De Regn. Success.*), and con-

ferred on him the rank of emperor. As Leo died in January 474, this must have been at latest at the end of 473. He was first proclaimed emperor at Ravenna by Domitianus, an officer of Leo, and, after vanquishing his predecessor Glycerius [GLYCERIUS (8)], was proclaimed at Rome, June 24, 474. His short reign did not justify the praises and the hopes of Sidonius (*Epist.* v. 16 and viii. 7 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 546, 598). Almost his only recorded act is the cession of Auvergne and its brave defenders to the Visigoths [EURIC (1)]. The following year, Orestes the patrician entered Ravenna, at his approach on August 28 (*Chronicon Cuspinianum*) Nepos fled to Salona in Dalmatia, where he retained his hereditary principality, and perhaps some other fragments of the Western Empire, with the title of emperor. The only attempt he made to regain his throne seems to have been to send an embassy to the emperor Zeno, in 477 or 478, entreating his assistance. Zeno gave him fair words, but no substantial help (Malchus, p. 236, ed. Dindorf). In 480 he was murdered, May 9, in his own villa near Salona by Viator and Ovida (Marcellinus, *Chronicon*, in *Patr. Lat.* li. 932). According to one account his predecessor was implicated in his death. [GLYCERIUS (8).] [F. D.]

NEPOTIANI. [NEPOS (1).]

NEPOTIANUS (1), FLAVIUS POPILIUS (Ducange, *Fam. Byzant.* 85), son of Eutropia, who was sister of Constantine the Great. His father was perhaps the Nepotian who was consul in A.D. 301, and he himself was probably consul in A.D. 336.

In the troubled year that followed the death of Constans and the usurpation of Magnentius (A.D. 350), he made a bold attempt to seize the empire. On the 3rd June (Idatius, *Fasti*), he assumed the purple near Rome, assembled a band of desperadoes and gladiators, marched against the city, defeated with great slaughter Anicetus, the praetorian prefect, and made himself master of Rome. He used his victory cruelly; the houses, streets, and temples were filled with blood and corpses, and the prefect himself was put to death. His triumph, however, was a short one; Magnentius sent against him Marcellinus the master of the offices, who defeated and killed him on the 1st of July, and his head was struck off and carried about the city on a pole. (Zosimus, ii. 43; Victor *de Caes.* 42, and *Epit.* 42; Eutropius, x. 11.) [F. D.]

NEPOTIANUS (2), bishop of Clermont in Auvergne (Greg. Tur. *Glor. Conf.* cap. 37, *Hist. Fr.* i. 41); believed to have died Oct. 22, 388. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 22 Oct. ix. 613; *Gall. Chr.* ii. 228; Tillem. viii. 126, xiv. 129.) [C. H.]

NEPOTIANUS (3), a presbyter at Altinum, under his uncle Heliodorus, the bishop of that place. His death in 396 elicited an interesting letter from Jerome to Heliodorus. It relates his relinquishment of a military life in favour of voluntary poverty and monachism, which he intended to pursue in Egypt, Mesopotamia, or the solitudes of the Dalmatian islands; his ordination, from which at first his modesty greatly shrank; and finally his intense and unwearied devotion to his pastoral duties. One of Jerome's letters (ep. 52, ed. Vall.), *De Vita Clericorum* et *Monachorum*, A.D. 394, is addressed to Nepotianus. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 11 Mai. ii. 627; Tillem. viii. 402, xi. 536, xii. 13, 29, 31, 150–155, 200–202; Ceill. vii. 603, 605, 606.) [HELIODORUS (7).] [C. H.]

NEREUS, martyr with Achilleus in the reign of Trajan. The priest of a church dedicated to their memory at Rome subscribes a decree of Gregory the Great (*Pat. Lat.* lxxvii. 1339; Mansi, x. 488). See more under NEREUS in *D. C. A.* and Tillem. i. 189, 316, ii. 127. [C. H.]

NERIANUS, nobleman, addressed in a false decretal attributed to pope Anastasius. (Isidor. Mercat. *Decret. Coll.* ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. cxxx. 693; Tillem. xii. 257; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* vi. 94, discussing its sources). [J. G.]

NERIENDA, one of the abbesses mentioned in a spurious charter of Wihtred king of Kent, c. 604; but for the reading "Aebbam et Neriendam," another is "et Aebbam reverendam." (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 246.) [C. H.]

NERO (1), CLAUDIUS CAESAR, emperor (13th October, A.D. 54–9th June, A.D. 68). For the purposes of the present work the interest of Nero's life centres in his persecution of the Christians. For the general history of his reign, see Merivale, c. lii.–lv. During the early part of it, Christianity was unmolested and seems to have spread rapidly at Rome. No doubt it received a great impetus from the preaching of St. Paul during the two years that followed his arrival, which probably occurred early in A.D. 61. For a prisoner of his rank, he appears to have been treated kindly and to have met with no hindrance in his work. But before long a terrible storm was to burst on the infant church.

On the night of the 16th of July, A.D. 64, a fire broke out among the wooden booths and shops that were built against the Circus Maximus in the valley between the Palatine and the Aventine. That part of the city contained no great houses or temples of solid masonry to resist the flames, but consisted of a crowded mass of humble dwellings and shops full of inflammable contents. Thus the fire soon got such a hold, that all attempts to check its progress were vain. The lower parts of the city became a sea of flame, which occasionally swept over parts of the hills themselves. For six days the fire raged till it reached the foot of the Esquiline, where it was stopped at last by pulling down a number of houses, and thus leaving a vacant space in front of it. Soon afterwards a second fire broke out in the gardens of Tigellinus near the Pincian, and raged for three days in the northern parts of the city. Though the loss of life was less than in the first fire, the destruction of temples and public buildings was more serious. By the two fires, three of the fourteen regions into which Rome was divided were utterly destroyed, four escaped entirely, in the remaining seven but few houses were left standing. Nero was at Antium when the fire broke out, and did not return to Rome till it had almost reached the vast edifice which he had constructed to

connect his palace on the Palatine with the gardens of Maecenas on the Esquiline.

Though judicious measures were taken both for the immediate relief of the houseless and starving multitude, and for the restoration of the city on a regular plan, and with materials better adapted to resist future fires, and though various ceremonies were performed to appease the offended gods, the horrible suspicion that Nero himself was the author of the fire gained strength. This is asserted as a positive fact by Suetonius (c. 38), Dion (lxii. 16), and Pliny the Elder (xvii. 1), the last being a contemporary, but Tacitus alludes to it only as a prevalent rumour. Whether it was well founded or not, and whether, supposing it to be true, the emperor's motive was to clear away the crooked, narrow streets of the old town in order to rebuild it on a new and regular plan, or whether it was a mere freak of madness, need not be discussed here. At any rate Nero found it necessary to discover some scapegoats to divert from himself the rage of the people. For this purpose he selected the Christians.

The only author who lived near the time of the persecution that gives an account of it is Tacitus. As the passage is short and obscure, and has been the subject of various interpretations, it seems best first to give a translation of it, and then to notice the various explanations that have been proposed. After describing the origin of the sect he proceeds as follows:—"First were arrested those who confessed (correpti qui fatebantur), then on their information a vast multitude was convicted, not so much on the charge of arson as for their hatred of the human race. Their deaths were made more cruel by the mockery that accompanied them. Some were covered with the skins of wild beasts and torn to pieces by dogs; others perished on the cross or in the flames; and others again were burnt after sunset as torches to light up the darkness. Nero himself granted his gardens (on the Vatican) for the show, and gave an exhibition in the circus, and, dressed as a charioteer, mixed with the people or drove his chariot himself. Thus, guilty and deserving the severest punishment as they were, yet they were pitied, as they seemed to be put to death, not for the benefit of the state but to gratify the cruelty of an individual" (*Ann.* xv. 44). This brief narrative has been the subject of the most various interpretations. Gibbon (c. xvi.) was the first to put forward as a conjecture that the persons who really suffered were not Christians but Jews. Though the general body of Jews might have been protected by Poppaea's influence, it might easily have been suggested, he argues, that the sect of Galilaeans which had arisen among them was capable of the most horrid crimes. He then goes on to assume a confusion between two classes known as Galilaeans, namely, the Christians and the Zealots who followed Judas the Gaulonite. The latter sect being extinguished in the ruins of Jerusalem, Tacitus transferred their guilt and sufferings to the Christians.

Merivale, c. liv., without going so far, suggests that the turbulent Jews, who were notorious for their appeals to the name of Christ as an expected prince, were the first objects of suspicion; when some were arrested and questioned, not so much as to the burning as to their political creed, they sought to implicate the Christians in the same charge; and that the true Christians, thus associated in the charge of Christ-worship, avowed the fact in their own sense, a sense which their judges did not care to discriminate; and that finally the historian, finding that the name of Christ was the common shibboleth of the victims, imagined that the persecution was directed against the Christians only.

Lightfoot on the other hand (*Philippians* 24–27) considers that the Christians were at this time sufficiently numerous and conspicuous to attract the fury of the populace. He further adduces the evidence of the Apocalypse, and inquires how the language applied to Babylon, by which Rome is meant, can be explained if the Neronian persecution be a figment of later date.

The German critics are no less divided, and here we may notice one of the ambiguities presented by the passage in Tacitus. What is the meaning of "fatebantur"? Is it "first were arrested those who confessed they were Christians, who openly confessed Christianity," or "first were arrested those who confessed they were guilty of the burning;" and there is a minor doubt as to the right translation of "correpti." Merivale translates it "arrested," but it may also bear the Tacitean sense of "accused." The second explanation is adopted by Schiller (*Geschichte des Röm. Kaiserreichs unter Nero*, 435). He argues that "fateri" in Tacitus is always used of the confession of a crime. According to his view, as many of the shops near the circus where the fire originally broke out were occupied by Jews, suspicion would fall upon them, which would be strengthened by the fact that the Transtiberine, the Ghetto of that time, was one of the few quarters that had escaped the fire. At that time Jews and Christians lived in the same part of the town and in the same manner. Some Orientals were probably arrested on suspicion and put to the question; by torture and promises of pardon an admission of their guilt was extorted, with the names of their accomplices; while some of the fanatical Jews may voluntarily have made confession in the hopes of thereby extinguishing Christianity. Possibly too, some faithless Christians may have made a similar confession to regain the good opinion of the Romans. He treats the proceedings as being purely a measure of police, pointing out that Suetonius (c. 16) refers to the persecution merely incidentally among a number of police regulations, and argues that if religion had been the motive Nero would have referred the matter to the senate.

Nipperdey on the other hand, the latest editor of Tacitus, with Weiszäcker and Holtzmann (*Hist. Zeitschrift*, xxxii. 13), adopts the first interpretation of "fatebantur." Thus Weiszäcker (*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, xxi. 269, &c.) considers that Nero and his advisers having decided to select the Christians as the victims of the popular indignation, those were first seized who were conspicuous members of the sect, some of whom, no doubt, were already known to the police. They were then charged as incendiaries, and from them the names of others were ascertained, and these were then treated in the same way. Thus a vast number were arrested, so many that they could not all have been guilty of arson. We are here

parenthetically cautioned against supposing that any real confession of the crime was made either under torture or through Jewish hatred of the Christians. The charge of arson thus breaking down, that of "odium humani generis" was brought forward, and it was on this they were convicted. On what grounds could such a charge be based; on their practice or their doctrine? As to the former, the mind of the historian may indeed have been coloured by the calumnies of a later date, the *θυεστεῖα δεῖπνα*, and the like, but it is not unlikely that such dark rumours were already current, and inflamed the passions of the mob. Still the expression, "odium humani generis," is too vague, had the trial been decided for such reasons, while a superficial examination of their doctrines would supply ample grounds for the conviction which had been previously determined. One of the beliefs most cherished and insisted upon by the early Christian was that the end of the world was close at hand when all things should perish in the flames. Such a doctrine was sufficient justification of "odium humani generis," and it was consistent that those who believed in the approaching destruction of the world by fire should anticipate it by burning the chief city of the world. Thus though arson was the crime for which they were put on their trial, it was not that for which they were convicted. Though the original charge had broken down, yet enough had transpired on the trial to shew that they deserved to be punished, and accordingly they were found guilty. A regular trial was necessary for Nero's purpose, and the more formal it was, the better it would clear his character. Thus though the Christianity of the victims was not directly the cause of their sufferings, yet indirectly it was in two ways. The fact that their religion was hated and evil spoken of was, in the first place, the cause that they were selected by Nero and his advisers as scapegoats; and in the next, the original charge having broken down, the cause of their condemnation was not indeed the circumstance that they belonged to a particular religion, but the character with which they were invested in the eyes of the public by the mere fact of their belonging to it.

In such a conflict of authorities it seems impossible to arrive at any positive conclusion, but it may be proper to indicate as shortly as possible the view that seems most probable.

Nero, in search of some victims to divert the popular indignation from himself, selected the Christians. Why he did so must remain uncertain. The Jews, who at first sight would seem more likely to be chosen, as being more conspicuous and probably more unpopular, were in the first place protected by their influence at court [POPPAEA], and in the next they were strong enough to make even Nero think twice about attacking them. A Jewish persecution in Rome might excite a dangerous revolt in Judaea. A variety of causes on the other hand might point out the Christians as convenient objects for the emperor's purpose. While they were conspicuous and numerous enough to furnish a plentiful supply of victims, they were too few and weak to be formidable. Possibly the Jewish influence at court which has been alluded to may have thrown its weight into the scale. The predictions current among the Christians of the approaching destruction of the world may have lent a colour to the accusation, and some of them may have incautiously expressed their satisfaction at the destruction of so many heathen temples, which must have appeared to them as an anticipation of the approaching catastrophe. The victims thus being selected, Weizsäcker's account of the subsequent proceedings against them seems on the whole to be fairly probable.

From the allusions of St. Clement (Epistle to the Corinthians, c. 6), a little more information can be obtained. Like Tacitus, he speaks of the vast multitude, and mentions that women underwent terrible and unholy tortures. From the MS. reading of the passage (*διὰ ζῆλος διωχθεῖσαι γυναῖκες Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι, αἰκίσματα δεινὰ καὶ ἀνόσια παθοῦσαι*), it has been supposed that they were tortured to death on the stage or in the circus, being compelled to represent various mythological stories ending in the death of the performer. Such scenes were not uncommon on the Roman stage, *e.g.* a Hercules was represented burning to death in the fatal Nessus shirt (Tert. *Apol.* 15), or an Orpheus being torn to pieces by a bear (Mart. *Spect.* xxi.), and the account agrees well with the expression of Tacitus, *pereuntibus addita ludibria.* The famous group at Naples generally known as the Farnese Bull, shews how the myth of Dirce might be adapted for such a purpose; it represents her being tied by Amphion and Zethus to the horns of a wild bull. On the other hand no plausible conjecture has been made as to how the story of the Danaids could be scenically represented so as to serve as a means of torture, and if St. Clement's meaning was that women in the characters of Danaids and Dirces suffered tortures, the form of expression he has chosen seems very strange and unnatural. For these reasons Bishop Wordsworth has conjectured *γυναῖκες, νεάνιδες, παιδίσκαι.* This reading is approved by the bishop of Durham, by Bunsen, and by Lipsius (Lightfoot, 51 and 409). The meaning would then be wives, tender maidens, even slave-girls. M. Renan (*L'Antechrist*, 167–181) expands these two words into fourteen pages.

Was the persecution confined to Rome, or did it extend to the rest of the empire? There is little evidence in favour of the latter conclusion. The acts of the saints who are mentioned by Tillemont (*Mém. Eccl.* ii. 73–89) are all more or less fabulous, and assuming them to be authentic there seems to be little or no ground for placing them in the reign of Nero. Renan (*L'Antechrist*, 183) argues that the persecution must have extended to Asia Minor, from the allusions in the Apocalypse, especially in the epistles to the seven churches. But to support this inference, first the theory that the Apocalypse was written in the reign of Galba must be adopted, and, even if this were established, the allusions in question may be explained without assuming that a regular persecution was commanded. The accounts in the Acts of the missionary journeys of St. Paul shew how easily an outbreak of popular fury might be excited by Jews or heathens, who, either on religious or private grounds, were hostile to the new doctrine, and how easily in such an outbreak a conspicuous Christian might be murdered without any edict against

Christianity being issued by the state, or indeed without the public authorities interfering at all, and also it is not unreasonable to suppose that, when Nero set the example of persecution, many of the provincial magistrates would take a harsher view in the case of any Christian that might be brought before them than they had previously done. As for inscriptions, that given by Cyriac of Ancona as found in some unknown place in Spain has long been considered a forgery (*Corpus Inscript.* ii. 25*).

An attempt has been made to find an allusion to the Neronian persecution in a graffito discovered at Pompeii in 1862, an account of which is given by M. Aubé (*Persécutions de l'Eglise*, 415–421). But in the first place the only word in the inscription which is legible with certainty is *Christianos*, and in the next place it apparently must have been traced shortly before the destruction of the city in A.D. 79, that is ten years at least after the end of Nero's reign.

There finally remain the late testimonies of Orosius, vii. 7, and Sulpicius Severus, ii. 29. But they wrote many centuries after these events and at a time when the idea of a general proscription of Christianity was familiar. Against their evidence is to be set the silence of contemporary history, and especially the fact that Tacitus in his narrative seems to consider that the only places where Christians were then found were Judaea and Rome.

A few words remain to be said on the question of the connection between Nero and Antichrist, which has been lately brought into prominence by the interesting work of M. Renan. The significance of the Neronian persecution lies in the fact that it was the first. Hitherto the attitude of the state officials to Christianity had on the whole been favourable; at the worst they treated it with contemptuous indifference. All this was now suddenly changed. The head of the state has made a ferocious attack on the infant church. Henceforth the two powers are to be in antagonism more or less violent till the struggle of 250 years is closed by the conversion of Constantine. Whatever be the date of the Apocalypse, it can hardly be doubted that the Neronian persecution with all its horrors was vividly present to the mind of the author.

To have perished obscurely by his own hand seemed both to Pagans and Christians too common-place an end for a monster who for fourteen years had filled such a place in the eyes and the minds of men. Such a career seemed to demand a more dramatic, a more striking termination. At the same time few had witnessed his death, so that the notion easily arose that he was still alive, had taken refuge with the Parthians, and would reappear again. Tacitus mentions two instances (*Hist.* i. 2, ii. 8–9) of the appearance of false Neros, and Suetonius (c. 56) alludes to another. In the days of his prosperity diviners had predicted his fall, and had added that he would gain a new dominion in the East and Jerusalem and would at last regain the empire (Suetonius, c. 40).

According to the theory of M. Reuss (*Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne*, i. 429–452), adopted by Renan, the Apocalypse was written during the reign of Galba, that is at the end of A.D. 68 or the beginning of A.D. 69, when men's minds were agitated, especially in Asia Minor, by the appearance of a false Nero in the island of Cythnus (Tac. *Hist.* ii. 8). M. Reuss interprets the first six heads of the first beast as the emperors Augustus, Tiberius, Caius, Claudius, Nero, and Galba, of whom the first five were dead, while the sixth, Galba, was then on the throne. As the latter was then seventy-three his reign must soon terminate; then a seventh was to follow and reign for a short time, and then one of the preceding emperors who was supposed to be dead was to reappear as Antichrist. The first four emperors had not been hostile to the Christians, and none of them, except Caius, had perished by a violent death. Nero therefore is the only one that answers the description. Finally M. Reuss interprets the number of the beast as the numerical value of the letters composing the words Νέρων Καῖσαρ when written in Hebrew, and explains the existence of the ancient various reading 616 by supposing it was due to a Latin reader who had found the solution, but pronounced the name Nero and not Neron, the omission of the final *n* making the difference of 50.

Whether this theory be well founded or not, it is certain that the opinion that Nero would return again as Antichrist continued for centuries. Commodianus, who probably wrote about A.D. 250, alludes to it (xli. in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* v. 231), and even in the fifth century St. Augustine (*de Civ. Dei*, xx. 19, in *Patr. Lat.* xli. 686) mentions that some then believed he would rise again and reappear as Antichrist, and that others thought he had never died, but would appear again at the appointed time, and recover his kingdom. Another view was that Nero would reappear again, but would be distinct from Antichrist and would be his precursor. (Lact. *Mortes* 2, Sulp. Sev. *Dial.* ii. 14 in *Patr. Lat.* vii. 197, xx. 211.) [F. D.]

NERO (2), magister and ex-consul, addressed by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 319 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix.), who predicts that his wickedness will not go unpunished. (Tillem. xiv. 198.) [C. H.]

NERSAN, a Persian nobleman who apostatised from Christianity in the reign of Sapor, and perished miserably (Boll. *Acta SS.* 9 Apr. i. 825, § 3; Tillem. vii. 95, 96). [C. H.]

NERSAPUS, bishop of Daron in Armenia, and the great supporter of the Julianist section of the Monophysite party in that country. (Le Quien, i. 1424.) [G. T. S.]

NERSAS, bishop and martyr in Persia. *Vid. D. C. A.*

NERSES. [Norseses.]

NERVA, Roman emperor, A.D. 96–98. M. Cocceius Nerva was the third in succession of a family conspicuous for legal and administrative power in the first century of the empire. His grandfather, eminent as a jurist, had been consul under Tiberius (Tac. *Ann.* iv. 58, vi. 26) in A.D. 22, was the emperor's chosen companion, and starved himself to death in A.D. 33. His father was consulted as an advocate at the age of seventeen, and is mentioned by Tacitus as a

praetor designatus. The future emperor was born A.D. 32 at Narnia in Umbria, but the family is said to have been originally from Crete (Aurel. Vict. *Epit.* xii.). In conformity with the traditions of the family he acquired a civil rather than a military reputation, and was consul with Vespasian A.D. 71, and with Domitian in A.D. 90. On the assassination of Domitian by Stephanus, the freedman and agent of Domitilla, he was elected as emperor by the soldiers, the people and the senate, and his reign was distinguished by a reversal of the policy of his predecessor. The connexion of Stephanus with Domitilla, if we accept the tradition that she and Flavius Clemens were Christians [DOMITIAN] may indicate that the movement that placed Nerva on the throne of the empire was in part, at least, designed to further a more tolerant system of government than that which had prevailed under Domitian. Such, at any rate, was its effect. St. John was recalled from his exile in Patmos (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 20). The crowd of *delatores*, who, under the heads of treason, atheism and Judaism, had preferred accusations which, in the nature of the case, fell most heavily on the Christians, were banished, and those who had been sent to prison or exile on these charges were recalled and set at liberty. Other measures of the emperor, though not distinctly Christian, tended in the same direction. Provision was made for the poor by the purchase and cultivation of lands. Institutions, afterwards supported and enlarged by Trajan, were founded for the education of orphans and destitute children in the cities of Italy. The prohibition of the growing practice of castration indicated a higher morality (Dion Cass. lviii. 2). The conspiracy of Calpurnius Crassus, a man of senatorial rank, and the demands of the Praetorian Guard, headed by their prefect, Aelianus Casperius, for the punishment of the murderers of Domitian, a demand to which the emperor reluctantly yielded by the execution of Petronius Secundus and Parthianus (Plin. *Panegyr.* c. 6; Aurel. Vict. *Epit.* 12; Dion Cass. lviii. 3), made him feel the necessity of associating a younger man with him in the cares of government, and his choice fell on M. Ulpius TRAJANUS, then in command of the legions on the Rhine. In connexion with a victory obtained in Pannonia, Nerva took the title of Germanicus, conferred the same distinction on Trajan, together with the title of Caesar and the *Tribunicia potestas*, and the two were elected as consuls in A.D. 98. In the course of the same year he died after a short illness, was carried to the sepulchre of Augustus on the shoulders of the senators, and his memory honoured by the customary apotheosis which added the title of *Divus* to his name. The reputation which he left behind him is best summed up in the words of Tacitus, who speaks of his reign as having opened the "*beatissimum saeculum*," which included the reigns of Trajan, Hadrian and the Antonines, and of the emperor himself as having united "*res olim dissociabiles, principatum ac libertatem*" (*Vit. Agric.* c. 3). [E. H. P.]

NESTABUS, martyr. [EUSEBIUS (113).]

NESTEROS. [NISTHEROUS.]

NESTOR. See also under NESTORIUS.

NESTOR (1) (Νέστωρ) a confessor at Gaza, who died of wounds inflicted by the populace in the reign of Julian. (Soz. v. 9.) [C. H.]

NESTOR (2), a gladiator, martyred under Maximian, according to Simeon Metaphrastes (Surius, *De Prob. SS. Hist.* 8 Oct., pp. 107, 108, num. vii.–ix.; Boll. *Acta SS.* 8 Oct. iv. 60). Tillemont (v. 638) comments on the narrative, which he calls fabulous and scandalous. [C. H.]

NESTOR (3), bishop of Tarsus, one of those banished from their sees in 489 by the emperor Zeno, as related by Theophanes (*Chronog.* sub. A.C. 482). The text, which is here confused, gives his see incorrectly, but the Latin of Anastasius Bibliothecarius amends it (*Pat. Gr.* cviii. 325, 1239). [C. H.]

NESTOR (4), Feb. 14, bishop of Trimithus in Cyprus, placed by Le Quien (ii. 1070) before 680 (cf. Boll. *Acta SS.* 7 Mart. i. 643). [C. H.]

NESTORIANISM. (The adherents of this party were named Simoniani by an edict of the emperor Theodosius. They reject the name Nestorians, and call themselves Chaldaeans.) Nestorianism was the heresy which marked the earlier portion of the 5th century, as Arianism marked the earlier portion of the 4th century. It marked, too, one of the great stages on the road towards that complete Christological conception to which the church has since clung. We shall discuss the subject in the following order: I. The sources of Nestorianism and its relation to previous heresies. II. Its rise and progress to the council of Ephesus. III. Its subsequent history within the empire till the suppression of the school of Edessa by the emperor Zeno, A.D. 489. IV. Nestorianism in Persia.

I. As to the sources of Nestorianism and relation to previous heresies we may describe it as a reaction against Apollinarianism. Nestorianism was a product of the school of Antioch. The school of Antioch was marked by one doctrinal tendency, the school of Alexandria by an opposite tendency. To quote the very clear words of Neander (*H. E.* iii. 500, ed. Bohn), "In the Alexandrian school, an intuitive mode of apprehension inclining to the mystical; in the Antiochene, a logical reflective bent of the understanding predominated." The Alexandrian school fixed its attention therefore almost entirely on the Divine side of Christ's person, a tendency which found its final development in the Monophysite heresy; to which even Cyril, with all his dogmatic precision, at times approached perilously near. The Antiochene school fixed its attention chiefly, though not exclusively, on the human side of Christ's person, insisting on its completeness and therefore its separate personality, a tendency which found its final development in Nestorianism. The full exposition and proof of these statements will be found in Neander, *l. c.* iii. 499, iv. 107–123. The Antiochene school holding fast to the completeness of Christ's human nature was brought by its dogmatic tendencies, as well as by local contact, into sharp conflict with the Apollinarian view, Apollinaris being a Syrian bishop. Now Apollinaris, in defining the unity of Christ's person, made much use of the theological principle

called the interchange of attributes (communicatio idiomatum; ἀντιμεθίστασις τῶν ὀνομάτων); and was fond of such expressions as "God died," "God was born," which were most abhorrent to the great writers Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, who shaped the fortunes of the Antiochene school towards the end of the 4th century, and the beginning of the 5th. In Theodore's writings, indeed, can be traced all the principles of Nestorianism, of which he was the real founder. Thus, in his treatise on the Incarnation in Mai's *Nova Coll. Vett. Scriptt.* t. vi. p. 305, we see Nestorianism appearing full blown as a reaction against Apollinarianism. There he teaches that both natures in Christ are complete, and as such are each of them personal, personality being an essential part of a complete nature. He therefore rejects the use of the term union (ἕνωσις), preferring conjunction (συνάφεια), in reference to the two natures in Christ. He allows the application of the term θεοτόκος to the Blessed Virgin only, in a figure preferring the term ἀνθρωποτόκος; and maintains that God dwelt not in the man Jesus either by nature or by energy, which cannot be limited or conditioned (περιγραφόμενος), but solely by the Divine Complacency (εὐδοκία) in his eminent virtue just as he dwells in the saints, only in a higher degree, inasmuch as the virtue of the man Christ surpassed all human virtue. On this point of the connexion between Theodore and Nestorianism the reader may consult Neander, *l. c.*, Dorner's *Doctrine of Christ's Person*, Div. ii. t. i. p. 25 pass., and Leontius of Byzantium in his treatise against Nestorius, where this view is expounded at length. (Migne, *Pat. Graec.* t. lxxxvi. 1386, cf. *de Sectis*, 1222.)

II. History of heresy to the council of Ephesus. Theodore of Mopsuestia was the real founder of Nestorianism, but, as has often happened, the heresy has gained its name from a man who merely popularised principles which a deeper and more retired thinker had previously elaborated. The following was the occasion of its rise. Sisinnius, patriarch of Constantinople, died Dec. 24th, 427. The school of Antioch was then in high repute at Constantinople, owing to the saintly memory of St. Chrysostom. From it therefore Nestorius was chosen as his successor. [NESTORIUS.] Nestorius was a disciple of Theodore, a monk of the monastery of Euprepius, near Antioch, and celebrated for his eloquence and austerity. He was consecrated bishop of Constantinople the 10th of April, 428; when he at once set himself to crush out by force various forms of heresy which had hitherto found toleration in the imperial city and neighbourhood; a course of conduct in which he must have advanced to great lengths, as even the public opinion of the orthodox turned against him and branded him as an incendiary (Soc. *H. E.* vii. 29). He soon, however, fell himself under suspicion. He had brought with him from Antioch a presbyter, Anastasius, as his syncellus or private chaplain. This man was a thorough-going adherent of Theodore's doctrines, and came to Constantinople evidently determined to use his official position to advance them in every way. [ANASTASIUS.] This Anastasius, preaching one day in presence of Nestorius, said: "Let no one call Mary Theotocos; for Mary was but a woman, and it is impossible that God should be born of a woman." These words created a great sensation, as the title had become a popular one for the Blessed Virgin, sanctioned as it had been by Athanasius and many orthodox fathers, and even by Eusebius in the third book of his life of Constantine. Nestorius, instead of condemning the preacher, threw the shield of his episcopal authority over him by delivering several discourses in maintenance of the same view. These sermons are still extant in the works of Marius Mercator, a devout African layman, who, being just then in Constantinople, took the greatest interest in this controversy. A report of these discussions was rapidly borne to Egypt, where it stirred up considerable debate among the monks, whereupon Cyril, at Easter A.D. 429, addressed to them an elaborate exposition of the orthodox doctrine in twenty-seven chapters (Mansi, *Concil.* iv. 587). A copy of this epistle was soon carried to Constantinople, and excited the wrath of Nestorius, who handed it over to Photius, one of his clergy, for refutation. This being reported to Cyril, he wrote an epistle to Nestorius in July of the same year, pointing out that he had taken up no new position in special opposition to Nestorius when writing to the monks, but had simply reiterated views he had already enunciated in his work on the Trinity, published during the episcopate of Atticus, bishop of Constantinople. He also called the attention of Nestorius to the conclusions which some of the monks had already deduced from his teaching, refusing to style Christ God, and calling him merely the instrument of the divinity. Nestorius replied to the expostulation in a brief and scornful manner, whereupon a very embittered controversy began, wherein each party charged the other with the most extreme consequences he could deduce from his adversary's premises. Cyril charged Nestorius with denying the real divinity of Christ, like Paul of Samosata, while Nestorius retorted by charging his opponent with attributing the temporal accidents of birth, suffering and death to the Divine Nature like the pagans. Each combatant strove to secure the pope for his own side. They did not indeed formally appeal to him, as Roman writers like Lupus (*Opp.* t. vii.) maintain. They simply strove as independent patriarchs to gain his powerful alliance. Nestorius took the initiative in this proceeding early in the year 430. He made an excuse of the presence of Julian, a Pelagian bishop and his associates from the West to request full information from pope Celestine about their case. This led him to notice his own perplexities. Views, as he puts it, akin to Arianism and Apollinarianism were popular at Constantinople, so much so that some say "that God the Word had taken his origin from the Virgin, the mother of Christ, and that Christ's flesh after the resurrection had been changed into the nature of the divinity." The pope not having replied at once to this letter, Nestorius addressed another to him on the same topic. Whereupon Celestine sent an epistle (Mansi, iv. 1026), telling Nestorius that the delay was unavoidable, as his letter and documents had to be translated into Latin, a fact which clearly shews the decline of Greek learning in Rome one hundred years after the change of empire to Constantinople. Cyril meanwhile had been informed by his emissaries

at Constantinople of the correspondence between Nestorius and the pope. The interval of delay afforded him time to communicate with Celestine, who was a very poor theologian. The pope completely adopted Cyril's views, and plainly told Nestorius that his tenets were simple blasphemy. Events now proceeded apace. The literary activity of Cyril was immense, as the collected edition of his works in Migne's *Patr. Graec.*, the documents collected in Mansi, (t. iv.) and the works of Marius Mercator abundantly prove. Cyril addressed lengthened treatises to the emperor Theodosius, who was however completely under the influence of Nestorius, to the empresses Pulcheria and Eudoxia, to the bishops of the East, and to his sympathisers and adherents among the clergy and monks of Constantinople, whom Nestorius had excommunicated. The pope held a council at Rome in August, A.D. 430, which excommunicated Nestorius, unless he repented within ten days of the reception of their sentence. Cyril assembled another at Alexandria, which ratified this sentence, and forwarded it to Constantinople, together with twelve anathemas, which he called on Nestorius to accept. To these Nestorius replied by a series of counter-anathemas. The emperor and his advisers, seeing no prospect of peace, consented at last in November, A.D. 430, to summon a general council, the writs for which were addressed to all metropolitan bishops, requiring them to meet at Ephesus by the following feast of Pentecost, attended by such a number of their holiest bishops that a sufficient supply might be left at home to discharge necessary episcopal functions; a limitation so vague that Cyril and his friends easily evaded it, and packed the council with their own adherents. [JOHN (31) OF ANTIOCH.] There is no necessity to repeat the story of the general council of Ephesus, and the struggles of Nestorius on the one hand and of Cyril on the other, as this has been already told in Cyril's life (t. i. p. 767) cf. EPHESUS, Councils of, in DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES, Vol. I. It must suffice to say that the bishops attendant on Cyril and on Memnon, the local bishop of Ephesus, so completely outnumbered their opponents that Nestorius did not even appear at the council, but allowed judgment to go against him by default. In connexion however with John, metropolitan of Antioch, he held a council of his own adherents, some thirty or forty in number, who in turn excommunicated and deposed Cyril and Memnon. Nestorius seems to have completely relied on the imperial protection. Cyril, on the other hand, though very violent, seems to have realised more deeply the great spiritual issues involved, and therefore openly defied the imperial wishes. The atmosphere of Constantinople had too often an enervating effect on the fibre of its prelates. They became secularised, mere courtly sycophants, more ready to rely upon imperial favour or humour imperial wishes, than to depend upon spiritual forces and arguments. Cyril had much more of the sturdy spirit of Western independence. He at least had not been nurtured in and weakened by the atmosphere of a court. An epistle of count Irenaeus, an imperial official entrusted with the maintenance of order, is very instructive on this point. It is found in Mansi, iv. 1390. It is addressed to the emperor, and dwells on the contempt for imperial authority and wishes shewn by Cyril. Letters addressed by the Nestorian party to the magistrates and to the provost or head of local police of Ephesus prove that the populace were bitterly hostile to Nestorius (*l. c.* 1383–1386). They complain of insults, houses attacked with stones, churches closed against them, all because of their obedience to the imperial commands, and they petition the crown for the assembling of a new council, where each metropolitan should appear, attended by two bishops alone. They assert that Cyril had brought with him a crowd of "ignorant rustics," whose violence overawed all others, together with fifty Egyptian bishops; while Memnon had summoned forty more from his jurisdiction, a statement which is fully borne out by the admissions of Cyril and his friends as found in Coptic MSS. published by Zoega in *Cat. Cod. Copt. MSS.* [cf. SENUTI]. While the bishops spent the summer of 431 in bitter wranglings and disputes, venting themselves at times in personal encounters, Cyril and his friends called to their aid powerful allies in the monks of Constantinople, headed by the archimandrite Dalmatius, who for forty-eight years had never left the cell in which he had immured himself. [DALMATIUS (4).] This man headed a procession of monks to the imperial palace, and terrorised the weak emperor into compliance with their wishes. But Cyril depended not alone upon the influence of monks, or the power of his arguments and treatises. He lavished bribes right and left, in order to gain powerful court officials to his side. His course of proceedings in such cases is disclosed to us by a letter of his archdeacon and syncellus Epiphanius, preserved for us in the Synodicon, c. 203 (Theodoret, *Opp.* t. v. *Ep.* 173). This letter was addressed to Maximianus, the patriarch of Constantinople, appointed, instead of Nestorius, in October 431. [MAXIMIANUS.] It is an interesting specimen of the way theological and political considerations were intermingled at Constantinople. Epiphanius tells the patriarch that Cyril had written to the empress Pulcheria, and to her influential chamberlains, and bribes, or, as he more elegantly puts it, presents (εὐλογίαι) had been sent to such as were worthy of them. An attempt had been made to gain over one of the chief chamberlains, Chrysoretes, who was hostile by sending him magnificent presents "ut tandem desisteret ab oppugnatione ecclesiae." The patriarch was requested to urge Pulcheria to use her influence with the palace officials. The patriarch was to give these officials whatever their avarice demanded, although they had already received presents enough. Various court ladies were to be induced to cooperate in effecting a separation between John of Antioch and Nestorius. The abbat Dalmatius must protest earnestly before the emperor, so as to alarm his conscience. The abbat Eutyches even, whose name afterwards became so famous, was called upon to act with vigour as one of the tools of Cyril's party. Appended to the letter was a list of the persons to whom bribes had been sent from Alexandria, that the patriarch Maximianus might see how much the Alexandrian church had interested itself in his cause, because of course he could only retain his office, if the deposition of Nestorius remained valid. The

clergy and church of Alexandria even mourned over the poverty brought upon them by the excessive expenditure incurred. The patriarch was also requested to procure the appointment of Lausus as chief chamberlain, that so the power of Chrysoretes might be destroyed and the orthodox faith confirmed. (Cf. Hefele's *Councils*, t. iii. pp. 112, 134, Clark's ed. for a very weak defence of Cyril's conduct in this matter.) [CHRYSORETES. LAUSUS.] The upshot of all the imperial vacillations and episcopal intrigues was that Nestorius was deprived in Sept. or Oct. 431 of his patriarchal throne, and relegated to the monastery of Euprepius, near Antioch, whence he had been summoned to the episcopate, and Maximianus was substituted in his place. It is unnecessary now to enter into all the subsequent details, as they will be found stated under the names of the various actors in the controversy, Cyril, John of Antioch, Ibas, Rabulas, Theodoret, &c. We will therefore only present a rapid summary of the course of events between the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. After the deposition of Nestorius, Cyril, like a skilful general, perceiving that the forces of his opponents were too strong for him when united, determined to effect a division in their ranks. With this end in view he endeavoured to win over John, whose metropolitan position at Antioch marked him out as the natural leader of the Syrian opposition. An opportunity soon offered. The emperor was weary of controversy, and determined to effect an ecclesiastical peace. He therefore put pressure upon the Syrians who opened negotiations with Cyril through Paul of Emesa. Paul had belonged to the party of Nestorius at the council of Ephesus, where his address and knowledge of affairs had made him a natural leader. He now lent himself to the imperial wishes, and towards the latter part of 432 visited Cyril at Alexandria, and explained the views of the Orientals as set forth in a symbolic document, which applied the term *θεοτόκος* to the Blessed Virgin in the sense that two natures were united in Christ, while each remained pure and unmixed in its individuality. To this Cyril consented, while, on the other hand, John and his adherents agreed to acquiesce in the condemnation of Nestorius, and recognise the ordination of his successor as valid. From this time John completely abandoned the cause of Nestorius. He even demanded that more rigorous action should be taken against him. His presence just at the gates of Antioch was felt by John as a standing reproach against his own inconsistency. In 435, therefore, the joint influence of Cyril and John obtained the adoption of stronger measures against Nestorius and his followers. His disciples were to be called Simonians; his books were to be burnt; the republication or preservation of them was made a penal offence; the bishops who adhered to his views were to be deposed, while the poor man himself was exiled first of all to Petra in Arabia, a destination afterwards changed to the great oasis of Egypt. The treaty between Cyril and John was met, however, with the sternest opposition. Theodoret and Andrew of Samosata were satisfied with Cyril's explanation, but could not agree to the deposition of Nestorius; while, as for the zealots of the Syrian party, men like Alexander of Hierapolis and Meletius of Mopsuestia, they threw all their energies into organising an active opposition. Cyril and John, however, using the forces of imperial law, by degrees crushed all opposition, and drove their opponents across the border into Persia, where the Nestorian party organised itself afresh. Within the empire the controversy was silenced only for a little time. The opposing doctrinal tendencies shewed themselves in the controversies which burst forth anew after Cyril's death in A.D. 444 between Theodoret and Dioscorus, the new patriarch of Alexandria, which led up to the synod of Chalcedon, where by the force of reaction Theodoret's orthodoxy was vindicated, and Syrian theology became triumphant. [DIOSCORUS (1).] Theodoret at the same time, like John of Ephesus, seems to have become bitterly hostile to Nestorius himself, as the cause of the whole quarrel. He speaks very severely of him in his fourth Book on *Heresies*; so severely indeed that grave doubts have been expressed concerning the authorship of the passage. Cf. Theodoret, t. v. Diss. 2, p. 251, *Opp.*; ed. Garner; see *contra*, Ceillier, x. 84. Unsuccessful men like Nestorius are, however, apt to meet with but slight sympathy from their more fortunate brethren. The continued existence of Nestorianism as an organised system is due, however, not to episcopal controversialists within the empire, but to the great ecclesiastical school of Edessa, and its Persian disciples beyond the border. That school had been famous for ages, and had served as a great Christian literary centre for all the neighbouring lands, Armenia, Syria, Chaldaea, and Persia. Its influence on Armenia and its church has been noticed under MESROBES and MOSES (5) of Khoren. At the time of the council of Ephesus the bishop of Edessa was one Rabulas. He was in entire accord with Ibas, the head of the Persian school in Edessa, and both were devoted disciples of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Rabulas attended at Ephesus, and took a most decided part with John of Antioch and Nestorius in opposition to St. Cyril. He soon, however, recognised the winning side and joined it. Immediately upon his return he held a synod, where he excommunicated John and his party, anathematised Theodore, who was dead, committed the writings of Theodoret and Andrew of Samosata to the flames, and expelled the Persian school from Edessa. This must have occurred towards the close of 431, or early part of 432 A.D., as even John of Antioch, who that same year abandoned the side of Nestorius, wrote a letter reprobating the proceedings of Rabulas. It is from the celebrated letter of Ibas to Maris, bishop of Hardascir in Persia, that we learn the details of his bishop's conduct, and at the same time get a glimpse of the views taken by the more moderate party in the Syrian church about the whole controversy, as Ibas deals out blame to Nestorius as well as to Cyril. [IBAS.] [MARIS (4).] Ibas, however, took up a bitterly hostile position towards Rabulas, and by his translation into Persian of the works of Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore laid the foundation of the Nestorian movement in that country. In 435 he was elected bishop of Edessa in succession to his opponent Rabulas, a choice which must of course have given a great impulse to the progress of Nestorian views. The tyran-

nical expulsion of the Edessene school by Rabulas drove into Persia a scholar named Barsumas, to whom the foundation of Persian Nestorianism was specially due. He obtained the bishopric of Nisibis in 435, and continued to hold the see for fifty-four years, till his death in 489. He there established a flourishing school, which was largely increased and strengthened by the final dissolution of the Edessene school by the emperor Zeno in A.D. 489, on account of its incorrigible Nestorianism. The Nestorians, indeed, devoted themselves in those early times to education, and established other flourishing schools at Seleucia and many other places, as fully described by Asseman. iv. cap. xv. sec. ii. p. 924; cf. sec. iv. p. 937, where the very liberal course of study pursued therein is set forth. By his age and learning Barsumas obtained immense influence even over the kings of Persia. He cleverly used their political jealousies to advance his own party. He represented that the Catholic party were the friends and spies of the Roman power, while he and his friends were persecuted by it, and therefore necessarily hostile. The Nestorian sect rapidly consolidated itself in Persia, by conforming more or less to the ideas and prejudices of the Persians. The Zoroastrians specially abhorred celibacy and the monks. In fact they taught and practised incest in its worst forms, permitting the marriage of the nearest relations, as of a brother and sister, or of a son and his mother. In 499 a synod was held by the Nestorians under Babaeus, the metropolitan of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, at which clerical celibacy was abolished, and the clergy of all ranks up to the bishops themselves permitted to marry. The Nestorian sect rapidly extended itself into all the lands south and east and north of Persia. COSMAS INDICOPLEUSTES (cf. *s. v.* t. I. p. 693) is a sufficient witness to this fact in the 6th century. His narrative, compiled about A.D. 547, proves that within half a century the Nestorians had organised churches in India and Ceylon, whose bishops acknowledged the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Seleucia. They had also diffused the gospel among the Bactrians, Huns, Armenians, Medes and Elamites. They gained a firm hold, too, upon the Tartars and Chinese. A monument describing their progress in China was discovered at Siganfu by the Jesuits. It described their first mission to China in A.D. 636, and related its history till the current year, A.D. 781, or, as the monument calls it 1092, of the era of the Greeks. This inscription has been the subject of much controversy, rather however, as Milman puts it, "from hatred to the Jesuits by whom it was made known" than from any other motive. The arguments on either side can be seen in E. Renaudot, *Relat. Ancienn. des Indes*, p. 228–271, Paris, 1718; Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* iv. 502–552; *Mém. de l'Acad. des Ins.* xxx. 802–819; Gibbon, cap. xlvii. note 118, ed. Milman; Remusat, *Mélang. Asiat.* i. 33; Schmidt, *Gesch. der Ost Mongolen*, p. 384. This last denies that there is any satisfactory proof that this monument was ever found in China. He declares that it was manufactured in Europe by the Jesuits, but does not explain how it could benefit the Jesuits to invent a monument which only redounds to the credit of Oriental heretics; as Mosheim has well remarked in his learned note on this inscription (*H. E.* cent. vii. par. i. cap. i.). Cf. for latest discussions of it, Gibbings's edit. of Mosheim's *Mem. of Church in China*, Dub. 1862; Neumann, *Zeitsch. der deutsch. Morgenland. Gesellsch.* iv. 38 (1850); Renan, *Hist. Lang. Sémit.* p. 282. These last two writers are dubious about it. We meet with rather a curious account of Nestorianism as it existed in Central Asia in the 10th century in Albîrûnî's *Chronology of Ancient Nations*, p. 306, whose importance as a historian has been already pointed out (t. iii. p. 794). He lived at Khiva between A.D. 973–1048. In his account of the Nestorians he dwells on their intellectual activity as a specially notable feature distinguishing them from the Catholic party. The original tone imparted by Theodore and the great Syriac writers at once struck the acute Mahometan. "Nestorius," he says, "instigated people to examine for themselves, and to use the instruments of logic and analogy in meeting their opponents." He gives us some very curious details about their feasts and ritual. He noticed that Nestorians and Melchites, as he calls the orthodox party, agreed about the observance of Lent, Christmas and Epiphany, but disagreed about other feasts and fasts. The Nestorians evidently retained, or perhaps adopted, some Jewish ideas from the great Jewish schools in Babylonia. On the feast of Ma'al'tha (Ingressus), Albîrûnî tells us, they wandered from the naves of their churches up to their roofs in memory of the return of the Israelites to Jerusalem. According to this writer the majority of the inhabitants of Syria, 'Irâk and Khurâsân were Nestorians, their catholicus being appointed by the khalif on the nomination of the leaders of the sect. The direct influence of Nestorianism on the West was not very great. During the 6th and following centuries they seem to have followed closely in the train of the Persian and Saracen invasions of the empire, till under the khalifs their hierarchy extended from China to Cyprus and Jerusalem. A considerable Nestorian element, indeed, continued to exist in the leading cities of the empire, notwithstanding the severe edicts of Theodosius and succeeding emperors. In A.D. 433, on the death of his intruding successor, the friends and partisans of Nestorius were numerous enough in Constantinople to raise a riot demanding his restoration, while again in the next century we find that Cosmas Indicopleustes, to whom we have referred, was a Nestorian at Alexandria (La Crose, *Christianisme des Indes*, i. 40–55; Asseman. *l. c.* iv. 605, 606). Tillemont, indeed, discovers traces of it in the empire till the close of the 6th cent. (*Mém.* t. xiv. p. 615 sqq.) But indirectly Nestorianism has had a considerable intellectual influence on the West through the controversy about the three chapters and the writings of JUNILIUS and FACUNDUS in the 6th century (cf. Kihn, Theodor von Mopsuestia, Freiburg, 1880). The leading dogma of Nestorianism was revived in a modified shape by the Adoptionists of Spain (cf. vol. I. p. 44 and FELIX of Urgel; Neander, *H. E.* v. 218.

Literature.—The most exhaustive work on Nestorianism, ancient and modern alike, is Asseman. *Biblioth. Oriental.* t. iv. This volume, of 950 pp., is occupied with this subject alone. It collects information from all quarters, especially from the Oriental writers, concerning their history, ritual, organisation, schools and mis-

sions. In other volumes of the same work Assemani gives more information on the same subject, cf. t. i. p. 203, t. iii. 64–70, 378–395, 396–410, 580–589; and t. ii. 387–463 for an elaborate catalogue of the patriarchs of the Nestorians (cf. Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 1078–1341). These two works bring down their history to the last century. The original documents concerning the councils of Ephesus, and the other councils and synods held in connexion therewith, will be found in Mansi (*Concil.* tt. iv., v. and vi.). There is a careful statement of the history in Natalis Alexander (*H. E.* saec. v. cap. iii. art. 12, p. 56–64, ed. Mansi), and an exhaustive monograph in Hefele's *Councils*, lib. ix., which will be found in the third vol. of Clark's translation of that work. Among the most recent works on the subject are Badger's *Nestorians and their Ritual*, London, 1852; Renan, *Hist. Lang. Semit.*, very useful upon the spread of Syriac through Nestorian agencies, p. 277 passim; Mosheim's *Authentic Memoirs of Christian Church in China*, ed. R. Gibbings, B.D., Dublin, 1862; Georgius Ebedjesu Khajjath, *Syri Orientales seu Chaldaei Nestoriani et Roman. Pontiff. Primatus*, Rom. 1870; Petermann's art. *Nestorians*, in new ed. of Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* [G. T. S.]

NESTORIANUS, a Greek historian, who flourished A.D. 474. He wrote the lives of the Roman emperors to the death of Leo the younger. He is cited by John Malalas, who calls him the wisest of the chronographers. Garnerius in his preface to Liberatus, Num. 11, makes him the same as Nestorius bishop of Phragones [NESTORIUS (4)], but, as Cave thinks, on the most flimsy grounds. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 454.) [G. T. S.]

NESTORIUS (1), ST. (NESTOR), Feb. 26, the first known bishop of Side in Pamphylia Prima, one MS. calling him, but incorrectly, bishop of Perga (Le Quien, i. 997). He was a martyr in the Decian persecution, A.D. 250, under a president variously called Publius, Pollion, or Polius. His Acts in a Latin version have long been known. They are given in a concise shape in Ado's martyrology; and in a longer shape in *AA. SS.* Boll. Feb. iii. 627. He is also commemorated in *Martyr. Vet. Rom.* and Usuard. The acts have been hitherto considered worthless. Aubé, however, discovered the original Greek Acts in a MS. of the National Library at Paris, which he printed in the *Revue Archéologique* for April, 1884, pp. 215–234, together with the Latin version and an elaborate commentary. He was arrested by the local Irenarch, required to sacrifice, and on his refusal despatched in charge of two lictors to the court of the president Pollio, who tortured and then crucified him. The martyr's answer to the president's queries sufficiently indicate his theological position. Pollio said to him, "Are you willing to take part with us or with Christ?" To which Nestor replied, "Cum Christo meo et eram, et sum, et ero;" to which the indignant president replied that as he was devoted to Jesus who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, he should be crucified like his God. The acts fix even the day and hour of his martyrdom; it happened on the fifth day of the week at the third hour. Le Blant, in his *Actes des Martyrs*, p. 46, points out the accuracy of the details. [G. T. S.]

NESTORIUS (2) (NESTOR), prefect of Egypt in 349 (Athan. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 56, *Hist. Ar.* § 23, *Vit. Ant.* § 86; Tillem. viii. 122, 125, 135). [C. H.]

NESTORIUS (3), patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 428–431. He was a native of Germanicia, the birthplace of Leo the Isaurian and Iconoclast some three centuries later. He became a monk of the convent of St. Euprepius near the gates of Antioch, where he attained great popularity as a preacher, having a fine voice and a great reputation for ascetic holiness. He was very diligent as a student of theology, so that on one occasion he even denounced some expressions of Theodore of Mopsuestia as unorthodox, though in general he was a devoted adherent of the system taught by Theodore and Diodore of Tarsus. After the death of Sisinnius, the church of Constantinople was so divided into opposing factions that the emperor resolved that none of that church should fill the vacant see; he therefore promoted Nestorius to the post, hoping that his eloquence would be useful in the instruction and guidance of the people. He was consecrated on April 10, 428, more than three months after the death of Sisinnius, which had happened on Dec. 24 of the preceding year. His first sermon proved him to be of a fierce and intolerant spirit. Addressing the emperor, he said, "Give me, my prince, the earth purged of heretics, and I will give you heaven as a recompense. Assist me in destroying heretics, and I will assist you in vanquishing the Persians." He proceeded at once to put his intolerant views into practice. Five days after his consecration he demolished a private oratory used by the Arian community; an act which caused a conflagration, for when the Arians saw the work of destruction going forward, they set fire to the building, which, spreading on all sides, reduced many other buildings to ashes. He next assailed the Novatians, being jealous of the reputation for piety enjoyed by Paul their bishop. The emperor, however, would not allow them to be persecuted. He attacked the Quartodecimans in Asia, Lydia, and Caria, causing fearful riots and loss of life at Miletus and Sardis. His example proved contagious. Antony, bishop of a city of the Hellespont, began to persecute the Macedonians with such violence that two of that sect assassinated him. This increased the rage of Nestorius, who immediately deprived them of their churches at Constantinople, and throughout his whole province. In this course of action he was ably seconded by a presbyter, Anastasius, whom he had brought with him from Antioch to assist in the management of his diocese. This man was an extreme adherent of the Syrian school of theology, and his preaching first raised the controversy which proved fatal to Nestorius. Anastasius was intolerant of all opposition to his views. Apollinarian dogmas were specially repugnant to his school, to which heresy the popular theology of Constantinople seemed to him to incline. He therefore assailed it in a controversial sermon, in which he said, "Let no man call Mary Theotocos; for Mary was but

a woman, and it is impossible that God should be born of a woman;" a statement which caused great excitement, especially when endorsed and defended by the patriarch himself in a series of set discourses. The further history, however, of this controversy must be sought in the article NESTORIANISM and the references there given. We shall here confine ourselves to the events of his personal life. After the council of Ephesus, Nestorius was deposed from his bishopric by the emperor's authority. Socrates indeed, who takes a very moderate and dispassionate view of Nestorius, tells us (*H. E.* vii. 34) that when he found his cause hopeless, he cried out in bitter regret, "Let Mary be called Theotocos, if you will, and let all disputing cease." His regrets, however, availed him nothing. His friends fell off on every side, even including John of Antioch, who had stoutly supported him. He was banished first to his former monastery of St. Euprepius, near Antioch. John of Antioch, however, felt his presence near his episcopal seat a reproach to his own inconsistency, so, after a lapse of four years (Evag. i. 7), John prayed for his exile to some more distant place, whereupon he was sent to the Oasis of Ptolemais, whither the worst criminals were usually transported, and exposed to the attacks of the nomadic Arabs or Ethiopians who, under the name of Blemmyes, were known as the most formidable enemies of the Roman power in North Africa. He occupied himself in the preparation of a defence of his conduct, and his doctrines, addressed according, to Evagrius, (*l. c.*) to a certain Egyptian. He was captured after some years by the Blemmyes, and liberated in the Thebaid, whence he addressed pitiful supplications to the governor of the locality, extracts from which are given by Evagrius. He was then re-arrested, dragged hither and thither, and finally died of his ill-treatment, though ecclesiastical bitterness represents that "when his tongue had been eaten through with worms, he departed to the greater and everlasting judgment" (Evag. *l. c.*). He died some time subsequent to A.D. 439, for he was yet alive when Socrates wrote his history. E. Revillout, in a mem. on the Blemmyes read before the Acad. des Inscrip. and published in their Mem. t. viii. 1st Ser. 1874, pp. 396–401, discusses his place of exile, his persecution by the celebrated monk Senuti, and the time of his death, which he fixes about A.D. 454. He maintains out of a Coptic MS. of the life of Dioscorus of Alexandria (discovered among the Fayûm MSS., and lately printed in the *Revue Egyptologique*, 1880–1883, cf. Krüger's *Monoph. Streitigk.* p. 12 *sqq.* Jena, 1884), that Nestorius was summoned to the Fourth General Council, but died before the summons reached him; a view which gains some support from Evagrius *H. E.* ii. 2. [SENUTI]. The writings of Nestorius were consigned to the flames by an edict of Theodosius; they were therefore diligently extirpated by the magistrates (cf. Jac. Gretser, *de jure prohibendi libros malos*, lib. i. cap. 9); while a passage in John Moschus (*Spirit. Prat.* c. 46) proves that the clergy were not backward in the work of destruction [HESYCHIUS (26)]. We have therefore almost none of his writings, save what have been preserved in the replies of his adversaries. His principal works seem to have been—a treatise, *De Incarnatione Domini*, which contained sixty-two passages of scripture, interpreted according to his system; a volume of sermons arranged in the order of the alphabet, and his apology composed in Egypt (cf. Gennadius, *de Vir Illust.*, cap. 53). An accurate statement, however, of all his admitted and dubious writings is contained in Fabricius *Bib. Graec.* ed. Harles, t. x. p. 529–549. The liturgy attributed to him will be found in Eus. Renaudot, *Liturg. Orient. Collect.* t. i.

The tomb of Nestorius continued to be for ages a subject of interest to the Persian Nestorians. Asseman. *Bib. Orient.* t. ii. p. 316, tells us how incensed they were in the year 805, when they heard that his tomb was subjected to insults in Egypt. A certain historian, Gabriel, physician to the Khalif, used his master's influence, and obtained a letter demanding from the ruler of Egypt possession of the sacred relics. The Nestorians were, however, appeased by a hermit of their sect, who assured them that the tomb which had been insulted was not really that of Nestorius; and that Nestorius was like Moses in this respect, no man knew of his real sepulchre. The original authorities for his life have been all quoted, either in this article, or in that on Nestorianism. For a convenient summary of his life and list of his reputed writings, see Ceillier, t. viii. 366–374. Fabricius (*l. c.*) gives six reasons assigned by Nestorius justifying the imprecatory psalms, as published by Scipio Maffeus from a *Catena inedita ad Psalm. xxxix.* They are these—(1) To make David's adversaries better through affliction. (2) To secure their eternal good through present afflictions. (3) To edify and instruct others. (4) To remove evil-doers from the earth and thus benefit society. (5) To warn others by fear of like punishments. (6) To prevent atheism and manifest a providence. [G. T. S.]

NESTORIUS (4), bishop of Phragones in Egypt, a prelate of orthodox convictions at the time of the Eutychian controversy. He attended the council of Chalcedon and subscribed the condemnation of Nestorius; assisted at the election of Proterius to the see of Alexandria, A.D. 452 (Liberatus, *Breviarium*, cap. xiv.); carried a letter of Proterius to Leo the Great at Rome, A.D. 454 (Leonis *Epp.* cxxix. cap. 1), and an accompanying letter of the emperor Marcian (Leon. *Epp.* cxxx. cap. 1). Afterwards, in 458, fled, with other bishops and clerics, to Constantinople, to escape the persecution of Timotheus Aelurus (q. v.). Leo addressed to them there a letter of commendation and encouragement. (*Ep.* clx. and see Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, ii. p. 566.) [C. G.]

NESTORIUS (5), addressed by Theodoret, *Ep.* 172. [C. H.]

NESTORIUS (6), fourteenth Nestorian bishop of Adjabene (called also Hazza and Arbela) on the Tigris, A.D. 800. (Assem. *Bibl. Or.* iii. 492; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 1232.) [J. G.]

NETHALENUS, NETHELMUS. [NATHALAN.]

NETRAS. [NATHYRAS.]

NICAEAS of Romaciana. [NICETAS (3).]

NICANDER (1) (Νίκανδρος), an exceptor, advised by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 148 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxix.) to take no heed to works of magic and sorcery. [C. H.]

NICANDER (2), a stylite to whom Nilus (lib. ii. epp. 114, 115) addressed the warning text, "He that exalteth himself shall be abased." [NILUS ( ).] But Tillemont doubts, on chronological and other grounds, if these letters could have been written by St. Nilus. (Tillem. xiv. 214; xv. 362, 365.) [C. H.]

NICANDER (3), martyr in Moesia. [MARTIANUS (23) in *D. C. A.*]

NICARETE (Νικαρέτη), a lady belonging to one of the noblest and richest families of Nicomedia, who devoted herself to perpetual virginity in connection with the church of Constantinople. She was warmly attached to Chrysostom, and was punished for her devotion to his cause by the confiscation of the greater part of her property in the troubles that followed his expulsion. She was at this time advanced in life, and had a large household dependent on her, but she managed her lessened resources with such wise economy that she not only had enough for their wants and her own, but also to give largely to the poor. She was skilled in the compounding of medicines, often succeeding in curing those who had derived no benefit from regular physicians. Her humility and self-distrust were such that she would never become a deaconess, and declined the office of lady superior of the consecrated virgins which was earnestly pressed on her by Chrysostom himself. She retired from Constantinople to avoid the persecution in 404 A.D. (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 23). She is commemorated on December 27. [E. V.]

NICARETUS (1) (Νικάρετος), reproved by Nilus (lib. ii. 284 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxix.) for frequenting the theatre. [C. H.]

NICARETUS (2), a scriniarius addressed by Nilus (lib. i. ep. 231) on the overwhelming nature of sorrow when left without aid and sympathy. [C. H.]

NICASIUS (1), reputed first bishop of Rouen, ordained by St. Dionysius of Paris cir. 250, but more probably a presbyter, martyred in the Vexin. (*Gall. Chr.* xi. 4; cf. Tillem. iv. 485.) [C. H.]

NICASIUS (2) (NECASIUS), a bishop in Proconsular Africa, designated "Culcitanus," at the council of Carthage in 348. At his suggestion it was enacted in the sixth canon that the clergy should not act in the capacity of stewards and legal directors in families. (Mansi, iii. 147, 155; Morcelli, i. 148.) [C. H.]

NICASIUS (3), Dec. 14, eleventh bishop of Rheims, slain by the Vandals in 407, with his sister Eutropia. (Flodoard, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* i. 6, 7, ii. 5, § 27, 6 in *Pat. Lat.* cxxxv. 36, 40, 42, 105, 106; *Mart.* Usuard.; *Gall. Chr.* ix. 6, 203; Tillem. x. 463.) [C. H.]

NICEA, NICAEA, martyr. [GALONICA.]

NICEAS of Romaciana. [NICETAS (3).]

NICEAS (1), subdeacon of Aquileia addressed by St. Jerome in 375 or 376 (*Ep.* 8 in *Pat. Lat.* xxii. 341, and note; Tillem. xii. 11, 13, xv. 817; Ceill. vii. 582). He is sometimes identified with the Nicetas praised by Paulinus. [NICETAS (3).] [C. H.]

NICEAS (2) (Νικέας), a Christian charioteer at Neapolis (Sichem) in 529, when Julian, recently crowned by the Samaritans [JULIANUS (110)], celebrated the Circenses in that town. Niceas carried off the first prize, and on presenting himself to receive it was asked by Julian of what religion he was. He avowed himself a Christian and was executed on the spot. (Joan. Malal. pt. ii. p. 180, Oxon.) [T. W. D.]

NICENTIUS, mentioned by Ambrose (*Ep.* v. 8), with reference to the affair of Indicia, as an ex-tribune and notary who had ordered a slave girl to be examined by a midwife on a charge of unchastity. A story is told of him by Paulinus in his life of Ambrose (§ 44). He suffered from gout in the feet; and when once, on approaching the altar to receive the sacrament, he was accidentally kicked by Ambrose, the pain made him cry out. Ambrose thereupon said to him, "Go, and thou shalt straightway be whole." That he never suffered again, he testified with tears at the time of Ambrose's death. [J. Ll. D.]

NICEPHORUS (1) (NICEFORUS, Hartel), Roman acolyte, A.D. 251, went to Rome with METTIUS (Cyp. *Ep.* 45) and took from Cornelius to Cyprian the news of the accession to the side of the former by Novatianizing confessors [MAXIMUS (7)], and of the sailing for Carthage of Novatian's second batch of emissaries. (Cyp. *Ep.* 49, 52.) [E. W. B.]

NICEPHORUS (2), Feb. 25, martyr in Egypt, with six others, under the emperor Numerianus and the governor Sabinus. They belonged to Corinth, where they confessed the faith in the Decian persecution before the proconsul Tertius. (Asseman. *AA. MM. Orient. et Occident.* t. ii. p. 60; Ceill. ii. p. 464.) [G. T. S.]

NICEPHORUS (3), Feb. 9, martyr at Antioch about the year 260, under the emperor Valerian. His story is a very interesting one. He was an intimate friend of a Christian priest called Sapricius, but they had a quarrel. Nicephorus sought in every way to bring about a reconciliation, but Sapricius was inexorable. The persecution after a time waxed very hot. Sapricius was arrested, endured torture, and was condemned to die by the sword. Nicephorus again sought his favour, and was again refused. Thereupon God withdrew the grace of constancy, which Sapricius had hitherto possessed. He consented to sacrifice, notwithstanding the entreaties of Nicephorus, who at once took his place, and suffered death for Christ. (Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 244; Ceill. ii. 392.) [G. T. S.]

NICEPHORUS (4), praised by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 183; Tillem. x. 353). [C. H.]

NICEPHORUS (5), of Antioch, surnamed the Heavenly, on account of his eloquence. He was also called Μαγίστρος, a title equivalent to Professor. Cf. Suiceri *Thesaur.* s. v. Μαγιστεριανός. The surname Malalas belonging to John of Antioch seems to have had much the same meaning. [MALALAS.] His only extant work is the Life of Symeon Stylites, Jr., which will be found in Migne, *P. G.* t. lxxxvi. Pars Posterior. col. 2984. Nicephorus Callist. (*H. E.* xviii. 24) says that Simeon's life was written by another Συμεῶνι μαγίστρῳ τῷ Οὐνῷ. This last word seems a contraction for ὁμωνύμῳ. [G. T. S.]

NICEPHORUS (6), a presbyter of St. Sophia in C. P., A.D. 480, who wrote the life of a fanatic named Andrew, who pretended to be a fool for Christ's sake. He lived under Zeno the Isaurian. The MS. is extant in the Imperial Library of Vienna. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 456.) [G. T. S.]

NICEPHORUS (7), bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, exiled by the emperor Justin in 518. (Assem. *B. O.* t. ii. *Dissert. de Monoph.* num. 2; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 425.) [C. H.]

NICEPHORUS (8) I., emperor, was descended from an Arabian king, who had become a Christian, and had fled to Constantinople in the reign of Heraclius. He held the office of grand logothete or treasurer under the empress Irene. In A.D. 802 a conspiracy to place him on the throne was formed by some of the great officers of the palace, who were displeased at the ascendency the eunuch Aetius had acquired over the empress. On the night of October 31st, the conspirators seized the palace, pretending that it was by Irene's orders that Nicephorus was proclaimed emperor. Guards were placed round the palace of Eleutherius where the empress was, and at dawn she was removed to the palace and placed in confinement. Nicephorus was then crowned at Saint Sophia. The next day he had an interview with his dethroned mistress; and, by promising that she should be kindly treated, and professing that he had been forced to ascend the throne against his will, persuaded her to disclose where the imperial treasures were concealed. Having thus attained his object, he banished her first to the island of Prinkipo and then to Lesbos, where she died in the following August [IRENE II. vol. iii. p. 285].

The early years of his reign were troubled by rebellion at home and war abroad. He refused on his accession to continue the tribute which Irene had paid to Haroun al Raschid. The indignant caliph invaded Asia Minor and attacked Heraclea. The army which had been sent against him revolted in July, proclaimed their commonder, the patrician Bardanes, emperor against his will, and advanced on Chrysopolis. The citizens refusing to admit him he withdrew, and obtaining from Nicephorus an amnesty for himself and his adherents, guaranteed by the patriarch and all the nobles, he retired in September to the island of Prote, where he assumed the monastic habit. Nicephorus in violation of his promise confiscated his property, banished his chief adherents, and deprived his troops of their pay. Bardanes, the following year, was blinded by some Lycaonian brigands who had made a descent on the island; and it was suspected that the emperor was implicated in the crime. Nicephorus, in consequence of this rebellion, was obliged to make peace with the caliph, but broke it as soon as the latter had retreated. The Arabs, however, recrossed Mount Taurus in the middle of winter, and in the August of A.D. 804, Nicephorus, who had taken the command in person, was defeated with heavy loss at Crasus in Phrygia, by Djabril Ibn Jahja, having a narrow escape of being made prisoner himself. An armistice followed, which was violated the next year by the emperor rebuilding Ancyra and some other fortresses, and making incursions into Syria. In A.D. 806, Haroun, who had been engaged the previous year in Persia, again invaded Asia Minor at the head of 300,000 men. He built a mosque at Tyana as a token of its annexation to his dominions, ravaged the whole country, and took several strong places. Nicephorus was obliged to sue for peace, which he obtained on condition of paying an annual tribute of 30,000 pieces of gold, and three in addition as a personal tribute from himself, and the same from his son. This peace was again violated by the Greeks rebuilding the demolished fortresses. and defeating two Arabian armies near Tarsus. The Arabs retaliated by another invasion, by ravaging Cyprus, and, in September A.D. 807, Rhodes. (Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, ii. 158–162.)

To strengthen himself at home, Nicephorus had his son Stauracius crowned in Saint Sophia in December A.D. 803, and four years later selected as his wife Theophano, a relation of the deposed empress, though she was already betrothed to another man.

In February A.D. 806, the patriarch Tarasius died; and Nicephorus seems to have taken considerable pains to choose a fitting successor (Ignatius, *Vita S. Nicephori* 21, in Migne, *Patr. Graec.* c. 64.) He finally selected his namesake, Nicephorus, who was still a layman. The new patriarch was forbidden to hold any communication with the pope, whom the emperor regarded as the adherent of his rival, Charlemagne (Theophanes, 419 in *Patr. Graeca*, cviii. 993). The same year a synod was held, in which the oeconomus JOSEPHUS (30), who had been degraded from the priesthood for having celebrated the marriage of Constantine and Theodote, was, at the instigation of the emperor, restored. (Michael, *Vita S. Theodori Studitae*, 43, 44; S. Theod. Stud. *Epp.* xxxiii. in *Patr. Graec.* xcix. 156, 1017.) Theodore, abbat of Studium, and his brother Joseph withdrew from communion with the patriarch. Their conduct soon attracted notice. The emperor had been previously inclined to expel them from Constantinople, because they had opposed the appointment of Nicephorus on the ground of his being a layman, and he had only been dissuaded by representations of the odium that would be caused by the banishment of 700 monks and the destruction of so famous a monastery, and he now took advantage of his opportunity. In January A.D. 809 a synod was convened, by which Theodore and Joseph, with the recluse Plato and ten other monks, who adhered to them. were banished from Constantinople.

The same synod declared that emperors were above the divine law, and asserted that each bishop had the power of granting dispensations from the canons (S. Theodor. Stud. *Epp.* xxxiii.).

In February A.D. 808, a conspiracy of many influential persons was formed to place the quaestor Arsaber on the throne. The plot was detected by Nicephorus, who compelled Arsaber to become a monk and banished him to Bithynia, and punished his supporters with corporal punishment, banishment, and confiscation of their property, not sparing certain bishops and monks, and the syncellus, sacristan, and librarian of Saint Sophia, who were among the conspirators.

In A.D. 809 we first hear of Bulgarian inroads. In the spring of that year their king Crumn took Sardica. Nicephorus marched against him, declaring that he would keep his Easter in his palace. His hopes were frustrated by a dangerous mutiny in the army, which was with difficulty appeased. The following winter he caused military colonies to be planted on the Bulgarian frontier, a measure which, according to Theophanes, occasioned much discontent. In October A.D. 810 he had a narrow escape from a mad monk who attacked him with a sword.

In May A.D. 811 he again, with his son Stauracius, took the field against the Bulgarians. He entered their territory on July 20th, and appears to have been at first successful and to have taken the palace of Crumn himself. The account of what follows is very obscure; we hear of desertions to the Bulgarians, who at last surrounded the whole Roman army, and finally attacked at dawn on the 25th. They were completely successful, Nicephorus himself was killed, his son mortally wounded, and the greater part of the officers and soldiers perished. The head of Nicephorus was exposed on a pole for some days, and the skull was mounted in silver as a drinking cup, and preserved in the royal family of Bulgaria.

His relations with the West may be briefly noticed. At the deposition of Irene, ambassadors from Charlemagne were at Constantinople, who had come to negotiate a reunion of the Eastern and Western empires by means of a marriage of their sovereigns. On their return they were accompanied by ambassadors from Nicephorus, who concluded a treaty with Charlemagne on the banks of the Saal, by which Venice and the cities of the Dalmatian coast were left to the Eastern empire. Notwithstanding this treaty, attempts on the Dalmatian towns in A.D. 806, and one on Venice in A.D. 808, the latter under the command of Pippin king of Italy in person, are mentioned. The fleets of the Eastern empire, commanded in the former year by the patrician Nicetas, and in the latter by Paul the governor of Cephalonia, seem to have successfully repulsed these attacks, and in A.D. 810 a new treaty was concluded between Nicephorus and Charlemagne. (Einhard, *Annales* in *Patr. Lat.* civ. 463–473; A. Dandolo. *Chron.* in Muratori, *Rer. Ital. Scr.* xii. 151–158.)

Nicephorus appears to have been a skilful though rapacious financier. A list of his chief financial measures is given by Theophanes (411, 412). The only one that need be noticed here is his extending the hearth-tax to monasteries and charitable institutions, and making it retrospective to the first year of his reign. He also quartered his officers in bishops' residences and in monasteries, and blaming those who had dedicated gold or silver in churches, declared that church property ought to be applied for the service of the state. He favoured the Paulicians and Athingans who lived in Phrygia and Lycaonia, and is accused of having had recourse to their divinations. (Theophanes, *Chron.* 402–416; G. Cedrenus, 829–843 in *Patr. Gr.* cxxi. 912–928; Zonaras, xv. 13–15 in *Patr. Graec.* cxxxiv. 1352–1361; Finlay ii. 92–107.) [F. D.]

NICETA, martyr. See GALONICA.

NICETAS (1), legendary brother of Clement of Rome (*Rec.* vii., *Hom.* xiii.). [G. S.]

NICETAS (2), the father of Herodes the Irenarch (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 15). [G. S.]

NICETAS (3) (NICAEAS, NICEAS, NICIAS), bishop of Romaciana or Remetiana in Dacia, a place which is identified in an article on Bulgarian topography by Professor Tomaschek, of Graz, in the *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad.* 1881–82, t. xcix. p. 441. Our knowledge of him is derived from the epistles and poems of Paulinus of Nola, whom he visited, A.D. 398 and 402, and who has devoted to him two poems (Nos. 17 and 24), composed for the feast of St. Felix. He was probably a native of Dacia, and may have been the Nicias, or Nicaeas, subdeacon of Aquileia, to whom St. Jerome wrote (Hieron., *Ep.* 42 (or 8) ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xxii. 341), yet many doubt it. He evangelized the Scythae, Getae, Daci, Bessi, and Riphaei, but settled specially among the Daci, reducing the wild manners of the barbarians to meekness and honesty. He was noted for eloquence and learning, honoured by the Romans when he visited them, and specially beloved by Paulinus at Nola, but we cannot define the extent of his see or the dates of his episcopate. He is identified by Baronius (*Mart. Rom.* Jun. 22) with Nicaeas, or Nicetas, of Aquileia, who must, however, be later, A.D. 454–485 (Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 773; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 399). The double form, NICETAS and NICEAS, has introduced much difficulty, and has allowed the double commemorations of Jan. 7 and June 22. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. i. 365; and Jun. iv. 243; Tillemont, *H. E.* x. 263, sq.; Fleury, *H. E.* xxi. c. 31; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* v. 458, viii. 84.) [G. T. S.]

Gennadius (*De Vir. Ill.* c. xxii.) says he composed, in a simple and graceful style, six instructions to neophytes, regarding their general conduct and the gentile errors, also "de fide unicae Majestatis, adversus genealogiam (or genethlogiam), de symbolo, de agni paschalis victima;" they are all lost. Gennadius mentions another, "*ad lapsam virginem libellum*," which from the nature of the subject alone has been identified with the *De Lapsu virginis consecratae*, which is usually found attached to the works of St. Ambrose (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xvi. 367), but the conjecture is unsupported by evidence, and many might write on the same subject. [J. G.]

NICETAS (4), bishop of Aquileia, in 458. Leo the Great addressed him a letter (*Ep.* clix.) answering a number of questions he had asked as to the course to be pursued in certain disci-

plinary difficulties, arising mainly out of the Hunnish invasion (*e.g.* when a woman had married a second husband during the captivity of her first, believing him to be dead, what was to be done in the event of his return?) Of this prelate nothing further is known. He is to be distinguished from *Niceas*, the archdeacon of Aquileia, to whom Jerome wrote, and who seems to be identical with Niceas or Nicetas, bishop of Romesiana in Dacia, mentioned by Gennadius, etc. (Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, vol. v. p. 24, edit. 1720.) [C. G.]

NICETAS (5), a commander of the imperial guard under Heraclius. He presented, A.D. 613, to the great church of Constantinople the sacred sponge and lance used at the crucifixion. The sponge was affixed to the relics of the true cross. (*Chron. Pasch.* in Migne, *Pat. Graec.* t. xcii. col. 987–990.) About the legend of the sacred sponge see Willelm Tyr. lib. xx. cap. 25; Bondelmontius in *Descript. C. P.* iii. et t. iii. *Hist. Franc.* p. 343. [G. T. S.]

NICETAS (6), 48th patriarch of Constantinople, 78th bishop, unorthodox, A.D. 766–780, successor to Constantinus II. Nicetas was an eunuch of Sclavonic origin, presbyter of the church of the Holy Apostles, and was, contrary to canon law, consecrated by order of the emperor, Nov. 16. (Nicephorus puts it in August.) The brutal treatment of his deposed predecessor in 767 [CONSTANTINUS II.] is a stain on Nicetas. In A.D. 768 Nicetas carried out some repairs in the great church; and took the opportunity to remove some tesselated or mosaic pictures of Christ and the saints from a neighbouring wing of the patriarchal palace which was used in connection with processions and as a lodging for the emperors on ceremonial occasions. Nicetas died A.D. 780, on Feb. 6th, and was succeeded by Paul. (Baronius, A.D. 766–780; Theoph. *Chronog.* 369, 370, 371, 373, 382; St. Niceph. Patr. C. P. 84, 85; Fleury, *Hist. du Christ.* xliii. 42, 49, 50; xliv. 16, 38.) [W. M. S.]

NICETAS (7), bishop of Dadybra in Paphlagonia. He was present at the seventh general council. He may have been the same as Nicetas the Paphlagonian, whose Encomia on the Apostles Combefis has published in his *Auct. Nov. Bib. PP. Graec.* There is great uncertainty upon the whole question. (Cf. Fabr. *Bib. Graec.* lib. v., cap. v., where he is identified with a Nicetas of the 9th cent.) (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 557.) [G. T. S.]

NICETAS (8), Mar. 20, bishop of Apollonias and confessor for images (*Menol. Graec.* Sirlet.). Le Quien (i. 614) believes his see to be the Bithynian Apollonias, and places him next to Theophylact, who flourished in 787. [C. H.]

NICETIUS (1), May 5, bishop of Vienne, in succession to Nectarius (*Gall. Chr.* xvi. 13). Under the year 379, and calling him Niceta, Ado (*Chron.* in *Pat. Lat.* cxxiii. 96 A) represents him as an eminent upholder of the faith against the Arians. After *Mart. Hieron.* the Bollandists (Mai. ii. 9) commemorate him and Nectarius together on May 5. Tillemont (iii. 624) considers there is reason to make him and Nectarius the same person. Hefele (*Councils*, ii. 405) is inclined to identify our Nicetius with him of 374 NICETIUS ( )], and the NICESIUS of 394. See Tillem. xvi. 104. [C. H.]

NICETIUS, ex-tribune. [NICENTIUS.]

NICETIUS (2), FLAVIUS, an eminent orator of Gaul in the time of Sidonius Apollinaris (lib. viii. ep. 6 in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 594; Tillem. xvi. 269, 270, 279, 749). [C. H.]

NICETIUS (3) (NICET, NICESSE), ST., 25th archbishop of Trèves, between Aprunculus and St. Magnericus (circ. A.D. 527–566), is a figure of some importance in the 6th century. In his day the bishop was already beginning to pass into the baron, and the holy pope Nicetius was already a territorial lord (Freeman, *Augusta Treverorum*, *Histor. Essays*, 3rd series, p. 111). Our principal knowledge of him is derived from Gregory of Tours, who received his information from St. Aredius, an abbat of Limoges, Nicetius' disciple (*Vitae Patrum*, cap. xvii.). The story is that from birth he was marked out for the spiritual life, being born with the tonsure (corona clerici). As a youth he entered a monastery, apparently at Limoges (Ebervinus, *Vita S. Magnerici*, i. Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. vi. 183), and becoming, in time, abbat, shewed himself a strict disciplinarian, setting his face as sternly against idle conversation as bad actions. On the death of Aprunculus the clergy desired St. Gallus for a successor, but king Theoderic had destined him, by his own wish, for Clermont, and Nicetius was appointed (*Vitae Patrum*, cap. vi.). At Trèves, his position was a difficult one. The Franks who surrounded him were little else than barbarians, rioting in the license of an older civilization, and scarcely more than nominal converts to Christianity. Their respect Nicetius won by personal asceticism, an inflexible temper, and fearless demeanor in the face of the strong, activity in good works, and uncompromising orthodoxy. Gregory says of him, on the authority of Aredius, "nec minitantem timuit, nec a blandiente delusus est" (*Vitae Patrum*, cap. xvii.). His weapon was the power of excommunication, and this he used freely against princes and nobles in cases of oppression, or flagrant immorality (cf. Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 462–4). While still an abbat he is said to have confronted king Theoderic, and won his esteem by laying bare to him his wrong-doings. On his way to Trèves to be consecrated, he sternly rebuked his escort of nobles for turning their horses into the standing corn of the poor, and, himself, drove them out. Theoderic's successor, Theodebert, came into conflict with him, and some of his court were excommunicated by the bishop. Clotaire, into whose power Trèves came in 555, was an object of reprobation to the church for the incestuous marriages he had contracted. Wearied of the reproofs which these and other iniquities brought on him, he obtained the bishop's exile by the judgment of a corrupt assembly of fellow-bishops. He was, however, restored by Sigebert after Clotaire's death (circ. A.D. 562), and there is extant a letter of warm congratulations from an anonymous ecclesiastic upon the event (Hontheim, *Hist. Trevir.* i. 40). The councils which he attended shew his wide-reaching activity. He was at Clermont in 535, at Toul in 540, at

Orleans in 544, at the second of Clermont a little later, and at Paris in 555 (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 380). He also convened one himself, under Theodebald, about 550, at Toul to consider the subject of insults which had been levelled at him by certain persons whom, after his custom, he had excommunicated for contracting incestuous marriages. To this council relates the angry letter of Mapinius, bishop of Rheims, who had not been properly invited (Mansi, ix. 147–50; *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1165–6). His orthodoxy is illustrated by two extant letters; one written by him to Clodosinda, the wife of Alboin the Lombard, urging her to turn her husband to Catholicism; the other to the emperor Justinian, whose lapse in his latter days into a form of Eutychianism, Nicetius declares, is lamented by all Italy, Africa, Spain, and Gaul (*Pat. Lat.* lxviii. 375–80; Hontheim, *ibid.* 47–51). Nicetius set himself to restore the churches which had suffered in the storms of the previous generations, and in part rebuilt the metropolitan church of Trèves, the foundation of which patriotism ascribed to Helena, the mother of Constantine, though it was probably a secular building of the time of Valentinian and Gratian (Venant. Fort. *Misc.* iii. 11, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 134). His alterations and additions are described by Wilmowsky, *Der Dom der Trier*, p. 37 sqq., and Freeman, *ibid.* p. 113. For his own defence in those troublous times he built a castle on a lofty hill overlooking the Mosel. The walls, with thirty towers, stretched down to the river banks, and the bishop's hall, with marble columns, occupied the highest point (Venant. Fort. iii. 12, *Patr. Lat. ibid.* 135). It is the first recorded building of a class which later ages were greatly to multiply, but its site is unknown (Freeman, p. 112). For his architectural undertakings he summoned workmen from Italy (Rufus, *Epist.*, Hontheim, *ibid.* p. 37). The high position he made for himself is also evidenced by the letter of Florianus, abbat of Roman-Moûtier, near Lake Como, begging his influence with Theodebald (Hontheim, *ibid.* 35–6), and the praises of Venantius Fortunatus (*Misc.* iii. 11, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 134). He left numerous disciples, chief among them being St. Aredius (Yrier) and St. Magnericus, his successor. (*Vita S. Aridii*, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1120; Ebervinus, *ibid.*; Venant. Fort. iii. 13, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 137.) He died about 566, and was buried in the Church of St. Maximin, where his tomb still is. Even in Gregory's time it was famous for its miracles (*De Glor. Conf.* 94; *Vitae Patr.* xvii.). The day of his death is given as Dec. 5, but he is also commemorated Oct. 1 (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 382).

Besides his two letters mentioned above, he was the author of two little treatises called *De Vigiliis servorum Dei* and *De Psalmodiae Bono*, first published by d'Achéry in 1659. They are slight works of a didactic character, which may well have been written while he was still a monk. They are to be found in the *Patr. Lat.* lxviii. 365–76, and, with the letters, are discussed at some length by Ceillier, xi. 203–6, and in the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 294–6. The authorship of the *Te Deum* has been erroneously ascribed to Nicetius, but it is older than his time. (*Hist. Litt.* iii. 294; Tillem. xiii. 963.)

[S. A. B.]

NICETIUS (4) (Nizier), ST., Ap. 2, abp. of Lyons, between St. Sacerdos and St. Priscus (circ. A.D. 552–573), "vir totius sanctitatis egregius, castae conversationis" (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 36), and one of the few bishops in the West dignified with the title of "patriarcha" (*ibid.* v. 21). We possess two early biographies of him, one written about the year 590, by a clerk of Lyons, at the bidding of Etherius, second occupant of the see after Nicetius, the other a few years later by the historian Gregory of Tours, whose mother was a niece of Nicetius, and who was himself taught by him in early years. Dissatisfied with the meagre information of the earlier life, he undertook to supplement it, though unfortunately he adds little but a string of miracles. The former life was first published by Chifflet and is also to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. i. 100, (cf. *Hist. Litt.* iii. 360–1). Gregory's is found in cap. viii. of his *Vitae Patrum.* A briefer account of him is also contained in his *De Glor. Conf.* (cap. 61); and he is often alluded to in the *Hist. Franc.* (iv. 36, v. 5, 21, viii. 5, and see *De Glor. S. Julian.* cap. 1).

His father was that Florentius of senatorial rank, whose wife Artemia persuaded him to decline the bishopric of Geneva, prophesying that the child she then bore in her womb was destined to be a bishop of his own flesh and blood [Florentius (42)]. This child was called Nicetius "quasi victorem futurum mundi." He was carefully brought up in ecclesiastical learning, and living on in his mother's house after his father had died, and he had entered the ranks of the clergy, was not ashamed to labour with his hands. At the age of thirty, he was ordained priest by Agricola, bishop of Châlons-sur-Saône (circ. A.D. 545), and occupied himself much in teaching the young. Five years later St. Sacerdos the archbishop of Lyons, on his death-bed obtained a promise from king Childebert that Nicetius, his nephew, should succeed him. [Sacerdos.] We know very little of his episcopate except that he presided over the 4th, or, as it is usually called, the 2nd council of Lyons, summoned by king Guntram in 566 (Mansi, ix. 785; Ceillier, xi. 887; *Hist. Litt.* iii. 386); that he was remarkable for his insistence upon the virtue of chastity, for his almsgiving, and for his hospitality to strangers, whose feet he would privily wash; and that, while energetically building churches and houses, cultivating fields and planting vineyards, he did not neglect the duty of prayer.

He died in 573, and his cult was firmly established when his earlier biographer wrote. Gregory enumerates many miracles performed both during his life and after his death, and refers to a heap of fetters preserved in his church which had fallen from the limbs of captives at his tomb. The church of the Apostles, in which he was buried and his body long preserved, took his name. Troyes and the diocese of Tours also possessed relics of him. For his epitaph in verse see *Gall. Christ.* iv. 34, and Boll. *Acta SS.* 2 Ap. i. 95. [S. A. B.]

NICETIUS (5), ST., archbishop of Besancon, between Silvester II. and St. Prothadius, according to an anonymous life to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* 8 Feb. ii. 168–9, was contemporary with

Gregory the Great, and received from him several circular epistles urging the extirpation of simony (none of which, however, have survived). He is also said to have entertained St. Columban when exiled from Luxeuil (circ. A.D. 610). The supposed day of his death was Feb. 8, on which he is noticed in the *Acta SS.*, but he is now commemorated Jan. 31 (*Gall. Christ.* xv. 13). He was buried in the church of St. Peter, which he had restored. [S. A. B.]

NICIAS (1), the bearer of Basil's letter to the members of the church at Satala in 372, informing them that he had granted their request that a relation of his own should be sent to them as bishop. (Basil, *Ep.* 102 [183].) [E. V.]

NICIAS (2), heretic bishop of Laodicea in Syria Prima, an adversary of the council of Chalcedon and an ally of Philoxenus of Hierapolis against Flavian of Antioch (Evag. *H. E.* iii. 31; Le Quien, ii. 796). [C. H.]

NICIAS (3) (Νικίας), a monk, who wrote (cir. 601) against John Philoponus [JOANNES (564)]. Photius (*Cod.* 50) mentions the titles of his treatises: **Κατὰ τῶν τοῦ Φιλοπόνου Κεφαλαίων ἑπτά** (mentioned in the **Διαιτητής** of Philoponus); **Κατὰ τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς Σεβήρου**, and **Κατὰ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι δύο**. (Cave, i. 573; Dupin, ii. 8, ed. 1722; Ceill. xi. 653.) [C. H.]

NICIAS of Romaciana. [NICETAS (3).]

NICO (1), bishop of Cyzicus, a native of Naples, martyred in Sicily with numerous companions in the reign of Decius. His *Acta* are very fabulous. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 23 Mart. iii. 442; Le Quien, i. 749; Tillem. iii. 334.) [C. H.]

NICO (2) (Νίκων), a solitary of Mount Sinai cir. 400, falsely accused by a woman (*Apophth. Pat.* in Cotel. *Mon. Eccl. Gr.* i. 577), thought by Tillemont (xiv. 191, 192) to be the Nico commemorated by the Greeks on Nov. 26. [C. H.]

NICO (3), an archimandrite addressed by Nilus (lib. iii. ep. 119 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxiv.) on the discredit into which the monastic life had fallen. (Ceill. viii. 221.) [C. H.]

NICOBULUS (1), the husband of Gregory Nazianzen's favourite niece Alypiana. From the very favourable portrait of him drawn by his uncle, in whose esteem he deservedly stood very high for his loving and dutiful attention, we learn that Nicobulus was a man of good birth, of large wealth, and considerable literary attainments, writing prose and verse with equal facility. His personal qualifications were as conspicuous as those of his mind. He was very tall and singularly handsome. He was a favourite at court, and served with much distinction in various campaigns, especially that against the Persians. His wealth, high character, and aptitude for business marked him out for civil appointments. These, however, were by no means to his taste, as he preferred a domestic life, with leisure for his literary pursuits. The pen of his uncle Gregory was continually employed in writing to one high official after another to obtain his excuse from duties which had been assigned him. In one letter he begs Olympius the governor of Cappadocia Secunda (c. 382) to relieve him of the office of postmaster of the province, and to substitute some other less onerous charge (*Ep.* 178). In another he urges Helladius, his friend Basil's successor as bishop of Caesarea, to use his influence to get him excused from such duties altogether (*Ep.* 234). There are other letters of a similar character relating to Nicobulus's troubles and difficulties, which it would be tedious to particularise (*Epp.* 47, 48, 107, 160, 166, 179; cf. Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* ix. pp. 382 ff.; 527 ff.). It was at the instance of Nicobulus that Gregory compiled a collection of his own letters (*Ep.* 208), and at his request he drew up a code of rules for letter-writing, enforcing conciseness, perspicuity, and elegance, and, above all, naturalness (*Ep.* 209). Nicobulus died at an early age, c. 385, leaving his wife encumbered with the charge of a large family of children, in very different circumstances from those she had been accustomed to, and exposed to the machinations of evil-disposed persons, who brought suits against her imperilling her property (*Epp.* 44, 45). His eldest son was named after him [NICOBULUS (2)], and his eldest daughter after her mother. (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. ix. pp. 381 ff.; 527 ff., 545.) [E. V.]

NICOBULUS (2), the eldest son of the above by Alypiana, the daughter of Gorgonia, the sister of Gregory Nazianzen. The aged Gregory lavished all the affectionateness of his nature on the boy, in whose religious and intellectual progress he took the keenest interest. He describes him as a quick, clever boy, but inclined to indolence and needing the spur (*Ep.* 116). On Nicobulus and his brothers being sent by their father to Tyana, c. 382, to learn "tachygraphy," Gregory wrote to commend them to the care of Theodorus, the bishop of that city, begging him to see that they had lodgings near the church. When in the same or the following year the boys were removed to Caesarea to study rhetoric, Gregory requested Helladius, the bishop, to take care that they were placed under the ablest and most diligent masters, and to allow them to visit him often, making them feel he did not look down on them (*Ep.* 218). Nicobulus and his brothers had as their private tutor Eudoxius, the son of an old friend of Gregory's, to whom he wrote frequent letters on the subject of the boys' training (*Epp.* 115–117; 119–121; 139) [EUDOXIUS (9) (10)]. A little later Gregory wrote a poetical epistle to Nicobulus the elder, in the name of his son, asking his father's permission to go abroad to study eloquence as his great-uncle had done with such happy results (*Carm.* xlix.). To this Nicobulus replied also in verse (if this be not also from Gregory's pen), granting the lad's request, but adding some sage counsels as to the company he kept and his general conduct (*Carm.* 50). In accordance with this permission the lad went to Constantinople, where he studied under a sophist named Photius, who delighted Gregory with his report of his great-nephew's marvellous progress (*Ep.* 118), and afterwards under Stagirius. This arrangement gave great offence to an old friend and fellow-student of Gregory's named Eustochius, who wrote violent letters complaining that the boy had not been placed under his charge (*Epp.* 61, 62). [EUSTOCHIUS (3).]

The early death of Nicobulus the elder plunged his family into trouble, and after the death of Gregory the boy with his brothers disappears from our view. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* tom. ix. pp. 542–545.) [E. V.]

NICOCLES, a Lacedemonian, the instructor of the emperor Julian in grammar (Soc. *H. E.* iii. 1). His name often recurs in the correspondence of Libanius. In Wolfe's edition of Libanius (*Ep.* 1137), Nicocles apologizes to him for the insults offered by a citizen of Antioch, on the ground that in such a populous city there must be some bad persons. Even in his own Sparta, with a Lycurgus as legislator, all the citizens were not equally good. From *Ep.* 1142 he seems to have been a pagan, at least under Julian. [G. T. S.]

NICODEMUS, counselled by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 22, in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix.) to be thankful for poverty, as it will diminish his responsibility in the day of judgment. [C. H.]

NICOLAITANS. The mention of this name in the Apocalypse (concerning which see DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, *s. v.*) has caused it to appear in almost all lists of heresies; but there really is no trustworthy evidence of the continuance of a sect so called after the death of the Apostle John. Irenaeus, we know, in writing his great work made use of a treatise against heresies by Justin Martyr; and there seems reason to think that Justin's list began with Simon Magus, and made no mention of Nicolaitans. This may be conjectured from the order in which Irenaeus discusses the heresies, viz. Simon, Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, the Ebionites, the Nicolaitans. That these last should have so late a place in the list is inconsistent with chronological order; and the most plausible account of the matter is that Irenaeus followed the order of an older list, which did not include the Nicolaitans, and which he afterwards proceeded to supplement by additions of his own. About the Nicolaitans he has nothing to say (I. xxvi. 3), but what he found in the Apocalypse; for the words "qui indiscrete vivunt," which is the only thing having the appearance of an addition, seems to be only an inference from Rev. ii. 13, 14, and 20–22. Irenaeus in a later book (III. x. 6) incidentally mentions the Nicolaitans as a branch of the Gnostics, and seems to ascribe to them the whole body of Ophite doctrine. It may therefore have been from Irenaeus that Hippolytus derived his view of these heretics. In his earlier treatise (see Vol. III. 93), as we gather from comparing the lists of Epiphanius, Philaster, and Pseudo-Tertullian, he brings them up into an earlier, though still too late a place in his list, his order being Simon Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, Nicolaitans; and he ascribes to them the tenets of a fully developed Ophite system. Concerning this we refer to the article OPHITES, believing that there is no sufficient evidence that these people called themselves Nicolaitans. In the later work of Hippolytus, Nicolaus the deacon is made to be the founder of the Gnostics; but the notice is short, and goes little beyond what is told in the first book of Irenaeus. It is needless to notice the statements of later writers.

Concerning Nicolas the deacon see the article NICOLAS (DICT. OF BIBLE). We merely repeat here the statement of Stephen Gobar (cf. Phot. *Bibl.* 232) that Hippolytus and Epiphanius make Nicolas answerable for the errors of the sect called after him, whereas Ignatius,[a] Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, and Theodoret condemn the sect, but impute none of the blame to Nicolaus himself. [G. S.]

NICOLAUS (1), Dec. 6, bishop of Myra in Lycia, at the time of the Diocletian persecution, and one of the most popular saints both in the East and West. His acts, which may embody some historical elements, are filled with legends and miracles which have become celebrated in hagiological literature. His father's name is reputed to have been Epiphanius, and his mother's Joanna. They lived at the city of Pataca, where they occupied a high position. Nicolaus is regarded as the patron of children, and their exemplar in piety. Accordingly we are told that as soon as he was born he stood up and returned thanks to God for the gift of existence. He rigorously observed the canonical fasts of Wednesdays and Fridays, even when an infant, by abstaining on those days from sucking his mother's breasts. As soon as he grew to man's estate he adopted the ascetic life, and went on a journey to Palestine to visit the holy places. Then began a series of miracles which have rendered him the favourite patron of sailors. He predicted bad weather when everything seemed fair and beautiful, calmed storms which threatened his ship with destruction, and healed a sailor who had fallen off the mast. He is said to have been present at the Council of Nice, where he waxed so indignant with the sentiments of Arius, that he rushed over and inflicted a tremendous box on the heretic's ear. Dean Stanley (*Eastern Church*, pp. 110, 132) represents Nicolaus as occupying the central place in all the traditional pictures of the council. Mr. Tozer in his notes to Finlay's *Hist. of Greece*, t. i. p. 124, notes that Nicolaus has taken the place of Poseidon in Oriental Christianity. Thus, in the island of Eleüssa, a temple of Poseidon has been changed into the church of St. Nicolaus. His popularity in England has been very great, 376 churches being dedicated to him. His feast day was formerly connected in Salisbury Cathedral, Eton, and elsewhere with the curious ceremonial of choosing a boy-bishop, who presided till the following Innocents Day, over his fellow choristers, arrayed in full episcopal attire (cf. *The Antiquities of Cathedral Church of Salisbury*, A.D. 1723, pp. 72–80, where the ritual of the feast is given). We can trace the fame of this saint back to the 6th century, when Justinian built a church in his honour at C. P. (Procop. *de Aedif.* i. 6). His relics were translated in the middle ages to Barri in Italy, whence he is often styled Nicolaus of Barri. The acts of Nicolaus will be found at length in Surii *Hist. Sanct.*, and his legends and treatment in art in Jameson's *Sacred Art*, t. ii. p. 450. The figure

[a] The reference is to the larger form of the Epistle to the Trallians.

of St. Nicolaus is a leading one in the celebrated Blenheim Raphael, lately purchased for the National Gallery. [G. T. S.]

NICOLAUS (2), of Damascus, writer on the Deluge. (Hieron. *De Sit. et Nom. Loc. Heb.* lib. i.; *De Genesi*, in *Pat. Lat.* xxiii. 861 A.) [C. H.]

NICOLAUS (3), a monk at the end of the 4th century, to whom Marcus the anchorite inscribed the eighth book of his work. (Phot. cod. 200.) [C. H.]

NICOLAUS (4), presbyter and monk of the monastery of St. Publius at Zeugma, to whom, together with Theodotus and Chaereas his brother monks, Chrysostom wrote in 405, thanking them for their wish to visit him at Cucusus, from accomplishing which they had been kept by fear of the Isaurian banditti (Chrys. *Ep.* 146). It is probable that he is the same person to whom Chrysostom addressed three letters relating to the missionary work among the pagans of Phoenicia (*Epp.* 53, 69, 145). From the first of these we learn that Nicolaus took a very warm interest in those missions, and had sent monks thither to carry on the work of evangelization, in which he had exhorted them to persevere in spite of the opposition they met with, and the violence with which they were treated. Chrysostom wrote in 405 warmly commending his zeal, and entreating him to send able reinforcements, and to urge Gerontius to go to the mission field as soon as his health would allow (*Ep.* 53). Towards the end of the same year Chrysostom wrote again from Cucusus, expressing his earnest desire to see him, and begging him since that was impossible to write to him as often as he could. It would be a consolation to him, in his loneliness, sickness, and daily terrors of an Isaurian inroad, to know that his friend was in good health (*Ep.* 145). After his flight to Arabissus in 406 he wrote again, describing the danger he had been in with "death every day at the door," praising him for the interest Nicolaus continued to take in the Phoenician missions, and begging him to write if he had anything fresh to tell of them (*Ep.* 69). [E. V.]

NICOLAUS (5), priest of Thessalonica, deputed by pope Leo I., A.D. 444, to act as his legate in eastern Illyria: this was at the request of Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica (St. Leo, *Ep.* vi.), and while Nicolaus received full instructions as to regulating the ordinations of bishops and clergy, and the general discipline, the Illyrian metropolitans were directed to receive him as the papal representative (*Ib.*, *Ep.* v. ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. liv. 616–7; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 202–3. On the legatine authority, see *Dict. Chr. Antiq.* ii. 967). [J. G.]

NICOMACHUS, an apostate at Lampsacus, A.D. 250, said to have been slain by demons (Boll. *Acta SS.* 15 Mai. iii. 453 A; Tillem. iii. 321). [C. H.]

NICOMAS, bishop of Iconium, noted by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 28) as one of the leading bishops at the middle of the third century. [G. S.]

NICOMEDES (1), African bishop of Segermi (Segelmi, Secermi), which is not mentioned by ancient geographers (nor in Dict. Gk. & Roman Geog.), but whose bishops occur twice or three times as belonging to Provincia Byzacena (see Morcelli). Its name does not occur in inscriptions. He is named fourth in *Syn. Carth.* 2 *de pace*, A.D. 251, Cyp. *Ep.* 57; fifth in *Syn. Carth. de Basilide*, A.D. 254, Cyp. *Ep.* 67; eighth in *Syn. Carth. de Bapt. H.* i. Cyp. *Ep.* 70; ninth in *Syn. Carth. de Bapt.* iii. *Sent. Epp.* [E. W. B.]

NICOMEDES (2), a monk, member of a coenobitic society at Nazianzus, one of those highly praised by Gregory Nazianzen in his poem extolling the virtues of these solitaries (*Carm.* 46, p. 108). Nicomedes was a kinsman of Gregory's, who had consecrated all his property to religious uses, and like a second Abraham had devoted his two children, a son and a daughter, to the service of God in coenobitic societies. [E. V.]

NICOMEDIA, MARTYRS OF. Under this head may be reckoned Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia and a great number of his flock who perished under suspicion of having set fire to the Imperial palace at the very beginning of the Diocletian persecution. Euseb. viii. 6, 13. The acts of Anthimus are given by the Bollandist in April t. iii. in Greek and Latin. Cf. Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* p. 320, and Tillem. *Mém.* v. 23. [G. T. S.]

NICOSTRATUS (1), Roman deacon (Cyp. *Ep.* 31, tit.; *Ep.* 32), and confessor 253. From use of *patronae* (*Ep.* 50) probably a freedman. Slaves could be ordained (*Can. Ap.* 81), with consent of masters followed by manumission, but the word *dominae* would then probably have been used. At the council of Elvira freedmen were forbidden to be ordained during the life of patrons. One of the fellow-sufferers (*Ep.* 37) of MOYSES and MAXIMUS, and, like the latter and his friends, an adherent of Novatian. But at the time when they returned to the Catholic church and to Cornelius (*Ep.* 49, 51, 52) he left them and sailed with Novatus to Carthage to push the Novatianist cause. (*Ep.* 50.) He is accused by Cornelius of peculation in his office, or rather it may be transferring to what he considered the true church funds which he had in his keeping belonging to the church of Rome (*Ep.* 50, 52). In *Catal. Vet. Pontif.* (Pearson, *Ann.* p. 30 *a*) it is said that Novatus made or caused him to be made a bishop in Africa; but this seems to be a confusion, and so thinks Baluze: see EVARISTUS, who with Nicostratus, Novatus, Primus, Dionysius, composed the legation to Carthage. [E. W. B.]

NICOSTRATUS (2), a primiscrinius at Rome, c. 287, in the *Acta* of St. Sebastian, by whom he was converted while having in his custody SS. Marcus and Marcellianus. He afterwards suffered martyrdom. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 20 Jan. ii. 268–270, §§ 24, 30, 35, 68, 76; Tillemont, iv. 518, 519, 520, 528.) [C. H.]

NICOSTRATUS (3), eastern bishop, deposed probably by the emperor Anastasius I. Along with two other bishops, Helias and Thomas, who were in a like predicament, he is mentioned in several letters of pope Hormisdas, who in 519 and 520 was very urgent

with the emperor Justin I. for their restoration. For references see HELIAS. [J. G.]

NICOTYCHUS (1), a scholasticus charged by Nilus (lib. iii. ep. 8) with being secretly addicted to Gentile wickedness. [C. H.]

NICOTYCHUS (2) (Νικότυχος), a deacon warned by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 142) against indulging voluptuous thoughts. [C. H.]

NIDAN, Welsh saint, son of Gwrvyw, of the family of Coel Godebog, in the college of Penmon, Anglesey; patron of Llannidan in Anglesey. Feast Sept. 30. (Rees, *W. SS.* 295; Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 504, 528, 558; *Myv. Arch.* ii. 49.) [J. G.]

NIDHARDUS, addressed by Winfrid c. 720 (*Ep.* 4 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxix. 692). [C. H.]

NIERSES. [NORSESES.]

NIGIDIUS, a heretic, apparently a Gnostic, mentioned by Tertullian in his *De Praescript. Haeret.* cap. xxx. He classes him with Hermogenes and several others as "still perverting the ways of the Lord," whence we conclude he was still alive when this was written [HERMOGENES] (Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte*, 554). [G. T. S.]

NILAMMON (1) (Νειλάμμων), one of the bishops ordained by Alexander bishop of Alexandria, and banished by the Arians to Ammoniaca in the time of Athanasius. (Athan. *Ap. de Fug.* § 7, *Hist. Ar.* § 72; Tillem. viii. 697.) [C. H.]

NILAMMON (2), a solitary, elected bishop of Gera in Egypt, about the time of the expulsion of Chrysostom from Constantinople. He shrank from the honour, however, and died when Theophilus archbishop of Alexandria came to ordain him. (Soz. viii. 19; Boll. *Acta SS.* 6 Jun. 326 B; Tillem. xi. 214, 489; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 551.) [C. H.]

NILAMMON (3), a scholasticus, one or more, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium on the preference of deeds to words (lib. i. ep. 3 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxviii.), on the principle that religion cannot be fairly reproached with the crimes of its ministers (lib. iii. ep. 242), and on the terrors of conscience (lib. v. ep. 561). Other Nilammons addressed by Isidore are—

(4), two persons in one letter (lib. iii. ep. 288); their characters, in which as well as in name they resembled one another, are severely censured.

(5), a presbyter (lib. iii. ep. 293), who enquires why those under intoxication are differently affected in appearance.

(6), a deacon (lib. iii. ep. 364) on the guilt incurred by those who minister at the sacrament while indulging in sin.

(7), a deacon and physician (lib. iii. 71) on God being a God of judgment as well as of mercy.

(8), a monk (lib. iv. ep. 98) in reply to his enquiry why, since it behoved Christ to suffer, those who crucified Him should be punished.

(9), (lib. iv. ep. 150) in answer to the question why St. Paul should have written to the Corinthians, "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." [C. H.]

NILO (Νείλων), addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. iv. ep.108) on St. Paul's words, "having spoiled principalities and powers," &c. [C. H.]

NILUS (1), a proconsul and father of Pansophius, an Egyptian martyr during the Decian persecution. Pansophius is commemorated by Bas *Men.* Jan. 16. (Leo Allat. *Diatrib. de Nilis et eorum Scriptis*, sec. ii.) [G. T. S.]

NILUS (2), Sept. 19, an Egyptian bishop who suffered by fire in Palestine with another Egyptian bishop, Peleus, in the Diocletian persecution. (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13, *Mart. Palest.* cap. xiii.) [G. T. S.]

NILUS (3), Nov. 12, a famous ascetic of Sinai, who flourished at the end of the 4th century. He was probably born in Galatia, as he speaks of St. Plato, martyr of Ancyra as his countryman. He rose to high position at Constantinople, where he held the office of prefect. He married, and had two children, when he determined about A.D. 390 to retire to Sinai, taking with him his son Theodulus. His epistles are very curious, and interesting reading, detailing the assaults made on him by demons, and replying to the various queries of every kind, doctrinal, disciplinary, and even political, with which he was assailed by his admirers. GAÏNAS, the Gothic general, consulted him on the Arian controversy, but without changing his opinions (*Epp.* lib. i. 70, 79, 114). Nilus boldly took the side of St. Chrysostom when banished from C. P. in 404, and wrote in his defence to the emperor Arcadius (*Epp.* iii. 279), who in reply solicited the prayers of Nilus to protect Constantinople from impending ruin. The story of his ordination is a curious one. The Saracens invaded the desert of Sinai, and took captive a number of the solitaries, among whom were Nilus and his son Theodulus. They dismissed Nilus and the older men, but retained the young men, intending to offer them as sacrifices to the Morning Star on the next day. They overslept themselves, however, and then, as the propitious time was past, they sold Theodulus, who fell into the hands of a neighbouring bishop. There he was found by his father. The piety of them both so struck the bishop that he compelled them to accept ordination at his hands. They then returned to Sinai, and distinguished themselves by a severer piety than they had practised previously. Nilus died about the year 430. Theodulus is commemorated on January 14. Fabricius, in vol. x. 1–12 of his *Bibliotheca Graeca*, bestows a lengthened notice on Nilus, and gives a list of his works, which were first published in a complete shape in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, t. lxxix., where his letters will be found after the text of Leo Allatius. The bibliography of his works is detailed at length in Fabricius, *l. c.*, and in Ceillier, viii. 229. The study of his writings throws much light on the state of monasticism,

and of Christian society in general at the end of 4th century. Take his letters for instance:— The two last epistles in the collection lib. iv. *Epp.* 61 and 62 were quoted at the second Nicene council as bearing on the Iconoclastic controversy, both sides claiming support from such an eminent saint. They are, certainly, both of them most interesting and important documents for the illustration of church life at that period. Olympiodorus, an Eparch, was desirous of erecting a church which he proposed to decorate with images of saints in the sanctuary, together with hunting scenes, birds, and animals in mosaic, and numerous crosses in the nave, and on the floor. He designed a scheme of decoration, in fact, which we find carried out some time later in the churches of Central Syria, depicted in De Vogüé's great work on the *Civil and Ecclesiastical Architecture of Syria.* The reply of Nilus is important from the purely artistic and architectural point of view. He condemns the mosaics as mere trifling and unworthy a manly Christian soul. He rejects numerous crosses in the nave, but orders the erection of one cross at the East end of the sanctuary, "Inasmuch as by the Cross man was delivered from spiritual slavery, and hope has been shed on the nations." Good pictures from the Old and New Testaments meet with his approval. They serve as books for the unlearned; teach them Scripture history, and impress on them the record of God's mercies. The church was to have numerous chapels. Each chapel may have a cross erected therein. Epistle sixty-two proves that his prohibition of mosaics only extended to hunting scenes, and did not probably include the images of saints. It was written for the purpose of exalting the fame of his favourite martyr, Plato of Ancyra, and it conclusively proves that the invocation of saints was then practised in the East [cf. FIDENTIUS (2)]. It tells a story of a father and son who were taken captive by the barbarians. The son invoked the help of Christ and of St. Plato, when the latter appeared to him mounted on horseback, and leading with him a riderless horse which the pious captive was compelled to mount, and was guided by the supernatural visitor to a place of safety. The martyr was recognized by the young man from the numerous pictures he had seen. Nilus did not approve of the extraordinary forms which monasticism was assuming. Lib. ii. *Epp.* 114 and 115 are addressed to one Nicander, a Stylite, who must have set the fashion which St. Simeon followed. In his first epistle, Nilus tells him his lofty position is due simply to pride, and shall find a fulfilment of the words, "He that exalts himself shall be abased." In the second epistle he charges upon him light and amorous conversation with women. Monastic discipline seems indeed to have been very relaxed in his time, as the same charges are often repeated in his letters and works. We often find in them the peculiar practices of the monks or of the early church explained with mystical references. Thus in lib. i. *Ep.* 24 he explains to one Marcianus, the reason of washing the hands before entering a church (cf. Bingham. t. ii. p. 398). *Epp.* 26–31 are taken up with a defence of the practice of ecclesiastical vigils, in reply to the arguments and objections of one Timotheus, a sub-deacon, who adopted the views of Vigilantius, while Nilus uses a more Christian style of argument than that employed by Jerome. *Epp.* 86 and 87 explain standing with outstretched arms at prayer as a figure of the Cross, with which may be compared, lib. iii. *Ep.* 132 expounding standing at prayer on Sundays as a testimony to the resurrection. *Epp.* 124—127 contain his replies to a Jew named Benjamin, who attacked Christianity. In the second book we find *Ep.* 116 reproving a nun, who had so far forgotten Eastern modesty as even to teach men publicly in a church. He refers her very briefly to the Apostolic prohibition. In *Ep.* 160, he writes to a bishop, Philo, who combined, like the ancient Celts, the office of bishop with that of abbat, advising him about the management of his monks. In *Ep.* 245, he refers to the custom of monks, who wore their cloaks over the right shoulders, while seculars wore theirs over the left; while in *Ep.* 289, he writes to a chamberlain, Methodius, explaining Christ's fear of death, and His prayer against it in the Garden of Gethsemane, as a mere pretence, to deceive the devil and to lead him to think Christ a mere man. Therefore the devil brought about His crucifixion; otherwise, had he known Him to be God, he would not have done so. These specimens of the matters contained in his letters will show how very various are the subjects discussed. In fact, there is no more copious source for illustrations of the life and times of the close of the 4th century, than this correspondence which he maintained with all classes from the emperor downwards. Another circumstance shows the wide influence Nilus exercised even in the distant West. Cardinal Pitra has published in his *Spicilegium Solesmense*, iii. 398, a letter, written by Nilus to one Nemertius, expounding the mystical meaning of the various parts of a church—the gates, columns, bishop's throne, etc. He explains the position of the episcopal throne in the midst of all the presbyters as representing the Seat of the Great High Priest, Jesus Christ. This original position of the episcopal throne, facing westwards in the midst of the twelve presbyters, is retained to this day in the Coptic churches of Egypt, in the 7th-century church of Torcelli, near Venice, and the cathedral of Parenzo in Istria (cf. Butler's *Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt*, Oxford, 1884, p. 35 and p. 78, where a plan may be seen illustrating this arrangement). This epistle was found by Pitra in a manuscript of Cambrai, belonging to 9th century, in a Latin translation made by Anastasius Bibliothecarius; affording an instance of the percolation, at that period, of Syrian ideas into the West of Europe. The prevalence of the anchorite life in the Celtic church of the West may be largely due to his influence. He wrote a treatise in twenty-seven chapters in praise of it, entitled *De Monachorum Praestantiâ*, which can be consulted in the volume of the *Patrol. Graec.*, already cited, col. 1061. His treatise on prayer in one hundred and fifty-three chapters was highly praised by Photius, *cod.* 201. It is contained in the same volume, and embraces many noble thoughts. It rises above the narrow view of prayer, which limits it to petition merely, and defines it as a colloquy of the human spirit with the Divine.

Ceillier (viii. 205—230) has a good account of the life, doctrines, and bibliography of Saint Nilus. [G. T. S.]

NILUS (4), a scholasticus addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. v. epp. 240, 241).

(5), another person or more (lib. i. epp. 5, 56, 137, 219; ii. 160; iii. 69, 139; iv. 151, 158, 167, 179, 193; v. 130, 145, 157, 272, 287, 391, 438, 487, 492, 516).

(6), a deacon, who affirms that philosophy, rhetoric, grammar, &c., derive their ornament and grace from Christian truth (lib. iii. ep. 65), and comments on the passages, "If thine eye offend thee," &c. (iii. 66), and "The natural man receiveth not," &c. (iv. 127).

(7), a monk (lib. i. epp. 80, 427) on the passage "Agree with thine adversary quickly," &c., and on the hypocrisy of those who wear the sheep-skin girdle, but do not mortify the flesh.

NILUS (8), a priest addressed by NILUS (3) (lib. iii. epp. 236, 256) on the value of prayer and on the passage St. John v. 7; a monk (lib. iii. epp. 155, 255) on the value of prayer and on Ps. xlii. 3; a scholasticus (lib. iii. ep. 153) on the spiritual conflict. Another person (lib. iii. ep. 170) on divine chastisements. [C. H.]

NILUS (9), bishop of Orthosias in Phoenicia, ordained by Leontius bishop of Tripolis, having been trained in the monastery of St. Euthymius in Palestine (*Vit. Euthym.* § 129, in Coteler. *Eccl. Gr. Monum.* ii. 310; Le Quien, ii. 826). [C. H.]

NIMMIA, Aug. 12, martyr at Augsburg, with Hilaria, mother of St. Afra, and several other women. (*Mart.* Us., Adon.) [HILARIA (1).] [G. T. S.]

NINIAN (NINIAS, NINAN, NINAS, NINUS, NINYAS, NYNIA, NYNYANE, DINAN, RINGAN, RINGEN), bishop and confessor, commemorated Sept. 16. The general facts of his life and work present comparatively few points for dispute, owing perhaps to there being but one tradition, and that not materially departed from.

The primary authority is Bede (*E. H.* iii. 4), who makes however only an incidental allusion to St. Ninian in connection with St. Columba, yet touches therein the chief points embodied in the later *Life*—his converting the southern Picts a long time before St. Columba's day (multo ante tempore), his being "de natione Brittonum," but instructed in the Christian faith and mysteries at Rome; his friendship with St. Martin of Tours, in whose honour he dedicated his episcopal see and church at Candida Casa in the province of the Bernicii, and his building the church there of stone "insolito Brittonibus more" (*M. H. B.* 176). This is repeated in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* A.D. 565 (*Ib.* 303). Ailred's *Vita S. Niniani* appears to be little more than an expansion of these details, but in how far he, in the 12th century, had or had not authentic evidence of an earlier date to assist him in the compilation we have no means of knowing, beyond this that he specially refers to Bede's information and also to a "liber de vita et miraculis ejus, barbario (barbarice) scriptus," but of its value we are ignorant. The chief life is *Vita Niniani Pictorum Australium apostoli, auctore Ailredo Reivallensi*, first printed by Pinkerton (*Vit. Ant. SS.* 1 sq. ed. 1789), and reprinted with translation and notes, by Bp. Forbes (*Historians of Scotland*, vol. v. 1874). Capgrave (*Nov. Leg. Angl.* f. 241–3) has *De Niniano Ep. et Conf.* which appears to be taken from or based upon a Life in the Burgundian Library at Brussels; this is partly translated and commented upon by Cressy (*Ch. Hist. Brit.* 154, 161, 184). In *Brev. Aberdon.* (Prop. SS. p. Est. ff. 107 sq.) there are 9 lections with antiphons, hymns, &c. The Scotch annalists have been mindful of St. Ninian, and Ussher (wks. vi. 200 sq.) has collected their notices, but they are of no special value. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 16 Sept. v. 318–28) print no Life, but give a learned commentarius historico-criticus by Stickenus, in which most of the points in his life are considered. (See further Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. 44 sq. 853; Bp. Forbes, *Lives of SS. Kent and Nin.* Introd.; Grub, *Eccl. Hist. Scot.* i. c. 2 et al.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 3, 444; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 14, 35; Pinkerton, *Enquiry*, ii. 263 sq.; Pryce, *Anc. Brit. Ch.* 104 sq.)

Ailred's *Life of S. Ninian* is of the usual unhistoric character, fuller of moralisings than of facts, and having only one fixed point to suggest a date. St. Ninian was of royal birth and belonged to the valley of the Solway; his father was probably a regulus in the Cumbrian kingdom, and, being a Christian, had his son early engrafted into the church by baptism. The youth soon manifested a desire to visit Rome, and crossing over to the Continent set out on a pilgrimage to the holy city, which he appears to have reached in the time of pope Damasus (A.D. 366–384), perhaps in A.D. 370. After devoting several years (pluribus annis) there in study of the Scriptures and holy learning, he was raised to the episcopate, A.D. 394, by the pope himself, probably Siricius (A.D. 385–399), and sent as bishop to the western part of Britain, where the Gospel was unknown, corrupted, or misrepresented by the teachers. Calling on St. Martin at Tours and receiving from him masons to build churches according to the Roman method, he returned to his native shores and built his church at Witerna, now Whithern in Wigtonshire, but whether it was near the site of the later abbey or on the island near the shore is uncertain. As he was building the church when the news reached him of St. Martin's death (A.D. 397), in whose honour he was careful to dedicate the church itself, this at the latest must have been in the spring of 398. Farther than this we have no landmarks for ascertaining his dates. The chief field of his missionary labours was in the central district of the east of Scotland among those barbarians who had defied the Roman power in the days of Agricola, and who were separated off from the Roman province of Valentia by the rampart of Antoninus; but the veneration in which his name is held is shown by his dedications being found over all Scotland. (For dedications see Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 424.)

His monastic school, known by various names as Magnum Monasterium, Monasterium Rosnatense, Alba, and Candida Casa, was famous

through Cumbria and Ireland, and was one of the chief seats of early Christian learning to which the Welsh and Irish saints resorted, till both school and see were destroyed by the irruptions of the Britons and Saxons. The see was revived for a time in the 8th century, under Saxon influence from York (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 7–8, 56 sq.; Stubbs, *Reg. Sac. Ang.* 184 et al.), to be again restored in the 12th cent. by King David I. of Scotland. The date usually assigned for his death, though on no definite data, is Sept. 16 A.D. 432, and Bede (E. H. iii. c. 4) relates that he was buried in his church at Candida Casa, which in the middle ages became a much frequented place of pilgrimage. (See Chalmers, *Caled.* iii. 42.) At the same time it must be noted that an Irish tradition (O'Conor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 86; Todd, *B. of Hymns*, i. 100 sq.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 3, 46) carries him to Ireland as Monenn, &c., who founded a church at Cluain-Conaire in the north of Ui-Faelain, and died there. But this is probably fictitious. Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 502) ascribes to him *Meditationes Psalterii* and *De Sententiis Sanctorum*, while Tanner (*Bibl.* 549), from Leland, mentions *Eulogium temporis*, all probably fictitious. The Clog-rinny or Bell of St. Ringan, of rude workmanship, is in the Antiquarian Museum, Edinburgh, and his cave is still pointed out on the sea-shore in the parish of Glasserton, Wigtonshire. His feast is Sept. 16th.

The era embraced in the life of St. Ninian (A.D. 360–432?) is a memorable epoch in the history of the Western church. While in the East were living and suffering for the faith the great St. Basil of Caesarea, the Gregories, and St. Chrysostom, there were no less saints in the West moulding the church's teaching and destiny, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine. And still further west St. Martin was consolidating at Tours the monastic system which was to prove so effectual in christianising Britain [MONASTIC BISHOP, *Dict. Ch. Ant.* ii. 1270]. But it was a time of barbarous warfare, and the Roman empire was falling to pieces before the inroads of the Goths from the north and east. Rome required her forces to protect, if possible, her own citadel, and the colonies were left to shift for themselves. The last of the legionaries were withdrawn from Britain in A.D. 410, while St. Ninian was preaching among the southern Picts, and for a time all intercourse was practically broken off with Rome. But up to this time Britain had formed part of the empire, and the road was open for soldier or pilgrim to the capital, and the youthful Briton from the Solway may easily have found his way to the holy city and been a witness of the wretched scenes which distinguished the episcopate of Damasus. Coming from Rome through the Gallican church and imbibing the views of his patron St. Martin, he would impress upon the new church in Britain the mark of a peculiarly Western character, and the first fruits of his mission would appear in the monastic establishment at Whithern, but of other foundation time or tradition has left no trace. Where the imperial legions had failed to maintain their footing, this pioneer of the Gospel entered to establish the kingdom of peace, and laboured for upwards of thirty years in the centre and south-west of what is now Scotland. He died in peace, and, according to tradition, his work was taken up by St. Palladius, St. Ternan, St. Servanus, St. Kentigern, and other Scotch saints, but St. Ninian remains the first and greatest of the ancient British missionaries of whom we have clear and distinct tradition.

[J. G.]

NINNIDH (NENNIUS, NENNIDH, NENNIDIUS, NAINNIDH), surnamed Saebhruisc or Laobhdhearc, of Inismacsaint, co. Fermanagh, in Loch Erne, bishop, commemorated Jan. 18; belongs to the 6th century, but his legend is doubtful. (*M. Doneg.* 23; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 111 sq.; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 319 sq.; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. 451; ii. 233. For the architectural remains at Inismacsaint, and the rudely executed ancient cross of St. Nenn, see O'Hanlon *ut supr.* and Proc. *Roy. Ir. Acad.* vii. 304.) [J. G.]

NINNOCA. [NENNOCA.]

NINUS (Cyp. *Ep.* 56), in the Decian persecution with Florus and Clementianus endured the question before local magistrates, but broke down under more protracted torture before the proconsul. Their case was brought by Superius before six bishops at Capsa, who referred it to Cyprian and he to the council. He was inclined to restore them after *three* years of penance, counted from Feb. A.D. 250 to April 252. [E. W. B.]

NIOBITES, a sub-division of the Monophysite party, who derived their name from a Niobes, an Alexandrian professor. They differed from the catholics only in the use of language. They flourished in cent. vii. (Hefele's *Councils*, sec. 208.) [G. T. S.]

NISTHEROUS (Νισθερῶος), two fathers (if not the same) of the Egyptian desert, one of whom is designated ὁ μέγας, and called the friend of Antony, and the other a coenobite; but they may be the same person. The former gave more practical advice to a man who questioned him than monks often imparted. He was asked to point out the best course of action a man should follow, to promote God's glory. He replied that in God's sight all good actions are equally acceptable, all virtues stand on a level. Abraham was noted for hospitality, Elijah for retirement, David for humility, yet God accepted all equally. "Choose then the course your spirit inclines towards, and guard your heart," was his conclusion. The second Nistherous was supposed to possess miraculous powers. A famous anchorite of that day, Poemen or Pastor, brother of Nub or Anuph [NUB] [POEMEN], asked him how he obtained such spiritual power. Nistherous replied that when he entered on the monastic life, he said to his soul, "Tu et Asinus estis unum," and then acted accordingly. An ass when beaten replies not; so had he acted till he attained to the state depicted by the Psalmist (lxxiii. 21, 22), "so foolish was I, and ignorant: even as it were a beast before thee; nevertheless I am always by thee." (Cotelerii *Monum. Graec. Eccles.* i. 575, 577.) [G. T. S.]

In Rosweyd's *Vitae Patrum* these fathers

occur under the forms Nisteron and Nesteron (v. 12, 30; vii. 12, 42), one of them being Nisteron major, who answers to the ὁ μέγας. One of them, apparently the coenobite, is met with again in Cassian, who visited him in 395. Two of the *Conferences*, the 14th and 15th, are held with him, the subjects being *De Spiritali Scientia* and *De Charismatibus Divinis*. He and his associates, Chaeremon and Joseph, are "senes tres ... anachoretae antiquissimi" [JOSEPHUS (27)] (Cassian, *Coll.* xiv., xv. ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. xlix. col. 953 sq.; Tillemont, *H. E.* x. 10, 439, 442; xiv. 162, 163; xv. 154, 155; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 147.) [J. G.]

NITIGISIUS (NITIGIS, NIGESIUS), bishop of Lugo (561–585), to whom St. Martin bishop of Braga dedicated his collection of canons (*Patr. Lat.* cxxx. 575). He heads the subscriptions at the synod of Lugo in 572 (Mansi, ix. 841). For a fuller account of this prelate, see Florez. *Esp. Sag.* xl. 66. [MARTINUS (2), p. 847 a.] [C. H.]

NITRIA, MONASTERIES OF. This district, which has contributed to the British Museum some of its most important manuscript treasures, is a desert valley situated between 30 and 31 degrees both of latitude and longitude, about thirty-five miles to the left of the most western branch of the Nile. The name of Nitria (Strabo, *Geogr.* xviii. i. 23, ed. Paris, 1858) belongs properly to the northern part of the valley, where the famous Natron lakes are situated; the southern part is more correctly the Valley of Scithis or Scete. It is also called the Desert, or Valley, of Macarius, from the convent dedicated to one of the three saints who bore that name. The Mohammedans commonly call the whole valley Wadi Habib, after one of their own saints, one of the Prophet's companions, who retired hither about the end of the 7th century. This valley has been the resort of ascetics from the earliest times; the Therapeutae of Philo's day may have set the example (Neander, *H. E.* i. 84). Possibly, as Jerome seems to hint (*ad Eustoch.*), from some fancied virtues of purification in the lakes themselves, in allusion to Jeremiah xi. 22: "Oppidum Domini Nitriam, in quo purissimo virtutum nitro sordes lavantur quotidie plurimorum." Bingham (*Antiquit.* lib. viii. cap. i. sec. 4) has ably discussed the origin of monasticism, pointing out that while ascetic lives have been led from the very beginning of Christianity, monasticism took its rise in Egypt after the Decian persecution, when men fled to the neighbouring deserts for safety, where, finding not only a safe retreat, but also more time and liberty to exercise themselves in acts of piety and contemplation, they remained there when the danger had passed. The first person to organize the ascetics of Nitria was Saint Ammon [AMMON], who flourished under Constantine, and was a friend of Athanasius. He died about A.D. 345 (Ceill. iv. 314). He was succeeded by Macarius, who instituted the first community in that part of the valley which to this day bears his name. [MACARIUS (17).] The fame of this place rapidly extended Ascetics thronged to it in thousands. Men of high position weary of the world, like Ausonius, the preceptor of Arcadius and Honorius, retired hither. Rufinus. who visited Nitria about the year 372, mentions some fifty convents (cf. Soz. *H. E.* vi. 31), and Palladius, who in 390 passed twelve months here, reckons the devotees at five thousand (Pallad. *Hist. Lausiac.* cap. vii.; Ceill. vii. 484). Jerome also visited them about the same time, and gives us numerous details of their life (cf. *Epp.* ad Eustoch., ad Rustic.). The influence of Nitria upon Western Europe was very great. Athanasius brought with him to Rome upon his second exile Ammon, a monk of Nitria; not, however, the same as the above-mentioned Ammon. From that time (A.D. 340) the introduction of the monastic life into Italy must be dated. [ATHANASIUS, Vol. I. p. 188; cf. Hieron. *Ep. ad Princip. Epitaph. Marcellae*; Baron. *An.* 340, n. 7.] Even the very discipline of Western monasticism was modelled upon that of Nitria, as Cassianus introduced the knowledge of it into Gaul by his treatises, *De Institutis Renuntiantium*, and the *Collationes Patrum in Scithico Eremo Commorantium*, the latter of which St. Benedict ordered to be read daily by his disciples. [CASSIANUS.] This connexion between Gaul and Nitria was maintained during the 4th century, as we see from the conclusion of Jerome's treatise against Vigilantius, where he mentions the haste of the Gallic monk, Sisinnius, "who is about to proceed to Egypt for the relief of the saints," as an excuse for the brevity of his treatise. Sisinnius was the messenger of Exuperius of Toulouse, Riparius, and Desiderius, and carried their alms to the ascetics of Egypt (cf. Hieron. *Prolog. in Zachar.*). [EXUPERIUS.] For other instances of this Eastern and Syrian connexion with southern Gaul, cf. Boeckh. *Corp. Inscriptt. Graec.* 9886, 9891–93; Le Blant, *Chrét. Inscriptt. en Gaule*, i. p. 324. These inscriptions seem to relate to a regular Syrian colony settled at Arles and Vienne, about 450. From the above-named works of Cassianus, together with the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius, the *Monumenta* of Cotelerius, and Sulpicius Severus, *Dialogus I.*, the curious reader will gain the most ample details of the life, conversation, discipline, and religious observances of the Nitrian communities in the 4th and 5th centuries (Ceill. vii. 486; Du Pin, *H. E.* i. 425, ed. Dublin, 1723). [PALLADIUS.] Towards the conclusion of the 4th century they were torn with religious controversy. On the one hand, a section of the Nitrian monks, led by Pathomius, embraced anthropomorphism [ANTHROPOMORPHITAE], while, on the other hand, the vast majority of them followed the opinions of Origen, for which they were violently persecuted, even to death, by Theophilus, the patriarch of Alexandria (A.D. 401), and roundly denounced by Jerome. (Cf. Correspondence between Jerome and Theophilus among Hieron. *Epp.*; Sulpic. Sever. *l. c.*; Neander, *H. E.* iv. 464–66.) [THEOPHILUS, CHRYSOSTOM.] This Origenistic tendency reproduced itself in Cassianus and his followers in Gaul (Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christ.* t. i. 165–170, ed. 1867). It also prepared the way for that Monophysite view of our Lord's person, which the Nitrian monks, in common with the whole Egyptian church, maintained from the 5th century onwards.

Joannes Moschus tells us that in his time—the beginning of the 7th century—the Nitrian monks numbered three thousand five hundred, and gives us interesting details of the inner life of the monasteries at that time in his works, as published by Cotelerius in *Mon. Eccles. Graec.*, and in the *Vitae Patr.* or *Hist. Eremit.* in Migne's *Patr. Lat.* lxxiii., lxxiv., wherein will be found many of the ancient works already referred to in this article. After the invasion of the Saracens we principally depend upon the Arab historians for information, the chief of them being al-Makrizi, who died A.D. 1441. His *History of the Copts* was published with a German translation by Wüstenfeld, at Göttingen, in the *Abhandlung. der Königl. Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* Bd. iii. and separately at the same place in 1845. The writings of Severus, bishop of Ashmunin, whose works form the foundation of Renaudot's *Hist. Pat. Alex.*, and of Georgius al-Makim (A.D. 1273), another Christian writer, also help to throw light on their mediaeval history. It is, however, with the history of the Convent of St. Mary Deipara, or of St. Suriani, as it is often called in modern works, that we must now deal. It is one of the four remaining out of the fifty or sixty which existed twelve hundred years ago. It is said to have been founded by a holy man named Honnes, whose tree is still shewn a couple of miles south of the convent. It was originally connected with the Syrian Monophysites, perhaps in some such way as to this day different nations are represented among the religious houses on Mount Athos. We find fairly conclusive evidence in the history of John of Ephesus that this Syrian monastery existed as such in his time—the middle of the 6th century—as we are told how that three bishops came to Nitria, and, by force, compelled the Syrian Theodore, who then presided over a monastery there, to accept the patriarchate of Alexandria (John of Eph. *H. E.* trans. by R. P. Smith, p. 262). This Syrian monastery seems ever to have been the most literary of the societies, as the school of Edessa, with which it was probably connected, was the most active and speculative of its age. They had strict rules for their library, and the members seem to have been bound to add a volume each to its stores, which were still further enlarged by gifts from private families in Syria, which practice continued so late as the 11th cent., as we learn from inscriptions still existing on the MSS. It was fortunate, too, in its abbat, when the ages of literary darkness were settling down over the West. A certain Moses entered the convent A.D. 907, bringing with him the book of Ecclesiasticus as a present from the family of Abu 'l-Bashar Abdu 'ltah of Tagrit (Wright, *Cat. Syr. MSS.*, No. cliv.). He was abbat in 927, in which year he was sent to Bagdad to procure from the caliph the remission of the poll-tax demanded from the monks. Having been successful in this, he journeyed through Mesopotamia and Syria, and returned in 932, bringing with him 250 volumes, which can be still recognised. In the same age Ephraim, or Abraham, patriarch of Alexandria A.D. 977–81, was a liberal donor to its library; and even as late as the beginning of the 16th century the abbat Severus tried to do something similar, but evil days of ignorance had come, when even the preservation of the books was difficult. They were repaired and bound in 1194, 1222, 1493, and in 1624, when the library contained 403 volumes; but these successive reparations were the cause of the destruction of several of the most ancient and valuable MSS., especially those of classical authors. Some of them have been restored as palimpsests. We now come to the history of the convent and its library in later times. The first modern notice of the Nitrian MSS. which we discover is in Gassend's *Life of N. C. F. de Peiresc.*, p. 269, Paris, 1641, where we are told that a Franciscan monk, Egidius Loehiensis, informed that scholar of their existence in the year 1633. Some persons in Europe must have previously known of them, as we find several of them in libraries prior to that date, and specially two splendid ones in the Ambrosian Library at Milan. Visits in search of MSS. have been paid to Nitria by the following persons—by Robert Huntington, A.D. 1678, then chaplain at Aleppo, and afterwards provost of Trinity College, Dublin, and bishop of Raphoe, whose fine collection of oriental manuscripts now adorns the Bodleian Library (Huntingtoni *Epp.* ed. Smith, 1704, *Ep.* xxxix.); by the Assemanis, Elias and his cousin Joseph Simon, in 1707, 1715, and 1716, an account of whose mission will be found in their *Biblioth. Oriental.* t. i. praef. sec. vii.; by the Jesuit Claude Sicard in Dec. 1712, and again with J. S. Assem. in 1716; by Gen. Andréossy in 1799 (*Mém. sur la Vallée des Lacs de Natron*); by Lord Prudhoe in 1828; by Hon. R. Curzon in 1837 (*Monasteries of the Levant*); and by Archdeacon Tattam in 1838, who went looking for MSS., serviceable towards a Coptic edition of the Bible. He on that occasion secured fifty Syriac MSS., which included the *Theophania* of Eusebius, which Dr. S. Lee forthwith edited and published A.D. 1842. The interest excited by this discovery led to the despatch of Mr. Tattam a second time in 1842, who secured a further consignment of two hundred volumes, which arrived at the British Museum March 1, 1843. It was now thought that all the treasures of Nitria were exhausted, and Cureton wrote his celebrated article in the *Quarterly Review* of Dec. 1845 (vol. lxxvii.), under this impression; but the monks had been too long trading on them to part with all at once, notwithstanding the most solemn bargains. In 1844 Tischendorf paid them a visit, and got some more. And now the spirit of deception spread from the monks to others. Auguste Pacho, a native of Egypt, was sent from London in 1847 to search for more MSS. He obtained several, but only handed over a part of them to the English authorities in November of that year. He obtained others, which he disposed of, partly to the Museum in 1851, and partly to the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg in 1852. Even since 1870 rumours have been current of large quantities of MSS. being still for sale in Cairo or Alexandria, and one at least of importance has been secured by the famous Egyptologist, Dr. Brugsch, and sold to the Prussian Government. The full value of these MSS. has scarcely been yet ascertained. They have had, indeed, one important indirect result already in the vast development of Syriac studies within the last thirty years. The specimens which have been as yet translated by Lee,

Cureton, Smith, and others, such as the *Festal Epistles* of Athanasius, the *Theophania* of Eusebius, and the *Ecclesiastical History* of John bishop of Ephesus, throw much light on cent. iv.–vi. That of the Ephesian bishop is specially valuable as treating history from the standpoint of a Monophysite, for in general all the writings of heretics, real or reputed, have been destroyed. Canon Cureton's verdict upon them is this:—"The contents of these MSS. are most important. The copies of the Holy Scriptures are some of the oldest in existence, and the translations of the works of the great fathers of the church are most valuable. Moreover, this collection contains several really important works, of which the Greek copies have been long since lost, and are now only known to us either by their titles, or by being short extracts preserved by other writers. Besides, there are many original works of Syriac authors." For an exhaustive account of the whole collection in its different aspects, its biblical, historical, philosophic, and scientific value, the handwriting of the MSS., the binding, and the very materials thereof, the instruments used for writing, see the preface prefixed to Wright's *Catalogue of Syriac MSS. in Brit. Mus.* The catalogue itself, which has been the work of many years, gives an analysis of each MS., and is the best substitute for those translations which may alter very much our views of early ecclesiastical history. Among them we may, in conclusion, notice that Dr. Wright has discovered a work often quoted in this Dictionary, viz. the most ancient Christian martyrology. Its date Wright fixes for a few years prior to 412, some time at the close of the 4th century. He published it in the *Journal of Sac. Liter.* t. viii. ed. Cowper, pp. 45, 423, January, 1866. In addition to the articles of Canon Cureton and Dr. Wright's preface, already quoted, and to which this article owes much, the reader may consult Cureton's prefaces to the *Syriac Gospels* and to the *Festal Epistles of St. Athanasius*; Hahn's *Fathers of the Desert*, ed. Dalgairns; and for an account of the present state of Nitria Sir Gardner Wilkinson's *Modern Egypt and Thebes*, t. i. pp. 382–399. [G. T. S.]

NIVARDUS (NIVO), **ST.**, 25th archbishop of Rheims, was a brother of St. Gondebertus the martyr, and according to some of royal blood (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. i. 268 for his family). He had lived in the court of Austrasia before his accession to the episcopate (circ. A.D. 650). The church of Rheims he found in an impoverished condition which he set himself to remedy. His influence at court enabled him to obtain various privileges, and by purchasing here and exchanging there he extended and consolidated the estates (cf. Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 7, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxxv. 107–8; Boll. *ibid.* p. 270). With the consent of the bishops assembled at a council of Nantes (circ. A.D. 658), he rebuilt the ruined monastery of Altumvillare (Hautvilliers) on the Marne, near Epernay, endowed it and granted it privileges, and made St. Bercharius abbat (see *Gall. Christ.* ix. 251, and Boll. p. 272 for this monastery; and Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. vii. 993, seqq. for Bercharius). He also gave a church to the monastery of St. Basolus (Saint-Basle) at Verzy (see *Gall. Christ.* ix. 195). After a long episcopate, extending apparently over a great part of the reigns of Clovis II., Clotaire III., and Childeric II. (A.D. 638–73), he died at Hautvilliers, and was either buried there, according to his 9th century biographer, Almannus, (Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. i. 283), or carried to Rheims and buried in the church of St. Remigius according to Flodoard (*ibid.*). He is commemorated Sept. 1. For the history of his relics see Boll. *ibid.* p. 276–7. [S. A. B.]

NIZIER, ST. [NICETIUS (4).]

NOBILIUS, a bishop to whom St. Augustine wrote, excusing himself on the score of health and winter season from accepting an invitation to be present at the dedication of a new building, perhaps a church. (Aug. *Ep.* 269 al. 251.) [H. W. P.]

NOCHAITAE, an heretical sect mentioned by Hippolytus, without explanation of their tenets (*Ref.* viii. 20). [G. S.]

NOETUS, a native of Smyrna according to Hippolytus, but of Ephesus according to Epiphanius (*Haer.* 57), whose narrative is, however, in other respects wholly derived from Hippolytus; on this point, therefore, the transcriber probably made a mistake. He came from Asia Minor at any rate, whence Praxeas, some years before, had imported the same views as he taught. Hippolytus traces the origin of the Patripassian heresy at Rome to Noetus, who, in his opinion, derived it from the philosophy of Heraclitus. Hippolytus expounds this at length in the *Refutation*, lib. ix. cap. 3–5, cf. x. 23. Noetus had a brother who assisted in his teaching, and whom he identified with Aaron, while claiming himself to be Moses. He came to Rome, where he converted Epigonus and Cleomenes. He was summoned before the council of Roman presbyters, and interrogated about his doctrines. He denied at first that he had taught that "Christ was the Father, and that the Father was born and suffered and died," but his adherents increasing in number, he acknowledged before the same council, when summoned a second time, that he had taught the views attributed to him. "The blessed presbyters called him again before them and examined him. But he stood out against them, saying, What evil am I doing in glorifying one God? And the presbyters replied to him, We too know in truth one God, we know Christ, we know that the Son suffered even as He suffered, and died even as He died, and rose again on the third day, and is at the right hand of the Father, and cometh to judge the living and the dead; and these things which we have learned we allege.' Then after examining him they expelled him from the church. And he was carried to such a pitch of pride, that he established a school." Cf. Routh's *Reliq. Sac.* t. iv. 243–248. As to the date of Noetus, Hippolytus tells us "he lived not long ago," in the opening words of his treatise against that heretic. Drs. Lipsius and Salmon think that this very treatise was used by Tertullian in his tract against Praxeas (Hippolytus Romanus in t. iii. p. 95 of this dictionary) while Hilgenfeld and Harnack date Tertullian's work between A.D. 206 and 210.

This would throw the treatise of Hippolytus back to A.D. 205, or thereabouts. From its language and tone, we would conclude that Noetus was then dead, a view which Epiphanius (*Haer.* 57, cap. 1) expressly confirms, saying that he and his brother both died soon after their excommunication, and were buried without Christian rites. The period of his teaching at Rome must then have been some few years previous to the year 205. But the Refutation of Heresies gives us a farther note of time. In ix. 2, Hippolytus tells us that it was when Zephyrinus was managing the affairs of the church that the school of Noetus was firmly established at Rome, and that Zephyrinus connived at its establishment through bribes. It is not possible, however, to approximate more closely to the precise date, than to fix his excommunication and death about the year 200. Hippolytus (*Refut.* x. 23) tells us that a portion of the Montanists adopted the views of Noetus. He seems to have written some works, from which Hippolytus often quotes. The original authority for Noetus is of course Hippolytus, the precise references to which we have already given. Cf. the Libellus Synodicus 20, concerning a pretended synod under Victor, which excommunicated Noetus and Sabellius. *Die Quellen der aeltesten Ketzergeschichte* von R. A. Lipsius, Leipzig, 1875, pp. 179–190. Harnack in Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s.v. *Monarchianismus*. Hilgenfeld's *Ketzergeschichte*, p. 616 [PRAXEAS] [EPIGONUS] [CLEOMENES]. [G. T. S.]

NOMUS, one of the leading personages at Constantinople in the latter years of Theodosius II., with whom he was all-powerful—τὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν χερσὶν ἔχων πράγματα (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 407). Nomus filled in succession all the highest offices in the state. In 443 he was "magister officiorum" (*Cod. Theod.* nov. p. 14, 1); consul in 445; patrician in 449, the year of the infamous "Latrocinium." Nomus was the confidential friend of Chrysaphius the eunuch and shared with him the government of the emperor and the empire. Through their means Dioscorus of Alexandria and the Eutychian doctrines he supported were brought into favour with the court, while the adherents of the orthodox faith, and especially Theodoret, against whom Dioscorus had a personal pique, were systematically depressed. Through his influence the feeble Theodosius was induced to publish a decree in 448 confining Theodoret to the limits of his diocese. The interesting series of letters, to the principal men of the empire, in which Theodoret, while observing the mandate, protested against its arbitrary character, contains several addressed to Nomus. He had had a short interview with the great man, which was curtailed by the serious illness, and its renewal prevented by the death, of a member of the family of Nomus. This gave rise to a short courteous letter of respectful sympathy (Theod. *Ep.* 58), followed by one of considerable length (*Ep.* 81), in which, after expressing his surprise that neither of his two former letters had received any answer, he proceeds to defend himself from the charges which had been the ostensible ground of the emperor's decree, and to recount the services he had rendered to the church during a quarter of a century, which had merited far different treatment, and closes with the earnest entreaty that as so much power rested in his hands, Nomus would take the trouble of acquainting himself with the real evils of the church, and use his authority to arrest them. Nomus still maintaining his former silence, Theodoret wrote again (*Ep.* 96), saying that he was quite unaware how he could have given him offence, and requesting him to tell him what his cause of complaint against him was, and thus give him an opportunity of clearing himself. With the death of Theodosius and the accession of Marcian and Pulcheria, Nomus's power sensibly waned. He took, however, a leading position as a high state official at the council of Chalcedon (Labbe, iv. 77, 475, &c.). During the session of this council a libel or petition against him was presented by a nephew of Cyril, Athanasius by name, a presbyter of Alexandria, who had come to Constantinople to seek redress for the ill-usage he and his family had sustained from Dioscorus, accusing Nomus of acts of violence and extortion by which he and his relatives had been reduced to beggary, and his brother had died of distress (Labbe, iv. 407–410). [E. V.]

NONNA (1), the mother of Gregory Nazianzen. She was a lady of good birth, the child of Christian parents, Philtatius and Gorgonia, brought up in the practice of the Christian virtues, of which she was so admirable an example. Her son describes in glowing terms the holiness of her life and the beautiful conformity of all her actions to the highest standards of Christian excellence. To her example, aided by her prayers, he ascribes the conversion of his father from the strange medley of paganism and Christianity which formed the tenets of the Hypsistarian sect, to which by birth he belonged (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 11, 19; *Carm.* 1, 2). We know of two other children of the marriage besides Gregory; a sister named Gorgonia, probably older than himself, and a brother named Caesarius. It is unnecessary to repeat what has been already said of the influence of the pious example and instructions of such a mother in forming the character of the son whom she regarded as given in answer to her prayers, and whom before his birth she devoted to the service of God [GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS, ii. p. 742, col. 2]. Nonna's life was quiet and uneventful, though not devoid of the domestic sorrows which necessarily fall to the lot of the mother of a family (*Orat.* 19, p. 292). Her health was usually very robust, but in 371 the year preceding her son's reluctant elevation to the episcopate as bishop of Sasima, she suffered from a severe illness which caused the postponement of an intended visit of her son's to his friend Basil (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 4). But on arriving at her house he found the crisis of her disorder passed, her recovery being ascribed by her to a vision, in which she had been fed by her son with cakes of bread marked with a cross, and blessed by him (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 9, p. 306). Three years later, 374, the elder Gregory died, and his widow only survived him a very short time. The date of her death is placed with great probability on Aug. 5 (on which day Nonna is commemorated both by the Greek and Latin churches), in the year 374 (*Orat.*

19, p. 315; *Carm.* 1, p. 9). (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. ix. pp. 309-311; 317, 318, 322, 385, 397.) [E. V.]

NONNA (2), one of the three daughters of Gorgonia, the sister of Gregory Nazianzen, called after her maternal grandmother, whose virtues she appears to have been very far from imitating, as she and her sister Eugenia are spoken of by Gregory Nazianzen in his will as undeserving of notice from their reprehensible life. This may however mean no more than that, having been devoted to a life of virginity by their mother (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 11, p. 180), they declined to accept such a vocation, for which they were not fitted. (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. ix. p. 704, note xvi.) [E. V.]

NONNA (3), ST. (NONNITA, NON, NONN), mother of St. David. A legendary life of her existed A.D. 1281, in the service book of her church at Alternun, in Cornwall. This is close by Davidstow, and St. David's Welsh name, Dewi, is preserved in the local pronunciation, Dewstow. Her feast day was 3rd March, two days after the date of her son's death. Several places in Cornish parishes, such as Creed and Pelynt, and in Bradstone, just across the Tamar in Devon, were sacred to her, and a mystery play written in her honour existed in Brittany before the 12th century (*Buhez Santez Nonn.* ed. Sionnet). St. Nun's pool in Alternun was famous for the cure of lunacy. An inscription at Tregony (Hübner's *Inscriptiones Britanniae Christianae*, No. 10) reads Nonnita, Ercili, Viricati, tris fili Ercilinci, which shews the existence of the name in Cornwall. As Cornwall and South Wales were evidently under the same dynasty, and kindred chiefs ruled in Brittany, the wandering Celtic saints found a home in each without difficulty. Rees gives the names of several churches in Wales dedicated to her, all in the immediate neighbourhood of churches ascribed to St. David. (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 98; William of Worcester, 164; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 162–166, 180, 200, 341.) [C. W. B.]

NONNICHIUS, (NUNECHIUS), 10th bishop of Nantes, A.D. 472, signed the acts of the council of Vannes, and had a converted Jew specially recommended to him by Sidonius Apollinaris (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lviii. 611, *Ep.* 13; Binius, *Conc.* ii. 421; *Gall. Chr.* xiv. 797; Tillem. xvi. 234; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 394). [J. G.]

NONNICHIUS (2) II. (NUNNICHIUS MONICHIUS, MONNICHIUS, MANOCHUS, DONICHIUS), bishop of Nantes, succeeding his cousin FELIX (117) in 582, and thought by the Sammarthani, but without grounds, to have been the count of Limoges in the following article (*Gall. Chr.* xiv. 800; Greg. Tur. *H. F.* vi. 15). Gregory of Tours (*Mirac. S. Martin.* iv. 27) relates that he brought his infirm servant to the church of St. Martin at Tours on a feast day of the saint, and after the services took him home cured. The same author (*H. F.* viii. 43) mentions that the son of Nonnichius was suspected of being concerned in the death of Domnola, the wife of Nectarius. Nonnichus is mentioned by Venantius Fortunatus in his *Life of Germanus* (cap. 60 in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 472). [C. H.]

NONNICHIUS (3), count of Limoges in the reign of Chilperic, occasioned the spread of false accusations against Charterius bishop of Perigueux, 582. Two months afterwards he died (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* vi. 22; Aimoin, *G. F.* iii. 48 in Bouquet, iii. 89; *Gall. Chr.* ii. 1453). [C. H.]

NONNITUS (1), bishop of Gerona, in Catalonia, succeeded Joannes Biclarensis, 621, and died 633 (Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 32). He was a monk, and continued to rule by example rather than command (Ildefonsus, *De Vir. Ill.* c. 10, ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 203; Fleury, *H. E.* xxxvii. c. 46; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 699). [J. G.]

NONNITUS (2), said to have been the first bishop of Seville after the Saracen conquest. (*Esp. Sag.* ix. 235.) [F. D.]

NONNOSUS (1), son of Abraham, a priest, was sent by the emperor Justinian on an embassy to Caïsus king of the Saracens, to Elesbaan, king of the Auxumites, and to the Homerites. After many dangers he returned and wrote a history of his journey, but we now possess only an abridgment by Photius (*Cod.* 3; *Corp. Scrip. Hist. Byz.* Bonn, 1829, pt. i. 478, sq.; Hoeschelius, *Bibl. Photii*, Ant. 1611, pp. 6–7; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vi. 239), omitting the fabulous and condensing details. His father Abraham, and grandfather Nonnosus, had been sent on similar missions. He lived about A.D. 540 (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 519; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 280; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and R. Biog.* ii. 1208). [J. G.]

NONNOSUS (2), provost of a monastery on Mount Soracte, to whom miracles were attributed. (Greg. Mag. *Dial.* i. 7; *Epp.* lib. iii. ind. xi. ep. 51 in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii.; Ceill. xi. 474; Dupin, i. 580, ed. 1722.) [C. H.]

NONNOSUS (3), a person of station, whose request for a certain possession in 591 pope Gregory the Great intends to comply with (lib. i. ind. ix. ep. 22; Jaffé, *R. P.* num. 725). [C. H.]

NONNUS (1), one of the leading inhabitants of the town of Zeugma, to whom, with others, Theodoret addressed a consolatory letter (*Ep.* 125) in the midst of the persecutions subsequent to the "Latrocinium," 449, encouraging them in their struggle for the maintenance of the orthodox faith, which for their instruction he sets forth distinctly, guarding them from the opposite errors of Nestorius and Eutyches. [E. V.]

NONNUS (2) of Panopolis. The name is very common, being properly an Egyptian title equivalent to Saint. Consequently confusion has arisen between this writer and others of the same name. He has been identified, with some probability, with a Nonnus whose son is mentioned by Synesius (*Ep. ad Anastas.* 42, *ad Pyl.* 102); and, with very little probability, with the deacon Nonnus, secretary at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451; or Nonnus, the bishop of Edessa, elected at the synod of Ephesus, A.D. 449; or lastly with Nonnus the commentator on Gregory Nazianzen (vide Bentley, *Phalaris ad in.*).

Life.—Of his life we have no details. He was a native of Panopolis in Egypt; cf. Eudocia, *s. v.*

Agathias, iv. p. 128; and an epigram in *Anth. Graeca*, i. p. 140.

> Νόννος ἐγώ· Πανὸς μὲν ἐμὴ πόλις. Ἐν φαρίῃ δὲ
> Ἔγχει φοινήεντι γονὰς ἤμησα Γιγάντων.

He is classed by Agathias among *οἱ νέοι ποιηταί*, and this mention, supported by a comparison of his poems with the other late Epic writers, makes it probable that his date should be placed at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century, A.D. Beyond this nothing is known for certain. The *Dionysiaca* shews frequently a knowledge of astronomy (cf. vi. 60, xxv. xxxviii. 4), and a special interest in Berytus (xli.), Tyre (xl.), and Athens (xlvii.), but whether this arises from a personal acquaintance with these towns is uncertain. In iv. 250, the discoveries of Cadmus are traced to Egypt, but otherwise there is no reference to his native country. The whole tone of the *Dionysiaca*, with its delight in the drunken immoralities of Dionysus, makes it hard to believe that the poem was written by a Christian. Consequently there is a probability that this was a work early in life, that after it Nonnus was converted to Christianity, and that the paraphrase of St. John was written after his conversion. Possibly, as has been suggested, it may have been intended as a contrast to the *Dionysiaca*, portraying the life and apotheosis of one more worthy than Dionysus of the name of GOD. Possibly too, as has also been suggested, Nonnus may have been one of the Greek philosophers who accepted Christianity at the time of the destruction of heathen temples under the decree of Theodosius (Socr. *Eccl. Hist.* v. 16).

Works.—Of his literary position it is possible to speak with more certainty. He was the centre, if not the founder, of the literary Egyptian school, which gave to Greek Epic poetry a new though short-lived brilliancy, and to which belonged Quintus of Smyrna, John of Gaza, Coluthus, Tryphiodorus, and Musaeus. This school revived the historical and mythological epic, but treated it in a style peculiar to itself, of which Nonnus is the best representative. While frequently proclaiming himself an imitator of Homer, and shewing traces of the influence of Callimachus and later writers, he yet created new metrical rules, which gave an entirely new effect to the general rhythm of the poem. This was effected by the avoidance of the combination of two spondees, a frequent use of long, especially dactylic, compounds, and of the trochaic caesura in the third foot; by a very sparing use of elision, contracted inflections, crasis and hiatus, which is very rare at the end of any foot, except the first and fourth, and rarer still in arsis. These rules are less strictly observed in the *Paraphrase* than in the *Dionysiaca*. The general effect is however in both that of an easy but rather monotonous flow, always pleasant, but never rising or falling with the tone of the narrative. The style is very florid, marked by a luxuriance of epithets and original compounds (often of very arbitrary formation), of elaborate periphrasis, and of metaphors often piled together in hopeless confusion; and many unusual forms are invented (*e.g.* δάκτυλα, ἄγγελα, θύρσα), by false analogy. Point is gained by a fondness for sharp antithesis (cf. *Paraph.* iii. 5, διδάσκαλον ἄνδρα διδάσκων, vii. 52, μεμφόμενοι Νικόδημον ἀμέμφεα, xi. 44, xviii. 31), and the repetition of an emphatic word or clause (cf. viii. 55; ix. 6, 9, 13; xiv. 8; xviii. 6, &c.). So that he seems to deserve the title of λογιώτατος applied to him by Eudocia (cf. Lehrs, *Quaest. Epicae.* p. 253; Ludwich, *Beiträge zur Kritik des Nonnus.* Regiomonti, 1873; and the references in Bernhardy, *Grundriss der Gr. Lit.* § 99, 4).

The Dionysiaca attributed to Nonnus by Agathias (*ubi s.*) is a history of the birth, conquests and apotheosis of Dionysus, spun out at such great length that the main thread is almost lost. The poem commences with a description of the chaos existing in the world and the sadness of human life before the birth of Dionysus, narrating incidentally (iv. 250 sqq.) the introduction of civilisation and the first elements of the worship of the first Dionysus into Greece from Egypt (i.–vi.); then comes an account of the birth and education of Dionysus, and his early connexion with the Satyrs (vii.–xii.); then, as the central point, his attack on India and conquest of its leaders and maidens (xiii.–xl.); then the return to Syria and Greece, the conquest of his foes there, and the apotheosis in Olympus after he has begotten a child to take his place on earth (xli.–xlviii.). The whole seems a fanciful treatment of the Dionysiac legend, altered partly by the poet's own imagination erecting Ampelus, Staphyle, Botrys, &c., into real personages; partly perhaps by the influence of Alexander's similar conquest of India. The idea of the triple incarnation of Dionysus and the fantastic shapes that he assumes may perhaps be due to an Oriental influence, and a careful examination of the Indian names might repay the efforts of Indian scholars. The whole poem has been regarded "as an allegory of the march of civilisation across the ancient world;" but it would be simpler, and we hope truer, to describe it as "the gradual establishment of the cultivation of the vine and the power of the Wine-God."

The chief editions are those of Falkenbourg, Antwerp, 1569; Lectius, with Latin transl. in *Corp. Poet. Gr.* ii. Gen. 1606. Cunaeus, Hanau, 1605; Graefe, Leipzig, 1819–26. Passow, Leipzig, 1834; Le Comte de Marcellus, with interesting introduction, French transl. and notes, in Didot's *Bibl. Graeca*, Paris, 1856. Köchly with apparatus criticus, Leipzig, 1857, cf. Ouwarow, St. Petersburg, 1817. Köhler, *über die Dion. des Nonnus*, Halle, 1853.

(2) *Paraphrase* (Μεταβολή) *of St. John's Gospel*, attributed to Nonnus by Eudocia (Viol. 311).

This is a fairly faithful paraphrase of the whole of the Gospel. It seems impossible to decide exactly what text was used by Nonnus. On the whole it seems to approximate most to that represented by C. and L. among the MSS., and by the Memphitic version (cf. i. 24, iii. 15, vi. 69, vii. 8, viii. 39, ix. 35, xii. 41). In i. 3 it seems to agree with the Memph. v., and St. Chrysostom as against all best uncials and the Alexandrine interpretation, while in i. 28, iii. 13, xix. 28 (?) it follows A.

The text is faithfully treated. The omissions, except when he has MSS. authority (*e.g.* v. 1, 4; vii. 53 sqq.), are rare (v. 1, 29; iv. 27, 41, 42; vi. 41, 53; viii. 38; xviii. 16, 18). The additions are chiefly those of poetical expansion, reminding us of modern attempts to make the scene graphic or portray the feelings of the actors.

Homeric epithets form a strange medley with the Palestinian surroundings, and in many cases the illustrations are drawn out into insipid details (cf. iv. 26, vii. 21, xviii. 3, xx. 7). At other times we have interpretations suggested, in most of which he agrees with the Alexandrine tradition as represented by Cyril and Origen, cf. i. 16, 24, 42 (Peter's name); vi. 71 (the motive of Judas); vii. 19 (the reference to the Sixth Commandment); viii. 40 (the hospitality of Abraham); xii. 6, 10; xviii. 15 (ἰχθυβόλου παρὰ τέχνης); xix. 7. In some of these interpretations he seems obviously wrong; *e.g.* ii. 12 (δυωδεκάριθμος); ii. 20, x. 12 (the reference to Solomon); vii. 28 (ὑψῶν); xi. 44, σουδάριον, explained as a Syrian word; while in ii. 4. τί μοι γύναι ἠὲ καὶ αὐτῇ, looks like an attempt to avoid a slight to her who is constantly called Θεοτόκος.

He shews too a looseness in the use of theological terms (cf. i. 3, μῦθος; 1, 50, xi. 27, λόγος) which with the luxuriance of periphrasis forms a striking contrast with the simplicity and accuracy of St. John.

The Paraphrase was frequently edited in the 16th century. The chief editions are those of Aldus, Venice, 1511; Nansius, Lugd. Bat., 1589–93; Sylburg, 1596; Heinsius, *Aristarchus Sacer*, Lugd. Bat. 1627; Passow, Leipzig, 1834; Le Comte de Marcellus, with French transl. and notes, 1860. It will also be found in Migne, vol. xliii. (with the notes of Heinsius and of Le Comte de Marcellus); De la Bigne, *Bibl. Patrum*, Appendix; Mansi, *Bibl. Patr.* vi. (ed. 1618), ix. (ed. 1677). For an account of the MSS., cf. Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* viii. p. 601; Kinkel, *die Ueberlieferung des Ev. Joh. von Nonnus*, Zurich, 1870; Köchly, *de Ev. Joh. Paraphrasi a Nonno*, Zurich, 1860). See also a series of articles in the *Wiener Studien* for 1880 and 1881.

[W. L.]

Among the Greek MSS. lately discovered in the Fayûm in Egypt has been found a fragment of an Epic poem, which Dr. Stern, of Berlin, attributes to the circle of Greek poets in Egypt, of which Nonnus was the centre. [G. T. S.]

NONNUS (3), commentator on Gregory Nazianzen's *In Julianum Imp. invectivae duae:* his Greek scholia are given in Montague's edition of that work, Eton, 1610, and Greg. Naz. *Opp.* ii. Paris, 1630. By Fabricius (*Bibl. Graec.* vii. 682, 690) he is called Palaestinus, and the period assigned to him is the middle of the 6th century. The commentary by Nonnus is full of mistakes and of little value (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 249; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* v. 247, here called an abbat in the 5th century; Bentley, *Diss. Phal.* i. 94 sq. Lond. 1836). [J. G.]

NONNUS (4), bishop of Edessa. On the deposition of Ibas by the "Latrocinium" of Ephesus, A.D. 449, Nonnus was put in his place, and as bishop of Edessa attended the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. His name appears in the first day's proceedings (Labbe, iv. 328, 373, 450, 467, 495, 553, 569), but after the eighth session, in which Ibas was reinstated in his see, his name disappears (Facund. *Herm.* lib. v. c. 3). Both however signed the decree of faith promulgated by the council, Nonnus as "bishop of the city of the Edessenes," Ibas as "bishop of Edessa" (Labbe, iv. 582, 586). On the restoration of Ibas, the episcopal dignity was specially reserved to Nonnus, and the consideration of his case was committed to Maximus bishop of Antioch (*ibid.* 678). On the death of Ibas, Oct. 28, 457, Nonnus returned to the see of Edessa, and as metropolitan of Osrhoene headed the signatures to the reply to Leo's letter in that year (*ibid.* 891, 917). A difficult question has been raised whether Nonnus of Edessa was the same with Nonnus of Heliopolis, the converter of the notorious actress and courtesan Pelagia of Antioch, whose biography was written by James the deacon. The circumstances of this conversion are fully detailed elsewhere [JACOBUS (40); PELAGIA]. Baronius (*Martyrol.* Oct. 8), following Nicephorus (*H. E.* xiv. 30) and Theophanes (*Chron.* p. 79), regards them as the same. This is also accepted by Vossius (*de Hist. Graec.* lib. ii. c. 20) and by Gams (*Series Episc.*) on the view that after he was obliged to give way to Ibas he was translated to Heliopolis, which city he converted to the faith (Rosweid. *Vit. Patr.* p. 379), and thence on the death of Ibas returned to Edessa. This hypothesis is combated by Tillemont (*Mém. Ecclés.* tom. xii. p. 664, *Note sur Sainte Pelagie*). [E. V.]

NONNUS (5), bishop of Amid 505; appointed at the request of the people by the patriarch Flavian, in succession to John who had died before the city was taken (Jan. 503) by the Persians under Cavades. He had previously been a presbyter and oeconomus under John. He sent Thomas, his chorepiscopus, to Constantinople [THOMAS ( )], as his deputy to the emperor Anastasius; but Thomas treacherously intrigued against him, procured his deposition, and was consecrated in his room, within the same year. Flavian thereupon sent Nonnus to fill the vacant see of Seleucia, which he held until he was expelled as a Severian in 519. He then returned to his native Amid, where, on the death of Thomas the same year, he was, against his will, reappointed to the throne, but held it only three months, dying 519–20. He was succeeded by Maras (a man of noble birth), also a Severian, who was soon after banished by Justin, and lived seven years in exile at Petra with his two virgin sisters. See farther, THOMAS HARKL. (*Chron.* of Joshua Styl., c. 83, Wright's edition; and ap. Assem. ii. 49.) [J. Gw.]

NONNUS (6), bishop of Circesium, a Monophysite and follower of Severus of Antioch. He was banished by the emperor Justin, A.D. 518–527. He survived till A.D. 532, at least he was one of the bishops attached to the party of Severus, who in that year had a conference at Constantinople with Hypatius of Ephesus and other Catholic prelates [HYPATIUS (8)].

[G. T. S.]

NOREA. According to an Ophite system reported by Irenaeus (i. 30) the sister of Seth; in another system the name of the wife of Noah (Epiph. *Haer.* 26, p. 82). [See HORAEA.] Epiphanius says that the real name of Noah's wife was not Norea but Parthenos, on which Lipsius ingeniously conjectures that in Norea the Hebrew נַעֲרָה is preserved of which παρθένος is a translation. [G. S.]

NOROBERT (NORBERT), a presbyter to whom, when on his travels, Alcuin gave a letter of introduction to his friends (Alc. *Ep.* 211, Migne, 161 Froben, in *Opp.* i. 221 Frob.). [C. H.]

NORSESES I., Catholicus of Armenia for thirty-four years towards the latter portion of 4th century. Ammianus Marcellinus (lib. xvii. 12) calls him Nierses, son of Athenagoras, nephew of Hesychius, and grand-nephew of St. Gregory the Illuminator. He was present at the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. He was poisoned by Pharme, son of king Arsaces. [ARMENIANS, t. i. p. 164.] (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 1375; Galanus, *Hist. Armen.* iii. 109.) [G. T. S.]

NORSESES II., alias Nierses, twenty-fifth Catholicus of Armenia. He succeeded Leontius, and held the national council of Tiben, A.D. 535, which consummated the division between the orthodox Greek and the Armenian churches, as told under ARMENIANS, t. i. p. 165. [G. T. S.]

NORSESES III. alias Nierses, thirty-third Catholicus of Armenia. He made in the early half of the 7th century an attempt, successful for a time, to reunite the Armenian and orthodox churches as told under ARMENIANS, t. i. p. 165. [G. T. S.]

NOTBURG, ST. (NEITBURGA, NOTBURG, NOITBURGA, NOTBURGIS, NOTHBURG), niece of Plectrude the wife of Pepin of Heristal. She was brought up by Plectrude, and lived with her at Cologne, in the palace which Plectrude made into a monastery about 689. Notburg being threatened with a marriage suitable to her rank, prayed to be delivered by death from such a fate, and presently died, about A.D. 700. Supernatural lights are said to have appeared at her head and at her feet, in testimony to her holiness. She was venerated as a saint by the people of Cologne. Her day is Oct. 31. (Surius, *De Probatis Sanctorum Historiis*, v. 1006, 1007, edit. Col. Ag. 1570; Le Cointe, *Annales Ecclesiae Francorum*, iv. 213, 214, ann. 689; Brower, *Annales Trevirenses*, lib. vii. 362. Her name is in the *Auctaria* of Greven and Molanus to Usuard, Oct. 31, Migne, cxxiv. 641, 642.) [A. B. C. D.]

NOTHBALD (NORTHBALD, NODBALDUS), the ninth abbat of St. Augustine's. The dates assigned to him are A.D. 732–748 (*Mon. Angl.* i. 120, 121; Elmham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 10, 302–316; Thorn, ap. Twysden, cc. 1772, 2235, 2236). According to the monastic authorities, Nothbald received the benediction from archbishop Tatwin (Thorn, c. 1772), and the later historian, Elmham, adds that he was elected by the brethren after a proper licence had been obtained from the king of Kent, and in conformity with the decree of Augustine (p. 302). The same writer mentions the abbat's friendship with archbishop Nothelm (*ib.* p. 312). Nothing definite is recorded of his abbacy. The place of his burial was unknown, but Elmham gives a traditionary epitaph (p. 316):

> "Nothbaldi mores rutilant inter seniores
> Cujus erat vita subjectis norma polita."

[S.]

NOTHBERT (NORTHBERT), the second bishop of Elmham after the division of the East Anglian dioceses (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 618; W. Malmesbury, *G. P.* p. 148). He is known only from the fact that his name occurs in the ancient lists, between those of Beadwin and Heatholac. The last trace of Beadwin's existence occurs in A.D. 693 (Kemble, *C. D.* 36), and Heatholac first appears in Bede's list of contemporary bishops in 731; (*H. E.* v. 23). Between these limits Nothbert's episcopate must have fallen, and accordingly his name is attached as subscribing to the grant of Oshere to the monastery of Evesham, which is dated A.D. 706 (Kemble, *C. D.* 56); and to the decree of the council of Clovesho of A.D. 716, in which the privilege of king Wihtred was confirmed (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 300). [S.]

NOTHEARD, presbyter of the diocese of Winchester, present at the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803 (Kemble, *C. D.* 1024). [C. H.]

NOTHELM (1), king of the South Saxons, known to us only from a charter by him in the chapter library at Chichester printed by Kemble (*C. D.* num. 995). He grants to his sister Nothgitha lands in Lydesige, Aldingburne, Genstedegate, Mundhame, for the erection of a monastery and church. The charter bears its own date "anno ab incarnatione Christi 692," and is subscribed by Nunna king of the South Saxons, Wattus king, Coenred king of the West Saxons, Ine, Eadberht bishop, Aldhelm and Haguna abbats. [OSMUND (3)]. [C. H.]

NOTHELM (2), tenth archbishop of Canterbury. He was a priest of the church of London, St. Paul's, and a common friend of Bede and Albinus, abbat of St. Augustine's, who communicated through him to the venerable historian all that he knew of the early history of the Kentish church. Nothelm himself, some time between 715 and 731, visited Rome, and searched the records of the holy see by permission of pope Gregory II.; bringing away copies of letters which were incorporated by Bede in his history. Thorn and Elmham, the historians of St. Augustine's, give Nothelm the title of arch-priest of St. Paul's (Elmh. p. 312; Thorn, c. 1772), and he probably was not a monk. Archbishop Tatwin died on the 30th of June, 734; the consecration of Nothelm as his successor is dated by the Continuator of Bede in 735, and possibly may have been performed by Egbert of York, who just at that crisis received his pall from Gregory III. In 736 he received his own pall from the same pope, and afterwards consecrated three bishops, Cuthbert of Hereford, Ethelfrith of Elmham, and Herewald of Sherborne. The same year he received a letter from St. Boniface, asking for the Responsiones of St. Gregory to Augustine, as to whether a man might marry a woman for whose son he had been sponsor, and in what year St. Gregory sent his mission to Britain (Mon. Mogunt. ed. Jaffé, no. 30; *Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 335, 336). Nothelm certainly held one ecclesiastical council in 736 or 737, attended by nine bishops of the province; one act, by which he ordered the restoration of a charter concerning an estate at Withington to the abbess Hrotwari, is preserved in the Worcester Cartulary; (Kemb. *C. D.* no. 82, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 338). This act is described as a decree of a sacred synod. Nothelm's

name appears in another charter as corroborating a record in April 738 (Kemble, *C. D.* no. 86).

He died after a pontificate of five years on the 17th of October, probably in the year 739: (Cont. Bed. *M. H. B.* 288; see Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 335), but as his successor was appointed in 740 his death is sometimes advanced a year. Cuthbert was certainly archbishop in 740.

A short poetical life of Nothelm containing ten lines only, and no particulars, is printed from a Lambeth MS. in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 71. The historians of St. Augustine's add to our information about him only that he was a patron of Abbat Northbald (Elmham, 312), and his epitaph in four lines of Latin verse. As he was not a monk he does not seem to have caught the fancy of the Benedictine Annalists: but in the Bollandist Acts, October, vol. iii. pp. 117–124, there is an article on his history.

His career as archbishop is unfortunately obscure; coinciding as it does with one of the darkest portions of Kentish history, and with the period of the greatest illumination in the church of York, any ray of historical light from Canterbury would have been doubly valuable. As it is, Bede's obligation to Nothelm during his tenure of office at St. Paul's is the most important point about his history.

The literary history of Nothelm elaborated by Leland (*Scriptores*, p. 131) and Bale (ed. 1559, p. 100) is imaginary, or, to say the least, apocryphal. [S.]

NOTHGITHA. [NOTHELM (1).]

NOTHLAN, bishop. [NATHALAN.]

NOUS. In the Valentinian system [VALENTINUS], Nous is the first male Aeon. Together with his conjugate female Aeon, Aletheia, he emanates from the Propator Bythos and his coeternal Ennoia or Sige; and these four form the primordial Tetrad. Like the other male Aeons he is sometimes regarded as bisexual, including in himself the female Aeon who is paired with him. He is the Only Begotten; and is styled the Father, the Beginning of all, inasmuch as from him are derived immediately or mediately the remaining Aeons who complete the Ogdoad, thence the Decad, and thence the Dodecad; in all thirty, Aeons constituting the Pleroma. He alone is capable of knowing the Propator; but when he desired to impart like knowledge to the other Aeons, was withheld from so doing by Sige. When Sophia, youngest Aeon of the thirty, was brought into peril by her yearning after this knowledge, Nous was foremost of the Aeons in interceding for her. From him, or through him from the Propator, Horus was sent to restore her. After her restoration, Nous, according to the providence of the Propator, produced another pair, Christ and the Holy Spirit, "in order to give fixity and stedfastness (εἰς πῆξιν καὶ στηριγμὸν) to the Pleroma." For this Christ teaches the Aeons to be content to know that the Propator is in himself incomprehensible, and can be perceived only through the Only Begotten (Nous). (Iren. *Haeres.* I. i. 1–5; Hippol. *Ref.* vi. 29–31; Theod. *Haer. Fab.* i. 7.)

A similar conception of Nous appears in the later teaching of the Basilidean School [BASILIDES], according to which he is the first begotten of the Unbegotten Father, and himself the parent of Logos, from whom emanate successively Phronesis, Sophia, and Dynamis. But in this teaching Nous is identified with Christ, is named Jesus, is sent to save those that believe, and returns to Him who sent him, after a passion which is apparent only,—Simon the Cyrenian being substituted for him on the cross (Iren. I. xxiv. 4; Theod. *H. E.* i. 4). It is probable, however, that Nous had a place in the original system of Basilides himself; for his Ogdoad, "the great Archon of the universe, the ineffable" (Hipp. vi. 25) is apparently made up of the five members named by Irenaeus (as above), together with two whom we find in Clement (*Strom.* iv. 25), Dikaiosyne and Eirene,—added to the originating Father.

The antecedent of these systems is that of Simon Magus (Hipp. vi. 12 ff.; Theod. I. i.), of whose six "roots" emanating from the Unbegotten Fire, Nous is first. The correspondence of these "roots" with the first six Aeons which Valentinus derives from Bythos, is noted by Hippolytus (vi. 20). Simon says in his Ἀπόφασις μεγάλη (ap. Hipp. vi. 18), "There are two offshoots of the entire ages, having neither beginning nor end. ... Of these the one appears from above, the great power, the Nous of the universe, administering all things, male; the other from beneath, the great Epinoia, female, bringing forth all things." To Nous and Epinoia correspond Heaven and Earth, in the list given by Simon of the six material counterparts of his six emanations. The identity of this list with the six material objects alleged by Herodotus (i.) to be worshipped by the Persians, together with the supreme place given by Simon to Fire as the primordial power, leads us to look to Persia for the origin of these systems in one aspect. In another, they connect themselves with the teaching of Pythagoras and of Plato. In the subsequent developments of Neoplatonism, Nous is prominent. Τὸ Ὂν, Νοῦς, and Ψυχὴ, constitute the Trinity of Plotinus. [NEOPLATONISM, p. 20.] (Harvey's *Irenaeus*, Prelim. Obss.; Mansel's *Gnostic Heresies*.) [J. Gw.]

NOVATIANISM. The members of this sect were called by themselves Καθαροί (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43). They were called by others Novatiani (Pacian. *Ep.* i. sec. i.); Mundi (Ambr. *de Poenit.* lib. i. cap. i.); Ναυάται, Ναυατιανοί, Ἀριστεροί, or Ἄριστοι (Soc. *H. E.* iv. 28; Conc. CP. can. vii. in Hef. ii. 366, Clark's ed.; Timoth. CP. in Meursii *Var. Div. Lib.* pp. 121, 125); Ναυατιανοὶ αἱρεσῖται (Suidas), Montenses, Μοντήσιοι (Noris, *Hist. Donat. Opp.* iv. 301, ed. 1732, and Hef. ii. 387, ed. Clark; cf. however *Cod. Theod.* ed. Haenel, p. 1550, which applies this name to Donatists); Sinistri, Scaevi (Bened. ed. in Ambr. *de Poenit. l. c.*). Offshoots of the sect are called Sabbatiani or Σαββατιανοὶ in *Cod. Theod.* ed. Haen. pp. 1566, 1570, and Protopaschitae in *Cod. Theod.* p. 1581.

Novatianism was the first great schism in the church on a pure question of discipline. In Montanism questions of discipline were involved as side issues, but did not constitute its essential

difference. All sects previous to Novatianism had erred on the doctrine of the Trinity. The Novatians alone were orthodox thereupon. The church therefore baptized even Montanists, while admitting Novatians by imposition of hands alone (Conc. Laodic. can. vii. viii.; Hef. *Councils*, ed. Clark, t. ii. 303, 332; Conc. CP. can. vii. in Hef. *l. c. ut sup.*; Pitra, *Jur. Eccles. Graec. Hist.* i. 430, 576). The reader will find in the articles on CYPRIAN, NOVATIAN, and NOVATUS the circumstances which gave rise in A.D. 251 to the so-called Novatian sect. The principles, however, which Novatian formulated into a system, and to which he gave a name, took not their rise from him; they existed and flourished long before. The origin of the Novatian schism must be sought in the struggle which, originating with *The Shepherd* of Hermas (Baur, *Church Hist.* trans. Menzies, 1879, t. ii. p. 50, note; cf. Ritschl, *Entstehung der Altkath. Kirche*, 2nd ed. p. 529), had been raging at Rome for seventy years, at first with the Montanists and the followers of Tertullian, and then between Hippolytus and Callistus. Every one of the distinctive principles of Novatianism will be found advocated by some or all of them (Baur, *l. c.* p. 270, note). The Montanists rejected the lapsed, and in fact all who were guilty of mortal sins, Tertullian second marriages, as also did the strict discipline of the 2nd century (Ambr. *de Viduis*, cap. ii.; Lumper, *Hist. SS. PP.* iii. 95. *De S. Athenag.*; Aug. *Ep.* ad Julian. *de Viduit.*). Hippolytus held, in a great degree, the same stern views. This identity in principle between Montanism and Novatianism has been noted by many; both of the ancients and moderns, *e.g.* Epiph. *Haer.* 59; Hieron. *Opp.* Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. i. 188, *Ep. ad Marcellam*, 457, *Ep. ad Oceanum*; t. vii. 697 *cont. Jovinian.* lib. ii.; Gieseler, *H. E.* t. i. pp. 213–215, 284, ed. Clark; Neander, *Anti-Gnostic*, t. ii. p. 362; Bunsen, *Christ. and Mankind*, t. i. 395, 428; Pressensé, *Life and Pract. of Early Ch.* lib. i. cap. 6, 7; Baur, *l. c.* pp. 124–126. Not with Montanism only, but also with Donatism is Novatianism allied, for it is the same question, viz. the treatment of the lapsed, which underlay that schism as well. Other points of similarity between the three may just be noted. They all sprung up, or else found their most enthusiastic supporters in Africa. They each arose simultaneously with great persecutions. They were separated by periods of about fifty years. The two earliest of them at least, as we shall have occasion to notice, proved their essential oneness, uniting their ranks in Phrygia in the course of the 4th century. Novatianism may indeed be regarded as a conservative protest on behalf of the ancient discipline against the prevalent liberalism of the Roman church (Baur, *l. c.* p. 271). The sterner treatment of the lapsed naturally found favour with the more enthusiastic party, who usually give the tone to any religious society. Thus Eleutherus, bishop of Rome, in latter part of 2nd century was inclined to take the Puritan view (Euseb. *H. E.* lib. v. cap. 3). Ozanam, in his *History of Civilization in 5th Cent.* t. ii. p. 214, Eng. trans., has noted an interesting proof of the prevalence at that time of this view in Rome. Archaeologists have often been puzzled by the symbol of a Good Shepherd, carrying a kid, not a lamb, on his shoulders, found in the cemetery of St. Callistus. Ozanam explains it as a reference by the excavators of the cemetery to the prevalent Montanist doctrine, which denied the possibility of a goat being brought back in this life. Novatianism thus fell upon ground prepared for it, and found in every quarter a body of adherents with whose views it coincided. At the same time it must be observed that Novatian was the first who made the treatment of the lapsed the express ground of schism. In fact many continued to hold the same view within the church during the next one hundred and fifty years (cf. Hef. *Councils*, t. i. p. 134, Clark's ed.; Innocent I. *Ep.* iii. *ad Exuperium*, in Mansi, iii. 1039). This fact accounts for the rapid spread of the sect. In Africa they established themselves in many cities within the course of the two years subsequent to Novatian's consecration in the spring of A.D. 251 (CYPRIAN, Vol. I. p. 746 of this Dict.). In Southern Gaul Marcian, bishop of Arles, joined them (Cypr. *Ep.* lxviii.; Greg. Turon. *Hist. Francor.* lib. i. in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 175). In the East they made great progress, as we conclude from the state of affairs presented to us by Socrates. Between A.D. 260 and the council of Nice we hear scarcely anything about them. The controversies about Sabellianism and Paul of Samosata, together with the rising tide of Arianism, occupied the church during the concluding years of the 3rd century, while the peace which it enjoyed prevented the question of the lapsed becoming a practical one. We may, however, trace the influence of this period on Novatian doctrine. It became harder and sterner. Obliged to vindicate their position, they drew the reins tighter than Novatian had done. With him idolatry was the one crying sin which excluded from communion. During the long peace there was no temptation to this sin, therefore his followers were obliged to add all other deadly sins to the list (Soc. *H. E.* vii. 25; Ambr. *de Poenit.* lib. i. capp. 2, 3; Ceill. v. 466, 467). At the council of Nice we find them established far and wide, with a regular succession of bishops at the principal cities of the empire and in the highest reputation for piety. The monk Eutychian, one of their number, was a celebrated miracle-worker, reverenced by Constantine himself, who also endeavoured at the same time to lead one of their bishops, Acesius, to unite with the Catholics (Soc. *H. E.* i. 10, 13) [ACESIUS]. During the 4th century we can trace their history much more clearly in the East than in the West, as Socrates gives such copious details about them, as have led some (Nicephorus, Baronius, and P. Labbaeus) to suspect that he was a member of the sect. In the East their fortunes were very varying. Under Constantine they were tolerated and even favoured (*Cod. Theod.* ed. Haenel, lib. xvi. tit. v. p. 1522). Under Constantius they were violently persecuted, together with the rest of the Homoousian party, by the patriarch Macedonius. Socrates (ii. 38) mentions several martyrs for the Catholic faith whom they then furnished, specially one Alexander a Paphlagonian, to whose memory they built a church at Constantinople existing in his own day. Several of their churches, too, were destroyed at Constantinople and Cyzicus, but were restored by Julian

upon his accession, and Agelius their bishop was banished. "But Macedonius consummated his wickedness in the following manner. Hearing there was a great number of the Novatian sect in the province of Paphlagonia, and especially at Mantinium, and, perceiving that such a numerous body could not be driven from their homes by ecclesiastics alone, he caused, by the emperor's permission, four companies of soldiers to be sent into Paphlagonia that, through dread of the military, they might receive the Arian opinion. But those who inhabited Mantinium, animated to desperation by zeal for their religion, armed themselves with long reaping-hooks, hatchets, and whatever weapons came to hand, and went forth to meet the troops, on which, a conflict ensuing, many indeed of the Paphlagonians were slain, but nearly all the soldiers were destroyed." This persecution well-nigh brought about a union between the Catholics and the Novatians, as the former frequented the churches of the latter party during the Arian supremacy. The Novatians again, however, as in Constantine's time, were obstinate in refusing to unite with those whose church-theory was different from their own, though their faith was alike. Under Valens, seven years later, A.D. 366, they suffered another persecution, and Agelius was again exiled. Under Theodosius, bishop at Constantinople, Agelius appeared in conjunction with the orthodox patriarch Nectarius as joint-defenders of the Homoousian doctrine at the synod of A.D. 383, on which account the emperor conferred on their churches equal privileges with those of the establishment (Soc. *H. E.* v. 10, 20). John Chrysostom's severe zeal for church discipline led him to persecute them. When visiting Ephesus to consecrate a bishop, A.D. 401, he deprived them of their churches, an act to which many attributed John's subsequent misfortunes. An expression uttered by Chrysostom in reference to their peculiar views about sin after baptism, "Approach (the altar) though you may have repented a thousand times," led to a literary controversy between him and the learned and witty Sisinnius, Novatian bishop of Constantinople (Soc. *H. E.* vi. 21, 22). Two or three other points of interest may be noted in their history during the 4th century. About the year 374 there occurred a schism in their ranks concerning the true time of Easter. Hitherto the Novatians had strictly observed the Catholic rule. A few obscure Phrygian bishops however convened a synod at Pazum or Pazacoma, where they agreed to celebrate the same day as that on which the Jews keep the Feast of Unleavened Bread. This canon was passed in the absence of Agelius of Constantinople, Maximus of Nice, and the bishops of Nicomedia and Cotyaeum, their leading men (Soc. *H. E.* iv. 28). Jewish influence was also at work, as Sozomen (vii. 18) tells us that a number of priests were converted by the Novatians at Pazum during the reign of Valens, who still retained their Jewish ideas about Easter. To this sect was given the name Protopaschitae (*Cod. Theod.* ed. Haenel, p. 1581), where severe penalties are denounced against them as worshippers of a different Christ because observing Easter otherwise than the orthodox. This question, when raised by a presbyter of Jewish birth, named Sabbatius, some twenty years later, caused a further schism among the Novatians, at Constantinople, under the episcopate of Marcian, A.D. 391, whence the name Sabbatiani (Σαββατιανοί). This division of the Novatians finally coalesced with the Montanists, though we can trace its distinct existence till the middle of the 5th century [SABBATIUS]. (Soc. *H. E.* v. 21; Soz. *H. E.* vii. 18; *Cod. Theod.* ed. Haenel, pp. 1566, 1570, 1581). The curious student will find many particulars about the various customs of the Eastern Novatians and concerning the reflex influence of the sect on the church in the matter of auricular confession in Soc. *H. E.* v. 19, 22. The historian in cap. 19 ascribes the original establishment of the office of penitentiary presbyter and secret confession to the Novatian schism. To prevent scrupulous persons knowing who had lapsed, the bishops appointed a presbyter to receive privately the confession of penitents. This office continued in Constantinople till the time of the patriarch Nectarius, A.D. 391, when it was abolished owing to a grave scandal which arose therefrom. Thenceforward it was determined "to leave every one to his own conscience with regard to participation in the sacred mysteries." The succession of Novatian patriarchs of Constantinople during the 4th century was Acesius, Agelius Marcianus, Sisinnius (Soc. *H. E.* v. 21; vi. 22; Soz. *H. E.* vii. 14). During the 5th century the Novatians continued to flourish notwithstanding occasional troubles. In Constantinople their bishops during the first half of the century were Sisinnius, died in A.D. 412, Chrysanthus in 419, Paul in 438 and Marcian. They lived on amicable terms with the orthodox patriarch Atticus, who, remembering their fidelity under the Arian persecution, protected them from their enemies. Paul even enjoyed the reputation of a miracle-worker, and died in the odour of universal sanctity, all sects and parties uniting in singing psalms at his funeral (Soc. *H. E.* vii. 46). In Alexandria, however, they were persecuted by Cyril, their bishop Theopemptus and their churches plundered, notwithstanding which they continued to exist in large numbers in that city till the 7th century, when Eulogius, Catholic patriarch of Alexandria, wrote a treatise against them (Phot. *Cod.* 182, 208; Ceill. xi. 589). Even in Scythia their churches existed, as we find Marcus, a bishop from that country, present at the death of Paul, Novatian bishop of Constantinople in July 21, 438. In Asia Minor, again, we find them as widely dispersed as the Catholics. In parts of it, indeed, the orthodox party seem for long to have been completely absorbed by those who took the Puritan view. Epiphanius tells us, for instance, there were no Catholics for 112 years in the city of Thyatira (*Haer.* li.; Lumper, *Hist. SS. PP.* viii. 259). They had established a regular parochial system. Thus (in Boeckh, *Corp. Gr. Inscriptt.* iv. 9268) we find at Laodicea in Lycaonia an inscription on a tombstone erected by one Aurelia Domna to her husband Paul, deacon of the holy church of the Novatians (Ναυάτων),[a]

[a] The learned Editor of Boeckh, not recognising the name of the sect, speculates about some unknown town of Ναῦα to which the holy deacon might be assigned. Amid the corruptions of the Greek language Ναυάτος was a frequent form assumed by the larger Ναυατιανὸς. See references at beginning of article.

while even towards the end of the preceding century St. Basil, though hesitating on grounds similar to those of Cyprian, to recognize their baptism, concludes in its favour on the express ground that it was for the advantage and profit of the populace that it should be received (Basil, *Ep.* clxxxviii. *ad Amphiloch.*; cf. R. T. Smith's *Basil the Great*, p. 119). After the close of the 5th century we find but few notices of their history. As the times of persecution receded into the distance of antiquity, their protest about the lapsed seemed obsolete and their adherents fell away, on the one side to the church, on the other to sects like the Montanists. The last formal notice of their existence in the East within our period will be found in the ninety-fifth canon of the Trullan (Quinisext) council A.D. 692. In the West we have no such particular details of the history of the Novatian schism as in the East. Yet we can perceive clear evidence of their widespread and long-continued influence. Already we have noted their extension into Southern Gaul and Africa in the very earliest days of its history. In Alexandria also, whose church-life, however, belongs more to the East than the West, we have noted its last historical manifestation. Between the middle of the 3rd century, when it arose, and the close of the 5th, we find repeated notices of its existence and power. Constantine's decree (*Cod. Theod.* XVI. v. 2, with Gothofred's comment), for instance, giving them a certain restricted liberty, was directed to Bassus, probably vicarius of Italy. Towards the close of the same 4th century we find a regular succession of Novatian bishops existing —doubtless from Novatian's time—at Rome, and held in such high repute for piety that the emperor Theodosius granted his life to the celebrated orator Symmachus on the prayer of the Novatian pope Leontius, A.D. 388. In the beginning of the 5th century, however, pope Celestine persecuted them, deprived them of their churches, and compelled Rusticula their bishop to hold his meetings in private, an act which Socrates considers as another proof of the overweening and unchristian insolence of the Roman see (*H. E.* vii. 11). In the Code we find about the same time several severe edicts directed against the Novatians (*Cod. Theod.* ed. Haenel, lib. xvi. tit. v. legg. 59, 65, cf. vi. 6). In the south of Gaul and north of Italy and Spain the Novatian sect seems to have taken as firm root as in Phrygia and central Asia Minor. Whether the original religious teaching of the people whose Christianity may have been imported from Africa but a short time before by Marcellinus [MARCELLINUS, (2)], or the physical features—the mountainous character, for instance, of these countries—may not have inclined them towards its stern discipline is a fair question. The fact, however, is proved by the treatises which Pacian of Barcelona and Ambrose of Milan felt necessary to direct against them. They are couched in language which proves the sect to have been then an aggressive one and a real danger to the church by the assertion of its superior sanctity and purity. The work of the Milanese bishop was evidently in answer to some work lately produced by them (*De Poenit.* lib. ii. cap. x.). The Separatist tendency begotten of Novatianism in this district and continued through Priscillianism, Adoptionism, and Claudius of Turin (Neander, *H. E.* t. vi. 119–130, ed. Bohn; cf. specially note on p. 119) may be a point of contact between the Novatians of primitive times and the Waldenses and Albigenses of the Middle Ages. Their wide spread in Africa in Augustine's time is attested by Augustine, *cont. Gaudent.* in *Opp.* ed. Bened. Paris, ix. 642, 794.

The principal controversial works directed against the sect which remain to us, beside those of Cyprian noted under his name, are the epistles of St. Pacian of Barcelona, the *de Poenitentia* of St. Ambrose, and the *Quaestiones in Nov. Testam.* num. cii. wrongly attributed to St. Augustine and found in the Parisian Ben. edit. t. iii. pars ii. 2942–2958, assigned by the editor to Hilary the deacon who lived under pope Damasus. The work of Pacian contains many interesting historical notices of the sect. From it we find they refused to the Catholics the name of a church, calling them *Apostaticum*, *Capitolinum*, or *Synedrium*, and, on the other hand, rejected the name Novatians and styled themselves simply Christians (*Ep.* ii. sec. 3). The following were some of the texts relied on by the Novatians, and to the consideration of which the writers on the Catholic side applied themselves (1 Sam. ii. 25; Matt. x. 33; xii. 31; xiii. 47–49; 1 Cor. vi. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 20; Heb. vi. 4–7; 1 John v. 15). Novatianism in the tests which it used, its efforts after a perfectly pure communion, its crotchetty interpretations of Scripture, and many other features, presents a striking parallel to many modern sects. In addition to the original authorities already quoted, there may be consulted Ceillier, ii. 427, *et passim*; Walch, *Ketzerhist.* ii. 185; Natal. Alex. ed. Mansi, saec. iii. cap. iii. art. iv.; Till. *Mém.*; Bingham, *Opp.* t. vi. 248, 570; viii. 233, ed. Lond. 1840; Gieseler, *H. E.* i. 284, ed. Clark; Neander, *H. E.* ed. Bohn, i. 330–345.

[G. T. S.]

NOVATIANUS (NOVATIANUS, Cyprian, *Ep.* xliv.; Νοουάτος, Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43; Ναυάτος, Soc. *H. E.* iv. 28. Lardner has appended a lengthened note to the 47th chapter of his *Credibility* to prove that Eusebius and the Greeks in general were correct in calling the Roman presbyter Novatus, not Novatianus. He attributes the origin of the latter name to Cyprian, who called the Roman presbyter Novatianus, as being a follower of his own rebellious priest, Novatus of Carthage). Novatian, the founder of Novatianism, is said by Philostorgius to have been a Phrygian by birth, a notion which may have originated in the popularity of his system in Phrygia and its neighbourhood (Lightfoot's *Colossians*, p. 98). He was, before his conversion, a philosopher, but we cannot certainly determine the sect to which he belonged, though from a comparison of the language of Cyprian in *Epist.* lv. sec. 13, ad Antonian., with the Novatian system itself, we should be inclined to fix upon the Stoic. The circumstances of his conversion and baptism are stated by Pope Cornelius in his letter to Fabius of Antioch (Eusebius, *l. c.*), but we must accept his statements with much caution. He was a very tetchy man, and his narration was evidently coloured by his feelings. The facts of the case appear to be thus. He was converted after he

had come to manhood, and received clinical baptism, but was never confirmed, which furnishes Cornelius with one of his principal accusations. Notwithstanding this defect he was admitted to the clerical order, and, according to a tradition preserved in the treatise of Eulogius of Alexandria against his followers, he was for a time archdeacon of Rome, and was ordained presbyter to deprive him of that position and its customary claim to succeed to the see when vacant (cf. Neander, *H. E.* v. 158). This tradition, however, is contradicted by the statement of Cornelius, who, though an enemy, admits that his predecessor Fabianus had considered him so worthy of the office of presbyter as to have ordained him thereto in opposition to the whole body of the clergy who were opposed to the ordination of clinics. Novatian's talents, especially his eloquence, to which even Cyprian witnesses (*Ep.* lx. 3), rapidly brought him to the front, and he became the most influential presbyter of the Roman church. In this character, the see being vacant, he wrote *Ep.* xxx., to the Carthaginian church, touching the treatment of the lapsed, while the anonymous author of the treatise against Novatian, written A.D. 255, and included by Erasmus among Cyprian's works, describes him while remaining in the church as "having been a precious vessel, an house of the Lord, who, as long as he was in the church, bewailed the faults of other men as his own, bore the burdens of his brethren as the apostle directs, and by his exhortations strengthened such as were weak in the faith." This testimony sufficiently disposes of the accusation of Cornelius that Novatianus denied the faith in time of persecution, declaring himself "an admirer of a different philosophy." In the earlier part of A.D. 250 he approved of a moderate policy towards the lapsed, but towards the close of the year he changed his mind, and seems to have taken up such extreme views that the martyr Moses, who probably suffered on the last day of 250, condemned his course (see Art. on CYPRIAN, Vol. I. p. 743 of this Dictionary). The chronology of this period, which presents many difficulties, will be found amply discussed there and in Lipsius (*Chronol. d. Röm. Bisch.* pp. 200–210). In March, 251, Cornelius was consecrated bishop (Lipsius, *l. c.* p. 205). This roused the stricter party to action (Cyprian, *Ep.* xlvi.). Novatus, the Carthaginian agitator, having meanwhile arrived at Rome, flung himself into their ranks, urging them to take the final step of setting up an opposition bishop. For this purpose he made a journey into distant parts of Italy, whence he brought back three bishops who consecrated Novatian [NOVATUS]. Their names may possibly have been Marcellus, Alexander of Aquileia, and Agamemnon of Tibur (cf. Eulogii *Cont. Novatianos*, in Phot. *Cod.* 182, 208; Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43; Theodoret, *Haeret. Fab.* iii. 5). On the other hand Bingham suggests *Opp.* Lond. 1840, t. viii. p. 235, that Trophimus was the name of the leading consecrator, quoting Cyprian (*Ep.* lv. sec. 8). After his consecration he despatched the usual epistles announcing it to the bishops of the chief sees, to Cyprian, Dionysius of Alexandria, Fabius of Antioch. Cyprian rejected his communion at once. Dionysius wrote exhorting him to retire from his schismatical position (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 45). Fabius, however, so inclined to his side that Dionysius addressed to him a letter on the subject; and two bishops, Firmilianus of Cappadocia and Theoctistus of Palestine, wrote to Dionysius requesting his presence at the council of Antioch to restrain tendencies in that direction (Euseb. vi. 44, 46). In the latter part of the same year Novatian was formally excommunicated by a synod of sixty bishops at Rome. He then threw himself into the work of organising a distinct church, rebaptizing all who came over to his side (Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxiii. 2), and despatching letters and emissaries to the most distant parts of the East and West (Soc. *H. E.* iv. 28). His subsequent career is buried in darkness, save that Socrates informs us that he suffered martyrdom under Valerian (Socrates, *H. E.* iv. 28; cf. the apocryphal Acts of Novatian included in the treatise of Eulogius noticed above). Novatian was a copious writer, as we learn from Jerome (*de Vir. Illust.* c. lxx.), where we have the following list of his works: "De Pascha, de Sabbato, de Circumcisione, de Sacerdote, de Oratione, de Instantia, de Attalo, de Cibis Judaicis, et de Trinitate," only the two last of which are now extant. That on Jewish meats was written at some place of retreat from persecution. The Jewish controversy seems to have been very hot just then at Rome, and Novatian wrote his treatise to refute their contention about distinction of meats. He points out that the old law prohibited certain meats to restrain Jewish intemperance, and to reprove in man certain vices mystically depicted in animals (cf. cap. iii. with Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 18). He shews, however, that all such shadows have been done away in Christ, and that Christians have now liberty to eat everything save what is offered to idols. Jerome describes his work on the Trinity as an epitome of Tertullian's, and as attributed by some to Cyprian (Hieron. *Apol. cont. Rufin.* lib. ii. *Opp.* t. iv. p. 415). It proves Novatian to have been a diligent student, as its arguments are identical with those of Justin Martyr in his *Dialog. cum Tryph.* cap. cxxvii.; Tertull. *adv. Prax.* cap. xiv.–xxv.; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* ii. 16; v. 11, 12. He deals first with the absolute perfection of the Father, His invisibility, &c., then discusses the anthropomorphic expressions of the Scriptures, laying down that "such things were said about God indeed, but they are not to be imputed to God but to the people. It is not God who is limited, but the perception of the people." In cap. vii. he declares that even the terms Spirit, Light, Love, are only in an imperfect degree applicable to God. In cap. ix.–xxviii. he discusses the true doctrine of the Incarnation, explaining, like Clement and others, the theophanies of the Old Testament as manifestations of Christ, and refuting the doctrine of the Sabellians, or Artemonites, according to Neander (*H. E.* ii. 298), which had just then developed itself. He ends the discussion by explaining the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, wherein he is thought by some to have fallen into error. He was quoted indeed by the Macedonians of the next century as supporting their view (cf. Fabric. *Bib. Graec.* xii. 565 and references noted there; Bull's *Def. of Nicene Creed*, ii. 476, Oxon. 1852; *Judg. of Cath. Ch.* pp. 9, 137, 291, Oxon. 1855). Lardner (*Credib.* cap. 47, t. iii. p. 242) shews that Novatian did not accept the

Epistle to the Hebrews as Scripture, since he never quotes any texts out of it, though there were several which favoured his cause, notably Heb. vi. 4–8. His followers, however, in the next century, did use them. Some have even thought that Novatian was the author of the *Refutation of all Heresies* (Bunsen, *Christ. and Mankind*, i. 480). The works of Novatian were published by Welchmann, Oxon, 1724; by Jackson, London, 1728, and in Galland. *Bib. PP.* t. iii. They have been also translated in the volume of Clark's Ante-Nicene Lib. containing the second part of St. Cyprian's writings, Edinburgh, 1869. Jackson's edition is the best. It was severely criticised by S. Crellius in a work styled *Artemonii defensio emendat. in Novatiano factar. cont. J. Jackson*, Lond. 1729. [FORTUNATUS; MAXIMUS; MOSES; EVARISTUS; DIONYSIUS; FABIUS; NICOSTRATUS (1).] (Forbesii *Instruct. Histor. Theolog.* p. 666: Lumper, *Hist. SS. PP.* viii. 259; Natal. Alex. ed. Mansi, saec. iii. cap. i. art. iv.; Welch's *Ketzerhist.* ii. 185; Neander, *H. E.* ed. Bohn, pp. 330–335; Ceillier, ii. 426; Gieseler, *H. E.* i. 284, ed. Clark.) [G. T. S.]

NOVATUS (1), presbyter of Carthage. He seems to have been an original opponent of Cyprian's election, but is first mentioned by him in *Ep.* xiv. sec. 5, with three other presbyters—Donatus, Fortunatus, and Gordius—as having written about some question to Cyprian then in retirement. This was, doubtless, touching the request of the confessors, to have peace granted to certain of the lapsed which, in *Ep.* 50, Cyprian refuses until he had taken counsel with the presbyters and faithful laity. Cyprian, in this latter epistle, reproves certain presbyters, evidently Novatus and his companions, who, "considering neither the fear of God nor the honour of the bishop," had already granted peace to the lapsed. In *Ep.* xliii., writing to the church of Carthage, he compares Novatus and his associates to the five chief commissioners entrusted with the conduct of the persecution, and, as it seems, intimates that they threatened to raise a riot upon his appearance from his place of retirement. In *Ep.* lii. 3 Cyprian, writing to Cornelius, gives a very bad character of Novatus. He describes him as one "ever eager for innovation, of insatiable avarice, puffed up with pride, always known for evil to the bishops here, a heretic, and perfidious," again, as "having robbed orphans, defrauded the church, permitted his father to die of hunger, having kicked his wife when pregnant, and having thus become the murderer of his own child." The critic will be apt to think that Cyprian's feelings must have here coloured his judgment, as such a bishop as he was could scarcely have tolerated such a bad man in the presbyterate. He, in the same epistle, describes him as having made his follower Felicissimus a deacon, and then "at Rome committing greater and more grievous crimes. He who at Carthage made a deacon against the church, there made a bishop." The Liberian catalogue in like manner describes Novatus as ordaining Novatian in Rome and Nicostratus in Africa, though Cornelius (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43) tells us Novatian was ordained by three bishops from distant parts of Italy. Neander (*H. E.* i. 313, ed. Bohn), concluding on the contrary, from Cyprian's words, that Novatus, "spurning the yoke of episcopal monarchy," himself ordained Felicissimus. Cyprian evidently merely means that Novatus brought about the ordination of both the deacon and bishop. At the same time, *Ep.* xliii. sec. 2, proves that Cyprian's wrath was specially stirred by some anti-episcopal innovations of Novatus and his party. What their character was it would be now impossible to determine (cf. Bingham, Dissert. on 8th Nicene canon in *Opp.* London, 1840, t. viii. p. 417). After the consecration of Novatian, Novatus was sent by him, together with Evaristus, Nicostratus, Primus and Dionysius to organize his party in Africa (Cyprian, *Ep.* l.). After this he disappears from our sight. (Compare Dr. Pusey's note upon him, appended to Cyprian, *Ep.* lii. in Oxford, *Lib. of Fathers*. See also Milman, *Lat. Christ.* t. i. pp. 60–62, ed. Lond. 1867. On the latter page he remarks in a note, "We are on historical ground, or what a myth might be made out of these two *innovators*—Novatus and Novatian.") [NOVATIANUS; CYPRIAN.] [G. T. S.]

NOVATUS (2), bp. of Thamogade (Hartel—as also some Inscriptions; Thamugade, more common (*hod.* Timgâd), near Lambaesis in Numidia, afterwards a headquarters of Donatism (vid. Morcelli) *Sentt. Episcopor.* 4 in *Syn. Carth.* sub Cyp. *de Bap.* 3). His expressions as one of the oldest of the eighty-seven bishops seem to affect our estimate of the date of the Agrippinensian council. He could scarcely have called its members "sanctissimae memoriae" had not the generation passed, nor "collegae" if they had been beyond his memory. [E. W. B.]

NOVATUS (3), called CATHOLICUS, a monk probably of the 4th century, author of a short Latin piece, *Sententia de Humilitate et Obedientia et de Calcanda Superbia.* (*Patr. Lat.* xviii. 67; Ceillier, vi. 331.) [C. H.]

NOVATUS of Sitifa. [NAVATUS.]

NOVELLUS, bishop of Tyzica, a small town of Proconsular Africa, Thisica of Ptolemy, between Tabraca and the river Bagradas (Ptol. iv. 3–31). The see appears to have lasted as late as A.D. 449, for a bishop of Tizzica was present at the Lateran council held in that year (Böcking, *Not. Dign.* i. p. 642). Novellus is mentioned by Augustine as being, together with Faustinus of Tuburbo, open to a charge from the Donatist point of view, of the same kind as Caecilianus, yet not condemned by his party on that account, probably because both he and Faustinus adopted Donatist views. Augustine does not mention the charge, but it was no doubt one of having received consecration from a "traditor." (Aug. *ad Don. post Coll.* xxii. 38; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 342.) FAUSTINUS (4).] [H. W. P.]

NOVELLUS, bishop of Complutum, is mentioned in A.D. 579 by J. Biclarensis (*Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 866) as an illustrious person. Nothing more is known of him. At the third council of Toledo in A.D. 589 the see was vacant (*Esp. Sag.* vii. 179). [F. D.]

NUADHA (NUAD, -DATUS, -DUS, NUAT, NODTAT), abbat, classed in recent times among

the bishops and archbishops, of Armagh, has a memoir by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 373), *De S. Nuadato archiepiscopo Ardmachano;* is noticed by O'Hanlon (*Ir. SS.* ii. 637–8). He was probably an anchoret at Lochuamha in Lower Breffny, and succeeded Torbach in the primacy at Armagh A.D. 812 (*Four Mast.* by O'Don. i. 419; Cotton, *Fast.* iii. 7). The Irish Annals record that in A.D. 815 (*Ann. Ult.* and *Four Mast.* A.D. 810) he went to Connaught, for the rectification apparently of some abuses. He died A.D. 816. His feast is Feb. 19. [J. G.]

NUB. [ANUPH, PAESIS, POEMEN.]

NUDD (1) ap Ceidio, Welsh saint of the 6th century, member of St. Illtyd's college (Rees, *W. SS.* 208; Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 503, 530). [J. G.]

NUDD (2), bishop of Llandaff early in the 9th century (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, 626), perhaps Nudd the "reader," and clerical witness of many charters, but probably Novis or Nywys, who died A.D. 873 (*ib.*). [J. G.]

NUDD (3) (HAEL), classed sometimes among the Welsh saints, one of the men of the North in the beginning of the 6th century, a member of St. Illtyd's college, and perhaps founder of Llysvronudd (*Triads* in *Myv. Arch.* ii. 3, 14, 70; Skene, *Four Anc. B. Wal.* ii. 457; Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 542 et al.). [J. G.]

NUMENIUS (1), philosopher; vid. *Dict. G. & R. Biog.*

NUMENIUS (2), a disciple of Lucian the martyr. He was one of a brilliant band who imbibed from him Arian principles. Among them was Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris of Chalcedon, and Leontius of Antioch. They were like the rest of the Arian party rather weak in Christian principle. "They yielded to the violence of tyrants so far as to offer sacrifice to the gods of the heathen; but afterwards made amends for their lapse, Lucian their master himself assisting to bring them to repentance." (Philostorgii *E. H.* ii. 14; Tillem. v. 770). [G. T. S.]

NUMENIUS (3), a primate addressed by the famous ascetic Nilus on the benefit of studying Holy Scripture, *Ep.* lib. ii. 198, where Nilus shews that he favoured the mystical mode of interpreting Holy Scripture. [NILUS (3).] [G. T. S.]

NUMERIA (Cyp. *Ep.* 31, 32), sister of CELERINUS, unless her real name was ETECUSA, q. v. [E. W. B.]

NUMERIANUS (1), emperor, A.D. 284. M. Aurelius Numerianus, the younger son of the emperor Carus, was associated with his father in the war against the Sarmatians and Persians, which was the one conspicuous event in his short reign. He and his brother Carinus received the title of Caesar, and while the latter was left at Rome outraging the feelings of the senate and of all the decent citizens by a licentiousness like that of Elagabalus and a cruelty like that of Domitian, and attracting the admiration of the populace by spectacles of unprecedented magnificence, the former accompanied his father in his Eastern expedition. On the death of Carus, as it was reported, struck by lightning, the two brothers were acknowledged as emperors both by the army and the senate. The superstition of the troops saw however, in the manner of the emperor's death, an indication of the wrath of the gods at the attempted extension of the empire beyond the Tigris, and clamorously called on Numerian to lead them home. The young emperor, amiable, cultivated, with the tastes of a poet and an orator, had not strength to resist them, and they began their march. During their eight months' march to Heraclea on the European side of the Propontis, he was scarcely seen, and was carried in a litter, suffering from an inflammation of the eyes, brought on by exposure to the sun, or by his ceaseless weeping for his father's death. All business was transacted in his name by his father-in-law, Annius Aper, who held the office of praetorian prefect. Before long a report spread that the emperor was dead. The soldiers rushed into the imperial tent and found his corpse. Suspicion fell on Aper, who was arrested and taken in chains to Chalcedon. The generals and tribunes of the army held a council, in which DIOCLETIAN was elected emperor. Addressing the legions, he appealed to the "all-seeing Sun" as witness that he was guiltless of the death of Numerianus, and ordering Aper to be brought before his tribunal, pointed him out as the murderer, and, without waiting for his defence against the charge, plunged his sword into his breast. Carinus, still at Rome, prepared for resistance, and the two armies met in Moesia, near the banks of the Danube. The conflict, fought at Margus, was for a time doubtful as to its issue, but the murder of Carinus on the field of battle, by a tribune whose wife he had seduced, left the victory with Diocletian (Vopisc. *Numer.*; Aurel. Vict. *Epit.* 38; *De Caes.* 38; Eutrop. ix. 12; Zonar. xii. 30; Gibbon, c. xii.). [E. H. P.]

NUMERIANUS (2), praeses of Cilicia, in the early part of the Diocletian persecution. His full name, according to the Greek version of the Acts of Tarachus, was Flavius Gaius Numerianus Maximus (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* p. 422). The action of this official has given M. Ed. le Blant some of his best instances, shewing the use we can make of the acts of the martyrs to illustrate Roman legal procedure. (Le Blant, *Les Actes des Mart.* pp. 27–29, cf. p. 121, Paris, 1882.) [G. T. S.]

NUMERIANUS (3), bishop in the district of Constantinople, bearer of a letter from pope Zosimus (*Ep. et Decr.* No. 16) to the bishops throughout Byzacene A.D. 418 (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* vii. 538). [J. G.]

NUMERIANUS (4), ST. (MEMORIANUS, MUNERIANUS), July 5, bishop of Trèves (Browerus, *Antiq. Trevirens.* i. 355, ii. Chr. Index p. 8; Boll. *Acta SS.* 5 Jul. ii. 231; *Gall. Chr.* xiii. 385), his period being *c.* 657–670 (Brow.) or *c.* 640–666 (*G. C.*), while as to his exact position in the series, authorities are not agreed (cf. Mabillon, *Annal. O. B.* t. i. pp. 487, 507, 604 and art. HILDULFUS). Browerus can find nothing of him except his monumental inscription recording his day in the church of St. Helen at Trèves founded in the 11th century. But there are likewise charters mentioning him. One attributed to himself, *c.* 664 or 677, grant-

ing a privilegium to abbat Deodatus (*Gall. Chr.* xiii. *Instrum.* p. 291; Mabillon, *Annal. O. B.* i. 696; Brequigny, *Diplom.* num. 360, ed. Pardessus) is spurious as shewn at length by Brequigny (t. i. Proleg. pp. 100, 298). A charter of Sigebert II. to abbat Remaclus, 648, mentions him in one recension (Breq. num. 313), and omits him in another (*Acta SS.* 1 Feb i. 235 A). A charter of Childeric II., 667, mentions him (Breq. 359; *Acta SS.* 1 Feb. i. 235 E) as Memorianus. [C. H.]

NUMERIUS, a deacon of Nuceria, into whose fitness for the episcopal office (sacerdotium) the subdeacon Peter was requested by pope Gregory the Great to examine, A.D. 593 (Greg. lib. iii. ind. xi. ep. 40 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxvii.; Jaffé, *R. P.* num. 880). [C. H.]

NUMIDICUS, African confessor in Decian persecution, left for dead after stoning and burning, but recovered by his daughter. His wife perished. He was a presbyter, and Cyprian enrols him in the Carthaginian Clerus as an honour, assigning him a seat in the circle, promises his elevation (to episcopate), and, *Ep.* 41, associates him with his former commissary ROGATIAN and the bishops CALDONIUS, HERCULANUS, and VICTOR in the commission for relief of Carthaginian sufferers which led to the open schism of FELICISSIMUS. In *Ep.* 43 he is one of the main stays while Cyprian is away. [E. W. B.]

NUMIDIUS, bishop present as an African deputy at the council of Aquileia, A.D. 381. (Ambros. *Opp.* ii. 786, in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* xvi. 916, 934.) The acts of this council as there set forth have been challenged as spurious, but are accepted by the Benedictine editor and by Hefele, *Counc.* ii. 376, Clark's translation. [G. T. S.]

He and his colleague Felix, who was no doubt the bishop of Selemsela [FELIX (150)], spoke in favour of the Nicene faith. This bishop was no doubt Numidius I. of Maxula, who, together with Felix of Selemsela, was a prominent speaker at the council of Carthage in 390 (Hard. i. 951). He appears also at the conference of 411, where his Donatist opponent is one Felix (*Collat. Carth.* cognit. i. 112, in Hard. i. 1077). He may be assumed to have been the Numidius who stands first in the address to pope Innocent at the council of Carthage in 416 (Hard. i. 1215) against the Pelagians (Tillem. vi. 157, xiii. 304, 395, 690; Morcelli i. 220; Ceill. iv. 648). A second Numidius of Maxula was present at the council of Carthage in 525 (Hard. ii. 1082; Morcelli, i. 220). [C. H.]

NUMULENUS (MUMMULENUS), Gallic noble, father of Bobo and Bodegisilus, was called Suessionicus by Greg. Tur. (*Hist. Franc.* vi. c. 45, x. c. 45, ap. *Pat. Lat.* lxxi.), is highly praised by Fortunatus Venantius (*Miscell.* vii. c. 14, x. c. 2), who addresses a poem and consolatory letter to him on the death of his daughter (*Pat. Lat.* lxxxviii. 251, 322, sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 409). [J. G.]

NUNCUPATUS, a presbyter who carried information to Charibert king of Paris of the deposition of Emerius bishop of Saintes and was banished (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* iv. 26). [C. H.]

NUNDINARIUS (1), a deacon, who for some cause unknown was degraded by Silvanus bishop of Cirta. He endeavoured to obtain restoration through the influence of Purpurius bishop of Limata, Fortis, and Sabinus, who each of them wrote letters to Silvanus and to the church of Cirta, exhorting reconciliation, but recommending secrecy in the matter. The dangerous facts to be thus concealed were (1) the act of "tradition" on the part of Silvanus, (2) the bribery by means of which Victor obtained his ordination, whose proceeds, 20 folles, he said were divided among themselves by the bishops, (3) the corrupt means used by Purpurius and Silvanus to obtain their bishoprics, and (4) the money given by Lucilla for obtaining the appointment of Majorinus. Of the truth of all these charges Nundinarius gave evidence before Zenophilus, and was supported by other witnesses, A.D. 320. (Aug. *Unit. Eccl.* 18, 46; *c. Cresc.* iii. 28, 32; 29, 33; *Ep.* 53, 3; Opt. i. 14; *Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. ed. Oberthür.) [LUCILLA, FORTIS, CRESCENTIANUS, SATURNINUS, SILVANUS.] [H. W. P.]

NUNDINARIUS (2), bishop of Barcelona, c. A.D. 465, by appointing Irenaeus his successor, caused an appeal to be made to pope Hilary and the enactment of five disciplinary canons [IRENAEUS (10)] (Hilarius, *Epp.* i. ii. ap. *Pat. Lat.* lviii.; Hard. ii. 801; Florez, *Esp. Sag.* xxix. 114; Tillem. xvi. 45; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 339). [J. G.]

NUNNA (NUN), a king of the South Saxons, who in concert with his kinsman Ine king of the West Saxons carried on a successful war in 710 against Gerent (called Uuthgirete by Ethelwerd) king of the Britons (*A. S. C.* ann. 710; Flor. Wig. ann. 710; Ethelwerd, *Chron.* ii. 12; Hen. Hunt. lib. iv.; *L'Estorie des Anglois*, ver. 1629; for which passages see *M. H. B.* 326, 507, 540 c. 724 a, 784). In the charters of Kemble's *Cod. Dipl.* he is found subscribing in 692 as king of the South Saxons a charter of Nothelm king of the South Saxons (num. 995); as king of the South Saxons he grants land to Beadufrid and his brethren dwelling in the island of Selsey, where Nunna desires to be buried (999); he grants land in 725 to bishop Eadbert (1000); in an undated charter (1001) he grants to Berhfrid a servant of God lands in the place called Piperingas, near the river Tarente [OSMUND]. [C. H.]

NUNNECHIUS. [NONNICHIUS.]

NUNNINUS (NUMNIUS), a tribune of Auvergne in the time of queen Teudechildis, said to have been preternaturally punished for chipping the tomb of St. Germanus of Auxerre (Greg. Tur. *Glor. Conf.* cap. 41). [C. H.]

NUNNIO, a courtier of Childebert I. king of Paris (Greg. Tur. *Vit. Pat.* cap. ix. 1). [PATROCLUS.] [C. H.]

NURSINUS, a priest said to have seen in the hour of his death the apostles Peter and Paul (Greg. Mag. *Dial.* iv. 11; Ceill. xi. 478). [C. H.]

NYCTAGES, heretics described by Isidorus Hispal., as opposing vigils on the ground that God made the day for work and the night for sleep. They took up merely the same ground as Vigilantius against Jerome and the subdeacon Timotheus against St. Nilus, cf. Nili *Epist.* i. 26. (Isidor. Hispal. *de Eccles. Offic.* i. 22, in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. 83, col. 759.) [G. T. S.]

NYMPHA, a virgin saint of about the fifth century, honoured in Tuscany and at Rome (Peter Natalis, lib. x., c. 42, p. 197; Tillem. iii. 342, 343, 709). [C. H.]

NYMPHIDIANUS, FLAVIANUS, a scholasticus of Philadelphia, who renounced Quartodecimanism at the council of Ephesus (Mansi, iv. 1355, v. 610, vi. 893). [C. H.]

NYMPHODORA, martyr in Bithynia in the reign of Maximian, with her sisters Menodora and Metrodora (*vid.* those names in *D. C. A.* and Tillem. v. 160). [C. H.]

NYNIA, NYNYANE. [NINIAN.]

O

OAN, princeps, that is, abbat, of Egg in the Hebrides, died A.D. 724. (*Ann. Ult.*; Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 307, 382.) [J. G.]

OBINUS (OUINUS), the fourth name in the mythical list of the British bishops or archbishops of London (Godwin, *de Praesulibus*, ed. Richardson, p. 170; Ussher, *Antiq.* ed. 1639, p. 67.) The compiler of the list in which the name occurs was Joscelin of Furnes, a monk of the 12th century, of whose life and materials nothing satisfactory seems to be ascertained; and the MS. from which Ussher and the other writers excerpted it has not been recognised (Hardy, *Cat. Mat.* i. 64; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Lat. s. v.*). [S.]

OCCILIANUS, addressed by Gregory the Great in A.D. 599, on his appointment as tribune of Hydruntum or Otranto by the exarch, requesting him to redress the wrongs done by his predecessor Viator to the inhabitants of Gallipoli, by exacting forced services from them, and otherwise oppressing them, about which Sabinus, or Sabinianus, bishop of the place, had written to complain. From another letter it appears that Occilianus had personally visited Gregory (*Epp.* ix. 99, 100, 102). [F. D.]

OCEANUS, a Roman of noble birth in the 4th and 5th centuries, connected by birth with Fabiola (q. v.) and the Julian family, and by friendship with Jerome, Augustine and Pammachius. Jerome speaks of him as his son (*Ep.* lxxvii. 1, ed. Vall. and lxix. 10), but as the spiritual father of Marcellinus, the Roman governor (*Ep.* lxxvi. 1, A.D. 411). He was, perhaps, like his friend Pammachius, a senator (comp. their letter among Jerome's lxxxiii. with his expression, *Ep.* xcvii. 3, Vos Christiani Senatus lumina). He probably became known to Jerome during his stay in Rome in 383–5. He was a zealous upholder of orthodoxy and strict discipline, and first comes to our knowledge by a public protest which he made against Carterius, a Spanish bishop who, having married before his baptism and lost his wife, had, as a Christian, married a second wife. Jerome points out that there is no law or principle condemning such marriages, and urges him to silence. This was about the year 397. Either in that or the previous year, Oceanus, in company with Fabiola, visited Jerome at Bethlehem, whence they were driven by the fear of the invasion of the Huns. While there, he appears to have made acquaintance with Rufinus, who, according to Jerome's insinuation (*Adv. Ruf.* iii. 4), had an Origenistic document placed in Oceanus's room in Fabiola's house, with a view to identify him with that tendency. Rufinus having gone to Rome the same year (397), and having published shortly afterwards his edition of the Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, Oceanus and Pammachius watched his actions with critical eyes, and, on the appearance of the work, wrote to Jerome (Jer. *Ep.* 83) requesting him to deny the insinuation of Rufinus that he was only completing a work begun by Jerome, and to furnish them with a translation of Origen's work as it really was. Oceanus, no doubt, took part in the subsequent proceedings which led to the condemnation of Origenism at Rome. On the death of Fabiola, about 399, Jerome wrote to Oceanus his Epitaphium of her (*Ep.* 77), accompanied by his exposition, which had been intended for her, of the 42 resting-places of the Israelites in the desert. At a later time, in 411, Oceanus, who had maintained his correspondence with Jerome, and possessed his books against Rufinus and other of his works, interested himself specially in the questions which arose in connexion with the Pelagian controversy, on the origin of souls. Jerome writes to Marcellinus and Anapsychius (*Ep.* 126) who had consulted him on this subject, referring them to Oceanus as one thoroughly "learned in the law of the Lord" and capable of instructing them. Oceanus was also in correspondence with Augustine, who writes to him in the year 416 on the two subjects on which he had differed from Jerome, the origin of souls, and the passage in Galatians relating to the reproof of St. Peter by St. Paul at Antioch. Augustine speaks also of another work of Jerome's on the resurrection which had been brought by Orosius to Oceanus, and of letters which he had received from him. The tenor of his letter indicates his deep respect and consideration. Oceanus is placed by Migne with Pammachius, among the ecclesiastical writers (*Patrologia*, vol. 20); but no writing of his has come down to us except the letter to Jerome (*Ep.* 83). [W. H. F.]

OCIALDUS, disciple of St. Richarius, whom c. 645 he succeeded as abbat of Centula or St. Riquier in Picardy. (Alcuin, *Vit. S. Richar.* § 14, in *Pat. Lat.* ci. 691; *Gall. Chr.* x. 1243.) [C. H.]

OCLEATINUS, forbidden by Gregory the Great in A.D. 591, in letters to Severus, bishop of Ficulum, and to the governor and inhabitants of Ariminum (*Epp.* 1, 57, 58), on what grounds it is not stated, to be chosen bishop of that city. [F. D.]

OCTAVIANA, wife of Hesperius, used her husband's influence with the usurper Maximus in favour of a Tertullianist teacher whom she had brought with her from Africa to Rome. (Praedest. *Haer.* 86.) [G. S.]

OCTAVIANUS, an archdeacon and martyr in the Arian persecution under Hunneric. (Greg. Turon. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 3.) [G. T. S.]

OCTAVIUS (1). [MINUCIUS FELIX.]

OCTAVIUS (2), Nov. 20 (Usuard. *Mart.*), one of the martyrs of the Thebaean legion, commemorated, together with his companions Adventitius and Solutor, at Turin. They were the subject of a homily by St. Maximus, bishop of Turin. [MAXIMUS (16).] (Hom. 81, *De Natali SS. Martyrum Octav., Advent., et Solut.* in *Pat. Lat.* lvii. 427). [C. H.]

OCTAVIUS (3), a presbyter of Sirmium, who, *c.* 366, subscribed with INNOCENTIUS (28). [C. H.]

OCTAVIUS (4), a bishop at the council of Nismes in 394 (Hefele, ii. 405). In 401 he and two other bishops, Remigius and Treferius, were acquitted at the council of Turin (can. III.) on the charge of having performed some unlawful ordinations (Hardouin, i. 958). [C. H.]

OCTOBER. [LYONS, MARTYRS OF.]

ODA, widow, said by some to have been daughter of Childebert III., king of the Franks. She was married to Bogo or Boggus, duke of Aquitaine, and after his death, A.D. 688, devoted herself to religion, and specially to active works of charity to the suffering and poor. She died about A.D. 722, and her relics are preserved at Amay. Her feast is Oct. 23. The authority is a late *Life* by an anonymous writer, given with valuable commentarius praevius by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Oct. x. 139), but she is a favourite with French writers as the pattern of chaste widowhood. (Chevalier, *Repert. Moyen Age*, 1661). [J. G.]

ODDA (ODA), virgin, patron of Rhoda in Brabant, commemorated Nov. 27. She is called daughter of a king of Scotia; Dempster says, of Eugenius V. In her legend there is nothing distinctive beyond her residence at Rhoda in the 6th or 8th century, and the elevation of her remains by bishop Othbert in 1103. (Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 509; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* ii. 72, giving a useful résumé.) [J. G.]

ODDO, of Mercia. [DODDO.]

ODHRAN (ODRANUS, ORAN, OTTERAN) is a name often met with in Irish hagiology, and perhaps is allied to the Latin Adrianus. (For lists of Odhran or Odranus, see Colgan, *Acta SS.* 372 n.[17], 540 n.[2])

(1) ODHRAN, monk of Iona under St. Columba, to whom he was closely related. His feast is Oct. 27. Colgan (*T. T.* 506 c. 3) calls him monk of Derry, and Skene (*Celt. Scot.* 35 n.) might accept the gloss of Aengus as identifying him with Odhran of Lattaragh, but the dates prevent it. Of his life there is no account till the close, when the curious legend is told by O'Donnell (Colgan, *T. T.* 411 c. 12) of Odhran's choice to die and be the first of St. Columba's followers to take corporal possession of Iona. His death is assigned to 563, the year of St. Columba's arrival. His fame in the West of Scotland is attested by the number of dedications. On Iona the Reilig Odhrain, and St. Oran's chapel, dating from about the 12th century and said to have been the place of burial for the Scotch, Irish, and Norwegian kings, are well known. (On St. Odhran, see Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 35; Boll. *Acta SS.* 27 Oct. xii. 342–4, with full Sylloge Historica by De Buck trying to discriminate the many Odrani and believing this to be St. Adamnan's Brito; Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 203 et al., ed. 1857.)

(2) ODHRAN, disciple and successor of St. Senan at Iniscathay in the Shannon about A.D. 580. (Cotton, *Fast.* i. 431; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 537.) [J. G.]

ODILBERTUS (EDELBERTUS, ODBERTUS, OLIBERTUS, ALIBERTUS, ALIPERTUS, OLDIBERTUS, OLDEPERTUS), archbishop of Milan, to whom Charlemagne addressed a letter of questions on the subject of Baptism (Baluze, *Capitularia*, t. i. p. 483). He presided from 805 to 814 (Ughelli, *Ital. Sac.* iv. 75; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d' Ital.* xi. 134, 202; Ceillier, xii. 185, 238). [C. H.]

ODILIA (ODILA, OTHILIA, OTTILIA), virgin and abbess, has an abundant literature, but her biography is based on a life of the eleventh century, which is entirely unhistorical (Mabillon, *A. SS. O.S.B.* iii. 2, pp. 441, ed. 1734. As patron of Alsace, and specially of Hohenburg, where her relics are still largely resorted to, she is held in great repute on the confines of France and Germany. Very briefly stated, tradition represents her as daughter of Adalric or Ethico, duke of Alsace, and Berchsind his wife. Being born blind, she was exposed by her father's order, but afterwards rescued from death, and at the age of twelve baptized by a bishop called Erhardt, when her eyes were at once opened (but see Boll. *A.SS.* Jul. iii. 212, 214 sq., upon this baptism and miracles, and claiming them as the work of St. Hildulfus of Treves; the father is Ethico or Athicus). Her father in remorse built a nunnery for her at Hohenburg, where she died Dec. 13th, A.D. 720. She is invoked in affections of the eyes, and has as her symbol two eyes lying upon a book (Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* vi. 197; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, viii. 89–1). [HILDULFUS.] [J. G.]

ODILLEOZ, a monk sent to Alcuin in 796 from the brethren of the church of St. Liudgar, which may have been at Autun, or else at Münsterthal in Alsace (Alcuin, ep. 52 and note, in *Pat. Lat.* c. 217), or Murbach (Dümmler, *Mon. Alc.* p. 340). [C. H.]

ODILO (OTILO), dux of Bagoaria (Bavaria), who greatly encouraged the mission of St. Boniface among his people, and in conjunction with him established the first four bishoprics of Bavaria (Othlo, *Vit. Bonif.* num. 31, in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxix. 649). [BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINENSIS.] His marriage in 742 with Chiltrudis or Hiltrudis, the daughter of Charles Martel, and his defeat in 743 at the Lech by Carloman and

Pippin, are recorded by Fredegarius (*Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 681) and some anonymous annals (Bouquet, v. 33, 196, vi. 97, 137). [C. H.]

ODLANDUS, 10th abbat of St. Bertin, circ. 795–804. There is extant a document dated in the 20th year of Charles the Great's reign purporting to be a grant by him to Autlandus or Audlandus, and his monks, of the privilege of hunting wild beasts in the monastery domain, but not in the royal forests, for skins to bind books for the monks and make them gloves and belts. This document was published by Mabillon in the *De Re Dipl.* p. 631, and thence transferred into Migne's collection (*Pat. Lat.* xcvii. 976), but it is rejected as spurious by Le Cointe. Odlandus acquired for his foundation several villages, with their churches and dependencies, and in 797 established his residence at Arques, where he executed some engineering works for the improvement of the channels of the Aa and built flour-mills, for which he afterwards acquired the grant of a monopoly. The church of St. Martin in the same parish which had been destroyed by Northmen, he re-established, and attached to it ten monks. (Laplane, *Les Abbés de Saint-Bertin*, i. 39–42; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 487–8.) [S. A. B.]

ODOACER (ODOVACAR), king. The first is the generally received form of the name, but the latter is correct. (ODOVACAR, Cassiod., *Chron.* and MS. in Marini *Papiri Dipl.* n. 82; ODOVACHAR and ODOBAGAR, Eugyppius, *Vita S. Sev.* 14, 40, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, lxii. 1176, 1192; AUDOACHAR, *Or. Gent. Lang.* in *Mon. Germ. Hist. Script. Rer. Lang.* 3, the last form supporting Grimm's derivation from *Audags* and *vakrs* = a good watcher, Pallmann, ii. 168.) His father's name was Edecon (*An. Val.*, Ant. *M.* 209), who has been identified by Gibbon and others with the Edecon mentioned by Priscus, and with Edica, king of the Scyri (Jord. *Get.* 130), but this identification, though possibly correct, is unproved. He was a Teuton, but of what tribe is uncertain. The statement that he was a Scyrian, (Ant. *M.* 209) seems the most probable, though Jordanes (*Rom.* 44) makes him a Rugian. At any rate he sprang from one of the four kindred tribes, the Scyri, Rugi, Turcilingi, or Heruli, who in the middle of the fifth century dwelt between the Danube and the Carpathians in what is now Northern Hungary. He was born in A.D. 433 (Ant. *H.*). He is first mentioned as one of a band of young barbarians who visited the hermit Severinus on their way through Noricum to seek their fortunes in Italy. The saint predicted his future elevation. "Go," said he, "to Italy. Thou art now clad in skins, but shalt soon be able to give costly gifts to many." (Eugyppius, *ubi supra.*) He probably took service in the *Foederati*, the barbarian auxiliaries who had become the backbone of the Roman army, and in A.D. 472 had risen so high that his adhesion to Ricimer in his revolt against Anthemius is expressly mentioned (Ant. *M.* 209). In the summer of A.D. 476 the foederati, whose suspicions may have been aroused by the attempts of Nepos and Orestes to remove them from Italy to defend against the Visigoths the remnants of the Roman possessions in Gaul, demanded from Orestes, the father of the puppet emperor Romulus, a grant of one-third of the lands of Italy (Procopius, *Goth.* i. 1). A refusal was followed by a mutiny, which probably broke out in the north-east of Italy. Recruits from the Rugians, Scyrians, Turcilingi and Heruli may have marched across Noricum to join their kinsfolk, thus supplying a ground for the false conception of Odovacar as a barbarian invader of Italy. The campaign was a short one. On August 23rd (*An. Cusp.*) Odovacar, then one of the imperial guard, was proclaimed king. On the 27th, Pavia, where Orestes had retreated, fell, and the city experienced all the horrors of a storm, though Epiphanius did all he could to protect the inhabitants. [EPIPHANIUS (13).] The next day Orestes was taken and executed at Placentia. Odovacar marched on Ravenna, captured Paulus, the brother of Orestes, at the Pineta on September 4th, put him to death, and took Ravenna, where Romulus had taken refuge. From pity or from policy he spared his life, and granted him the Campanian villa of Lucullus with an annual pension.

The first act of Odovacar was to negotiate a treaty with Genseric, who ceded him the greater part of Sicily on the condition of his paying tribute for it (Victor Vit., *de Pers. Vand.* i. 4, in *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 187). His probable motive was to provide for the corn supply of Italy, which had been seriously diminished by the loss of Africa. He granted his soldiers the lands Orestes had refused (Procopius, *ubi supra*), but the execution of Count Brachila on July 11th of the following year (*An. Cusp.*) seems to indicate a mutinous tendency among them.

His relations with the East and the conquered Romans were in a critical state. The latter could not reconcile themselves to the dominion of a barbarian, and the orthodox clergy could still less tolerate the supremacy of an Arian. It is remarkable in the Papal correspondence how completely Odovacar is ignored, and Zeno regarded as the sole legitimate monarch. The emperor Nepos, too, though a fugitive from Italy, retained his hereditary dominions in Dalmatia, and was acknowledged by the fragment of Gaul that remained Roman. After the restoration of Zeno at the close of A.D. 477, envoys from the different parties in the West appeared at Constantinople. The deposed Romulus (no doubt at the instigation of Odovacar), caused the senate to send Latinus and Madusius to inform Zeno that they required no separate emperor in the West, but that one would be sufficient for the whole empire. Odovacar they said was qualified to govern by his ability in both civil and military affairs, and they asked Zeno to grant him the dignity of patrician, and commit to him the government of Italy. From Odovacar a separate embassy came, and Nepos also sent to congratulate Zeno on his restoration and to request his aid in recovering the empire. Zeno, from the influence of his wife Verina and a fellow-feeling for the misfortunes of Nepos, was inclined to favour him, but lacked the power; he therefore returned diplomatic answers. He reproached the envoys of the senate with having killed one of the two emperors they had received from the East and with having expelled the other. They knew, he said, what their duty was, namely, to welcome the surviving emperor on his return. He directed Odovacar to seek the dignity of patrician from Nepos, but added that he would

grant it himself if Nepos did not anticipate him. He trusted that Odovacar would welcome back the emperor who had granted him such an honour, and in his letter to Odovacar, he addressed him as patrician (Malchus). It was probably on this occasion that the imperial regalia of the West were sent to Constantinople (*An. Val.* 64), and probably also that envoys from the fragment of Gaul that was still Roman appeared at Constantinople, and that Zeno was inclined to lean to the side of Odovacar as against them (Candidus).

After the murder of Nepos in A.D. 480, Odovacar invaded and conquered Dalmatia, putting his murderers to death. This war apparently occupied the years 481 and 482 (*An. Cusp.*, Cass. *Chron.*). Odovacar's dominions thus became conterminous with those of Zeno, a fact which did not tend to improve the relations between them. In 484 Illus sought the aid of Odovacar in his revolt against Zeno, which he refused, but two years later he made preparations to assist him (Ant. *M.* 214). Zeno's counter-move was to stir up the Rugians against Odovacar. In the war which followed in A.D. 487, Odovacar was completely successful, almost exterminating the Rugians and capturing their king Fava or Feletheus, who was afterwards executed, and Gisa his queen (Eugypp. 54, *An. Val.* 48, *An. Cusp.*). He sent, perhaps in irony, a portion of the spoils to Zeno, who simulated a satisfaction he did not feel. An invasion by Frederic the son of Fava the next year was repelled by Onulf, Odovacar's brother, and Frederic fled to Theoderic. By Odovacar's orders, Northern Noricum was then evacuated by the Romans that remained there. (Eugypp. xii.)

So far the Eastern diplomacy had failed, but Zeno's next move was more successful. Theoderic, the king of the Ostro-Goths, had in 486 and 487 made two invasions, on the second of which he had penetrated within twelve miles of Constantinople. Zeno now by a master-stroke of policy persuaded him to undertake an expedition against Odovacar, thus ensuring the destruction of one or other of his enemies, and the removal of the most dangerous from his neighbourhood. The fugitive Frederic probably threw his influence into the same scale, and there was apparently some tie of relationship between Theoderic and the Rugian royal family. In the winter of 488 Theoderic with the Gothic nation evacuated Moesia and marched into Italy. Odovacar was defeated on August 28th, 489, on the Isonzo, and a month later in a second great battle at Verona, and fled to Ravenna. Milan and Pavia surrendered, and the greater part of Odovacar's army, headed by Tufa, his magister militum, went over to the conqueror. Tufa was sent to besiege Ravenna, but by a double treason went over to his old master, betraying to him Theoderic's officers. Odovacar was thus enabled to take the offensive; he marched in the spring of 490 on Milan, and besieged Theoderic in Pavia (Ennod. *V. Epiph.* in *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 225). He was rescued from this perilous position by reinforcements of the kindred Visigoths from Gaul, and a third great battle on the Adda on August 11th ended in the total defeat of Odovacar. Still he defended himself bravely for two years and a half in Ravenna, making frequent sallies, including one on July 10th, 491, on the side of the Pineta, which caused great slaughter on both sides. His position grew more hopeless, Cesena alone outside Ravenna was held for him, provisions grew very scarce, and in August 492, Theoderic blockaded Ravenna by sea. On the other hand the Goths were weary of the long siege, and on February 27th, 493, a peace was arranged by the mediation of John the archbishop of Ravenna (Procop. *ubi supra*; Agnellus, *Lib. Pont.* in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 303), Odovacar giving his son Thela or Ocla, whom he had proclaimed Caesar (Ant. *H.*), as a hostage, on the terms that Theoderic and Odovacar should reign jointly over Italy, and Ravenna surrendered on March 5th. The arrangement could not be a durable one, and in fact lasted just ten days. Theoderic, perhaps justly, suspected Odovacar of plotting against him, and resolved to anticipate him. Odovacar was sitting in the palace of Lauretum, when two of his men entered and seized his hands as suppliants. Armed men who had been waiting in the adjoining rooms immediately rushed in, but hesitated to strike. Theoderic, however, plunged his sword through his body, crying out, "So thou hast treated my kinsfolk." His brother was shot to death in the church where he had taken sanctuary, his wife Sunigilda starved to death, and his son first was banished to Gaul, and when he escaped was put to death (Ant. *H.*). The remnants of Odovacar's army shared his fate (*An. Val.* 56).

As has been previously noticed, Odovacar interfered little in ecclesiastical matters, and is but little noticed by ecclesiastical writers. Though an Arian himself, he appears to have treated the orthodox with mildness and justice. After his accession he wrote to S. Severinus, promising to grant whatever he wished (Eugypp. 40), and at the request of EPIPHANIUS (13), remitted for five years the taxes of Pavia (Ennod. *V. Epiph.* in *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 224). The only occasion on which he took a prominent part in church matters was at the Papal election after the death of Simplicius, of which a full account is given under FELIX III.

The significance of Odovacar's place in history is due to two facts: that by him the separate line of Western emperors was extinguished, and the first German kingdom established in Italy. Thus the field was left clear for the development of the Papal power, and for the eventual establishment of a Teutonic emperor. Yet no contemporary seems to have marked the significance of the deposition of Romulus or to have realised that the Western line was to end with him. There had been previous interregna, and, not to mention Romulus and Glycerius, Nepos was still emperor de jure and over a considerable territory emperor de facto. The newly discovered fact that Odovacar, probably as a last resource, proclaimed his son emperor, shews that it was quite possible that the Western line might have been restored. Again, Odovacar ruled in a two-fold capacity, the Teutonic part of his subjects as king, while over the Roman part he wielded as patrician what was in theory a delegated authority. It is noticed (Cass. *Chron.*) that he did not assume the purple or other royal ornaments, and he seems to have styled himself simply king, without adding any tribal or territorial designation. He is once indeed called

rex Italiae by a contemporary writer (Victor Vit. *ubi supra*), but this is probably a description and not a formal title. Insecure as the position of his successor was, that of Odovacar was far more so. The former was hereditary king of a united and organized nation, while Odovacar could only rely on the support of the army, composed of fragments of different and discordant tribes.

The authorities for his history are very meagre and fragmentary. The principal are the chronicle known as Anonymus Cuspiniani (*An. Cusp.*), the fragments discovered by Valois (*An. Val.*), Jordanes (ed. Mommsen 1882), Cassiodorus (*Chronicon*); and especially John of Antioch, many fragments of whose history are published in Müller's *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.* iv. (Ant. *M.*), and others, including one of great value, by Mommsen in *Hermes* vi. (Ant. *H.*). Modern accounts of Odovacar are given by Tillemont, *Emp.* vi., Gibbon, ch. 36, 39, Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen* ii., and a very full one by Pallmann (*Geschichte der Völkerwanderung* ii.). Mr. Hodgkin's *Invaders of Italy* gives an excellent account of his history up to A.D. 477. The relation of the different authorities has been examined by Waitz (*Nachrichten*, Göttingen, 1865–81, and Holder-Egger, *N. Archiv*, i. 215). [F. D.]

ODOARIUS, first bishop of Lugo, after its recovery from the Mahommedans. He had fled before the invaders, and after long banishment, on the recapture of Lugo by Alphonso I., returned there with a number of his retainers and others, rebuilt the city, which he found wasted and uninhabited, and became bishop of it. He built various churches, and settled his retainers in various villages in the surrounding country, and planted vineyards and orchards. Two wills of his are extant, one of which is dated in A.D. 747, in which he styles himself "Archiepiscopus." By them he gave the villages and churches he had founded to the see of Lugo. He also assisted in repeopling Braga after its recovery. According to an ancient Kalendar, he died on September 21st, 786. (*Esp. Sag.* xl. 89; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2), 251.) [F. D.]

ODOBECCUS. [EDOBICHUS.]

ODRENE (ODRINUS, HUIDHREINI, HUIDREN), bishop of Moville, co. Down, died A.D. 694. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 693; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 152; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* iii. 219.) [J. G.]

ODUINUS, a presbyter, to whom Alcuin addressed his epistle *De Baptismi caeremoniis* (*Pat. Lat.* ci. 611). [C. H.]

ODULFUS (AUDULFUS, AOTOLFUS), count, a friend of Alcuin, who asks Arno archbishop of Salzburg to remind him to be just in judgment and merciful to the poor (*Ep.* 153, Froben. 113, and notes in *Pat. Lat.* c. 403 A). The letter belongs to the year 805, when Odulfus was a missus regius conjointly with Arno (*vid.* the second capitulary of that year, capit. 7, in Baluze, *Capitularia*, t. i. p. 425; and Meichelbeck's *Historia Frisingensis*, t. i. p. 2, *Instrum.* 118, 123, pp. 90, 93). He died in 819, as recorded in the *Breves Annales Ratisponenses*, given by Mabillon (*Vetera Analecta*, 1723, p. 368). [C. H.]

OEDILRAEDUS, and **OETHILRAED** (Kemble, *C. D.* 35). [HODILRED.] [C. H.]

OEGETCHAIR, bishop of Mahee Island, co. Down, died A.D. 735. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 734, calling him OEDGEDCAR. See also Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 149; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* iii. 218.) [J. G.]

OENGUS (1) (AENGHUS), son of Tibraide or Tipraite, priest or abbat of Clonfad, county Westmeath, is known only for his hymn in praise of St. Martin, written in the Irish character and in rude latinity; it is printed with notes by Dr. Todd (*Book of Hymns*, Fasc. ii. 171 sq.). From the Scholiast's Preface we learn that it was written in expectation of a visitation of the churches of St. Colum-cille in Ireland by the abbat of the parent house, St. Adamnan, probably at the close of the 7th century. He died A.D. 746. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 745.) [J. G.]

OENGUS (2), son of Crunnmhael, abbat of Duleek, co. Meath, died A.D. 783. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 782.) [J. G.]

OENGUS (3), son of Urguist king of the Picts. His name assumes many forms—ANGUS, OENGUS, HUNGUS, UNGUS, UNUST, UIDNUIST, UNUIST (Skene, *Chron.* 496; *M. H. B.* 288, 662–3). He was one of the most powerful kings of Pictavia and Hungus of the *Legend of S. Andrew*, but it antedates the occurrence by four centuries. (Skene, *Chron.* pass.; Innes, *Crit. Ess.* i. 101 sq.) [HUNGUS.] [J. G.]

OENNA, Jan. 20, Mac ua Laighisi, abbat of Clonmacnoise, King's County, succeeded the founder St. Ciaran, A.D. 549, and died A.D. 570 (*Ann. Tig.*, as Aengusius; Gams, *Ser. Ep.* 212) as a bishop. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 382.) [J. G.]

OFELLUS, bishop of Cleopatris in Egypt. Mentioned in the paschal letter of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria for the year 404 (translated by Jerome, and forming *Ep.* 100 in his works), as then recently appointed. [W. H. F.]

OFFA (1), the youngest son of Ethelfrith, king of Northumbria (A.D. 593–617), by his second wife Acha, daughter of Ella and sister of Edwin (Symeon Dunelm. ed. Surtees Soc. i. 209, 218). During the reign of Edwin, Offa and his brothers took refuge in Scotland, and several of them, at least, were baptized at Iona (Id. 210; Beda, iii. 3; *Vita S. Columbae*, i. 113; *S. C.* 20, 43). They returned on the death of Edwin, but we hear no more of Offa. [J. R.]

OFFA (2), a son of Aldfrith, king of Northumbria (A.D. 685–705). His mother, probably, was Cuthburh, sister of Ina, king of Wessex. Symeon of Durham (*H. R.* sub anno 750, and *H. E. Dunelm.* ii. 17) tells us that to escape from his enemies, he fled for protection to the body of St. Cuthbert at Lindisfarne, whence when half-dead with hunger, he was dragged out and slain. He had probably incurred the animosity of Eadbert, king of Northumbria, who also imprisoned Kynewulf bishop of Lindisfarne, and put his see in commission. The king was probably affronted with the bishop for allowing Offa to take sanctuary (Pref. to Symeon, *H. R.* ed. Surtees Soc. xvii.–xviii.). [J. R.]

OFFA (3), king of the East Saxons, son of Sighere and nephew of Sebbi, who, after a reign of thirty years, died about the year 695. Sebbi, according to Bede, was succeeded by his sons Sighard and Suefred (*H. E.* iv. 11). Offa's accession may have taken place either on his father's death, the date of which is unknown, or on his uncle's death, when he may have obtained his father's share of the kingdom, or on the death or displacement of his cousins. Bede (*H. E.* v. 19) describes him as a youth of great beauty and devotion, most beloved by his people. Out of a spirit of piety he left his country, wife, lands, and kinsfolk, for the sake of Christ, that he might receive a hundredfold more in this present life, and in the world to come life eternal. Accordingly, when Coenred, king of Mercia, in A.D. 709, went on pilgrimage to Rome, Offa accompanied him, received the tonsure, and spent the rest of his life as a monk.

To this story a few other particulars are added by later writers. Florence of Worcester (Appendix, *Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 637) alleges that Offa was persuaded to go to Rome by Kineswitha, the daughter of Penda, whom he wished to marry, and that he was accompanied by Ecgwin, bishop of Worcester, who on the occasion of this journey obtained from pope Constantine a confirmation of his foundation at Evesham (*ibid.* 540, 637). William of Malmesbury repeats the story (G. P. lib. iv. § 180; G. R. lib. i. § 98), adding that by Kineswitha he was "edoctus amores mutare in melius." As Penda, Kineswitha's father, died fifty-four years before the pilgrimage was undertaken, the lady must have been too old for Offa's bride, and could hardly be the wife whom Bede mentions him as forsaking. She may, however, have been an instructress, or adviser. The connexion of Ecgwin's visit to Rome with the pilgrimage of Offa and Coenred is also brought out in the Evesham charters, which are incorporated in the life of Ecgwin (Mab. *AA. SS. O.S.B.* saec. iii. pt. 1, pp. 320, 321). Ecgwin himself is made to mention their companionship in a foundation charter (p. 320; cf. Kemble, *C. D.* 64; *Chron. Evesham*, ed. Macray, pp. 17–20); and the two kings are represented as agreeing with and confirming the charter of Constantine, which likewise mentions their visit to Rome (Mab. l. c. p. 321; *Chron. Evesham*, p. 171; *Councils*, &c., ed. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 281, 282). The life of Ecgwin by Brihtwald further implies that the two kings returned from Rome with the bishop (Mab. l. c. p. 324), but this is at variance with the statement of Bede, and is mixed up with some other unhistorical statements.

The name of Offa appears in other charters in connexion with Ecgwin. A grant of lands at Scottarith, Hnuthyrste, and Hellerelege, made by Offa, "rex Merciorum," but attested by Ecgwin, is referred by Kemble (K. *C. D.* 55) to Offa of Essex; and Offa, as king of the East Angles, is made to join with Coenred in an Evesham charter granted at Rome (K. *C. D.* 61; *Mon. Angl.* ii. 15). This confusion seems to have misled even William of Malmesbury, who calls Offa king of the East Angles (*G. P.* §§ 160, 180, 232). This has led to another mistake; the East Anglian kings being descended from an early Wuffa, bore the name of Uffings: some confusion of this name with that of East Saxon Offa, whose sanctity was well established by his pilgrimage, led perhaps to the idea that the Offings were a saintly stock, and to it accordingly Ercenwold and his sister Ethelburga are referred. The East Saxon Offa had an ancestor of his own name, Offa, father of Escwin, and eighth in descent from Woden (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 628).

[S.]

OFFA (4), king of Mercia, 757–796.

Offa occupies a most important place in the history of the English nation in the eighth century. He is the most powerful king of the greatest of the English kingdoms; his extant charters are more numerous than those of any other king of the age; his relations to both pope and emperor are more definite, and the general impression as to his character and policy, which the history of the time leaves on the mind of investigators, is at once more distinct and more imposing than that left by any other contemporary sovereign except Charles the Great. Yet it must be confessed that the materials for forming a consecutive history of his reign are extremely jejune: they are distinct, but very meagre, and legend has been unfortunately active in filling in the outlines. The following sketch contains no more than is required for piecing together the several incidents of his career, the more important parts of which have been treated under other titles.

Offa was the son of Thingferth, the son of Eanulf, who was the founder of the family monastery of Bredon. Eanulf was the son of Osmod, the son of Eowa, the brother of Penda, and was first cousin to Ethelbald. Offa was eighteenth in descent from Woden, and thirteenth from Offa, the son of Warmund, whose mythological history, going far into heathen times, was a part of the common stock of English and Scandinavian legend. It may be here stated that the lives of the two Offas, ascribed, but on very uncertain authority, to Matthew Paris, are an attempt to bring the two heroes into historical connexion, with the unfortunate result of making the Mercian Offa almost as shadowy as his predecessor. According to this fabulous narrative, the mother of Offa was named Marcellina, and he himself in childhood bore the name of Winefred.

On the death of Ethelbald, which we have good reason for dating in 757, the Mercian throne was filled for a short time by a tyrant named Beornred, whose name is not found in the pedigrees, and who perished within the year, being either driven into exile by his people, as Matthew Paris circumstantially states, or, as is perhaps more probably put by Florence of Worcester, being killed by Offa (M. Paris, *Hist. Major*, i. 342, 343; Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 638). The chronicle merely tells us that he was expelled. Wessex and Northumbria experienced a change of sovereigns about the same time, or in the following year. Offa retained his authority without recorded disquietude, and his history is a blank for several years. Unless Ethelbald's power had been sorely diminished in the closing years of his reign, or the influence of Mercia had collapsed under Beornred, Offa must have inherited a claim to the superiority over the East Anglian, East Saxon, and Kentish

kingdoms, a brisk rivalry with Wessex, and a position of triumphant security on the side of the Welsh. It is probable, however, that in most of these respects he had heavy work to maintain his authority: we find him in the course of his reign dealing severally but summarily with each of his neighbours, and the annals of the time breathe no suspicion of any break in his continuous successes.

After he had been for fourteen years on the throne, we learn from the Northumbrian annals preserved by Simeon of Durham (*M. H. B.* 661) that in 771 he subdued the Hestingi: a mysterious notice, which cannot be satisfactorily explained. Possibly the Hestingi are the East Angles, of whose history at the time nothing is known but that they were under the rule of Ethelred, the father of Ethelbert, who subsequently married a daughter of Offa. His next recorded victory was over Kent: in a battle fought at Otford in 775 (corr. for 773, *Chr. S. M. H. B.* 334) he defeated the national army. Unfortunately we do not know the name of the king of Kent, who must have led the host; for Alric, the son of Wihtred, whom William of Malmesbury represents as defeated on the occasion (*G. R.* i. § 15), must have been long dead [ALRIC; KENT, KINGS OF]. The blow seems to have been successful; although there were risings in Kent more than once before the end of Offa's reign, the kingdom was practically dependent on Mercia until it was won by Egbert, about 824.

In the year 779 (*Chr. S.* 777) Offa fought with Cynewulf of Wessex a decisive battle at Bensington, in Oxfordshire. The victory which he there obtained added Oxfordshire permanently to Mercia, and gave the opportunity, taken some half-century later, of bringing the episcopal see of Middle Anglia from Leicester to Dorchester. It is unnecessary to inquire minutely into the possible cause of the struggle between two states which by position and history could not fail to be rivals. Following up the string of Offa's successes, we next come to his relations with the British tribes on the western border. The Welsh annals (*M. H. B.* p. 834) mention two devastations by Offa, one in 778, a second in 784. Possibly we may refer to these dates the construction of Offa's dyke, the great boundary fortification between Mercia and Wales, which extended from the Wye to the Dee. The interest, however, of the years 780 to 790 is mainly ecclesiastical and diplomatic, and will be noticed further on. The years were a period, if we may argue from the silence of historians, of internal peace, and marked by a policy intended to secure the consolidation of the Mercian power.

In 786 the death of Cynewulf made way for Brihtric to ascend the West Saxon throne [BEORHTRIC]. It is possible that, although the influence of Offa may not have placed him there, he was sustained by Mercian support against the claims of Egbert, who had family pretensions in both Wessex and Kent [EGBERT]. The marriage of Brihtric with Eadburga, a daughter of Offa, intended to secure peace between the two kingdoms, took place in 789 (*Chr. S.* 787). The marriage of another daughter, Ealhfleda, with Ethelred, king of Northumbria, which took place at Catterick on Sept. 29, 792, was probably a political measure also, although it is more probable that Ethelred needed the support of Offa than that Offa feared danger to his northern frontier in the disturbed condition of Northumbria. It was possibly in the same year, or more probably in 794, that Offa ordered the East Anglian king Ethelbert to be beheaded [ETHELBERT], an act which not only suggested a topic for the embellishments of legend, but has left on Offa's memory its one great stain. The circumstances are very obscure, but the tradition of the fact is uniform, and it cannot be disproved. In 795, according to the *Annales Cambriae*, Offa was engaged in hostilities with the Welsh, and ravaged Rienuch. The movement in Kent in favour of Eadbert Praen, which was doubtless in preparation about this time, did not break into war until Offa's death, which occurred in the following year.

This short review of his wars shows that middle and eastern England were entirely under his hand during a great part of his reign, whilst during the latter years, by the marriages of his daughters, he secured a hold on Northumbria and Wessex. This no doubt justified foreign nations in regarding him as the chief ruler of the whole nation, in which character he appears in the correspondence of Alcuin and also of Charles the Great. Our knowledge of his relations with Charles dates from the point of time at which Alcuin took up his abode in the Frank kingdom, about 780 or 781.

Probably the earliest trace of Offa's foreign diplomacy occurs in a letter of Adrian I. to Charles. The pope had heard from the king that Offa, "the king of the nation of the English," had signified to him, Charles, that certain persons, enemies of both kings, had informed the pope that Offa had proposed to Charles to depose him and appoint a German pope in his place. Charles, at Offa's request, contradicted the story, and Adrian accepted the contradiction, adding that until informed by Charles he had heard no such report, and that he would receive with welcome the envoys of the English king (*Mon. Carol.* ed. Jaffé, pp. 279–282). As Adrian and Offa were clearly on good terms in 786, this letter must belong to an earlier year. In 786 the pope sent the legates George and Theophylact to England; they were accompanied by Wighod, a Frank abbat, sent with them by Charles. Their first visit after their reception in Kent was to Offa, who received them with great honour, and, after holding a conference with the West Saxon Cynewulf, took Theophylact with him into Mercia and the British border, whilst George and Wighod went into Northumbria. One result of their mission was the holding of the legatine synods of 787; another, the institution of the see of Lichfield; a third, probably, the consecration of Egfrith, the son of Offa, as his coadjutor and presumptive successor. The last two measures were intended to consolidate the accumulated power of Mercia. [See GEORGIUS (33); JAENBERT.] The canons of the legatine councils, although very interesting generally, afford little that belongs peculiarly to England. They were, however, read in synod, "tam Latine quam Teutonice," and afford important data as to tithes, royal succession, vestiges of paganism, episcopal jurisdiction and visitation, and the differences between monks and canons, the latter

an order which had not yet under that name been introduced into Britain. The southern synod in which these acts were passed was attended and its acts were confirmed by Offa, archbishop Jaenbert, twelve bishops, four abbats, three duces, or ealdormen, and one "comes" (*Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461; Wilkins, i. 151). But the report of the legates is apparently incomplete, and no mention is made in it either of the division of the province or of the consecration of Egfrith. Both these measures were carried through the next year. We learn further, from a letter of pope Leo III. to Kenulf, that in this synod Offa undertook to pay an annual subvention of 365 mancuses to the pope for the support of the poor and the maintenance of lamps at St. Peter's (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 445, 524). In 790 the two kings had quarrelled; mercantile intercourse was broken off, and Alcuin thought it likely that he would be sent to Offa on an embassy of peace (Alc. ep. 14, *Mon. Alc.* p. 167). How this dispute ended we are not told. The name of Offa does not occur in connexion with the proceedings of Charles on the question of image worship, but he must be understood as acquiescing in the doctrine promulgated by Alcuin in the name of the princes and bishops of Britain (Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* p. 667) in 792.

It is probable that Ethelheard, the archbishop who succeeded Jaenbert in 793, was a Mercian, and owed his promotion to Offa's patronage; he certainly aided with the Mercian party under Kenulf against the Kentish or West Saxon party under Eadbert Praen. Whether or no he was apprehensive of an alliance between the Kentish men and their great neighbours across the Channel, Offa must have felt safer with a dependent of his own in the chair of Augustine. A few letters of Charles in the later years of Offa's reign concern England and Kent in particular. In one the king of the Franks writes to Offa to urge the recall home of a Scottish priest who has eaten flesh in Lent, and is now resident at Cologne (*Mon. Carol.* p. 351). In another, Charles urges Ethelheard to intercede with Offa on behalf of certain exiles, attached to a person named Umhringstan, who had died in France, and who may have been concerned in the East Anglian troubles which cost Ethelbert his life, or in the Northumbrian disasters connected with the death of Ethelred (*Councils*, &c. iii. 488, 498). A letter of the year 796 is extant, in which Charles promises to Offa immunity for pilgrims on the way to Rome, and informs him that he has sent presents to the episcopal sees of Mercia in memory of pope Adrian, who died in 795; in another letter from Alcuin to Offa we learn that Charles has dispatched the gifts, but is sorely grieved to hear of the murder of Ethelred, which took place in April 796. This is the last trace of Offa in this direction. He died on the 29th of July 796, leaving his kingdom on the eve of outbreak of rebellion in several quarters, the history of which belongs to the next two reigns. The general impression left by these letters is that both Charles and Alcuin had confidence in the good faith of Offa, and regarded him as the great man of the island.

We turn next to Offa's relations to the churches of his kingdom. A very long series of charters illustrates the monastic and synodical history of his reign. The largest number is found in the Worcester Cartularies (Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 105, 117, 118, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 133, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 150, 154, 156, 164, 166, 167); others record gifts to Peterborough (K. *C. D.* 165, 168), Evesham (*ib.* 130, 134, 147), Minster (*ib.* 106, 112), Rochester (*ib.* 111, 132, 152, 155, 157), Christ Church, Canterbury (*ib.* 121, 122, 153, 158), St. Augustine's (*ib.* 107, 108, 109, 119), Chertsey (*ib.* 151), the family monastery at Bredon (*ib.* 120, 138), and to some private persons (*ib.* 137, 148). There are among them many forgeries, chiefly, however, connected with St. Alban's (K. *C. D.* 161, 162), Crowland (*ib.* 163), and Westminster; of the Worcester and Canterbury gifts most have been noticed in the articles on the respective bishops. They fill nearly ninety pages in Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus*, and comprise charters of the Kentish and South Saxon kings granted with the consent or attested with the confirmation of Offa. Of the St. Alban's and Westminster foundations a word is necessary. Offa is the traditional founder of St. Alban's. According to the legend, amplified and embellished by Matthew Paris (*Hist. Maj.* i. 356 sq.; *Vit. duor. Off.* ed. Wats. p. 26; *Mon. Angl.* ii. 214), the murder of Ethelbert, king of the East Angles, was contrived by Offa's queen Kinethritha, in order to place East Anglia at Offa's disposal. The king was bitterly grieved at the murder, and banished his wife from his society. She died soon after, and Offa was left free to fulfil a vow which he had made some time before to build a monastery. By miracle, the place where St. Alban's body was buried was revealed to him; he went with his bishops Ceolwulf and Unwona to Verolamium, and translated the saint. Offa then went to Rome to procure privileges for his monastery, was graciously received by the pope, to whom he promised the tribute of Peter's pence, and on his return founded and endowed the abbey, at the head of which he placed Willegod as the first abbat. The whole of this seems to be fabulous: the charters which are assigned to the period are forged, and the journey to Rome is a mere invention. It is, however, quite possible that Offa was the founder of St. Alban's: such seems to have been the belief in the eleventh century, and it is accepted as true by Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury. At Westminster he was regarded in the age of the Conquest as a restorer, and some of his charters may be genuine (*Mon. Angl.* i. 266; Kemble, *C. D.* 149). His relations to Peterborough rest on a little better authority, or at least on more ancient fabrications, and the evidence of the interpolations in the Chronicles. His confirmation of the possessions of Chertsey is perhaps one degree nearer to authenticity, though still suspicious (*Mon. Angl.* i. 422). But many small Mercian foundations likewise looked back to him as patron, and it is improbable that where so much is ascribed to him some little part of the tradition should not be true. A grant to the abbey of St. Denys at Paris, dated in 790, and sealed, bestowing lands in Sussex, is printed in Birch's *Cartularium Saxonicum*, vol. i. pp. 360–362.

Offa's laws for Mercia were in existence in the time of Alfred, who selected, as he says, from

them as well as from those of Ethelbert and Ine, those which were fitted for his subjects (Thorpe, *Ancient Laws*, p. 27). It is possible that the remnants of recorded Mercian law may be fragments of a code of Offa, but we have no warrant for affirming that they are so, and it would be very natural to ascribe any traces of national customs in any kingdom to its most famous king.

Offa's wife was Kinethritha; his only son was Ecgferth, or Egfrith, who reigned for a few months after him. Of his daughters Eadburga, the wife of Brihtric, had an evil report and a miserable end [EADBURGA]; Ealhfleda was the wife of Ethelred of Northumbria, and had a happier end [ELFLEDA]; Ethelburga, an abbess, was a friend of Alcuin [ETHELBURGA]. Florence of Worcester, who does not mention Elfleda or Ethelburga, names a daughter Elfthritha, who lived in virginity, and may be the Elfrida who was wooed by the unfortunate Ethelbert. Another, named Ethelswitha, occurs only in the Chertsey Charter (K. *C. D.* No. 151).

The date of Offa's death is misplaced by two years in some of the MSS. of the Chronicle, and by other writers who have copied the mistake: it really took place on the 29th of July, 796. (See Will. Malmesb. *G. R.* i. §§ 86, 87–94; Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* i. pp. 128–206.) [S.]

OFTFOR (ESTFOR, *M. H. B.* 622; OSTFOR, W. Malmesb. *G. P.* § 136), the second bishop of Worcester (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 622). He was a pupil of St. Hilda, with whom he spent much time in both her monasteries of Hartlepool and Whitby, in study of holy scripture. Having exhausted the means at his disposal in the northern monasteries he went to archbishop Theodore in Kent, where also he spent some time in study. Thence he proceeded to Rome, a work which, as Bede remarks, was at that time esteemed one of great virtue; after his return he went to preach among the Hwiccii, then under the rule of king Osric, and after long service, was, on the resignation of bishop Bosel, elected "omnium judicio" to fill his place. This event happened when Wilfrid was acting as bishop of the Middle Angles, and in the interval between the death of archbishop Theodore and the appointment of his successor. At the command of king Ethelred, Oftfor was consecrated by Wilfrid (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 23). All this information is derived from Bede, and is sufficiently circumstantial to fix the date of Oftfor's short episcopate; the year 691 is the date of the coincidence of Wilfrid's work in Middle Anglia, and of the vacancy at Canterbury.

Florence of Worcester (*M. H. B.* p. 539) places the death of Oftfor and the succession of Ecgwin under the year 692, which limits Oftfor's pontificate to less than two years; it may, however, be questioned whether this limitation is not conjectural, and whether the date of Ecgwin's accession can be really ascertained.

The Worcester Cartulary (K. *C. D.* 32) preserves a charter of Ethelred of Mercia, in which the king bestows on Oftfor thirty cassates at Heanburg and Aust, for the church of St. Peter at Worcester (cf. *Mon. Angl.* i. 584). This charter is undated, and attested by bishops Headda and Oftfor; it is not open to any suspicion. Another grant, by the same king, of forty-four cassates at Fladbury, also to Oftfor, is rejected as spurious, and with it a charter of Ecgwin which mentions it (K. *C. D.* 33; *Mon. Angl.* i. 585). Kemble's objection to this document is based upon the fact, that in it Ethelred speaks of Osthryth as "conjugis quondam meae," whereas Osthryth was alive until 697, and Oftfor is understood to have died in 692. Supposing Oftfor, however, to have lived longer, that objection would vanish. A more valid one perhaps would be found in the fact that the preamble, which is generally a distinguishing feature of a charter, is nearly the same in the Fladbury as in the Heanburg charter. As the date of Ecgwin's appointment rests ultimately in the words of Florence, the date of Oftfor's death must remain undecided.

Oftfor attests a charter of Oshere, king of the Hwiccii, in which land is granted to a comes or gesith named Cuthbert, to construct a monastery for the abbess Cutswitha (Kemble, *C. D.* 36; *Mon. Angl.* i. 585). This may be genuine, but it is undated. It is, however, attested by archbishop Brihtwald and cannot be earlier than 693. [S.]

OGDOAD. The number eight plays an important part in Gnostic speculations; but it is necessary to distinguish three different forms in which it has entered in different stages of the development of Gnosticism.

Ogdoad 7 + 1. We need not hesitate to place as earliest that which has been described in the article HEBDOMAS (Vol. II. p. 850). Astronomical theories had introduced the conception of seven planetary spheres with an eighth above them, the sphere of the fixed stars. Hence the earliest Gnostic systems included a theory of seven heavens, and a supercelestial region called the Ogdoad. When the Valentinian system had established belief in a still higher place, the supercelestial space was called the middle region (see MESOTES); but Ogdoad was clearly its earlier name. In addition to the references given in the article HEBDOMAS, proving the continued use of the name Ogdoad in this sense even among Valentinians, we cite *Excerpt. Theod. ex script.* 63 (Clem. Al. p. 984).

Ogdoad 6 + 2. In the system of Valentinus, the seven heavens, and even the region above them, were regarded as but the lowest and last stage of the exercise of creative power. Above them was the Pleroma, where were exhibited the first manifestations of evolution of subordinate existence from the great First Principle. In the earliest stages of that evolution we have (Iren. I. i.) eight primary Aeons constituting the first Ogdoad. Though this Ogdoad is first in order of evolution, if the Valentinian theory be accepted as true, yet to us who trace the history of the development of that system the lower Ogdoad must clearly be pronounced the first, and the higher only as a subsequent extension of the previously accepted action of an Ogdoad. Possibly also the Egyptian doctrine of eight primary gods (Herod. ii. 145) may have contributed to the formation of a theory of which Egypt was the birthplace. In any case an Ogdoad 7 + 1 would have been inconsistent with a theory an essential part of which was the coupling its characters in pairs, male and female. Hippolytus (*Ref.* vi. 20, p. 176) connects the system of Valentinus with that of Simon, in

which the origin of things is traced to a central first principle, together with six "roots." If for the one first principle we substitute a male and female principle, the 6 + 1 of Simon becomes the 6 + 2 of Valentinus. This very question, however, whether the first principle were to be regarded as single or twofold was one on which the Valentinians themselves were not agreed; and their differences as to the manner of counting the numbers of the primary Ogdoad confirm what has been said as to the later origin of this doctrine.

Ogdoad 4 + 4. The doctrine of an Ogdoad of the commencement of finite existence having been established by Valentinus, those of his followers who had been imbued with the Pythagorean philosophy introduced a modification. In that philosophy the Tetrad was regarded with peculiar veneration, and held to be the foundation of the sensible world. The Pythagorean oath by the Tetrad is well known. For references see Meursius, *Demiurg. Pythag.* ch. 7, *ap.* Gronov. *Thes. Gr. Ant.* col. 9; to which may be added Hippol. *Ref.* vi. 23, p. 179. We read there (Iren. I. xi.) of Secundus as a Valentinian who divided the Ogdoad into a right-hand and a left-hand Tetrad; and in the case of MARCUS (*q. v.*), who largely uses Pythagorean speculations about numbers, the Tetrad holds the highest place in the system. [MARCUS (17).] [G. S.]

OIDDI, a priest who assisted Wilfrid in the conversion of the South Saxons (Bed. *H. E.* iv. 13). [PUCH, *s. f.*] [C. H.]

OIDILUALD, hermit of Farne (Bed. v. 1). [ETHELWALD (3).]

OIDILVALD, of Northumbria. [ETHELWALD (1).]

OISSEIN (OISSENE, OSSENEUS, OISSENIUS, OSENIUS), surnamed Fota (the Long), abbat of Clonard, co. Meath, died A.D. 654 (*Ann. Tig.*). He is referred to as an undoubted authority by St. Adamnan (*Vit. S. Col.* i. c. 2; Colgan, *T. T.* 339). His feast is May 1. [J. G.]

OISSENE (OSSENIUS), abbat of Clonmacnoise, King's Co., died A.D. 706. (*Ann. Tiq.*; *Ann. Ult.* A.D. 705.) [J. G.]

OJA (OLA), bishop of Barcelona, subscribes the canons of 5th and 6th councils of Toledo, held in June A.D. 636 and January A.D. 638. His predecessor Severus was alive in A.D. 633. No bishop of Barcelona is mentioned between A.D. 638 and A.D. 656, when QUIRICUS had been bishop for some years. (*Esp. Sag.* xxix. 133; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 322, 348.) [F. D.]

OLBIANUS, a bishop, whose martyrdom by fire in the reign of Maximian for refusing to sacrifice to Juno, is commemorated in the Basilian *Menology*, May 4 and 29. In one place the see is Anea, and the persecutor is the hegemon Julius; in the other Aelianus, hegemon of Asia, persecutes. In the *Menologium Graecorum*, May 29, the imperial reign is the same, the consuls are Alexander and Maximus, the praesides Julius and Aelianus. A *synaxary* given by Boll. *Acta SS.* 29 Mai. vi. 101, twice mentions the name. Under 4 Mai. i. 458, Henschen quotes all the Greek sources, including the *Menaea* for May 29. He makes Olbianus the Latin Ulpianus, and fixes Anea or Enea on the Carian coast opposite Samos, under the metropolitan of Ephesus, in the province of Asia. (Cf. Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 717). [C. H.]

OLCAN. [BOLCAN.]

OLOMUNDUS (OLEMUNDUS), abbat of the monastery of St. John the Baptist, honourably mentioned by Alcuin in a letter to the monks (*Ep.* 217 Frob., al. 226). The monastery, also called Malaste, and subsequently Mons Olivus (Montolieu), was in the diocese of Carcassonne. Mabillon puts his death on Dec. 11, 827. (*Gall. Chr.* vi. 971, *Instrum.* 412; Mabillon, *Annal.* t. ii. pp. 250, 251, 420, 517, ed. 1704.) [C. H.]

OLOPUEN (LO-PUEN), first Nestorian bishop of Sighanfu in India, A.D. 636 to 699. (Le Quien, *Or. C.* ii. 1269.) [J. G.]

OLYBRIUS (1), ANICIUS HERMOGENIANUS, son of Sextus Anicius Probus and his wife Anicia Faltonia Proba, husband of Juliana and father of Demetrias (q. v.), was consul, when still very young, with his brother Probinus in the year 395. He is described by Jerome (*Ep.* cxxx. c. 3, ed. Vall.) as a pious son, a man worthy of love, a kind master, a courteous citizen. He took a distinguished part in the senate, but died while still young, amid the grief of all Rome, not long before the city was sacked by Alaric (410). [W. H. F.]

OLYBRIUS (2), FLAVIUS ANICIUS, emperor of the West. He was descended from the great Anician family. After the capture of Rome by the Vandals he withdrew to Constantinople. When Genseric released Eudoxia and Placidia, the widow and daughter of Valentinian III., the latter was given in marriage to Olybrius (Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 7 in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lxxxvi. 2, 2517). Genseric employed this marriage as an excuse for continuing his ravages, declaring he wished the empire should be conferred on the brother-in-law of his son Hunneric, who had married Placidia's sister (Priscus, p. 74). While living at Constantinople, according to the *Vita S. Euthymii* (in Cotelier's *Eccl. Graec. Monum.* iv. 64), he wrote to Eudocia, the widow of Theodosius II. and the grandmother of his wife, urging her to abandon the Eutychian heresy, which she appears to have done [EUDOCIA (4)]. He also with his wife built a church dedicated to St. Euphemia. In A.D. 472, Olybrius was sent by the emperor Leo to Rome, where civil war was raging between the emperor Anthemius and his son-in-law count Ricimer. There he was proclaimed emperor by Ricimer and his party, according to the *Chron. Pasch.* (in *Patr. Gr.* xcii. 820), against his will. Rome fell after a five months' siege, in which the inhabitants suffered grievously from famine, and Anthemius was murdered by Gundobad, Ricimer's nephew, in the church of St. Chrysogonus, where he had taken refuge. (Joan. Ant. 209, in Müller, *Frag. Hist. Gr.* iv. 617.) Olybrius survived his rival only about three months, dying at Rome of dropsy on October 23, about seven months after

he assumed the Imperial title (Cassiodorus, *Chronicon* in *Patr. Lat.* lxix. 1246). The only recorded act of his reign is his creating Gundobad a patrician. He left one daughter, JULIANA (9) ANICIA. [F. D.]

OLYBRIUS (3), presbyter, addressed by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 191, in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix.). [C. H.]

OLYMPIANUS. [OLYMPIUS.]

OLYMPIANUS (OLYMPIUS), governor of Cappadocia, addressed as an excellent judge and most eloquent orator by Gregory Nazianzen (*Ep.* 234 al. 165), who asks him to return a volume containing Aristotle's epistles. [C. H.]

OLYMPIAS (1), the elder, queen of Armenia. She was the daughter of ABLAVIUS, the famous pretorian prefect in Constantine's reign, and was betrothed to his son, the emperor Constans. Constans after her father's execution took care of her as long as he lived and brought her up as if she had been his wife, but apparently the marriage never actually took place. In A.D. 360, ten years after the death of Constans, his brother Constantius gave her in marriage to Arsaces III., king of Armenia. (Ammian. xx. 11; St. Athanasius, *Hist. Arianorum ad Monachos.* § 69, in *Patr. Gr.* xxv. 776.) Baronius (*A. E.* Ann. 388, xliv.) supposes that on the death of Arsaces, c. 369, Olympias may have married Anysius Secundus, becoming by him the mother of Olympias the deaconess, the subject of the following article; but the supposition seems untenable (Tillem. xi. 416). [F. D.]

OLYMPIAS (2), the younger, widow, a celebrated deaconess of the church of Constantinople, the most eminent in all respects of the band of holy and high-born women whom Chrysostom gathered round him. The family to which Olympias belonged was one of high rank, but pagan. Her birth is placed by Tillemont in or about 368, A.D. Her father, Seleucus, a count of the empire, died young, and her mother being also dead, Olympias was left at an early age the orphan heiress of a fortune of immense magnitude. Happily for Olympias her uncle Procopius, under whose guardianship she was placed, was a man of high character, an intimate friend and correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen. She was equally fortunate in her instructress, Theodosia, the sister of St. Amphilochius of Iconium, whom Gregory desired the young girl to set before her constantly as a pattern of Christian excellence both in word and deed. During Gregory's residence at Constantinople, 379–381, he became much attached to the bright and beautiful maiden, then probably about twelve years old, calling her "his own Olympias," and delighted to be called "father" by her. (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 57; Cann. 57, pp. 132, 134.) Olympias had many suitors. The one selected as her husband by her guardian, Procopius, was Nebridius, a young man of high rank and excellent character, to whom she was married in 384 [NEBRIDIUS]. From Olympias's own words, as reported by Palladius, her intimate friend, concerning the happiness of being freed from the heavy yoke of matrimony, and from service, δουλείας, to a husband whom she found it impossible to please, μὴ δυναμένην ἀνδρὶ ἀρέσαι, there can be little doubt that her married life was not a happy one (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 164). In less than two years Olympias was left a widow without children. She regarded this early bereavement as a declaration of the Divine will that she was unsuited to the married life, and ought not again to be united to a husband. But it was by no means in accordance with the will of the emperor that one whose fortune was a prize to be coveted even by men of the highest rank should remain a widow. Theodosius marked her out as wife to a young Spaniard, a kinsman of his own, named Elpidius. Enamoured at once of the person and fortune of the fair young widow Elpidius sought her hand with the utmost importunity. But Olympias steadily refused to listen to his suit, not from any expressed dislike to her suitor, but from her fixed determination not again to entangle herself with the cares of a married life. Theodosius, indignant at her opposition to his will, and resolved that she should not enjoy the wealth she refused to share with his kinsman, commissioned the prefect of the city to take the whole of Olympias's property into public custody, and retain it until she had attained her thirtieth year. The imperial orders were carried out with so much harshness at the instigation of her lover, who hoped thereby to drive her to accept him for her husband, that she was even forbidden to go to church for her devotions, or to enjoy the congenial society of the leading ecclesiastics. Olympias's only reply to this act of unfeeling despotism was a letter of dignified sarcasm, in which she thanked Theodosius for having so graciously relieved her from the heavy burden of the administration of her property, and told him that he would increase her debt of gratitude if he would desire her fortune to be distributed among the poor, and towards the support of churches. She had long since renounced the empty glory of making any such distribution herself, lest she should thereby lose the true riches of the soul. The lady's quiet irony stung the honest soldier to the quick. Ashamed of his unworthy tyrannical behaviour, on his return from the campaign against Maximus, Theodosius revoked his order, and restored to her the management of her estates (Pallad. pp. 164, 165). Thenceforward Olympias devoted herself and her wealth entirely to the service of religion. Renouncing not luxuries only, but the ordinary comforts and even the decencies of life, she practised the greatest austerities, denying herself both food and sleep, abstaining from the bath, and wearing none but coarse and worn-out apparel. Her whole time and strength were given to ministering to the wants of the poor and sick, and to the hospitable entertainment of bishops and other ecclesiastics, visiting the imperial city, who never left her roof without large pecuniary aid, sometimes in the form of a farm or an estate, towards the religious works on which they were engaged. Among others Palladius enumerates Amphilochius, Optimus (whose eyes she closed on his death-bed), the two brothers of Basil, Gregory Nyssen (who dedicated to her the Commentary on a portion of the Song of Solomon, which he had written at her request (Greg. Nyss. *in Cant.* tom. i. p. 468) and Peter, and Epiphanius of Cyprus as well as the three who

signalized themselves subsequently as the unwearied persecutors of Chrysostom, and even of Olympias herself, Acacius, Atticus and Severianus. Palladius also asserts that Theophilus, the first author of the cabal against Chrysostom, when seeking some gift from her, with feigned humility prostrated himself before Olympias and kissed her knees, on which the holy woman, ashamed to behold a bishop assuming such an attitude, threw herself with tears at his feet. Palladius also tells us that when Theophilus found that Olympias, acting under Chrysostom's advice, dismissed him with petty gifts and presents of eatables, his disappointment vented itself in virulent abuse of his benefactress (Pallad. *Dial.* 151, 155). Her house was the common home of the clergy, as well as of the monks and virgins who swarmed from all parts of the Christian world to Constantinople. It is unnecessary to state that Olympias was the victim of much imposition, and that her charity was grievously abused. Indeed, her liberality was so unrestricted and inconsiderate that Chrysostom interposed his authority to limit it, representing to her that her wealth was a trust to her from God, and that she was bound to use it in the most prudent manner for the relief of the necessities of the poor and destitute, not in making presents to the opulent and covetous (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 9). Olympias followed Chrysostom's advice, which brought upon her the illwill of those who, like Theophilus, had previously made a market of her lavish generosity. But so far from resenting these disagreeable results of his wise counsels, Olympias only manifested increased devotion to Chrysostom, exhibiting a woman's tender care for his bodily wants, of which he was entirely negligent. She made arrangements for his being supplied with food suitable to his enfeebled stomach, at proper intervals, and prevented his abstinences being too prolonged (Pallad. p. 165).

When she was still under thirty years of age Olympias was appointed by Nectarius deaconess of the church of Constantinople. The courtly old prelate consulted her on ecclesiastical matters, in which he was a novice, and was guided by her advice (Pallad. p. 166; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 9). As has been already intimated, Olympias retained her position as deaconess under Chrysostom, to whom she became the chief counsellor, and his active agent in all works of piety and charity, not only in Constantinople, but in distant provinces of the church.

On the arrival of the Nitrian monks, known as the Tall Brothers, in Constantinople in 401, Olympias received the refugees hospitably, and lodged them for some time at her own house (Pallad. p. 153), careless of the indignant remonstrances of Theophilus, who charged her with shewing favour to the enemies of the truth (*ibid.* p. 155). On Chrysostom's final expulsion from Constantinople, June 20, 404, Olympias took the chief place in the band of courageous women who assembled in the baptistery of the church to take a last farewell of their deeply loved bishop and friend, and to receive his parting benediction and commands (*ibid.* 89, 90). The suspicion of having been instrumental in the conflagration of the cathedral which immediately followed the departure of Chrysostom from its walls, attached to Olympias in common with the other ladies who had shared the bishop's friendship. Olympias was brought before the prefect Optatus, and subjected to a brutally severe examination. No question being made of the fact, it was bluntly demanded of her why she had set the church on fire. The calm courage and piercing irony of her replies foiled the prefect. He proposed that on condition of her entering into communion with Arsacius, as some other ladies had done, the investigation should be dropped, and that she should be freed from further annoyance. Olympias's proud spirit indignantly rejected the base compromise. A charge had been publicly brought against her which could not be substantiated and of which her whole manner of life, which the prefect could not be ignorant of, was a sufficient refutation. Before she even considered the terms proposed she must be cleared of the accusation as openly as she had been calumniated. Force would be unavailing to compel her to hold communion with those whom conscience and true religion forbad her to recognise. Her request that she might have a short respite for the purpose of consultation with her legal advisers as to the proper means of disproving the calumnious accusations was granted (Soz. *Hist. Eccles.* viii. 24). The severe conflict Olympias had sustained brought on a severe and almost fatal illness, πρὸς ἐσχάτας ἀναπνοάς, in the latter part of the year, the intelligence of which caused much distress to Chrysostom in his banishment (Chrys. *Ep.* vi. p. 580 C.). On the recovery of her health, in the spring of 405, she left Constantinople, whether voluntarily or by compulsion is uncertain. Sozomen seems to speak of a voluntary retirement to Cyzicus. But the language of Chrysostom (*Ep.* 16, p. 603 C.) leads us to believe that she was never allowed to remain long in one spot, her persecutors hoping that by perpetually hurrying her from one place to another (τόπους ἐκ τόπων ἀμείβειν, καὶ πάντοθεν ἐλαύνεσθαι), and exposing her to the rude treatment of soldiers and other public officials this noble woman's spirit might be broken, and that she might be induced to yield. This hope being frustrated Olympias was once again summoned before Optatus, who, on her renewed refusal to communicate with Arsacius, imposed on her the heavy fine of 200 pounds of gold. (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 24; Pallad. p. 28). This fine was readily paid, and the intelligence of Olympias's heroic disregard of all worldly losses and sufferings endured for the truth's sake was a source of intense joy to Chrysostom in his banishment. He wrote congratulating Olympias on the victory she had achieved, for which he calls upon her to glorify the living God who had enabled her to acquire such great spiritual gain. (Chry. *Ep.* 16, p. 604 A). We know nothing very definitely of the remainder of Olympias's life, nor can we say certainly when it terminated. We may safely dismiss the later legendary tales of the credulous Nicephorus (*H. E.* xiii. 24), who states that she was finally banished to Nicomedia, where she suffered many trials and persecutions and ended her days. Our only trustworthy source of information is contained in the letters addressed to her by Chrysostom from his banishment, seventeen in number, some swelling to the bulk of long religious tracts, the composition of which relieved the tedium of his exile and made him almost forget his mise-

ries. We gather from them that Olympias was subject to frequent and severe attacks of sickness, and that the persecution of the party of Arsacius and Atticus was violent and unsparing. The compulsory dispersion of the society of young females of which she was the head, and who had copied her resolution in refusing to hold communion with the intruding bishops, was a great sorrow to her (Chrys. *Ep.* 4, p. 577 A). But the dates of these letters are uncertain, and it would be lost labour to seek to arrange the various references to Olympias's circumstances in chronological order. The style in which Olympias is addressed in this correspondence is "at once respectful, affectionate and paternal" (Stephens, *S. Chrysostom*, p. 383), "but it exhibits a highly-wrought complimentary" tone, full of "bold and lavish praise" of her many signal virtues which is "too widely remote from the mind and taste of our own times to be fairly estimated by us." We cannot conceive of a woman of any delicacy at the present time receiving such fulsome effusions without being grievously offended by them, and regarding the writer as a base and shameless flatterer. But the standard of honesty and of sensitiveness varies with the age, and it is unfair to measure past generations by that of our own day. Besides the letters Chrysostom wrote for Olympias's consolation a special treatise on the theme that "No one is really injured except by himself," *ὅτι τὸν ἑαυτὸν μὴ ἀδικοῦντα οὐδεὶς παραβλάψαι δύναται* (tom. iii. pp. 530–553); as well as one "to those who were offended by adversities"—*πρὸς τοὺς σκανδαλισθέντας ἐπὶ ταῖς δυσημερίαις ταῖς γενομέναις* (*ibid.* pp. 555–612). To both of these reference is made in his fourth letter to Olympias (*Ep.* 4. p. 576, C.). The date of the death of Olympias cannot be determined. She was evidently living when Palladius published his Dialogue in 408 A.D., but was no longer alive when the *Lausiac History* was published in 420 A.D. Olympias is commemorated in the Latin church on the 17th of December, and in the Greek church on the 25th of July. (Palladius, *Dialogus Historicus;* Chrysostom, *Epistolae*, 1–17; Sozomen, *H. E.* viii. 24; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* vol. xi.; Stephens, *St. Chrysostom;* Thierry, *St. Jean, Chrysostome.* [E. V.]

OLYMPIODORUS (1), historian of the 5th century. He wrote a work in twenty-two books on the history of the empire under Honorius from A.D. 407–425, which has been preserved for us in an abridgment by Photius (*Cod.* 80), and included in Niebuhr's edition of the Byzantine Historians. He covertly attacks the Christians, and especially Olympius, who is so warmly praised by St. Augustine. [OLYMPIUS (10).] He was a pagan. Hierocles dedicated to him his work on Prudence and Fate. See for a fuller account his life in DICT. GR. AND ROM. BIOG.; and Cave, i. 468. [G. T. S.]

OLYMPIODORUS (2). Various philosophers of this name lived at Alexandria during the Christian period. One was the teacher of Proclus [PROCLUS]. Another was the last philosopher of any celebrity in the Neo-Platonic school of Alexandria. He lived in the first half of the 6th century under the emperor Justinian. A third was a disciple of Aristotle, who taught his philosophy at Alexandria about A.D. 565 after the Neo-Platonic school had become extinct A fourth of this name was a follower of Plato and a correspondent of Isidorus of Pelusium in the 5th century. See the *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* for a full account of them. [G. T. S.]

OLYMPIODORUS (3), a deacon of Alexandria, who lived in the early years of the 6th century, having been ordained by the patriarch John III. surnamed Niciota [JOANNES (13)]. He wrote commentaries on Job, Ezra, Nehemiah and Ecclesiastes (cf. Migne's *Pat. Graec.* t. xciii. col. 9–470). For an account of the controversy about him and other works attributed to him, especially a treatise on the state of the soul separated from the body, see Ceillier, xii. 912, 913. Cf. the account of him in the *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* and in Fabric. *Bib. Graec.* ed. Harles, x. 67.) [G. T. S.]

OLYMPIODORUS (4), an eparch addressed by Nilus about the adornment of a church he is about to erect (lib. iv. ep. 61); another person who admired Plato, but neglected his precepts, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. ii. ep. 256); Isidore shews him how the arguments of the pagans recoil on themselves (iv. 27, 186). [C. H.]

OLYMPIUS (1), a bishop, sent to Africa on a mission of enquiry in company with Eunomius. [EUNOMIUS (2).] [H. W. P.]

OLYMPIUS (2), bishop of Hadrianople in Pisidia. He opposed the views of Origen about the resurrection of the body. He is mentioned in the Scholia of St. Maximus on Dionys. Areop. *Ecclesiast. Hierarch.* cap. vii. (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 1049.) [G. T. S.]

OLYMPIUS (3), bishop of Aeni in Thrace, expelled from his see by the Arian party along with Theodulus bishop of Trajanopolis (Athanas. *Apol. de Fug.* § 3, *Hist. Arian.* § 19; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 1201). [C. H.]

OLYMPIUS (4), a Spanish bishop, according to some of Barcelona, according to others of Toledo, but of what see is not certainly known. St. Augustine speaks of him more than once as a man of high reputation in the church, ranking him with Irenaeus, Cyprian, and Ambrose, and quotes with approval a passage from a theological treatise of his concerning original sin, which does not now exist. A bishop Olympius was present at the council of Toledo, A.D. 400. (Aug. *c. Jul.* 1, 3, 8; 2, 10, 33; 3, 17, 33; Gennadius, *de Vir. ill.* c. 23; Hardouin, i. 992; Baronius, v. p. 279; Cave, i. 415.) [H. W. P.]

OLYMPIUS (5), a wealthy layman of Neocaesarea, an intimate and trusted friend and correspondent of Basil's. After the publication of the calumnies of Eustathius Basil wrote to Olympius (c. 373, A.D.) telling him how deeply he had been wounded by them, and begging him not to give any credence to them, or to suspect him of agreeing with Apollinaris. During his retirement Basil wrote Olympius other short letters, complaining of his writing so seldom (*Ep.* 12 [171], 13 [172]), and rallying him for

chasing away the poverty which had been his home-companion and the helper of his studies by his generous gifts (*Ep.* 4 [169]). In A.D. 375, when the people of Neocaesarea were loading Basil with insult and ridicule, he wrote to Olympius to thank him for his friendly letter, and still more for the sight of his sons who had conveyed it, whose company had cheered him and made him forget his trials. He had written some letters to the people of Neocaesarea to exculpate himself and to warn them of the dangers of their line of conduct, and would write again if any good was likely to come of it. (*Ep.* 211 [170]; 63 [207]; 64 [210].) [E. V.]

OLYMPIUS (6), a solitary of Antioch, a friend of Gregory Nyssen, at whose desire he wrote the life of his sister Macrina (Greg. Nyss. *Vit. Macr.* pp. 177, 178). Olympius's request that he would give him some rules for attaining Christian perfection was also the cause of Gregory's writing his treatise *De Perfectione*, in which he proposes Christ Himself as the only model of the perfect life. (*Ibid.* p. 275, ed. Migne, vol. iii. 251–286.) [E. V.]

OLYMPIUS (7), governor of Cappadocia Secunda in the year 382, for whom Gregory Nazianzen entertained a high esteem, and whose Christian virtues, as well as the manner in which he fulfilled the duties of his office, he takes every occasion of extolling highly. Olympius on his side shewed an equally affectionate reverence for Gregory, to whom he offered many thoughtful attentions especially valuable to one enfeebled by old age and sickness, which Gregory gratefully commemorates. Fourteen letters written by Gregory to him are still extant. The greater part of these are petitions in behalf of persons who had either some favour to ask from the governor, or some punishment to deprecate. The number of these is an evidence of Gregory's influence over Olympius, and of the readiness with which his requests were granted. He writes on behalf of Aurelius, a deserter (*Ep.* 78); of Leontius, a presbyter who had been deposed for his offences, and was in danger of punishment (*Ep.* 175); of a kinsman of his own, Eustratius (*Ep.* 177); of Paulus (*Ep.* 173); of the citizens of Caesarea, who had committed some grievous offence, for which the governor had threatened to rase the city to the ground (*Ep.* 49); of his niece's husband Nicobulus, who wished to exchange his place as postmaster for some lighter and more agreeable office (*Epp.* 178, 179); of Philumena, a childless widow (*Ep.* 174); of Verianus' daughter, whom her father was desiring against her own will to divorce from her husband (*Epp.* 176, 211). In another letter Gregory excuses himself for neglecting the emperor's commands conveyed by Olympius to attend the Council at Constantinople in 382, on account of age and weakness, and requests Olympius to act as his mediator, recalling the fact, that the same cause had hindered him from paying his respects to him on entering on his office (*Ep.* 76); on his retirement from which he writes a grateful and highly panegyrical letter (*Ep.* 50). The only angry letter in the whole series is one in which he calls upon Olympius to use his authority as governor to punish the Apollinarian party at Nazianzus, who had taken advantage of Gregory's being at the warm baths to elect a bishop of their own and get him consecrated (*Ep.* 77). The correspondence otherwise gives a very pleasing picture of the relations between Gregory and the provincial governor. [E. V.]

OLYMPIUS (8), (OLYMPUS), heathen philosopher at Alexandria, c. A.D. 389, said by Valesius to have come from Cilicia. When the Alexandrians rose in tumult against the Christians and the imperial authority, at the destruction of the temple of Bacchus, and held that of Serapis as a fortress, Olympius encouraged the idolaters in their revolt, by assuring them that they should prefer death to the neglect of their ancestral gods, and that the destruction of the statues in the temple was no warrant for forsaking the worship, as the statues were perishable materials, but the gods, therein worshipped, had only removed to heaven. This was the philosophical view of all idol-worship, when the heathen were pressed by the Christian argument. When Theodosius issued an edict favourable to the Christians, and inviting the pagans to Christianity and peace, and when Olympius saw that the temple of Serapis was about to be surrendered, he fled to Italy, but explained his flight by saying that he had heard a voice in the Serapion singing, Alleluia. Sozomen (*H. E.* vii. c. 15) is the only authority for the story of Olympius; but Ruffinus and other authors describe the destruction of the temples at Alexandria (Baronius, *Annal.* A.D. 389, cc. 76 sq.; Fleury, *H. E.* xix. cc. 28, 29; Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* v. 136 sq. ed. 1732.) [J. G.]

OLYMPIUS (9), the name of various persons addressed by Nilus; a scholasticus (lib. i. epp. 152, 153), monk (ii. 77), a bishop (ii. 190), a quaestor (ii. 305, 306). [C. H.]

OLYMPIUS (10), a native of a province on the borders of the Euxine Sea, who by the favour of Honorius held an important military command in the imperial palace. He professed to be a Christian, but in the opinion of Zosimus, whose evidence must perhaps be taken with some qualification, his profession was only a mask to conceal depravity. It was he who informed Honorius, on his way from Bologna to Pavia, of the ambitious designs of Stilicho, May 408, and having ingratiated himself with the soldiers there by visiting the sick in the military hospitals, made use of the opportunity to influence their minds against him. When, after the mutiny at Pavia, Stilicho went to Ravenna, it was again Olympius who obtained an order from Honorius that he should be arrested. He took refuge in a Christian church, but having left his asylum under a promise of safety, he was again seized and put to death by Heraclian. Olympius succeeded to his post of master of the offices, and devoted himself to the task of destroying or persecuting all the friends of Stilicho. Eucherius, his son, escaped for a time by taking refuge in a church at Rome, but was afterwards overtaken and put to death. Deuterius, imperial chamberlain (praepositus cubiculi), and Peter, tribune or chief of the notaries (primicerius notariorum), having refused to acknowledge for themselves any complicity with Stilicho, or

to inform against others, were beaten almost to death with clubs. When Alaric was on the point of entering Italy, and was threatening Rome, it was owing to Olympius that Honorius, relying, says Zosimus scornfully, on the prayers of his minister, refused at the same time both the powerful military aid of Sarus and his barbarians to repel the enemy, and the moderate demands which were then made by Alaric on behalf of peace; and when, after raising the blockade of Rome, Alaric allowed the senate to send commissioners to Ravenna to obtain the consent of Honorius to the terms proposed by him, it was Olympius who persuaded his weak master to refuse them, and to send back the commissioners under an escort only numerous enough to provoke destruction. One of the very few who escaped, Valens, the commander, reached Rome in safety, and was able to counteract in some degree the cruel system of confiscation promoted by Olympius towards all the friends of Stilicho. He succeeded in gaining with the Hunnish auxiliaries a trifling success over the invading Goths, but his ascendency was soon to come to an end, for being denounced by the eunuchs to the emperor as the cause of the public disasters, he was dismissed from his office, and, fearing for his safety, left Ravenna, and fled to Dalmatia, A.D. 409. According to Olympiodorus, he returned and was again displaced a second and third time, and then, after being deprived of his ears, was beaten to death with clubs by order of Constantius, the husband of Placidia. (Zos. v. 32–46; Olympiod. ap. Photium, *Bibl.* 80, p. 57; HONORIUS, Vol. III. pp. 144, 147.) These details, which belong more to general than to special church history, are nevertheless important in this latter respect so far as they bear witness to the character of Olympius in his relation to St. Augustine, from whom two letters addressed to him are extant, both of them expressing warm admiration and friendship, and belief in the sincerity of his Christian professions. The first of them was written soon after his promotion to the post of master of the offices, on which it congratulates him, but with the hope and belief that he will not be unduly elated thereby. Its purpose is to request his kind interference on behalf of Boniface bishop of Cataqua in Numidia, who was in trouble as to the possession of some land purchased by Paul, his predecessor, under fraudulent conditions. At a time when he was deeply in debt to the imperial treasury, Paul made a surrender of his property, but reserving privately a certain portion, which he placed on bond in the hands of a person at that time in high office, possibly as Tillemont suggests, Bathanarius, brother-in-law of Stilicho, to be laid out in buying by auction some land, nominally on behalf of the church, but really to provide himself with a maintenance, and made an arrangement with the nominal purchaser that, without paying the debt due to the treasury, he should not be molested by the tax-gatherer. When Paul died, Boniface succeeded in due course to the property as bishop, and, as belonging to the church, might have held it without disturbance, but had scruples of conscience as to his right of enjoyment; and though he might probably have obtained this securely by simply petitioning the emperor to remit the small amount of payment which had become due since the purchase, he preferred to lay the whole case before him, being ready to abandon the property rather than enjoy it clandestinely. To his application on this point no answer had been received, and Augustine wrote to Olympius, as his friend, and in his opinion a sincere Christian, to request him to intercede on behalf of this small boon, suggesting that Olympius might perhaps arrange the matter by obtaining a grant of the land to himself, and that he, in his Christian piety, should bestow it upon the church (*Ep.* 96). The success of this letter may perhaps be inferred from a second, which Augustine wrote to Olympius soon afterwards on another matter. The bishops of Proconsular Africa were much disturbed by the unruly behaviour both of idolaters and of heretics (Donatists), after the death of Stilicho [EVODIUS (3), NECTARIUS (5)], and sent a deputation to the emperor, to request that the laws against the disturbers of peace and of religion should be put in force. Augustine had not seen the members of this deputation, but took advantage of a presbyter from Mileum passing through Hippo on his way to Rome, though it was now winter time, to send a letter by him to Olympius, pressing the matter on his attention (*Ep.* 97). Edicts for the repression of Donatists and other sectaries were issued at various times from A.D. 405 to 407, during the lifetime of Stilicho (*Cod. Theodos.* xvi. 5, 38–41). Stilicho was murdered in August, 408, and the decree of Honorius to Olympius, master of the offices, and Valens, forbidding pagans from being employed in military service within the palace, is dated Nov. 14 in the same year (*ib.* 42). Successive edicts against Donatists and others appeared on Nov. 15, 24, and 27, A.D. 408, and one on Jan. 16, 409, which last may perhaps represent the result of this appeal (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 43–46). The point at issue is the extent of St. Augustine's knowledge of the true character of Olympius. According to Zosimus, a bitter opponent of Christianity, his religious profession was nothing but a cloak for his iniquity. According to Olympiodorus, whose description consists of a few epithets, his behaviour towards Stilicho was "murderous and inhuman," and if any credit at all is to be given to the narrative of Zosimus, his unrelenting persecution of the friends of Stilicho after his death appears to justify this character. In the opinion of Baronius and Tillemont, the favourable mention of him by St. Augustine outweighs any unfavourable judgment on the part of Zosimus, but there is no evidence to shew that Augustine had any personal acquaintance with him; and while, as both Baronius and Tillemont remark, some deduction must be made from the opinion of Zosimus, who never misses an ill-word against Christians, some allowance on the other side is also due on the ground (1) of the exaggerated complimentary phraseology of the day, attributing to Olympius in any case a higher rank of merit than he probably deserved, and (2) of the very natural, though not entirely excusable, warmth of expression on Augustine's part towards a man undoubtedly a Christian by profession, probably up to that time in outward appearance sincere, and now appointed to a high office in the place of one whose Christianity was at the best doubtful, and who, whatever the

demerits of his opponents may have been, was undoubtedly guilty of ambitious designs against the existing government, which Olympius had succeeded in defeating. St. Augustine may have pitched too highly the praises of his friend, without a full knowledge of his character, but we can hardly believe that he was aware of that serious defect in it which a historian with strong antipathies, as was the case with Zosimus, professes to point out. (Baronius, *Ann. Eccl.* vol. v. A.D. 408, p. 316–323; Tillemont, *Mém.* vol. 13, 174, 175; Gibbon, chap. xxx. xxxi.; *Dict. of G. and R. Biog.* vol. iii. p. 913.) [H. W. P.]

OLYMPIUS (11), addressed by Firmus (*Ep.* 27, in *Pat. Gr.* lxxvii.). [C. H.]

OLYMPIUS (12), the name of various persons addressed by Isidore of Pelusium; a count (lib. i. epp. 377, 378), a deacon (ii. 24), a presbyter and scholasticus (iv. 205), a presbyter (v. 105); others (v. 387, 477). [C. H.]

OLYMPIUS (13) I., bishop of Constantia, capital of the island of Cyprus, who took part in the "Robbers' Synod" in A.D. 449 (Labbe, iv. 117). He was one of the fifty-eight bishops, chiefly metropolitans, to whom in A.D. 457 the emperor Leo addressed his circular letter relative to the decrees of Chalcedon and the troubles caused in Egypt by Timothy Aelurus. (*Ib.* 891.) [E. V.]

OLYMPIUS (14) II. (OLYMPIANUS), archbishop of Constantia in Cyprus, in the reign of Justinian. Through the influence of the empress Theodora, who was a Cypriote, he obtained the emperor's leave to enforce the decrees of Chalcedon in his diocese. He also completed what his predecessor Artemion had begun, the ecclesiastical freedom of Cyprus from the patriarchate of Antioch (Étienne de Lusignan, *Descr. de l'Isle de Cypr.* p. 59; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 1048). [C. H.]

OLYMPIUS (15), bishop of Theodosiopolis and Evaza, was present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, and signed the decrees. When Bassianus was tried by the council for intruding into the see of Ephesus [BASSIANUS], Olympius was called upon to explain his own part in the transaction, and shewed that he had gone to take his share in what was to be a canonical action, and was then forced by popular tumult into the enthronization of Bassianus. The council appears to have acquitted him of blame. (Mansi, *Conc.* vi. vii. per Conc. Chalc., Actio xi.; Binius, *Conc.* ii. pt. i. 127 sq.; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 981; Fleury, *H. E.* xxviii. 26; Tillemont, *Hist. Eccl.* xv. 460 sq., ed. 1732.) [J. G.]

OLYMPIUS (16), a deacon of the church of Antioch, by whom, together with Marianus, a presbyter of the same church, Maximus of Antioch had written to Leo the Great, and by whom he sent his reply, dated June 10th, 453. (Leon. Magn. *Ep.* 119 [92].) [E. V.]

OLYMPIUS (17), a messenger from Anatolius of Constantinople to Leo the Great. (Leonis *Epp.* clv. cap. 1. clviii.) [C. G.]

OLYMPIUS (18), bishop of Scythopolis in Palestine, from A.D. 452 to 466. He was succeeded by Cosmas. (Cotelerius, *Monum. Graec. Eccles.* t. ii. num. 103, p. 286; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 689.) [G. T. S.]

OLYMPIUS (19), an Arian who died suddenly in the public baths of the empress Helena, at Constantinople, in the year 498. He is said by several writers to have been struck by an angel when blaspheming the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. The angel destroyed him by fire or boiling water, though he was in the cold bath at the time. The emperor Anastasius ordered a picture of the miracle to be painted. John of Damascus in Orat. 3, *de Imag.* tells the story out of Theod. Lect. lib. iv. (Cf. Victor Tunnun. *Chronic.* A.D. 498; Ceill. xi. 103.) [G. T. S.]

OLYMPIUS (20), exarch of Ravenna, sent by the Emperor Constans, c. 649, to enforce acceptance of the Type in Italy. For his dealings with pope Martin I., see MARTINUS (3), vol. iii. 854. He died c. 652, in an expedition to Sicily against the Saracens, of a pestilence that ravaged his army (*Lib. Pont. Vita Martini*, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 739). [F. D.]

OLYMPIUS (21), a guard sent by the emperor Constantinus IV. to arrest pope Martin for his rejection of the Type. He is said to have attempted the assassination of the pope. His conduct on this occasion is, however, involved in much obscurity. [CONSTANTINUS IV.; MARTINUS (3) in t. iii. p. 854.] [G. T. S.]

OMAR, the second of the caliphs and one of the numerous fathers-in-law of Mahomet. He was one of Mahomet's three chief companions, upon whom the government and organization of his followers devolved on the death of the Prophet. He was forty-five years old when that event occurred A.D. 632. He succeeded to the caliphate in August 634. It does not fall within the range of this dictionary to trace his career as head of the new movement. This has been amply and clearly done in Muir's *Annals of the Early Caliphate.* We can only note his attitude towards Christianity. Under the rule of Omar, Syria, Palestine and Egypt fell into Mahometan hands. [COPTIC CHURCH.] Jerusalem was besieged for two years, and only succumbed when Sophronius, the patriarch, intervened and agreed to surrender the city if Omar himself would come in person to receive its capitulation. No caliph had hitherto stirred beyond the boundaries of Arabia, but Omar did not care about precedents when a useful object was to be attained. He at once set out for Jerusalem, received its formal surrender, and was shewn over the celebrated sights and holy places by the patriarch himself. He proved himself a very tolerant conqueror, imposing only a light tribute upon the Christians, and in some cases even endowing Christian institutions and praying in Christian churches, as at Bethlehem in the church of the Nativity. While visiting the holy places of Jerusalem the patriarch is said to have shewn Omar a stone venerated as Jacob's pillar. It was covered with filth and clay; so the caliph with a humility which always characterized him, at once applied himself to clean the sacred spot with his own hands, and laid there the foundations of the mosque of

Omar which still exists. Humility indeed and toleration for Jews and Christians were marked features of his character. He hated all kinds of display. On one occasion he was making a journey into Palestine, and was entering a Christian settlement near the head of the gulf of Acaba. He knew the people would be rushing in crowds to see him, so he changed places with his camel driver, and when the crowds came demanding where the caliph was, he simply replied, "He is before you," whereupon they rushed on, thinking he was in advance. Meanwhile, Omar had time quietly to reach the Christian bishop's house, where he tarried during the heat of the day. He had torn his coat on the journey, and he gave it to the bishop to have it repaired. The bishop not only mended the rent, but prepared a new coat as a present, which, however, Omar refused, preferring his old garment. He was an enemy of all kinds of luxury, ostentation and vice among the Mahometans, and strove to carry out rigorously the discipline and precepts of the Prophet. The conquest of Antioch and Damascus was a great trial for Mahometan discipline. Wine was a great temptation to the true believers. At Damascus an immense number were accused of drinking it. So large was the number that the governor became alarmed and consulted Omar as to his course of conduct. His stern reply was this, "Gather an assembly and bring them forth. Then ask, Is wine lawful or is it forbidden? If they say forbidden, lay eighty stripes on each. If they say it is lawful, behead them every one." Three great Mahometan arrangements are ascribed to Omar. (1) He arranged and committed to writing the Coran which was previously preserved by oral tradition merely. (2) He established the Mahometan era of the Hegira or Flight of Mahomet, beginning with the new moon of the first month in the year of the prophet's flight from Mecca. (3.) To him is also ascribed the code called the "Ordinance of Omar" which to this day is the formal law regulating the condition of Jews and Christians in Mahometan lands. Muir thinks that Omar was not its author, as he was too tolerant and too friendly to Christians to have devised it. The emperor Heraclius and Omar had some kindly and courteous communications notwithstanding their frequent wars. [HERACLIUS.] Theophanes (*Chronographia*) gives us some information about Omar. Muir's book is the best modern authority. Gibbon, in his fifty-first chapter gives a good account of Omar and the conquest of Jerusalem. [G. T. S.]

OMER, ST. [AUDOMARUS.]

OMMATIUS (1), senior, a man of rank in Auvergne, whose daughter Iberia was the wife of Ruricius the elder, bishop of Limoges. Sidonius mentions him in his epithalamium to Ruricius and Iberia (carm. 10, 11), and addresses to him carm. 17, which is an invitation to a family birth-day fête. Through Iberia he was the grandfather of OMMATIUS (2), bishop of Tours. [C. H.]

OMMATIUS (2) (OMMACIUS, OMACIUS), junior, grandson of the preceding, son of Ruricius and Iberia, addressed and mentioned by Ruricius (lib. i. ep. 18; ii. 27, 56, and notes, *Pat. Lat.* lviii). He is regarded as the Ommatius described by Gregory of Tours as the 12th bishop of Tours, a man of senatorial family in Auvergne, and of large estates, which he bequeathed to the churches of those towns where they were situated. At Tours he heightened the church of SS. Gervasius and Protasius, beneath and adjoining the walls, and commenced, but did not live to complete, the basilica of St. Mary beneath the wall. He died after an episcopate of either three or four years and five months, and was buried in the basilica of St. Martin at Tours. The *Gall. Chr.* gives him the alternative name of Martius, and from the *Chronicle of Tours* puts his accession to the see in 521 (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* iii. 17, x. 31; Bouquet, ii. 387 note; *Gall. Chr.* xiv. 17). [C. H.]

OMOLINGC, OMULUNG. [HOMOLUNCH.]

OMOTARIUS, bishop of Laon late in the seventh century (*Gall. Chr.* ix. 512). [C. H.]

ONASUS, of Segesta, an opponent of Jerome in Rome (anno 384). He had taken some of Jerome's satirical descriptions as personal to himself. Jerome writes a jeering and unseemly letter about him to Marcella (*Ep.* 40, ed. Vall.), playing upon his name as derived from *ὄνος* or from Nasus. [W. H. F.]

ONCHU (ONCHON, ONCHUO), Mac-in-Eccis (son of the poet), poet in Connaught in the middle of the 6th century, embraced the Christian faith and settled at Clonmore, co. Carlow or Wexford; he set himself to gather relics of all the Irish saints into one shrine. His feast is Feb. 8, where Colgan (*Acta SS.* 276–7) and O'Hanlon (*Ir. SS.* ii. 402 sq.) have memoirs. [J. G.]

ONESICRATIA, a lady, a correspondent of Chrysostom's, to whom he wrote, from Cucusus, a letter of consolation on the death of her daughter, which had speedily followed some previous bereavement. (Chrys. *Ep.* 192.) [E. V.]

ONESIMUS (1), bishop of Ephesus, sent by the Ephesian church to meet Ignatius at Smyrna on his way to Rome. (Ignat. *ad Eph.* 2; see also Euseb. iii. 35.) [G. S.]

ONESIMUS (2), TITUS FLAVIUS, reputed husband of Flavia Domitilla, daughter of Clement the martyr, and grandniece of Domitian. The name of Tit. Flav. Onesimus appears on two inscriptions in Gruter (*Corp. Ins.* pp. ccxlv. and cclii.), one being a monument erected by him to his wife. The whole question about the Domitillas is in a state of confusion which these inscriptions increase since tradition represents the younger Domitilla as living a virgin. [G. T. S.]

ONESIMUS (3) a correspondent of MELITO of Sardis. See Vol. III. p. 896 a. [G. S.]

ONESIMUS (4), ST., bishop of Soissons, said to have destroyed the remains of idolatry in that region (*Gall. Chr.* ix. 334). The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 13 Mai. iii. 204) give a *Vita* of him with notes by Henschen, who assigns him to the year c. 360. [C. H.]

ONESIMUS (5), bishop of Nicomedia in Bithynia in latter part of the 4th century. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* i. 587; Philostorg. *H. E.* i. v.) [G. T. S.]

ONESIMUS (6), one of those who at the Council of the Oak bore testimony against Chrysostom or urged the council to come to a speedy decision. (Phot. lix. p. 60.) [E. V.]

ONESIMUS (7), the name of two persons addressed by Nilus; a monk (lib. ii. ep. 84), a primate (ii. 177). [C. H.]

ONESIPHORUS, bishop of Iconium about A.D. 450. He was present at the general council of Chalcedon, and also at the Robber-synod of Ephesus, 449. He declared at Chalcedon that he had opposed the proceedings of Dioscorus at Ephesus. (Hefele's *Councils*,—Clark's translation, iii. 254, 314; Mansi, vi. 827.) [G. T. S.]

ONIAS, a pupil (under a fancy name, and not otherwise known) of Alcuin (*Epp.* 124, 183, ed. Frob.), who addresses him as a sacerdos c. A.D. 800 (*Epp.* 230, 231, 227, 228); he is also one of those to whom Alcuin addressed his work on *Ecclesiastes*, A.D. 802. [CANDIDUS (16).] (Alcuin, *Opp.* i. 148, 292, 410, in *Pat. Lat.* t. c.) [R. J. K.]

ONOEL. [HEBDOMAS, Vol. II. 850, *b.*]

ONUPHRIUS (1) (ONOFRIO, HONOFRIO), June 12, an Egyptian solitary, who left the monks of the Thebaid, with whom he had been brought up, for the remoter solitude of a spot named Calidonna. Here he lived in a cave for seventy years, cheered by the annual visits of a holy man, when the anchoret Paphnutius in his journeyings discovered him, having more the appearance of a wild beast than of a man. As Onuphrius was narrating the story of his life an extreme pallor was observed to spread over his face, and he intimated that his end was near and that his visitor would bury him; then blessing Paphnutius and committing his spirit to God he expired. Paphnutius wrapped the body in a portion of his own cloak and laid it in a crevice of the rock. (Rosweyd, *Vit. Pat.* p. 99; Boll. *Acta SS.* 12 Jun. ii. 527; Tillem. x. 49, 723.) Mrs. Jameson (*Legend. Art*, ii. 280) describes a picture in the Louvre of which Onuphrius is the subject. [R. J. K.]

ONUPHRIUS (2) (HONOPHRIUS), a solitary of Emesa in Phoenicia, by whose prayers Leucippe, the wife of Clitophon, is said to have been relieved of her barrenness upon her forsaking paganism, and to have become the mother of St. Galacteon. (Rosweyd, *Vit. Pat.* p. 99; Surius, *De Prob. SS. Hist.* iv. 158.) [R. J. K.]

OPHELIUS (1), a grammaticus addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. *Epp.* 11, 86, ii. 42, 55, 119, 255, 273, iii. 31, 70, 92, 93, 94, iv. 105, 162, 200); (2) a scholasticus (ii. 154, 201). [C. H.]

OPHELLUS. [OFELLUS.]

OPHIANITAE, heretics, in the list of Sophronius (Mansi, xi. 850 D). In Hardouin's version they appear as 'Αφονιταί and Aphonitae Hard. iii. 1291 A). [C. H.]

OPHITES ['Οφιανοί, Clem. Alex., Orig.; 'Οφῖται, Hippol., Epiph.] Among the peculiarities of several of the Gnostic sects of the 2nd century, there was one which was felt by members of the church as most striking and most offensive, namely, that the symbol of the serpent, which to Christians generally represented the source of all evil and the enemy of the human race, was by these heretics held in reverence and honour. Accordingly, though "Gnostics" was the title which these people claimed for themselves (Hippol. *Ref.* v. 1, 11), the Catholics called them Ophites, or else, in places where it was the Hebrew word for serpent, Nahash, which appeared in their mythologies, NAASSENES; and ultimately some of themselves took pride in those titles. It is so natural to regard as most fundamental that characteristic which gives the name to a sect, that it is useful to remember that this name Ophite seems to have been at first imposed from without, and that the characteristic from which it is derived was common to many of the Gnostic sects, and in most of them was not entitled to be counted their most prominent feature.

The honour paid to the serpent in these sects may be traced to a twofold origin. Gnostic speculation busied itself much with the problem of the origin of evil, and the favourite solution was that evil was inherent in matter. It followed that the God of the Jews to whom the Old Testament ascribes the creation of matter had therein done a bad work, and therefore that he could not be identical with the Supreme Good God. When the Old Testament went on to relate how the serpent had offered to teach our first parents knowledge and to make them wise, and how the Creator God had cursed them for embracing this offer, it was a consistent theory to maintain, that in this the serpent had shewn himself to be the friend of the human race, and the Creator its enemy. We seem thus to have a sufficient account of the use of the serpent as an emblem of wisdom, and of the honour paid it by those who held it to be a point of duty to run counter to the God of the Jews. But in truth veneration of the serpent appears to be of earlier date than opposition to Judaism. We cannot pretend to trace the history of the totems or animal symbols which different tribes regarded as peculiarly their own: but there is sufficient evidence that in the countries where Gnosticism most flourished, a heathen use of the serpent emblem had previously existed. Sanchoniathon, quoted by Eusebius, in a chapter containing several notices of ancient serpent worship (*Praep. Evan.* i. 10), tells of the honour paid the serpent by the Phoenicians. They admired the quickness of its motions though destitute of the instruments of locomotion employed by other animals. They observed how, by casting its skin it renewed its youth, and they not only ascribed to it great length and tenacity of life, but even fancied that except by violence from without it would never die. A religious use of the serpent emblem was common to the Phoenicians with the Egyptians. We may indeed identify the names of the Phoenician Taaut and the Egyptian divinity Thoth, both of which are connected with serpent worship. The Egyptians are said by the same authority to have derived from the Phoenicians the name agathodaemon

which a later writer (Lamprid. *Vit. Heliogab.*) tells us was given to the pet snakes which they kept. The serpent represented the vital principle of nature, the world being symbolized by a figure like the Greek theta, a circle with a snake in the middle. In the same chapter of Eusebius, Pherecydes Syrius is said to have derived from the Phoenicians his representations of the god Ophioneus as serpent-formed; but as we know from Celsus (Origen, vi. 42) that Ophioneus was described as a Titan and an opponent of Kronos, Pherecydes would seem to have more in common with those who made the serpent typify the evil rather than the good principle. For the purposes of this article, however, it is needless to ascertain the details of ancient serpent worship; it is enough to know in a general way that there was such a thing, for then we can understand that among the eclectic speculators, included among those known by the name of Gnostics, who adopted only such elements of Christianity as harmonized with their system, there would be some whose previous training would indispose them to share that hostility to the serpent which was common to Christianity and Judaism, and who would be willing to give the emblem an honourable place in their schemes. Accordingly in one Gnostic system (Iren. I. xxx. 5), Nous, the source of intelligence, is serpent-formed; in another (I. xxx. 14), Sophia herself is identified with the serpent. As members of the church were ingenious in finding the figure of the cross in different objects, natural or artificial, so these Gnostics were equally ingenious in discovering the figure of the serpent. By anyone who would lift up his eyes with intelligence it might be seen holding a presiding place among the constellations of heaven (Hippol. v. 16, p. 134). It was to be seen in the form of the brain (Hippol. iv. 51, p. 91, v. 17, p. 137), and in the convolutions of the intestines (Iren. I. xxx. 14). It was the serpent who gave wise counsel to Eve, the serpent rod by which Moses wrought his miracles, the brazen serpent which gave deliverance to the perishing people in the wilderness, it was he in whose likeness the Son of Man was to be lifted up (Hippol. v. 18, p. 133); nay, the serpent was identified with the Logos Son. But perhaps even the wildest extravagance of Ophite theory was not so revolting to Christians as a practice with some of these Gnostics to allow the tame snakes which we have already mentioned, to crawl about and sanctify their Eucharistic bread, thus, as it seemed from a Christian point of view, binding themselves to the author of evil by a sacrament of abomination (Ps.-Tert. 6; Epiph. *Haer.* xxxvii. 5, p. 272). The story is repeated by Augustine (*Haer.* 17) and improved on by "Praedestinetus" (i. 17).

In what precedes we have collected the principal characteristics which justify the application of the name Ophite to these sects: but as we have already intimated, the name has been applied to sects of different degrees of antiquity, and differing a good deal in their principles. It is advisable therefore to state separately what we learn from different sources of information.

The Ophites of Irenaeus.—Irenaeus having given (I. xxiii.–xxviii.) in what seems intended for chronological order, a list of heresies, beginning with Simon and ending with Tatian, adds in a kind of appendix a description of a variety of Gnostic sects deriving their origin, as he maintains, from the heresy of Simon. Irenaeus does not use the name "Ophite," but Theodoret, who copies his description, gives that title to them, and he has been followed by later writers. This system gave the following account of the origin of things. The first principle was a light dwelling in Bythus, blessed and incorruptible, which these heretics called the Father of all and the First Man. His Thought or Conception became a Son, which they called the Second Man, and after these was the Holy Spirit, which they called the First Woman, the mother of all living, the name for spirit in Shemitic languages being feminine. [On this trinity see Vol. II. p. 683.] Beneath lay, in a sluggish mass, the four elements, viz. water, darkness, abyss, and chaos; while above these moved the Holy Spirit. And of her beauty both first and second Man became enamoured, and they generated from her a third male, an Incorruptible Light, called Christ. But the excess of light with which she had been impregnated was more than she could contain, and while Christ her right-hand birth was borne upward with his mother, forming with the First and Second Man the true holy church, a drop of light fell on the left hand downwards into the world of matter, and was called Sophia and Prunikos. By this arrival the still waters were set in motion, all things rushing to embrace the Light, and Prunikos wantonly playing with the waters, assumed to herself a body, without the protection of which the light was in danger of being completely absorbed by matter. Yet when oppressed by the grossness of her surroundings, she strove to escape the waters and ascend to her mother, the body weighed her down, and she could do no more than arch herself above the waters, constituting thus the visible heaven. In process of time, however, by intensity of desire she was able to free herself from the encumbrance of the body, and leaving it behind to ascend to the region immediately above, called in the language of another sect the middle region. Meanwhile a son, Ialdabaoth, born to her from her contact with the waters, having in him a certain breath of the incorruptible light left him from his mother, by means of which he works, generates from the waters a son without any mother. And this son in like manner another, until there were seven in all, ruling the seven heavens, Ialdabaoth, Iao, Sabaoth, Adoneus, Eloaeus, Oreus, Astaphaeus; a Hebdomad which their mother completes into an Ogdoad. [See the article HEBDOMAD, Vol. II. p. 850.] But it came to pass that these sons strove for mastery with their father Ialdabaoth, whereat he suffered great affliction, and casting his despairing gaze on the dregs of matter below, he, through them, consolidated his longing and obtained a son Ophiomorphus, the serpent-formed Nous, whence come the spirit and soul, and all things of this lower world; but whence came also oblivion, wickedness, jealousy, envy, and death. Ialdabaoth, stretching himself over his upper heaven, had shut out from all below the knowledge that there was anything higher than himself, and being puffed up with pride at the sons whom he had begotten without help from his mother, he cried, I am Father and God, and above me

there is none other. On this his mother, hearing him, cried out, Do not lie, Ialdabaoth, for above thee is the father of all, the first man, and the son of man. When the heavenly powers marvelled at this voice, Ialdabaoth, to call off their attention, exclaimed, "Let us make man after our image." Then the six powers formed a gigantic man, the mother Sophia having given assistance to the design, in order that by this means she might recover the Light-fluid from Ialdabaoth. For the man whom the six powers had formed, lay unable to raise itself, writhing like a worm until they brought it to their father, who breathed into it the breath of life, and so emptied himself of his power. But the man having now Thought and Conception (Nous and Enthymesis), forthwith gave thanks to the First Man, disregarding those who had made him.

At this Ialdabaoth, being jealous, planned to despoil the man by means of a woman, and formed Eve, of whose beauty the six powers being enamoured generated sons from her, namely, the angels. Then Sophia devised by means of the serpent to seduce Eve and Adam to transgress the precept of Ialdabaoth; and Eve, accepting the advice of one who seemed a Son of God, persuaded Adam also to eat of the forbidden tree. And when they ate they gained knowledge of the power which is over all, and revolted from those who had made them. Thereupon Ialdabaoth cast Adam and Eve out of Paradise; but the mother had secretly emptied them of the Light-fluid in order that it might not share the curse or reproach. So they were cast down into this world, as was also the serpent who had been detected in working against his father. He brought the angels here under his power, and himself generated six sons, a counterpart of the Hebdomad of which his father was a member. These seven demons always oppose and thwart the human race on whose account their father was cast down.

Adam and Eve at first had light and clear and, as it were, spiritual bodies, which on their fall became dull and gross; and their spirits were also languid because they had lost all but the breath of this lower world which their maker had breathed into them; until Prunikos taking pity on them gave them back the sweet odour of the Light-fluid through which they woke to a knowledge of themselves and knew that they were naked. The story proceeds to give a version of Old Testament history, in which Ialdabaoth is represented as making a series of efforts to obtain exclusive adoration for himself, and to avenge himself on those who refused to pay it, while he is counteracted by Prunikos, who strives to enlighten mankind as to the existence of higher powers more deserving of adoration. In particular the prophets who (as explained Vol. II. p. 850) were each the organ of one of the Hebdomad, the glorification of whom was their main theme, were nevertheless inspired by Sophia to make fragmentary revelations about the First Man and about Christ above, whose descent also she caused to be predicted.

And here we come to the version given of New Testament history in this system. Sophia, having no rest either in heaven or on earth, implored the assistance of her mother, the First Woman. She, moved with pity at her daughter's repentance, begged of the First Man that Christ should be sent down to her assistance. Sophia, apprized of the coming help, announced his advent by John, prepared the baptism of repentance, and by means of her son, Ialdabaoth, got ready a woman to receive the annunciation from Christ, in order that when he came there might be a pure and clean vessel to receive him, namely Jesus, who, being born of a virgin by divine power, was wiser, purer, and more righteous than any other man. Christ then descended through the seven heavens, taking the form of the sons of each as he came down, and depriving each of their rulers of his power. For wheresoever Christ came the Light-fluid rushed to him, and when he came into this world he first united himself with his sister Sophia, and they refreshed one another as bridegroom and bride, and the two united descended into Jesus, who thus became Jesus Christ. Then he began to work miracles, and to announce the unknown Father, and to declare himself manifestly the son of the First Man. Then Ialdabaoth and the other princes of the Hebdomad, being angry, sought to have Jesus crucified, but Christ and Sophia did not share his passion, having withdrawn themselves into the incorruptible Aeon. But Christ did not forget Jesus, but sent a power which raised his body up, not indeed his choical body, for "flesh and blood cannot lay hold of the kingdom of God," but his animal and spiritual body. So it was that Jesus did no miracles, either before his baptism, when he was first united to Christ, or after his resurrection, when Christ had withdrawn himself from him. Jesus then remained on earth after his resurrection eighteen months, at first himself not understanding the whole truth, but enlightened by a revelation subsequently made him, which he taught to a chosen few of his disciples, and then was taken up to heaven.

We need not doubt that the Gnostic doctrine here expounded claimed to be derived from the revelation thus made to the chosen few (see the article PISTIS SOPHIA, where an account is given of a later work of this school). The story proceeds to tell that Christ, sitting on the right hand of the father Ialdabaoth, without his knowledge enriches himself with the souls of those who had known him, inflicting a corresponding loss on Ialdabaoth. For as righteous souls instead of returning to him are united to Christ, Ialdabaoth is less and less able to bestow any of the Light-fluid on souls afterwards entering this world, and can only breathe into them his own animal breath. The consummation of all things will take place when, by successive union of righteous souls with Christ, the last drop of the Light-fluid shall be recovered from this lower world.

The system here expounded evidently implies a considerable knowledge of the Old Testament on the part either of its inventor or expounder. It begins with "the spirit of God moving on the face of the waters," and it summarises the subsequent history, even mentioning the sacred writers by name. Yet that it is not the work of one brought up in Judaism is evident from the hostility shewn to the God of the Jews, who is represented as a mixture of arrogance and ignorance, waging war against idolatry from mere love of self-exaltation, yet constantly thwarted and overcome by the skill of superior know-

ledge. We have already remarked that the feminine attributes ascribed to the Holy Spirit indicate that Greek was not the native language of the framer of this system, and this conclusion is confirmed by the absence of elements derived from Greek philosophic systems. If, for instance, we compare this system with that of Valentinus, we discover at once so much agreement in essential features as to assure us of the substantial identity of the foundation of the two systems; but the Valentinian system contains several things derived from Greek philosophy, whereas that which we have described can be explained from purely Oriental sources. We are entitled therefore to regard the latter as representing the more original form. The reporter of this system is clearly acquainted with the New Testament, since he adopts a phrase from the Epistle to the Corinthians; he knows that our Lord habitually spoke of himself as Son of Man; and in denying that our Lord performed miracles before his baptism, he adopts the history as told in our Gospels in opposition to that told in apocryphal Gospels of the Infancy. We have already remarked (II. 683) that the place which the doctrine of a Trinity holds in this system indicates that it proceeds from one who had received Christian instruction.

Although, following Theodoret, we have given the name Ophite to the system described by Irenaeus, it will have been seen that not only does the doctrine concerning the serpent form a very subordinate part of the system, but also that the place it assigns the serpent is very different from that given it by those whom we count as properly to be called Ophites. For this name we think properly belongs to those who gave the serpent the place of honour in their system, but the present system agrees with Christian doctrine in making the serpent and his attendant demons the enemy and persecutor of the human race. If we were to single out what we regard as the most characteristic feature of the scheme, it is the prominence given to the attribute of light as the property of the good principle. This feature is still more striking in the derived system of *Pistis Sophia*, where the mention of light is of perpetual occurrence, and the dignity of every being is measured by the brilliancy of its light. It is natural to imagine a connexion with the system of Zoroaster, in which the history of the world is made to be a struggle between the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness. This suspicion is confirmed when we refer to what Plutarch tells of the system of Zoroaster (*De Is. et Osir.* 47), for we there find other coincidences with our system, which can scarcely be accidental. In the Persian system, the opposing powers, Ormuzd and Ahriman, each generate six derived beings to aid in the contest, precisely in the same way that Ialdabaoth and Ophiomorphus have each the co-operation of six subordinate and derived beings. The story of Sophia stretching out her body so as to form the visible heavens has a parallel in a similar myth told about Ormuzd enlarging his bulk, and there is a likeness to Ophite doctrine in the account which Zoroaster gives of our resurrection bodies, which are to be so clear and subtle as to cast no shadow. (See also the Persian representations of seven heavens and an eighth region above them (Orig. *Adv. Cels.* vi. 22).) On the whole there seems good reason to believe that the Gnostic system described by Irenaeus is the work of a disciple of Zoroaster, half-converted to Christianity. As to his obligations to previous Gnostic systems, see SATURNINUS. In the section of Irenaeus immediately preceding that of which we have just given an account, there is a summary of a system which has been called Barbeliot, from its use of the name BARBELO to denote the supreme female principle. It contains some of the essential features of the scheme just described, of which it seems to have been a development, principally characterized by a great wealth of nomenclature, and, with the exception of the name which has given a title to the system, all derived from the Greek language. Again, in the passage immediately following the chapter we have analysed, Irenaeus shews acquaintance with a section of the school who may be called Ophite in the proper sense of the word, some teaching that Sophia herself was the serpent, some glorifying Cain and other enemies of the God of the Old Testament See CAINITES.

The Ophites of Clement and Origen.—Clement of Alexandria incidentally mentions Cainites and Ophites (*Strom.* vii. 17, p. 900), but gives no explanation of their tenets. Nor do we suppose that there is any reason to connect with this sect his reprobation of the use of serpent ornaments by women (*Paed.* ii. 13, p. 245).

Origen is led to speak of the Ophites (*Adv. Cels.* vi. 28 sqq.) by an accusation of Celsus that the Christians counted seven heavens, and spoke of the Creator as an accursed divinity, inasmuch as he was worthy of execration for cursing the serpent who introduced the first human beings to the knowledge of good and evil. Origen replies that Celsus had mixed up matters, and had confounded with the Christians the Ophites, who so far from being Christians would not hear the name of Jesus, nor own him to have been so much as a wise and virtuous man, nor would admit anyone into their assembly until he had cursed Jesus. It may be doubted whether Origen has not here been misinformed about a sect of which he intimates that he knows but little. According to all other authorities the Ophites claimed to be Christians. Elsewhere (*Comm. in St. Matt.* iii. 852) Origen classes the Ophites as heretics of the graver sort with the followers of Marcion, Valentinus, Basilides, and Apelles. The identity of the nomenclature proves that these Ophites of Origen are a branch of the Zoroastrian sect described by Irenaeus, and therefore justifies our application of the name Ophite to that sect. The names of the seven princes of the Hebdomad, as given by Origen, agree completely with the list of Irenaeus. Origen also gives the names of the seven demons. [See HEBDOMAD, Vol. II. p. 850.] Irenaeus only gives the name of their chief, but that one is enough to establish a more than accidental coincidence, since it is a name we should not have expected to find as the name of a demon, namely, Michael. The name Prunikos is also found in the report of Origen. Origen gives what must have been one of the valuable secrets of this sect, viz. the formula to be addressed by an ascending soul to each of the princes of the hebdomad in order to propitiate him to grant a passage

through his dominions. Perhaps the secret would have been more jealously guarded if it were not that in addition to the use of the formula, it seems to have been necessary to produce at each gate a certain symbol. These would only be in the possession of the initiated, and we may imagine that they were buried with them. We may note a point of which Origen does not seem to have been himself aware, namely, that he gives the formulae in the inverse order; *i.e.* first the formula to be used by a soul which has passed through the highest heaven and desires to enter the Ogdoad; next the formula to be used in order to gain admission to the highest heaven, and so on. Origen also gives a description of an Ophite diagram, which Celsus likewise had met with, consisting of an outer circle, named Leviathan, denoting the soul of all things, with ten internal circles, variously coloured, the diagram containing also the figures and names of the seven demons. Matter (*Histoire du Gnosticisme*, II., p. 221; plate I. D.) attempts to reproduce the figure from Origen's description, but in truth Origen has not given us particulars enough to enable us to make a restoration with confidence, or even to enable us to understand what was intended to be represented. In all probability the picture was not intended to explain or illustrate anything, but merely was supposed to possess some magical virtue. Origen names Euphrates as the introducer of the doctrine of the sect which he describes, whence we may conjecture [see EUPHRATES (1)] that the sect may have been that branch of the Ophites who are called Peratae.

The Ophites of Hippolytus.—The method by which Lipsius has attempted to recover the lost earlier treatise of Hippolytus has been explained (Vol. III. p. 93). This treatise appears to have contained a section on the Ophites, following that on the Nicolaitans, with whom they were brought into connexion. Philaster has transposed this and two other sections, beginning his treatise on Heresies with the Ophites, and making the Ophites, Cainites, and Sethites pre-Christian sects. We may set this aside as a mere blunder, into which Philaster was led by the names. The section of Hippolytus appears to have given a condensed account of the mythological story told by Irenaeus. In giving the name Ophite, however, he appears to have brought into greater prominence than Irenaeus the characteristics of the sect indicated by the word, their honour of the serpent, whom they even preferred to Christ, their venerating him because he taught our first parents the knowledge of good and evil, their use of the references to the brazen serpent in the Old and New Testament, and their introduction of the serpent into their Eucharistic celebration.

The great difference between the earlier and the later treatise of Hippolytus is that the former was a mere compilation, his account of the opinions of heresies being in the main derived from the lectures of Irenaeus; but at the time of writing the latter, he had himself read several heretical writings, of which he gives an extract in his treatise. In this book he makes a contemptuous mention of the Ophites in company with the Cainites and Nochaitae (viii. 20) as heretics whose doctrines did not deserve the compliment of serious exposition or refutation. And it is strange that he does not seem to suspect that these heretics have any connection with those who form the subject of his fifth book. In that book he treats of sects which paid honour to the serpent, giving to the first of these sects the name Naassenes, a title which he knows is derived from the Hebrew name for serpent. Possibly Hippolytus restricted the name Ophites to the sect described by Irenaeus, which has very little in common with that which he calls Naassenes. Another identification which Hippolytus failed to make has also been overlooked by, as far as we know, all his previous readers. The two first sections of the 5th book treat of the Naassenes and the Peratae, and no doubt give an account of two distinct works which fell into the hands of Hippolytus, and which he supposed to represent the opinions of two distinct sects of heretics. But a careful comparison of the two sections shews that both works must have reached Hippolytus from the same quarter, both having evidently proceeded from the same workshop. The doctrines of the heretics of the two sections agree so completely that the statements of the one may be used to clear up obscurities in the statements of the other, several technical words are common to the two sections, and in both the same not very obvious illustrations are employed. Before giving the detailed proof of these assertions, it will be convenient to state the doctrines of each sect as described by Hippolytus.

The book of the sect which he calls Naassenes, a name not heard of elsewhere, professed to contain heads of discourses communicated by James, the Lord's brother, to Mariamne. A very interesting feature of the book seems to have been the specimens it gave of Ophite hymnology. The doctrine has little in common with the Zoroastrian Ophites described by Irenaeus, the contrast for instance between light and darkness not being once insisted on. The writer is in fact not Oriental, but Greek. He does indeed use the Hebrew words Naas and Caulacau, but (see Vols. I. 425, III. 589) these words had already passed into the common heretical vocabulary so as to become known to many unacquainted with Hebrew. He does shew a knowledge of the religious mysteries of various nations, yet as it appears to us not a personal, but a literary knowledge. For instance, he dilates much on the Phrygian rites, but the whole section seems to be but a commentary on a hymn to the Phrygian Attys which had fallen into his hands. It must be remembered that without ever leaving Rome there was opportunity to become acquainted with the religious rites of various nations.

The Naassenes so far agreed with other Ophites that they gave to the first principle the names Man and Son of Man, calling him in their hymns Adamas. Instead, however, of retaining the female principle of the Oriental Ophites, they represented their "Man" as bisexual; and hence one of their hymns runs "From thee, father, through thee, mother, the two immortal names." See this also quoted under MONOIMUS (*Hippol. Ref.* viii. 12, p. 269). Compare also Irenaeus, i. 29, "refrigerant in hoc omnia hymnizare magnum Aeona. Hinc autem dicunt manifestatam Matrem, Patrem, Filium." Although

the coincidence here is but slight, it deserves some attention, because Irenaeus's section referred to contains some Naassene technical words, Adamas, Autogenes, virginalis spiritus; and these Barbeliots of Irenaeus appear to have taught a Greek form of Ophite doctrine. To return to the Naassenes, they taught that their primary man was, like Geryon, threefold, containing in himself the three natures *τὸ νοερόν, τὸ ψυχικόν, τὸ χοϊκόν*; and so that in Jesus the three natures were combined, and through him speak to these different classes of men. From the living waters which he supplies each absorbs that for which his nature has attraction. From the same water the olive can draw its oil, and the vine its wine, and in like manner each other plant its special produce: chaff will be attracted by amber, iron only by the magnet, gold only by the prickle of the sea-hawk,[a] so each according to his nature attracts and imbibes a different supply from the same source. Thus there are three classes of men and three corresponding churches, angelical, psychical, and choical, whose names are elect, called, captive. We should imagine that these indicate (1) the heathen chiefly captive under the dominion of matter, (2) ordinary Christians, and (3) out of the many called, the few chosen members of the Naassene sect. Elsewhere, however, a greater diversity of men is indicated. For the Saviour, we are told, said, "Unless ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven; but even if ye drink the cup that I drink of, whither I go ye cannot come." For every one must go to his own nature. Therefore it was that he chose twelve apostles for the twelve tribes, and by them spoke to every tribe. So all men cannot receive the preaching of all the twelve, but each only according to his own nature.

The Naassene work known to Hippolytus would seem to have been of what we may call a devotional character rather than a formal exposition of doctrine, and this perhaps is why it is difficult to draw from the accounts left us a thoroughly consistent scheme. Thus, as we proceed, we are led to think of the first principle of nature, not as a single threefold being, but as three distinct substances; on the one hand the pre-existent, otherwise spoken of as the Good Being, on the other hand the "outpoured Chaos," intermediate, between these one called Autogenes, and also the Logos. Chaos is naturally destitute of forms or qualities; neither does the pre-existent being himself possess form, for though the cause of everything that comes into being, it is itself none of them, but only the seed from which they spring. The Logos is the mediator which draws forms from above and transfers them to the world below. Yet he seems to have a rival in this work; for we have reference made to a fourth being, whence or how brought into existence we are not told, a "fiery God," Esaldaeus,[b] the father of the *ἰδικὸς κόσμος*. That is to say, if we understand the theory rightly, it was this fiery being, the same who appeared to Moses in the burning bush, who gave forms to the choical or purely material parts of nature. It is he who supplies the fiery heat of generation by which these forms are still continued. In this work the Logos had no part, for "all things were made through him, and without him was made nothing." The "nothing" that was made without him is the *κόσμος ἰδικός*. On the other hand, it is the Logos, who is identified with the serpent, and this again with the principle of Water, who brings down the pneumatic and psychical elements, so that through him man became a living soul. But he has now to do a greater work, namely, to provide for the release of the higher elements now enslaved under the dominion of matter, and for their restoration to the good God. For the restoration of the chosen seed an essential condition is the complete abandonment of sexual intercourse. The captive people must pass out of Egypt; Egypt is the body, the Red Sea the work of generation; to cross the Red Sea and pass into the wilderness is to arrive at a state where that work of generation has been forsaken. Thus they arrive at the Jordan. This is the Logos through whose streams rolling downward forms had descended from above, and generations of mortal men had taken place; but now Jesus, like his Old Testament namesake, rolls the stream upwards, and then takes place a generation not of men, but of gods, for to this name the new-born seed may lay claim (Ps. lxxxii. 6). But if they return to Egypt, that is to carnal intercourse, "they shall die like men." For that which is born from below is fleshly and mortal, that which is born from above is spiritual and immortal.

The specimens already given present but a faint idea of the author's tyrannical method of Scripture exegesis by which he can prove any doctrine out of any text. One or two specimens more must suffice. In "*ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι*," which occurs in St. Paul's description of the evil deeds of the Gentiles (Rom. i. 27), *ἀσχημοσύνη* is explained to mean the formlessness of the blessed pre-existent Being, *ἡ ἀσχημάτιστος οὐσία*. Again, it is explained that the publicans (*τελῶναι*) who go first into the kingdom of God, are we upon whom the ends of the world (*τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων*) have come. The writer, it will be seen, makes free use of the New Testament. He seems to have used all the four Gospels, but that of which he makes most use is St. John's. He quotes from Paul's epistles to the Romans, Corinthians (both letters), Galatians, and Ephesians. There is a copious use also of the Old Testament; and besides we are told there is a use of the Gospel according to the Egyptians, and that of St. Thomas. But what most characterizes the document under consideration is the abundant use of heathen writings. For the author's method of exegesis enables him to find his system in Homer with as much ease as in the Bible. Great part of the extract given by Hippolytus is a commentary on a hymn to the Phrygian Attys, all the epithets applied to whom are shewn when etymologically examined, to be capable of a Naassene interpretation. One or two specimens of the etymology will suffice. Every temple, *ναός*, shews by its title that it is intended for the honour of the serpent *νάας*. Again, one of the first of the titles

[a] "*κερκὶς θαλασσίου ἱέρακος*." I don't know what this fish is, nor have I seen elsewhere this remarkable property of its bone.

[b] Schneidewin unwarrantably edits Ialdabaoth, the fact being that this system differs altogether in its nomenclature from that of the Zoroastric Ophites.

applied to Attys is *πάπας*. Here we are taught to recognize him who brought to rest (*ἔπαυσε*) all the disorderly motion that prevailed before his appearing. To him all things cry *παῦε, παῦε, τὴν ἀσυμφωνίαν.* In like manner it is explained that, in this hymn, *αἰπόλος* does not mean a goatherd, nor *ἀμύγδαλος* an almond, but the reader will not care to be informed of the mysteries which these words contain. This exegesis can be paralleled by anyone who has chanced to meet some of the insane documents which in our own days are issued from time to time by crazy persons who fancy themselves to be inspired, and who are able to find support for their pretensions in texts of Scripture used with utter disregard of their context. According to our view the Naassene writer under consideration was a person of this kind, not a philosophic writer, nor the originator of the Ophite system which he teaches, but one trained up in it, and proud to give new proofs and illustrations of it of his own discovery. Although the myths of the earlier Ophite system are but lightly touched on, there is some trace of an acquaintance with them, as for example the myth that the first created man lay crawling until a spirit was poured into him from above, and the story of the descent of Christ through the seven heavens on his mission to release the higher elements imprisoned in chaos.

We turn now to the section which treats of the Peratae. It had been known from Clement of Alexandria that there was a sect of that name, though he tells nothing as to its tenets. Hippolytus was acquainted with more books of the sect than one. One called *οἱ προάστειοι* appears to have been of an astrological character, treating of the influence of the stars upon the human race, and connecting various heathen mythologies with the planetary powers. For the astrology of the Naassene writer, see p. 102. But there was besides a treatise the resemblance of the doctrine of which to that previously described as Naassene we have already remarked. According to this, the world is one, but admits of a threefold division, *πατήρ, υἱός, ὕλη*. Each of these parts contains in itself an infinity of powers. The first is perfect goodness, unbegotten, *μέγεθος** *πατρικόν*, the second is *ἀγαθὸν αὐτογενές*; the third *γεννητόν, ἰδικόν*. Intermediate between Hyle and the father sits the Son, the Word, the Serpent, ever turning, now to the immovable father, now to the moving Hyle, drawing powers from the first by means of which Hyle, in itself destitute of properties or of form, is fashioned according to the ideas received from the father. These he draws in some ineffable manner, just as the various colours passed into the sheep from the rods which Jacob set up, or rather as a painter transfers forms to his canvas without detracting aught from his model. When, then, the Saviour says, "Your Father which is in heaven," he means that heavenly father, the first principle, from which the forms have been derived; but when he says "your father was a murderer from the beginning," he means the ruler and framer of Hyle, who, taking the forms transmitted by the Son, works generation here, a work which is destruction and death. For the redemption of this world below, Christ was made to descend in the days of Herod, from the region of the unbegotten, a man himself threefold, having in himself powers from the three parts of the world, "for in Him the whole Pleroma was pleased to dwell bodily," and in Him was the whole Godhead. His mission is in order that those elements which descended from above may by him be enabled to return, while those elements which plotted against the higher ones shall be separated and left for punishment. Thus, then, when it is said "the Son of Man came not to destroy the world, but that the world through Him might be saved," by "the world" is meant the two superior parts, *τὸ ἀγέννητον* and *τὸ αὐτογέννητον*; but when the Scripture says "that we should not be condemned with the world," by the world is meant the third part or the *κόσμος ἰδικός*; for that part must be destroyed, but the two superior parts freed from destruction. When, then, the Saviour comes into the world, just as the amber attracts the chaff, and the magnet the iron, and the spine of the sea hawk the gold, so this serpent attracts to himself those whose nature is such as to be capable of receiving his influence. Such persons are called Peratae, because, by means of their "knowledge" they have learned how safely to pass through (*περᾶσαι*) the corruption to which everything that is generated is subject. All the ignorant are Egyptians. Egypt is the body, coming out of Egypt is coming out of the body, and passing the Red Sea, that is the water of destruction; or, in other words, generation. Those, however, who suppose themselves to have passed the Red Sea, are still liable to be assailed by the gods of destruction, whom Moses called the serpents of the desert, who bite and destroy those who had hoped to escape the power of the gods of generation. For these Moses exhibited the true and perfect serpent, on whom they who believed were not bitten by the gods of destruction. None but this true serpent, the perfect of the perfect, can save and deliver those who go out of Egypt, that is to say from the body and from the world. In the sketches here given we have by no means touched on all the coincidences between what Hippolytus calls the Naassene and Peratic systems; but we consider that enough has been told not only to shew that in both works the doctrines of the same sect are described, but also that there is a literary dependence of one work on the other. If the two had not the same author it seems to us that the Peratic work is the elder, and that it was made use of by the writer who uses the name Naassene.

In close connection with these two sections ought to be considered what Hippolytus tells under the head MONOIMUS. In the article with that title we have given an account of his system, and pointed out that he belongs to the Naassene sect. The extracts of Hippolytus begin with a quotation from Homer—

ὠκεανὸς γένεσίς τε θεῶν γένεσίς τ' ἀνθρώπων

used by the Naassene writer, pp. 105, 106. He quotes the Naassene hymn, "Father, mother, the two immortal names." He makes his supreme first principle to be "Man" and the "Son of Man." He quotes in exactly the same form the text that "it pleased the whole ple-

* The technical use of the word *μέγεθος* is found also in the Naassene system, p. 107. (See also the Valentinian fragment, Epiph. *Haer.* 31, p. 168.)

roma to dwell bodily in the Son of Man." He teaches the same ascetic doctrine, and describes the men outside his sect as *ὅσοι περὶ τὸ γέννημα τῆς θηλείας εἰσὶ πεπλανημένοι.* He finds mysteries in Moses' rod (compare p. 133). He employs the same vocabulary *ἀβασιλεύτως* (pp. 107, 113), *μαχίμη* (compare pp. 269, 110), *μυριόμματος καὶ μυριώνυμος* (pp. 270, 117), *ῥυείση ἄνωθεν*, pp. 270, 115, &c. On the whole the evidence is conclusive that Monoimos was a teacher of this Peratic sect; and apparently his work was used by the Naassene writer.

Coincidences, not less numerous and less striking, are to be found between the Naassene extracts and other writings preserved by Hippolytus. Thus the "fiery god," of whose origin the Naassene gives no explanation, is to be found in the Docetic system (p. 265); and we may also compare the Docetic explanation of the parable of the sower (p. 263) with the Naassene (p. 113). Again, although the system of Justinus differs totally in character from the Naassene, being mythical rather than philosophical, yet there are some striking coincidences. For instance, both find their Good Being in the heathen use of the phallic emblem crowned with fruits (pp. 102, 157), and there Justinus gives a derivation of the name Priapus quite in the style of the Naassene etymology. Again, there is much resemblance between the language in which both speak of the "water above the firmament (pp. 121, 158). The names Naas and Esaldaeus are common to the two writers. Both also endeavour to find their doctrines beneath the veil of heathen mythologies. Under the article SIMON we shall mention some apparent instances of the use in later systems of the work ascribed to that heretic.

When we attempt from such coincidences as have been pointed out, to draw inferences as to the relations between the systems in which they are found, there is an element of uncertainty arising from the fact, that these coincidences are between different documents known to us only through Hippolytus, and that we have no evidence how these documents came into his hands, whether from one source or from several. Gnosticism was evidently in much less credit in his time than it had been in the days of Irenaeus. The works which Irenaeus refutes were in open circulation, but in the time of Hippolytus the Gnostic sects were burrowing underground, and it is his pride to drag to light their secret documents, of which he was evidently an ardent collector. Now collectors are sometimes imposed on by dealers; so that when we find Hippolytus possessed of books purporting to be by heretical teachers of whom we hear from no one else, we cannot quite refuse to put to ourselves the question, did such teachers ever exist, or is it not possible that a heretic who had got a good price from Hippolytus for one of his books, may have been tempted to compose others under different names, with no other object than to sell them to his orthodox customer. But since, notwithstanding many points of agreement, the documents reported as by Hippolytus differ so much among themselves as to make common authorship unlikely, we think their resemblances may be more probably accounted for by the hypothesis, that several reached Hippolytus from the same quarter. He might, for instance, have got hold of the library of the writer whom we have called Naassene, and so have become possessed of the very books which had suggested his speculations.

Besides the two sections already considered, the fifth book of Hippolytus contains sections on two other Ophite systems, that of the Sethians and of Justinus. The latter has been described under its proper head (Vol. III., p. 587). It will be convenient to treat of the former here.

The Sethians [Σιθιανοί, Hippol.; Σηθιανοί, Epiph.; Sethoitae, Ps.-Tert.]. The systems described by Hippolytus under this name in his earlier and in his later work appear to have been quite different. Seth seems to have played no part in the system of the latter book, which appears to have been called Sethite only because contained in a book called the Paraphrase of Seth. It is very closely related to a myth told in the earlier treatise under the head of Nicolaitans, but the Sethite story of the earlier treatise threw some of the commonplaces of Gnosticism into the form of a myth, of which Seth was the hero. This myth is to be found in Epiph. *Haer.* 39; Philaster, 3; Ps.-Tert. 8, the coincidences of language clearly shewing that all three writers drew from the same source. Another article of Epiphanius, on the Archontici (*Haer.* 40) evidently treats of the same school, books of which seem to have become directly known to Epiphanius. Two of these, a greater and a lesser, were called Symphonia; a third was called Ἀλλογενεῖς, by which latter name the sons of Seth were denoted, some books being written in their name, and some in that of their father. The myth assumes the ordinary Gnostic principle, that it was only by inferior angels that the world was made. The myth went on to tell that two of these angels, by intercourse with Eve, became the fathers of Cain and Able respectively. Then arose strife between the angels, which resulted in the death of Abel by the hands of Cain. Then the mother (no doubt the same as the Sophia Prunikos of the other legends), in order to destroy the power of these angels, caused Seth to be born of Adam (and therefore of a "different race" from his elder brothers) and endowed him with a spark of power from above, to enable him to resist the angelic powers and to become the father of a pure seed. The purity of the race, however, becoming corrupted by intermarriages, the mother sent the deluge to sweep away the corrupt brood, but the angels defeated her design by introducing into the ark Ham, one of the race which she had wished to destroy. So the confusion of the world continued and there was a necessity for further interference by the descent of Christ, who according to some of these books was identical with Seth. The angelic nomenclature of these books agrees (but for trifling variations) with that of the Irenaean Ophites. Thus it is Sabaoth, not Ialdabaoth, who is identified with the God of the Jews. The books told of Sethite prophets called Martiades and Marsianus, who were said to have ascended to heaven and apparently to have brought down revelations.

The Sethite section of the later treatise of Hippolytus is of quite a different nature, and aims at being of a philosophic rather than a mythical character, yet, as we have said, it is the development of an older myth told by Epi-

phanius (*Haer.* 25, p. 80), of so repulsive a character that we do not care to relate it at length. As told by Hippolytus it strongly presents Zoroastrian features which are absent from the other sections of his fifth book, the opposition between light and darkness being the main theme. These so-called Sethites, then, teach that there are three principles of the universe, each of those principles containing under it an infinity of powers. These principles are, above, light; below, darkness; and separating between them the spirit, which is to be understood not as a wind perceptible to sense, but as a certain subtle fragrance. The light then pours its rays, the spirit sheds its fragrance, some of which fall upon the terrible waters of darkness, and these eagerly lay hold of the light and strive to detain it. From the concourse of these principles is generated a great womb, namely the seal or type of heaven and earth, which may be seen to have the form of a pregnant womb. In like manner, though the various powers included under the three principles are at rest when by themselves, yet when powers of different kinds come near each other they rush together, and from their concourse is formed a seal or type. In this way, from the concourse of the infinite variety of powers were formed the ideas of the different kinds of living creatures. The agent which gave these actual existence was a principle first born of the water, a rushing mighty wind, the cause of all generation, which is also described as a flying serpent. Through its means some of the light which fell on the darkness and some of the sweet savour of the spirit are bound in human bodies and cannot find release. Then, since the foul womb will admit no form but that of the serpent, the perfect word deceived it by assuming the like form and entering into the womb in order to effect the release of the imprisoned elements. This is what is meant by the "form of a serpent," and by the "Word of God descending into a virgin's womb." By bringing the compounded elements within the reach of this more powerful attraction the compound is resolved. Like runs to like; the Logos elements in man run to the perfect Logos "as chaff runs to amber, as iron runs to the magnet, as gold to the bone of the sea hawk." This resolution of compounds is what is referred to in the saying, "I come not to send peace on earth, but rather a sword."

The appearance for the third time of the illustration[d] from the bone of the sea-hawk arrests attention and forces us to enquire whether, in spite of great apparent unlikeness, this Sethite system may not have affinities with the Naassene and Peratic systems previously described. We find that these heretics have no resemblance whatever to those elsewhere designated Sethites, and that they seem to have been so called by Hippolytus merely because their doctrines were taught in a book bearing the name of Seth. The peculiar character of the book is accounted for when we gain independent knowledge that it is founded on a myth of the Zoroastrian school to which it attempts, with but poor success, to give a philosophic character. But all the fundamental ideas are the same as in the previous sections of the 5th book. We have again the threefold division of the universe, the identification of the Logos with the serpent, the representation of the object of his mission as the releasing of the elements imprisoned in matter. There is the same perverse system of Scripture exegesis; and some sacramental rite of the sect seems to be referred to in what is insisted on in this, as in the other systems, that every one who wishes to put off the form of the serpent, and to put on the heavenly garment, must wash and drink the cup of living water (p. 143: compare p. 158, pp. 100, 116, 121).

Whatever opinion we form as to the authorship of this Sethite document, the affinity of the sect with those previously described is unmistakable. There is, however, far less room to doubt the affinity of the sect with those called DOCETAE (p. 262, sqq.). In a previous article we have noticed the singular discovery of a proof of the triplicity of nature from the three words σκότος, γνόφος, θύελλα (Deut. v. 22). We may here add the technical use of the words ἰδέα, χαρακτήρ, and the illustration drawn from the eye (pp. 139, 266).

I have no doubt that if any one were to take the trouble to make a concordance to this work of Hippolytus, he would find many coincidences between things told of different sects, which escape one who has made no systematic search for them. On the whole the conclusion at which I arrive is, that we are to take the sections in Hippolytus as representing not necessarily the teaching of different sects, but of different books with which he became acquainted. It is possible that these books may, as he supposed, have emanated from different sects; for the Gnostic sects had affinities between themselves, of which, with our present information, we cannot pretend to give a historical account, many fundamental thoughts and many myths being common to sects which we must recognise as distinct. It is also possible that books which Hippolytus supposed to describe the doctrines of different heresies really emanated from the same sect, nay even may have had a common authorship. So much of what we are told by Hippolytus is peculiar to himself, and cannot be checked by other sources of information that it seems rash to be over-confident in choosing in what way the coincidences that have been pointed out are to be accounted for.

Ophite teaching was, as we believe, dying out in the days of Hippolytus; in the time of Epiphanius it was not absolutely extinct, but the notices in his work would lead us to think of it as but the eccentric doctrine of some stray heretic here and there, and not to have counted many adherents. In the 5th century Theodoret tells (*Haer. Fab.* i. 24) of having found serpent worship practised in his diocese by people whom he calls Marcionites, but whom we may believe to have been really Ophites. But the most curious instance of the spread and survival of the notions of this sect is that Ophite teachers would seem to have penetrated to India (see *Asiatic Researches*, x. p. 40). [G. S.]

OPILIO, deacon of the church of Venafrum, and Crescentius were accused of selling certain

[d] Possibly this illustration was found in the work of Simon, and was borrowed thence by later Gnostic writers.

of the ornaments of the church to a Jew, viz. two silver chalices, two coronae with the dolphins that supported them, the lilies from other coronae, and six large and seven small pallia. Gregory, in August 591, directs the sub-deacon Anthemius to inquire into the matter. (*Epp.* i. 68.) [F. D.]

OPILIUS, bishop of Ebusus (Iviça), attended the council of bishops assembled by Hunneric at Carthage in A.D. 484 (*Notitia Africana*, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 276). Ebusus, with the Balearic Islands, then belonged, both civilly and ecclesiastically, to the Province of Sardinia. [F. D.]

OPINATORES (OPINARII, OPINANTES), heretics so named from the Latin rendering of the word Δοκηταί (Baron. *A. E.* ann. 191, ii). [DOCETAE.] [C. H.]

OPPA, bishop of Tuy, signs thirty-third the canons of the 13th Council of Toledo, in A.D. 683. His episcopate must have been short, as his predecessor signs the canons of the 12th, and his successor those of the 15th, Council of Toledo, in A.D. 681 and 688 (Tejado y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 481, 512). Florez (*Esp. Sag.* xxii. 33) disproves the theory that he was the same person as the traitor Oppas. [F. D.]

OPPAS, archbishop of Seville, son of king EGICA, and brother of king WITIZA, the last but one of the Gothic kings of Spain. He became archbishop shortly before his brother's death. That he and his brother Sisebut, and his nephews, the sons of Witiza, headed a party hostile to RODERIC, and that the defeat of the latter by the Arabs, and the conquest of Spain, was mainly due to their treason or treachery seems certain, but the details are wrapt in the obscurity in which all the events connected with the overthrow of the Goths are involved. According to one version (Sebastian, *Chron.* in *Esp. Sag.* xiii. 478) they sent messengers to invite the invaders from Africa, and furnished them with ships. Dozy (*Recherches sur l'histoire de l'Espagne*, i. 74) disbelieves this story, as unsupported by Arabian sources, from which he gives the following account. The family of Witiza had been apparently but not really reconciled to Roderic, and avenged themselves upon him by deserting him in the fatal battle. They supposed that the expedition of Taric, like that of his predecessor Tarif, was a mere descent for plunder, and that on his departure they would be able to regain the throne, and indeed Mousa, when he despatched his lieutenant, had no designs of permanent conquest. When they discovered their mistake, they came to terms with the conquerors, and Oppas in particular is accused of taking an active part on their side on two occasions. He arrested and executed certain lords at Toledo, who were meditating flight (Isidorus Pacensis in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcvi. 1263), and he accompanied the army that attacked Pelayo in his mountain stronghold, and was taken prisoner in their rout (*Chron. Albeldense* in *Esp. Sag.* xiii. 450). According to the Chronicle of Sebastian (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 479) he was sent to summon Pelayo to surrender. (Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2), 242; *Esp. Sag.* ix. 229). [F. D.]

OPPILA, an ambassador from the Spanish Arian king Leovigild to Chilperic, the catholic king of the Franks. On his first arrival he professed to hold the catholic faith, but his Arianism was discovered by an observation he made upon the worship of the Frank church:—"You do not recite the gloria correctly; for whereas we, after St. Paul, say 'Gloria Deo Patri per filium,' you say 'Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto.'" There followed a long debate, which is preserved in Gregory of Tours, but with what effect on Oppila is not known. His colleague Agila, however, after his return to Spain, adopted the catholic view (Greg. Turon. *Hist. Fr.* vi. 40 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 316). [R. J. K.]

OPPORTUNA, ST., abbess of Monasteriolum or Montreuil in Normandy. To other virtues she added extreme gentleness, correcting the faults of her nuns with words instead of blows. When her brother St. Godegrand bishop of Séez returned from a seven years' pilgrimage to Rome, and was murdered at the instigation of his kinsman and locum-tenens, Chrodobert, between Opportuna's monastery and that of her aunt St. Lantildis at Almenèches, she carried him to Monasteriolum, and buried him in her church. She survived him one year, dying about A.D. 770. Her life, written in the following century by St. Adalelmus or Adelinus, bishop of Séez, is given by Mabillon, *Acta SS. O. S. B.* iii. pars. ii. 220, edit. 1672, and by Henschenius, Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. iii. p. 61. Her day is April 22. She is not commemorated in the old Martyrologies, nor in the modern Roman, but is praised in the Acts of St. Godegrand (Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. i. 763; *Gallia Christiana*, xi. 677). She is one of the patron saints of Paris and of Almenèches and is represented with an angel near her, in allusion to a tradition that when she entered the monastery to take the veil, the nuns saw her guardian angel walking by her side (Cahier, *Caractéristiques des Saints*, 43, 626, 660). [A. B. C. D.]

OPPORTUNUS (1), abbat of the monastery of ST. LEONTIUS (72), complained to Gregory the Great that certain relics of the martyr had been stolen from his church. Gregory thereupon writes to Petrus, bishop of Hydruntum, (Otranto) asking him to send something to be substituted in their place, as the body of Leontius was preserved in the church of Brundusium, over which Petrus had a visitatorial jurisdiction (*Epp.* vi. 62). [F. D.]

OPPORTUNUS (2), of Aprutium (Teramo) had been rebuked by Gregory the Great, who, hearing afterwards that he was overwhelmed with grief in consequence, wrote to encourage him, exhorting him to turn to God with his whole heart, to be charitable to his neighbours, to forgive injuries, and to think it gain if he had been unjustly blamed. (*Epp.* x. 68.) Gregory afterwards heard that he was leading a religious life, and directs Passivus, bishop of Firmum, to summon him and exhort him to persevere; and if he found he had done nothing worthy of death, to advise him to become a monk or subdeacon, and after a time, commit to his charge Aprutium, which had long been without a pastor (xii. 12). [F. D.]

OPTATIANUS. [PORFIRIUS.]

OPTATUS (1), a bishop stated to have appeared after death in a vision to St. Saturus. Morcelli (*Afr. Chr.* ii. 54) makes him bishop of Carthage, A.D. 201–204. [PERPETUA.] Tillemont concludes that nothing can be decided from the mention of Optatus as to the place of martyrdom of St. Saturus and St. Perpetua. (Tillemont, iii. 151, 644; *Visio Saturi* in Boll. *Acta SS.* 7 Mart. i. 636.) [R. J. K.]

OPTATUS (2), African bishop (Cyp. *Ep.* 56). [AHIMNIUS.] [E. W. B.]

OPTATUS (3), Carthaginian confessor, after being lector and master of catechumens (*Doctor Audientium*), to which office he was appointed after examination by the bishop and presbyter-teachers (*doctores*, compare *Aspasius* in *Act. Perpet. et Felic.* xiii.), he was made subdeacon at the same time and for the same purpose as SATURUS was ordained for. (Cyp. *Ep.* 29; *Ep.* 35.) [E. W. B.]

OPTATUS (4), a bishop mentioned in the Acts of ST. JUSTINA (4). He is said to have baptized that saint, and to have ordained her father a presbyter (Boll. *Acta SS.* 26 Sep. vii. 218). The Bollandist Cleus, followed by Le Quien, reckons him bishop of Antioch in Pisidia, about A.D. 300. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* i. 1037.) [G. T. S.]

OPTATUS (5) [SARAGOSSA, MART. OF.]

OPTATUS (6), saint and martyr (?), bishop of Milevis, or Mileum (Milah), a town of Numidia, 25 m. N.W. of Cirta (Shaw, *Trav.* p. 63), a vigorous opponent of the Donatists. He says of himself that he wrote about sixty years, or rather more, after the persecution under Diocletian, i.e. c. A.D. 363. St. Jerome speaks of him in general terms as having written during the reigns of Valentinian and Valens, A.D. 365–378. But in the second book of his treatise Siricius is mentioned as bishop of Rome, "qui est noster socius." As Siricius did not succeed Damasus until A.D. 384, these words may have been inserted, as Baronius suggests, by the transcriber of his book, or he may have outlived the period mentioned by St. Jerome, and himself inserted them at a later time. The date of his death, however, is unknown. He is called a saint by Fulgentius, and a martyr by Baronius, on the authority of the Roman Martyrology, which connects his name with June 4. But no church or altar is known to be dedicated to his memory, and no public persecution was raging at any time when his death may be supposed to have taken place. St. Augustine mentions his name once in the same sentence as St. Ambrose, and elsewhere as a church-writer of high authority, even among Donatists. (*Opt. c. Don.* i. 13, ii. 3; S. Hieron. *Vir. Illustr.* c. 110, vol. ii. p. 706; Aug. *c. Don. ep.* (*de Unit. Eccl.*) 19, 50; *c. Parm.* i. 3, 5; *Brevic. Coll.* 20, 38; *Doctr. Christ.* ii. 40, 61; Baronius, *Ann.* vol. iv. p. 243; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* ii. 275; Dupin, *Optatus Praef.* 1.)

The treatise of Optatus against the Donatists is in the form of a letter to Parmenian, Donatist bishop of Carthage, and consists of six books, with a seventh of doubtful authenticity.

I. The first book opens with a eulogy of peace, which he complains that the Donatists set at nought by reviling the Catholics. He adds some compliments to Parmenian, as the only one of his party with whom he can communicate freely, and regrets being compelled to do so by letter, because they refuse to meet for conference. Some statements by Parmenian, who is a "peregrinus," i.e. perhaps not a native of Africa, but certainly belonging to a different province, were made in ignorance, especially such as related to the sending of the soldiers. Like the Catholics, Donatists maintain unity of baptism, yet they repeat it, and in so doing covertly commend themselves as the only persons fit to administer that rite. But if it be unlawful for "traditors" to do this, they ought to be excluded, for their own fathers were guilty of "tradition;" and if for schismatics, they themselves are guilty of schism. Five points call for discussion, to which Optatus adds a sixth. 1. In accusing Catholics of "tradition," particulars ought to be specified of time and place. 2. The true church ought to be defined. 3. Which side is really responsible for calling in the aid of the soldiers. 4. What Parmenian means by "sinners" whose "oil and sacrifice" God rejects. 5. The question of baptism. 6. The riotous and rash acts of the Donatists. But before proceeding farther Optatus finds fault with Parmenian for his inconsiderate language about our Lord's baptism, to the effect that His flesh required to be "drowned in the flood" of Jordan, in order to remove its impurity. If the baptism of Christ's body were intended to suffice for the baptism of each single person, there might be some truth in this, but we are baptized, in virtue not of the flesh of Christ, but of His name, and moreover we cannot believe that even His flesh contracted sin, for it was more pure than Jordan itself. It is probable, however, as Ribbeck remarks, that Optatus, in his anxiety to prevent misapplication by others of the language of Parmenian in this matter, has taken it in too literal a sense, and imputed to it a meaning beyond what it was intended to convey. Having complained of Parmenian for dragging in heretical names irrelevantly, as if to magnify his charges against the church, he agrees with him in what he says about heretics, how the gifts of the church, the sacraments, and marriage do not truly belong to them, and he quotes Cant. iv. 12, vi. 9, in support of this view. They have not the keys of St. Peter, nor the ring which is the seal of admission, closing the "fountain," for it was not Caecilianus who withdrew from the chair of Peter and of Cyprian, but Majorinus, whose seat is now filled by Parmenian. As a schismatic, he ought to shrink from joining heretics, for there is a great difference between heresy and schism, yet by their conduct the Donatists condemn themselves in this respect. But it is necessary to recount the history of the past, which he gives in detail, for which the reader may be referred for the most part to the articles on DONATISM, Vol. I. p. 882; CAECILIANUS, *ib.* p. 367; FELIX (26), Vol. II. p. 487; LUCILLA, Vol. III. p. 751. A few particulars, however, may be added. 1. That Mensurius, having been summoned by Maxentius to account for his protection afforded to Felix (187), died on his return to Carthage. 2. The schism at Car-

thage arose partly from the disappointment of Botrus and Celestius, partly from the ill-will of the Seniors against Caecilianus for detecting their dishonesty, and partly from the conduct of Lucilla. The purpose of Optatus is to shew that it was not the church which cast off the Donatists, but they who separated from the church, following in this respect the example of Korah and his company. When they disclaim the right of princes to interfere in the affairs of the church they contradict their forefathers, who, when the matter of Caecilianus was in dispute, petitioned Constantine to grant them judges from Gaul instead of from Africa.

II. In the second book Optatus proceeds to discuss the question, what is the church, the dove and bride of Christ, Cant. vi. 9. Its holiness consists in the sacraments, and is not to be measured by the pride of men. It is universal, not limited, as Parmenian would have it, to a corner of Africa, for if so where would be the promises of Pss. ii. 8, lxxii. 8? And the merits of the Saviour would be restricted, Pss. cxiii. 3, xcvi. 7. The church has five gifts, which Donatists make six. 1. The chair of Peter. 2. The angel which is attached inseparably to the first. By this Optatus appears to mean the power of conferring spiritual gifts, which resides in the centre of episcopal unity. Parmenian must be aware that the episcopal chair was conferred from the beginning on Peter, the chief of the apostles, so that in virtue of this one chair unity might be preserved among the rest, and no one apostle set up a rival opponent. This chair, with whose exclusive claim for respect the little Donatist community can in no way compete [MACROBIUS, MONTENSES, Vol. III. 781, 947], carries with it necessarily the "angel" (ducit ad se angelum), unless the Donatists have this gift enclosed for their own use in a narrow space, and excluding the seven angels of St. John (Rev. i.), with whom they have no communion; or if they possess one of these, let them send him to other churches: otherwise their case falls to the ground. 3. The holy spirit of adoption, which Donatists claim exclusively for themselves, applying to Catholics unjustly the words of our Lord about proselytism, Matth. xxiii. 15. 4. The fountain (probably faith) of which heretics cannot partake, and 5. its seal, "annulus" (probably baptism), Cant. iv. 12. But a want of clearness in the language of Optatus at this point renders his meaning somewhat doubtful. The Donatists add a sixth gift, the "umbilicus" of Cant. vii. 2, which they regard as the altar; but this, being an essential part of the body, cannot be a separate gift. These gifts belong to the church in Africa, from which the Donatists have cut themselves off, as also from the priesthood, which they seek by re-baptism to annul, though they do not rebaptize their own returned seceders. But why do they lay so much stress on gifts, for these belong to the bride, not the bride to them. They regard them as the generating power of the church instead of the essentials (viscera), viz. the Sacraments, which derive their virtue from the Trinity. Parmenian truly compares the church to a garden, but it is God who plants the trees therein, some of which Donatists seek to exclude. In offering the sacrifice to God in the Eucharist, they profess to offer for the one church, but by their re-baptism they really make two churches. Thanking Parmenian for his language about the church, which, however, he claims as applicable to the Catholic church alone, he challenges him to point out any act of persecution on its part. Constantine took pains to restore peace and suppress idolatry, but another emperor, who declared himself an apostate, when he restored idolatry allowed the Donatists to return, a permission for the acceptance of which they ought to blush. It was about this time that the outrages broke out in Africa [FELIX (185), URBANUS], of which when Primosus complained, the Donatist council at Theneste took no notice. Besides others mentioned above [Vol. I. p. 883] they compelled women under vows to disregard them and perform a period of penance, and deposed from his office Donatus bishop of Tysedis. Yet they speak of holiness as if Christ gave it without conditions, and take every opportunity of casting reproach on church ordinances, fulfilling the words of Ezek. xiii. 20.

III. In the third book, after going over again some of the former ground, and as before laying the blame of the schism on the Donatists, Optatus applies to them, in a figurative way, several passages of Scripture, especially Pss. lxxxvii., cxlvii., Is. ii. 3, xxii. 1, 9. In these he considers Zion, though destroyed as a city, to denote the church spread over the Roman empire. The "old pool" (Is. xxii. 9) answers to baptism, which, together with the fish of Tobit vi. denoting Jesus Christ, they have endeavoured to divert. Daniel foretold four persecutions, but neither of these answers to the so-called persecution under Macarius, and their proceedings have made them liable to the denunciation of Ezek. xiii. 10–15, for it was their wall of "untempered mortar" which Leontius and others were obliged to destroy. If these men were to blame, then Elijah and Phineas were so also. They surely come under the denunciation of Is. v. 20, and also the prophecies about Tyre, Is. xxiii., Ezek. xxviii.

IV. In the fourth book, disclaiming all unfriendly feeling, and appealing to the common possessions of both parties, Optatus charges the Donatists with infraction of unity by appointment of bishops, and by proselytism, by forbidding social intercourse, and perversely applying to Catholics Scripture passages directed against obstinate heretics, as 1 Cor. v. 11, 2 John 10. As to the "oil and sacrifice" which they say ought not to be administered by sinners, God is the judge of this, as appears from Ps. l. 16-20, and the word "sinners" in Ps. cxli. 5 ought not to be applied in the sense in which they apply it against Catholics.

V. In his fifth book Optatus returns to the oft-repeated subject of re-baptism. Of his argument an abstract will be found in Vol. I. p. 886, to which little need be added. The repetition of baptism, he says, is an insult to the Trinity, worse than the doctrines of Praxeas and the Patripassians. In the confusion caused by the opposite doctrines of Catholics and Donatists, an umpire seems to be necessary, but what judge, he asks, can be required beyond the plain words of Scripture, John xiii. 8, Eph. iv. 5? Three elements are requisite: (1) the Trinity, (2) the minister, (3) the faithful receiver; but of these the Donatists exalt the second above the other

two. They use as a quotation words not found in Scripture, "How can a man give what he has not received?" (see 1 Cor. iv. 7); but in baptism God alone is the giver of grace. As it is not the dyer who changes the colour of his wool, so neither does the minister of himself change the operation of baptism. Of two candidates for baptism, if one refused to renounce while the other consented, there can be no doubt which of them received baptism effectually. By re-baptizing Donatists rob Christians of their marriage garment, that robe which suits all ages and conditions of life. He who has permitted himself to be rebaptized will rise no doubt at the last day, but he will rise naked, and the voice of the Master will be heard, "Friend, I once knew thee, and gave thee a marriage-garment; who has despoiled thee of it, into what trap, amongst what thieves hast thou fallen?" According to Donatists, he who misses their ministers and doorkeepers is cast out of the heavenly company; will their holiness raise the dead and mend men's lives? If not, why meddle with the living and slay those that ought not to die? (Ezek. xiii. 19.)

VI. In the sixth book he repeats some previous charges against Donatists, and adds others, how they destroyed altars, the "seats of Christ's Body and Blood," at which they themselves must have offered. But during service the tables are covered, and if so, not the wooden tables but the cloths must have been in fault, but if the tables, then the ground on which they stood. They have broken up chalices and sold them to women and even to pagans, yet they quote Hagg. ii. 14; but even impurity of men does not profane the vessels of service, see Numb. xvi. 37, 38. They compelled virgins to change their caps, but St. Paul gave no command about virgins, 1 Cor. vii. 25, thus confessing that he had expended the "two pence" of Luke x. 35, viz. the two Testaments. By taking away these caps, which in themselves are no remedy against sin, they expose the women to danger. They have also taken away sacred books and instruments, and ventured to purify the latter of these; but if so why not the books also? They have washed the walls of churches with salt water, and forbidden in them burial of Catholics. Lastly, they seek to seduce Catholics from the faith.

VII. The seventh book, which is not mentioned by St. Jerome, but which may on good MS. grounds be ascribed to Optatus, is supplementary to the six previous books, and answers a fresh complaint made by the Donatists, that if they are the children of "traditors," as Optatus says, they ought to be let alone, and no attempt made to "reconcile" them; but, says Optatus, though their fathers deserved to be excluded, there is no reason why they should be so, for the church repels no baptized persons. Christ allows two sorts of seed to grow in His field, and no bishop has power to do what the apostles could not, viz. separate them. They might have refused to communicate with Peter because he denied his Lord, yet he retained the keys given to him by Christ. They sometimes quote Eccl. x. 1 regarding "ointment" as God's grace; but if the ointment belongs exclusively to them, how can Catholics corrupt it if Donatists refuse to mix with them? They compare themselves to Moses withstanding Jannes and Jambres, but are the chair and keys of Peter signs of falsehood? The case ought really to be inverted. Lastly their accusations against Macarius cannot be sustained, but Donatists seek to condemn him in his absence by the testimony of persons who do not acknowledge that he acted wrongly.

The foregoing abstract, taken in connexion with the article on Donatism (Vol. I. pp. 885, 886), may perhaps be taken as a sufficient account of the work of Optatus, of which we may say that it is more important in a historical than in a doctrinal point of view. As a theological treatise it is often loose and rambling, and guilty of frequent repetition; but it exposes with clearness and force the inconsistency of the Donatists, and of all who, like them, fix their attention exclusively on the ethical side of religion, estimated by an arbitrary standard of opinion, to the disregard of other conditions of the greatest importance in the constitution of a church. How perversely and inconsistently the Donatists applied this principle in the matter of re-baptism, Optatus again and again demonstrates, returning in various parts of his treatise to this point with much soreness of feeling. That there was a doctrine of re-baptism in the African church, to which Cyprian had lent the weight of his authority, there can be no doubt, but with him it was directed against heretics; on the principle that the followers of Marcion, Praxeas, and the like, were in fact not truly Christians, and thus their baptism was in itself valueless. But Optatus is never weary of urging, that though by their own act Donatists had incurred the charge of schism, the church did not regard them as heretics, and that they ought not to treat as heretical their brethren who disclaimed fastening on them that opprobrious name. In maintaining the unity of the church, a principle upheld by Donatists no less strongly than by Catholics, Optatus insists greatly on communion with the church of Rome and the chair of St. Peter, and he is accordingly cited by Romanist writers with much confidence as an important witness to the supremacy of the papal chair. No doubt his words taken alone appear strongly to support that view, but they must be weighed in connexion with the words and also the conduct of Cyprian and other church authorities, and thus compared they will be found to assert no more than the necessity, so obvious in that day, of communion with the Roman church, and its acknowledged primacy among the other churches of the Christian community. In his application of Scripture passages, especially of a prophetical and symbolical kind, Optatus may be thought too strained and fanciful; but his mode of application is in accordance with the current interpretations of the time, and would probably agree in principle, though not in application, with such as were recognised by his opponents. His style, though not always clear, and often harsh, is for the most part homely and unpretending, and though sometimes pompous and inflated, contains one passage at least which rises to eloquence (v. 20).

The earliest printed edition of the works of Optatus was prepared by John Cochlée, dean of St. Mary, Frankfort, and published at Mentz, 1549, but was full of errors. A corrected edition of this was published at Paris in 1562 by Baudouin, and a further one by the same

editor, with corrections, notes, dissertations, and important historical additions, in 1569. This was followed in the *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum*, vol. 4. Other editions followed at various times, including one by Gabriel de l'Aubespine bishop of Orleans, published in 1631, after his death, and probably from that cause containing many mistakes, and one by Meric Casaubon, London, 1631, which as regards the text is mainly a reprint with conjectural emendations, but containing some useful notes. At length the work of a new edition, on the basis of fresh MSS., was undertaken by Dupin, who published the seven books as they now stand at Paris in 1700. This was reprinted at Amsterdam in 1701, and at Antwerp, best ed., thin folio, in 1702, and is the groundwork of all subsequent editions. One of his new MSS. contains documents relating to the Donatists, which were unknown before, and to his revised text he added valuable notes, both of his own and by previous editors. A reprint of Dupin will be found in Galland, *Bibliotheca Patr.* vol. v. The text alone was published by Oberthür in vol. 12 of his *Bibliotheca*, Würzb. 1789, with a second volume (13) of various readings and useful notes, selected and original. The form, 8vo, is convenient, and the additional documents are numbered, but the misprints are very numerous and perplexing. The text, without notes, appears in Caillau's *Collection*, vol. 57. The edition of Dupin has lately been reprinted in the 11th volume of Migne's *Patrologia*, and his pagination is preserved; but the map being smaller in size is less clear than in Dupin's folio, and all the documents previous to A.D. 362 are purposely omitted and must be sought for in vol. viii. of the *Patrologia*. Thus the edition of Dupin, though perhaps in some respects less convenient in size, is altogether the best and most comprehensive. An account of Optatus and his writings will be found in Ceillier, vol. v. [H. W. P.]

OPTATUS (7), Donatist bishop of Thamugada, in which see he preceded Gaudentius, though in what year he became bishop does not appear. (Aug. *c. Gaud.* i. 38, 52.) He was a violent partisan of the original Donatist party, and as such supported Primian against the Maximianists. He attached himself to Gildo so closely, and as his opponents said, in so servile a manner, as to obtain the name of Gildonianus, and in their opinion deserved every possible epithet of reproach, thief, plunderer, traitor, tyrant, viper, which the excesses of Gildo, during his ten years' ascendancy in Africa, drew down upon him from every one, whether Jew, Pagan or Christian. Perhaps in the violence of the general invective there is some exaggeration, especially in the charge brought against him that he regarded Gildo as a deity, but he certainly appears to have made unscrupulous use of the military force under Gildo's command to carry out a system of persecution both against Catholics and Maximianists, destroying a church belonging to the latter, and even marching, it was said, over the corpses of the slain to accomplish his purposes; and by his conduct bringing more discredit on the Donatist party than any African traitor had brought on the rest of the world. His persecution was so far successful as to compel the people of Musti and Assurae with their bishops Felicianus and Rogatus, who had succeeded to Praetextatus, to return to the original party of the Donatists, by whom his conduct is said to have been cordially approved, and his birthday, i.e. probably the anniversary of his episcopate, celebrated with honour. [FELICIANUS (4).] After the downfall of Gildo he was apprehended, and died in prison, a conclusion which Augustine was falsely charged by Petilian of contributing to bring about. His memory was held in respect by the Donatists, by whom he was regarded as a martyr. Emeritus was taunted by Augustine, if not with sympathy, at least with faint condemnation of his behaviour, and Cresconius and Petilian taxed with declaring themselves unable to express a decided opinion concerning him, either of acquittal or condemnation. In arguing with Petilian on the subject of Baptism, Augustine mentions the argument current among Donatists that Catholic Baptism was invalid, because of the bad character of those who administered it, and in reply he asks how they can regard as valid baptism by such a man as Optatus. While they argued that re-baptism was justified by the fact that St. Paul re-baptized persons baptized by St. John the Baptist, they forget that St. Paul's baptism was not in his own name, but in that of Christ, and that the efficacy of baptism does not after all depend on the personal character of the minister. (Aug. *Parm.* ii. 1, 2; *c. Petil.* i. 10, 11; 13, 14; 18, 20; ii. 23, 53, 54; 37, 85, 88, 103, 237; iii. 40, 48; *c. Cresc.* iii. 13, 16; iv. 25, 32; 46, 55; *c. Gaud.* i. 38, 52. *Ep.* li. 3; liii. 3, 6; lxxvi. 3; lxxxvii. 4, 5, 8; cviii. 2, 5.) [H. W. P.]

OPTATUS (8), prefect of Constantinople in the latter part of A.D. 404, subsequently to the banishment of Chrysostom and the conflagration of the cathedral. Optatus, who was a bigoted pagan, had held the praefectship of Egypt, c. A.D. 384 (*Cod. Theod.* ed. Gothofred, tom. vi. pp. 310, 311), and that of Constantinople in A.D. 398 (*ibid.* tom. iv. p. 493; xii. tit. i. lex 160 *de Decur.*). He was appointed praefect a second time in the place of Studius, who had shewn himself too lenient in his treatment of the adherents of Chrysostom. No such charge could be brought against Optatus. He felt the implacable animosity of a thorough pagan against the new faith, and evidently rejoiced in the opportunity offered him of treating its adherents with contumely and cruelty. He endeavoured to extort confessions of complicity in the conflagration by the most horrible tortures, under which some of his victims expired. [EUTROPIUS; SERAPION; TIGRIUS.] The noble ladies who were known to be friends and supporters of Chrysostom were dragged before him, and counselled to communicate with Arsacius or to brave the consequences. Some few complied. The majority stood firm, among whom the deaconesses Pentadia and Olympias held a distinguished place for the courage of their confession. It proving impossible to substantiate the charge of setting the cathedral on fire, and equally hopeless to bend her to his will, Olympias was dismissed. Towards the middle of the following year, A.D. 405, Olympias was summoned before Optatus a second time, and was fined 200 lb. of gold

(Socr. *H. E.* vi. 18; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 24; Pallad. *Dial.* p. 28). The fourth law *de usuris* was addressed to him, A.D. 405. (*Cod. Theod.* tom. i. p. 237; ii. tit. 33.) [E. V.]

OPTATUS (9), a bishop, perhaps of Milevis, who joined with St. Augustine and other Catholic bishops in exculpating Marcellinus from the charge brought against him by the Donatists of corrupt partiality at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411; Aug. *Ep.* cxli. 169, 13; clxxxv. 6. MARCELLINUS (7). He also wrote to Augustine a letter, of which Renatus was the bearer, requesting his opinion on the metaphysical question of the propagation of the human soul, a subject concerning which there was much discussion in the church at that time, and on which previously to the conference Marcellinus had written to Augustine and also to St. Jerome to ask their opinion, to whom, together with his wife Anapsychia, St. Jerome replied, excusing himself from discussing the question at length on the ground of want of time, but mentioning what he believed to be the opinion generally held by the Western church, viz. that the soul is transmitted by descent, though he himself was disposed to think that each soul is created separately, and recommending his correspondents to consult Augustine as being within their reach in Africa. (Aug. *Ep.* cxliii. 165.) In reference to this appeal Augustine wrote to St. Jerome declining to give any positive opinion of his own on the question, and requesting one from him, approving his condemnation of Origen's notion that, as a punishment for sins committed in other states of being, souls transmigrate into other bodies (Hieron. *adv. Ruff.* iii. 30), mentioning that in his own book on Free Will he had stated the opinions on the subject which were current at that time, and stating some important objections to them of the same kind as those which he states in his subsequent letter to Optatus. (*Ep.* clxvi. A.D. 415.) In his reply to Optatus, Augustine persists in declining to give a positive opinion, but discusses the question cautiously yet with all respect and deference for his friend. The question put by him was whether the soul is derived from a single original creation, as in the case with natural descent, or proceeds in each case from a separate act of the Creator. In his book on Free Will Augustine had mentioned two other notions, viz. that souls which existed in a previous state of being, are either transferred into other bodies by a divine impulse, or pass into them of themselves (*de Lib. Arb.* iii. 21). Dismissing in the course of his letter as untenable, some arguments of a merely verbal kind founded on such passages as Gen. ii. 23; xlvi. 26; Ps. xxxiii. (xxxii.) 15; Eccl. xii. 7; Zech. xii. 1, pointing out the error contained in Tertullian's opinion that the original of the soul was not a spiritual but a bodily substance (Tertull. *adv. Prax.* 7; *de An.* 7; Aug. *Gen. ad lit.* x. 25), and shewing that as in the case of Esau and Jacob, the soul's existence in men's corruptible body is no part of a punishment for sin committed in another state of being (Rom. ix. 11, 13), he points out the necessity of reconciling any opinion on the subject with the two cardinal doctrines (1) of original sin incurred in the person of Adam, and (2) redemption through Christ alone, with neither of which can any speculative opinion as to the origin of the soul be allowed to interfere. Even if no answer can be given to the question, the fact of redemption must stand firm. The law came in to take away any notion of men's self-sufficiency, and both they who under the law believed in a Redeemer to come, and also all righteous men at any time, either before or after the Incarnation, are raised through faith in Him. (Acts xv. 10, 11; 2 Cor. iv. 13.) As he pointed out in his letter to St. Jerome, the case appears most strongly in that of infants. Having no actual sin of their own; if they be a new creation, and in virtue of this newness they be exempt from the guilt of original sin, how can it be true, as the church believes, that this sin of theirs is remitted through the sacrament of the One Mediator, while those who die without it do not obtain the benefit which it confers? If these new souls are liable to condemnation, they must have derived their origin not from God but from some other author. God's anger is not a sudden passion but a serious determination, in which He uses the condemnation of the wicked as a warning to the good. Infants dying regenerate and taken to bliss, cannot be said to obtain this by any exercise of free will, any more than those who die without this grace in the lump (massa) of condemnation, in which, except for God's mercy, all would be included. His mercy may thus be said to assist the children and prevent the grown people. The transmission of the soul is not less intelligible than the communication of light from one object to another without diminution of itself, he cannot believe that regeneration of infants is fictitious, or that God is the author of the stain in them. While he is unable to form a definite judgment on the matter from canonical scripture, he warns his friend against falling into a new error like that of Pelagius, on which he will send him the judgment of the apostolic see, if he has not already seen it (ZOSIMUS). This heresy consists in denying, not that souls proceed from a sinful origin, but that children derive from Adam any taint which must be removed in baptism. If, said Pelagius, the soul is not propagated, but only the body, then the body alone ought to be punished. That the soul of the Mediator derived no taint from Adam cannot be doubted, not because he was unable to obtain for himself a soul without sin, nor to create a new one for that body which being free from sin He himself took from his Virgin Mother. (Aug. *Ep.* 190.) [H. W. P.]

OPTATUS (10), a presbyter, bearer of a letter from St. Augustine to Celer, proconsul of Africa. [CELER (1).] (Aug. *Ep.* 56.) [H. W. P.]

OPTATUS (11), bishop of Sitifa, A.D. 525, mentioned in the address of bishop Boniface to the council of Carthage; obliged to absent himself from the meeting of the council on a special commission for king Hilderic. (Hardouin, ii. 1075; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 284.) [R. J. K.]

OPTATUS (12) ST., bishop of Auxerre in the 6th century. Commemorated on Feb. 18 (*Gall. Chr.* xii. 266). [C .H.]

OPTATUS (13), defensor, was charged by Gregory the Great, in A.D. 603, to inquire if

certain clerics at Nursia had women in their houses who were not related to them. If this was true, he was to admonish them to desist, and if they were contumacious to call in the aid of CHRYSANTHUS, bishop of Spoleto. (*Epp.* xiii. 35.) He is probably not the same person as the defensor of the same name mentioned in another letter (*Epp.* xiii. 11). [F. D.]

OPTATUS (14), abbat of Monte Casino. St. Boniface archbishop of Mainz writes to him and his community, exhorting to brotherly love, and recommending the establishment of a confraternity with his own monks, A.D. 752. He ruled the monastery from about 752 to Jan. 4, 760. (Jaffé, *Monum. Mogunt.* 256; Bonif. *Ep.* 82 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxix.; Ceillier, xii. 52; *Vid.* Leo, *Chron. Mon. Cas.* in Pertz, *Mon. Hist.* vii. 585, 586.) [R. J. K.]

OPTIMUS (1), bishop of Antioch in Pisidia, to which he was translated from Agdamia (Soc. vii. 36), which Le Quien (i. 817) calls Acmonia in Phrygia Pacatiana. He was one of the most distinguished orthodox prelates of his time, having undauntedly defended the Catholic faith under Valens, and had refuted heretics (Theod. *H. E.* iv. 20). He attended the council of Constantinople in 381 (Theod. *H. E.* v. 8; Labbe, ii. 957), and was appointed one of the centres of Catholic communion for the Eastern church (designated "patriarch" by Socrates, *H. E.* v. 8), by the council and the emperor Theodosius, representing in that capacity the diocese of Asia, together with Amphilochius of Iconium (*Cod. Theod. de fid. Cath.* xvi. tit. i. lex 3, tom. vi. p. 9). While at Constantinople he signed the will of Gregory Nazianzen as a witness. He also shared in the bounty of Olympias for the poor of her diocese, and, dying in the imperial city, his eyes were closed by the same holy woman (Pallad. p. 116). We have a very long letter of Basil's addressed to Optimus in A.D. 377, expounding at his request the passages relating to Cain (Gen. iv. 15), Lamech (*ib.* 23–25), and the words of Simeon (Lu. ii. 34, 35) (Basil, *Ep.* 260 [317]). Optimus is mentioned in the petition of the deacon Basil and other monks, in the acts of the council of Ephesus, among the holy fathers whose doctrine they desired to follow. (Labbe, iii. 426.) [E. V.]

OPTIMUS (2), proconsul of Asia in the time of the Decian persecution, under whom several martyrs suffered at Lampsacus. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 15 Mai. iii. 453 E; Tillem. iii. 345, 346, 392–394; Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* pp. 144, 147.) [G. T. S.]

OR. [See HOR.]

ORACH, abbat of Lismore and of Inch Var-Shelmaliere, co. Wexford, died A.D. 781. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 780.) [J. G.]

ORATORIA, the name of an abbess addressed in one of the letters of Caesarius bishop of Arles, according to the reading of Holstenius, "Epistola ad Oratoriam Abbatissam" (*Codex Regul.* iii. 40); but Migne (*Pat. Lat.* t. lxvii. 1135) heads the letter, "Epistola Hortatoria ad Virginem." (Ceill. xi. 152; Boll. *Acta SS.* 27th Aug. vi. 63.) [J. G.]

ORDBRIHT (1), the name assigned to the first of the fictitious abbats of Westminster. He is stated, in Sporley's MS. history of the abbey, to have ruled for twelve years, and to have died on the 13th of January, 616 (*Mon. Angl.* i. 266). The early history of Westminster is very obscure, and the fictitious portions of it are hardly entitled to the name of legends, as they emerge so late from utter darkness. There is no mention of the abbey or of any church on the site, in any contemporary authority before the time of Hardicanute, whom the chronicle states to have been buried there (*M. H. B.* p. 432). Yet within five and twenty years the abbey has risen into the first rank of monastic foundations, and a few years later possesses a history running back to the first ages of the English Church. Under the auspices of abbat Vitalis, who ruled from 1076 to 1082, a monk called Sulcard wrote an elaborate account of the ancient and miraculous foundation; and later writers, Sporley in particular, who lived in the 15th century, threw the history back to the age of King Lucius. According to Sulcard, the founder was a Londoner of the age of Ethelbert, whom Ailred of Rievaulx and Gervase of Canterbury identify with the East Saxon king Sebert. Mellitus, when bishop of London, procured the foundation in 604, and the consecration was miraculously performed by St. Peter himself. A bare list of names carries the story on to the days of Offa, in whose name some charters were forged either in the time of Edgar or more probably on the eve of the Norman Conquest. The languishing foundation was revived under Edgar, under whose name a further collection of charters is produced, in one of which the earlier fabulous history is recorded. In that reign an abbat named Wulfsin is placed at Westminster by William of Malmesbury, who seems to have known of the fabulous history, and whose evidence is therefore of little value. The real history of the house begins with the reign of the Confessor, and the whole of the fabulous history probably originated within a few years after his death. (See *Mon. Angl.* i. 265 sq.; W. Malmesb. *G. P.* § 73; Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* Nos. 149, 569, 779, 824–829; 842–846, &c. &c.) [S.]

ORDBRIHT (2), a second abbat of Westminster, who is made by the fabulous history to preside from 785 to 797, and to have been bishop in Devon. There was no Anglo-Saxon bishopric in Devon for at least a century after that date. (*Mon. Angl.* i. 266, 267; Kemble, *C. D.* No. 149.) [S.]

ORENTIUS, Pelagian bishop at council of Ephesus (Labbe, iii. 666). [ORONTIUS (3).] [T. W. D.]

ORENTIUS or **ORIENTIUS**, called by Cave (i. 503) and Ceillier bishop of Elvira, is more properly ORONTIUS (5).] [C. H.]

ORENTIUS, bp. Merida. [ORONTIUS (7).]

ORENTIUS, of Tarragona. [ORESIUS.]

ORESIESIS (al. ORESIS), a friend and coadjutor of Pachomius. He wrote a treatise, now lost, on the monastic life. (Gennad. *De Viris Illustr.* s. v.; Cave, *H. L.* s. v.) [I. G. S.]

ORESIUS, a Spaniard of Tarragona, addressed by Sidonius (lib. ix. *Ep.* 12 in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 629), the date of the letter being in or about 484 (Baron. *Ann.* 484 cxxxvi. and Pagi). Baronius names him Orentius, and thinks he may have subsequently become the bishop of Elvira, if it be not Lerida, called Orontius, who attended the council of Tarragona in 516 (Hardouin, ii. 1044). [ORONTIUS (6).] [C. H.]

ORESTES (1), keymaker, addressed by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 217). [C. H.]

ORESTES (2), prefect of Alexandria [CYRILLUS (2), HYPATIA], incensed against Cyril, chiefly because the archbishop wished to spy into his official acts. For an account of their quarrel, and the riot and bloodshed, vide Soc. vii. 13, 14. His name is also associated with Hypatia, who was regarded as the obstacle to a reconciliation between Cyril and Orestes through her frequent communications with the latter. (Soc. vii. 15.) [R. J. K.]

ORESTES (3), 2nd or 3rd bishop of Bazas, was, according to Gregory of Tours, one of the three bishops who consecrated Faustianus, the nominee of the pretender Gundovald, to the see of Dax. Though Orestes denied complicity he shared the penalty imposed on the other two [FAUSTIANUS]. He was present at the second council of Mâcon held in 585, where the matter was considered. (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* vii. 31, viii. 2, 20; *Gall. Christ.* i. 1192; Mansi, ix. 957.) [S. A. B.]

OREUS, see HEBDOMAS, Vol. II. p. 580.

OREUS or **ORENTIUS**, of Auch. [ORIENTIUS.]

ORGARUS, abbat of Westminster (744–56) in the spurious list of the monk Sporley (*Monast. Angl.* i. 267). [C. H.]

ORIBASIUS, addressed by Nilus (lib. iv. ep. 15); another, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. ep. 437). [C. H.]

ORIENTIUS, bishop of Auch (Ausci, Augusta Ausciorum, or Auxium), in the early part of the 5th century. Of this bishop it is related that he resolved to abandon the pleasures of the world, and the vices to which he had been somewhat prone, for the devout life; and that he was led, by supernatural guidance, to choose, as the place of his retirement, Bigorra in Vasconia (Bigorre, about 15 miles N.E. of Pau). Here he is said to have lived in austere sanctity until he was chosen bishop of Auch, on the death of Ursianus or Ursinianus. As bishop, he distinguished himself by resisting and overcoming the Arian heresy, which prevailed extensively among the people of his diocese, more especially among the Goths. The date of his episcopate, which is said to have lasted 41 years, is to a certain extent fixed by the statement that he was sent by the king of the Goths (Theodoric) from Toulouse to Aetius and Litorius. This event, late in his life, must have been in the year 439 or 440. The date of 396, given as that of his death by Gams (*Series Episc.* p. 497), has for its foundation a document of the year 1108, quoted in *Gallia Christiana*, i. 974. The *Gall. Christ.* itself, by a miscalculation, gives the date of his episcopate as 323–364. His successor Armentarius was apparently bishop in 451, a date which would agree with the story of Orientius's mission. There are also recorded concerning him several marvels; notably, the purification of a certain mountain, formerly much infested by evil spirits ("immundis spiritibus valde refertum"). His modern title is St. Orens. To him were dedicated a Cluniac monastery at Auch, where his body was laid, and a chapel at Toulouse, of which city he is reckoned the patron saint. To this saint is ascribed the *Commonitorium S. Orientii*, a short poem on the chief points of Catholic doctrine and practice. The poem has indeed been ascribed to Orosius of Tarraco, and to Orontius (perhaps identical with Orosius), who was present at the council of Tarraco, A.D. 516. It appears, however, from internal evidence, to be of the 5th century, and the work of one who not only bore the same name as the bishop of Auch, but had had similar experiences, political and religious. Certain minor works, comprising a poem on the Holy Trinity, an enumeration and explanation of the names of Christ, and fragments of a collection of prayers in verse, are probably of a later date. The *Commonitorium S. Orientii* was first published by Martene (in the *Coll. Nov. Vet. Mon.* 1700), and is also to be found in the Benedictine *Thesaurus Anecdotorum* (v. 18). (Martene, in the *Thesaurus*; Ebert, *Gesch. der Chr.-Lat. Lit.* 392; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 503; Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Mai. i. 61.) [H. A. W.]

ORIGENES (1).

I. SOURCES.
II. LIFE.
III. CHRONOLOGY OF WORKS.
IV. LIST AND ANALYSIS OF WORKS.
  A. EXEGETICAL WRITINGS.
    1. *Writings on the Old Testament.*
    2. *Writings on the New Testament.*
  B. DOGMATIC WRITINGS.
    1. *On First Principles.*
    2. *Miscellanies.*
  C. APOLOGETIC WRITINGS.
    Books against Celsus.
  D. PRACTICAL WRITINGS.
    On Prayer.
    Exhortation to Martyrdom.
  E. CRITICAL WRITINGS. [See HEXAPLA.]
  F. LETTERS.
  G. PHILOCALIA.
    Pseudonymous Writings.
V. VIEW OF CHRISTIAN LIFE.
VI. ORIGEN AS A CRITIC AND INTERPRETER.
VII. ORIGEN AS A THEOLOGIAN.
VIII. CHARACTERISTICS.
IX. EDITIONS OF ORIGEN'S WORKS.

I. SOURCES.—The main authority for the details of Origen's life is EUSEBIUS (*Hist. Ecc.* vi.). Eusebius had made a collection of upwards of a hundred letters of Origen (*H. E.* vi. 36). These, together with official documents (*H. E.* vi. 23, 33), and the information which he derived from those who had been acquainted with Origen (*H. E.* vi. 2, 33), formed the basis of his narrative. His account of the most critical period of Origen's life, his retirement from Alexandria, was given in the second book of his *Apology*, which he composed with the help of Pamphilus (*H. E.* vi. 23). This unhappily has not been preserved.

The controversial writings of JEROME and RUFINUS have preserved some facts from the *Apology* of Eusebius and Pamphilus; the first book of which remains in the translation of Rufinus. But Jerome had no independent knowledge of the details of Origen's life. His short notice in *De Viris illustribus*, c. 54, depends mainly on Eusebius; but it contains a few details which may have been derived from the *Apology* mentioned above.

EPIPHANIUS (*Haer.* lxiv.) has preserved some anecdotes of different degrees of credibility.

A few details, taken from the *Apology* of Pamphilus and Eusebius, are due to PHOTIUS (*Cod.* 118).

The writings of ORIGEN himself give but few details as to the circumstances of his life. But the loss of his letters is irreparable. They would have given at least a fuller picture of the man, even if they gave little additional information on the outward circumstances of his life. Only once, so far as I have noted, does he refer to the associations of Caesarea with the early history of the church (*Hom. in Num.* xi. 3). In another place he speaks of having witnessed the constancy of martyrs (*Hom. in Jud.* ix. 1). On the other hand, the *Farewell Address* (προσφωνητικὸς ἢ πανηγυρικὸς λόγος) of GREGORY of NEO-CAESAREA is a contemporary record of his method and influence of unique importance and interest.

Some books of modern times may be mentioned at once. An account of Origen's opinions, so far as they seemed open to objection, was given by Sextus Senensis in his *Bibliotheca*, *Librr.* vi. vii. (1566) in the spirit of a generous apologist. Genebrard arranged these points under general heads, in the introduction to his edition of Origen's *Works* (1574), and advocated Origen's cause with too great partiality in the judgment of Huet. P. Halloix went further in his elaborate account and defence of Origen (*Origenes defensus*. . . Leodii, 1648) dedicated to Innocent X. (G. B. Pamfili: "Solent similia a similibus, si quidem Παμφιλίοις, in re non dissimili παμφιλίως expectari"). The book was attacked and placed upon the *Index*, 'donec corrigatur,' but it had a powerful effect. The great work of Huet (*Origeniana*), prefixed to his edition of Origen's *Commentaries* (1668), was more complete and just. Nothing which has been written since shews greater or even equal mastery of the facts, though Huet's treatment is scholastic and necessarily deficient in historical feeling. Meanwhile the controversy on Origen's doctrine of the pre-existence of souls had spread to England. "*A Letter of Resolution concerning Origen and the Chief of his Opinions*" (London, 1661), published anonymously by G. Rust, fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, and afterwards bishop of Dromore, seems to have attracted considerable attention. Fabricius speaks of it with respect; and it is in every way a remarkable piece of theological criticism. Two letters by S. Parker, afterwards bishop of Oxford, on the "Platonick Philosophy," and the "Origenian hypothesis of the pre-existence of souls" (Oxford, 1667), may be referred to as representing the other side. J. H. Horbius concludes his *Historia Origeniana* (Francofurti, 1670) with the words of Justinian, and holds that Origen may "fairly be called the fountain of all heresies" (p. 91). Other works are mentioned by Fabricius (*Bibl. Gr.* vii. 241 ff.) It must be sufficient to refer generally to the accounts of Origen's life and opinions given by—

Tillemont (*Mémoires*, iii. Paris, 1695, *ed.* 2, 1701).
Lardner (*Credibility*, p. ii. vol. iii. London, 1750; vol. ii. ed. Kippis).
Ceillier (*Auteurs Sacrés*, ii. Paris, 1730).
Maréchal (*Concordantia Patrum*, Paris, 1739).
Lumper (*Hist. Patrum Theol. Critica*, ix. August, Vindob. 1792).
Walch (*Gesch. d. Ketz.* vii. viii. Leipzig, 1762, ff.).
Du Pin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclés.* tom. i. Paris, 1690.

The histories of Mosheim (*De reb. Christ. ante const. Comm.*, Helmst. 1753) and Schroeckh (*Kirchen-Gesch.*, Leipzig, 1772–1803) contain useful materials. The analyses of Schramm (*Anal. Patrum*, Aug. Vind. 1780–96) are good: his literary notices are taken from Delarue.

More recently Origen's life and doctrine has been discussed, with special reference to his historical position in the development of Christian thought, by—

Guericke, *De Schola Alex. Catech.*, Halis Sax., 1825.
Neander, *Kirch. Geschichte.*
Thomasius, *Origenes*, Nürnberg, 1837.
Redepenning, *Origenes*, Bonn, 1841–6.
Moehler, *Patrologie*, Regensburg, 1840.
Huber, *Philos. d. Kirchenväter*, München, 1859.
Schaff, *Church History*, New York, 1867.
De Pressensé, *Histoire des trois premiers siècles*, Paris, 1858–77.
Boehringer, *Kirchengesch. in Biogr. Klemens u. Origenes*, Zurich, 1869, 2[te] Aufl.

To these may be added—

Joly, *Etude sur Origène*, Dijon, 1860.
Freppel, *Origène*, Paris, 1868.
Denis, M. J., *La Philosophie d'Origène*, Paris, 1884.

The notice of Origen in Ritter's *Gesch. d. Christ. Philos.* 1858–9 is very meagre: that in Ueberweg's *Gesch. d. Philos.* is much more satisfactory. Unhappily Origen did not fall within Zeller's scope.

II. LIFE.—The nationality and birthplace of Origen are uncertain. It is probable that he was born at Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 1), but it has not been recorded whether he was of Egyptian or Greek or mixed descent. The statement of Epiphanius, that he was "an Egyptian by race" (*Haer.* lxiv. 1, Αἰγύπτιος τῷ γένει), is not decisive even if his authority were higher; and the loose phrase of Porphyry, that he "was a Greek and reared in Greek studies" (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19), is in itself of little value, but the name of his father (Leonides) points in the same direction. His mother's name has not been preserved. Is it possible that she was of Jewish descent? Origen is said to have learnt Hebrew so successfully that in singing the psalms "he vied with his mother" (Hier. *Ep.* 39 (22), § 1). Origen was the eldest of seven sons (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 2). Nothing however is known of his brothers. His fame probably overshadowed them; and his father, though himself a martyr, was distinguished as "Leonides the father of Origen."[a]

[a] This appears to be the meaning of the words of Eusebius (vi. 1), ὁ λεγόμενος 'Ωρ. πατήρ, which caused Tillemont difficulty: *Mémoires*, Orig. note ii. According to some late and insufficient authorities (Suidas, *s.v.* 'Ωριγένης and some MSS. of Hier. *de Vir. Ill.*) Leonides was a bishop.

The full name of Origen was ORIGENES ADAMANTIUS. The name *Origenes* was borne by one contemporary philosopher of distinction,[b] and occurs elsewhere. Thus the name of "*Aurelius Origenes*, also called *Apollonius*," a prytanis of Arsinoe, occurs in a Greek inscription set up in the city in A.D. 232–3 (Boeckh, *Inscrr. Gr.* No. 4705). Another, "*M. Aurelius Apollonius*, also called *Origenes*, a Roman knight," is mentioned in another Greek inscription in the Vatican as having constructed a "private box" in some theatre (*id.* No. 6189 *b*).

The name *Leonides* is found in an inscription at Kosseir (*id.* add. No. 4716 *d* [23]) and in other places. There can be no doubt that Origenes (which is written in MSS. not unfrequently with the rough breathing) is formed from the name of the Egyptian deity Orus or Horus, popularly identified with Apollo. Such names (*e.g.* Dionysius) were common among Christians. The name Adamantius (bishop of Athens) occurs in Boeckh, *l.c.* No. 9373. See also Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14.

The name ADAMANTIUS has commonly been regarded as an epithet describing Origen's unconquerable endurance (Hier. *Ep.* 33 (29), § 3, where he also claims for Origen the epithet χαλκέντερος given to Varro), or for the invincible force of his arguments (Photius, *Cod.* 118). But the language of Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 14, ὁ γέτοι Ἀδαμάντιος καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν τῷ Ὠριγενεῖ ὄνομα) and of Jerome himself (*De Vir. Ill.* 54, Origenes qui et Adamantius) shews that it was a second name, such as is given in the cases quoted above, and not a mere adjunct. Epiphanius characteristically misrepresents the truth when he speaks of Origen as having "given himself in vain the surname of Adamantius" (*Haer.* lxiv. 73).

The date of Origen's birth is fixed within very narrow limits by that of his father's martyrdom. Leonides suffered in the persecution of the tenth year of Severus (A.D. 202), and Origen at the time had not completed his seventeenth year (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 2). He must have been born therefore A.D. 185–6, a date which is consistent with the further statement (Euseb. vii. 1) that he died in his sixty-ninth year, in the reign of Gallus (A.D. 251–254). In Origen we have the first record of a Christian boyhood, and he was "great from the cradle." His education was superintended by his father, who specially directed him to the study of Scripture, in addition to the ordinary subjects of instruction (ἡ τῶν ἐγκυκλίων παιδεία). The child entered into the study with such eager devotion that his inquiries into the deeper meaning of the words which he committed to memory caused his father perplexity, who, while he openly checked his son's premature curiosity, silently thanked God for the promise which he gave for the future. As years went on Origen became the pupil of Pantaenus (after his return from India) and Clement, in whose school he met Alexander, afterwards bishop of Jerusalem (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14) with whom he then laid the foundation of that life-long friendship which supported him in his sorest trials.

When Leonides was thrown into prison, Origen would have shared his fate if he had not been hindered by the device of his mother. As he could do no more he addressed a letter to his father—his first recorded writing, still extant in the time of Eusebius—in which he prayed him to allow no thought for his family to shake his resolution. Such an act shews at once the position of influence which Origen already enjoyed in his family and the power of his self-sacrifice. Leonides was put to death, and his property was confiscated. Upon this the young Origen seems to have fulfilled the promise which his words implied. Partly by the assistance of a pious and wealthy lady, and partly by teaching, he obtained all that he required for his own support and (as may be concluded) for the needs of his mother and brothers. Already he collected a library. At first he gave lessons in literature; but as the Christian school was now without a teacher, all having been scattered by the persecution, he was induced to give instruction in the Faith. Thus in his eighteenth year he occupied, at first informally, the position which belonged to the head of the Christian school in Alexandria in a season of exceptional danger.[c] In this work he obtained such success that after no long time Demetrius, the bishop of Alexandria, definitely committed to him the office, which had been thrown upon him by circumstances. The charge decided the tenor of his life (Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 54, "decimo octavo aetatis suae anno κατηχήσεων opus aggressus, postea a Demetrio...in locum Clementis presbyteri confirmatus"). From this time Origen devoted himself exclusively to the office of a Christian teacher; and to ensure his independence he sold his collection of classical writers for an annuity of four oboli (sixpence) a day, on which he lived for many years, refusing the voluntary contributions which his friends offered him (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 3). His position at this time is a remarkable illustration of the freedom of the early church. He was a layman, and yet recognised as a leading teacher. His work was not confined within any district. Numbers of men and women flocked to his lectures, attracted in part by the stern simplicity of his life, which served as a guarantee of his sincerity. For he resolved to fulfil without reserve the precepts of the Gospel. For many years he went barefoot, and wore only a single robe (Matt. x. 10). He slept upon the ground. His food and sleep were rigorously limited (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 3). Nor did his unmeasured zeal stop here. In the same spirit of sacrifice he applied to himself literally the words of Matt. xix. 12, though wishing to conceal the act from most of his friends. The act however could not remain hid. It was against the civil law (comp. Just. M. *Ap.* i. 29, Otto's note), and utterly at variance with the true instinct of the church, which at a later time found formal expression (*Conc. Nic.* can. 1, and Hefele's note). Origen's own comment on the words of the gospel which he had misunderstood, is a most touching confession of his error (*in Matt.* tom. xv. 1 ff.).[d] But for the time the purpose of the act was accepted as its excuse.

[b] On this Origines, the Platonist, see Zeller, *Die Philosophie d. Griechen*, v. 407.

[c] The anecdote preserved by Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxiv. 1) of his proclaiming Christ on the steps of the temple of Serapis, when forced there by the heathen population, is probably to be referred to this date.

[d] Boehringer (*Origenes*, pp. 28 ff) endeavours to shew that the narrative is a fable, but his arguments are not convincing.

And when the matter came to the ears of Demetrius, the bishop, so far from inflicting any punishment, urged him still more to devote himself to the work of Christian instruction (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 8).

For twelve or thirteen years Origen was engaged in these happy and successful labours; and it was during this period, in all probability, that he formed and partly executed his plan of a comparative view of the LXX in connexion with the other Greek versions of the Old Testament, and with the original Hebrew text [HEXAPLA], though the work was slowly elaborated as fresh materials came to his hands (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 16). To fit himself the better for the work he learnt Hebrew, "contrary to the spirit of his years and race" (Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 54, contra aetatis gentisque suae naturam), though he seems to have found a fellow-student in his mother (Hier. *Ep.* 39 (22), § 1). From time to time he refers to interpretations which were given to him by his "Hebrew master" (*De Princ.* i. 3, 4; iv. 26; ὁ Ἑβραῖος, Gr. fr. 7); and Jerome says that he referred to "the Patriarch Huillus," as having given him information on many points (*adv. Ruf.* i. § 13, comp. *Sel. in Ps.* xi. p. 352, L. Ἴουλλος). A short visit to Rome in the time of Zephyrinus, to see "the most ancient church of the Romans" (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14) and an authoritative call to Arabia (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19) alone seem to have interrupted the fixed tenor of his life. Persecution tested the fruit of his teaching. He had the joy of seeing martyrs trained in his school; and his own escapes from the violence of the people was held to be due to the special protection of Providence (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 4, f. 3).

During the same period Origen devoted himself with renewed vigour to the study of non-Christian thought, and attended the lectures of Ammonius Saccas (comp. Porphyry, ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19; Theodoret, *Graec. affect. cur.* vi. p. 96).[e] Heretics and Gentiles attended his lectures, and he felt bound to endeavour to understand their opinions thoroughly, that he might the better correct them (comp. *c. Cels.* vi. 24). His conduct in this respect excited ill-will, but he was able to defend himself, as he did in a letter written at a later time (*Ep.* ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19), by the example of his predecessors and the support of his friends.

So Origen's work grew beyond his single strength, and he associated Heraclas in the labours of the catechetical school. Heraclas had been one of his first converts and scholars, and the brother of a martyr (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 3). He was a fellow-student with Origen under "his teacher of philosophy" (Ammonius Saccas); and when he afterwards became bishop of Alexandria he did not even then lay aside the dress or the reading of a philosopher (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19).

At length, c. 215 A.D., a tumult of unusual violence (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19, οὐ σμικροῦ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ἀναρριπισθέντος πολέμου; comp. Herodian. iv. 8, 9; Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, i. 224 f.) forced Origen to withdraw from Alexandria and from Egypt. He took refuge in Palestine, at Caesarea. Here his reputation brought him into that position of prominence which became the occasion of his later troubles. His fellow pupil, Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, and Theoctistus (Theotecnus; Photius, *Cod.* 118), bishop of Caesarea, begged him to expound the Scriptures in the public services of the church, though he had not been ordained. Demetrius of Alexandria expressed strong disapprobation at a proceeding which he ventured to describe as unprecedented. Alexander and Theoctistus defended their conduct by precedents. Demetrius replied by action. He recalled Origen to Alexandria, and hastened his return by special envoys, deacons of the church (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19).

The stay of Origen in Palestine was of some considerable length, and it seems most probable that it was during this time he made his famous visit to Mamaea, the mother of the emperor Alexander (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 21), who was herself a native of Syria.[f]

Some time after his return to Alexandria (c. 219), Origen entered upon a new form of work, the written exposition of Scripture. This was not the result of his own choice, but was due in a great measure to the influence of Ambrosius [AMBROSIUS], whom he had rescued not long before from the heresy of Valentinus, or, as Jerome says, of Marcion (Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 56). Ambrosius not only urged him to the task, but amply supplied him with the means of fulfilling it. More than seven shorthand writers (ταχυγράφοι) were provided to take down his comments, and other scribes were ready to copy out fairly what they had written (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 23).

These literary occupations considerably curtailed Origen's work in the catechetical school. Some years before he had, as we have seen, associated Heraclas with himself in the conduct of it, assigning to him the introductory instruction of students (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 15). He could now therefore withdraw in a great measure from the charge without disturbing the method of teaching. At the same time the first parts of his *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John* marked him out more decisively than before as a teacher in the church even more than in the school. But the exhibition of this new power was accompanied by other signs of a bold originality which might well startle those who were unfamiliar with the questionings of philosophy. The books *On First Principles*, which seem to have been written spontaneously, made an epoch in Christian speculation, as the *Commentary on St. John* made an epoch in Christian interpretation. Under such circumstances it is not surprising that Demetrius yielded, in the words of Eusebius, to the infirmity of human nature (*H. E.* vi. 8), and wished to check the boldness and the influence of the layman. It became clear that Origen must seek somewhere else than in Alexandria the full sanction and free scope for his Scriptural studies. He did not however precipitate the separation from a place where he had laboured

[e] The difficulties and objections which have been urged in regard to this fact, from a supposed confusion of other persons bearing the names of Ammonius and Origen, have been considered at length by L. Krüger in an essay in Illgen's *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.* 1843, i. 47 ff.

[f] Mamaea was probably at Antioch in 218. Clinton places the visit during Origen's later visit 226 (*F. R.* i. 239), on the assumption that Eusebius states that the visit took place "in the reign of Alexander and in the episcopate of Philetus;" but the language of Eusebius, due regard being had to his desultory style of narrative, does not require this interpretation.

for more than five and twenty years. The occasion came in an invitation to visit Achaia for the purpose, as it seems, of combating some false opinions which had arisen there (Hier. *de Virr. Ill.* 54). The exact date is uncertain, but it was probably between 226 and 230. Origen availed himself of this call to visit Caesarea. It was natural that he should seek counsel from his oldest friends as to his future course; and the invitation to Achaia seems to have brought his relations with Demetrius to a crisis. Photius, on the authority of Pamphilus' "Apology" (*Cod.* 118), says that he went "without the consent (or even contrary to the judgment) of his own bishop" (χωρὶς τῆς τοῦ οἰκείου γνώμης ἐπισκόπου). Jerome again states that he was furnished with "commendatory letters" (*l.c.* sub testimonio ecclesiasticae epistolae). He may therefore have gone to Caesarea to consider whether he should accept the invitation, and, in that case, to obtain the proper authorization. No record remains of the deliberations which took place. But the meeting issued in the ordination of Origen as presbyter "by the bishops there" (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 23), Theoctistus of Caesarea and Alexander of Jerusalem (Hier. *de Virr. Ill.* 54; Photius, *Cod.* 118). After taking this decisive step Origen continued his journey to Greece. He visited Ephesus (*Ep. fragm.* ap. Ruf. *Apol.*, Delarue, i. p. 6) and stayed some time at Athens, and during this stay it is not unlikely that he heard some of the teachers of philosophy there (Epiph. *Haer.* lxiv. 1). At length, having completed his mission, he returned to Alexandria.

In returning to Alexandria Origen could not have been unprepared for the reception which awaited him from Demetrius. It is by no means unlikely that Demetrius had shewn clear unwillingness to admit him to the priesthood. He may have regarded the act which had appeared venial in the lay catechist as a fatal bar to ordination, according to the tenor of later canons. He may perhaps have taken exception to some of the details of Origen's teaching. But at any rate the fact that Origen received orders from Palestinian bishops without his consent, and probably against his judgment, might be construed as a direct challenge of his authority. Origen at once perceived that he must retire before the rising storm. The preface to the sixth book of the *Commentary on St. John* shews how deeply he felt the severance of old ties and the hostility of former colleagues. But there was no choice. In A.D. 231 he left Alexandria never to return.[g] The act however was his own; and his influence to the last is shewn by the fact, that he "left the charge of the catechetical school" to his coadjutor Heraclas (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 26).[h]

[g] In Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 26 the reading δέκατον is better supported than δωδέκατον.

[h] It is hardly necessary to refer to the monstrous story related by Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxiv. 2). If any one cares to consider it, it is enough to refer to Delarue's note on Huet's *Origeniana*, l. 2, § 13.

The passage quoted by Justinian, as from Peter of Alexandria, in his letter to Menas, in which he is represented as saying that "the frantic Origen" caused great trials to Heraclas and Demetrius, is not of weightier authority. The passage occurs in a speech in the martyrdom of Peter (*Acta Sincera*, Migne, xviii. p. 460). Comp. Huet, *l. c.* § 15.

It is difficult to trace the different stages in the condemnation which followed. Eusebius treated of the matter at length in his "Apology" (*H. E.* vi. 23), and therefore thought it unnecessary to repeat in his "History" what he had already given in detail. The fragmentary notices of writers at second or third hand are therefore all that remain. Photius (*Cod.* 118) following the "Apology" of Pamphilus and Eusebius, gives the most intelligible and consistent account. According to him Demetrius, completely alienated from Origen by his ordination, collected a synod of "bishops and a few presbyters" (ἐπισκόπων καί τινων πρεσβυτέρων), in which it was decided that Origen should leave Alexandria and not be allowed to stay or teach there. He was not however deposed from the priesthood, though it is implied that Demetrius had made a proposition to that effect. Demetrius was dissatisfied with the result; and combining with some Egyptian bishops (without presbyters) he afterwards excommunicated Origen (καὶ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἀπεκήρυξε), and those who had voted with him before now subscribed this new sentence. Jerome describes with greater severity the spirit of Demetrius' proceedings, and adds that "he wrote on the subject to the whole world" (*De Vir. Ill.* 54) and obtained a judgment against Origen from Rome (*Ep.* 33 (29), § 4).[i]

So far the facts are tolerably clear, but in the absence of trustworthy evidence, it is impossible to tell on what points the condemnation of Origen really turned. Demetrius unquestionably laid great stress on formal irregularities (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 8), and it is possible that the sentence against him was based on these, though Origen's opinions may have been displeasing to many. Such a view finds support in the fact, that no attempt was made to reverse the judgment after the death of Demetrius, which followed very shortly, and perhaps within three years, when Heraclas, the pupil and colleague of Origen, succeeded to the episcopate. Nor again was anything done by Dionysius, the successor of Heraclas, another devoted scholar of Origen, who still continued his intercourse with his former master (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 46).

Whatever may have been the grounds of Origen's condemnation, the judgment of the Egyptian synod was treated with absolute disregard by the bishops of Palestine, Arabia, Phoenicia, and Achaea (Hier. *Ep.* 33), and Origen defended himself warmly (Hier. *Apol. adv. Ruf.* ii. 18). He soon afterwards settled at Caesarea, which became for more than twenty years, up to his death, the centre of his labours. It had indeed not a few of the advantages of Alexandria, as a great seaport, the civil capital, and the ecclesiastical metropolis of its district.

At Caesarea Origen found ungrudging sympathy and help for his manifold labours. Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistus of Caesarea remained devoted to him; and Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia was no less zealous in seeking his instruction (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 27;

[i] The statement quoted by Justinian, that Origen was expelled by Heraclas, is wholly unworthy of credit. It probably arose from the fact that Heraclas did not recal him. The reading δωδέκατον, in Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 26, may be a trace of the belief in this apocryphal statement. Comp. Huet, *Origeniana*, l. 2, § 15, and Delarue's notes.

Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 54, diu Caesareae in sanctis Scripturis ab eo eruditus est). Ambrosius was with him to stimulate and maintain his literary efforts. He formed afresh something of a catechetical school; and the highest forms of his philosophical teaching were exercised by the presence of a continual succession of distinguished students. At the same time he was unwearied in the public exposition of Scripture. It was his practice to explain it popularly to mixed congregations in the church, to Christians and to catechumens (*Hom. in Ezech.* vi. § 5). As a rule he gave these lectures on Wednesdays and Fridays (Socr. *H. E.* v. 22, τῇ τετράδι καὶ τῇ λεγομένῃ παρασκευῇ), but in practice he gave them daily, and at times oftener than once a day. His subjects were sometimes taken from the lessons (*Hom. in Num.* xv. 1; *in* 1 *Sam.* ii. § 1), and sometimes specially prescribed to him by an authoritative request (*Hom. in Ezech.* xiii. 1). His aim was the edification of the people generally (*Hom. in Lev.* vii. 1; *in Jud.* viii. 3); and not unfrequently he was constrained to speak, as he wrote, with some reserve, on the deeper mysteries of the Faith (*Hom. in Num.* iv. 3; *in Lev.* xiii. 3; *in Ezech.* i. 3; *in Rom.* vii. 13, p. 147 L; viii. 11, p. 272; comp. *Hom. in Jos.* xxiii. 4 *s.f.*; *in Gen.* xii. 1, 4).

These labours were interrupted by the persecution of Maximinus (A.D. 235–237). Ambrosius and Protectetus, a presbyter of Caesarea, were among the victims. Origen addressed to them his *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, while they were in prison. He himself escaped (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 28). During part of the time for which the persecution continued he seems to have been with Firmilian in Cappadocia, and while there is said to have enjoyed the hospitality of a Christian lady, Juliana, who had some of the books of Symmachus, the translator of the Old Testament (comp. Hier. *l. c.* Firmilianus...cum omni Cappadocia eum invitavit et diu tenuit. Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* 147).

In 238 or perhaps in 237,[k] Origen was again at Caesarea, and Gregory (Thaumaturgus) delivered the *Farewell Address*, which is the most vivid picture left of the method and influence of the great Christian master. In this the scholar recounts, with touching devotion, the course along which he had been guided by the man to whom he felt that he owed his spiritual life. He had come to Syria to study Roman law in the school of Berytus, but on his way there he met with Origen, and at once felt that he had found in him the wisdom for which he was seeking. The day of that meeting was to him, in his own words, the dawn of a new being: his soul clave to the master whom he recognised, and he surrendered himself gladly to his guidance. As Origen spoke, he kindled within the young advocate's breast a love for the Holy Word, the most lovely of all objects, and for himself the Word's herald. "This love," Gregory adds, "induced me to give up country and friends, the aims which I had proposed to myself, the study of law of which I was proud. I had but one passion, philosophy, and the godlike man who directed me in the pursuit of it" (c. 6).

Origen's first care, Gregory says, was to make the character of a pupil his special study. In this he followed the example of Clement (Clem. *Strom.* i. 1, 8, p. 320, P). He ascertained, with delicate and patient attention, the capacities, the faults, the tendencies of those whom he had to teach. Rank growths of opinion were cleared away: weaknesses were laid open: every effort was used to develope endurance, firmness, patience, thoroughness. "In true Socratic fashion he sometimes overthrew us by argument," Gregory writes, "if he saw us restive and starting out of the course... The process was at first disagreeable to us and painful; but so he purified us ... and ... prepared us for the reception of the words of truth ...," "by probing us and questioning us, and offering problems for our solution" (c. 7). In this way Origen taught his scholars to regard language as designed, not to furnish material for display, but to express truth with the most exact accuracy; and logic as powerful, not to secure a plausible success, but to test beliefs with the strictest rigour.

This was the first stage of intellectual discipline, the accurate preparation of the instruments of thought. In the next place, Origen led his pupils to apply them first to the "lofty and divine and most lovely" study of external nature. Here he stood where we stand still, for he made Geometry the sure and immovable foundation of his teaching, and from this rose step by step to the heights of heaven and the most sublime mysteries of the universe (c. 8). Gregory's language implies that Origen was himself a student of physics; as, in some degree, the true theologian must be. The lessons of others, he writes, or his own observation, enabled him to explain the connexion, the differences, the changes of the objects of sense. Such investigations served to shew man in his true relation to the world. A rational feeling for the vast grandeur of the external order, "the sacred economy of the universe," as Gregory calls it, was substituted for the ignorant and senseless wonder with which it is commonly regarded.

But Physics were naturally treated by Origen as a preparation and not as an end. Moral Science came next; and here he laid the greatest stress upon the method of experiment. His aim was not merely to analyse and to define and to classify feelings and motives, though he did this, but to form a character. For him ethics were a life, and not only a theory. The four cardinal virtues of Plato, practical wisdom, self-control, righteousness, courage, seemed to him to require for their maturing careful and diligent introspection and culture. And here he gave a commentary upon his teaching. His discipline lay even more in action than in precept. His own conduct was in his scholar's minds a more influential persuasive than his arguments.

So it was, Gregory continues, that Origen was the first teacher who really led me to the pursuit of Greek philosophy, by bringing speculation into a vital union with practice. In him I saw the inspiring example of one wise at once and holy. The noble phrase of older masters gained a distinct meaning for the Christian disciple. In failure and weakness he was enabled to perceive that the end of all was "to become like to

---

[k] Dräseke, *Der Brief d. Orig. an Gregorios, Jahrb. f. Protest. Theol.* 1881, s. 106. Dräseke gives good reasons for dating Origen's letter to Gregory in 235–6 (not in 240 from Cappadocia, when Gregory had retired to Alexandria.

God with a pure mind, and to draw near to Him and to abide in Him" (c. 12).

Guarded and guided by this conviction, Origen encouraged his scholars in theology to look for help in all the works of human genius. They were to examine the writings of philosophers and poets of every nation, the atheists alone excepted, with faithful candour and wise catholicity. For them there was to be no sect, no party. And in their arduous work they had ever at hand, in their master, a friend who knew the difficulties of the ground to be traversed. If they were bewildered in the tangled mazes of conflicting opinions, he was ready to lead them with a firm hand: if they were in danger of being swallowed up in the quicksands of shifting error, he was near to lift them up to the sure resting-place which he had himself found (c. 14).

Even yet the end was not reached. The hierarchy of sciences was not completed till Theology with her own proper gifts crowned the succession which we have followed hitherto, Logic, Physics, Ethics. New data corresponded with the highest philosophy, and Origen found in the Holy Scriptures and the teaching of the Spirit the final and absolute spring of Divine Truth. It was in this region that Gregory felt his master's power to be supreme. Origen's sovereign command of the mysteries of "the oracles of God" gave him perfect boldness in dealing with all other writings. "Therefore," Gregory adds, "there was no subject forbidden to us, nothing hidden or inaccessible. We were allowed to become acquainted with every doctrine, barbarian or Greek, on things spiritual or civil, divine and human; traversing with all freedom, and investigating the whole circuit of knowledge, and satisfying ourselves with the full enjoyment of all the pleasures of the soul..." (c. 15).

Such in meagre outline was, as Gregory tells us, the method of Origen. He describes what he knew and what his hearers knew. There is no parallel to the picture in ancient times. And when every allowance has been made for the partial enthusiasm of a pupil, the view which it offers of a system of Christian training actually realised exhibits a type which we cannot hope to surpass. The ideal of Christian education and the ideal of Christian philosophy were fashioned together. Under that comprehensive and loving discipline Gregory, already trained in heathen schools, first learnt, step by step, according to his own testimony, what the pursuit of philosophy truly was, and came to know the solemn duty of forming opinions which were to be not the amusement of a moment, but the solid foundations of life-long work.

The method of Origen, such as Gregory has described it, in all its breadth and freedom, was forced upon him by what he held to be the deepest law of human nature. It may be true (and he admitted it) that we are, in our present state, but poorly furnished for the pursuit of knowledge, but he was never weary of proclaiming that we are at least born to engage in the endless search. If we see some admirable work of man's art, he says, we are at once eager to investigate the nature, the manner, the end of its production; and the contemplation of the works of God stirs us with an incomparably greater longing to learn the principles, the method, the purpose of creation. "This desire, this passion, has without doubt," he continues, "been implanted in us by God. And as the eye seeks the light, as our body craves food, so our mind is impressed with the characteristic and natural desire of knowing the truth of God and the causes of what we observe." Such a desire, since it is a divine endowment, carries with it the promise of future satisfaction. In our present life we may not be able to do more, by the utmost toil, than obtain some small fragments from the infinite treasures of divine knowledge, still the concentration of our souls upon the lovely vision of truth, the occupation of our various faculties in lofty inquiries, the very ambition with which we rise above our actual powers, is in itself fruitful in blessing, and fits us better for the reception of wisdom hereafter at some later stage of existence. Now we draw at the best a faint outline, a preparatory sketch of the features of Truth: the true and living colours will be added there. Perhaps, he concludes most characteristically, that is the meaning of the words, "to every one that hath shall be given;" by which we are assured that he who has gained in this life some faint outline of truth and knowledge will have it completed in the age to come with the beauty of the perfect image (*De Princ.* ii. 11, 4).

While Caesarea remained Origen's permanent home he visited different parts of Palestine; Jerusalem,[1] Jericho, the valley of the Jordan (*Tom.* vi. *in Joh.* § 24); Sidon, where he made some stay (*Hom. in Josh.* xvi. § 2), partly at least to investigate "the footsteps of Jesus, and of His disciples, and of the prophets" (*in Joh. l. c.*). He also went again to Athens and continued there for some time, being engaged on his Commentaries (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 32). Two visits to Arabia were of more characteristic interest. In the first he went to confer with Beryllus of Bostra, who had advanced false views on the Incarnation (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 33); and in the second to meet some errors on the doctrine of the resurrection (*id.* vi. 37). In both cases he was specially invited, and in both cases he justified his reputation by persuading those whom he controverted to abandon their opinions.[m]

Origen's energy now rose to its full power. Till he was sixty (A.D. 246) he had forbidden his unwritten discourses to be taken down. Experience then at length enabled him to withdraw the prohibition, and most of his homilies are due to reports made afterwards. The *Books against Celsus*, and the *Commentaries on St. Matthew*, belong to the same period, and shew, in different directions, the maturity of his vigour.

Thus his varied activity continued till the persecution of Decius in 250. The preceding reign of Philip had favoured the growth of Christianity; and there is no sufficient reason to question the fact of Origen's correspondence with the emperor and his wife Severa (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 36). Such intercourse marked Origen out for attack to Philip's conqueror and suc-

[1] Perhaps the story given by Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxiv. 2) of his reading Ps. l. 16, when constrained to address the church there, and then closing the book with tears while all wept about him, may be a reminiscence of something which happened during this time.

[m] Specimens of his oral controversy with a Jew are preserved in *c. Cels.* i. 45, 55 f.

cessor. His friend Alexander of Jerusalem died in prison. He himself suffered a variety of tortures, probably at Tyre,—chains, the iron collar, and the rack, but his constancy baffled all the efforts of his enemies (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 39). He was threatened with the stake, and a report gained currency in later times that his sufferings were crowned by death (Photius, *Cod.* 118, p. 159). During this sharp trial his former pupil Dionysius, now bishop of Alexandria, addressed to him a letter on martyrdom (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 46). The testimony is valuable as shewing that the old affection was still alive, in spite of long separation. Origen himself described his sufferings and his consolations in letters which Eusebius characterizes "as full of help to those who need encouragement" (*H. E.* vi. 39).

The death of Decius (251, Clinton, *F. R.* i. 270), after a reign of two years, set Origen free. But his health must have been broken by the hardships which he had endured. He died at Tyre, in the next year (253), "having completed seventy years save one" (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 1; Hieron. *Ep.* 65 *ad Pammach.*). Origen was buried in the city where he died (William of Tyre (c. 1180), *Hist.* xiii. 1: "haec (Tyrus) et Origenis corpus occultat sicut oculata fide etiam hodie licet inspicere"), and his tomb was honoured as long as the city survived. When a cathedral, named after the Holy Sepulchre, was built there, his body is said to have occupied the place of greatest honour, being enclosed in the wall behind the high altar (Cotovicus (1598), *Itin. Hier.* p. 121: "pone altare maximum magni Origenis corpus conditum ferunt"). The same church received, in a later age (A.D. 1190), the remains of Barbarossa; but the name of the great theologian prevailed over the name of the great warrior. Burchard, who visited Tyre in the last quarter of the 13th century (c. 1283), saw the inscription in Origen's memory in a building which was amazing for its splendour. (Burchardus, *Descript. Terrae Sanctae*, p. 25, *ed.* Laurent.: "Origenes ibidem in ecclesia sancti sepulcri requiescit in muro conclusus. Cujus titulum ibidem vidi" (the edition of 1587 adds *et legi*). "Sunt ibi columpnae marmoreae et aliorum lapidum tam magnae, quod stupor est videre.") Before the close of the century the city was wasted by the Saracens; but if we may trust the words of a traveller at the beginning of the 16th century (c. 1520), the inscription was still preserved on "a marble column sumptuously adorned with gold and jewels." (Bart. de Saligniaco, *Itin. Hier.* ix. 10: "In templo sancti sepulcri Origenis doctoris ossa magno in honore servantur, quorum titulus est in columna marmorea magno sumptu gemmarum et auri.") It is not unlikely, I fear, that this statement is a false rendering of Burchard's notice. Burchard's book was very widely known in the 16th century. The statements of Adrichonius (*Theatr. T. S. Tr. Aser*, 84), which are repeated by Huet and others, have no independent value whatever. Not long after, the place where Origen lay was only known by tradition. The tradition however still lingers about the ruins of the city; for it is said that the natives point out the spot where "Oriunus" lies under a vault, the relic of an ancient church, now covered by their huts. Prutz, *Aus Phönicien*, 219, 306, quoted by Piper, *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.* 1876, p. 208.

Into the later fortunes of Origen's teaching we do not enter. It is enough to say that his fate after death was like his fate during life: he continued to witness not in vain to noble truths. His influence was sufficiently proved by the persistent bitterness of his antagonists, and there are few sadder pages in church history than the record of the Origenistic controversies. But in spite of errors which it was easy to condemn, his characteristic thoughts survived in the works of Hilary and Ambrose and Jerome, and in his own Homilies, to stir later students in the West. His Homilies had indeed a very wide circulation in the middle ages in their Latin translation; and it would be interesting to trace their effect upon mediaeval commentators down to the time when Erasmus wrote to Colet in 1504: "Origenis operum bonam partem evolvi; quo praeceptore mihi videor non-nullum fecisse operae pretium; aperit enim fontes quosdam et rationes indicat artis theologicae." That however cannot be done here. [ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSIES.]

III. CHRONOLOGY OF WORKS.—The works of Origen, of which some notice has been preserved, were produced, as far as can be ascertained, in the following chronological order. The titles of those which still remain, wholly or in part (otherwise than in isolated fragments), in the original, or in a translation, are printed in capitals.

1. *Before Origen's removal from Alexandria* (A.D. 231).

The commencement of the HEXAPLA.
Commentary on the *Canticles*. Ὑπομνήματα (perhaps not published: Euseb. *H.E.* vi. 18).
228–231. COMMENTARY (Τόμος) ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN (Books i.–v.), Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 24.
Commentaries on *Ps.* i.–xxv. (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 24).
Commentaries on *Genesis*, Books i.–viii. (Euseb. *l. c.*).
On the Resurrection (two books), mentioned in the Commentaries on the Lamentations (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 24).
Commentaries on the *Lamentations* (five books remained in the time of Eusebius, *H. E. l. c.*).
Commentaries on *Exodus*, books i. ii.
ON FIRST PRINCIPLES, four books (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 24).
Miscellanies (Στρωματεῖς), ten books (Euseb. *l. c.*). Comp. *Tom. in Joh.* xiii. 45; Hier. *Praef. ad Gal.*; *Comm. on Dan.* xiii.; *Ep. ad August.* cxii. 6; *ad Pammach.* lxxxiv.
ON PRAYER (date uncertain).
On free-will (the date is doubtful: comp. *in Rom.* vii. § 16; Cramer, *Catena*, 1 Pet. i. 4).

2. *After Origen's withdrawal to Caesarea* (231).

Commentaries (Homilies) on 1 *Cor.* (before Comm. on St. Luke).
Homilies on *Deuteronomy*.
Commentaries on *St. Luke* (five books): Hier. *Prol. Hom. in Luc.*
HOMILIES ON ST. LUKE.
232–238. COMMENTARIES ON ST. JOHN continued, Books vi. ff. (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 28).
235–6. Letter to Gregory of Neo-Caesarea.
Commentaries on *Genesis*, Books ix.–xii. (xiii.).
Mystical Homilies on *Genesis*.
235. EXHORTATION TO MARTYRDOM (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 28).
Homilies (nine) on *Judges* (date uncertain; before Comm. on *Canticles*).

235. HOMILIES (NINE) ON ISAIAH (date uncertain).
Commentaries on *Isaiah* (thirty books, extending to "the vision of the beasts in the wilderness:" extant in the time of Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 32).

c.238-240. Commentaries on *Ezekiel*, twenty-five books on the whole prophet, finished at Athens (Euseb. *l. c.*)

c. 240. LETTER TO JULIUS AFRICANUS on the Greek additions to Daniel.
COMMENTARIES ON THE CANTICLES, five books written at Athens, the remaining five at Caesarea (Euseb. *l. c.*).

c. 241. HOMILIES (NINE) ON PSALMS xxxvi.-xxxviii.
To this period may probably be assigned the Commentaries and notes on *Exodus* and *Leviticus*: the Commentaries on *Isaiah* and the *Minor Prophets:* the Notes on *Numbers:* the Homilies and detached notes on the *Historical Books:* the completion of the Commentary on the *Psalms*.

after 244. Homilies taken down from his extempore addresses (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 36) on the first four books of THE PENTATEUCH, on JOSHUA, on JUDGES (doubtful), on JEREMIAH (probably), on EZEKIEL.
COMMENTARIES (fifteen books) ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.
HEXAPLA finished (Epiph. *de pond. et mens.* 18).
COMMENTARIES ON ST. MATTHEW (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 36).
Letters to Fabianus and others (Euseb. *l. c.*).
Commentaries (three books) on 1 *Thess.*, and (perhaps) the Commentaries on *Galatians*, *Ephesians*, the other Epistles of St. Paul, and on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*.

249. THE EIGHT BOOKS AGAINST CELSUS (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 36).

Pamphilus made a collection of Origen's writings in the library at Caesarea, transcribing a great part of them with his own hand (Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 75). In the next century the library had fallen to decay, and it was restored by Euzoius, bishop of the city (*id.* 113). A relic of it remains in the Coislin MS. (H_3 of St. Paul's Epistles), which is said to have been collated with a copy at Caesarea written by Pamphilus.

IV. WRITINGS.

The multitude of Origen's writings was a marvel to later scholars, and even a cause of anxious thought to himself (*Philoc.* c. v.). Epiphanius says (*Haer.* lxiv. 63) that in popular reports (ὁ ᾄδεται) no less than 6000 works were ascribed to him. Jerome denies the truth of his statement (*Ep.* lxxxii. 7), and brings down the number to a third (*Adv. Ruf.* ii. c. 22; cf. c. 13). It is not unlikely (comp. Redepenning, in Niedner's *Zeitschrift*, 1851, 67 f.) that there was some early error in the cipher used by Eusebius in his Life of Pamphilus, from whom others drew their information (as of Stigma, 6000, for Sampi, 600); but the question is of no moment. The fact of the voluminousness of Origen's works does not depend upon determining their number. His works will be noticed in the following order: A. EXEGETICAL, pp. 104–18; B. DOGMATICAL, pp. 119–122; C. APOLOGETIC, pp. 122–4; D. PRACTICAL, p. 124; F. LETTERS, p. 125; G. PHILOCALIA, pp. 125–6.[a]

A. EXEGETICAL WRITINGS.

Epiphanius states, in general terms, that Origen undertook to comment on all the books of Scripture (*Haer.* lxiv. 3). Such a statement from such a man is of very little value, but independent and exact evidence goes far to confirm it. In the following sections a short account will be given, in the common order of the books of Scripture, of Origen's labours upon them.

His exegetical writings, it must be noted, are of three kinds: detached *Notes* (Σχόλια, σημειώσεις, in the narrower sense, *excerpta, commaticum interpretandi genus*), *Homilies* addressed to popular audiences (Ὁμιλίαι, *Tractatus*), and complete and elaborate *Commentaries* (Τόμοι, σημειώσεις in the wider sense, *volumina*). Comp. Hier. *in Ezech. Prol.*; *Praef. Comm. in Matt.*; Rufin. *Praef. in Num.*

1. *Writings on the Old Testament.*

i. THE PENTATEUCH.

GENESIS.

Origen, according to Eusebius, wrote *twelve* books of Commentaries (Τόμοι) on Genesis, of which the first eight were written before he left Alexandria (*H. E.* vi. 24). Jerome gives the number of books as *thirteen* (Ruf. *Apol.* ii. 20), and mentions that the thirteenth book contained a discussion of Gen. iv. 15. In *c. Cels.* v. 49, Origen refers to his work on Genesis "from the beginning of the book to v. 1;" and there is no evidence that his detailed commentary went further.

The two books of mystical Homilies (Ruf. *Apol.* ii. 20) seem to have been distinct from the seventeen homilies which remain in a Latin translation; and the notice of Melchizedek, to which Jerome refers (*Ep. ad Evang.* 72), was probably found in them. (14 "Books" on Genesis; 2 books "localium [moralium] omeliarum;" 17 Homilies.—H. C.)

Of these writings there remain:

Greek.

(1) On Gen. i. 2; *Fragm.* of *Tom.* iii. on Gen. i. 14; i. 16 f.

Huet, i. 1-17.
Delarue,[o] ii. 1-24.

[a] Jerome, in a letter addressed to Paula about 384, of which parts have been preserved by Rufinus (*Apol.* ii. 20; Hier. *Ep.* xxxiii.), compares the writings of Origen with those of the most voluminous classical writers, Varro and Didymus the grammarian (Chalcenteros); and after giving a catalogue of Origen's works, concludes: "Videtisne et Graecos pariter et Latinos unius labore superatos?"

The catalogue in the common texts is reduced to a few lines; but Sir T. Phillips was fortunate enough to find a copy of the letters in a MS. of the 12th century at Arras, in which the list of the works of Varro and Origen is given in full. The catalogue of Origen's writings has been reprinted, from a copy privately circulated by Sir T. Phillips, with a short notice by Redepenning, in Niedner's *Zeitschrift*, 1851, 66 ff. It has not seemed worth while to reprint the catalogue at length, but I have added under the different heads the testimony of the catalogue with the letters H. C.

The list does not include the *Book against Celsus*, or the address on *Prayer;* the latter, however, may have been included in the collections of letters. On the other hand, it contains the title of a *Homily on Peace*, two *Homilies, de jejunis de monogamis et trigamis*, and of two *Homilies at Tarsus*. It also mentions the *Dialogue with Candidus the Valentinian*, which was known to Jerome (*Apol. adv. Ruf.* ii. 18 f.)

[o] It may be worth while to notice that the name is always spelt as one word in the titles and notices in the French as well as in the Latin text.

(2) *Fragm.* of *Tom.* iii. (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 1); notes from Catenae; *Fragm.* of *Hom.* ii.

Delarue, ii. 25–52, 60 ff.

(3) Additional notes.

Galland, *Biblioth.* xiv. app. 3 ff. The additional notes from Galland, and some of those from Mai, with one note from Cramer's *Catena*, are given in a supplementary volume of Migne.
(1) and (2) are given by Lommatzsch, viii. 1–104.

Latin.
Seventeen *Homilies*, of which the last is imperfect, translated by Rufinus. The translation, as in other cases, is sometimes falsely ascribed to Jerome, *e.g.* in Merlin's edition.

Delarue, ii. 52–110.
Lommatzsch, viii. 105–298.

The MSS. of the Latin Homilies on the books of the Old Testament, it may be observed once for all, are very abundant. The most interesting which I have seen is one in the British Museum, Add. 15,307, written in 1163, which deserves collation.

One of the fragments of the Commentary on Genesis contains a remarkable discussion of the theory of fate in connexion with Gen. i. 16 (quoted by Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* vi. c. 11, and given in *Philoc.* 23 [22]; comp. Euseb. l. c. vii. 20); and in the scattered notes there are some characteristic remarks on the interpretation of the record of Creation. (See notes on i. 26; ii. 2, 16; iii. 21.) For Origen all Creation was "one act at once," presented to us in parts, in order to give the due conception of order (comp. Ps. cxlviii. 5).

The Homilies, which were taken down from Origen's extemporary addresses (after A.D. 244), were translated by Rufinus, with such additions as he thought requisite to complete the interpretation of the passages touched upon (*Praef. ad Rom.*). They deal mainly with the moral application of main subjects in the book:

i. Gen. i. *The origin of the world and of that which is in it.*
ii. „ vi. 13–16. *The construction of the Ark.*
iii. „ xvii. 1–14. *The circumcision of Abraham.*
iv. „ xviii. 1–21. *The visit of the three men to Abraham.*
v. „ xix. *Lot and his daughters.*
vi. „ xx. *The history of Abimelech.*
vii. „ xxi. *The weaning of Isaac and ejection of Ishmael.*
viii. „ xxii. 1–14. *The offering of Isaac.*
ix. „ xxii. 15–17. *The renewed promise to Abraham.*
x. „ xxiv. *Rebecca at the well.*
xi. „ xxv. *Abraham and Keturah; Isaac at the well of vision.*
xii. „ xxv. 21 ff.; xxvi. 12. *The birth of Esau and Jacob.*
xiii. „ xxvi. 17 ff. *The wells of Isaac.*
xiv. „ xxvi. 26 ff. *Isaac and Abimelech.*
xv. „ xlv. 25 f. *The return of the sons of Jacob from Egypt.*
xvi. „ xlvii. 20 f. *The policy of Joseph.*
xvii. „ xlix. *The blessings of the patriarchs.*

They contain little continuous exposition, but abound in striking thoughts. Among the passages of chief interest may be named the view of the Divine image and the Divine likeness, as expressing man's endowment and man's end (i. §§ 12, 13), the symbolism of the ark (ii. §§ 4 ff.), the nature of the Divine voice (iii. § 2), the lesson of the opened wells (xiii. § 4), the poverty of the Divine priesthood (xvi. § 5).

EXODUS and LEVITICUS.

Of the Books, Homilies, and Notes, which Origen wrote on Exodus and Leviticus, no detailed account has been preserved. (Comp. *in Rom.* ix. § 1, p. 283 L; Ruf. *Apol.* ii. 20; Hier. *Ep.* 33.) (Notes on Exodus; ten "Books" on Leviticus; Notes. Thirteen Homilies on Exodus; eleven on Leviticus.—H. C.)

The following remain:

EXODUS.

Greek.

(1) On Ex. x. 27. (Several fragments.)

Huet, i. 17–25.
Delarue, ii. 111–120.

(2) Notes from Catenae. Two short *fragments* of *Hom.* viii.

Delarue, ii. 121–129, 158.

(3) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* p. 5.
(1) and (2) are given by Lommatzsch, viii. 299–332.

Latin.
Thirteen *Homilies*, translated by Rufinus.

Delarue, ii. 129–178.
Lommatzsch, ix. 1–162.

The main fragment of the Commentary on Exodus (*Philoc.* 27 [26]) deals with interpretation of the "hardening of Pharaoh's heart" (Ex. x. 27), which Origen (to use modern language) finds in the action of moral laws, while Pharaoh resisted the divine teaching.

The Homilies, like those on Genesis, were translated by Rufinus from the reports of Origen's sermons, which he supplemented with interpretative additions (*l. c.*). They deal with the following topics:

i. Ex. i. 1–10. The multiplying of the people and the strange king.
ii. „ i. 15–22. The Egyptian midwives.
iii. „ iv. 10–v. The Mission of Moses and Aaron.
iv. „ vii. ff. The ten plagues.
v. „ xii. 37 ff. The Exodus.
vi. „ xv. 1–22. The Song of Moses.
vii. „ xv. 23–xvi. 12. The waters of Marah and the Manna.
viii. „ xx. 1–6. The first Two Commandments.
ix. „ xxv. The Tabernacle.
x. „ xxi. 22–25. Miscarriage from strife.
xi. „ xvii. xviii. Rephidim: Amalek: Jethro.
xii. „ xxxiv. 33 f. The glory of the face of Moses.
xiii. „ xxxv. Freewill offerings of the Tabernacle.

Throughout Origen dwells upon the spiritual interpretation of the record. "Not one iota or one tittle is," in his opinion, "without mysteries" (*Hom.* i. 4). The literal history has a mystical and a moral meaning (*e.g. Hom.* i. 4 f.; ii. 1; iii. 3; iv. 8; vii. 3; x. 4; xiii. 5). Some of the applications which he makes are of great beauty, as, for example, in regard to the popular complaints against religious life, and the troubles which follow religious awakening (Ex. v. 4 ff., *Hom.* iii. 3); the difficulties of the heavenward pilgrimage (Ex. xiv. 2, *Hom.* v. 3); the believer as the tabernacle of God (*Hom.* ix. 4); turning to the Lord (Ex. xxxiv. 34, coll. 2 Cor. iii. 16, *Hom.* xii. 2); the manifold offerings of different believers (Ex. xxxv. 5, *Hom.* xiii. 3).

LEVITICUS.

Greek.

(1) *Fragm.* of *Hom.* 2 (5).

Huet, i. 26.
Delarue, ii. 192 f.

(2) Notes from Catenae.

Delarue, ii. 180–184.

(3) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* 6 f.

(4) A fragment (comp. *Hom. in Lev.* viii. 6), Mai, *Class. Auct.* t. x. p. 600.

(1) and (2) are given by Lommatzsch, ix. 163–171.

Latin.

Sixteen *Homilies* (translated by Rufinus).

Delarue, ii. 184–269.
Lommatzsch, ix. 172–446.

The main substance of the Greek Notes is contained in the translation of the Homilies. The fragment given in Philocalia (c. 1), as from the *second* Homily, is found in the *fifth* Latin Homily (§ 1), though, by a strange oversight, writers, from Huet (*Orig.* iii. 2. 1: "cujus ne apicem quidem in Homilia Latinae editionis secunda aliisve reperias") downwards, have said that it is not found in the Latin.

The Latin translation of the Homilies was made by Rufinus, who speaks of it as having been a work of considerable labour, as he altered their character from hortatory to interpretative (*Peror. Ep. ad Rom.*: "quae ab illo [Origene] quidem perorandi stilo a nobis vero explanandi specie translata sunt").

The Homilies treat of the following subjects:

i. Lev. i. 1–9. On offerings generally.
ii. „ iv. 3; 27 f. On the different persons who offer: the priest, "a soul of the people of the land."
iii. „ v. 1 ff. On offerings for involuntary offences.
iv. „ vi. 1–23. Offering for offences committed knowingly: burnt-offering.
v. „ vi. 24–vii. 34. Sin-offering: trespass offering: peace-offering.
vi. „ vii. 35–viii. 13. The consecration and array of the priests.
vii. „ x. 8 ff.–xi. Special laws for the priests. Animals clean and unclean.
viii. „ xii. 2 ff. xiii. xiv. Ceremonial uncleanness: leprosy.
ix. „ xvi. 1–17. The day of Atonement.
x. „ xvi. The fast on the day of Atonement and the scape-goat.
xi. „ xx. 7 ff. Consecration.
xii. „ xxi. 10. The High Priest.
xiii. „ xxiv. 1–9. The lamps, the shewbread, &c.
xiv. „ xxiv. 10–14. The blasphemer.
xv. „ xxv. Sales and redemptions.
xvi. „ xxvi. 3 ff. The blessings of obedience.

In the interpretation of Leviticus Origen naturally dwells on the obvious moral and spiritual antitypes of the Mosaic ordinances. Not unfrequently the use which he makes of them is impressive and ingenious. Such, for instance, is his view of man's soul and body, as the deposit which he owes to God (Lev. vi. 4, *Hom.* iv. 3); of the office of the Christian priest foreshadowed in that of the Jewish priest (Lev. vii. 28 ff., *Hom.* v. 12); of the priesthood of believers (Lev. viii. 7 ff., *Hom.* vi. 5; comp. *Hom.* ix. 9); of the Saviour's sorrow (Lev. x. 9 coll. Matt. xxvi. 9, *Hom.* vii. 2), of the purification by fire (Lev. xvi. 12, *Hom.* ix. 7). Throughout Christ appears as the one Sacrifice for the world, and the one Priest (*Hom.* i. 2; iv. 8; v. 3; ix. 2; xii.), though elsewhere He is said to join with Himself apostles and martyrs (*Hom. in Num.* x. 2).

NUMBERS.

No mention is made of "Books" on Numbers, unless the reference in *Prol. in Cant.* p. 316, &c. is to a commentary and not to a lost Homily. (Twenty-eight Homilies.—H. C.)

Of Notes and Homilies (comp. *Hom. in Jer.* xii. § 3) the following remain:

Greek.

(1) Notes from Catenae. Small *Fragment* of *Hom.* xiii.

Delarue, ii. 270–274; 321.
Lommatzsch, x. 1–8; 156 note.

(2) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* 7 f.

Latin.

Twenty-eight *Homilies*, translated by Rufinus.[p]

Delarue, ii. 275–386.
Lommatzsch, x. 9–370.

The Homilies follow the whole course of the narrative:

i. Num. i. 1–3. The idea of "numbering."
ii. „ ii. 1 f. The ordering of the tribes.
iii. „ iii. 11 ff. The separation of the Levites.
iv. „ iii. 39. The number of the Levites.
v. „ iv. 18 f., 47. The work of the Levites.
vi. „ xi. 24 ff., xii. 2. The seventy elders. The Ethiopian wife of Moses.
vii. „ xii. 5 ff. The leprosy of Miriam.
viii. „ xiv. 8 ff. The report of the spies and the murmurings of the people.
ix. „ xvi., xvii. The sedition of Korah. Aaron's rod.
x. „ xviii. 1 ff. The vicarious office of the priests.
xi. „ xviii. Of the first-fruits.
xii. „ xxi. 16 ff. The song of the well.
xiii. „ xxi. 24 ff., xxii. The defeat of Sihon and Og. Balaam and the ass.
xiv. „ xxii. Balaam.
xv. „ xxiii. 1–10. The first prophecy of Balaam.
xvi. „ xxiii. 11–24. The second prophecy.
xvii. „ xxiii. 27–xxiv. 9. The third prophecy.
xviii. „ xxiv. 10–19. The fourth prophecy.
xix. „ xxiv. 20–24. The fifth prophecy.
xx. „ xxv. The sin with Baal-peor.
xxi. „ xxvi. The second numbering of the people.
xxii. „ xxvii. 1 ff. The daughters of Zelophehad. Provision for Moses' successor.
xxiii. „ xxviii. On the various Festivals.

---

[p] Cassiodorus (*Instit.* 1) mentions thirty, but this is probably only a difference of numbering. Several Homilies might be properly divided: *e.g.* ix. xiii., xxii. The translation of the Homilies (twenty-eight) on Numbers was among the latest works of Rufinus. It was made in the year of his death (410), after the desolation of Rhegium by Alaric, and while Sicily was still threatened by the Goths (Ruf. *Prolog.*). Rufinus incorporated in his translation the notes (*Excerpta*) which he found (*l. c.*) In offering it to Ursacius, at whose request it was undertaken, he proposes, if his health allows, to translate the Homilies on Deuteronomy, which alone remained of Origen's writings on the Pentateuch. This design however was hindered by his death.

xxiv. Num. xxx. On various offerings.
xxv. „ xxxi. The vengeance on the Midianites.
xxvi. „ xxxi. 48 ff., xxxii. Differences among the people.
xxvii. „ xxxiii. Stages in the people's journeyings.
xxviii. „ xxxiv. The borders of the land.

One main idea is prominent throughout. The struggles of the Israelites on the way to Canaan are the image of the struggles of the Christian. The entrance on the Promised Land foreshadows the entrance on the heavenly realm (*Hom.* vii. 5). The future world will even, in Origen's judgment, offer differences of race and position corresponding to those of the tribes of Israel and the nations among whom they moved (*Hom.* i. 3; ii. 1; xi. 5; xxviii. 4). The interpretation of the record of the stations (*Hom.* xxvii.) is a very good example of the way in which he finds a meaning in the minutest details of the history. Of wider interest are his remarks on man's spiritual conflict (*Hom.* vii. 6), on the wounds of sin (*Hom.* viii. 1), on advance in wisdom (*Hom.* xvii. 4), on the festivals of heaven (*Hom.* xxiii. 11), on self-dedication (*Hom.* xxiv. 2), on the stains of battle (*Hom.* xxv. 6).

DEUTERONOMY.

Cassiodorus (*de Instit.* 1) mentions four Homilies of Origen on Deuteronomy (in quibus est minuta nimis et subtilis expositio), and there can be no doubt that it was these (*oratiunculae*) Rufinus proposed to translate if his health had been restored. Origen speaks of the interpretation of Deuteronomy as a work still future in the latest book of his commentary on St. John (*in Joh.* Tom. xxxii. § 11). On the other hand he refers to his discussion of Deut. iv. 17 in his homilies on St. Luke (*Hom.* viii.).

(Thirteen Homilies.—H. C.)

The scanty remains are:

(1) Notes from Catenae.

Delarue, ii. 386–393.
Lommatzsch, x. 371–382.

(2) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* 8–14.

One interesting note at least among those which have been collected from Catenae appears to be a fragment of a homily (*in Deut.* viii. 7).

It is probable (Hier. *Ep.* 84, 7) that considerable fragments of Origen's comments on the Pentateuch are contained in Ambrose's treatise on the *Hexaemeron*, but the treatise has not yet been critically examined.

ii. JOSHUA–SECOND KINGS.

Origen appears to have treated these historical books in homilies only, or perhaps in detached notes also.

(Twenty-six Homilies on Joshua.—H. C.)

There remain of the several books:

JOSHUA.

Greek.

(1) *Fragm.* of *Hom.* xx.

Huet, i. 26 ff.
Delarue, ii. 442 f.

(2) Notes from Catenae.

Delarue, ii. 393–6.

(3) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* 14 f.
(1) and (2) are given by Lommatzsch, xi. 167 ff. 1–166, 170–214.

Latin.

Twenty-six *Homilies*, translated by Rufinus.

Delarue, ii. 397–457.
Lommatzsch, xi. 6–214.

The homilies on Joshua belong to the latest period of Origen's life. They were delivered after the homilies on Jeremiah (*Hom.* xiii. 3), and the reference to a systematic persecution in *Hom.* ix. 10 seems to point to that of Decius 250. In this case the Latin translator Rufinus appears, from the language of his preface, to have adhered faithfully to the texts before him. (Comp. *Peror. Ep. ad Rom.*: quae in Jesu Naue scripsimus simpliciter expressimus ut invenimus.) Perhaps for this reason these homilies offer the most attractive specimen of Origen's popular interpretation. The parallel between the leader of the Old Church and the Leader of the New is drawn with great ingenuity and care. The spiritual interpretation of the conquest of Canaan, as an image of the Christian life, never flags. Fact after fact is made contributory to the fulness of the idea; and the reader is forced to acknowledge that the fortunes of Israel can at least speak to us with an intelligible voice. Rufinus himself may have felt the peculiar charm of the book, for he selected it for translation in answer to a general request of Chromatius to render something from Greek literature for the edification of the church.

The homilies cover the whole narrative up to the settling of the land (c. xxii.):

i. Introductory.
ii. Josh. i. 1 ff. The charge to Joshua.
iii. „ i. 16 ff., ii. The preparation.
iv. „ iii. The passage of Jordan.
v. „ iv.–v. 9. The renewal of the Covenant.
vi. „ v. 10 ff. The Passover at Gilgal; and the divine vision.
vii. „ vi. The capture of Jericho.
viii. „ vii.–viii. 29. The failure before Ai and its capture.
ix. „ viii. 30 ff. The altar in Ebal, and the blessings and cursings.
x. „ ix. The craft of the Gibeonites.
xi. „ x. The battle of Beth-horon.
xii. The spiritual interpretation generally.
xiii. Josh. x. 28 ff. The taking of Libnah, &c.
xiv. „ xi. 1 ff. The conquest of Jabin.
xv. „ xi. 9 ff. Vengeance on the enemies of the Lord.
xvi. „ xiii. 1. Joshua at the close of life.
xviii. „ xiii. 14. The Levites without earthly inheritance.
xviii. „ xiv. 6 ff. The request of Caleb.
xix. „ xv. 1. The borders of Judah.
xx. „ xv. 13 ff. Caleb and his daughter.
xxi. „ xv. 63. The Jebusites unconquered.
xxii. „ xvi. 10. Ephraim and the Canaanites.
xxiii. „ xviii. 8. Distribution by lot.
xxiv. „ xix. 47 (LXX) ff. The remaining Amorites. The portion of Joshua.
xxv. „ xxi. 2 ff. The cities of the Levites.
xxvi. „ xxi. 42 (LXX), xxii. 11 ff. The burying of the stone knives and the altar of the trans-Jordanic tribes.

Among other passages of special interest may be mentioned those on the help which we gain from the old fathers (*Hom.* iii. 1); the broad parallel between the Christian life and the history of the Exodus (*Hom.* iv. 1); the Christian realising Christ's victory (*Hom.* vii. 2); growing wisdom (*Hom.* xii. 2).

(Nine Homilies on Judges: eight *in Paschae.*—H. C.)

JUDGES.

Greek.

(1) Notes from Catenae.

Delarue, ii. 457 f.
Lommatzsch, xi. 215 f.

(2) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* 15.

Latin.

Nine *Homilies*, translated by Rufinus.

Delarue, ii. 458–478.
Lommatzsch, xi. 217–284.

RUTH.

Greek.

A note on i. 4.

Delarue, ii. 478.
Lommatzsch, xi. 284.

The Homilies on Judges contain a reference to Homilies on Joshua (*Hom.* iii. § 3), but Origen may have treated the book more than once. Rufinus translated them, as he says, literally as he found them (*Peror. Ep. ad Rom.*). They are of much less interest than those on Joshua, and deal with the following subjects:

i. Jud. ii. 7. The Israelites serving the Lord.
ii. „ ii. 8 ff. The death of Joshua.
iii. „ iii. 9 ff., 12 ff. Othniel and Ehud.
iv. „ iii. 31, iv. 1 ff. Shamgar, Jabin, Sisera.
v. „ iv. 4 ff. Deborah, Barak, Jael.
vi. „ v. The song of Deborah.
vii. „ vi. 1 ff. The oppression of Midian.
viii. „ vi. 33 ff. Gideon.
ix. „ vii. The victory of Gideon.

A passage on martyrdom—the baptism of blood—is worthy of notice (*Hom.* vii. 2). In another passage (*Hom.* ix. 1) Origen seems to refer to the persecution of Maximinus, which was but lately ended.

FIRST and SECOND SAMUEL, FIRST and SECOND KINGS (First to Fourth Kings).

Greek.

(Four Homilies on 1 Kings.—H. C.)

(1) *Hom.* on 1 Sam. xxviii. (*On the Witch of Endor*).

Huet, i. 28–37.
Delarue, ii. 490–498.

(2) Notes from Catenae and Fragments.

Delarue, ii. 479–81.

(3) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* 16–24.
(1) and (2) are given in Lommatzsch, xi. 317–332, 285–288.

Latin.

Homily on 1 Sam. i. ii. (*De Helchana et Fenenna*), delivered at Jerusalem (§ 1: nolite illud in nobis requirere quod in papa Alexandro habetis). The translator is not known.

Delarue, ii. 481–489.
Lommatzsch, xi. 289–316.

The remains of Origen's writings on the later historical books are very slight. Origen himself refers (*Hom. on Josh.* iii. § 4) to a Homily on Solomon's Judgment (1 Kings iii.); and in the time of Cassiodorus there were, in addition to the two extant Homilies, four Homilies on 1 Sam., one on 2 Sam., one on 2 Chron. (*Instit.* 2), and "two on the book of Ezra, which were translated into Latin by Bellator" (*Instit.* 6). It is possible that at least the two last may yet be found.

The Homily on the witch of Endor provoked violent attacks. In this Origen maintained, in accordance with much early Christian and Jewish opinion, that the soul of Samuel was truly called up from Hades. Among others Eustathius of Antioch assailed Origen in unmeasured terms. One passage in the Latin Homily may be specially noticed, in which unity is set forward as the special privilege of saints (§ 4).

iii. THE HAGIOGRAPHA.

JOB.

Origen composed many Homilies on Job (Eustath. Antioch. *de Engastr.* 391), which were rendered freely into Latin by Hilary of Poictiers (Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 100; *Ep. adv. Vigil.* 61, 2). The scattered Notes which remain are not sufficient to enable us to estimate their value. Comp. *Hom. in Ezech.* vi. 4; Hier. *Ep. ad Pammach.* 57, 6; *Lib.* 1. *c. Ruf.* § 2.[q]

(Twenty-two Homilies on Job.—H. C.)

There remain:

Greek.

(1) Notes from Catenae.

Delarue, 500–510.
Lommatzsch, xi. 335–350

(2) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* 30–54.
Mai, *Class. Auct.* tom. ix. in Procopius (many additional passages).

Latin.

Fragment quoted from a homily of Hilary by August. *Lib.* ii. *c. Jul.* § 27, and assumed to be translated from Origen.

Delarue, ii. 500.
Lommatzsch, xi. 333 f.

THE PSALMS.

The Psalms engaged Origen's attention before he left Alexandria. At that time he had written commentaries on Pss. i.–xxv. (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 24). He continued and completed the book afterwards. Jerome expressly states that he "left an explanation of all the Psalms in many volumes" (*Ep.* cxii. § 20); and his extant books contain references to his commentaries on psalms scattered throughout the collection (comp. Hier. *Ep.* xxxiv. § 1).

In addition to these detailed commentaries Origen illustrated the Psalter by short Notes ("a handbook:" enchiridion ille vocabat, Auct. ap. Hier. *Tom.* vii. *App.*[r]), and by Homilies.

---

[q] The two works on Job printed with Origen's writings are not his. Comp. Tillemont, note 34.

[r] The passage is worth quoting: "Cum Origenis Psalterium, quod Enchiridion ille vocabat .... in commune legeremus, simul uterque deprehendimus nonnulla eum .... intacta reliquisse, de quibus in alio opere .... disputavit .... Igitur .... studiose .... postulasti ut quaecumque mihi digna memoria videbantur signis quibusdam annotarem .... non quod putem a me posse dici quae ille praeteriit, sed quod ea quae in tomis vel homiliis ipse disseruit vel ego digna arbitror lectione in hunc angustum commentariolum referam." There can be no doubt therefore that this *Breviarium in Psalmos* contains much of Origen's work and deserves consideration in this respect.

The Homilies which are preserved in Rufinus's Latin translation belong to the latest period of Origen's life, c. 241–247 (*Hom.* 1 *in Ps.* xxxvi. § 2; *Hom.* 1 *in Ps.* xxxvii. § 1). They give a continuous practical interpretation of the three psalms, and are a very good example of this style of exposition. One passage on the permanent effects of actions on the doer may be specially noticed (*Hom.* ii. § 2).

The Greek fragments preserved in the Catenae offer numerous close coincidences with the Latin Homilies, and there is no reason to doubt that they represent the general sense of Origen's comments. Comp. *Comm. in Rom.* iv. § 1 (cum de Psalmis per ordinem dictaremus); *id.* § 11; *Hom. in Jer.* xv. 6.

(Notes on Psalms, in all forty-six books; and one hundred and eighteen Homilies.—H. C.)

There remain still of writings on the Psalms:

Greek.

(1) *Fragments* from the Τόμοι and *Homilies.*

Huet, i. 1–51.
Delarue, ii. 525–529, 532, 565–572.

(2) Additional fragments and notes from Catenae.

Delarue, ii. 513–524, 529–849.

(3) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* 54–73. Comp. Delarue, ii. *Praef.* p. ii.
(1) and (2) are given in Lommatzsch, xi. 351–458; xii. xiii. 1–165, with an additional fragment from Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 38.

Latin.

Nine *Homilies* on Pss. xxxvi. xxxvii. xxxviii. (translated by Rufinus).

Delarue, ii. 655–679, 680–689, 691–700.
Lommatzsch, xii. 151–234, 237–271, 274–306.

PROVERBS.

(Three Books; seven Homilies; one book of questions.—H. C.)

On the book of Proverbs there remain:

Greek.

(1) Fragments.

Delarue, iii. 2–10.
Lommatzsch, xiii. 219–234.

(2) Notes from Catenae.

Galland, *l. c.* 25–29.
Additional notes, Mai, *Bibl. Nov. Patrum*, vii.

Latin.

Fragments.

Delarue, iii. 1.
Lommatzsch, xiii. 217 f.

ECCLESIASTES.

(Notes; eight Homilies.—H. C.)

Notes on iii. 3, 7, 16 f.

Galland, *l. c.* 30.

LAMENTATIONS.

Origen wrote commentaries on the Lamentations before 231, of which five books had come down to the time of Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 24). The Greek notes are probably derived from these.

(Five Books.—H. C.)

Delarue, iii. 321–351.
Lommatzsch, xiv. 167–216.

CANTICLES.

It was natural that the book of Canticles should occupy Origen early. He wrote a small volume upon it, of which a fragment remains in the *Philocalia*, c. vii. At a much later time, when he was at Athens 240, he composed five books of a full commentary, which he afterwards completed at Caesarea (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 32). Jerome speaks of the work with enthusiasm: "in his other books Origen," he says, "surpassed every one else, in this he surpassed himself" (*Prol. in Hom. in Cant.*). The prologue and part of the full commentary (to *Cant.* ii. 16) were translated by Rufinus.[a] Jerome himself shrank from undertaking the task, and rendered instead two Homilies, which cover the same ground but in a simpler form. No work of Origen's more widely influenced later commentators. He marked in it once for all the main lines of allegorical interpretation which they followed. The writing contains also some passages of more general interest, as the examination of the three books of Solomon—Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles—in connexion with the popular types of speculation (*Prol.*).

(Ten Books; two Books written early; two Homilies.—H. C.)

There remain:

Greek.

(1) *Fragments* of his early work.

Huet, i. 51 f.
Delarue, iii. 11.
Lommatzsch, xiv. 232 f

(2) Extracts by Procopius.

Delarue, iii. 94–104.
Lommatzsch, xv. 91–108.

Latin.

Two *Homilies* (translated by Jerome).

Delarue, iii. 12–22.
Lommatzsch, xiv. 235–278.

Prologue and four books on Canticles, translated by Rufinus.

Delarue, iii. 26–94.
Lommatzsch, xiv. 287–437; xv. 1–90.

iv. THE PROPHETS.

ISAIAH.

Origen interpreted Isaiah in each of the three forms which he used in Books (τόμοι), in Notes, and in Homilies. Thirty books of his Commentaries remained when Eusebius wrote his *History* extending to c. xxx. 6 (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 32). Some of these had already perished in the time of Jerome, who speaks of the work as abounding in allegories and interpretation of names (*Prol. in Lib.* v. *in Es.*: liberis allegoriae spatiis evagatur et interpretatis nominibus singulorum ingenium suum facit ecclesiae sacramenta). Besides these Commentaries Jerome was acquainted with twenty-five Homilies and Notes.

(Thirty-six Books; thirty-six books of notes (?); thirty-two Homilies.—H. C.)

---

[a] This appears to be the real meaning of what Cassiodorus says, *De Div. Instit.* § 5, though he apparently describes Rufinus' work as only an amplified translation of the same original as Jerome rendered: quos item Rufinus...adjectis quibusdam locis usque ad illud praeceptum quod ait *capite nobis*... (ii. 15) tribus libris latius exposuit.

All that at present remains of these Commentaries and Homilies is:

Latin.

Two fragments of the "Books."

Nine *Homilies.*

Delarue, iii. 105–124.
Lommatzsch, xiii. 235–301.

The last of the Homilies is imperfect. They were translated by Jerome, who is accused by Rufinus of having modified the original text for dogmatic purposes.

The Homilies were addressed to a popular audience, including catechumens, but they want the ease of the latest discourses, and follow no exact order.

i. Is. vi. 1–7. The call of the prophet.
ii. „ vii. 10–16. The virgin's son.
iii. „ iv. 1. The seven women.
iv. „ vi. 1–7. The vision of God.
v. „ xii. 2; vi. 1 ff.
vi. „ vi. 8 ff. The mission of the prophet.
vii. „ viii. 18 ff. The prophet and his children.
viii. „ x. 10–13.
ix. „ vi. 8–vii. 11. (A fragment.)

One passage of characteristic excellence may be mentioned (*Hom.* vi. 4), in which Origen describes the "greater works" of Christ's disciples.

JEREMIAH.

Cassiodorus enumerates forty-five homilies of Origen on Jeremiah "in Attic style" (*de Instit. div. litt.* § 3). Of these Jerome translated fourteen "confuso ordine" (*Praef. in Hom. in Jer. et Ezech.*), which have been preserved; and Rabanus Maurus (*Praef. in Jerem.*), referring to the statement of Cassiodorus, states that he could find only fourteen homilies translated. Of the nineteen Greek homilies twelve are identical with twelve of Jerome, so that altogether twenty-one homilies remain. The homilies were written in a period of tranquillity, and therefore, in all probability, after the close of the persecution of Maximinus, c. 245 (*Hom.* iv. 3).

(Twenty-four Homilies.—H. C.)

There remains then altogether:

Greek.

(1) Nineteen *Homilies* (with Jerome's version of twelve). Fragment of *Hom.* xxxix.

Huet, i. 53–199.
Delarue, iii. 125–276, 285 f.
Lommatzsch, xv. 109–388 (without Jerome's translation).

(2) Notes from Catenae.

Delarue, iii. 287–320.
Lommatzsch, xv. 418–480.

Latin.

Two *Homilies*, translated by Jerome.

Delarue, iii. 277–286.
Lommatzsch, xv. 389–417.

The Greek homilies were first published in 1548, from a MS. in the Escurial under the name of Cyril, which they bore in the MS., by B. Corderius. A second MS., containing the same Homilies, was afterwards found in the Vatican by M. Ghisler, who published the Greek text of the seven not translated by Jerome (3, 5, 6, 7, 15, 18, 19) in his *Commentary on Jeremiah* (1623). The various readings of this text were added by Huet to his reprint of the text of Corderius, and they are given from him in later editions of Origen.[t]

The nineteen Greek *Homilies* follow the order of the text:

i. Jer. i. 1–10. The mission of the prophet.
ii. „ ii. 21 f. The degenerate vine.
iii. „ ii. 31. The universal goodness of God.
iv. „ iii. 6–10. Perils of degeneracy.
v. „ iii. 22–iv. 8. Call to repentance.
vi. „ v. 3 ff. Insensibility.
vii. „ v. 18 f. Chastisement.
viii. „ x. 12 ff. The work of God for men.
ix. „ xi. 1–10. The word of God to His people.
x. „ xi. 18–xii. 9. The apostasy of the Jews. Christ's work.
xi. „ xii. 11–xiii. 11. The rejection of the Jews.
xii. „ xiii. 12–17. Just judgment.
xiii. „ xv. 5 ff. Punishment of backsliders.
xiv. „ xv. 10–19. The lot of the rejected prophet.
xv. „ xv. 10 ff.; xvii. 5. The sorrow of Christ. No hope in man.
xvi. „ xvi. 16–xvii. 1. Fishers and hunters of souls. The record of sin.
xvii. „ xvii. 11–16. The image of the partridge. Divine help.
xviii. „ xviii. 1–16; xx. 1–6. The potter. The punishment of the impenitent. The lesson of Pashur.
xix. „ xx. 7–12. How God deceives. Endurance of reproaches.
xx. (Latin.) Jer. i. 23–29. The hammer of the earth broken.
xxi. (Latin.) „ ii. 6–9. Flight from Babylon.
xxxix. (Gk. fragm.) Jer. xliv. 22. Each word of Scripture has its work.

For the most part the Homilies give a full interpretation of the text, accommodating the language of the prophet to the circumstances of the Christian Church. But Origen's total want of historical feeling makes itself felt perhaps more in his treatment of this book than elsewhere, for the teaching of Jeremiah is practically unintelligible without a true sense of the tragic crisis in which he was placed. There are however many separate passages of the Homilies of considerable beauty, *e.g.* on the fruitful discipline of God (*Hom.* iii. 2), the ever-new birth of Christ (*Hom.* ix. 4), the marks of sin (*Hom.* xvi. 10). Comp. *Hom. in Josh.* xiii. § 3.

The selected Notes probably supply the general sense of the lost homilies on the passages to which they refer. As far as the Homilies extend, they contain the main substance of the Notes.

EZEKIEL.

(Twenty-nine Books; twelve Homilies.—H. C.)

Of Origen's writings on Ezekiel there remain:

Greek.

(1) Fragments.

Huet, i. 200 f.
Delarue, iii. 352 f.
Lommatzsch, xiv. 1 ff.

(2) Notes from Catenae.

Delarue, iii. 406–437.
Lommatzsch, xiv. 179–232.
Mai, *Bibl. Nov. Patrum*, vii.

---

[t] It is commonly said, as even the language of Huet seems to suggest, that Ghisler found only seven homilies. His own account (*Praef.* c. vii.) is quite clear that he found twenty homilies, nineteen on Jeremiah with one other, and that he printed the seven homilies on Jeremiah which were not translated by Jerome. It does not appear that either of the MSS. have been re-examined.

Latin.

Fourteen *Homilies.*

Delarue, iii. 353–406

Lommatzsch, xiv. 4–178.

Eusebius records that Origen wrote a Commentary on Ezekiel in twenty-five books, which was finished at Athens, c. 238 (*H. E.* vi. 32). Of these the notes may contain some fragments; and one fragment of the twentieth book is given in the *Philocalia* (c. xi.). The Homilies belong to a later date. Of these (it is unknown how many were published) Jerome translated fourteen, preserving in his version, as he says, the simple style of the original (*Prol. in Ezech.*). These treat of the following passages:

i.	Ezek.	i. 1–16.	The first vision of Ezekiel.
ii.	„	xiii. 2–9.	The message to false prophets.
iii.	„	xiii. 17–xiv. 8.	The heaviness of the prophet's charge.
iv.	„	xiv. 13 f.	Personal salvation of the righteous.
v.	„	xiv., xv. 2.	The judgments of God.
vi.	„	xvi. 2–15.	The misery of God's people in sin.
vii.	„	xvi. 16–29.	The abominations of false teaching.
viii.	„	xvi. 30–33.	The issues of false teaching.
ix.	„	xvi. 45–52.	The heinousness of pride.
x.	„	xvi. 52–60.	The fruit of chastisement.
xi.	„	xvii. 2, 3.	The parable of the eagle.
xii.	„	xvii. 12–24.	Judgments and promises.
xiii.	„	xxviii. 12, 13.	Corruption of blessings.
xiv.	„	xliv. 2.	The closed gate.

It will be seen that the Homilies cover only a small portion of the book; nor do they offer many features of special interest. The passages which speak of the responsibility of teachers (*Hom.* v. 5; vii. 3) are perhaps the most striking.

DANIEL.

Origen commented upon the histories of Susanna and of Bel (Dan. *Apocr.* xiii. xiv.) in the tenth book of his *Miscellanies* (*Στρωματεῖς*), and Jerome has preserved a brief abstract of his notes as an appendix to his commentary on Daniel (Delarue, i. 49 f.; Lommatzsch, xvii., 70 ff.).

In a collection of notes on Daniel printed by Mai (*Script. Vet. Nova Coll.* i. 2, Romae 1825), I have observed two notes referred to Origen on Dan. i. 8; iv. 25, but they might well have been taken from homilies on other books.

THE MINOR PROPHETS.

Origen wrote extensive commentaries on the twelve minor prophets, of which twenty-five books remained in the time of Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 36); and Jerome says that he found a manuscript of them "written by the hand of Pamphilus" which he kept "as the treasures of Croesus" (*De Vir. Ill.* § 75). Of the number of these were probably the two volumes on Zech. i.–v., the three on Malachi, and the two on Hosea, which Jerome mentions in the prefaces of his own commentaries on those books. The fragment on Hosea xii., preserved in the *Philocalia*, c. viii., is all that now remains.

(Two Books on Hosea (one on Ephraim); two on Joel; six on Amos; one on Jonah; two on Micah; two on Nahum; three on Habakkuk; two on Zephaniah; one on Haggai; two on Zechariah (principio); two on Malachi.—H. C.)

HOSEA.

Fragment.

Huet, i. 201 f.

Delarue, iii. 438 f.

Lommatzsch, xiii. 302 ff.

2. WRITINGS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

ST. MATTHEW

There remain:

Greek.

(1) Fragments of Τόμοι i. ii. Τόμοι x.–xvii. (Matt. xiii. 36–xxii. 33).

Huet, i. 203–469.

Delarue, iii. 440–829.

Lommatzsch, iii. 1–iv. 172.

(2) Notes from Catenae.

Galland, *l. c.* 73–83.

(3) A large number of additional notes from *Cod. Coislin.* xxiii.

Cramer, *Catena*, vol. i., Oxford, 1840.

Latin.

(1) Fragments.

(2) An old version of the commentary on St. Matthew, xvi. 13–xxvii.

Delarue, iii. 521–931.

Lommatzsch gives the Latin version from the point where the Greek fails; iv. 173–v. 84.

Eusebius states that Origen wrote twenty-five Books (*τόμοι*) on St. Matthew (*H. E.* vi. 36); and Jerome, in the preface to his commentary on St. Matthew, says that he had read that number; but in the prologue to his translation of Origen's homilies on St. Luke he speaks, according to the common text, of "thirty-six books" (the Corpus Christi Coll. Camb. MS. reads *twenty-six*), and Rufinus again (*Apol.* ii. § 22) of "twenty-six." From the proportion which the remaining books bear to the whole gospel, the statement of Eusebius appears to be correct. The largest number is certainly wrong.

The commentaries seem to have been written c. A.D. 245–6. He refers in them to his (lost) homilies on St. Luke (Tom. xiii. 29; Tom. xvi. 9); and to his commentaries on St. John (Tom. xvi. 20; *Comm. Ser.* §§ 77, 133, John xix. 18) and on the Romans (Tom. xvii. 32). In addition to the "Books" Origen also wrote Homilies and Notes (scholia) upon the Gospel (Hier. *Praef. in Matt.*). Fragments from these may be preserved in some of the notes from Catenae.

(Twenty-five Books; twenty-five Homilies. —H. C.)

The Greek text of the Commentaries is preserved in four MSS.

1. *Codex Holmiensis*, in the Library of Trin. Coll. Cambridge, B. 8, 10, quoted by Delarue as *two* MSS.: collated by Bentley, in a copy of Huet, in the same library, F. 7, 13.[a]
2. *Codex Regius*, a Paris MS., used by Huet.
3. *Codex Vaticanus* 597, used by Delarue.
4. *Codex Venetus* 43, examined partially by Petermann for Lommatzsch.

To these may be added a copy of a MS. made by Tarinus and used by Delarue.

[a] Huet seems to insinuate some doubts as to Thorndike's title to the MS. The inscription in the MS. is quite definite: "Hic est ille codex Holmiensis quem toties laudat Dan. Huetius in suis Origenianis. (Then apparently in another hand.) Donavit Herberto Thorndicio Isaacus Vossius." A MS. of the *Dialogues against the Marcionites* in the same collection (B. 9. 110) bears an inscription in the same hand: "Dedit Herberto Thorndicio cl. v. Is. Vossius."

All the MSS. are from one archetype (see lacunae, xii. 20, 42; xiii. 28; xvii. 29, 31).

The Latin text of the *editio princeps* (Merlin) represents a good MS. Delarue in the Appendix in vol. iv. pp. 388 ff. has given a collation of two MSS., one of the 8th and the other of the 12th century, which Lommatzsch has incorporated in his edition; and there is a very fine MS. (*Saec.* xii.) in the British Museum (*Add.* 26,761).

The Latin MSS. like the Greek, seem to represent a single archetype.

The work was probably addressed to Ambrosius. Personal addresses occur in it not unfrequently (xiv. 24, σὺ ζητήσαις ἄν; xv. 5; xvi. 7, § 19).

The *Cod. Holm.* gives the tenth and eleventh books under one heading—ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὸ K. M. εὐαγ. T. ιᾱ (the later books are headed Τόμις ιβ̄, &c.), and the same heading is found in other authorities. The commentary however does not seem to be a mere series of extracts; and the old Latin version is not more remote from the text than other Latin versions of Origen's works in which the translators introduced from time to time notes from other parts of his works.

The *tenth* book gives a continuous exposition of Matt. xiii. 36–xiv. 15. The most interesting passages are those in which Origen discusses characteristically the types of spiritual sickness (*c.* 24); and the doubtful question as to "the brethren of the Lord" (*c.* 17). In the latter place he gives his own opinion, on internal grounds, in favour of the belief in the perpetual virginity of the mother of the Lord. In the account of Herod's banquet he has preserved definitely the fact, that "the daughter of Herodias" bore the same name as her mother (*c.* 22), in accordance with the true reading in Mark vi. 22 (τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἡρῳδιάδος); but he strangely supposes that the power of life and death was taken away from Herod in consequence of the execution of the Baptist (*c.* 21).

The *eleventh* book (*c.* xiv. 15–xv. 32) contains several pieces of considerable interest on the discipline of temptation (*c.* 6), on *Corban* (*c.* 9), on the conception of things unclean (*c.* 12), on the healing spirit in the Church (*c.* 18), and perhaps, above all, that on the Eucharist (*c.* 14), which is of primary importance for the understanding of Origen's view.

The most important passages in the *twelfth* book which gives the commentary on *c.* xvi. 1–xvii. 9, are those which treat of the confession and blessing of St. Peter (*cc.* 10 ff.), and of the Transfiguration (*cc.* 37 ff.). In the former he regards St. Peter as the type of the true believer. All believers, as they are Christians, are Peters also (*c.* 11: παρώνυμοι πέτρας πάντες οἱ μιμηταὶ Χριστοῦ... Χριστοῦ μέλη ὄντες παρώνυμοι ἐχρημάτισαν Χριστιανοί, πέτρας δὲ πέτροι). His ignorance of the Hebrew idiom leads him, like other early commentators, to refer the "binding and loosing" to sins (*c.* 14).

The *thirteenth* book (*c.* xvii. 10–xviii. 18) opens with an argument against transmigration. Later on there is an interesting discussion of the influence of the planets upon men (*c.* 6). Other characteristic passages deal with the various circumstances under which the Lord healed the sick (*c.* 3), the rule for avoiding offences (*c.* 24), and especially the doctrine of guardian angels (*cc.* 26 f.).

The *fourteenth* book (*c.* xviii. 19–xix. 11) contains a characteristic examination of the senses in which the "two or three" in Matt. xviii. 20 may be understood (*cc.* 1 ff.); and a somewhat detailed discussion of points connected with marriage (*cc.* 16 ff.; *cc.* 23 ff.).

The *fifteenth* book (xix. 12–xx. 16) has several pieces of more than usual interest: the investigation of the meaning of Matt. xix. 12 f. with (as it appears) clear reference to his own early error (*c.* 2); a fine passage on the goodness of God even in His chastisements (*c.* 11); and some remarkable interpretations of the five sendings of labourers to the vineyard (Matt. xx. 1 ff.), in one of which he likens St. Paul to one who had wrought as an apostle in one hour more perhaps than all those before him (*c.* 35).

The *sixteenth* book (xx. 17–xxi. 22) gives some striking pictures of the darker side of Christian society, of the growing pride of the hierarchy, of the faults of church officers, of the separation between clergy and laity (*cc.* 8, 22, 25). In discussing the healing of Bartimaeus Origen holds that a choice must be made between supposing that the three evangelists have related three incidents, if the literal record is to be maintained, or that they relate one and the same spiritual fact in different words (*c.* 12).

The *seventeenth* book (xxi. 23–xxii. 33) contains interpretations of the parables of the two sons (*c.* 4), of the vineyard (6 ff.), of the marriage feast (15 ff.), which are good examples of Origen's method; and his explanations of the questions of the Herodians (*cc.* 26 ff.) and the Sadducees (*c.* 33) are of interest.

The old Latin translation continues the commentary to Matt. xxvii. 63. As passages in it of chief interest may be noticed: the application of the woes (Matt. xxiii. 1 ff.), §§ 9–25; the legend of the death of Zachariah the father of the Baptist, § 25; the danger of false opinions, § 33; the gathering of the saints, § 51; the limitation of the knowledge of the Son (Matt. xxiv. 36), § 55; the administration of the revenues of the church, § 61; the duty of using all that is lent to us, § 66; the eternal fire, immaterial, § 72; the supposition of three anointings of the Lord's feet, § 77; the passover of the Jews and of the Lord, § 79; on the Body and Blood of Christ, § 85; the lesson of the Agony, § 91; tradition of the different appearance of the Lord to men of different powers of vision, § 100; the reading *Jesus Barabbas* to be rejected, § 121; tradition as to the grave of Adam on Calvary, § 126; on the darkness at the crucifixion, § 134.

St. Mark.

A Latin commentary attributed to Victor of Antioch, published at Ingoldstadt in 1580, is said to contain quotations from Origen on *cc.* i. xiv. (Ceillier, p. 635). These, if the reference is correct, may have been taken from other parts of his writings.

(Fifteen Books; Thirty-nine Homilies.—H. C.)

St. Luke.

There remain of Origen's writings on St. Luke:

Greek.

(1) Fragments.

Delarue, iii. 979–983.
Lommatzsch, v. 237–244.

(2) Notes from a Venice MS. (xxviii.)

Galland, *l. c.* 83–109.

(3) Additional notes, Mai, *Class. Auct.* tom. x. p. 474 ff.[v]

(4) Additional notes from *Cod. Coislin.* xxiii.

Cramer, *Catena*, ii., Oxford, 1841.

Latin.
Thirty-nine *Homilies.*

Delarue, iii. 932–979.
Lommatzsch, v. 85–236.

Origen wrote four Books on St. Luke (Hier. *Prol. ad Hom.*) from which the detached notes were probably taken.

There is a MS. of the Homilies of sec. viii.–ix., written in Lombardic characters, in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (No. cccxxxiv.), which is of the highest importance. This gives in the prologue "viginti sex tomos in Matthaeum ... triginta *duos* in Johannem." It has lost one leaf containing the end of *Hom.* i. and the beginning of *Hom.* ii.

The short Homilies on St. Luke, an early work of Origen, were translated by Jerome; and in spite of the objections of Daillé (*De Scriptis quae sub Din. Areop. et Ign. nomine feruntur*, pp. 439 f.), which were answered by Pearson (*Vindic. Ignat.* pars i. c. 7), they appear to be certainly genuine, and abound in characteristic thoughts.

They deal with the following passages:

i.	Luke	i. 1–3.	The four canonical gospels.
ii.	„	i. 6.	The righteousness of Zachariah and Elizabeth.
iii.	„	i. 11.	The appearance of the angel to Zachariah.
iv.	„	i. 13–17a.	The angelic message to Zachariah.
v.	„	i. 22.	The dumbness of Zachariah.
vi.	„	i. 24–32a.	The faith of the Virgin.
vii.	„	i. 39–45.	Mary and Elizabeth.
viii.	„	i. 46–51a.	The Magnificat.
ix.	„	i. 56–64.	The birth of the Baptist.
x.	„	i. 67–76.	The Benedictus.
xi.	„	i. 80–ii. 2.	The growth of John.
xii.	„	ii. 8–10.	The angel's message to the shepherds.
xiii.	„	ii. 13–16.	The angelic hymn.
xiv.	„	ii. 21–24.	The Circumcision and Purification.
xv.	„	ii. 25 f.	Simeon.
xvi.	„	ii. 33 f.	The prophecy of Simeon.
xvii.	„	ii. 33–36.	The prophecy of Simeon: Anna.
xviii.	„	ii. 40–49.	The finding in the temple.
xix.	„	ii. 40–46.	Jesus in the temple.
xx.	„	ii. 49–51.	The subjection of Jesus.
xxi.	„	iii. 1–4.	The mission of John.
xxii.	„	iii. 5–8.	The call of John to repentance.
xxiii.	„	iii. 9–12.	The call to different classes: the publicans.
xxiv.	„	iii. 16.	The baptisms of water and fire.
xxv.	„	iii. 15.	Mistaken devotion.
xxvi.	„	iii. 17.	Divine sifting.
xxvii.	„	iii. 18.	The work of John: the descent of the Spirit.
xxviii.	„	iii. 23 ff.	The genealogies.
xxix.	Luke	iv. 1–4.	The first temptation.
xxx.	„	iv. 5–8.	The second temptation.
xxxi.	„	iv. 9–12.	The third temptation.
xxxii.	„	iv. 14–20.	Jesus at Nazareth.
xxxiii.	„	iv. 23–27.	Jesus at Nazareth.
xxxiv.	„	x. 25–37.	The good Samaritan.
xxxv.	„	xii. 58 f.	Make peace with thine adversary.
xxxvi.	„	xvii. 33–21 (order inverted).	The king dom of God within.
xxxvii.	„	xix. 29 ff.	The ass's colt.
xxxviii.	„	xix. 41–45.	Cleansing the temple.
xxxix.	„	xx. 27 ff., 20 ff. (order inverted).	Questions of Sadducees and Herodians.

[v] Mai adds in a note: "Plura deinceps ex Origenis scriptis daturus nunc scholiorum eius in Lucam gustum brevem exhibeo," a promise which he partially fulfilled by publishing the notes on Proverbs in *Bibl. Nova Patrum*, vii. Romae, 1854.

The passages of greatest interest are those which deal with the four canonical gospels (*Hom.* 1), spiritual manifestations (*Hom.* 3), the nobility and triumph of faith (*Hom.* 7), spiritual growth (*Hom.* 11), shepherds of churches and nations (*Hom.* 12), spiritual and visible co-rulers of Churches (*Hom.* 13), Infant Baptism (*Hom.* 14), second marriages (*Hom.* 17), Baptism by fire (*Hom.* 24), man as the object of a spiritual conflict (*Hom.* 35).

Besides these Homilies Origen wrote other Homilies upon the gospel which are now lost. References to them are found *in Matt.* tom. xiii. 29; xvi. 9; *in Joh.* tom. xxxii. 2

St. John.

(Thirty-two Books; some notes.—H. C.)

The remains of the Commentary on St. John are in many respects the most important of Origen's exegetical writings. There are left:

Τόμοι i. ii. (iv. v. small fragments), vi. x. xiii. xix. (nearly entire), xx. xxviii. xxxii.

Huet, ii. 1–422[x] (with Ferrarius's version).

[x] Huet has retained the arbitrary division of the remains of the Commentary into *thirty-two* books which is given in the Venice MS. followed by Ferrarius. As Huet gives no sections, it may be convenient for reference to give the beginning of these "books."

Huet.	Delarue.
Tom. i.	Tom. i.
„ ii.	„ ii. 1.
„ iii.	„ ii. 10.
„ iv.	„ ii. 20.
„ v.	„ ii. 25.
„ vi.	„ vi. 1.
„ vii.	„ vi. 6.
„ viii.	„ vi. 15.
„ ix.	„ vi. 30.
„ x.	„ x. 1.
„ xi.	„ x. 15.
„ xii.	„ x. 20.
„ xiii.	„ xiii. 1.
„ xiv.	„ xiii. 17.
„ xv.	„ xiii. 31.
„ xvi.	„ xiii. 43.
„ xvii.	„ xiii. 50.
„ xviii.	„ xiii. 57.
„ xix.	„ xix.
„ xx.	„ xx. 1.
„ xxi.	„ xx. 7.
„ xxii.	„ xx. 14.
„ xxiii.	„ xx. 19.
„ xxiv.	„ xx. 21.
„ xxv.	„ xx. 24.
„ xxvi.	„ xx. 28.
„ xxvii.	„ xx. 31.
„ xxviii.	„ xxviii. 1.
„ xxix.	„ xxviii. 6.
„ xxx.	„ xxviii. 12.
„ xxxi.	„ xxviii. 17.
„ xxxii.	„ xxxii.

Delarue, iv. 1–456 (with Ferrarius' version).
Lommatzsch, i. ii.

These remains extend over the following portions of the gospel:

Tom. i.	John i. 1a.
„ ii.	„ i. 1b–7a.
„ vi.	„ i. 19–29.
„ x.	„ ii. 12–25.
„ xiii.	„ iv. 13–44.
„ xix. (part)	„ viii. 19–24.
„ xx.	„ viii. 37–52.
„ xxviii.	„ xi. 39–57.
„ xxxii.	„ xiii. 2–33.

The fragment of tom. iv. treats of the rude style of the apostolic writers; and those of tom. v. contain an interesting apology for the length of his own work, and a comparison of the sonship of Christ with that of believers.

The continuous text depends upon four MSS.:

1. *Cod. Venet.* S. Marci, xliii., written in 1374, followed by Ferrarius. Comp. Petermann, ap. Lommatzsch, iii. *Praef.* p. ix.
2. *Cod. Regius*, Paris, followed by Perionius, and used by Huet.
3. *Cod. Bodleianus*, Miscell. 58, saec. xvii., used by Delarue. Of this there is a collation by Bentley, in a copy of Huet, in the library of Trinity College Cambridge, with some emendations, and a transcript, with conjectural emendations, by H. Thorndike, in the same library, B. 9, 11. It seems likely that this MS. was one of the transcripts made for Tarinus (Delarue, *Praef.* § vii.). The published collations are most imperfect.
4. *Cod. Barberinus*, used by Delarue.

All are derived from one archetype, and have many lacunae. The text is consequently full of errors, which editors have done little to remove. A series of conjectures on book ii. is given in a *Programm* by Dr. J. L. Jacobi (Hales, 1878), and it is to be hoped that he will continue a work which he has begun happily.[y]

The commentary on St. John was undertaken at the request of Ambrosius (*in Joh.* tom. i. §§ 3, 6), and was "the first-fruits of his labours at Alexandria" (*id.* § 4). It marks an epoch in theological literature and in theological thought. Perhaps the earlier work of Heracleon [HERACLEON] may have suggested the idea, but Origen implies that the Gospel of St. John, by its essential character, claimed his first efforts as an interpreter. The first five books, extending to John i. 18, were written at Alexandria (tom. vi. § 1), and part, in all probability, before 228, while Origen was still a layman. The work was resumed afterwards at Caesaraea (tom. vi. § 1), and continued till after the persecution of Maximinus, 235–8 (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 28), but it does not appear that it was ever completed. The last book (tom. xxxii.) deals with John xiii. 2–33, and contains no such promise of a future continuation as is found in some of the other books. On the contrary Origen speaks at the beginning with doubt as to the fulfilment of his purpose of an explanation of the whole gospel (§ 1: *πότερον βούλεται τὸν ἡμῶν νοῦν τελέσαι...εἰ (l. ἢ) μή, αὐτὸς ἂν εἰδείη ὁ θεός*). In the time of Eusebius twenty-two books remained of all that Origen had written "on the whole gospel;" and Jerome (*Praef. in Luc.*), according to the MSS., speaks of "thirty-four" or "thirty-nine" books in all, though the reading is commonly altered on the authority of Rufinus (Huet, *Orig.* iii. 2, 7) to "thirty-two." Rufinus speaks of thirty-two books only (*Apol.* ii. § 22), and it is probable that the work ceased where it now ends. The commentary on the whole gospel would have extended to fifty books at least, and it is most unlikely that every trace of the later books would have been lost by the time of Rufinus if they had been published. The language of Eusebius (*l. c.*), on the other hand, is too vague to allow any certain conclusion to be drawn from it.[z]

The *first* book deals mainly with the fundamental conceptions of "the gospel" (§§ 1–15), and of "the beginning" (§§ 16–22), and of "the Logos" (§§ 19–42). The gospels are the firstfruits (ἀπαρχή) of the Scripture, the gospel of St. John is the firstfruits of the gospels (§ 6). As the law had a shadow of the future, so too has the gospel: spiritual truths underlie historical truths (§ 9). The gospel in the widest sense is "for the whole world," not for our earth only, but for the universal system of the heavens and earth (§ 15).

The discussion of the title Logos lays open a critical stage in the history of Christian thought. In what sense, it is asked, is the Saviour called the Logos? It had come to be a common opinion "that Christ was as it were only a 'word' of God" (§ 23). To meet this view Origen refers to other titles, Light, Resurrection, Way, Truth, &c. (§§ 24–41), and following the analogy of these he comes to the conclusion, that as we are illuminated by Christ as the Light, and quickened by Him as the Resurrection, so we are made divinely rational by Him as the Logos, *i.e.* Reason (§ 42). By this method he preserves the personality of the Lord under the title of Logos, which expresses one aspect of His being and not His being itself (as a word). At the same time he recognises that Christ may also be called the Logos (Word) of God as giving expression to His will.

In the *second* book Origen continues his discussion of the meaning of the Logos, distinguishing, in a remarkable passage (§ 2), God and Reason taken absolutely (*ὁ θεός, ὁ λόγος*) from God and Reason used as predicates (*θεός, λόγος*). "The Father is the foundation of Deity, the Son of reason" (§ 3). Afterwards he discusses the sense of the words "came into being through him (*δι' αὐτοῦ*)," and the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son (§ 6); and further, what "all things," and what that is which is called "nothing" (*i.e.* evil) which became without Him but is not (§ 7). The conceptions of life and light, of darkness and death, are then examined (§§ 11 ff.). In treating of the mission of John (§§ 24 ff.) Origen questions whether he may not have been an angel who sought to minister on earth to his Lord (§ 25); and characteris-

[y] One conjecture of Bentley's in Book ii. is of great excellence: § 7 *s. f.*, *καὶ τί τὸ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ οὐ γενόμενον μὲν ὂν δὲ οὐδέποτε.* He reads also, § 13 *init.*, *τὰ δύο ἐν*, as indeed every one must read, though the edition and MSS· give *ἕν*.

[z] It must however be added that in the note on Matt. xxvii. 44, in *Comm. ser. in Matt.* § 133, Origen says: "apud Johannen sicut potuimus exposuimus de duobus latronibus." The reference may be to some separate comment.

tically remarks that he was "the voice" preceding "the Word" (§ 26). Perhaps it is not less characteristic that he blames those who, like Heracleon (tom. vi. § 2), hold that John i. 16–18 are the words of the evangelist and not of the Baptist.

The *sixth* book, as has been already noticed, marks a new beginning. In this, after describing with calm dignity the circumstances which had interrupted his work, he examines in detail John i. 19–29. The question, *Art thou Elias?* leads to a remarkable discussion on the pre-existence of souls, and the entrance of the soul into the body, "a vast and difficult subject," which he reserves for special investigation (§ 7). The words of the Baptist (i. 26) give occasion for a minute comparison with the parallels in the other gospels (§§ 16 ff.), in the course of which (§ 17) Origen strikingly contrasts the baptisms of John and Christ, and explains Christ's presence "in the midst of the Jews" (*v.* 26) of His universal presence as the Logos (§ 22). The mention of Bethany (*v.* 28) leads him to a hasty adoption of the correction "Bethabara" (§ 24), which he justifies by the frequent errors as to names in the LXX. His brief exposition of the title of Christ "as the Lamb of God" (§§ 35 ff.) is full of interest; and in connexion with this he notices the power of the blood of martyrs to overcome evil (§ 36).

The *tenth* book deals with the history of the first cleansing of the temple and its immediate results (ii. 12–25). At the beginning Origen thinks that the discrepancy between the evangelists as to the sojourn at Capernaum (*v.* 12) is such that its solution can be found only in the spiritual sense (§ 2), to which every minute point contributes, though in itself outwardly trivial and unworthy of record (§§ 2 ff.). In the following sections the phrase "the passover *of the Jews*" leads to an exposition of Christ as the true Passover (§§ 11 ff.). The cleansing of the temple is shewn to have an abiding significance in life (§ 16); and Origen thinks that the sign which Christ offered is fulfilled in the raising of the Christian church, built of living stones, out of trials and death, "after three days,"—the first of present suffering, the second of the consummation, the third of the new order (§ 20).

The *thirteenth* book is occupied with the interpretation of part of the history of the Samaritan woman and the healing of the nobleman's son (iv. 13–54). It is chiefly remarkable for the number of considerable quotations from Heracleon's Commentary which it contains, more than twice as many as are contained in the other books. These still require careful collection and criticism. Lommatzsch failed to fulfil the promise of his preface (I. p. xiii.). Passages of interest in regard to Origen's own views and method are those on the relation of Christ's personal teaching to the Scriptures (§ 5), on the five husbands as representing the senses (§ 9), on the incorporeity of God (§ 25), on the joy of the sower and reaper, and the continuity of work (§§ 46 f.), on the unhonoured prophet (§ 54), on spiritual dependence (§ 58), on the distinction of signs and wonders (§ 60).

Of the *nineteenth* book, which is imperfect at the beginning and end, a considerable fragment remains (viii. 19–25). In this the remarks on the treasury (John viii. 20) as the scene of the Lord's discourses (§ 2), and on the power of faith (§ 6), are characteristic.

The *twentieth* book (viii. 37–53) has much that is of importance for Origen's opinions. It begins with an examination of some points in connexion with the pre-existence and character of souls; and later on Origen, in a striking passage (§ 29), illustrates the inspiration of evil passions. Of a different kind, but still of interest, are the passages in which he treats of love as "the sun" in the life of Christians (§ 15); of the ambiguities in the word "when" (§ 24); of the need of help for spiritual sight (§ 26); on spiritual influences (§ 29).

The most remarkable passage in the *twenty-eighth* book (*c.* xi. 39–57) is perhaps that in which Origen speaks of the power of self-sacrifice among the Gentiles as illustrating the vicarious sufferings of Christ (§ 14). Other remarks worthy of special notice are those on the lifting up of the eyes (John xi. 41) (§ 4), on the lesson of the death of Lazarus (§ 6), on the duty of prudence in time of persecution (§ 18), on the passover of the Jews and of the Lord (§ 20).

The *thirty-second* book (*c.* xiii. 2–33) treats of St. John's record of the Last Supper. Origen discusses the feet-washing at length, and lays down that it is not to be perpetuated literally (§§ 6 f.): he dwells on the growth of faith (§ 9), on the difference of "soul" and "spirit" (§ 11), on the character of Judas and moral deterioration (§ 12), on the sop given to Judas (§ 16).

From this slight sketch of the ruins of Origen's Commentary some idea may be formed of its character. It is for us the beginning of a new type of literature. It has great faults of style. It is diffusive, disproportioned, full of repetitions, obscure and heavy in form of expression. It is wholly deficient in historical insight. It is continually passing into fantastic speculations. But on the other hand it contains not a few "jewels five words long." It abounds in noble thoughts and subtle criticisms. It grapples with great difficulties: it unfolds great ideas. And, above all, it retains a firm hold on the human life of the Lord.

ACTS.

(Seventeen Homilies.—H. C.)

Greek.

(1) A single fragment from "the fourth homily on the Acts" is preserved in the *Philocalia.*

Huet, ii. 422.
Delarue, iv.
Lommatzsch, v. 245.

(2) A few notes are given in Cramer's *Catena,* col. iii. 184, on the following passages:

iv. 32; vii. 3, 53; xxi. 38.[a]

ROMANS.

(Fifteen Books.—H. C.)

Greek.

(1) Fragments from the first and ninth books contained in the *Philocalia.*

Huet, ii. 423 ff.
Delarue, iv.
Lommatzsch, v. 247 ff.

[a] The MS. in the Chapter library at Worcester, said in the *Catal. Codd. Angl.* to contain "Orig. in Num. xii. Proph. Ep. Can. Act.," does not unhappily answer to the description.

(2) A number of important notes are contained in Cramer's *Catena*, tom. iv. 1844, on the following passages:

i. 1, 10.
ii. 8, 16, 27.
iii. 2, 4, 9, 13, 19, 21, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31.
iv. 2.

Latin.

Ten books of Commentaries, translated and compressed from the *fifteen* books of Origen, by Rufinus, at the request of Heraclius. Rufinus seems to have had difficulty in finding a complete and satisfactory text to work upon (*Praef.*), and he undoubtedly used considerable freedom, both in other respects and in adapting the Commentary not unfrequently to the current Latin text of the Epistle.

Many MSS. ascribe the translation to Jerome, and alter the preface and epilogue in this sense. The work is so given in the earliest editions. Erasmus pointed out the blunder.

The earliest MS. which I have seen is *Brit. Mus. Harl.* 3030, saec. x.

The translation brings into prominence one important point in regard to the critical use to be made of the text of the translations of Origen's works which has not received proper attention. Unless Origen's Greek reading is expressly noted, the reading given must be regarded as a Latin reading and not as Greek.

The language of Rufinus himself seems to shew beyond doubt that he gave a current Latin text, and not a version of Origen's Greek text, as the basis of his adaptation of Origen's Commentary. Thus, after he has given the Latin version, he remarks several times that the Greek is better or more expressive, and seeks to express the full meaning of the original. Thus on vi. 11 he remarks upon the rendering "*existimate* vos mortuos esse peccato," "melius quidem in Graeco habetur '*cogitate* vos mortuos esse peccato;'" And again upon xii. 2: "ut probetis quae sit voluntas Dei, *quod bonum et beneplacitum et perfectum*," "sciendum est quod in Graeco habetur, 'ut probetis quae sit voluntas Dei *bona et beneplacita et perfecta*,'" "but we," he continues, "follow the custom of the Latins." The criticism may be faulty, but it shews his usage. This is marked again upon xii. 3, where he says, "we must first observe that when we have *omnibus qui sunt inter vos*," the text which he has given, "it is in the Greek *omni qui est in vobis*;" and in viii. 3 he gives "*de peccato*," the common Latin rendering, and adds, "or, as it is more truly in the Greek text, *pro peccato*." In one place, xv. 30, he quotes the Greek words which correspond to the Vulgate rendering, "*ut adjuvetis me in orationibus*," adding, "in quo hoc est quod indicatur, *ut adjuvetis me in agone orationum*..." But perhaps the most remarkable passage is xii. 13, where he gives the rendering "*usibus* sanctorum communicantes," with the note, "memini in Latinis exemplaribus magis haberi '*memoriis* sanctorum communicantes,' verum nos nec consuetudinem turbamus, nec veritati praejudicamus, maxime cum utrumque conveniat aedificationi." There are difficulties in the interpretation of his words, but they shew at least that the Latin text had a principal place in his thoughts.[b] The reference to the conflict of Latin copies is illustrated by his note on xii. 11: "*Domino* servientes," "scio autem in nonnullis Latinorum exemplaribus haberi '*tempori* servientes.'"

Apart from these statements the character of the text is decisive. It is essentially an old Latin text throughout. Sometimes it is directly in conflict with Origen's Greek text, or his interpretation, or with the groups of authorities with which Origen agrees:

iii. 9. *om.* οὐ πάντως.
iii. 20. in conspectu *Dei*; in commentary, *in conspectu eius.*
iii. 22. *in omnes et* super—against Origen's Greek text.
v. 8, 9. quoniam *si* cum...multo magis justificati—against Origen's Greek text and the commentary.
v. 16. per unum *peccatum*—against Origen's Greek text.
viii. 16. ipse *enim*, *id.*
ix. 19. quid *ergo*, *id.*
ix. 33. et *omnis* qui, *id.*
x. 3. suam *justitiam*, *id.*
xi. 36. in saecula *saeculorum.*
xiii. 9. Add. *non falsum testimonium dices*—against Origen's Greek text.
xv. 8. *Jesum Christum*, *id.*
xv. 14. *om.* μού.
xv. 19. spiritus Dei; in commentary, spiritus *sancti.*
xv. 30. *om.* ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ.
xvi. 19. *om.* δέ (1°).

Sometimes it gives readings which are solely or characteristically Latin:

i. 32. non solum qui faciunt illa sed etiam qui.
ii. 3. o homo *omnis.*
iv. 23. reputatum est ei *ad justitiam.*
iv. 24. Jesum *Christum.*
vii. 19. non enim quod volo *facio bonum.*
viii. 35. quis *ergo.*
ix. 5. *om.* ἀμήν.
ix. 25. et non dilectam dilectam et non m. c. m. c.
x. 18. *om.* μενοῦνγε.
xi. 5. *salvae* factae sunt.

Sometimes, on the other hand, it expresses the Greek more accurately than other Latin texts:

i. 26. nam *et.*
ii. 19. *et* confidis.

In a few cases it gives readings which are apparently unique, of the kind which are found in old Latin texts:

ii. 9. *et* tribulatio.
xi. 24. nam si *et* tu.
xiv. 20. *nolite.*
xvi. 9. adjutorem *meum.*

There remain a number of important readings, in which the Latin text agrees with Origen's Greek text or the commentary:

v. 14. in eos qui peccaverunt.
viii. 1. *om.* μή...πνεῦμα.
viii. 35. *Dei.*
viii. 37. *per* eum.
ix. 31. *om.* δικαιοσύνης (2°).
x. 15. *om.* εὐαγγ. εἰρήνην (?).
xii. 17. *om.* οὐ μόνον...ἀλλὰ καί.
xiv. 9. *vixit.*
xiv. 21. *om.* ἢ σκανδ. ἢ ἀσθενεῖ.

[b] See the remarks on *destinatus*, *praedestinatus*, lib. i. § 5, and on *subditus* (iii. 19), lib. iii. § 6.

To these perhaps may be added

xiv. 22. fidem *quam* habes.
xv. 15. *om.* ἀδελφοί.

It might appear at first sight that these readings are due to Origen's text of the epistle which Rufinus had before him, but it will be found that there is independent old Latin authority for every one of these readings, except that in x. 15, where, however, there is considerable variety of reading.

A careful consideration of this evidence leads to the conclusion, that we have substantially in the text of the epistle given by Rufinus an old Latin copy of the highest value, and characteristic renderings point out its affinities. It resembles closely, in its general form, the text of Sedulius, and of some of the copies used by Augustine. The extent and nature of the coincidence may be estimated roughly from the following peculiar phrases:

i. 15. quod in me promptus sum (comp. Ambrtr., Sedul.)
ii. 4. sustentationis et patientiae (Hier.)
ii. 8. diffidunt quidem...obtemperant.
iii. 9. quid ergo tenemus amplius? causati (Sedul. MSS.)
vi. 8. et convivemus ei (Sedul.)
vi. 12. ad obediendum desideriis eius (Aug.)
viii. 22. congemiscit et condolet (Sedul.)
ix. 22 f. apta in perditionem ut notas faceret (Aug., Sedul.)
xiii. 5. necesse est subditos esse (Sedul.)
xiv. 5. alter judicat alternos dies (Aug.)
xv. 15. commemorans vos per gratiam datam (Aug.)

Some renderings are apparently not found elsewhere, *e.g.*:

i. 11. ut aliquod tradam vobis donum spiritale.
iv. 17. ante eum cui credidit Deum.
xi. 14. in aemulationem immittam.
xv. 31. ut ministerium hoc meum acceptum fiat.
xvi. 5. initium Asiae.
xvi. 25. sacramenti saeculorum in silentio habiti, manifestati autem modo.

A comparison of these renderings with the corresponding renderings in the *Codex Boernerianus*, suggests that Rufinus probably adopted the Latin text of a Graeco-Latin copy, which had been in some details influenced by the Greek, but which preserved essentially its original complexion. The continuous Latin text cannot, however, be quoted as representing Origen's reading.

This is not the place to extend farther the inquiry into the textual characteristics of the biblical quotations in the translations of Origen's works. It will be sufficient to have called attention, in one signal example, to the singular and unexpected features of interest which they offer.

The commentary gives a continuous discussion of the text, often discursive, but still full of acute and noble conceptions. Some of the most striking passages may be indicated.

Book I. (c. i.).

§§ 4 ff. On the Sonship of the Lord.
§ 18. Responsibility.

Book II. (c. ii. 2–iii. 4).

§ 2. The duty of teachers. Comp. § 11.
§ 9. The law of nature.
§ 13. Spiritual circumcision.

Book III. (c. iii. 5–31).

§ 2. The universal sinfulness of man.
§ 6. The law of nature of universal obligation (p. 191 L., of great interest).
§ 8. Christ our propitiation.
§ 9. Justification by faith.

Book IV. (c. iv. 1–v. 11).

§ 1. The need of grace (non ex operibus radix justitiae sed ex radice justitiae fructus operum crescit, p. 241 L.)
§ 5. Faith of grace: the "likeness" of God to be gained.
§ 6. Hope.
§ 7. The experience of faith of Abraham fulfilled in the experience of Christians (pp. 283 ff. L., of great interest).
§ 9. Glory in tribulation.

Book V. (c. v. 12–vi. 11).

§ 1. The manifoldness of the divine treasures (pp. 322 ff. L., of great interest).
§ 2. Justification through Christ.
§ 6. The law of nature the occasion of sin.
§ 8. Baptism (and Confirmation) of infants.
§ 10. Spiritual death.

Book VI. (c. vi. 12–viii. 13).

§ 8. The operation of the law of nature.
§ 9. The conflict in man (ipse ea quasi in semetipso geri descripsit).
§ 12. The weakness of the law.
§ 13. The action of the Spirit through man.

Book VII. (c. viii. 14–ix. 33).

§§ 3 ff. The inheritance of Christians.
§ 7. The work of the Spirit.
§ 8. Foreknowledge not the cause of that which is foreknown.
§ 11. The discipline of suffering (p. 140, of great interest).
§ 13. St. Paul's spirit of self-sacrifice.
§ 17. Divine mysteries insoluble.

Book VIII. (c. x. 1–xi. 36).

§ 2. Christ and the Law.
§ 9. The several duties of men.
§ 10. The unity of rational beings.
§ 11. Purification by fire for those who neglect the Gospel.

Book IX. (c. xii. 1–xiv. 15).

§ 1. The worship of God.
§ 3. Gifts of grace according to the measure of faith here and hereafter.
§§ 25, 30. Civil duties.

Book X. (c. xiv. 16–end

§ 3. Things clean and unclean.
§ 6. Unselfishness.
§ 10. Progressive knowledge.
§ 14. Christians' help to Christians.

It may be added that Origen's treatment of the eighth chapter, as represented by Rufinus, is, on the whole, disappointing. It might have been expected to call out his highest powers of imagination and hope. His silence, no less than his rash conjectures as to the persons named in the sixteenth chapter, is a singular proof of the complete absence of any authoritative tradition as to the persons of the early Roman church.

For the passage (x. 43) which refers to Marcion's mutilation of the epistle by removing the doxology (xvi. 25–27) and (though this is disputed) the last two chapters, it must be enough to refer to the papers by Bp. Lightfoot and Dr. Hort in the *Journal of Philology*, 1869, ii. 264 ff.; 1871, iii. 51 ff., 193 ff.

1–2 CORINTHIANS.

(Eleven Homilies on 2 Cor.—H. C.)

Greek.

Jerome mentions (*Ep. ad Pammach.* xlix. § 3) that Origen commented on this epistle at length; and Origen himself refers to what he had said on 1 Cor. i. 2 (*Hom. in Luc.* xvii. *s. f.*).

A very important collection of notes on the first epistle is given in Cramer's *Catena*, vol. v. 1844, which deal with the following passages:

i. 2 (bis), 4, 7 (bis), 9 (bis), 10, 11, 17 (bis), 18, 20 (bis), 21, 22 f., 26 (ter).
ii. 1, 3, 5 f., 7, 9, 10, 14 f. (bis).
iii. 2, 3, 7, 9, 16, 21.
iv. 1 f., 5, 6, 7, 9, 15, 20.
v. 5 (bis), 9.
vi. 2, 4, 9 f., 12, 13 (bis), 15, 18, 19 f.
vii. 1 f., 5 (bis), 14, 18 f., 21, 25.
ix. 7, 10, 15, 19, 23, 24.
x. 5, 6.
xii. 3, 28.
xiii. 1 f., 3, 4, 12.
xiv. 31, 34, 39.
xv. 2, 20, 37.
xvi. 10, 13.

It appears that the notes were taken from homilies (*περὶ ὧν καὶ πρώην ἐλέγομεν*, *c.* iii. 1; *παρακαλοῦμεν καὶ ὑμᾶς ὦ παῖδες*, *c.* vi. 9). Some of the notes contain passages of considerable interest, as that on the vicarious death of Gentile heroes (*c.* i. 18; comp. *Hom. in Joh.* tom. xxviii. § 14), on the sovereignty of believers (*c.* iii. 21), on evangelic "counsels" (*c.* vii. 25), on the public teaching of women (*c.* xiv. 34, with reference to Montanism). In other places Origen gives the outline of a creed (*c.* i. 9, 20), and touches on Baptism (*c.* i. 14) and Holy Communion (*c.* vii. 5). He describes the Jewish search for leaven (*c.* v. 7); and supposes that many books of the Old Testament were lost at the Captivity (*c.* ii. 9).

The text, as in all the notes in Cramer, is full of obvious blunders and requires careful editing, with a fresh collation of the MS.

GALATIANS.

(Fifteen Books; seven Homilies.—H. C.)

Jerome, in the Prologue to his Commentary on the Galatians, mentions that Origen wrote five Books on this epistle, as well as various Homilies and Notes (*tractatus et excerpta*), and that he interpreted it with brief annotations (*commatico sermone*) in the tenth book of his *Stromateis* (*Proem. in Comm. ad Gal.*; *Ep. ad August.* cxi. §§ 4, 6).

Three fragments of the Commentary are contained in the Latin translation of Pamphilus's *Apology*.

Jerome does not seem to have made much use of Origen in his own Commentary; but this work has not yet been carefully examined with a view to determine how far it is original.

EPHESIANS.

(Three Books.—H. C.)

Origen's commentary on the Ephesians may still be practically recovered. Jerome, in the *Prologue* to his own *Commentary*, says that "his readers should know that Origen wrote three books on the epistle, which he had partly followed" (*Illud quoque in praefatione commoneo ut sciatis Origenem tria volumina in hanc Epistolam conscripsisse, quem et nos ex parte secuti sumus*). The extent of his debt could only be estimated by conjecture, till the publication of the Paris *Catena* (Cramer, 1842). This contains very large extracts from Origen's commentary, sometimes with his name and sometimes anonymous, and in nearly all cases Jerome has corresponding words or thoughts. Nor is it too much to say that a careful comparison of the Greek fragments with Jerome's Latin would make it possible to reconstruct in substance a very large part of Origen's work; and it is strange that the work has not yet been attempted. The corresponding notes on the description of the Christian warfare (vi. 11 ff.) offer a good example of Jerome's mode of dealing with his archetype.

The comments of Origen are almost continuous, and deal with the following passages:

Chap. i. 1, 2, 4, 7–11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 23.
" ii. 1 ff., 6, 12, 13, 17, 19 ff.
" iii. 1 ff., 12, 14, 15.
" iv. 3, 6, 9–15, 17, 18, 20, 24–32.
" v. 3–6, 10–12, 15–20, 29, 31, 32.
" vi. 1, 9–16, 18, 19, 21, 23.

A fragment on Eph. v. 28 f. is preserved in the Latin translation of the *Apology* of Pamphilus. This is not found in the Greek notes.

PHILIPPIANS. COLOSSIANS. TITUS. PHILEMON.

(One Book on Philippians; two Books on Colossians; one on Titus; one on Philemon; one Homily on Titus.—H. C.)

Short fragments from the third Book on the epistle to the Colossians, and from the Commentary on the epistle to Philemon, and more considerable fragments from the Book on the epistle to Titus (Tit. iii. 10, 11), are found in the translation of Pamphilus's *Apology*.

No Greek notes on these epistles have been preserved.

1 THESSALONIANS.

(Three Books; two Homilies.—H. C.)

A considerable fragment from the third book of the Commentary on 1 Thess. is preserved in Jerome's translation: *Ep. ad Minerv. et Alex.* 9 (1 Thess. iv. 15–17).

HEBREWS.

(Eighteen Homilies.—H. C.)

Origen wrote Homilies and Commentaries on the epistle to the Hebrews. Two fragments of the Homilies are preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 25), in which Origen gives his opinion on the composition of the epistle.

Some inconsiderable fragments from the "Books" are found in the translation of Pamphilus's *Apology*.

CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

The quotations from Origen, which are given in Cramer's *Catena* on the catholic epistles, are apparently taken from other treatises, and not from commentaries on the books themselves: James i. 4, 13; 1 Pet. i. 4 (*ἐκ τῆς ἑρμηνείας εἰς τὸ κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ*); 1 John ii. 14 (*ἐκ τοῦ ᾄσματος τῶν ᾀσμάτων* T. A′.).

APOCALYPSE.

Origen purposed to comment upon the Apocalypse (*Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 49), but it is uncertain whether he carried out his design.

B. Dogmatic Writings.[*]

On the Resurrection.

Delarue, i. 32–37.
Lommatzsch, xvii. 53–64.

Origen's writings "On the resurrection," which are said to have consisted of two books and of a dialogue in two books (Hier. *ap.* Ruf. *Apol.* ii. § 20; comp. Hier. *Ep.* xxxiii. 3 [H. C.]), preceded, in part at least, his essay on *First Principles* (c. 230). They were violently assailed by Methodius, and were considered by Jerome to abound in errors (*Ep.* lxxxiv. 7). Probably they excited opposition by assailing the gross literalism which prevailed in the popular view of the future life. The fragments which remain are consistent with the true faith, and express it with a wise caution, affirming the permanence through death of the whole man and not of the soul only. Thus Origen dwells rightly on St. Paul's image of the seed (*Fragm.* 2); and maintains a perfect correspondence between the present and the future (qualis fuerit uniuscujusque praeparatio in hac vita talis erit et resurrectio ejus), and speaks very happily of the "ratio substantiae corporalis" as that which is permanent.

On First Principles (περὶ ἀρχῶν. *De principiis*).[d]
(Four Books *Periaroon*.—H. C.)

Delarue, i. 42–195.
Lommatzsch, xxi.

Greek.
(1) Considerable fragments of books iii. iv., preserved in the *Philocalia*.
(2) A few others mainly in the letter of Justinian to Menas.

Latin.
(1) A complete translation by Rufinus, who took great liberties with the text.
(2) Fragments of a translation by Jerome, given in a letter to Avitus (*Ep.* 124).

The book *On first principles* is the most complete and characteristic expression of Origen's opinions. It was written while he was in the full course of his work at Alexandria. He was probably at the time not much more than thirty years old and still a layman, but there is no reason to think that he modified, in any important respects, the views which he unfolds in it. The book, it must be borne in mind, was not written for simple believers but for scholars,—for those who were familiar with the teaching of Gnosticism and Platonism; and with a view to questions which then first become urgent when men have risen to a wide view of nature and life. Non-Christian philosophers moved in a region of subtle abstractions, "ideas": Origen felt that Christianity converted these abstractions into realities, persons, facts of a complete life; and he strove to express what he felt in the modes of thought and language of his own age. He aimed at presenting the highest knowledge (γνῶσις) as an objective system. But in doing this he had no intention of fashioning two Christianities, a Christianity for the learned and a Christianity for the simple. The faith was one, one essentially and unalterably, but infinite in fulness, so that the trained eye could see more of its harmonies as it necessarily looked for more. Fresh wants made fresh truths visible. He who found much had nothing over: he who found little had no lack.

The book is the earliest attempt to form a system of Christian doctrine, or rather a philosophy of the Christian faith. In this respect it marks an epoch in Christian thought, but no change in the contents of the Christian creed. The elements of the dogmatic basis are assumed on the authority of the church. The author's object is, as he says, to shew how they can be arranged as a whole, by the help either of the statements of Scripture or of the methods of exact reasoning. And however strange or startling the teaching of Origen may seem to us, it is necessary to bear in mind that this is the account which he gives of it. He takes for granted that all that he brings forward is in harmony with received teaching. He professes to accept as final the same authorities as ourselves.

The treatise consists of four books. The composition is not strictly methodical. Digressions and repetitions interfere with the symmetry of the plan. But to speak generally the first book deals with God and creation (religious statics); the second and third books with creation and providence, with man and redemption (religious dynamics); and the fourth book with Holy Scripture. Or to put the case somewhat differently, the first three books contain the exposition of a Christian philosophy, gathered round the three ideas of God, the world, and the rational soul, and the last gives the basis of it. Even in the repetitions (as on "the restoration of things") it is not difficult to see that each successive treatment corresponds with a new point of sight.

In the first book Origen sets out the final elements of all religious philosophy, God, the world, rational creatures. After dwelling on the essential nature of God as incorporeal, invisible, incomprehensible, and on the characteristic relations of the Persons of the Holy Trinity to man, as the authors of being, and reason, and holiness, he gives a summary view of the end of human life, for the elements of a problem cannot be really understood until we have comprehended its scope. The end of life then, according to Origen, is the progressive assimilation of man to God by the voluntary appropriation of His gifts. Gentile philosophers had proposed to themselves the idea of assimilation to God, but Origen adds the means. By the unceasing action of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit towards us, renewed at each successive stage of our advance, we shall be able, he says, with difficulty perchance, at some future time, to look on the holy and blessed life; and when once we have been enabled to reach that, after many struggles, we ought so to continue in it that no weariness may take hold on us. Each fresh enjoyment of that bliss ought to enlarge or deepen our desire for it; while we are ever receiving or holding, with more ardent love and larger grasp, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit (i. 3, 8).

But it will be said that this condition of progress, effort, assimilation, involves the possibility of declension, indolence, the obliteration of the

[*] It is not certain what the *Monobiblia*, of which Jerome speaks (*Ep.* xxxiii. 3), were. They may have been detached essays on particular points.

[d] The edition of Redepenning (E. R.), Lipsiae, 1836, is useful and convenient. The translation by Schnitzer, Stuttgart, 1835, has a suggestive introduction.

divine image. If man can go forward he can go backward. Origen accepts the consequence, and finds in it an explanation of the actual state of men and angels. The present position of each rational being corresponds, in his judgment, with the use which he has hitherto made of the revelations and gifts of God. No beings were created originally immutable in character. Some by diligent obedience have been raised to the loftiest places in the celestial hierarchy: others by perverse self-will and rebellion have sunk into the condition of demons. Others occupy an intermediate place, and are capable of being raised again to their first state, and so upward, if they avail themselves of the helps which are provided by the love of God. "Of these," he adds, "I think, as far as I can form an opinion, that this order of the human race was formed, which in the future age, or in the ages which succeed, when there shall be a new heaven and a new earth, shall be restored to that unity which the Lord promises in His intercessory prayer." "Meanwhile," he continues, "both in the ages which are seen and temporal, and in those which are not seen and eternal, all rational beings who have fallen are dealt with according to the order, the character, the measure of their deserts. Some in the first, others in the second, some, again, even in the last times, through greater and heavier sufferings, borne through many ages, reformed by sharper discipline, and restored ... stage by stage ... reach that which is invisible and eternal ..." Only one kind of change is impossible. There is no such transmigration of souls as Plato pictured, after the fashion of the Hindoos, in the legend of Er the Armenian. No rational being can sink into the nature of a brute (i. 8, 4; comp. *c. Cels.* iv. 83).

The progress of this discussion is interrupted by one singular episode which is characteristic of the time. How, Origen asks, are we to regard the heavenly bodies,—the sun and moon and stars? Are they animated and rational? Are they the temporary abodes of souls which shall hereafter be released from them? Are they finally to be brought into the great unity, when "God shall be all in all"? The questions, he admits, are bold; but he answers all in the affirmative, on what he held to be the authority of Scripture (i. 7; comp. *c. Cels.* v. 10 f.).

In the second book Origen pursues, at greater length, that view of the visible world, as a place of discipline and preparation, which has been already indicated. He follows out as a movement what he had before regarded as a condition. The endless variety in the situations of men, the inequality of their material and moral circumstances, their critical spiritual differences, all tend to shew, he argues, that the position of each has been determined in accordance with previous conduct. And God, in His ineffable wisdom, has united all together with absolute justice, so that all these creatures, most diverse in themselves, combine to work out His purpose, while "their very variety tends to the one end of perfection." All things were made for the sake of man and rational beings. It is through man, therefore, that this world, as God's work, becomes complete and perfect (comp. *c. Cels.* iv. 99). The individual is never isolated, though he is never irresponsible. At every moment he is acting and acted upon, adding something to the sum of the moral forces of the world, furnishing that out of which God is fulfilling His purpose. The difficulties of life, as Origen regards them, give scope for heroic effort and loving service. The fruits of a moral victory become more permanent as they are gained through harder toil. The obstacles and hindrances by which man is hemmed in are incentives to exertion. His body is not a "prison," in the sense of a place of punishment only: it is a beneficent provision for the discipline of beings to whom it furnishes such salutary restraints as are best fitted to further their moral growth.

This view of the dependence of the present on the past—to use the forms of human speech—seemed to Origen to remove a difficulty which weighed heavily upon thoughtful men in the first age, as it has weighed heavily upon thoughtful men in our own generation. Very many said then that the sufferings and disparities of life, the contrasts of the law and the gospel, point to the action of rival spiritual powers, or to a Creator limited by something external to Himself (ii. 9, 5). Not so, was Origen's reply; they simply reveal that what we see is a fragment of a vast system in which we can do no more than trace tendencies, consequences, signs, and rest upon the historic fact of the Incarnation. In this respect he ventured to regard the entire range of being as "one thought" answering to the absolutely perfect will of God, while "we that are but parts can see but part, now this, now that." And this seems to be the true meaning of his famous assertion, that the power of God in creation was finite and not infinite. It would, that is, be inconsistent with our ideas of perfect order, and therefore with our idea of the Divine Being, that the sum of first existences should not form one whole. "God made all things in number and measure." The omnipotence of God is defined (as we are forced to conceive) by the absolute perfections of His nature. "He cannot deny Himself" (ii. 9, 1; iv. 35).

But it may be objected more definitely that our difficulties do not lie only in the circumstances of the present: that the issues of the present, so far as we can see them, bring difficulties no less overwhelming: that even if we allow that this world is fitted to be a place of discipline for fallen beings who are capable of recovery, it is only too evident that the discipline does not always work amendment. Origen admits the fact, and draws from it the conclusion, that other systems of penal purification and moral advance follow. According to him world grows out of world, so to speak, till the consummation is reached. What is the nature or position or constitution of the worlds to come he does not attempt to define. It is enough to believe that, from first to last, the will of Him who is most righteous and most loving is fulfilled: and that each loftier region gained is the entrance to some still more glorious abode above, so that all being becomes, as it were, in the highest sense, a journey of the saints from mansion to mansion up to the very throne of God.

In order to give clearness to this view Origen follows out, in imagination, the normal course of the progressive training, purifying and illumination of men in the future. He pictures them passing from sphere to sphere, and resting in each so as to receive such revelations of the

providence of God as they can grasp; lower phenomena are successively explained to them, and higher phenomena are indicated. As they look backward old mysteries are illuminated: as they look forward unimagined mysteries stir their souls with divine desire. Everywhere their Lord is with them, and they advance from strength to strength through the perpetual supply of spiritual food. This food, he says, is the contemplation and understanding of God, according to its proper measure in each case, and as suits a nature which is made and created. And this measure—this due harmony and proportion between aim and power—it is right that every one should regard even now, who is beginning to see God, that is, to understand Him in purity of heart (ii. 11, 6 f.).

But while Origen opens this infinite prospect of scene upon scene to faith or hope or imagination, call it as we may, he goes on to shew that Scripture concentrates our attention upon the next scene, summed up in the words, resurrection, judgment, retribution. Nowhere is he more studiously anxious to keep to the teaching of the Word than in dealing with these cardinal ideas. For him the resurrection is not the reproduction of any particular organism, but the preservation of complete identity of person, an identity maintained under new conditions, which he presents under the apostolic figure of the growth of the plant from the seed: the seed is committed to the earth, perishes, and yet the vital power which it contains gathers a new frame answering to its proper nature. Judgment is no limited and local act, but the unimpeded execution of the absolute divine law by which the man is made to feel what he is and what he has become, and to bear the inexorable consequences of the revelation. Punishment is no vengeance, but the just severity of a righteous King, by which the soul is placed at least on the way of purification. Blessedness is no sensuous joy or indolent repose, but the opening vision of the divine glory, the growing insight into the mysteries of the fulfilment of the divine counsels.

In the third book Origen discusses the moral basis of his system. This lies in the recognition of free-will as the inalienable endowment of rational beings. But this free-will does not carry with it the power of independent action, but only the power of receiving the help which is extended to each according to his capacity and needs, and therefore just responsibility for the consequences of action. Such free-will offers a sufficient explanation, in Origen's judgment, for what we see, and gives a stable foundation for what we hope. It places sin definitely within the man himself, and not without him. It preserves the possibility of restoration, while it enforces the penalty of failure. "'God said,' so he writes, 'let us make man in our image after our likeness.' Then the sacred writer adds, 'and God made man: in the image of God made He him.' This therefore that he says, 'in the image of God made He him,' while he is silent as to the likeness, has no other meaning than this, that man received the dignity of the image at his first creation: while the perfection of the likeness is kept in the consummation (of all things); that is, that he should himself gain it by the efforts of his own endeavour, since the possibility of perfection had been given him at the first..." (iii. 6, 1).

Such a doctrine, he shews, gives a deep solemnity to the moral conflicts of life. We cannot, even to the last, plead that we are the victims of circumstances or of evil spirits. The decision in each case, this way or that, rests with ourselves, yet so that all we have and are truly is the gift of God. Each soul obtains from the object of its love the power to fulfil His will. "It draws and takes to itself," he says in another place, "the Word of God in proportion to its capacity and faith. And when souls have drawn to themselves the Word of God, and have let Him penetrate their senses and their understandings, and have perceived the sweetness of His fragrance ... filled with vigour and cheerfulness they speed after him ..." (*in Cant.* i.). Such a doctrine, so far from tending to Pelagianism, is the very refutation of it. It lays down that the essence of freedom is absolute self-surrender: that the power of right action is nothing but the power of God. Every act of man is the act of a free being, but not an exercise of freedom: if done without dependence upon God, it is done in despite of freedom, responsibly indeed, but under adverse constraint.

The decision from moment to moment, Origen maintains, rests with us, but not the end. That is determined from the first, though the conduct of creatures can delay, through untold ages, the consummation of all things. The gift of being, once given, abides for ever. The rational creature is capable of change, of better and worse, but it can never cease to be. What mysteries however lie behind; what is the nature of the spiritual body in which we shall be clothed; whether all that is finite shall be gathered up in some unspeakable way into the absolute,—that Origen holds is beyond our minds to conceive.

As the third book deals with the moral basis of Origen's system, so the fourth and last deals with its dogmatic basis. This order of succession in the treatise is unusual, and yet it is intelligible. It moves from the universal to the special; from that which is most abstract to that which is most concrete; from the heights of speculation to the rule of authority. "In investigating such great subjects as these," Origen writes, "we are not content with common ideas and the clear evidence of what we see, but we take testimonies to prove what we state, even those which are drawn from the Scriptures which we believe to be divine" (iv. 1). Therefore, in conclusion, he examines with a reverence, an insight, a humility, a grandeur of feeling never surpassed, the questions of the inspiration and the interpretation of the Bible. The intellectual value of the work may best be characterised by one fact. A single sentence taken from it was quoted by Butler as containing the germ of his *Analogy*.

MISCELLANIES.

Delarue, i. 37–41.
Lommatzsch, xvii. 65–78.

Before he left Alexandria Origen wrote ten books of miscellanies (Στρωματεῖς: comp. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 18).* In these he appears to have dis-

* In H. C. the title "Stromatum," without any further definition, is given after the Books on Leviticus and before those on Isaiah.

cussed various topics in the light of ancient philosophy and Scripture (Hier. *Ep. ad Magn.* lxx. 4). The three fragments which remain, in a Latin translation, give no sufficient idea of their contents. The first, from the sixth book, touches on the permissibility of deflection from literal truth, following out a remark of Plato (Hier. *adv. Ruf.* i. § 18: comp. *Hom.* xix. *in Jer.* § 7; *Hom. in Lev.* iii. § 4). The second, from the tenth book, contains brief notes on the history of Susanna and Bel (Dan. xiii. xiv.) added by Jerome to his commentary on Daniel. The third, from the same book, gives an interpretation of Gal. v. 13, which is referred to the spiritual understanding of the narratives of Scripture (Hier. *ad loc.* Compare also Hier. *in Jerem.* iv. xxii. 24 ff.)

LETTER TO JULIUS AFRICANUS ON THE HISTORY OF SUSANNA (Dan. xiii.).

This letter was written from Nicomedia (§ 15), and probably on the occasion of Origen's second visit to Greece (c. 240). It contains a reply to the objections which Julius Africanus urged against the authenticity of the history of Susanna, and offers a crucial and startling proof of Origen's deficiency in historical criticism. Africanus pointed out, among other things, that the writing must have been Greek originally, from the plays upon words which it contains, and that it was not contained in the "Hebrew" Daniel. To these arguments Origen answers that he had indeed been unable (φίλη γὰρ ἡ ἀλήθεια) to find Hebrew equivalents to the paronomasias quoted, but that they may exist; and that the Jews had probably omitted the history to save the honour of their elders. In thus vindicating the authority of the narrative, on the evidence of the current Greek Bible, he recognises the difference between "the Scriptures of the Jews" and "the Scriptures of the church," which became fruitful in confusion afterwards. He is unwilling to sacrifice anything which he has found held to be sacred. Providence, he held, must have provided for the edification of the church. It is well, too, to remember the words which bid us "not to remove the eternal landmarks (αἰώνια ὅρια) which those set who were before us" (§§ 4 ff.). If it is natural to admire the reverence of the scholar, made doubly sensitive perhaps by the controversies which he had unwillingly raised, it must be allowed that right lies with the aged Africanus, who could address Origen as "a son," and whose judgment was in the spirit of his own noble saying:—"May such a principle never prevail in the church of Christ that falsehood is framed for His praise and glory" (*Fragm. ap.* Routh, *R. S.* ii. 230).

C. THE EIGHT BOOKS AGAINST CELSUS.

Delarue, i. 310–799.
Lommatzsch.

The following MSS. of the *Books against Celsus* are known more or less imperfectly:

1. Cod. August. (Munich, *Cod. Graec.* lxiv.) saec. xvi. followed in the main by D. Hoeschel in the *Editio princeps.* (See Reiser, *Catol.* p. 38.)
2. Cod. Palatinus, used also by Hoeschel.[f]
3. Cod. Vatic. (Rome) Montfaucon, Bibl. MSS. i. 12 E. [Used by Persona for the Latin translation ?]
4. Cod. Ottobon. (Rome) Montfaucon, *l. c.* i. 186 B.
5. Cod. Ambros. (Milan) 'c. Celsum volumina tria.' Montfaucon, *l. c.* i. 502 D.
6. Cod. Bodl. Miscell. 21 (Oxford). Saec. xv.
7. ————————, 36, 7 (Oxford). Saec. xvi. Bks. i. and part of ii.
8. Cod. Coll. Novi (Oxford). Saec. xvi. A gift of Card. Pole to the college.
9. Cod. S. Marci, 44 (Venice). Saec. xiv.
10. ————————, 45 (Venice). Saec. xiv.
11. ————————, 46 (Venice). Saec. xv.
12. Cod. Leidensis (Leyden). Fabricius, vii. p. 220.

Delarue says that his text was collated with eight MSS.:—"Regio, Basiliensi, Jobiano, qui nunc est ecclesiae cathedralis Parisiensis, duobus Vaticanis [recenti et vetere, ii. 11] et tribus Anglicanis" (i. p. 315), but he gives no further details. They probably included 3, 4, 6, 7, 8.

The MSS. agree not unfrequently in readings which are obviously corrupt, and differ from the text in the Philocalia; but as yet they have not been so examined as to determine their mutual relations. Elie Bouhéreau in his French translation of the work (Amsterdam, 1700) shewed great skill, with too much boldness, in dealing with the text; and Mosheim in the Preface to his valuable German translation (Hamburg, 1745) says justly: "Bouhereau, der nichts mehr als seinen Witz hat brauchen können, hat weit mehr kranke Stellen des Origenes geschickt geheilet als Carl de la Rue mit allen seinen acht alten Abschriften" (Pref. p. 8).

An edition of Books i.–iv. was published by Prof. W. Selwyn (Cambridge, 1872–4) with short critical notes and some emendations. The best English translation is that by Dr. Crombie, in Clark's *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, Edinburgh, 1869, 1872. The French translation by Bouhéreau, and the German translation by Mosheim (see above) are of considerable value.

The earlier apologists had been called upon to defend Christianity against the outbursts of popular prejudice, as a system compatible with civil and social order. Origen, in his *Books against Celsus*, entered upon a far wider field. It was his object to defend the faith against a comprehensive attack, conducted by critical, historical, and philosophical, as well as by political, arguments. He undertook the work very unwillingly, at the urgent request of his friend Ambrosius, but when he had once undertaken it, he threw into the labour the whole energy of his genius. Celsus was an opponent worthy of his antagonism [CELSUS]; and Origen has at least done justice to his adversary, by allowing him to state his case in his own words, and following him step by step in the great controversy. At first Origen proposed to deal with the attack of Celsus in a general form; but after i. 27 he quotes the objections of Celsus, in the order of their occurrence, and deals with them one by one, so that it is possible to reconstruct the work of Celsus, in great part, from Origen's quotations. It would be difficult to overrate the importance both of the attack and of the defence in relation to the history of religious opinion in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. The form of objections changes; but it may be said fairly that every essential type of objection to Christianity finds its representative in Celsus' statements,

[f] Hoeschel says on his titlepage that he edited the Book "ex bibliothecis Elect. Palat. Boica et Aug." In his notes he refers several times to "Codex Palatinus." I am not aware that this MS. has been identified.

and Origen suggests in reply thoughts, often disguised in strange dresses, which may yet be fruitful.

No outline can convey a true idea of the fulness and variety of the contents of the treatise. It may however indicate the range of the discussion. Speaking broadly the whole work falls into three parts,—the controversy on the history of Christianity (books i. ii.), the controversy on the general character and idea of Christianity (books iii.–v.), the controversy on the relations of Christianity to philosophy, to popular religion, and to national life (books vi.–viii.). There are necessarily many repetitions, but in the main this view appears to represent the course of the argument. The lines of the discussion were laid down by Celsus: Origen simply followed him.

After some introductory chapters (i. 1–27), which deal with a large number of miscellaneous objections to Christianity as illegal, secret, of barbarous origin, inspired by a demoniac power, an offshoot of Judaism, Origen meets Celsus' first serious attack, which is directed against the Christian interpretation of the gospel history. In this case Celsus places his arguments in the mouth of a Jew. The character, as Origen points out, is not consistently maintained, but the original conception is ingenious. A Jew might reasonably be supposed to be the best critic of a system which sprang out of his own people. The chief aim of the objector is to shew that the miraculous narratives of the gospels are untrustworthy, inconclusive in themselves, and that the details of the Lord's life, so far as they can be ascertained, furnish no adequate support to the Christian theory of His person. The criticism is wholly external and unsympathetic. Can we suppose, Celsus asks, that He who was God would be afraid and flee to Egypt (i. 66)? that He could have had a body like other men (i. 69; ii. 36)? that He would have lived a sordid wandering life, with a few mean followers (i. 62)? that He would have borne insults without exacting vengeance (ii. 35)? that He would have been met with incredulity (ii. 75)? that He would have died upon the cross (ii. 68)? that He would have shewn Himself only to friends if He rose again (ii. 63)? For the rest he repeats the Jewish story of the shameful birth of Christ, and of His education in Egypt, where Celsus supposes that He learned the magical arts by which He was enabled to impose upon His countrymen. These illustrations sufficiently shew the fatal weakness of Celsus' position. He has no eye for the facts of the inner life. He makes no effort to apprehend the gospel offered in what Christ did and was, as a revelation of spiritual power; and Origen rises immeasurably superior to him in his vindication of the majesty of Christ's humiliation and sufferings (i. 29 ff.). He shews that Christ did "dawn as a sun" upon the world (ii. 30), when judged by a moral and not by an external standard (ii. 40): that He left to His disciples the abiding power of doing "greater works" than He Himself did in His earthly life (ii. 48); that the actual energy of Christianity in regenerating men,[g] was a proof that He who was its spring was more than man (ii. 79).

[g] Seen, for example, in one like St. Paul, of whom Celsus took no notice (i. 63).

In the third and following books Celsus appears in his own person. He first attacks Christianity as being, like Judaism, originally a revolutionary system, based upon an idle faith in legends no more worthy of credence than those of Greece (iii. 1–43); and then he paints it in detail as a religion of threats and promises, appealing only to the ignorant and the sinful, unworthy of wise men, and, in fact, not addressed to them, or even excluding them (iii. 44–81). Here again Origen has an easy victory. He has no difficulty in shewing that no real parallel can be established between the Greek heroes (iii. 22), or, as Celsus had ventured to suggest, Antinous (iii. 36 ff.) and Christ. On the other side he can reply with the power of a life-long experience, that while the message of the gospel is universal and divine in its universality, "education is a way to virtue," a help towards the knowledge of God (iii. 45, 49, 58, 74), contributory, but not essentially supreme. But he rightly insists on placing the issue as to its claims in the moral and not in the intellectual realm. Christians are the proof of their creed. They are visibly transformed in character: the ignorant are proved wise, sinners are made holy (iii. 51, 64, 78 ff.).

The fourth and fifth books are in many respects the most interesting of all. In these Origen meets Celsus' attack upon that which is the central idea of Christianity, and indeed of Biblical revelation, the Coming of God. This necessarily includes the discussion of the Biblical view of man's relation to God and nature. The contentions of Celsus are that there can be no sufficient cause and no adequate end for "a coming of God" (iv. 1–28): that the account of God's dealings with men in the Old Testament is obviously incredible (iv. 29–50): that nature is fixed, even as to the amount of evil (iv. 62), and that man is presumptuous in claiming a superiority over what he calls irrational animals (iv. 54–99). In especial he dwells on the irrationality of the belief of a coming of God to judgment (v. 1–24); and maintains that there is a divine order in the distribution of the world among different nations, in which the Jews have no prerogative (v. 25–50). On all grounds therefore, he concludes, the claims of Christianity to be a universal religion, based on the coming of God to earth, are absurd. In treating these arguments Origen had a more arduous work to achieve than he had hitherto accomplished. The time had not then come—probably it has not come yet—when such far-reaching objections could be completely met. And Origen was greatly embarrassed by his want of that historic sense which is essential to the apprehension of the order of the divine revelations. His treatment of the Old Testament narratives is unsatisfactory; and it is remarkable that he does not apply his own views on the unity of the whole plan of being, as grasped by man, in partial explanation at least of the present mysteries of life. They underlie indeed all that he says; and much that he urges in detail is of great weight, as his remarks upon the conception of a divine coming (iv. 5 ff., 13 f.), on the rational dignity of man (iv. 13, 23 ff., 30), on the anthropopathic language of Scripture (iv. 71 ff.), on the resurrection (v. 16 ff.).

In the last three books Origen enters again upon surer ground. He examines Celsus' parallels to the teaching of Scripture on the know-

ledge of God and the kingdom of heaven, drawn from Gentile sources (vi. 1–23); and after a digression on a mystical diagnosis of some heretical sect, which Celsus had brought forward as a specimen of Christian teaching (vi. 24–40), he passes to the true teaching on Satan and the Son of God and creation (vi. 41–65), and unfolds more in detail the doctrine of a spiritual revelation through Christ (vi. 66–81). This leads to a vindication of the Old Testament prophecies of Christ (vii. 1–17), of the compatibility of the two dispensations (vii. 18–26), and of the Christian idea of the future life (vii. 27–40). Celsus proposed to point Christians to some better way, but Origen shews that he has failed: the purity of Christians puts to shame the lives of other men (vii. 41–61).

The remainder of the treatise is occupied with arguments bearing upon the relations of Christianity to popular worship and civil duties. Celsus urged that the "demons," the gods of polytheism, might justly claim some worship, as having been entrusted with certain offices in the world (vii. 62–viii. 32); that the circumstances of life demand reasonable conformity to the established worship, which includes what is true in the Christian faith (viii. 33–68); that civil obedience is paramount (viii. 69–75). Origen replies in detail; and specially he shews that the worship of one God is the essence of true worship (viii. 12 f.); that Christianity has a consistent certainty of belief, with which no strange opinions can be put into comparison (viii. 53 ff.); that Christians do, in the noblest sense, support the civil powers by their lives, by their prayers, by their organization (viii. 75).

The spirit of the arguments on both sides is, it will be seen, essentially modern: in the mode of treatment there is much that is characteristic of the age in which the writers lived. Two points of very different nature will especially strike the student. The first is the peculiar stress which Origen, in common with other early writers, and not with them only, lays upon isolated passages of the prophets and of the Old Testament generally: the second, the unquestioning belief which he, in common with Celsus, accords to the claims of magic and augury (i. 6, 67; iv. 92 f.; vii. 67; viii. 58). But when every deduction has been made, it would not be easy to point to a discussion of the claims of Christianity more comprehensive or more rich in pregnant thought. Among early apologies it has no rival. The constant presence of a real antagonist gives unflagging vigour to the debate; and the conscious power of Origen lies in the appeal which he could make to the Christian life as the one unanswerable proof of the Christian faith (comp. *Praef.* 2; i. 27, 67 *s. f.*).

In addition to the passages of the treatise which have been already noticed, there are many others of great interest, which are worthy of study apart from the context. Such are Origen's remarks on the spirit of controversy (vii. 46); on the moral power of Christianity, its universality, and its fitness for man (ii. 64; iii. 28, 40, 54, 62; iv. 26; vii. 17, 35, 42, 59); on foreknowledge (ii. 19 ff.); on the anthropomorphism of Scripture (vi. 60 ff.); on the beauty of the ideal hope of the Christian (iii. 81); on the ideal of worship (viii. 17 f.; vii. 44); on the divisions of Christians (iii. 12 f.; v. 61); on spiritual fellowship (viii. 64); on future unity (viii. 72).

Compare, in addition to the general writers on Origen—

Aubé, B., *La poïemique païenne à la fin du 11me Siècle*, Paris, 1878.
Keim. Th., *Celsus' wahres Wort* ... Zurich, 1873.
Pélagaud, E., *Etude sur Celse* ... Paris, 1878.
Lagrange (F.), Abbé, *La Raison et la Foi* ... Paris, 1856.
Kind (A.), *Teleologie u. Naturalismus* ... Jena, 1875.

D. Practical Works.

On Prayer.

Delarue, i. 195–272.
Lommatzsch, xvii. 79 ff.

Origen's essay on prayer was addressed to Ambrosius and Tatiana (*φιλομαθέστατοι καὶ γνησιώτατοι ἐν θεοσεβείᾳ ἀδελφοί*, c. 33), in answer to inquiries which they proposed to him as to the efficacy, the manner, the subject, the circumstances of prayer. No writing of Origen is more free from his characteristic faults, or more full of beautiful thoughts. He examines first the meaning and use of *εὐχή* (§ 3), and the objections urged against the efficacy of prayer, that God foreknows the future, and that all things take place according to His will (§ 5). Divine foreknowledge does not, he points out, take away man's responsibility: the moral attitude of prayer is in itself a sufficient blessing upon it (§§ 6 ff.). Prayer establishes an active communion between Christ and the angels in heaven (§§ 10 f.); and the duty of prayer is enforced by the example of Christ and the saints (§§ 13 f.). Prayer must be addressed to God only, "our Father in heaven," and not to Christ the Son as apart from the Father, but to the Father through Him (§ 15). The proper objects of prayer are things heavenly, to which "the shadow"—things earthly—may follow or not (§§ 16 f.). These general reflections are illustrated by a detailed exposition of the Lord's Prayer, as given by St. Matthew, with reference also to the corresponding prayer in St. Luke (§§ 18–30). The last chapters (§§ 31–33) give interesting details as to the appropriate disposition, the attitude, the place, the direction (*κλίμα*), the topics of prayer. He who prays will by preference, Origen says, pray standing, with eyes and hands uplifted, and turned to the East.

The observations on the habit of prayer (§ 8), on the sympathy of the dead with the living (§ 11), on life as "one great unbroken prayer" (§ 12, *μία συναπτομένη μεγάλη εὐχή*), on the preparation for prayer (§ 31), are of singular beauty. Elsewhere Origen dwells on the power of the prayers of the church (*in Rom.* x. § 15), even for heathen benefactors (*Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 120).

The essay is found complete in one MS. only, *Cod. Holmiensis* of Trin. Coll. Cambridge. Delarue found the last chapters (31–end) in a Colbertine MS., and had the advantage of a collation of the Trinity MS. by the skilful hand of J. Walker, with Bentley's conjectural emendations.

The Exhortation to Martyrdom (*εἰς μαρτύριον προτρεπτικὸς λόγος*).

Delarue, i. 273–310.
Lommatzsch, xx. 227 ff.

In the persecution of Maximinus (235–237), Ambrosius and Theoctetus, a presbyter of Caesarea,

were thrown into prison. Origen addressed them in a book written from his heart: as a boy and as an old man he looked face to face on martyrdom. Their sufferings, he tells them, are a proof of their maturity (*c.* 1), and in some sense the price of future blessedness (2), for which man's earthly frame is unfitted (3 ff.). The denial of Christ, on the other hand, is the most grievous wrong to God (6 ff.). Believers are indeed pledged to endurance, which will be repaid with unspeakable joys (12 ff.). Moreover they are encouraged in their trials by the thought of the unseen spiritual witnesses by whom they are surrounded in the season of their outward sufferings (18 ff.), and by the examples of those who have already triumphed (22 ff.). By martyrdom man can shew his gratitude to God (28 f.), and at the same time receive afresh the forgiveness of baptism, offering, as a true priest, the sacrifice of himself (30; comp. *Hom.* vii. *in Jud.* 2). So he conquers demons (32). And the predictions of the Lord shew that he is not forgotten (34 ff.), but rather that some counsel of love is fulfilled for him through affliction (39 ff.), such as we can represent to ourselves by the union of the soul with God when it is freed from the distractions of life (47 ff.). Perhaps, too, it may be that the blood of martyrs may have some virtue to gain others, for the truth (50, *τάχα τῷ τιμίῳ αἵματι τῶν μαρτύρων ἀγορασθήσονταί τινες*: comp. *Hom. in Num.* x. 2; *c. Cels.* viii. 44).

E. Critical Writings [Hexapla].

F. Letters.

(Eleven "books" of Letters in all, two books of letters in defence of his works.—H. C.)

Delarue, i. 3–32.
Lommatzsch, xvii. 1 ff.

Eusebius relates that he had made a collection of Origen's letters, containing more than a hundred (*H. E.* vi. 36, 2). Of these two only remain entire, those to Julius Africanus and Gregory, and of the remainder the fragments and notices are most meagre. The famous sentence from his letter to his father has been already quoted (p. 98). In another fragment (Delarue, i. p. 3, from Suidas, *s. v.* Ὠριγένης) he gives a lively picture of the incessant labour which the zeal of Ambrosius imposed upon him. A third fragment of great interest, preserved by Eusebius, contains a defence of his study of heathen philosophy (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19). Another important passage of a letter addressed to friends at Alexandria, in which he complains of the misrepresentations of those who professed to give accounts of controversies which they had held with him, has been preserved in a Latin translation by Jerome and Rufinus (Delarue, i. p. 5). Of the many letters which he wrote in defence of his orthodoxy, including one to Fabianus, bishop of Rome (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 36; comp. Hier. *Ep.* 41 (65)), nothing remains. In like manner his letters to Beryllus (Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 60), to his scholar Trypho (*id.* 57), to the emperor Philip and his wife (or mother) (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 36; Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 54), have also perished.

To Gregory of Neo-Caesarea.

Gregory was as yet undecided as to his profession when this letter was written (c. 236–7; comp. pp. 101 f.). Origen expresses his earnest desire that his "son" will devote all his knowledge of general literature and the fruits of wide discipline to Christianity (c. 1). He illustrates this use of secular learning by the "spoiling of the Egyptians" (c. 2); and concludes his appeal by a striking exhortation to Gregory to study Scripture (*πρόσεχε τῇ τῶν θείων γραφῶν ἀναγνώσει· ἀλλὰ πρόσεχε*): "He that said knock ... and seek ... said also, Ask and it shall be given" (c. 3). Comp. Dräseke, *Der Brief d. Orig. an Gregorios* ... *Jahrb. f. Protest. Theol.* 1881 1.

The letter to Julius Africanus has been already noticed (p. 122).

G. The Philocalia.

Some notice must be given of this admirable collection of extracts from Origen's writings, to which the preservation of many fragments of the Greek text is due. It was made, as it appears, by Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil; and the former sent it to Theodosius bishop of Tyana, about A.D. 382, with a letter (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* cxv.) in which he says: "That you may have some memorial from us, and at the same time from the holy Basil, we have sent you a small volume of the 'Choice thoughts' of Origen (*πυκτίον τῆς Ὠριγένους Φιλοκαλίας*), containing extracts of passages serviceable for scholars (*τοῖς φιλολόγοις*). Be pleased to accept it, and to give us some proof of its usefulness with the aid of industry and the Spirit."

The Philocalia is of great interest, not only from the intrinsic excellence of the passages which it contains, but as shewing what Catholic saints held to be characteristic thoughts in Origen's teaching.

The book consists of xxvii. chapters, which treat of the following subjects:

1. On the Inspiration of divine Scripture. How Scripture should be read and understood. What is the reason (*λόγος*) of its obscurity, and of that in it which is impossible or irrational according to the letter (*κατὰ τὸ ῥητόν*).—Long extracts from the fourth book on *First Principles*, § 1–23; an extract from the *Commentary on Psalm* l. (li.); an extract from the *Second Homily on Leviticus*.

2. That divine Scripture is closed (*κέκλεισται*) and sealed.—Extracts from the *Book on Ps.* i.

3. Why the Inspired Books [of the Old Test.] are twenty-two.—Extract from the same *Book on Ps.* i.

4. Of the solecism and poor style of Scripture. —Extracts from the *Fourth Book on St. John.*

5. What is much-speaking, and what are "many books;" and that inspired Scripture is one Book.—Extracts from the *Fifth Book on St. John.*

6. That divine Scripture is one instrument of God, perfect and fitted (for its work).—Extract from the *Second Book on St. Matthew.*

7. On the special character (*τοῦ ἰδιώματος*) of the persons of divine Scripture.—Extracts from (1) the early *Book on Canticles*, (2) the *Fourth Homily on the Acts.*

8. On the duty of not endeavouring to correct the inaccurate (*σολοικοειδῆ*) phrases of Scripture and those which are not capable of being understood according to the letter, seeing that they contain deep propriety of thought (*πολὺ τὸ τῆς διανοίας ἀκόλουθον*) for those who can understand.—Extract from the *Commentary on Hosea.*

9. What is the reason that divine Scripture often uses the same term in different significa-

tions, and (that) in the same place.—Extract from the *Ninth Book on the Romans.*

10. On passages in divine Scripture which seem to involve some stone of stumbling or rock of offence.—Extract from the *Thirty-ninth Homily on Jeremiah.*

11. That we must seek the nourishment supplied by all inspired Scripture, and not turn from the passages (ῥητά) troubled by heretics with ill-advised difficulties (δυσφήμοις ἐπαπορήσεσιν), nor slight them, but make use of them also, being kept from the confusion which attaches to unbelief.—Extracts from the *Twentieth Book on Ezekiel.*

12. That he should not faint in the reading of divine Scripture who does not understand the dark riddles and parables it contains.—Extract from the *Twentieth Homily on Joshua.*

13. When and to whom the lessons of philosophy are serviceable to the explanation of the sacred Scriptures, with Scripture testimony.—*Letter to Gregory.*

14. That it is most necessary for those who wish not to fail of the truth in understanding the divine Scriptures to know the logical principles or preparatory discipline (μαθήματα ἤτοι προπαιδεύματα) which apply to their use, without which they cannot set forth the exact meaning of the thoughts expressed as they should do.—Extract from the *Third Book on Genesis.*

15. A reply to the Greek philosophers who disparage the poverty of the style of the divine Scriptures, and maintain that the noble truths in Christianity have been better expressed among the Greeks; and who further say that the Lord's person was ill-favoured; with the reason of the different forms of the Word.—Extracts from the *Sixth and Seventh Books against Celsus,*[h] c. Cels. vi. 1–5 (with a fragm. from i. 2); vii. 58–61; vi. 75–77 (with fragments from i. 42, 63; ii. 15; and one of uncertain source, p. 89 L.).

16. Of those who malign Christianity on account of the heresies in the Church.—Extract from the *Third Book against Celsus* (c. Cels. iii. 12–14, with fragments from v. 61, 63).

17. A reply to those philosophers who say that it makes no difference if we call Him who is God over all by the name Zeus, current among the Greeks, or by that which is used by Indians or Egyptians.—Extracts from the *Third and Fifth Books against Celsus* (c. Cels. i. 21–25; v. 45, 46; iv. 48 fragm.).

18. A reply to the Greek philosophers who profess universal knowledge, and blame the simple faith (τὸ ἀνεξέταστον τῆς πίστεως) of the mass of Christians, and charge them with preferring folly to wisdom in life; and who say that no wise or educated man has become a disciple of Jesus . . . . Extracts from the *First and Third Books against Celsus* (c. Cels. i. 9–11; 19b, 20; 12, 13; 62b–66; iii. 44–54; 73b, 74).

19. That our faith in the Lord has nothing in common with the irrational, superstitious faith of the Gentiles . . . . And in reply to those who say, How do we think that Jesus is God when He had a mortal body?—Extracts from the same (*Third*) *Book against Celsus* (c. Cels. iii 38–42 a).

20. A reply to those who say that the whole world was made, not for man, but for irrational creatures . . . who live with less toil than men . . . and foreknow the future. Wherein is an argument against transmigration and on augury . . . —Extract from the *Fourth Book against Celsus* (c. Cels. iv. 73b–76a, 78–99).

21. Of free-will, with an explanation of the sayings of Scripture which seem to deny it.—Extract from the *Third Book of First Principles.*

22. What is the dispersion of the rational or human souls indicated under a veil in the building of the Tower, and the confusion of tongues . . . —Extract from the *Fifth Book against Celsus* (c. Cels. v. 25–28a, 35, 28b–32).

23. On Fate, and the reconciliation of divine foreknowledge with human freedom; and how the stars do not determine the affairs of men, but only indicate them . . . Extracts from (i.) the Third Book on Genesis, (ii.) the Second Book against Celsus (c. Cels. ii. 20b).

24. Of matter, that it is not uncreated (ἀγέννητος) or the cause of evil.—From the *Seventh Book of the Evangelical Preparation of Eusebius* (Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* vii. 22).[i]

25. That the separation to a special work (Rom. i. 1) from foreknowledge does not destroy free-will.—Extract from the *First Book on the Romans.*

26. Of the question as to things good and evil . . . Extract from the *Book on Ps.* iv.

27. On the phrase: "He hardened Pharaoh's heart."—Extracts from unnamed books; and from notes on Exodus, and from the *Second Book on Canticles.*

The MSS. of the Philocalia are numerous. One at Venice (No. 47) is referred to the 11th century. A MS. at New College Oxford is of interest as having been presented to the Society by Cardinal Pole.[k]

It does not fall within the scope of this article to notice in detail the works which have been falsely attributed to Origen. Of these the most important are:

The Dialogue against the Marcionites (Διάλογος κατὰ Μαρκιωνιστῶν ἢ περὶ τῆς εἰς θεὸν ὀρθῆς πίστεως).

Delarue, i. 800 ff.
Lommatzsch, xvi. 246 ff.[l]

[h] It will be noticed that the description of the sources of the extracts given in the book is not always exact or correct.

[i] The passage is quoted by Eusebius from "Maximus, a distinguished man." A large part of it is found in the "Dialogue of Adamantius," falsely attributed to Origen (Delarue, 1, 843 ff.; Lommatzsch, xvi. 341 ff.). Comp. Routh, *Rell. Sacrae,* ii. 77 ff.

It is by no means unlikely that this section was added to the text afterwards. The concluding note says that the passage is also found ἐν τῷ Ὠριγένους πρὸς Μαρκιωνιστάς, *i.e.*, the Dialogue of Adamantius, which they could hardly have attributed to him.

[k] See also § ix. note, p. 140.

[l] There is a MS. of the Dialogue in the Gale collection (O. 4.41) with the following note: "Collatus est hic Codex cum cod. ms. qui servatur in Bibl. Trin. Coll. Camb. Erat autem is descriptus ex cod. ms°. Regiae Bibl. Gall. et collatus cum alio ejusdem Bibliothecae libro ms°." At the end is the colophon: "Scripsit Petrus Goldmannus Scotus in bibliotheca Bodleiana anno redemptae salutis 1613." A loose sheet of conjectural emendations is included in the same volume.

Philosophumena, a fragment of a treatise "against all heresies."

Delarue, i. 872 ff.
Lommatzsch, xxv. 279 ff.

Commentaries on Job (three books), written after 311.

Delarue, ii. 850 ff.
Lommatzsch, xvi. 1 ff.

Philosophumena, published under the name of Origen from a Paris MS. by E. Miller, Oxford, 1851, but now generally attributed to Hippolytus.

It is probable that the *Lexicon of Hebrew names*, published under the name of Origen by Martianay (Hieron. iii. pp. 1203 ff., ed. Migne), has at least an Origenian foundation, and the interpretations deserve comparison with those scattered through Origen's Greek works. Comp. Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, vii. 226 f.[m]

V. View of Christian Life.

The picture of Christian life which is drawn in Origen's writings, is less complete and vivid than might have been expected. It represents a society already sufficiently large, powerful, and wealthy, to offer examples of popular vices. Origen contrasts the Christians of his own day with those of an earlier time, and pronounces them unworthy to bear the name of "faithful" (*Hom. in Jer.* iv. 3; comp. *in Matt.* xvii. 24). Some who were Christians by birth were unduly proud of their descent (*in Matt.* xv. § 26). Others retained their devotion to pagan superstitions—astrology, auguries, necromancy (*in Josh.* v. 6, vii. 4; comp. *in Matt.* xiii. § 6) and secular amusements (*Hom. in Lev.* ix. 9, xi. 1). There were many spiritual "Gibeonites" among them, men who gave liberal offerings to the churches but not their lives (*in Josh.* x. 1, 3). The attendance at church services was infrequent (*in Josh.* i. 7; *Hom. in Gen.* x. 1, 3). The worshippers were inattentive (*Hom. in Ex.* xiii. 2) and impatient (*Hom. in Jud.* vi. 1). Commercial dishonesty (*in Matt.* xv. 13) and hardness (*Sel. in Job.* p. 341 L.) had to be reproved.

Such faults call out the preacher's denunciations at all times. Origen deals with an evil more characteristic of his age when he dwells on the growing ambition of the clergy. High places in the hierarchy were now sought by favour and by gifts (*Hom. in Num.* xxii. 4; comp. *in Matt.* xvi. 22; *Comm. Ser.* §§ 9, 10, 12). Prelates endeavoured to nominate their kinsmen as their successors (*id.* xxii. 4); and shrank from boldly rebuking vice lest they should lose the favour of the people (*in Josh.* vii. 6), using the powers of discipline from passion rather than with judgment (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 14), so that their conduct already caused open scandal (*Hom. in Num.* ii. 17). They too often forgot humility at their ordination (*Hom. in Ezech.* ix. 2). They despised the counsel of men of lower rank, "not to speak of that of a layman or a Gentile" (*Hom. in Ex.* xi. 6).

Origen in particular denounces the pride of the leading men in the Christian society, which already exceeded that of Gentile tyrants, especially in the more important cities (*in Matt.* xvi. 8).

It is natural that a public teacher should dwell on vices rather than on virtues, but Origen's language must not be forgotten when an estimate is made of the early church.

Yet, according to Origen, traces still remained in his time of the miraculous endowments of the apostolic church, which he had himself seen (*c. Cels.* ii. 8, iii. 24; *in Joh.* tom. xx. 28, ἴχνη καὶ λείμματα; comp. *c. Cels.* i. 2). Exorcism was habitually practised (*Hom. in Jos.* xxiv. 1). Demons were expelled, many cures were wrought, future events were foreseen by Christians through the help of the Spirit (*c. Cels.* i. 46; comp. i. 25, iii. 36, viii. 58); and he says that the "name of Jesus" was sometimes powerful against demons, even when named by bad men (*c. Cels.* i. 6; comp. v. 45).

But this testimony must be taken in conjunction with the belief in the power of magic which he shared with his contemporaries. He appeals unhesitatingly to the efficacy of incantations made with the use of sacred names (*c. Cels.* i. 22, iv. 33 ff.; comp. *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 110), and otherwise according to secret rules (*c. Cels.* i. 24; *Hom. in Num.* xiii. 4; *in Jos.* xx. *fragm.* ap. *Philoc.* c. xii.)

Origen says little of the relations of Christians to other bodies in the state. The interpenetration of common life by paganism necessarily excluded believers from most public ceremonies, and from much social intercourse. The same influence made them ill-disposed towards art, which was for the most part devoted to the old religion (*c. Cels.* iii. 56; *De Orat.* 17), and had not as yet found any place in connexion with Christian worship (*c. Cels.* vii. 63 ff.). And it is remarkable that while Origen was pre-eminently distinguished for his vindication of the claims of reason (*c. Cels.* i. 13) and of Gentile philosophy, as being the ripest fruit of man's natural powers (comp. *Hom. in Gen.* xiv. 3; *in Ex.* xi. 6) and not their corruption (Tertullian), he still very rarely refers to the literature of secular wisdom in his general writings as ancillary to revelation. He even in some cases refers its origin to "the princes of this world" (*De Princ.* iii. 3, 2); and in an interesting outline of the course of Gentile education, he remarks that it may only accumulate a wealth of sins (*Hom.* iii. *in Ps.* xxxvi. 6). On the other hand, his directions for dealing with unbelievers are marked by the truest courtesy (*Hom. in Ex.* iv. 9); and in spite of his own courageous enthusiasm, he counselled prudence in times of persecution (*in Matt.* x. 23). Occasions for such self-restraint arose continually. For Origen notices the popular judgment, active from the time of Tertullian to that of Augustine, which referred "wars, famines, and pestilences"

The MS. in the Library of Trinity College which is referred to is marked B. 9, 10. The colophon is: "In gratiam praestantissimi et reverendissimi viri Isaaci Vossii I.V.D. describebam Lutetiae Parisiorum, Decembri 1647, ego Claudius Sarranius." The MS. was given by Voss to H. Thorndike.

[m] One apocryphal Homily *On Mary Magdalene* deserves to be noticed on account of its wide popularity. Chaucer says that:

> "He made also, gon is a grete while,
> Origenes upon the Maudelaine."
> *Legend of Good Women*, 427.

But the *Lamentation of Marie Magdaleine*, which is often printed among his works, is generally held to be spurious.

to the spread of the faith (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 39). In especial he dwells upon the animosity of the Jews, who "would rather see a criminal acquitted than convicted by the evidence of a Christian" (*id.* § 16). Of the extension of Christianity he speaks in general terms, rhetorically rather than exactly. It was not preached among all the Ethiopians, especially "those beyond the river," or among the Chinese. "What," he continues, "shall we say of the Britons or Germans by the Ocean, Dacians, Sarmatians, Scythians, very many of whom have not yet heard the word?" (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 39). Yet elsewhere he reckons inhabitants of Britain and Mauritania among those who held the common faith (*Hom. in Luc.* vi.).

As a general rule Christians declined public offices, not from any lack of loyalty, but as feeling that they could serve their country better through their own society (*c. Cels.* viii. 73, 75).

The church, according to Origen, is the whole body of believers animated by Christ, who, as the Divine Logos, stirs each member, so that without Him it does nothing (*c. Cels.* vi. 48). In the widest sense it has existed even from the Creation (*in Cant.* ii. p. 418 L.). Such a view, which makes the church coextensive with the existence of divine fellowship, carries with it the corollary, that "without the church there is no salvation" (*Hom. in Jos.* iii. 6). Origen, as has been seen, shewed practically his respect for the see of Rome, but he recognised no absolute supremacy in St. Peter (*in Matt.* xii. 11). He held indeed that he had a certain pre-eminence (*in Joh.* tom. xxxii. 5), and that the church was founded on him (*Hom. in Ex.* v. 4), but every disciple of Christ, he affirms, holds in a true sense the same position (*Comm. in Matt.* xii. 10).

In this connexion it may be noticed that Origen lays great stress upon the importance of right belief (*in Matt.* tom. xii. 23; *Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 33; *De Orat.* 29). As a young man he refused every concession to a misbeliever in the house of his benefactress (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 2). In later years he laboured successfully to win back those who had fallen into error. But none the less his sense of the infinite greatness of the truth made him tolerant (*c. Cels.* v. 63). He ventured to say that varieties of belief were due to the vastness of its object (*c. Cels.* iii. 12); and his discussion of the question, Who is a heretic? is full of interest (*Fragm. in Ep. ad Tit.*).

Casual notices scattered through Origen's writings, give a fairly complete view of the religious observances of his time. He speaks generally of stated times of daily prayer, "not less than three" (*De Orat.* 12), of the days which they kept—"the Lord's days (comp. *Hom. in Ex.* vii. 5; *in Num.* xxiii. 4), Fridays, Easter, Pentecost" (*c. Cels.* viii. 22; comp. *Hom. in Is.* vi. § 2),—and of the Lenten, Wednesday, and Friday fasts (*Hom. in Lev.* x. 2). Some still added Jewish rites to the celebration of Easter (*Hom. in Jer.* xii. 13), and other traces remained of Judaizing practices (*Hom. in Jer.* x. § 2). Jewish converts, Origen says without reserve, "have not left their national law" (*c. Cels.* ii. 1, comp. § 3); though he lays down that Christ forbade His disciples to be circumcised (*c. Cels.* i. 22; comp. v. 48). Christians however still abstained from "things strangled" (*c. Cels.* viii. 30), and from meat that had been offered to idols (*id.* 24). Outward forms had already made progress; and there were those whose religion consisted in "bowing their head to priests, and in bringing offerings to adorn the altar of the church" (*Hom. in Jos.* x. 3).

Baptism was administered to infants, "in accordance with apostolic tradition" (*in Rom.* v. § 9, p. 397 L.; *Hom. in Lev.* viii. § 3; *in Luc.* xiv.), in the name of the Holy Trinity (*in Rom.* v. § 8, p. 383 L.;[n] comp. *in Joh.* tom. vi. 17), with the solemn renunciations "of the devil and of his pomps, works, and pleasures" (*Hom. in Num.* xii. 4)[o]. The unction (confirmation) does not appear to have been separated from it (*in Rom.* v. § 8, p. 381: "omnes baptizati in aquis istis visibilibus et in chrismate visibili"). As for the gift of the Holy Spirit, which comes only from Christ, Origen held that it was given according to His righteous will: "Not all who are bathed in water are forthwith bathed in the Holy Spirit" (*Hom. in Num.* iii. 1). Compare also *Sel. in Gen.* ii. 15; *Hom. in Luc.* xxi.; *De Princ.* i. 2; and for the two sacraments, *Hom. in Num.* vii. 2. Adult converts were divided into different classes and trained with great care (*c. Cels.* iii. 51).

Of the Holy Communion Origen speaks not unfrequently, but with some reserve (*Hom. in Lev.* x. 10; *in Jos.* iv. 1). It is remarkable that he does not mention it when he discusses the various modes of remission of sin (*Hom. in Lev.* ii. 4). The passages which give his views most fully are *in Joh.* xxxii. § 16; *in Matt.* xi. § 14; *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* §§ 85 f.; *Hom. in Gen.* xvii. 8; *in Ex.* xiii. § 3; *in Lev.* ix. 10; *in Num.* xvi. 9. Comp. *c. Cels.* viii. 33, 57; *Hom. in Jud.* vi. 2; *Hom.* ii. *in Ps.* xxxvii. 6; *Sel. in Ps.* p. 365 L.

The ruling thought of his interpretation is suggested by John vi.: "corpus Dei Verbi aut sanguis quid aliud esse potest nisi verbum quod nutrit et verbum quod laetificat?" (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 85); "bibere autem dicimur sanguinem Christi non solum sacramentorum ritu sed et cum sermones eius recipimus in quibus vita consistit, sicut et ipse dicit, *Verba quae locutus sum spiritus et vita est*" (*Hom. in Num.* xvi. § 9; comp. xxiii. § 6). The passage which is often quoted to shew "a presence of Christ in the sacrament *extra usum*," indicates nothing more than the reverence which naturally belongs to the consecrated elements (consecratum munus, *Hom. in Ex.* xiii. 3).

The kiss of peace was still given "at the time of the mysteries" (*in Cant.* i. p. 331 L.), "after prayers" (*in Rom.* x. § 33); and the love-feast (Ἀγάπη) was sufficiently notorious to form a subject of Celsus's attacks (*c. Cels.* i. 1); but the practice of "feet-washing," if it ever prevailed, was now obsolete (*in Joh.* xxxii. § 7; *Hom. in Is.* vi. § 3). It may be added that the use made of

[n] In commenting on Rom. vi. 3 in this passage he meets the question which may be asked, how it is that St. Paul speaks of baptism "in the name of Christ Jesus," "while baptism is not held to be lawful unless under the name of the Trinity."

[o] In *Hom. in Ezech.* vi. 6, there appears to be a reference to the use of salt and milk and the white robe. Comp. *in Rom.* v. § 8 *l. c*

James v. 14, in *Hom. in Lev.* ii. 4, does not give any support, as has been often affirmed, to the practice of extreme unction.

The treatise *On Prayer* gives, as has been seen, a vivid picture of the mode and attitude of prayer. It was usual to turn to the east (*De Orat.* 31; *Hom. in Num.* v. § 1). Standing and kneeling are both recognised (*De Orat. l. c.*; *Hom. in Num.* xi. § 9; comp. *in Sam. Hom.* i. § 9). Forms of prayer were used (*Hom. in Jer.* xiv. § 14); and prayers were made in the vernacular language of each country (*c. Cels.* viii. 31).

Origen frequently refers to confession as made to men and not to God only (*Hom. in Luc.* xvii.; *De Orat.* 28; *Hom.* ii. *in Ps.* xxxvii. § 6); and reckons penitence completed by such confession to a "priest of the Lord" as one of the modes for forgiveness of sins (*Hom.* ii. *in Lev.* § 4). At the same time he speaks elsewhere of public confession (ἐξομολόγησις) to God as efficacious (*Hom.* i. *in Ps.* xxxvi. § 5), a form of penitence to be adopted after wise advice (*Hom.* ii. *in Ps.* xxxvii. § 6); and while he adopts the common but false view of Matt. xvi. 18, he supposes that the efficacy of "the power of the keys" depends upon the character of those who exercise it (*in Matt.* tom. xii. § 14).

Discipline was enforced by exclusion from common prayer (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 89); and for more serious offences penitence was admitted once only (*Hom. in Lev.* xv. § 2). Compare also what is said on "sin unto death" (*Hom. in Lev.* xi. 2). Those who had offended grievously after baptism were looked upon as incapable of holding office (*c. Cels.* iii. 51).

The threefold ministry is noticed as if it were universally recognised; and Origen speaks of presbyters as priests, and deacons as Levites (*Hom. in Jerem.* xii. 3). The people were to be present at the ordination of priests (*Hom. in Lev.* vii. 3). At the same time he recognises emphatically the priesthood of all Christians who "have been anointed with the sacred chrism" (*Hom. in Lev.* ix. 9; comp. *Hom. in Num.* v. 3; *in Jos.* vii. 2; comp. *Exh. ad Martyr.* 30).

Widows are spoken of also as having a definite place in the organization of the church (*Hom. in Is.* vi. § 3; *Hom. in Luc.* xvii.); and yet it does not appear that they were combined in any order (*in Rom.* x. §§ 17, 20).

As yet no absolute rule was made as to the celibacy of the clergy. Origen himself was inclined to support it by his own judgment (*Hom. in Lev.* vi. § 6). "No bishop, however, or presbyter or deacon or widow could marry a second time" (*Hom. in Luc.* xvii.): such Origen held to be in a second class, not "of the church without spot" (*l. c.*; but comp. note on 1 Cor. vii. 8). It was a sign of the difficulties of the social position of Christians that some "rulers of the church" allowed a woman to marry again while her husband (presumably a Gentile who had abandoned her) was still living (*in Matt.* tom. xiv. § 23).

Origen's own example and feeling were strongly in favour of a strict and continent life (comp. *c. Cels.* vii. 48; *Hom. in Gen.* v. 4), while he condemns false asceticism (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 10). He enforces the duty of systematic almsgiving (*id.* § 61); and maintains that the law of offering the firstfruits to God, that is to the priests, is one of the Mosaic precepts which is of perpetual obligation (*Hom. in Num.* xi. 1; comp. *c. Cels.* viii. 34). Usury is forbidden (*Hom.* iii. *in Ps.* xxxvi. § 11). The rule as to food laid down in Acts xv. 29, was as has been seen, still observed (*in Rom.* ii. § 13, p. 128 L.; *c. Cels.* viii. 30).

The reverence of Christian burial is noticed (*Hom. in Lev.* iii. § 3; *c. Cels.* viii. 30). Military service, according to Origen, was unlawful for Christians (*c. Cels.* v. 33, viii. 73), though he seems to admit exceptions to the rule (*id.* iv. 82).

VI. Origen as critic and interpreter.[p]

Origen regarded the Bible as the source and rule of truth (*Hom. in Jer.* i. § 7). Christ is "the Truth," and they who are sure of this seek spiritual knowledge from His very words and teaching alone, given not only during His earthly presence, but through Moses and the prophets (*De Princ. Praef.* 1). The necessary points of doctrine were, Origen held, comprised by the apostles in a simple creed handed down by tradition (*De Princ. Praef.* ii.), but the fuller exhibition of the mysteries of the gospel was to be sought from the Scriptures. In this respect he made no sharp division between the Old and New Testaments. They must be treated as one body, and we must be careful not to mar the unity of the Spirit which exists throughout (*in Joh.* x. 13; comp. *De Princ.* ii. 4). The divinity of the Old Testament is indeed first seen through Christ (*De Princ.* iv. 1, 6).

1. *The Canon of Scripture.*—In fixing the contents of the collection of sacred books Origen shews some indecision. In regard to the Old Testament he found a serious difference between the Hebrew Canon and the books which were commonly found in the Alexandrine Greek Bible. In his *Commentary on the first Psalm* he gives a list of the canonical books (αἱ ἐνδιάθηκοι βίβλοι) according to the tradition of the Hebrews, twenty-two in number (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25). In the enumeration the *Book of the Twelve* (minor) *Prophets* is omitted by the error of Eusebius or of his transcriber, for it is necessary to make up the number; and the "Letter" (*Baruch* vi.) is added to Jeremiah, because (apparently) it occupied that position in Origen's copy of the LXX., for there is no evidence that it was ever included in the Hebrew Bible. The *Books of the Maccabees*, which (1 *Macc.*) bore a Hebrew title, were not included in the number (ἔξω τούτων ἐστί).

But while Origen thus gives a primary place to the books of the Hebrew Canon, he expressly defended, in his letter to Africanus, the use among Christians of the additions found in the Alexandrine LXX. (comp. p. 122). He was unwilling to sacrifice anything which was sanctioned by custom and tended to edification. His own practice reflects this double view. He never, as far as we know, publicly expounded any of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, while he habitually quotes them as having authority,

[p] In addition to the general works already referred to the essay of J. J. Bochinger (Argentor. 1829–30), *De O. allegorica S.S. interpretatione* may be noticed as impartial and full in detail. There is another essay on the subject by C. R. Hagenbach (Basil. 1823)

though he frequently notices, while he does so, that their authority was challenged.

So we find references to the *Books of Maccabees* (*De Princ.* ii. 1, 5; *in Joh.* xiii. 57); to *Baruch* (*Hom. in Ex.* vii. 2; *Comm. in Rom.* ii. § 7); to *Ecclesiasticus* (*in Joh.* tom. xxxii. 14; *Hom.* ii. *in Ps.* 39, § 7); to *Wisdom* (*in Joh.* xxviii. 13, εἴ τις προσίεται; comp. tom. xx. 4; *De Princ.* iv. 33); to *Tobit* (*De Orat.* 14; *Comm. in Rom.* viii. § 11); to *Judith* (*in Joh.* vi. § 16); to the *Additions to Esther* and to *Daniel*, in the letter to Africanus.

In addition to these books, which had a certain sanction in the church, Origen quotes also the *Book of Enoch* (*c. Cels.* v. 55; *De Princ.* iv. 35; *Hom. in Num.* xxviii. 2), the *Prayer of Joseph* (*in Joh.* ii. 25, εἴ τις προσίεται), the *Assumption of Moses* (*Hom. in Jos.* ii. 1), and the *Ascension of Isaiah* (*De Princ.* iii. 2, 1; *Hom. in Jos.* ii. 1; comp. *in Matt.* t. x. 18); and it is probably to books of this type that he refers in the interesting remarks on "apocryphal" books in *Prol. in Cant.* p. 325 L.

How far Origen was from any clear view of the history of the books of the Old Testament may be inferred from the importance which he assigns to the tradition of Ezra's restoration of their text from memory after the Babylonian captivity (*Sel. in Jer.* xi. p. 5 L.; *Sel. in Ps. id.* p. 371).

His testimony to the contents of the New Testament is more decided. He notices the books which were generally acknowledged in the church as possessing unquestionable authority; the *Four Gospels* [the *Acts*[q]], 1 *Peter*, 1 *John*, *thirteen Epistles of St. Paul*. To these he adds the *Apocalypse*, for he seems to have been unacquainted with its absence from the Syrian Canon (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25). In another passage, preserved only in the Latin translation of Rufinus (*Hom. in Jer.* vii. 1), he enumerates all the books of the received New Testament, without addition or omission, as the trumpets by which the walls of the spiritual Jericho are to be overthrown (*the Four Gospels*, *1st* and *2nd Peter*, *James*, *Jude*, *the Epistles* and *Apocalypse of St. John*, the *Acts* by St. Luke, *fourteen Epistles of St. Paul*). This enumeration, though it cannot be received without reserve, may represent his popular teaching. In isolated notices he speaks of the disputed books as received by some but not by all (*Epistle to the Hebrews*, ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25; *Ep. ad Afric.* § 9; *James*, *in Joh.* xix. 6; *2nd Peter*, *Hom. in Lev.* iv. 4; *Jude*, *in Matt.* tom. x. 17, xvii. 30); and it was according to his spirit to accept, in a certain sense, whatever tended to edification, though he appears to have limited doctrinal authority to the acknowledged books (*Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 28).

In addition to the "controverted" books which have found a place in the New Testament, Origen quotes most frequently and with the greatest respect the *Shepherd* of Hermas (e. g. *De Princ.* i. 3, 3, iv. 11; *in Matt.* tom. xiv. § 21; *in Rom.* x. 31, p. 437 L.).[r]

He quotes also or refers to the *Epistle* (i.) *of Clement*, "a disciple of the apostles" (*De Princ.* ii. 3, 6; *in Joh.* tom. vi. 36; *Sel. in Ez.* viii. 3); "the *Catholic Epistle of Barnabas*" (*c. Cels.* i. 63; *De Princ.* iii. 2, 4; comp. *Comm. in Rom.* i. § 18), the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (*in Joh.* tom. ii. 6, ἐὰν προσίεταί τις; *Hom. in Jer.* xv. 4; *in Matt.* tom. xv. 14, *Vet. int. Lat.*; comp. Hier. *de Virr. Ill.* 2), the *Gospels* "*according to the Egyptians*," and "*according to the Twelve Apostles*," "*according to Thomas*," and "*after Matthias*" (*Hom.* 1 *in Luc.*, "Ecclesia quatuor habet evangelia, haeresis plurima, e quibus . . ."), the *Gospel according to Peter*, the *Book of James* (*in Matt.* x. 17, τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου ἢ τῆς βίβλου Ἰακώβου), *Peter's Preaching* (*in Joh.* xiii. 17; *De Princ.* Praef. 8, *Petri doctrina*), the *Acts of Paul* (*in Joh.* xx. 12; *De Princ.* i. 2, 3), the *Clementines* (*Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 77; *in Gen.* iii. § 14, αἱ περίοδοι), some form of the *Acts of Pilate* (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 122), the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*in Joh.* xv. 6), the *Teaching of the Apostles* (?) (*Hom. in Levit.* xi. 2).

Sayings attributed to the Lord are given *in Matt.* tom. xiii. § 2, xvi. § 28 (*Sel. in Ps.* p. 432 L. and *De Orat.* §§ 2, 14, 16; comp. Matt. vi. 33), xvii. § 31; *in Jos.* iv. 3. A few traditions are preserved: *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 126 (Adam buried on Calvary); *id.* § 25 (death of the father of John Baptist); *c. Cels.* i. 51 (the cave and manger at Bethlehem); *c. Cels.* vi. 75 (the appearance of Christ); *Hom. in Ezech.* i. 4 (the baptism of Christ in January).[s]

Anonymous quotations occur, *Hom. in Luc.* xxxv.; *Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 61; *Hom. in Ezech.* i. 5; *in Rom.* ix. § 2.

2. *The Text.*—It will be evident, from what has been said, that Origen had very little of the critical spirit, in the modern acceptation of the phrase. This is especially seen in his treatment of the biblical texts. His importance for textual criticism is that of a witness and not of a judge. He gives invaluable evidence as to what he found, but his few endeavours to determine what is right, in a conflict of authorities, are for the most part unsuccessful both in method and result. Generally, however, he makes no attempt to decide on the one right reading. He is ready to accept all the conflicting readings as contributing to edification. Even his great labours on the Greek translations of the Old Testament were not directed rigorously to the definite end of determining what was the authentic text, but mainly to recording the extent and character of the variations. Having done this, he left his readers to follow their own judgment (*Comm. in Matt.* xv. 14: ἵνα . . . ὁ μὲν βουλόμενος πρόηται αὐτά, ᾧ δὲ προσκόπτει τὸ τοιοῦτον, ὃ βούλεται περὶ τῆς παραδοχῆς αὐτῶν ἢ μὴ ποιήσῃ). [HEXAPLA.]

This want of a definite critical aim is more decisively shewn in his treatment of the New Testament. Few variations are more remarkable than those in Hebr. ii. 9: χάριτι θεοῦ and χωρὶς θεοῦ. Origen was acquainted with both, and apparently he was wholly unconcerned to

q This book is not specially mentioned, but Origen's usage is decisive as to the position which he assigned to it. The tacit omission is a good illustration of the danger of trusting to negative evidence.

r The statement of Tarinus, however (*Philoc.* p. 683), that Origen wrote a commentary on the *Shepherd* appears to be simply a false deduction from the word διηγούμεθα (*Philoc.* i. p. 22, 11).

s His statement as to the duration of the Lord's ministry, for "a year and a few months" (*de Princ.* iv. 5), cannot be included in this list. Comp. Redepenning, *de Princ.* p. 49.

make a choice between them; both gave a good sense, and that was a sufficient reason for using both (*in Joh.* tom. i. 40: *εἴτε δὲ χωρὶς θεοῦ ... εἴτε χάριτι ... in Joh.* xxviii. 14: the Latin of *Comm. in Rom.* iii. § 8, v. § 7, *sine Deo*, is of no authority for Origen's judgment).

In other cases of less importance he notices the existence of various readings in the same manner: Matt. xvi. 20 (*διεστείλατο, ἐπετίμησεν; Comm. in Matt.* xii. § 15); Matt. xviii. 1 (*ὥρᾳ, ἡμέρᾳ; Comm. in Matt.* xiii. § 14); Mark iii. 18 (*Λεββαῖον; c. Cels.* i. 62); Luke ix. 48 (*ἐστί, ἔσται; Comm. in Matt.* xiii. § 19); Luke xiv. 19 (*Fragm. in Luc.* p. 241 L.); John i. 4 (some read *τάχα οὐκ ἀπιθάνως ἐστίν* for *ἦν*; *in Joh.* ii. § 13).

In Matt. xxvii. 17 Origen found Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν in his copy, but he inclined to the omission of Ἰησοῦν, with many copies, "that the name Jesus should not be applied [contrary to the other evidence of Scripture] to an evil-doer" (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 121; comp. § 33; and schol. ap. Galland).

In noticing the variation in Luke xxiii. 45 he supposes that the phrase *τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος* (*-λιπόντος*) was introduced in place of *καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος* either from a false desire for clearness or by the malice of adversaries (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 134); and though he himself quotes the reading without remark elsewhere, the criticism is quite according to his style.

In discussing the scene of the cure of the demoniac (Matt. viii. 28; Mark v. 1; Luke viii. 26) he decides peremptorily, on geographical arguments, that Γερασηνῶν and Γαδαρηνῶν must both be wrong, and that Γεργεσαίων (Γεργεσηνῶν) must be read in all places, for in his time the scene of the miracle was shewn in the neighbourhood of Gergesa, though it does not appear certainly from his language that he found Γεργεσαίων in any evangelic text.

In Rom. iii. 5, if the Latin version of his commentary can be trusted, he seems to have found in his Greek copy *κατὰ ἀνθρώπων* (*Comm. in Rom.* iii. § 1, pp. 163, 167 L.). It is more difficult to determine whether the omission of *μὴ* in Rom. v. 14 (*ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτ.*) is simply due to Rufinus or not (*id.* v. § 1, p. 344 L.).[t]

Sometimes Origen indulges in conjectures without any adequate ground. Thus he suspects that the phrase in Matt. xix. 19, *ἀγαπ. τ. π. σου ὡς σ.* has been inserted, supporting the opinion by the fact that the words are not found in St. Mark or St. Luke (*in Matt.* xv. § 14). In Matt. v. 45 he thinks that *ὑμῶν* may be an addition of copyists (*in Joh.* xx. § 15). In Matt. xxvii. 9 he offers as an alternative explanation of the difficulty the substitution of "Jeremiah" for "Zechariah" by an "error of writing" (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 117).

The following passages in the Latin translations may also be noticed: *Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 43 (Matt. xxiv. 19): § 118 (Mark xiv. 61): *Hom. in Is.* ii. § 1 (Matt. i. 23); *Hom. in Luc.* vii. (Luke i. 46): *Comm. in Rom.* vi. § 7 (Rom. vii. 6).

The remarks on the variations of Latin MSS. are interesting in themselves but foreign to Origen—*e.g. Comm. in Rom.* iii. § 6 (Rom. iii. 19); vii. § 4 (c. viii. 22); ix. §§ 10, 12 (c. xii. 11, 13); ix. § 42 (Matt. xv. 20).

Of Origen's conjectures (if indeed it is simply a conjecture) the most famous is Βηθαβαρᾷ for Βηθανίᾳ, in John i. 28, which he maintained for local reasons. But when he says that Βηθανίᾳ was found *σχεδὸν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις* he implies that he found some other reading which may have been Βηθαβαρᾷ (Βηθαραβᾷ).

In spite of these drawbacks, which are practically of far less moment than appears from an enumeration of particulars drawn from a large area, Origen's importance as a witness to the true text of the New Testament is invaluable. Notwithstanding the late date and scantiness of the MSS. in which his Greek writings have been preserved, and the general untrustworthiness of the Latin translations in points of textual detail, it would be possible to determine a pure text of a great part of the New Testament from his writings alone (comp. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.* t. ii.).

In some respects his want of a critical spirit makes his testimony to the text of the New Testament of greater value than if he had followed consistently an independent judgment. He reproduces the characteristic readings which he found, and thus his testimony is carried back to an earlier date. At different times he used copies exhibiting different complexions of text; so that his writings reflect faithfully the variations to which he refers generally. Griesbach called attention to the most conspicuous illustration of this fact. He shewed by a wide induction from the variations in St. Mark that the evangelic text which Origen used while writing his commentary on St. Matthew, which was one of his latest works, was of the type generally described as "Western" (of which D is the best representative), while that used by him in writing his earlier commentary on St. John was of an "Alexandrine" character in the wider sense (represented by B C L) (Griesbach, *Comm. Crit. Partic.* ii. pp. x. ff. 1811, with which may be compared his early essay *De codicibus Evangg. IV Origenianis*, 1771. *Opuscula*, i. 226 ff.).

But while Origen's quotations are of the highest textual value, great care is required in using the evidence which they furnish. He frequently quotes from memory, and combines texts; and in some cases gives several times a reading which he can hardly have found in any MS. (*e.g.* 1 John iii. 8, *γεγέννηται*). Illustrations of this perplexing laxity occur in *Hom. in Jer.* i. 15 (Matt. iii. 12, xiii. 39); *id.* iv. 2, v. 1 (Acts xiii. 26, 46); *id.* iv. 4 (Luke xviii. 12); *id.* v. 1 (Tit. iii. 5 f.).

3. *Interpretation.*—Origen has been spoken of as the founder of a new form of literature in Biblical interpretation; and justly, though others, among whom Heracleon was conspicuous, had preceded him in expositions of Scripture more or less continuous. Origen himself constantly refers to interpretations of his predecessors:[u] to Heracleon *in Joh.* ii. 8 and constantly; *in Matt.* x. § 22 (*τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν τις*), xiv. § 2 (*id.*), xvii. § 17 (*νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι*), xvii. § 28; *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* §§ 31, 69, 75, 126; *Hom.*

[t] It may however be noticed that *c. Cels.* vi. 36 is not opposed to the present reading in Mk. vi. 3.

[u] Fabricius has given an important collection of writers quoted by Origen, *Biblioth. Graeca*, vii. 244 ff. (ed. Harles).

in Luc. xxxiv. (*quidam de presbyteris*); *in Rom.* iv. § 10, p. 304 L., vi. § 7, p. 40 L.; *Hom. in Gen.* v. § 5, xv. § 6; *in Ex.* xiii. 3; *in Levit.* viii. 6; *in Num.* ix. 5; *in Jos.* xvi. 1, 5; *in Jud.* viii. 4; *in* 1 *Sam.* i. 1; *in Ps.* xxxvi., *Hom.* ii. 6, *Hom.* iv. 1; *in Jerem.*, *c. Cels.* ii. 25.

It is probable that these references are in many cases to homilies or isolated treatises, but at any rate they give a striking view of the extent of Christian thought and literature in the 2nd century and at the beginning of the 3rd.

Origen's method of interpreting Scripture was a practical deduction from his view of the inspiration of Scripture. This he developed in the fourth book of the treatise *On First Principles.* Briefly he regarded every "jot and tittle" as having its proper work (*Hom. in Jer.* xxxix. fr. ep. *Philoc.* c. x.). All is precious; not even the least particle is void of force (*in Matt.* tom. xvi. 12). Comp. *Ep. ad Greg.* § 3; *in Joh.* tom. i. § 4. Minute details of order and number veil and yet suggest great thoughts (e.g. *Sel. in Pss.* xi. 370, 377 L.). It follows that in interpretation there is need of great exactness and care (*in Gen.* tom. iii. p. 46 L.; *Philoc.* xiv.), and scrupulous study of details (*in Joh.* xx. 29). Origen himself illustrates his principles by countless subtle observations of great interest—e.g. *in Matt.* xii. § 22 (c. iv. 10, ὀπίσω μου and στραφείς); *id.* § 35 (c. xvi. 28, γεύσασθαι θανάτου); xiii. § 31 (c. xvi. 19, οὐρανοί); xiv. 15 (c. ix. 9, ἀναστάς); xv. § 9 (c. xix. 15); xv. § 28 (c. xx. 4 ff.); *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 83 (c. xxvi. 24, δι' οὗ); *id.* § 90 (c. xxvi. 37, ἤρξατο); *id.* § 100 (c. xxvi. 50, φίλε); *in Rom.* v. § 6 (c. ii. 8, ὀργή); *Hom. in Gen.* iv. § 5, viii. § 1, xv. § 9, xvi. § 3; *in Levit.* xiv. § 3; *in Num.* xii. § 2, xiv. § 3, xvi. § 2, xxiv. § 2, xxvii. § 6; *in Ezech.* ix. § 2.

In these criticisms the skill with which he combines passages from different parts of Scripture in illustration of some particular phrase or detail is specially to be noticed—e.g. *in Matt.* c. xiii. § 3 (c. xvii. 4 f.); *id.* xiv. § 14 (c. xix. 1, ἐτέλεσε); *id.* xvi. § 4 (c. xx. 21, καθίσωσιν); *in Joh.* xxxii. 2 (p. 381 L., ἄριστον). Each term calls up far-reaching associations; and all Scripture is made to contribute to the fulness of the thought to be expressed.

One practical consequence followed from Origen's sense of the value of each word of Scripture. He recognised the necessity of learning Hebrew that he might be confident as to the original form of the records of the Old Testament. It must not however be supposed that he studied Hebrew with the spirit of a modern scholar. He seems to have contented himself with being able to identify the Hebrew corresponding with the Greek texts before him (comp. *Sel. in Pss.* xi. pp. 355 f. L.). Nor did he always take the trouble to do this. In his Homilies he constantly follows the Greek text, when it differs widely from the Hebrew, without marking the variation (e.g. *Hom. in Jos.* xxvi., a most remarkable example; *Hom. in Jos.* xxiv. § 1; *Hom. in Cant.* i. § 6, Cant. viii. 5).

In other cases he notes variations of the Greek copies without any reference to the Hebrew (*Hom. in Num.* xxviii. 4, Deut. xxxii. 8, a crucial example: comp. *Hom. in Ezech.* xiii. § 1; *in Joh.* tom. xiii. § 24, 1 K. xix. 12; *in Joh.* xx. § 20, Ps. xviii. (xix.) 10; *Hom. in Ezech.* xi. 1; *Hom. in Jer.* viii. 1, Job xxvi. 7); and he even appears to have obelized passages in consideration of the agreement of "the other editions" (αἱ λοιπαὶ ἐκδόσεις) alone (*in Joh.* xxviii. 13, Num. xxiii. 6).

Elsewhere he notes the variation of the Greek copies from the Hebrew (*Hom. in Cant.* ii. § 4, Prov. xxvii. 10; *Sel. in Pss.* p. 360 L.; *in Rom.* viii. § 5, Is. liii. 1; *id.* § 7, Ps. lxviii (lxix.) 22; *id.* § 11, Is. lix. 20; *Sel. in Pss.* p. 366 L.; *in Ezech.* vi. 4, xiii. 4; *in Jer.* xiv. 3); and in one place at least he notes the readings of "two Hebrew copies" (*Sel. in Pss.* xi. p. 393 L.).

Sometimes he implies that his knowledge of the Hebrew reading depends on the information of others (*Hom. in Num.* xvi. 4, "Hebraei habere se scriptum dicunt," Jonah iii. 5; *in Rom.* ii. § 13, p. 136 L.); and in especial he quotes what he learnt in conversation with "Iullus (Ἰουλλος) the patriarch" [of Alexandria?] (*Sel. in Pss.* pp. 352 ff.; comp. Hier. *Apol.* i. § 3, *Huillus*).

In one place he confounds the letters ח and כ, supposing that *Ahimelech* of 1 Sam. xxi. is called by a slight change *Abimelech* in the heading of Ps. xxxiv. (xxxiii.), "since the Hebrew letters *Caph* and *Beth* differ only by a small stroke" (*Sel. in Pss.* p. 363 L.). On the other hand, he notices the idiomatic usage of ו (*Hom. in Num.* xix. 3).

When he marks the variation he gives no paramount authority to the Hebrew text (*Hom. in Num.* xviii. 3, in "Hebraeorum codicibus . . . reperi, quibus quamvis non utamur, tamen agnoscendi gratia dicemus etiam ibi quae legimus," Dan. i. 17; *Hom. in Gen.* iii. 5, "codices ecclesiae . . . Hebraea exemplaria . . ."), but keeps faithfully to the LXX (*in Cant.* i. p. 344 L., "nos LXX. interpretum scripta per omnia custodimus;" comp. note on Gen. iii. 24, p. 59 L.).

But though his critical knowledge of Hebrew was slight he evidently learnt much from Hebrew interpreters, and not unfrequently he quotes Hebrew traditions and "Midrash" (*Sel. in Gen.* ii. 8; *Hom. in Ex.* v. § 5; *in Num.* xiii. 5; *in Rom.* x. § 7, p. 397 L.; *in Matt.* xv. 5; *Sel. in Pss.* p. 374 L.; *Prol. in Cant.* pp. 289 f.; *Hom. in Is.* i. § 5, ix.; *Hom. in Ezech.* iv. 8, x. 3; compare an interesting note on the sacred name Ἰαή, *Sel. in Ps.* xi. p. 396 L.). He gives also an interpretation of "Corban" (*in Matt.* tom. xi. 9) and of "Iscariot" (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* 78) from Jewish sources.

The most characteristic use which he makes of his knowledge is in the mystical interpretation of a series of names. These interpretations are often striking, even when they are based upon false etymologies (e.g. *Hom. in Jos.* xx. 5; *Hom. in Ex.* v.; comp. Redepenning, *Origenes*, i. pp. 458 ff.).

While Origen thus endeavoured to apply the principle that every word of Scripture has its lesson to all the sacred records without difference, he was met at once by the moral and historical difficulties of the Old Testament (comp. *De Princ.* iv. 1 = *Philoc.* 1 ff. throughout). To obviate these he systematized the theory of a "spiritual sense," which was generally if vaguely admitted by the church (*De Princ.* 1, *Praef.* 8). There is, he taught, generally, a threefold meaning in the text of the Bible, literal (historical), moral, mystical, corresponding to the three elements in man's constitution, body, soul, and spirit (*De Princ.* iv. 11; *Hom. in Lev.* v. §§ 1, 5). So it is

that Scripture has a different force for different ages and for different readers, according to their circumstances and capacities (*in Rom.* ii. § 14, p. 150 L.). But all find in it what they need.[x]

This threefold sense is to be sought for both in the Old and in the New Testament. The literal interpretation brings out the simple precept or fact: the moral meets the individual want of each believer: the mystical illuminates features in the whole work of Redemption (*Hom. in Lev.* i. §§ 4 f., ii. § 4; *De Princ.* iv. 12, 13, 22). There is then manifold instruction for all believers in the precise statement, the definition of practical duties, the revelation of the divine plan, which the teacher must endeavour to bring out in his examination of the text. Origen himself steadily kept this object in view. Examples of his method have been noticed in the brief analysis which has been given of his exegetical writings. It will be sufficient here to refer to *Hom. in Gen.* ii. § 6, xvii. §§ 1, 9; *in Ex.* i. § 4, iii. § 3; *in Lev.* v. § 5, vii. § 1; *in Num.* ix. § 7; and for the application of the method to the New Testament to *in Matt.* tom. xvi. § 12, xiv. §§ 2 f.; *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* 17 ff. 27.

Sometimes indeed he holds that only two of the three senses coexist, when the literal sense cannot be maintained (e. g. *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* 43, 1 Tim. ii. 15; comp. *Hom.* v. *in Ps.* xxxvi. 5); and even when the letter is true, the ideal meaning is of greater importance (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* 77, Matt. xxvi. 6 ff.). At the same time Origen affirms generally the literal truth both of the Old and of the New Testament (e.g. *Frag. in Philem.* and *Frag. in Galat.* p. 269 L.; comp. *De Princ.* iv. 19).

It is easy to point out serious errors in detail in Origen's interpretation of Scripture. On these there is no need to dwell. It is however of importance to mark that which was his main defect, and the real source of his minor faults. He was without true historic feeling. He speaks of the difficulty of history (*c. Cels.* i. 42); and he seems to have given up all idea of realising the changing conditions of life during the fulfilment of the counsel of God. He had therefore no law of proportion to assist him in judging of the primitive phases of revelation. He refused to interpret life in the phases of its growth, and converted it into a riddle. For him prophecy ceased to have any vital connexion with the trials and struggles of a people of God; and psalms (*e.g.* Ps. l.) were no longer the voice of a believer's deepest personal experience.

In this respect Origen presents, though in a modified form, many of the characteristic defects of Rabbinic interpretation. It is not indeed unlikely that he was directly influenced by the masters of Jewish exegesis. Just as they claimed for Abraham the complete fulfilment of the Law, and made the patriarchs perfect types of legal righteousness, Origen also refused to see in the Pentateuch any signs of inferior religious knowledge or attainment. The patriarchs and prophets were, in his opinion, as wise by God's gifts as the apostles (*in Joh.* vi. 3); and the deepest mysteries of the Christian revelation could be directly illustrated by the records of their lives and words (*in Joh.* ii. 28), though sometimes he seems to feel the difficulties by which his position was beset (*in Joh.* xiii. 46; comp. *c. Cels.* vii. 4 ff.).

But while this grave defect is most distinctly acknowledged, it must be remembered that Origen had a special work to do, and that he did it. In his time powerful schools of Christian speculation disparaged the Old Testament or rejected it. Christian masters had not yet been able to vindicate it from the Jews and for themselves. This task Origen accomplished. From his day the Old Testament has been an unquestioned part of our Christian heritage, and he fixed rightly the general spirit in which it is to be received. The Old Testament, he says, is always new to Christians who understand and expound it spiritually and in an evangelic sense, new not in time but in interpretation (*Hom. in Num.* ix. § 4; comp. *c. Cels.* ii. 4). If in pressing this conclusion he was led to exaggeration, the error may be pardoned in regard to the greatness of the service. The principle itself becomes more fruitful when history and criticism are allowed the fullest activity, within their own sphere, in dealing with Scripture, a part which Origen was unable to give to them.

Moreover Origen's method was fixed and consistent. He systematized what was before tentative and inconstant (comp. Redepenning, *De Princ.* pp. 56 f.). He laid down, once for all, broad outlines of interpretation; and mystical meanings were not arbitrarily devised to meet particular emergencies. The influence of his views is a sufficient testimony to their power. It is not too much to say that the mediaeval interpretation of Scripture in the West was inspired by Origen; and through secondary channels these mediaeval comments have passed into our own literature.

Origen indeed was right in principle. "He felt that there was something more than a mere form in the Bible: he felt that 'the words of God' must have an eternal significance, for all that comes into relation with God is eternal: he felt that there is a true development and a real growth in the elements of divine revelation, it not in divine communication, yet in human apprehension: he felt the power and the glory of the spirit of Scripture bursting forth from every part." No labour was too great to bestow upon the text in which priceless treasures were enshrined: no hope was too lofty for the interpreter to cherish. This conviction Origen has bequeathed to us that it may be embodied more fully than he could embody it.

VII. Origen as a Theologian.[y]

Origen was essentially the theologian of an age of transition. His writings present principles, ruling ideas, tendencies, but they are not fitted to supply materials for a system of formulated dogmas, after the type of later confessions. Every endeavour to arrange his opinions according to the schemes of the 16th century, can only issue in a misunderstanding of their general scope and proportion. This is sufficiently clear from the outline which has been already

[x] The relation of Origen's principles generally to those of the Alexandrine school has been discussed by Kihn, *Theodor v. Mopsuestia*, pp. 20 ff.

[y] In addition to works treating of Origen's opinions generally, the essay of P. Fischer, *Commentatio de O. Theologia et Cosmologia* (Halis, 1845), is worthy of notice.

given of his treatise *On First Principles*. The whole structure of this work, which presents a connected view of his intellectual apprehension of Christianity, is widely different from mediaeval and modern expositions of the faith. At the outset Origen gives a clear exposition of what were acknowledged to be the doctrines held generally by the church, corresponding in the main with the Apostles' Creed, which is of the highest interest (*De Princ. Praef.*); and starting from this he endeavours to determine, by the help of Scripture and reason, subjects which were left open or unexplored. But his inquiries and his results were profoundly influenced by his circumstances. They cannot be judged fairly when taken out of their connexion with contemporary thought. The book contains very little technical teaching. It is silent as to the sacraments. It gives no theory of the atonement: no discussion of justification. Yet it does deal with problems of thought and life which lie behind these subjects.

Origen found himself face to face with powerful schools, which within and without the church maintained antagonistic views on man, the world, and God, in their extremest forms. There was the false realism, which found expression in Montanism: the false idealism, which spread widely in the many forms of Gnosticism. Here the Creator was degraded into a secondary place; there God Himself was lost in His works. Some represented men as inherently good or bad from their birth: others swept away moral distinctions of action. Against all Origen sought to maintain two great truths which inspire all writings, the unity of all creation, as answering to the thought of a Creator infinitely good and infinitely just; and the power of moral determination in rational beings. The treatment and the apprehension of these two truths is modified for man by the actual fact of sin. The power of moral determination has issued in present disorder; and the divine unity of creation has to be realised hereafter. Origen therefore looks at the world as it is, and strives to find in revelation some solution for the riddles which it offers. His aim is to help his readers to gain a practical conception of what he holds to be the central truth of life, that the whole sum of finite being, even in its present state, offers an intelligible manifestation ot the goodness and righteousness of God in every detail, not only consistent with but dependent upon the free and responsible action of each individual, which forms a decisive element in the fulfilment of the divine counsel (on the ideas of Foreknowledge, Providence, the Divine will, see *Philoc.* c. 25; *in Rom.* i. 3 p. 18 L.; *in Gen.* tom. iii. 6 p. 21; *in Gen. Hom.* iii. 2; *c. Cels.* ii. 20).

In the attempt to establish this conception Origen does not conceal or extenuate the evils which are everywhere visible in the world. He believes that Scripture throws light upon them, and that in obedience to its guidance we must seek knowledge of God, of the Incarnation, of the origin and differences of rational creatures in heaven and on earth, of the creation, and of the causes of the wickedness which is spread over the earth and (as it appears) elsewhere (*De Princ.* iv. 14).

1. *Finite Beings, Creation, Man, Spirits.*—He goes backward therefore: he endeavours to pass from the outward to the inward, from the temporal to the eternal. He argues that it is impossible to think of God without a creation: of a king without subjects; even as it is impossible to think of a Father without a Son (comp. Phot. *Cod.* 235). In doing this he dimly feels the contradictions which follow from applying words of time (like "always") to God. Though in one sense there always was a finite order (*De Princ.* i. *fragm. Gr.* 2), the world was not coeternal with God (*De Princ.* ii. 1, 4). Affirming this truth Origen thinks that we shall best realise the fact of creation, according to our present powers, by supposing a vast succession of orders, one springing out of another (*id.* ii. 1, 3). The present order, which began and will end in time, must, as far as we can conceive, be one only in the succession of corresponding orders (*De Princ.* iii. 5, 3). The word used for the foundation of the world (καταβολή) really implies that it owes its being to a "dejection," a casting down from some loftier state (*id.* iii. 5, 4; *in Joh.* ix. 5). It points to a fall in another order. To understand the actual constitution of things which we see we must consequently form some idea of a beginning, if such a word can be used.

"In the beginning," then, he writes, "when God created what He was pleased to create, that is rational natures, He had no other cause of creation beside Himself, that is His own goodness" (*De Princ.* ii. 9, 6; comp. iv. 35). This creation answered to a definite thought, and therefore, Origen argues, was definite itself. God "could" not create or embrace in thought that which has no limit (*De Princ.* ii. *fragm. Gr.* 6; ii. 9, 1; iv. *fragm. Gr.* 4). The rational creatures which He made were all originally equal, spiritual, free. There was no ground for their difference. But moral freedom, including personal self-determination, gave occasion to difference. Finite creatures, once made, either advanced, through imitation of God, or fell away, declined, through neglect of Him (*id.* ii. 9, 6).

Evil, it follows, is negative,—the loss of good which was attainable, the shadow which marks the absence or rather the exclusion of light. But as God made creatures for an end, so He provided that they should, through whatever discipline of sorrow, attain to it. He made matter also, which might serve as a fitting expression for their character, and become, in the most manifold form, a medium for their training. So it was that, by various declensions, "spirit" (πνεῦμα) lost its proper fire and was chilled into a "soul" (ψυχή), and "souls" were embodied in our earthly frames in this world of sense. Such an embodiment was a provision of divine wisdom by which they were enabled, in accordance with the necessities of the fact, to move towards the accomplishment of their destiny (*De Princ.* i. 7, 4).

Under this aspect man is a microcosm. (*Hom. in Gen.* i. 11; *in Lev.* v. 2: *intellige te et alium mundum esse parvum et intra te esse solem, esse lunam, etiam stellas.*) He stands in the closest connexion with the seen and with the unseen· and is himself the witness of the correspondences which exist between the visible and invisible orders (*Hom. in Num.* xi. 4, xvii. 4, xxiv. 1, xxviii. 2; *Hom.* i. *in Ps.* xxxvii. 1; *in Joh.* tom. xix. 5, xxiii. 4; *De Princ.* iv. *fragm. Gr.* p.

184 R.). He is made for the spiritual and cannot find rest elsewhere. Hence it is that Origen combats with unwearying earnestness every tendency to unite indissolubly present conditions with the future, or to trust to deductions drawn from the temporal and local limitations of present human observation. The grossness of Millenarianism filled him with alarm (*De Princ.* ii. 11, 2; comp. *Sel. in Ps.* xi. p. 449 L.). The literal assertion of anthropomorphic conceptions of God seemed to him to overthrow the faith (comp. *Hom. in Gen.* iii. 2; *Sel. in Gen.* i. 26). And those who are familiar with the writings and influence of Tertullian will know that Origen's opposition to materialism in every form was called for by pressing dangers.

As a necessary consequence of his deep view of man's divine kinsmanship, Origen labours to give distinctness to the unseen world. He appears already to live and move in it. He finds there the realities of which the phenomena of earth are shadows (comp. *in Rom.* x. § 39). External objects, peoples, cities, are to him veils and symbols of invisible things. And more than this. Not only is there the closest correspondence between the constitution of different orders of being, there is also even now a continuation of unobserved intercourse between them (comp. *de Princ.* ii. 9, 3).

Angels (see *De Princ.* i. 8, iii. 2, throughout) are supposed to preside over the working of elemental forces, over plants and beasts (*in Num. Hom.* xiv. 2; *in Jer. Hom.* x. 6; *c. Cels.* viii. 31; *De Princ.* iii. 3, 3), and it is suggested that nature is affected by their moral condition (*in Ezech. Hom.* iv. 2). More particularly men were, in Origen's opinion, committed to the care of spiritual "rulers," and deeply influenced by changes in their feeling and character (*in Joh.* xiii. § 58; comp. *De Princ.* i. 8, 1). Thus he maintained that there are guardian angels of cities and provinces and nations (*Hom. in Luc.* xii.; *De Princ.* iii. 3, 2), a belief which he supported habitually by the LXX. version of Deut. xxxii. 8 (*in Matt.* tom. xi. § 16; *in Luc. Hom.* xxxv.; *in Rom.* viii. § 8; *in Gen. Hom.* xvi. 2; *in Ex. Hom.* viii. 2; *in Ezech. Hom.* xiii. 1 f., &c.). Individual men also had their guardian angels (*in Matt.* t. xiii. 27; *in Luc. Hom.* xxxv.; *in Num. Hom.* xi. 4, xx. 3; *in Ezech. Hom.* i. 7; *in Jud.* vi. 2; *De Princ.* iii. 2, 4); and angels are supposed to be present in the assemblies of Christians, assisting in the devotions of the faithful (*De Orat.* xxxi. p. 283 L.; *Hom. in Luc.* xxiii.; *c. Cels.* viii. 64).

But while Origen recognises in the fullest degree the reality and power of angelic ministration, he expressly condemns all angel-worship (*c. Cels.* v. 4, 11).

On the other hand Origen held that there are spiritual hosts of evil corresponding to the angelic forces, and matched in conflict with them (*in Matt.* tom. xvii. 2; *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 102; *Hom. in Jos.* xv. 5). He even speaks of a Trinity of evil (*in Matt.* xi. § 6, xii. § 20). An evil power strives with the good for the sway of individuals (*in Rom.* i. § 18); and thus all life is made a struggle of unseen powers (*e.g.* notes on Ps. xxxvii.; *in Joh.* xx. §§ 29, 32; *Hom.* xx. *in Jos. fragm.*).

One aspect of this belief had a constant and powerful influence on daily life. Origen, like most of his contemporaries, supposed that evil spiritual beings were the objects of heathen worship (*c. Cels.* vii. 5). There was, in his opinion, a terrible reality in their agency. Within certain limits they could work so as to bind their servants to them.

But the intercourse between the seen and unseen worlds was not confined, according to Origen's opinion, to the intercourse of angels and demons with men. He believed that the dead also influence the living.

The actions of men on earth last, in their effects, after the actors have departed (*in Rom.* ii. 4, p. 80 L.). Disembodied (or unembodied) souls are not idle (*in Matt.* xv. 35). So the "soul" of Christ preached to "souls" (*c. Cels.* iii. 43). And, in especial, the saints sympathize with man still struggling on earth with a sympathy larger than that of those who are clogged by conditions of mortality (*De Orat.* xi.; *in Matt.* tom. xxvii. 30; *in Joh.* tom. xiii. 57; iii. *in Cant.* 7). They help us not only by the examples of their lives and the lessons of their books, but also by their prayers (*Hom. in Num.* xxvi. 6; *in Jos.* xvi. 5); and they can pray with a better knowledge of our true wants than we have ourselves (*Exh. ad Mart.* 30, 38; *Hom. in Jos.* xvi. § 5; comp. *De Orat.* 14). But in this connexion Origen's silence as to prayers of the living for the dead is most remarkable. Prayers to the dead, like prayers to angels, are excluded by his view of the one object of all prayer (*c. Cels.* viii. 64). The innumerable hosts of spirits help us uncalled (*id.*).

Such views as have been indicated give a mysterious solemnity to the laws of creation (*c. Cels.* iv. 8), bound together in all its visible parts, and in all its parts bound to the invisible, and destined to judgment (*in Ezech. Hom.* iv. 1). Origen dwells upon them with devout partiality. He strives, not always successfully, to give them clearness and consistency. But he is happier in the assertion of his main principles, and he himself acknowledges that it must be so. The range of human observation, the scene of human experience, are, he repeats again and again, very small (*in Rom.* viii. § 10, p. 260; § 12, p. 280). Still we can trace correspondences in the periods of the divine dispensations (*in Matt.* xii. § 3; comp. *in Matt.* xv. § 31), and feel the dependence of phenomena one on another,[a] and the life and sympathy which unites all being (*in Rom.* i. 9, p. 35 L.; *De Princ.* i. 7, 5; 8, 2).

What has been said of Origen's opinions as to the wider relations of life, makes his view of man's position in the visible world more intelligible. His presence and condition here are due, as has been seen, to the fact of evil, of which the origin is referred to some unknown sphere (*c. Cels.* iv. 65; comp. *in Joh.* xiii. § 37). When placed in the world man, as a rational being, was still endowed with freedom, that is, moral responsibility (*in Num.* xii. 3). On this Origen insists with the greatest earnestness. (See *De Princ.* iii. = *Philoc.* 20; *id.* i. 5, 5 *s.f.*) But every one is sinful (*c. Cels.* iii. 69), a sign of which he sees in the baptism of infants (*Hom.*

---

[a] It is a characteristic illustration of this belief that Origen allows that there may be a true science of astrology, though not for us (*Comm. in Gen.* iii. § 9).

in Luc. viii. 3; *in Rom.* v. § 9, p. 397 L.), though all sins are not equal (*Hom. in Ex.* x. 3, *peccata ad damnum, ad mortem*); and grace is required for the doing of all good (*c. Cels.* vi. 78; comp. *Hom. in Num.* xx. 3). Every one also can justly be called to account for his corruption (*Hom. in Jer.* ii. 1).

But while Origen does not extenuate the effects of man's sin, he maintains a lofty view of the nobility of his nature and of his destiny (*c. Cels.* iv. 25, 30); and so he holds that the world has been made by divine wisdom to be a fitting place for the purification of a being such as man (*De Princ.* ii. 1, 1; 2, 2; 3, 1; *c. Cels.* vi. 44; comp. *in Rom.* viii. 10, p. 261); and that everything has been so ordered by Providence from the first as to contribute to this end (*De Princ.* ii. 1, 2). Man can, if he will, read the lesson of his life: he has a spiritual faculty, by which he can form conclusions on spiritual things, even as he is made to form conclusions on impressions of sense.

The body, so to speak, reflects the soul; the "outer man" expresses the "inner man" (*in Rom.* ii. 13, p. 142 L.). There is imposed upon us the duty of service (*in Matt. Comm. Scr.* § 66), and there is the largest variety of offices (*in Joh.* t. x. 23), room being made even for the meanest (*Hom. in Num.* xiv. 2, p. 162 L.).

All this is determined by law, that is, by the will of God; and God has not left man without spiritual knowledge (*in Rom.* i. 16). All alike have a natural law within them (*id.* ii. 8, 9, iii. 6; *c. Cels.* i. 4; *Hom. in Num.* x. 3). This "law of nature" is the "law of God" (*in Rom.* iii. 2, p. 177 L.). God Himself cannot break it, since He would then cease to be God (*c. Cels.* v. 23). It follows therefore that alleged miracles must be brought to a moral test (*c. Cels.* ii. 51, iii. 27). True miracles are "signs" (*in Joh.* vi. 17). The perception of the "law of nature" comes with the development of reason (*in Rom.* vi. 8, pp. 43 f. L.); and he who loyally follows its injunctions, though he has not the faith of Christ, be he Jew or Gentile, will not lose an appropriate reward (*id.* ii. 7, p. 98 L.).

The visible creation thus bears, in all its parts, the impress of a divine purpose; and the Incarnation was the crowning of the creation, by which the purpose was made fully known, and provision made for its accomplishment (*De Princ.* iii. 5, 6).

2. *Theology. The Incarnation. The Person of Christ. The Holy Trinity. The work of Christ.* —On no subject is Origen more full or more suggestive than on this (*De Princ.* i. 2, ii. 6, iv. 31). No one perhaps has done so much to vindicate and harmonize the fullest acknowledgment of the perfect humanity of the Lord and of His perfect divinity in one Person. His famous image of the "glowing iron" (*De Princ.* ii. 6, 6) made an epoch in Christology. Here and there his language is liable to misconception, or even found to be erroneous by later investigations, but he laid down the outlines of the faith, on the basis of Scripture, which have not been shaken. He maintained, on the one hand, the true and perfect manhood of Christ, subject to the conditions of natural growth, against all forms of Docetism; and, on the other hand, he maintained the true and perfect divinity of the "God Word" (θεὸς λόγος), which was so united with "the man Christ Jesus," through the human soul, as to be one person, against all forms of Ebionism and Patripassionism (*De Princ.* ii. 6, 3).

Origen's doctrine of the Incarnation of the God Word rests in part upon his doctrine of the Godhead. "All," he held, "who are born again unto salvation, have need of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and would not obtain salvation unless the Trinity were entire" (*De Princ.* i. 3, 5). Hence he speaks of baptism as "the beginning and fountain of divine gifts to him who offers himself to the divinity of the power of the invocations of the adorable Trinity" (τῶν τῆς προσκυνητῆς τριάδος ἐπικλήσεων) (*in Joh.* vi. 17).[a] But there is, in his judgment, a difference in the extent of the action of the Persons in the Holy Trinity. The Father, "holding all things together, reaches (φθάνει) to each being, imparting being to each from that which is His own, for He is absolutely (ὢν γάρ ἐστιν). The Son is less than the Father (ἐλάττων παρὰ τ. π.), reaching only to rational beings, for He is second to the Father; and, further, the Holy Spirit is less (ἧττον), and extends (διικνούμενον) to the saints only. So that in this respect (κατὰ τοῦτο) the power of the Father is greater in comparison with (παρά) the Son and the Holy Spirit; and that of the Son more in comparison with the Holy Spirit; and, again, the power of the Holy Spirit more exceeding (διαφέρουσα μᾶλλον) in comparison with all other holy beings." But to rightly understand this passage it is of primary importance to observe that Origen is not speaking of the essence of the Persons of the Godhead, but of their manifestation to creatures (comp. *De Princ.* i. 3, 7).[b] Essentially the three Persons are of one Godhead, and eternal. The subordination which Origen teaches is not of essence but of person and office. His aim is to realise the Father as the one Fountain of Godhead, while vindicating true deity for the Son and the Holy Spirit. In this respect he worked out first the thought of "the eternal generation" of the Son, which was accepted from him by the catholic church as the truest human expression of one side of the mystery of the essential Trinity.

Generally it may be remarked that Origen's specific opinions spring from a comparison of what man is and needs with the broad revelation of God in Scripture. Looking within he is conscious of personal existence, thought, hallowing, and in each relation he recognises the action of the one God.[c] He feels that, however imperfectly, the relations thus existing in himself correspond to something in the divine nature. So he interprets what Scripture and the rule of the church taught of the Holy Trinity. The Trinity of revelation answers to the trinity of being, but it is of the former that he treats: human thought can rise no higher with distinct conceptions.

---

[a] There can be no question as to the authenticity of this passage, and of the use of the word Τριάς. It must have escaped Redepenning's recollection when he wrote his confident note on the date of the term: *de Princ.* i, 3, 4, p. 126.

[b] Compare Maréchal, *Concord. Pp.* c. v. § 9, and Bp. Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* c. ix. (reprinted by Delarue), on Origen's view of subordination.

[c] Comp. Meier, *D. Lehre v. d. Trinität*, i. 103.

(For fuller details on Origen's teaching on the Holy Trinity it must be sufficient to refer to *De Princ.* i. 5, 3; iv. 27 f.; *in Rom.* vi. 13, p. 158 L., viii. 4, p. 216 L.; *in Num.* xii. 1; *fragm. in Gen.* tom. i. p. 4 L.; *c. Cels.* viii. 12 ff.; and especially *in Joh.* tom. ii. 1 ff. For his doctrine of the Father, see *De Princ.* i. 1.)

The peculiar connexion which Origen recognises between the Son (the God Word) and rational beings establishes (so to speak) the fitness of the Incarnation. The Son stood in a certain affinity with rational souls; and the human soul with which He was united in the Incarnation had alone remained absolutely pure, by the exercise of free choice, in its pre-existence (*De Princ.* ii. 6, 5). Through this union all human nature therefore was made capable of being glorified, without the violation of its characteristic limitations (comp. *c. Cels.* iii. 41 f.). The body of Christ was perfect no less than His soul (*c. Cels.* i. 32 f.).

Fuller illustrations of Origen's views will be found in—*in Joh.* tom. xii. 25, 34, 36, tom. xxxii. 17; *in Matt.* tom. xv. 24, xvi. 8, xvii. 14 (ὑπόστασις); *in Rom.* iii. 8, p. 208 L., vii. 5, p. 107, 14, p. 158; *fragm. in Hebr.* p. 300 L.; *Hom. in Lev.* xiii. 4; *in Jer.* i. 7 (human progress); *in Ezech.* i. 10; *Hom. in Luc.* xix.; *in Rom.* viii. 4 (prayer to Christ); *c. Cels.* ii. 9. Compare also in addition to the general works on the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, H. Schutz, *Die Christologie d. Origenes, Jahrbb. f. Prot. Theol.*, 1875.

The work of Christ was, Origen emphatically maintained, for all men and for the whole of man (comp. *c. Cels.* iv. 3 f.). It was therefore so revealed that it could be apprehended according to the several powers and wants of believers (*in Matt.* tom. xii. 36, 41, xv. 241, xvii. 19; *c. Cels.* iv. 15, vi. 68; *in Joh.* ii. 12). Christ became, in a transcendent sense, "all things to all men" (*De Princ.* iv. 31; *in Joh.* tom. xix. 1, xx. 28; comp. *c. Cels.* iii. 79). And there is still a present continuous manifestation of Christ. He is ever being born (*Hom. in Jer.* ix. 4). He is seen even now, as He was seen by the eye of faith, as each believer has the faculty of seeing (*c. Cels.* ii. 64, iv. 15, vi. 77; *in Matt.* xv. 7; *Hom. in Luc.* iii.). And as each reflects Him, he becomes, in the apostolic sense, himself a Christ, an anointed one (*in Joh.* tom. vi. 3 f.). For the union of God and man, which was accomplished absolutely in Christ, is to be fulfilled in due measure in each Christian (*c. Cels.* iii. 28; *in Joh.* i. 30), as Christ had made it possible (*in Matt.* tom. xiii. 9).

Origen thus insists on the efficacy of Christ's work for the consummation of humanity and of the individual, as a victory over every power of evil. He dwells no less earnestly upon the value of the life and death of Christ as a vicarious sacrifice for sin. He seeks illustrations of the general idea of the power of vicarious sufferings in Gentile stories of self-sacrifice (*c. Cels.* i. 31), and extends it to the case of martyrs (*Exh. ad Mart.* c. 42; comp. *in Joh.* tom. vi. 36; xxviii. 14). And though he does not attempt to explain how the sacrifice of Christ was efficacious, he frequently presents it as a ransom given to redeem man from Satan, to whom sin had made man a debtor. Christ, in His own person, freely paid the debt, by bearing the utmost punishment of sin, and so set man free, "giving His soul (ψυχή) as a ransom for him" (*in Matt.* tom. xvi. 8; *in Rom.* ii. 13, p. 140 L.; *Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 135). At other times he regards it as a propitiation for the divine remission of sins (*Hom. in Num.* xxiv. 1; *in Lev.* i. 3; comp. *c. Cels.* vii. 17).

As a necessary consequence of his view of the connexion of all things, Origen held that the death of Christ was salutary for the whole world (*c. Cels.* iii. 17); and of avail for heavenly beings, if not for the expiation of sin yet for advancement in blessedness (*Hom. in Lev.* i. 3, ii. 3; *in Rom.* v. *s. f.*, p. 409 L.; *id.* i. 4; *Hom. in Luc.* x.). Thus in a true sense angels themselves were disciples of Christ (*in Matt.* tom. xv. 7).

At times indeed Origen speaks as if he supposed that the Word was actually manifested to other orders of being in a manner corresponding to their nature, even as He was revealed as soul to the souls in Hades (*Sel. in Ps.* iii. 5, xi. p. 420 L.). In this sense also he thinks that "He became all things to all," an angel to angels (*in Joh.* tom. i. 34); and he does not shrink from allowing that His Passion may be made available, perhaps in some other shape, in the spiritual world (*De Princ.* iv. *fr. Graec.* 2; comp. iv. 25, Lat.).

The work of the Holy Spirit, according to Origen, is fulfilled in believers. His office is specially to guide to the fuller truth, which is the inspiration of nobler life. Through Him revelation comes home to men. He lays open the deeper meanings of the word. Through Him, "who proceeds from the Father," all things are sanctified (*De Princ.* iii. 5, 8). Through Him every divine gift which is wrought by the Father and ministered by the Son, gains its individual efficiency (*in Joh.* tom. ii. 6). Thus there is a unity in the divine operations, which itself tends to establish a unity in created beings. (For the doctrine of the Holy Spirit generally see *De Princ.* i. 3, iii. 7; *in Joh.* tom. ii. 6.)

3. *The consummation of being.*—These characteristic lines of speculation lead to Origen's view of the consummation of things. All human thought must fail in the endeavour to give distinctness to a conception which ought to embrace the ideas of perfect rest and perfect life. Origen's opinions are further embarrassed by the constant confusion which arises from the intermingling of ideas which belong to the close of the present order (αἰών) and the close of all things. It is again impossible to see clearly how the inalienable freedom of rational beings, which originally led to the Fall, can be so disciplined as to bring them at last to perfect harmony. This however Origen holds; and though he is unable to realise the form of future purification, through which souls left unpurified by earthly existence will be cleansed hereafter, he clings to the belief that "the end must be like the beginning" (*De Princ.* i. 6, 2), a perfect unity in God. From this he excludes no rational creature. The evil spirits which fell have not lost that spirit by which they are akin to God, which in its essence is inaccessible to evil (*in Joh.* xxxii. 11, ἀνεπίδεκτον τῶν χειρόνων τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), though it can be overgrown and overpowered (comp. *De Princ.* i. 8, 3). And, on the other hand, freedom remains even when perfect rest has been reached, and in this Origen appears

to find the possibility of future declensions (*De Princ.* ii. 3, 3; *fragm. Gr.* ii. 2). Whether matter, the medium through which rational freedom finds expression (*De Princ.* iv. 35), will at last cease to be, or be infinitely spiritualised, he leaves apparently undetermined. The question is beyond man's powers (*id.* i. 6, 4, ii. 2, ii. 3, 3, iii. 6, 1).

Origen evidently feels that the same is true of many speculations which he follows some way. He warns his readers that he is dealing with subjects which man has no power to determine, though he cannot but look upon them and ponder them (*De Princ.* i. 6, 1 f., iii. 4, 5 *s. f.*). And so he presents, in imaginary outlines, the picture of the soul's progress through various scenes of chastisement or illumination (*De Princ.* i. 6, 3, iii. 6, 6, iii. 5, 6 ff., and Redepenning's note), till he can rest in the thought of a restoration in which law and freedom, justice and love, are brought to a perfect harmony (comp. *De Orat.* § 27, p. 227 L.).

This thought Origen pursues in his endeavour to form some theory of future punishments. All future punishments exactly answer to individual sinfulness (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 16), and, like punishments on earth, they are directed to the amendment of the sufferers (*c. Cels.* iv. 10; *Hom. in Ezech.* v. 1). Lighter offences can be chastised on earth: the heavier remain to be visited hereafter (*Hom. in Lev.* xiv. 4). In every case the uttermost farthing must be paid, though final deliverance is promised (*in Rom.* v. 2 f.).

In this connexion Origen looked forward to a fiery ordeal, through which men should pass in the world to come. Every one already baptized with water and Spirit would, he thought, if he needed cleansing, be baptized by the Lord Jesus in a river of fire, and so purified enter into paradise (*Hom. in Luc.* xxiv.). And in this sense also he looked forward to a (spiritual) conflagration of the world, by which all beings in need of such discipline should be at once chastised and healed (*c. Cels.* v. 15; comp. iv. 13).

On the other hand, since the future state is the direct fruit of this, there are, so Origen held, varieties of blessedness in heaven (*in Rom.* iv. 12), corresponding to the life of saints (*id.* ix. 3, p. 303), and foreshadowed by the divisions of Israel (*Hom. in Num.* i. 3; *id.* xxviii. 2; *Hom. in Jos.* xxv. 4). Speaking generally the believer after death enters upon a being of fuller knowledge and loftier progress (*De Princ.* ii. 11, 6). The resurrection of the body completes the full transfiguration, without loss, of all that belongs to his true self; and he begins a nobler development of body and soul—moral, intellectual, spiritual—by which he is brought nearer to the throne of God (comp. *De Princ.* i. 3, 8; *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 51; *Hom.* i. *in Ps.* xxxviii. § 8). The relationships of earth come to an end (*in Matt.* tom. xvii. 33: on this point Origen is not consistent). The visible ceases, and men enjoy the eternal, for which now they hope (*in Rom.* vii. 5).[d]

Thus human interest is removed from the present earth to its heavenly antitype. And it is probably due to this peculiarity of his teaching that Origen nowhere, as far as I have observed, dwells on the doctrine of Christ's return, which occupies a large place in most schemes of Christian belief. The coming of Christ in glory is treated as the spiritual revelation of His true nature (*De Princ.* iv. 25), though Origen says that he by no means rejects "the second presence (ἐπιδημία) of the Son of God more simply understood" (*in Matt.* tom. xii. 30).

VIII. Characteristics.—A few words, necessarily fragmentary and inadequate, may be added to indicate Origen's position in the great line of Christian teachers; though the sketch of his works and opinions which has been given (apart from any comment) will be sufficient to convey a fair idea of his merits and of his failings. He is above all things a Christian philosopher. With a firmer conviction of the universal sovereignty of truth, a larger grasp of facts, and a deeper sympathy with the restless questionings of the soul than any other father, he claims for the domain of Christianity every human interest and power: he affirms that it is capable of coordinating all thought and all experience. He excludes indeed all irrational beings from the final unity to which he looks (*De Princ.* iii. 6, 2); but by giving a soul to the sun and stars he strives after a fuller feeling of fellowship between man and nature than his knowledge enables him to support.

It cannot be surprising that Origen failed to give a consistent and harmonious embodiment to his speculations. His writings represent an aspiration rather than a system, principles of research and hope rather than determined formulas. At the same time his enthusiasm continually mars the proportion of his work. His theorizing needs the discipline of active life, without which there can be no real appreciation of history or of the historical development of truth. The absence of a clear historic sense is indeed the spring of Origen's chief failures. Yet even in regard to the practical apprehension of the divine education of the world it is only necessary to compare him on one side with Philo and on the other with Augustine, to feel how his grasp of the significance of the Incarnation gave him a sovereign power to understand the meaning and destiny of life.

In the pursuit and expression of his great thoughts Origen sought knowledge from every

---

[d] None of Origen's opinions was more vehemently assailed than his teaching on the Resurrection. Even his early and later apologists were perplexed in their defence of him. Yet there is no point on which his insight is more conspicuous. By keeping strictly to the apostolic language he anticipated results which we have hardly yet secured. He saw that it is the "spirit" which moulds the frame through which it is manifested; that the "body" is the same not by any material continuity, but by the permanence of that which gives the law, the "ratio" (λόγος), as he calls it, of its constitution. No exigencies of controversy, it must be remembered, brought Origen to his conclusion. It was in his judgment the clear teaching of St. Paul. The subject has been carefully discussed by C. Ramers in a special essay: *Des O. Lehre von d. Auferstehung d. Fleisches*, Trier, 1851. His judgment is worth quoting:—"Die Lehre des Origenes von der Auferstehung . . . in allen wesentlichen Punkten mit der katholischen Lehre übereinstimmt . . . Und wie sonderbar auch die Lehre des Origenes in manchen Punkten . . . klingen mag, so möchte es doch vielleicht schwer zu entscheiden sein, ob sie . . . sonderbarer ist, als die Lehre, welche in späterer Zeit manche Scholastiker über diesen Punkt aufstellten" (§ 77 f.).

quarter, by conversation and by reading. His attendance on philosophic lectures at Alexandria has been noticed. And in different parts of his writings he presents parallels with the teaching of various schools of Greek thought (comp. Boehringer, pp. 226, 395, ff.). These may be due partly to the direct influence which they exercised upon him and partly to the speculative atmosphere of the time.*

But while Origen was ready to acknowledge to the fullest the claims of reason (comp. *Hom. in Luc.* i. p. 88 L.), he lays stress on the new data which are given by revelation to the solution of the problems of philosophy (*De Princ.* i. 5, 4). Again and again he points out the insufficiency of reason, of the independent faculties of man, to attain to that towards which it is turned. Reason enables man to recognise God when He makes Himself known, to receive a revelation from Him in virtue of his affinity with the Divine Word, but it does not enable the creature to derive from within the knowledge for which it longs. It follows that the capacity for knowing God belongs to man as man, and not to man as a philosopher. Origen therefore acknowledges the nobility of Plato's words when he said that "it is a hard matter to find out the Maker and Father of the Universe, and impossible for one who has found Him to declare Him to all men." But he adds that Plato affirms too much and too little (*c. Cels.* vii. 43). As Christians "we declare that human nature is not in itself competent in any way to seek God and find Him purely without the help of Him who is sought, of Him who is found by those who confess after they have done all in their power that they have yet need of Him . . ." (Comp. Clem. Al. *Cohort.* § 6.)

The fact that our results on earth will be to the last fragmentary and tentative does not interfere with the reality of the spirit which quickens the Gospel. "*Now*," he says, "we seek for a while, *then* we shall see clearly" (*De Princ.* ii. 11, 5). But both in the search and in the fruition the object is the same. The fulness of Truth, which is finally nothing less than a manifold revelation of God leading up to absolute fellowship with Him, is that towards which the believer is led by the Spirit alike through thought and feeling and action.

For Origen, while he looks upon knowledge as the noblest ambition and divinest reward of rational beings, never dissociates it from action. This made Christian philosophy the common possession of all. (Comp. *c. Cels.* vi. 2; iii. 44, ff.) No teacher of the present day could insist with greater earnestness upon the importance of conduct than he does. There is absolutely nothing in which he does not see ethical influences. His thought wearies itself in following out the effects of action, for all action is to be referred to God (*Hom. in Num.* xxv. 3). Without perpetuating the associations of the present, he strives to give definiteness to our conceptions of the continuity of the spiritual life. He carries the sense of responsibility up to the highest orders of finite existence. His system is a system of absolute idealism, but of idealism as a spring for action. "God cares," he says, "not only for the whole, as Celsus thinks, but beyond the whole in an especial manner for each rational being" (*c. Cels.* iv. 99). Thus in his doctrine of the re-incorporation of souls there is nothing accidental, nothing capricious, as in Plato's famous Myth. The belief, according to him, represents to human apprehension a judgment of Infinite Righteousness executed by Infinite Love. It is an embodiment, if I may so express it, of two principles, which he assumes as axioms—the first that every gift of God is perfect, and the second that God's gift to His rational creatures was not virtue, which it could not be by the nature of the case, but the capacity for virtue.

In the endeavour to fashion a Philosophy of Christianity it may be fully admitted that Origen did not practically recognise the limits and imperfection of the human mind which he constantly points out. His gravest errors are attempts to solve that which is insoluble. The question of the origin of the soul, for example, is still beset by the same difficulties as Origen sought to meet, but they are ignored. So too it is with regard to his speculations on an endless succession of worlds. Thought must break down soon in the attempt to co-ordinate the finite and the infinite. But with whatever errors in detail, Origen laid down the true lines on which the Christian apologist must defend the faith against Polytheism, Judaism, Gnosticism, Materialism. These forms of opinion without the Church and within it were living powers of threatening proportions in his age, and he vindicated the Gospel against them as the one absolute revelation, prepared through the discipline of Israel, historical in its form, spiritual in its destiny.

In this respect the principles which he affirmed and strove to illustrate have a present value. They are fitted to correct the Africanism which, since the time of Augustine, has dominated Western theology; and, at the same time, they anticipate in many ways difficulties which have come into prominence in later times. In the face of existing controversies, it is invigorating to feel that when as yet no necessity forced upon him the consideration of the problems which are now most frequently discussed, a Christian teacher, the master and the friend of saints, taught the moral continuity and destination of all being, interpreted the sorrows and sadnesses of the world as part of a vast scheme of purificatory chastisement, found in Holy Scripture not the letter only but a living voice eloquent with spiritual mysteries, made the love of truth, in all its amplitude and in all its depth, the right and the end of rational beings, and reckoned the fuller insight into the mysteries of nature as one of the joys of a future state.

Such thoughts bring Origen himself before us. Of the traits of his personal character little need be said. He bore unmerited sufferings without a murmur. He lived only to work. He combined in a signal degree sympathy with zeal. As a controversialist he sought to win his adversary and not simply to silence him (comp. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 33). He had the boldest confidence in the truth which he held, and the tenderest humility in regard of his own weakness (*in Joh.* tom. xxxii. 18; *in Matt.* tom. xvi. 13). When he ventures freely in the field of interpre-

* A list of the authors whom he quotes is given in Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii.

tations, he asks that he may be supported by the prayers of his hearers. His faith was catholic, and therefore he welcomed every kind of knowledge as tributary to its fulness. His faith was living, and therefore he was assured that no age could seal any one expression of it as complete. In virtue of this open-hearted trust, he kept unchilled to the last the passionate devotion of his youth. And therefore he was enabled to leave to the Church the conviction, attested by a life of martyrdom, that all things are its heritage because all things are Christ's.

IX. Editions.—The earliest edition of any part of Origen's works was an edition of the Homilies, which is described by Panzer (*Annales Typographici*, iv. 13; comp. p. 462, and Maittaire, i. p. 351) as *Homeliae B. Gregorii papae et Origenis Presbyteri* ...; and again by Maittaire (*Annales Typographici*, i. p. 355; comp. p. 351) simply as *Origenis Homiliae*, fol. 1475, without the place of publication or the name of the printer.[f]

This was followed by a Latin translation of the books against Celsus, made by "Christ. Persona, Romanus," and printed at Rome by Herolt, 1581. The dedication to the Doge and Council of Venice, contains a spirited appeal to a war against the Turks. The book was reprinted at Venice in 1514.

An edition of the Homilies on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Joshua, and Judges, "Hieronymo interprete," was published by Aldus at Venice in 1503; another edition followed in 1512.

The Commentary on the Romans, "Hieronymo interprete," was printed at Venice in 1506, and again in 1512.

The Homilies on Canticles, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Matthew (16), Luke (6), John (2), with the books on Job and Canticles, were printed at Venice, 1513 (Panzer, x. 40; Maittaire, ii. 242).

Meanwhile a collected [Latin] edition of the works of Origen had appeared. This was published at Paris by *Jacques Merlin*, doctor of the college of Navarre († 1541), and dedicated to Michael [Boudet], bishop of Langres, "*inter Francorum pares facile principi.*" The dedicatory letter, in which Origen is said to hold the same place among philosophical theologians (*inter theosophos*) "as the sun among the stars, or the eagle among birds," is dated 1512.

The contents of the edition are as follows:—Part I. Dedicatory Letter; a general *Index*; the *Homilies on Genesis* (17), *Exodus* (13), *Leviticus* (16), *Numbers* (28), *on Joshua* (26), *Judges* (9), 1 *Kings* (1). Part II. The *Commentaries on Job* (three books), *on Psalm* xxxvi. (Hom. v.), *Ps.* xxxviii. (Hom. ii.), *on Canticles* (Hom. ii. with a second, spurious, commentary), *on Isaiah* (Hom. ix.), *on Jeremiah* (Hom. xiv.), *on Ezekiel* (Hom. xiv.). Part III. Merlin's *Apology for Origen;* the *Homilies on St. Matthew* (35), *on St. Luke* (39); *Miscellaneous Homilies* (10); the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ten books); Jerome's notice of Origen (*De Virr. Ill.*). Part IV. Trithemius's notice of Origen; the *Books against Celsus* (8); *On First Principles* (four books); *Laments.*; Pamphilus's *Apology*; Ruffinus *On the falsification of Origen's Books; A Commendation of Origen*, by Jo. Badius, the original publisher of the work.

This edition was republished at Paris in 1519, 1522, 1530, and at Venice in 1516 (Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, vii. 235).

The edition of Merlin was succeeded by that of Erasmus, who, at the time of his death (1536), was engaged upon an edition of Origen (Latin), which was issued by Beatus Rhenanus, and dedicated to Hermann, archbishop of Cologne, in the same year.

The edition of Erasmus is more complete than that of Merlin; as Erasmus translated into Latin the remains of the Greek commentary on Matthew, tom. xiii., xiv., xv., xvi., and added an interesting and characteristic criticism of Origen and his writings. This edition was reissued in 1571 by J. J. Grynaeus, and dedicated to T. Erastus, with the addition of Ambr. Ferrarius's translation of the *Commentaries on St. John*, and L. Humfrey's Latin translation of *The Dialogue against the Marcionites.*

For meanwhile two Latin translations of the Commentary on St. John had been published, the first by Ambrosius Ferrarius from a MS. in the library of St. Mark at Venice in 1551, and the second from a MS. of the Royal Library at Paris by Joachim Perionius, "about 1554" (Huet).

An edition by G. Genebrard next appeared at Paris, 1574 (reprinted 1604, 1619; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 235), which contains Perionius's version of the Commentary on St. John, and a version of the Philocalia by Genebrard, and of the correspondence with Africanus by Hervetus.

The first edition of any part of the Greek text of Origen was that of the beginning of the letter in reply to Julius Africanus, published by D. Hoeschel at Augsburg, 1602 (Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 224). This was followed by an edition of the Books against Celsus, together with the Oration of Gregory, published at Augsburg in 1605 by the same scholar.[g] These were followed

[f] The book seems to have contained homilies of Gregory, Origen, and Leo, which were published separately or variously combined.

[g] Among the Gale MSS. in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, is a MS. of the *Philocalia* which had been prepared for publication by D. Hoeschel. It is referred to by Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii. 221, but the account is inaccurate. The title-page and colophon are worth quoting: "*Philocalia Origenis* ex ejus scriptis concinata variis a Basilio M. et Greg. Nazianzeno, ex codice Cyprio descripta manu Graecae linguae studiosi, posita a regione Gilberti Genebrardi interpretatione. Illustrissimo et generosissimo Dn. Henrico Uuottonio, serenissimi et potentissimi Regis Magnae Britanniae apud Venetos Oratori, felicem ex Italia in Germaniam gratulatus reditum David Hoeschelius A.

"Opus hoc Origenis *ἀνέκδοτον περικαλλὲς καὶ πολυωφελὲς* L. M. observantiae ergo D. D."

It is not easy to fix the date of the "return" from Italy. It probably was after Sir H. Wotton retired from his post at Venice in 1610. The Greek text has at the close: Prid. Non. Sept. 1606. The Latin text, which is written on the first side of the same page, Anno 1604, Nonis Septembris.

On a fly-leaf is written: "Hoeschelius edidit libros Origenis contra Celsum cum suis annotationibus in quibus saepe citat hujus codicis verba quod ex eo quoque fecit Tarinus in notis ad Philocaliam.

"In hoc nonnulla sunt quae in libris contra Celsum non habentur quae tamen ibi habere oportuit.

"Collatus est hic codex cum alio Novi Collegii apud Oxonienses uti conjicio."

by the Philocalia, published by Jo. Tarinus in 1618–9 (and again 1624).

The *Books against Celsus* and the *Philocalia* were again revised and published at Cambridge in 1658 and 1677, by W. Spencer, Fellow of Trinity College.

Meanwhile seven Homilies on Jeremiah had been published from a Vatican MS. by M. Ghisler, Lyons, 1629; and the whole collection of nineteen Homilies (under the name of Cyril Alex.), from a MS. of the Escurial, by B. Corderius, at Antwerp, 1648 (Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii. 214). To these was added the *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, published by J. R. Wetstein, Basle, 1674.

Hitherto there had been no collected edition of Origen's Greek writings. The want had been long felt; and as far back as 1635 the general assembly of French clergy had determined that editions of "John of Damascus, Origen, Maximus, Ephraem Syrus, among the Greek Fathers," should be published, "to serve as authorities in controversies of religion." The work was committed to Aubert, doctor of the Sorbonne. Collations of Italian (and so probably of other) MSS. were provided, which afterwards came into the hands of Tarinus (Huet, *Praef.*), but nothing more was done (Delarue, i. p. 5).

The purpose however was taken up in other quarters. Herbert Thorndike († 1672), Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, contemplated a complete edition of the works of Origen (Huet, *Praef.*), for which he made important collections, still preserved in the library of his college, including the *Codex Holmiensis*; but the plan was not carried out. Probably Thorndike was deterred from executing it no less by the troubles of the times than by the knowledge that P. D. Huet, still a layman, but afterwards (1685) bishop of Avranches, was engaged upon a similar task.

The work of Huet (ORIGENIS *in sacras Scripturas Commentaria quaecunque Graece reperiri potuerunt*, Rothomagi, 1668, 2 tom., republished at Paris, 1679, and at Cologne, 1685), dedicated in remarkable language to Louis XIV., is the foundation of the critical study of Origen. It is however only a part of the original design, which included three sections:—(1) the ἐξηγητικά; (2) the treatises, συντάγματα; (3) the supposititious writings. Of the second and third parts nothing has been published.

Tarinus refused to allow Huet to use the collations of Italian MSS. which were in his possession, though he was through age unable to make any use of them himself (Huet, *Praef.*). Huet had therefore to trust to a copy of the *Cod. Holm.*, which he had made in Sweden, and to *Cod. Reg.*, for his Greek text of the Commentary on St. Matthew; and to the *Cod. Reg.*, with Ferrarius's Latin translation of the *Cod. Venet.*, for the Commentary on St. John.

Huet's collection of the Ἐξηγητικά does not include the fragments found in Catenae. He had originally intended to include these, but he abandoned the purpose, partly from the immensity of the work required for collecting them, and partly from the uncertainty which attaches to extracts often abridged, altered, and misnamed (*Praef.*). It is also greatly to be regretted that he did not reprint the old Latin version of the Commentaries of St. Matthew, which has a value of its own. Still, though his materials were imperfect and his work incomplete, Huet holds the first rank among the editors of Origen.

An addition to the published Greek works of Origen was made by the appearance of the treatise *On Prayer*, which was edited at Oxford, 1686, and republished, after the recension of R. D. Wetstein, at Amsterdam in 1694. These editions were followed in 1728 by a far more complete one of Reading, London 1728, enriched by the notes of R. Bentley (reprinted by Delarue, i. pp. 911 ff.).

Bentley seems to have worked much at Origen. A copy of Huet in the library of Trinity College contains a collation of the *Cod. Holm.* of the Commentary on St. Matthew, and also of the *Cod. Bodl.* of the Commentary on St. John, in his handwriting, with many conjectures; but I am not aware that he contemplated any edition of these writings.[h]

About the same time Th. Mangey (1684–1755), the editor of Philo (1742), was also engaged upon Origen; and notes and collections of his are preserved in the British Museum (*MSS. Add.* 6428).

In the meanwhile the resolution of the French clergy found a tardy fulfilment through the labours of the great Benedictines of St. Maur. B. de Montfaucon edited the remains of the *Hexapla* in 1715 (Paris), carrying far forward the work of Flaminius Nobilius (Romae, 1587) and J. Drusius (Arnhemiae, 1622). And the first two volumes of a complete edition of Origen (ORIGENIS *opera omnia quae Graece vel Latine tantum extant et ejus nomine circumferuntur*) appeared at Paris in 1733, under the editorship of Charles Delarue, a priest of the same society. (Tom. i. *Letters*, *Treatises*, with the spurious *Dialogue* and the *Philosophumena*. Tom. ii. Exegetical writings on the Old Testament as far as the *Psalms*, with the anonymous commentary on *Job*.) The work had been undertaken by the wish of Montfaucon, and these two volumes had been sent to the press as early as 1725 (t. iii. p. vii.). The work was dedicated to Pope Clement XII.

The third volume (exegetical writings on the Old Testament from *Proverbs*, and on *St. Matthew* and *St. Luke*) appeared at Paris in 1740, a few months after the death of the editor (Oct. 1739), who left however the fourth volume, almost ready for the press as it was hoped, to the care of his nephew Charles Vincent Delarue, whom he had invited to help him in his work. The fourth volume however proved to be in a most imperfect state. For six years the younger Delarue was called away to complete Sabatier's Latin Bible, and he was not able to issue the fourth volume of the Origen till 1759 (remaining exegetical writings on the New Testament, with an appendix containing Pamphilus's *Apology*, Gregory's *Panegyric*, Huet's *Origeniana*, and selections from Bull's *Defensio*).

It would be most ungrateful not to acknowledge the service which the two Delarues rendered to Origen; but their edition is very far from satisfying the requirements of scholarship. The collations of MSS. are fragmentary and even inaccurate. The text is left only partially revised. The notes are inadequate.

---

h He and his friend J. Walker communicated to Delarue Grabe's collections from English Catenae: Delarue, ii. praef. i.

But though this is so, the later editions of Origen's works have added very little to the completeness of the Benedictine edition. This is the more to be regretted, as large additions have been made, and still can be made, to the Origenian fragments. In the appendix to the last volume of Galland's *Bibliotheca*,[i] published at Venice in 1781 after his death, there are given copious notes of Origen on Job, Psalms, St. Matthew, and St. Luke, and some notes on the Pentateuch, the historical books of the Old Testament, and Proverbs.

Not less important are the additional notes from Catenae on the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, the Acts, the Epistles to the Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, published by Cramer in his *Catena* (Oxford, 1840–1844), of which the notes on 1 Corinthians and Ephesians are of the highest importance.

To these must be added the notes on Proverbs published by Mai (*Patrum Nova Bibliotheca*, Romae, 1854) from a Vatican MS., and some other fragments noticed under the heads of the different books. Many fragments also have yet to be collected from *Catenae* (e. g. that on Pent. Josh. Jud. B. M. *Burn.* 34, 35, saec. xv.)

These materials have been either wholly neglected or only partially used in the latest editions of Origen; and the editors who came after the Delarues have done practically nothing to improve or illustrate the text of their author. The edition of Oberthür (Wirceburgi, 1780–1794) is a simple reprint of the Greek and Latin texts of Delarue. The handy edition of Lommatzsch (Berlin, 1831–1848) promised much of the highest interest (i. *Praef.*), but the promises have been unfulfilled. The textual indices scattered through many volumes are complete and serviceable, but with this exception (to which Petermann's account of the Venetian MS. of the Commentary on St. Matthew may be added: iii. iv. *Praef.*), the edition has no independent value. It contains none of the additional matter supplied by Galland and Cramer, but it gives the *Philocalia* which Delarue did not reprint.[k] Migne's reprint of Delarue, in his *Patrologia* (Paris, 1857) has the additions from Galland, most of the additions from Mai, and one fragment from Cramer as a supplement.

Enough has been said to shew that there is as yet no edition of Origen worthy of the subject, and no complete collection of his writings in any shape. To prepare such an edition would be a work for a society of scholars and for a university press. [W., 1882.]

ORIGENES (2), a layman, probably a professor of rhetoric, whose discourses and writings in defence of the truth during a time of persecution (which may be identified with the reign of Julian, when Christians were forbidden to teach secular literature) are highly commended by Basil, in a letter sent him by his sons, whose visit had caused him lively satisfaction. (Basil, *Ep.* 17 [384].) [E. V.]

ORIGENES (3), Platonic philosopher (*Dict. G. & R. Biog.*; Tillem. iii. 283, 284). [C. H.]

ORIGENIANI. Epiphanius, who makes the errors of the celebrated Origen the subject of the sixty-fourth section of his work on heresies, describes in his sixty-third chapter heretics whom he calls Origeniani, to whom he gives for distinction the epithet αἰσχροί; for he professes ignorance from what Origen they derived their name. He attributes to them no doctrinal errors, unless we count under this head a statement that they had in circulation among them the apocryphal acts of Andrew; but he states that though unmarried, and to outward appearance living the monastic life, they privately indulged in gross sexual impurity, only taking care to prevent a betrayal of it to the world through conception of children. Such a charge is easy to bring, but is difficult either to prove or to refute. Epiphanius states that these people themselves brought similar charges against the Catholics; and he also tells a story how the like accusation had been brought after his death against a Palestinian bishop who had been in the number of the confessors; but whether the charge was true or false Epiphanius will not venture to say. The theological animosities of the time made men on both sides so ready to believe evil of each other, that the historical enquirer may now feel himself justified in charitably disregarding such stories on either side. There is no authority independent of Epiphanius for the existence of such a sect of Origeniani; and he himself appears only to know of them by hearsay, and to have had but very vague information concerning them. The most probable account of the matter seems to be that the people of whom Epiphanius had heard were called Origeniani because they really were doctrinal disciples of Origen; and that a charge of immorality was brought against them by their opponents; but whether they had done or said anything to justify such a charge, is a point on which we have no trustworthy evidence. See August. *Haer.* § 63; Joan. Damasc. *Haer.* 42. [G. S.]

ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSIES.

I.—Controversy during Origen's Life.

We have already seen in the article on Origen, p. 100, that he was condemned at Alexandria during his life; the precise cause of the condemnation is less certain than the fact. Unquestionably, personal and formal irregularities entered largely into the complaint of Demetrius. Origen had preached at Caesarea, though not a priest himself, before an assembly of bishops and priests. He had accepted ordination in a foreign diocese without consulting his own bishop, as in duty bound; and though disqualified by the law of the church on account of a youthful indiscretion. It is true that no doctrinal charges are attributed to the time of this

[i] It may be worth while to notice that Galland was of French and not of Italian descent. In the license printed in his *Bibliotheca*, he is described as *Andrea Galland, Prete dell' Oratorio.*

[k] As Lommatzsch most unaccountably does not give the pages of Delarue, it may be well to mention that on an average one page of Delarue is equal to one and six-sevenths of Lommatzsch. The respective initial pages of the works are given above.

censure, but it must not be forgotten that Origen had already written the περὶ ἀρχῶν and the στρωματεῖς, embodying his characteristic doctrines; while there is no reason to suppose Demetrius to have been proof against the jealous prejudice excited by the power and fame of an ecclesiastical subordinate. At any rate, he took action against Origen, convened a council of priests and bishops, and obtained a decree expelling Origen from Alexandria, and forbidding him to reside or teach there, but leaving him his priesthood. Dissatisfied with these measures, Demetrius subsequently united with a few Egyptian bishops to deprive Origen of the priesthood also. Those who had voted with the bishop before now signed this new decree (cf. Photius, cod. 118, συνυπογραψάντων καὶ τῇ ἀποφάσει τῶν συμψήφων αὐτῷ γεγενημένων).[a]

To the account given above Hieronymus adds that Demetrius obtained a condemnation of Origen from Rome. (*Ep.* xxxiii.[b] Migne, *P.*, vol. xxii. [Bened. xxix]). If this be so, though there is little evidence to support the view, it must have been from a synod under Pontianus in A.D. 231 or 232. Doellinger (*Hippolytus and Callistus;* Eng. trans. pp. 244, foll., and p. 262) with Langen (*Römische Kirche*, pp. 267, 268), connects this condemnation with Origen's conduct in the controversy between Hippolytus and Callistus. One fact is clear: that the condemnation, if, or by whomsoever pronounced, could have had little weight even at Alexandria itself, since the doctrines and the personality impugned found devoted admirers and champions among the highest religious authorities in the city, even when Origen had removed, leaving his work to others.

II.—Origen's Followers at Alexandria.

(1) Heraclas, a pupil of Origen, succeeded his master at the catechetical school, and subsequently Demetrius in the bishopric (Eusebius, *H. E.* vi.; cc. 3, 15). He took no steps to effect his master's return, but we cannot therefore assume that he acquiesced in his condemnation. Doellinger (l. c. pp. 42–46) advocates the theory of a second expulsion by Heraclas, but the evidence of Gennadius (*De Script. Eccl.* c. 33) even when combined with the reference in a letter written three centuries later to a council at Alexandria (Mansi, vol. ix. p. 514), and one or two other vague illusions, is not of any real weight. The name of Heraclas was more famous than that of Demetrius, and the substitution might be easily made by careless or unscrupulous opponents. (2) Dionysius, who succeeded by similar steps to the bishopric of Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. cc. 29, 30), shewed his fidelity to Origen by open sympathy with his master in misfortune (*ib.* vi. 46), and by sorrow at his death. (Steph. Gobar in Photius, *cod.* 232.) A little while before Origen's death, Dionysius inscribed his *De Martyrio* to him, and in the controversy with the Chiliasts he defended Origen's allegorical system of interpretation against the literalism of Nepos (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. cc. 24–25); and he with his master was claimed as an ally by the Arians through his use of the term ὑπόστασις, and for his alleged subordination of the Son. Basil actually attacked him as an Arian (Photius, *Cod.* 232), while he was defended by Athanasius in the treatise which bears his name (Athan. *De Sent. Dionysii de Synod.* c. xxiv. cf De Decret. Syn. Nic. c. xxv. Migne, *P.* vol. xxv. pp. 479, foll. and 515, foll.). (3) Theognostus, a celebrated teacher at Alexandria, wrote seven books, ὑποτυπώσεις, in imitation of Origen's περὶ ἀρχῶν, containing similar speculations with reference to the nature of the Son, the Holy Spirit, and angels (Photius, *Cod.* 106). On the third point his views were orthodox, on the second avowedly heretical; his speculations on the third were only academical exercises (Athan. l. c. Photius, *ib.*). (4) Another of Origen's followers at Alexandria was Pierius, a priest famous for his piety and learning. He was at the head of the Alexandrian school of his day, the teacher of Pamphilus, and the author of twelve books in which he taught the subordination of the Spirit to the Father and the Son, possibly also the pre-existence of the human soul. His devotion and resemblance to his great predecessor secured for him the title of the "Second Origen" (Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.* c. 76, Photius, *cod.* 119, and Scholia; Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* iii. p. 425). [Fragments of the writings of Pierius and Theognostus are to be found in Migne, vol. x. pp. 239–246.]

III.—Controversy in Asia.

At Alexandria, as we have seen, the influence of Origen still remained supreme, but elsewhere, within a short period after his death, his doctrines were vehemently attacked. Foremost among the assailants was Methodius, formerly of Olympus, bishop of Patara in the early part of the 4th century. Socrates, alluding to Origen's foes, gives him a place in the "Quaternion of Revilers" (τετράκτυς κακολόγων), but states that in the Ξένων he recanted (ἐκ παλινῳδίας), expressing admiration for Origen (Socrat. *H. E.* vi. 13). Eusebius, as Walch points out (*Ketz.* vol. vii. p. 408. cf. Hieron. *c. Ruf.* 1, § 11), inverts this order of events; and the facts are quite uncertain, for we know neither the relative order of composition nor in whose mouth the recantation is placed. In dialogue Methodius would often state conflicting views, and in his other works such abusive expressions as ὦ κένταυρε are by no means rare when he refers to Origen.[c] The chief points that he attacked in the teaching of Origen were his views on the Creation, the relation of soul and body, Resurrection, and Freewill; but he also includes many subordinate elements in his hostile criticism. It often happens that Methodius, like many other critics of Origen, does not understand the principle which he attacks, and so bases the whole argument on a false foundation. For instance,

[a] Huet (*Origeniana*, I., ii. 15) states that the bishops who had voted with Origen at the first council were now compelled to sign the decree of Demetrius at the second. But in the phrase συμψήφων αὐτῷ, the word αὐτῷ refers to Demetrius, not to Origen, and the position of καὶ makes the meaning still more clear, *vid.* Migne, vol. xvii., p. 669, note (69).

[b] Migne, *Patrologia Graeco-Latina;* Migne, *P. Patrologiae cursus completus.*

[c] Vincenzi (vol. v. app. ii. p. 98) supposes that Methodius was convinced of misconception by the apology of Pamphilus and Eusebius.

he impugns Origen's doctrine of eternal generation. Origen had argued that if the Creator's existence in time were prior to the creation, this would involve change in the unchangeable; and that therefore the elementary interpretation of the Mosaic account was inadequate. Methodius replies that cessation from creation is change, and argues for the prior existence of the Creator on the analogy of the human sculptor and his handiwork, the statue. He does not apprehend that the term "creation" is an idea rather than an action; Origen would reply that there is no cessation of creative activity as also there is no beginning, and that the work of the Great Renewer is not limited to moments of time. Methodius also attacks Origen's saying that the body is the fetter of the soul, and was added to it after the fall of man from innocence and purity; that the clothes of our first parents (the "coats of skins") were their mortal bodies, and that the soul is the only essential part of man (vid. Migne, vol. xviii. p. 267). Methodius asks how, if the soul cannot sin without the body, the soul can have been sent into the body on account of sin; and if the body is a fetter, whether it is for the good or the evil? The good need no such restraint; and it does not check the evil, as we see in the case of Cain. In this same connection he also attacks Origen's doctrine of the Resurrection in a spiritual, not a material body, his allegorical interpretation of the "coats of skins," and his application of Ezekiel's prophetic promise (Photius, *cod.* 234. *De Resurr.*). Methodius seems also to have written against Origen with reference to the witch of Endor, and his explanation of the raising of Samuel. Methodius supposed Origen to believe that the soul of Samuel was in the power of Satan, and that the apparition was in reality the prophet's spirit. This theory may possibly have led to the charge of sorcery subsequently made against Origen, though the allegation was one which he shared with many other saints of pre-eminent learning. (*De Pythonissa; περὶ ἐγγαστριμύθου.* Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.* lxxxiii.) Another point of attack was the doctrine, that while in doing evil our choice is free to act or to refrain from acting, in thinking evil we are not free to admit or to repel temptation (Photius, *De Lib. Arbit.*, *cod.* 236 cf. *cod.* 234). From the reply of Pamphilus and Eusebius it would appear that Methodius also impugned the orthodoxy of Origen in his conception of the Divine Nature.

Antagonism intensified devotion; the books under ban were studied with increased ardour; nor did Origen's adherents allow the charges brought against their master to pass without challenge. Apologists were numerous (Photius, *cod.* 118). Pierius and Theognostus, already mentioned among Origen's successors, and other teachers of equal note, took up his cause. But the first place among these treatises belongs to the apology composed by Pamphilus and Eusebius of Caesarea in the first decade of the 4th century, probably about A.D. 306. It was famous at the time, and nearly a century after its appearance it again became the subject of embittered controversy. Pamphilus had been a pupil of Pierius, but had subsequently removed to Caesarea, where he made his home, celebrated for sanctity, learning, and devotion to Origen, whose commentaries he had transcribed and studied with incessant care (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 32). Eusebius had been attracted to him by kindred sympathies, and the pair continued in an intimate and lifelong friendship. With regard to Origen they were of one mind, and together they prepared a defence of his character and doctrine. Pamphilus seems to have been the originator; perhaps the first book was his sole work, but he was soon joined by Eusebius, and by the year A.D. 309, five books were completed and inscribed to Patermuthius and the confessors of Palestine—a dedication not inappropriate, seeing that part of the work had been composed in prison. After the death of Pamphilus in the persecution, Eusebius added a sixth book to the work, but of the whole only one book has come down to us, and that in the Latin translation of Rufinus (Photius, *Cod.* 118; Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 33; Soc. *H. E.*, iii. 7; Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.* lxxxv.). This apology must have comprised a general defence on the entire case, for though no doubt composed with special reference to Methodius, it also embraced the whole range of controversy, vindicating Origen's life (Euseb. l. c.), discussing in the second book the validity of his irregular ordination (*ib.* c. 36), and in the sixth the influence of his literary labours (*ib.* c. 36). Some of the charges advanced by Methodius are dealt with in the first book; the question of freewill was discussed in one of the later books now lost to us. The apology opens with a general introduction setting forth the principles of Origen, and then proceeding to details, vindicates him by appealing to his own words to refute the misrepresentations of his traducers. Much of the treatise, therefore, consists of quotations. Its contents have been described and its authenticity established in a preceding article. [EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA (23), § 28.] It is therefore only necessary to recapitulate the chief points on which issue was raised in Origen's behalf. The first set of charges refuted refers mainly to the Nature of the Divine Son. It is demonstrated that Origen believed (i) the Son to be of one substance with the Father; (ii) not produced out of the substance of the Father by extension ("per prolationem," προβολῇ) according to the Valentinian doctrine, which would divide and diminish the Divine substance; (iii) that Christ was not a mere man, and (iv) that his life on earth was not allegorical and illusory; (v) that there were not two Christs, one in heaven the other on earth. Then after vindicating Origen's method of interpreting scripture, it shews (vi) that he does not falsify the sacred narrative by allegorical exegesis. Lastly, it deals with his doctrines concerning the nature and destiny of the human soul, asserting (vii) Origen's belief in the resurrection of the body, and (viii) in the future punishment of the impenitent; (ix) it maintains the soundness of his views as to the condition of departed souls; and (x) that he does not teach that the souls of the wicked pass by transmigration into beasts. On essential principles, then, Origen's orthodoxy is asserted; it is, however, conceded that where the voice of the church is silent, e.g., on the relations of body and soul, his speculations are open to question. But the distinction between speculation and doctrine is insisted upon, and it is shewn that these theories are broached only in scattered

references, not advanced in a systematic treatise. On one point of primary importance the apology is silent. While it attributes the outcry against Origen to envy, ignorance, and stupidity, it makes no reference to any formal condemnation or forfeiture of orthodox reputation during his lifetime. In this matter therefore it gives us no clue to unravel the facts of the case. [The remains of this Apology are contained in Migne, vol. x., pp. 1557 foll., and in Caillau, *Coll. Eccl. Pat.* vol. xv. pp. 497, foll.] By anticipation the rejoinder to this defence (ἀντίρρησις), published by Antipater of Bostra, about A.D. 460, may be here mentioned. Fragments of this work survive in the Acts of the Second Nicene Council (Labbe, *Conc.* vol. vii. p. 367). In the passage there preserved Eusebius is attacked, but no mention is made of Pamphilus. Antipater admits the historical learning of the former, but denies his knowledge of doctrine on the score of his heretical tendencies. The doctrines of Origen to which he refers in the fragment are the pre-existence of souls, and the subordination of the Son. The treatise seems to have been accepted as an authoritative reply to Origenism, and to have been read by official command in churches. [In Migne, vol. lxxxv., pp. 1791 foll.]

IV.—Controversy in the Arian Period.

The Arian controversies of the 4th century roused a new storm against Origen. In the earlier part of the struggle indeed his name does not occur. The Arian party, though fortifying themselves with the sanctity of the martyr Lucian, made no reference to Origen, nor was he cited by Alexander, their chief opponent before Nicaea (Tillemont, vol. iii. p. 598; Soc. *H. E.* i. vi.; Huet, Origen., 2, 4. sec. 1, cc. 4–6; cf. Newman, Arians, i. sec. 3). But the appeal was inevitable. Before long by champions of orthodoxy he was denounced as "the Father of Arianism," while the Arians, catching the cue, sheltered themselves under his authority as countenancing their doctrine of the Logos. Some even attempted to set him in the place of Arius as the rallying-point of the party (Soc. *H. E.* iv. 26). On the other hand, Aetius, an Arian, in asserting the creation of the Son, attacks Origen together with Clement, as holding the orthodox position (Soc. *H. E.* ii. 35; Sozom. *H. E.* iv. 12). Suspicion, however, against Origen was aggravated by the character of his adherents. Dionysius of Alexandria lay under a similar charge of heresy; the sympathies of his apologist, Eusebius, were notorious; and Timotheus, a leader of the Arian party at Constantinople, in his devotion to the writings of Origen, was but a type of a numerous class (Soc. *H. E.* vii. 6). But while Origen's orthodoxy was impugned, his assailants exhibited the widest divergence of opinion as to the measure of his guilt. Eustathius of Antioch, a prominent opponent of the Arians, wrote a treatise against Origen, but only with reference to his interpretation of the story of the witch of Endor (*De Engastrimytho adv. Orig.* Galland, *Bibl. Pat.* vol. iv. pp. 541 foll.; Migne, vol. xviii. pp. 614–674). So that if Origen's views on the Trinity were really unsound, it is strange that they should have escaped impeachment by so zealous a champion of orthodoxy (cf. Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.* c. lxxxv). Marcellus of Ancyra, on the other hand, in his reply to Asterius, to which Eusebius in turn rejoined, sets down Origen as the fountain-head of Arianism. The primary cause, however, of his antipathy, seems to be the admixture of pagan philosophy with Christian teaching to be found in the introduction of the περὶ ἀρχῶν and elsewhere; and Origen's most heinous offence is not heresy, but his perverse union of Platonism and Christianity. On more vital errors he is strangely silent (Eusebius c. Marcellum; Migne, xxiv. p. 754 foll., especially, p. 761). Hostility did not confine itself within these limits. Origen's profound learning and ascetic morality excited the enthusiastic admiration of the cultivated portion of the Egyptian monks (Epiph. *Haer.* lxiv. or xliv.; Migne, vol. xli.), and Pachomius, the founder of Egyptian monasticism, and leader of the anthropomorphist party, forbade his monks to read Origen's writings. He is said to have ordered the books to be cast out of the monastery into the river (Boll. *Acta Sanc.* Maii 14, vol. iii. p. 304, and App. xxv. p. 30), and the act would only be in keeping with the intense antipathy to Origen and his followers recorded by the biographer, who tells us that Pachomius was once visited by strangers, unsavoury even to an ascetic nose. The reason of their noisomeness [δυσωδία] was soon explained by an angel, who informed Pachomius that he had been entertaining Origenists unawares. The doctrines of that heretic in the heart were supposed to pollute the whole man from centre to skin (*Vita Pachomii*; Boll. *Acta Sanc.* Maii 3, Appen. 25, p. 53; cf. Doucin, p. 122; Tillemont, vii. pp. 206). Theodorus, his successor, seems to have been imbued with the same spirit. (*Ep. de Vita Theodori*, c. iii.)

Origen, on his side, did not lack friends among the greatest and wisest men of the age. Athanasius was foremost in vindicating his orthodoxy against the Arians, maintaining the enormity of imputing to Origen as fundamental beliefs that which he wrote merely in the form of suggestion for those who go deeply into the mysteries of existence. So far from agreeing with the Arians, Origen's sympathies, he asserts, are with the orthodox. The Arians believe that the Word was created out of nothing; Origen, that it was generated from the womb of uncreated light. They admit the Word to have existed before all ages, but not its eternity; Origen holds that it had no beginning but was coeternal (συναΐδιος) with the Father. The Arians believed that the Word, like the rest of creation, was subject to change; Origen, that it was essentially immutable. The doctrine of subordination no doubt was a serious error, and Athanasius also combatted Origen's views about the nature of the soul and of sin; but these failings could not in his mind destroy the holiness of that wonderful saint (Athanasius, *De Decret. Syn. Nic.* xxvii.; *Ad Serap.* ep. iv. § 9 foll.; Migne, *P.* vol. xxv. p. 466; vol. xxvi. p. 650 foll. cf. Doucin, pp. 110, 111). Basil also in his treatise on the Holy Spirit claims Origen as orthodox on this crucial doctrine (*De Spiritu Sancto*, Migne, vol. xxxii. p. 203, § 61; Benedict. edit. vol. iii. p. 61), and though he admitted errors in some portions of Origen's works, he edited with Gregory of Nazianzum the φιλοκάλια, a volume of extracts selected from Origen's treatises on

important subjects (cf. Huet, *Orig.* II. iii. 6, 7; in Migne, vol. xvii. p. 1097). Gregory of Nyssa must also be included among his admirers and champions (Steph. Gob. in Photius, cod. 232; cf. cod. 233; Huet, *Orig.* II. iv. 1, § 6; Migne, l. c. p. 1121). To this company must be added Didymus, the teacher of Hieronymus, who was to prove one of Origen's most bitter assailants. His sympathy, however, was imperfect; and if we may accept the testimony of Hieronymus, not an impartial witness indeed, Didymus rejected the teaching of Origen as to the nature of the Trinity, holding the doctrine himself in the most rigidly orthodox form (Hieron. *adv. Rufin.* 1. § 6; cf. iii. § 13; Migne, *P.*, vol. xxiii. pp. 401 and 467). Didymus also wrote notes upon the περὶ ἀρχῶν, explaining apparent anomalies in an orthodox sense (Hieron. *Ep. ad Pamm.* lxxxiv. § 4 [=Bened. 41]), a proceeding which commended itself to many who, in spite of general admiration, viewed with suspicion Origen's extreme allegorical tendencies and the dubious passages in his great speculative treatises. While the controversy was still in this stage, Epiphanius, the venerable bishop of Cyprus, made his first appearance as an opponent of the Origenist party. His hostility was of no recent growth, for, while a monk in the Egyptian desert, he had allied himself to the party of Pachomius. At this time his power and reputation made him the most formidable antagonist that the Origenists had yet encountered since the attack of Methodius. In three separate works Epiphanius assailed the doctrines of Origen and his adherents, though his arguments had more vigour than novelty, recapitulating as they do the charges of his predecessor. (1) In his "*Ancoratus*," Ἀγκύρωτος (A.D. 374), Epiphanius includes Origen in the list of heretics (§ 13), and sets down as obnoxious tenets (*a*) his allegorical account of creation and paradise (§§ 54–5); (*b*) the doctrine that in the resurrection not the natural body will be raised, but a body of finer material here contained within it (§ 55); (*c*) Origen's interpretation of the phrase "coats of skins" as representing the human body (§ 62); (*d*) his subordination of the Son to the Father (§ 63). (2) In his great work against all heresies, πανάριον (A.D. 374–377), Epiphanius recurs to the attack, and in fuller detail, quoting Methodius at great length (*Haer.* lxiv. or xliii.).[p]

All the charges previously made by Methodius are reiterated in this work, and some new ones added (c. xii. Migne, vol. xli. pp. 1067, foll.) He asserts (*a*) that Origen teaches that the Son does not see the Father, nor the Spirit the Son, nor angels the Spirit, nor men angels. (*b*) That though Origen derives the Son from the substance (οὐσία) of the Father, he believes Him to have been created and made, bearing the name of Son, not by right but by favour; a direct encouragement to Arius (ἐκ τούτου ὁ Ἄρειος τὰς προφάσεις εἴληφε, c. 4). (*c*) That Origen maintains the souls of men to have existed as celestial spirits before the bodies in which they were imprisoned to punish them for sin (δέμας κέκληται τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὸ δέδεσθαι τὴν ψύχην ἐν τῷ σώματι, c. xii.). (*d*) That Origen asserted Adam to have lost the Divine image at the Fall, and allegorised the χιτῶνες δερμάτινοι (*ib.*). (*e*) That he mutilates and debases the doctrine of the resurrection; for if the body does not rise, what will? The soul is not in the grave (*ib.*). (*f*) That by his allegorical method of interpretation the sacred narrative is corrupted (*ib.*). (3) In his Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις (I. ii. 18; Migne, vol. xlii. p. 867) Epiphanius once again sums up his case against Origen under four heads: Resurrection; the nature of the Son; and of the Holy Spirit; allegorical interpretation of Paradise, Heaven, and all things; also stating that Origen taught that the kingdom of Christ would have an end. (4) This last accusation is repeated in an expanded form in a letter to Johannes, bishop of Jerusalem (Migne, vol. xliii. p. 379, §§ 4, 5). According to the writer, Origen believed that the devil would be restored to his former glory and made equal with Christ. So that if Satan shall be subdued, reasons Epiphanius, Christ will be subdued in like manner. But this is an inference without logic or reason. The struggle during this period was, as we have seen, almost entirely confined to literary controversy, and its issues were determined by the balance of conflicting personal authority, not by formal and authoritative decisions.

V.

In the next period the character of the controversy changes. Argument is enforced by action, and diplomatic intrigue becomes more potent than theological learning. We can trace three well-defined stages in the struggle. (1) The strife in Palestine between John of Jerusalem and Rufinus on the one side, and Hieronymus and Epiphanius on the other, Theophilus of Alexandria intervening. (2.) The personal quarrel between Hieronymus and Rufinus, arising out of the latter's translation of the περὶ ἀρχῶν. (3.) The conflict between Theophilus of Alexandria and the Egyptian monks, leading to the controversy in which Chrysostom and Epiphanius were involved, and to the council held near Constantinople, in the year A.D. 403. The details have been given with such fulness in other articles that in many instances a mere reference may serve instead of repetition.

(1) Strife in Palestine.

Palestine, as we have already seen, had for long been a stronghold of the Origenistic party, and about the year 390 A.D. Origen's admirers in that country were powerful as well as numerous. John, the bishop of Jerusalem, had imbibed his doctrines among the devoted monks of the Nitrian desert, and the heads of the religious communities at Bethlehem and on the Mount of Olives were imbued with the same spirit. At the former place Hieronymus and Paula respectively presided over the monastery and the convent; at the latter, Rufinus and Melania discharged the same functions; both

[p] In *Haer.* lxiii. (xliii.) Epiphanius mentions under the head of *Origenists* an impure sect in Egypt, though he admits that he cannot tell whether they sprang from Origen himself or from some other heretic of his name. The impure morality characteristic of the sect shows that with the genuine Origenists it can have no possible connection; though Doucin (p. 140) argues that men adopting Origen's conception of the body as the prison of the soul would naturally infer that its vices were unimportant (cf. August. *De Haer.* 42, 43).

societies being bound together in close and intimate friendship. Up to this time Hieronymus, without accepting all Origen's speculations, had studied his works with the religious and literary fervour of an enlightened disciple. He had translated treatises, he habitually used the commentaries. Attachment to the master drew him to the followers, and when he fled from Rome, though he visited Epiphanius, Origen's staunch opponent, he made his way to Isidorus at Alexandria, and listened to the lectures of Didymus. In a letter to Paula, written in 385 A.D. he strenuously maintains the cause of Origen against his assailants, attributing their zeal not to orthodoxy but envy, and Origen's condemnation to the supremacy of his learning and eloquence which meaner spirits could not brook. ("Pro sudore quid accepit pretii? damnatur a Demetrio episcopo. In damnationem eius consentit urbs Romana; ipsa contra hunc cogit senatum, non propter dogmatum novitatem, non propter haeresim, ut nunc adversus eum rabidi canes simulant; sed quia gloriam eloquentiae eius et scientiae ferre non poterant, et illo dicente omnes muti putabantur." (*Ep.* xxxiii.; [= Bened. 29.])

Dissension first arose with the arrival of the Egyptian monk Aterbius at Jerusalem in A.D. 392, who attacked Hieronymus and Rufinus for their devotion to Origen. Hieronymus, always morbidly sensitive to any imputation of heresy, repudiated the charge. He subsequently asserted that he had condemned the doctrines of Origen ("cum damnatione dogmatum Origenis satisfecissem," c. Ruf. iii. 33); but this was probably an exaggeration, for when Vigilantius soon after reiterated the charge, Hieronymus asserted the right to discriminate between the true and the false elements in the great speculative system (*Ep.* lxi. [= Bened. 36]). Inwardly however he was wavering, and the arrival of his friend Epiphanius in A.D. 394, who appears to have undertaken to extirpate the Origenistic heresy in Palestine, turned the scale, and Hieronymus at once appears as a partisan of orthodoxy. Full details of the personal wrangle which ensued may be found elsewhere. [HIERONYMUS (4); JOHANNES (216); EPIPHANIUS (1).] It is clear that Epiphanius at the outset contented himself with general denunciation of Origenism, not singling out Rufinus and Johannes for special censure. On the other hand, the conduct of the Origenist party in the church during the discourse of Epiphanius, and the menacing demeanour of Johannes; the warning that he sent to Epiphanius by his archdeacon, and his public attack upon anthropomorphic views in which the personal reference to Epiphanius was unmistakable, made a rupture only a question of time, and antagonism was intensified by a strenuous refusal twice repeated to condemn Origen and his doctrines. The subsequent conduct of Epiphanius intensified the irritation. Having failed to convince Johannes by argument, he endeavoured to crush him by isolation. With this end in view, he first induced the monks at Bethlehem to exclude Johannes with Rufinus and his other friends from communion, and, secondly, consecrated at Eleutheropolis Paulinianus, a brother of Hieronymus. Such conduct in an alien diocese was a serious encroachment upon the jurisdiction of the lawful bishop, and provoked indignant resentment.[q]

The pleas put forward by the partisans of Epiphanius in self-defence were futile, not to say frivolous (cf. Hieronymus, *Epist.* c. Johann. Migne, P. vol. xxii. *Ep.* 82; [= Bened. 39]), and the apology only supplied material for new controversy. Hieronymus, who throughout the quarrel is a zealous partisan of the bishop of Cyprus, translated his defence into Latin: the version disappeared, and Hieronymus accused Rufinus with having suborned an agent to steal it. (Hieron. *Ep.* lvii. (= Bened. 33); c. Ruf. iii. 84.) Johannes meanwhile is silent, his controversial zest having abated; but Epiphanius does not relax his efforts, and now writes the long letter to which allusion has already been made (Migne, vol. xliii. pp. 379, foll.), specifying the substance of his indictment of Origen. In answer to an appeal from Johannes, Theophilus of Alexandria, who was still an Origenist, makes an attempt to reconcile the disputants without success; for Isidorus, to whom the mission was entrusted, according to Hieronymus, acted with dishonourable partiality. (Hieron. *c. Johann.* §§ 37–39; *c. Ruf.* iii. § 18.) Johannes again writes to Theophilus, recounting the course of events, and the bishop of Alexandria takes advantage of a correspondence with Siricius of Rome to send on the letter with another from himself, charging Epiphanius with anthropomorphic heresy, not perhaps without reference to similar heretics in his own diocese. To this letter of Johannes, Hieronymus at once published an elaborate reply. (*Ad Pammach. adv. Johann. Ep.* lxxxiv. [= Bened. 41] cf. Palladius, *de Vita Chrysos.* § 16; Tillemont, vol. xii. pp. 186, 187.) Before this Rufinus had made his peace with his former friend, a harmony not destined to be permanent. The terms of reconciliation are uncertain. The account given by Hieronymus would lead us to suppose that any concession made was on the part of Rufinus, but such evidence without disinterested corroboration has little value. ("Iunximus dextras, ut vos essetis Catholici, non ut essemus haeretici," *c. Rufin.* iii. § 24; cf. § 33.) Probably the friends agreed to differ on the question in dispute. This reconciliation Archelaus, the governor of Palestine, endeavoured to extend to the other remaining foes, but his efforts were idle, the monks insisting upon the condemnation of Origen as an indispensable preliminary to any agreement ("ut futurae concordiae fides iaceret fundamenta," Hieron. *c. Johann.* § 40). Theophilus in a subsequent attempt had better fortune. After he had turned against the Origenists, A.D. 397–399, he wrote to Epiphanius, entreating for the cessation of strife. The advance was accepted (Migne, P. *Ep.* lxxxii. in Hieronymus; [= Bened. 39], and Theophilus went to Jerusalem and restored communion between the city and Bethlehem, allying himself with Hieronymus throughout the remainder of the controversy. (Hieron. *Epp.* lxxxvi.–xcvi.; = Bened. 59–63; 111; others unedited.)

[q] The two acts are really connected; one is a consequence of the other. Tillemont inverts the order, vol. xii., pp. 168, 170. Hieronymus did not officiate himself, and a priest was needed to keep up the services after the separation from Jerusalem. Cf. Vallarsi, Hieron i. p. 95; in Migne, P. vol. xxii. p. 95.

(2) RUFINUS AND HIERONYMUS.

Before peace had been made between the hostile parties in Palestine, Rufinus had left the scene of strife and had returned to Rome, where he soon became embroiled in a new quarrel, trivial in itself, indeed, but important as leading to a condemnation of Origen by a bishop of Rome. Without repeating all the history of the controversy given in other biographies [HIERONYMUS (4); RUFINUS], we may record the main incidents. At the request of his friend Macarius, Rufinus translated first the famous apology of Pamphilus,—of which only the first book still survives,—and then the περὶ ἀρχῶν of Origen himself. In a preface to the former work he exhorted those who might look upon his conduct with suspicion to disregard all imputations of heresy, and to make the knowledge of truth their supreme concern. At the same time he explicitly affirmed his own belief in the Holy Trinity, and in the resurrection of the body. In an appendix he discussed the adulteration of Origen's works, contending that heretics, to support their own errors, had falsified the text with interpolations. The introduction to the second treatise struck a bolder note. Rufinus reminds his readers that in undertaking such a translation he is but following the example of Hieronymus himself, who had translated more than seventy treatises of Origen, describing him as the greatest teacher of the church after the apostles. Furthermore, he had adopted the method of Hieronymus in explaining obscurities, amplifying too concise passages, illustrating difficulties by quotations from other works, and suppressing heterodox passages as dangerous or spurious. His task completed, Rufinus left Rome for Aquileia, provided with letters from Siricius, who died in the same year, A.D. 398. The two treatises he left behind to do their work at Rome. The friends of Hieronymus at once took up the challenge—for such it really was—and Pammachius wrote to him from Rome, forwarding a copy of the translation and suggesting that Hieronymus should prepare a genuine version (Hieron. *Ep.* lxxxiii. Migne, = Bened. 40). Hieronymus replied, clearing himself of the charges, and stating, somewhat disingenuously, that he had never been an admirer of Origen, but had controverted his errors. He also denied the incriminated passages in the works of Origen to be spurious interpolations, and impugned the genuineness of the apology attributed to Pamphilus. (*Ep.* lxxxiv. (= Bened. 41)). Finally, he recapitulates the heretical doctrines of Origen as set down by Epiphanius, and adds that at Nicaea Origen had been by implication condemned as the forefather of Arianism. After an interval, Rufinus replied in his Apologia addressed to his friend Apollonianus.[r]

The treatise is, in the main, a vindication of his personal faith and a retaliation upon Hieronymus. In the first book, he reasserts his own orthodoxy as to the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. He believes in the Trinity, but defends the statement which had been misinterpreted, that the Son does not see the Father ("non videt"). The Son knoweth the Father, he admits; but the Father is not visible to the eye of sense. He also professes his own faith in the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection of the body, adding with reference to this last doctrine that at Aquileia, his home, the definite phrase "huius carnis" was always used in place of the more common and vague expression. He then proceeds to explain how he had been induced to publish the translation of Origen's treatise, insisting that he had carefully guarded himself against all responsibility for error, and defending the integrity of his method of dealing with the text of the original. In the second book, stung by the charge that he had perjured himself in his profession of faith, he retorts upon Hieronymus that he had violated an oath by reading pagan writers, and Porphyry in particular, after a solemn renunciation of all such perilous erudition. Advancing still further along the same lines, he shews the inconsistency of Hieronymus, who had extolled Origen for virtue and learning, reviling his foes with equal vehemence, and was himself as a commentator largely indebted to Origen, especially in his treatise on Micah. He then vindicates the Apology of Pamphilus, the character of which had been impugned by Hieronymus in the heat of controversy, and asserts the genuineness of the work. But even accepting the theory of Hieronymus, he still maintains that the essential force of the defence is not impaired; for it proceeds by appeal to fact: every charge is refuted by Origen's own words. In conclusion, Rufinus leaves his opponent in this dilemma; that if Origen be condemned, he cannot escape, but as a translator and imitator must stand or fall with his former master.

This was but the beginning of strife. Through the influence of Marcella and other powerful friends of Hieronymus, Anastasius of Rome was drawn into the dispute. He was indeed entirely ignorant about Origen and his works, but recognised heresy in passages selected for his inspection. (Anastasius, Ep. ad Johann. *in Ep. et Dec.*, Migne, *P.*, vol. xx., pp. 68, foll.) He summoned Rufinus to Rome in 399 A.D. Rufinus did not obey the citation, but excused himself by letter, adding a new profession of orthodoxy and disclaiming any responsibility for the views of Origen. Dissatisfied with this reply, Anastasius proceeded to condemn Origen, and though not explicitly condemning Rufinus as well, he expresses his disapproval in the strongest terms. ("Nec dissimilis reo est qui alienis vitiis praestat assensum, illud tamen te cupio ita haberi a nostris partibus alienum, ut quod agat (sc. Rufinus) et ubi sit, nescire cupiamus, ipse denique viderit ubi possit absolvi." Anasta. ad Johann. vid. sup.) It has been alleged that other bishops joined in this condemnation, but the statement has little evidence to support it. Anastasius indeed in a letter to Simplicianus of Milan expresses a desire to unite with Theophilus in condemning the heretical doctrines of Origen, and asserts that "we established in the city of Rome" (nos in urbe Roma positi) do condemn anything contrary to faith found in the works of Origen; explaining that a priest, Eusebius by name, had

[r] Not "Invectivarum in Hieronymum libri duo," as the treatise has been wrongly entitled.

pointed out the blasphemous chapters, which, with any other (similar?) things set forth by Origen, had been condemned. Now "we" may or may not refer to other bishops; it is far more probable that the plural is used in an official sense. (Hieron. *Ep.* xcv. Migne, *P.*, vol. xxii., p. 772, cf. vol. xx. p. 74.) At any rate it is certain that the condemnation did not take place at a formal synod, for only one such council was held at Rome during the pontificate of Anastasius—the synod convened against the Donatists in A.D. 400 (Mansi, vol. iii. pp. 1023, 1024, cf. Binius on a Carthaginian synod, ib. pp. 1023, 1024). After Anastasius had condemned Origen, the Emperor Honorius forbade his works to be read. (Hieron. *ad Pammach. et Marc.* Ep. xcvii.; Ad Theoph. Ep. lxxxviii. cf. Baronius, ad ann. 400, nn. 33–35; ad ann. 402, n. 29. Schroeckh, x. p. 194.) It is probable that several letters passed between Rome and the eastern churches with a view of securing a more general concurrence in the decision of Anastasius; how far the attempt succeeded cannot be determined. (Hieron. *c. Rufin.* iii. § 20, foll. Coustant, *Epp. Pont. Roman.* pp. 714, 719, 724. Migne, *P.*, vol. xx. p. 58, foll. (iv.) to Venerius of Milan, condemning Origen's works, l.c. p. 59; (ix.) *c. Ruf. in Orient.* ib. p. 62; and *Ep.* lxxxviii. ref.) Hieronymus exhorts Rufinus to acquiesce in this verdict, "et duos (sc. Theophilum et Anastasium) orientis atque occidentis τροπαιοφόρους alacri sequamur incessu." (*c. Rufin.* iii. § 9.) The succeeding stages of the personal conflict are not essential to our immediate subject, and may therefore be ignored. The condemnation of Origen by Anastasius was the important result of the quarrel; it must certainly be accepted as a fact, and Rufinus in his reply to Hieronymus was not justified in discrediting it. (Cf. *c. Ruf.* iii. § 20.) The thorough ignorance of Anastasius is palpable, and his intervention was due to the influence of the partisans of Hieronymus and Epiphanius. The latter was the leading spirit in the movement. It is from him that Hieronymus adopts all his charges against Origen, for only one has even the semblance of originality, when in discussing the pre-existence of the soul, Hieronymus asks whether the human soul of Christ pre-existed before the Incarnation of the Divine Logos. If it did, then Christ must have had two souls, he argues, and so proceeds to attack Origen's interpretation of Philipp. ii. 5 (cf. Langen, *Römische Kirche*, pp. 649–663). All these charges are repeated in a letter to Avitus, dealing with the heresies of the περὶ ἀρχῶν. [Ep. cxiv. (= Benev. 94.)]

(3) THEOPHILUS AND THE EGYPTIAN MONKS.

While this controversy was in progress, the state of affairs at Alexandria had been transformed. Theophilus, who had made himself conspicuous by his antagonism to Epiphanius and his partisans in Egypt, had now changed sides, abandoning Isidorus with the "Tall Brethren" and his other allies among the monks of the Origenist faction. [ISIDORUS (28). DIOSCORUS (4). AMMONIUS (1). EUTHYMIUS (3). EUSEBIUS (117).] A passage in his Easter letter of A.D. 399 had roused a storm of passion among the adherents of the anthropomorphist party. They had gathered in great force, and threatened the bishop with instant vengeance. In his alarm he evaded their anger by equivocation. "In seeing you," he said, "I see the face of God" [οὕτως ὑμᾶς εἶδον ὡς θεοῦ πρόσωπον]; implying his belief in the corporeal nature of the Deity; at their demand he also disclaimed all sympathy with Origen and his doctrines. (Gennadius, *De Script. Eccl.* xxxiii. Migne, *P.*, vol. 58. Soc. *H. E.* vi. 7. Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 11.) About the same time, Isidorus, whom Theophilus had put forward as a rival claimant against Chrysostom for the throne of Constantinople, quarrelled with his patron, unable any longer to brook his avarice and tyranny. (Isidorus of Pelusium, i. 152, 310, ed. Commel. 1605.) Theophilus sought unsuccessfully to retaliate by a false accusation. The monks of the Origenist party took sides against the bishop, and he in his rage made their religious views a weapon against them. (Theophilus, in Hieron. *Ep.* xcii. § 3. Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 12.) Theophilus first convened a synod at Alexandria, probably in A.D. 400, at which Origen and his books were formally condemned, not without resistance, if it is to this incident that Sulpicius Severus refers in his account of the shameful strife at Alexandria over the books and opinions of Origen. (*Dial.* i. 6, Galland, *Bibl.* viii. p. 404.) Theophilus next wrote to Anastasius (Hieron. c. *Rufin.* ii. § 22) and also addressed to the bishops of Cyprus and Palestine a letter preserved in the translation of Hieronymus, exhorting them to join in the crusade. Justinian in his letter to Mennas quotes a fragment of another epistle written by Theophilus, either from this synod or from another held about the same time at Alexandria or in the Nitra. It attacks Origen for heresy with regard to the pre-existence and fall of souls, and mentions Heraclas, wrongly as we have seen, as the bishop who expelled him from Alexandria. (Mansi, *Conc.* vol. iii. p. 973, foll.)

As a result of this appeal a synod was held at Jerusalem, and from it a reply was sent to Theophilus acquiescing in the condemnation of the heresies which he had mentioned, but stating that several of those doctrines were not known in Palestine (Mansi, vol. iii. p. 989; Supp. vol. i. p. 271). Another synod was held in Cyprus, and Epiphanius, at the request of Theophilus his old antagonist, united with him in putting Origen's works under a ban (Mansi, vol. iii. p. 1020, 1022; Hieron. *Epp.* xc. xci. xcii.; Soc. *H. E.* vi. 10; Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 14). Chrysostom was proof against all pressure.[a]

The most important counts of the indictment brought against the Origenists by Theophilus are contained in the circular letter to the bishops of Palestine and Cyprus mentioned above, and in his Easter letters of A.D. 401, 402, and 404; all of which are preserved in the translations of Hieronymus (*Epp.* xcii. xcvi. xcviii. c). Gennadius also mentions a large treatise ("unum et grande volumen") composed by Theophilus against the Origenists (*De Script. Eccl.* xxxiii. in

[a] Mansi, ll. c., sets these synods in 399, A.D., agreeing with Walch (*Kirchenversam.* p. 245), and Baronius ad. ann.; Pagi, in 401, A.D.; ad ann. n. 2, foll. cf. Hefele, *Councils*, vol. ii. § 112, Migne, *Dict. Conc.*, vol. i, pp. 82–85.

Migne, vol. lviii. pp. 1077, 1078); and Cyril of Alexandria a discourse; but both are lost.

In the synodal letter Theophilus first enumerates the heretical doctrines of the περὶ ἀρχῶν, viz. (a) It is true that the Son is similar to us, but false that He is similar to the Father. (b) He is as inferior to the Father as Peter and Paul are inferior to Him. (c) The kingdom of Christ will have an end. (d) The devil will at some future time be purified from evil, and will with Christ be made subject to some other power. The next heretical doctrine (e) that we must not pray to the Son either alone or with the Father, is taken from the Book of Prayer (περὶ εὐχῆς). The sources of the rest are not stated: they are as follows: (f) The body of the Resurrection will be not only material but mortal, and in the course of ages it will vanish into thin air. (g) The angels were not originally created in different orders for different service, but were higher spirits fallen in different degrees from their several estates ("diversis lapsibus et ruinis"). (h) The Israelites sacrificed to angels as the heathen to demons. (i) That Origen attributes to the heavenly bodies a fore-knowledge of events which the devil will bring about, thus approving of heathen astrology. (j) That Origen permitted and practised the use of magic. (k) That he denied that the Son of God became man, interpreting Philippians ii. 7, not of the Divine Word but of the human soul of Christ which came down from above. (l) That Christ will at some future time suffer for the redemption of the devil as he has already suffered for the redemption of man (Hieron. *Ep.* xcii. § 24). In the first Easter Letter (Hieron. *Ep.* xcvi.) of A.D. 401, Theophilus repeats several of the charges enumerated above. Thus (c) is repeated in §§ 5–7; (d) in § 8; (e) in § 14; (f) in §§ 9, 13, 15; (j) in § 16; and (l) in §§ 10, 11. Theophilus also combats the theory that the terrestrial system is merely the product of sin among the higher orders, that matter is in itself evil and vain, and that the soul was sent down to earth in punishment for sin in a previous existence (§§ 17–19). Theophilus adds as a result of this degradation of matter that the Origenists dishonour the honourable estate of matrimony (§ 18); but it is possible that for his own purpose he here identifies them with the impure sect mentioned by Epiphanius. The second Easter Letter A.D. 402 (Hieron. *Ep.* xcviii.) is still more vehement. With general abuse of Origen, whom it styles "the hydra of all heresies" ("hydram omnium haereseon") it combines several new statements of old charges. The points assailed are as follows: (i.) Origen's misuse of allegory. By allegorical shadows and empty images he robs Scripture of its truth (§ 10). (ii.) That through the fall of spirits from heaven God was compelled to create bodies to contain them, and that the terrestrial system is thus the outcome of sin (§ 10). (iii.) That man dies many times, soul and body undergoing incessant transformation by union or separation (*i.e.* a doctrine of μετεμψύχωσις in a modified form) (§ 11). (iv.) That angels were made principalities and powers according to merit after the fall of the devil (§ 12). (v.) That the operation of the Spirit does not extend to inanimate and irrational beings. This Theophilus controverts by the ordinances of Baptism and the Eucharist, for the efficacy of which consciousness is not essential (§ 13). (vi.) The distinction between the human and the divine soul of Christ. By this false doctrine, says Theophilus, Origen destroys the universal faith (§ 14). (vii.) That νοῦς, *i.e.* the higher intelligence, was corrupted to ψύχη (ψῦχος, κ. τ. λ.) because it had lost the fervour of divine love (§ 15). (viii.) That as the Father and the Son are one, so the Son and the soul which He assumed are one (§ 16). (ix.) That God created only so many rational creatures as He could govern, conceive, keep in subjection, and rule by providence (§ 18). The third Easter Letter (A.D. 404, Hieron. *Ep.* c.) only repeats charges already mentioned.

Theophilus meanwhile had enforced his arguments by more active measures. In A.D. 400, he proceeded through the Nitrian desert, denouncing the Origenist party and arming their foes to attack them. More than three hundred monks were driven into exile, among them the "Tall Brethren," who finally took refuge with about fifty companions at Constantinople (Soc. *H. E.* vi. cc. 7, 9; Sozom. *H. E.* viii. cc. 12, 13). Chrysostom, the bishop, though not admitting the fugitives into full communion, entertained them hospitably, and interceded with Theophilus in their behalf. The latter, acting either on false information or in eagerness to revenge his former disappointment, at once sent emissaries to Constantinople to accuse Chrysostom of having illegally admitted excommunicated monks to communion (A.D. 401). In the meantime the complaints of the monks had reached the emperor, Arcadius, and he summoned Theophilus to appear in his own defence. Unwilling to obey the summons in person, the bishop deferred his coming, but arranged that Epiphanius should go on in advance and use his great influence to discredit the accusers, who were imprisoned till the character of their charges could be established (A.D. 402). The history of the struggle which ensued has been told elsewhere, and only such incidents as bear directly upon the condemnation of Origenism will be repeated here. [CHRYSOSTOM (d) and (e). DIOSCORUS (4). EPIPHANIUS (1).]

Epiphanius, after provocation by irregularities not unlike those committed by him in Palestine, demanded that Chrysostom should expel Dioscorus and sign a condemnation of Origen's works. But for an emphatic warning he would, in the Church of the Apostles, have publicly anathematised Dioscorus, his companions, the books of Origen, and the bishop. Chrysostom, on his side, insisted that both parties should wait for the synod to judge between them (Soc. *H. E.* vi. 14; Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 14. Cassiodorus, *Hist. Trip.* x. 12 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxix.). Epiphanius had already attempted to secure the adhesion of the bishops in the city, producing the decrees of the synod in Cyprus, and demanding their signatures in token of assent. Some yielded out of respect for Epiphanius; others, and prominently Theotimus of Scythia, gave an emphatic refusal (Soc. *H. E.* vi. 12; Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 14; Cassiodorus, *Hist. Trip.* x. 11). Foreseeing failure, and having other reasons for suspicion, Epiphanius, after a final altercation with Chrysostom, set out for Cyprus and died at sea, A.D. 403 (Cassiodorus, *ib.* c. 12). Sozomen gives a

different account of the departure and death of the great leader. His story is that through the intervention of the empress, Eudoxia, the monks and Epiphanius had an interview, and while they pleaded that they had read his Ἀγκύρωτος, he admitted that he had not read the literature on their side. He was moved by their entreaties, and was reconciled to them before his departure; the recrimination between the two bishops is referred to an earlier occasion. This account is not corroborated by other evidence, and it seems improbable that Epiphanius, who was a sincere bigot, should have at the last come to suspect the character of the man who had for so long adroitly used him as a tool to gratify his personal resentment. (Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 15.)

Before long Theophilus himself arrived at Constantinople, attended by a crowd of satellites. He succeeded at once in reversing his position ("ex reo subito factus est auctor et iudex." Binius in Mansi, vol. iii. p. 1147). Nothing more is heard of the charge against him, and it is Chrysostom who is cited to appear before a council convened not at Constantinople but at Chalcedon, on the estate ("suburbium") of the imperial prefect, Rufinus (Synodus ad Quercum, ἐπὶ δρῦν). Paul of Heraclea presided, and of the thirty-six bishops present the majority were creatures of Theophilus. Even the eastern contingent included some avowed foes of Chrysostom.[1] It was with persons not principles that the council dealt. In the original indictment of Chrysostom the charge of Origenism does not appear in a single one of the twenty-nine clauses. Socrates and Sozomen agree in asserting that the question was not discussed at all by the assembly (Soc. *H. E.* vi. 15; Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 17). At a later stage of the proceedings, however, there was an indirect reference to the bishop's Origenistic tendencies. John, a monk, accused the bishop Heraclides of being an Origenist and a thief; and bishop Isaac in a list of seventeen offences includes three which bear distinctly upon the point in question, though in reality the doctrinal issue is entirely obscured by personal considerations. It was alleged that (i.) Chrysostom, to please the Origenists, had beaten and imprisoned the monk John; (ii.) that Epiphanius on that account had refused to hold communion with him; (iii.) that Chrysostom had received the Origenistic monks, whom Theophilus had excommunicated, though he would not release prisoners actually in communion with the church and possessing letters of commendation. The first of these allegations, setting aside the reference to Chrysostom's heretical tendencies, had already been discussed in dealing with the second clause of the original indictment. The council now proceeded to consider the other points, and finally condemned both Chrysostom and Heraclides. The verdict, however, had no reference to doctrine, but only to conduct and demeanour. It must also be remembered that another large gathering of bishops friendly to Chrysostom was held at the same time, and that the decisions of Chalcedon would certainly have been reversed but for the overwhelming influence of the imperial court, which sent the bishop into exile. Innocent of Rome, to whom the result of the council's deliberations was announced, expressed a distinct disapproval in a letter still preserved in part (Palladius, *De Vit. Chrys.* c. ii.; Mansi, vol. iii. p. 1095, cf. p. 1117; Coustant, Ep. Pont. Roman. p. 787). The unfortunate Egyptian monks play a very subordinate part in the conflict to which they had given rise. Dioscorus died before the council; Ammonius, about the same time. The remainder made no specific recantation of Origenistic views, but were readily received back into communion by Theophilus, who had already pronounced a panegyric over the grave of Ammonius (Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 17). How little he cared for the cause which he championed may be inferred from the fact, that he still continued to read the very books which he had ordered to be destroyed, justifying his conduct on the principle of discrimination, saying that he read "culling the flower and passing by the thorn" (Soc. *H. E.* vi. 17).

[1] The date of the synod is disputed, but there is a great preponderance of authority for 403 A.D., vid. Hefele, vol. ii. § 115; Harduin, i. pp. 1037, foll.; Baronius, ad ann. 403, nn. 17, 18, 19, cf. Migne, *Dict. des Conciles*, i. pp. 551, 559 ("Du Chêne"). For the Acts, cf. Photius, cod. lix.; Mansi, vol. iii. pp. 1141–1154; and Labbe, vol. ii. pp. 1323, foll.

VI.

After the council of Chalcedon, save for casual and individual utterances, the Origenistic controversy was at rest for a century and a half. Some authorities, however, have recognised a condemnation of Origen's teaching in the proceedings of a synod at Diospolis, Lydda in Palestine, held in A.D. 415. The opinion of a council, small, meagre and disreputable (Hieron. *Ep.* cxliii.), cannot in any case claim any considerable weight; the facts moreover are far from clear. It appears that Pelagius was there brought to trial before fourteen bishops of Palestine on various charges of heresy, including an assertion that in the Day of Judgment sinners and the wicked would find no mercy, but would be utterly consumed (penitus exurendos) with everlasting fires. Pelagius vindicated his orthodoxy by appealing to Matt. xvi. 46, and added, "If anyone is of a different opinion, he is an Origenist" (et si quis aliter credit, Origenista est). The reply of the synod is ambiguous, though Pelagius was certainly acquitted on this as on the other charges. The words are these: "Hoc ergo synodus dixit non alienum esse ab ecclesia" (Baluze in Mansi, vol. iv. p. 316; Harduin i. p. 2009). Augustine applies the reference, i.e. in "Origenista est," to the doctrine of restoration, which, as he states, the church most deservedly abhors. The reply of the synod cannot, however, be understood as countenancing the assertion of Pelagius, that to hold a different opinion on the point was to be an Origenist and a heretic; nor does it prove that the doctrine of Origen about the punishment of the wicked has been "by itself condemned by the church." This indeed was Augustine's contention, but he was a consistent foe of Origen and his system (August. *De Gest. Pelag.* iii. n. 9, 10. Cf. *De Civ. Dei*, xxi. 17; *De Haer.* xliii.; and *Ad Orosium, c. Prisc. et Origen.* Migne, P. vol. xlii. pp. 670–678). The pronoun "*hoc*" must refer either to Pelagius's original assertion or to his vindica-

tion, not to an incidental detail in the reply. (For the synod of Diospolis, vid. Mansi, vol. iv. pp. 311–320; Harduin, i. p. 2009; Hefele, vol. ii. § 118; Pusey, *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?* pp. 134, foll.; Oxenham, *What is the Truth as to Everlasting Punishment?* vol. ii. p. 12, foll. For the Roman Catholic view, vid. Père Daniel, *Recueil de divers Ouvrages*, t. i. p. 635.)

Two official references to the doctrines of Origen occur during the fifth century. Leo I. the Great, stated that in his opinion Origen had been justly condemned for his doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul (*Ep.* xxxv. Migne, P. vol. liv. p. 807); and a synod at Rome under Gelasius (A.D. 494? Hefele A.D. 409. vol. ii. § 217), at which a great number of heretical works were put in an *index prohibitorum*, allowed those writings of Origen and Rufinus to be read which Hieronymus had not rejected as hurtful. Eusebius, though censured for his defence of heresy, was tolerated for his general excellence. (Mansi, vol. viii. pp. 163–165; Migne, *Dict. des Conc.* ii. pp. 595–599.)

VII.—The Home Synod and the Fifth Council.

The last stage of the controversy is the most intricate of all, complicated as it is by confusion of documents and conflict of authorities. Upon the central point of dispute, whether Origen was condemned at the fifth general council or not, it is impossible to pronounce any opinion with more than an approach to certainty. The question is one which has divided ecclesiastical historians of all centuries. It will be convenient to state at the outset the chief contemporary authorities and documents from which our information is derived. They are as follows: (1) A letter of the emperor Justinian to Mennas, the primate of Constantinople, containing an elaborate indictment of the doctrines attributed to Origen, and concluding with a series of anathemas which can be divided into nine or into ten clauses (Mansi, vol. ix. pp. 487–534). (2) A series of fifteen anathemas, brought to light by Peter Lambeck of Vienna in the 17th century, and then included in the acts of the fifth council (Mansi, vol. ix. pp. 395, foll.). (3) A life of Sabas, a Palestine monk, by Cyril of Scythopolis; a good authority for the details of the local controversy, but not trustworthy beyond this limited range (in Coteler. *Monument. Sacr. Eccl. Graec.* vol. iii.). (4) The *Breviarium* of Liberatus (in Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* vol. xii.; and Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxviii). (5) Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 38 (Migne, vol. lxxvi. pt. 2, pp. 2771, foll.). References to authorities of secondary importance will be given in the course of the narrative.

According to Cyril's account, strife arose among the monks of the Palestine Laura about A.D. 520. Four monks of the New Laura had Origenist sympathies, and were therefore expelled by Agapetus, the head of the community. After an ineffectual appeal to their archbishop, they were secretly restored by Maimas, who succeeded Agapetus. (Cyril, op. cit. c. 36.) After the lapse of some time, Sabas, the head of the monasteries in Palestine, seeing the power of the Origenists on the increase, came to Constantinople about A.D. 530, and asked for a general expulsion of all those who avowed those heretical views. A favourable answer was made to his request, but Sabas died in A.D. 531, before any decided action had been taken to carry out the promise, and Origenism then spread from the New Laura among the other monastic communities, in large measure owing to the influence and support of Domitian and Theodorus Ascidas, who formerly held positions of power and honour in that body. These two leaders had succeeded in gaining the favour of the emperor Justinian, and were by him advanced to high office; Theodorus to the archbishopric of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Domitian to the bishopric of Ancyra, in Galatia. After their promotion, which occurred about A.D. 537, they still continued to reside at court, using all their influence to support their partisans in Palestine, where controversy was still fierce between the Origenists and the "Sabaites," as the orthodox monks were named by their foes. (l.c. c. 83.) Gelasius, the successor of Sabas, caused a treatise against Origen, that written by Antipater of Bostra, to be read in the monastery, and procured a new expulsion of the Origenists. (l. c. c. 84.) The ejected monks betook themselves to a certain Eusebius, present at that time in the country with authority, who decided that Gelasius must either restore the Origenists or expel their adversaries. (c. 85.) The latter course was adopted, and in their distress these assailants of Origenism appealed to Ephraim, patriarch of Antioch. [EPHRAIM (6).] He responded to their complaints, convened a synod, and condemned the leaders [τοὺς προαγωνιστὰς αὐτοὺς] of the Origenist party in person besides anathematising their doctrines. (c. 85, cf. Mansi, vol. ix. p. 23.)[a] Nonnus, the Origenist leader, and his supporters, indignant at this proceeding, endeavour to avenge themselves by an insult to Ephraim; bringing pressure to bear upon Peter, the patriarch of Jerusalem, to induce him to obliterate the name of their foe from the sacred triptych of Jerusalem. Peter on his part offered no open resistance, but engaged Gelasius and his friend Sophronius to draw up a treatise against the Origenists and in support of Ephraim. This work, when completed, he sent to the emperor, adding a letter of his own to enforce its argument. Justinian in reply condemned the Origenists in an authoritative decree, signed not only by Mennas, the patriarch of Constantinople, but by Theodorus and Domitian, who found it impossible for the moment to withstand the storm. (c. 85.) The edict, however, did not settle the conflict in Palestine, where another ejection was followed by a temporary compromise. (c. 86.) Gelasius made a fresh attempt to secure help from the emperor, and on his homeward way, having been thoroughly out-generalled by Askidas, died at Amorium. (A.D. 545?) (c. 87.) His vacant place was filled by Georgius, an Origenist, and for the time that faction prevailed. But Nonnus died and Georgius was disgraced. Cassianus followed, and was succeeded by Conon. (c. 88.)

[a] From the fragment of the acts preserved it appears that this council was not convened in response to the edict of Justinian, but by Ephraim on his own account. Cf. Mansi, l.c. and also p. 707.

By this time the Origenist party was rent by internal discord, and Isidorus, one of their leaders, took sides with Conon, a staunch opponent. (c. 89.) A new effort on the part of Conon and his friends was made at Constantinople, where Askidas caused them much annoyance. Their hostility was intensified by events at Jerusalem, where Macarius, an Origenist, had succeeded to the patriarchal chair at the death of Peter. The complaints of the monks reach the emperor, in spite of all intrigue, and his resentment is roused. The fifth general council is summoned, mainly owing to a treatise of Conon (λίβελλος). Origen is anathematised, his followers outlawed, and Macarius ousted. (c. 90.) Eustochius is sent to carry out the decrees of the Council in Palestine. He supersedes Macarius, and expels the Origenists completely. Peace is finally restored, all the bishops signing the anathemas. The account given by Evagrius (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. cc. 37, 38) differs fundamentally from the version of Cyril. The same names recur, but in very different circumstances. He asserts that Eustochius, the bishop of Jerusalem, had endeavoured to clear the Origenists out of Palestine, but was thwarted by Askidas who defended them. Eustochius, therefore, sends Conon and Rufus to Constantinople. They report to the emperor on the heresy of (i.) Origen, (ii.) Evagrius and Didymus. Then Askidas, to create a diversion from Origen, brings up the case of Theodore of Mopsuestia. The fifth general council was then held. It first condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia, Evagrius and Didymus; subsequently letters from Conon, Eulogius, Syriacus, and Pancratius, were laid before the assembly, and then after discussion Origen was condemned as well.

Against this we may set the account of Liberatus. (*Breviarium*, 23, 24.) According to him, Pelagius, the Papal Apokrisiar, on his way back from Gaza to Constantinople, was met by monks from Jerusalem anxious to secure a condemnation of Origenist doctrine. As Pelagius was a rival of Askidas, their cause was in good hands. He took up the cause, and obtained from the emperor an edict of condemnation signed by Mennas and a number of bishops at Constantinople, presumably at an assembly of the Home Synod (σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα). ("Iubente eo dictata est in Origenem et illa capitula anathematis damnatio, quam subscripserunt una cum Menna archiepiscopo episcopi apud Constantinopolim reperti," c. 23.) This letter of condemnation was sent to Vigilius of Rome, Zoilus of Alexandria, Ephraim of Antioch, and Peter of Jerusalem, all of whom united in signing its decrees; and so, adds Liberatus, "Origen was condemned when dead, after being condemned when alive" ("damnatus est mortuus qui vivens olim fuerat ante damnatus"). Askidas then in retaliation induced Justinian to write against the "Three Chapters," and to condemn Theodore of Mopsuestia who had vehemently attacked Origen's allegorical method.

To harmonise these three versions is impossible on the face of it; but accepting Cyril's account of the earlier incidents of the struggle, we may reconcile his story in the main with that of Liberatus, either identifying the treatise presented to Pelagius with that drawn up by Gelasius and Sophronius (cf. Hefele, vol. ii. pp. 787, 788), or supposing the one to have followed and supported the other (cf. Walch, Ketz., vol. vii., pp. 668, 669.)[x] We may also assume that it was in deference to this appeal that Justinian addressed his edict to Mennas for the general suppression of Origenism throughout the empire, probably between A.D. 541–543. That famous epistle (in Mansi, vol. ix. pp. 487, foll.; Labbe, vol. v. pp. 635, foll.) consists of three well-defined parts. In the first Justinian enumerates the most vital errors of Origen, referring specially to his views on the Subordination of the Son, the pre-existence and fall of the soul, the restitution of the wicked, and the plurality of worlds. Then in contrast to a series of passages selected mainly from the περὶ ἀρχῶν, he gives extracts from the Fathers, to demonstrate the palpable heresy of Origen. Lastly, he condemns the doctrines, the person, and the adherents of the heretic, in a series of anathemas which read as follows:—(i.) Whosoever believes or affirms that human souls pre-existed, i.e. that they were once spirits and holy powers, which weary of beholding God, became degenerate, and because their love grew cold were called souls (ψύχαι) and in punishment sent down into bodies, let him be anathema. (ii.)...that the soul of our Lord pre-existed and was united with the Divine Word before becoming incarnate and being born of the Virgin, etc. (iii.)... that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ was first fashioned in the womb of the Virgin, and that the Divine Word was subsequently united with it and the pre-existing soul, etc. (iv.)...that the Divine Word became like all celestial orders, cherub for cherubim, seraph for seraphim, and so through all degrees, etc. (v.)... that in the resurrection bodies will be circular and not like ours (i.e. straight), etc. (vi.)...that the sun, moon, and stars, and the waters above the firmament, are spiritual and rational beings, etc. (vii.)...that Christ in after ages will be crucified for demons as He was for men, etc. (viii.)...that the power of God was limited, and that He created only so many worlds as He could comprehend, etc. (ix.)...that the punishment of demons and wicked men is but for a time, and will end in a universal restitution, etc. (x.) let Origen be anathema, and all who hold or teach his doctrines.

At the same time Mennas was directed by the emperor to convene a synod of the bishops and abbats under his jurisdiction, and to pronounce a formal condemnation of Origen in response to the imperial rescript; to send copies of the proceedings to all other ecclesiastical authorities, and to see that for the future no one should be ordained priest or abbat without first signing this condemnation. A similar edict was sent, as we saw above, to Alexandria, Antioch, Rome, and Jerusalem; and the mandate was everywhere accepted without open demur. At Constantinople Mennas assembled the bishops resident in the city ("episcopi apud Constantinopolim reperti." Liberat. l.c. c. 23), at a σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα, which echoed the anathemas of the emperor with one consent. Even such prominent and powerful disciples of Origen as Askidas and Domitian were forced to bow before the

[x] Hefele also supposes Evagrius to have confused with this earlier treatise that presented by Conon and his friends ten years later (l.c.)

storm, and to sign the condemnation with their opponents.[y]

There is strong reason for attributing to this Home Synod, under Mennas, the fifteen anathemas discovered by Lambeck, and inserted in the proceedings of the fifth general council. Hefele has discussed the question with great care, and he decides with Walch (*Ketz.* vol. vii. pp. 671, foll.; vol. viii. pp. 281, foll.), Doellinger (*Church History*, Engl. Trans. vol. ii. p. 180), Dupin (*Nouv. Bibl.* vol. v. pp. 203, foll.), and others, that the heading of the Vienna manuscript (τῶν ἁγίων ρξέ [=165] πατέρων τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἁγίας πεμπτῆς συνόδου κανόνες) represents only untrustworthy tradition. Evagrius is the only historian who connects specific anathemas of Origen with the fifth council, and his other errors shew how little confidence can be placed in his unsupported testimony.[z] We have already seen how he confuses the treatise of Sophronius and Gelasius with that of Conon, and while he rightly couples the condemnation of Origen with the condemnation of Evagrius and Didymus, he attributes all the proceedings to the fifth council, where, whatever may have occurred about Origen, the case of the other two was certainly not considered. Evagrius, however, as Hefele suggests, gives us some guidance in the matter. Quoting from the acts which he attributes to the council, he gives with other extracts a reference in the fifth article to Theodorus Askidas and some opinion of his about the resurrection. Combining this with two other fragments preserved by Evagrius, Hefele comes to the conclusion, that the complete document from which they were taken corresponded in form to the letter of Justinian, and was in fact the reply of the synod to the imperial mandate, containing (1) the reply of the synod to the emperor, (2) quotations from the works of Origen and his followers, with the reference to Askidas, and (3) the series of fifteen anathemas. We know that Askidas was present at the fifth council and took part in its proceedings; if therefore, we attribute these anathemas to it, we must assume that he not only again assented to the condemnation of his own principles in a form still stronger than before, but allowed such a decree to be passed without strenuous resistance. Evagrius, again, connects the condemnation of Origen with the emperor's letter to Mennas; this is quite accurate, but on the other hand Mennas was dead before the fifth council was held. The confusion seems to have arisen from combining the acts of several synods under Justinian in one codex, a very common cause of error (cf. Garnerius, c. ii.; in Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* vol. xii. p. 168; in Migne, *P.* vol. lxviii). At the Home Synod under Mennas, Askidas was not present; he signed the decree, but took no part in the deliberations. Vincenzi, who will have no condemnation of Origen on any terms, stands alone in denying that the Home Synod under Mennas was held, but his arguments have little force (vol. iv. cc. xii. xiii. pp. 125, foll.). To that assembly at any rate the two series of anathemas must belong; and if Origen was condemned at the fifth general council, it was in another form and in a different manner. This supposition is strengthened by the close resemblance that exists between the two series of anathemas. The latter restates in ampler detail the heresies outlined in the first, developing specially the errors regarding the nature of Christ, and supplementing the emperor's statement with the fuller knowledge of trained theologians. Without reproducing the fifteen clauses in detail, it may be well to state in a brief summary the doctrines with which they deal. (1) The pre-existence of the soul, and its restitution to its original holiness. (2) The derivation of the rational creation from spirits, at first incorporeal and immaterial, but now differentiated by varying guilt into thrones, principalities, powers, and other orders. (3) That sun, moon, and stars are degenerate spirits. (4) The human body a penalty for sin. (5) As spirits fall, so they may rise. (6) When the other spirits sank to the level of men or of demons, only one abode in the love and vision of God; this became Christ, Lord of creation and life. The universe was made by the creative mind (ὁ νοῦς, ὃν φασὶ δημιουργικόν), not by the Holy Trinity. (7) Christ will pass through all orders of being, suffering for each as for men. (8) The divine word did not become incarnate, but the Creative Spirit which was in reality Christ. The divine word is called Christ only in a secondary sense on account of its union with the Creative Spirit. (9) The divine word did not suffer for men, but the νοῦς, ὃν ἀσεβοῦντες λέγουσι κυρίως Χριστὸν, τῇ τῆς μονάδος γνώσει πεποιημένον. (10) The body of Christ in His resurrection is circular, and so will ours be. (11) Judgment to come is the destruction of the body, and there will be no material resurrection. (12) All inferior orders of beings in heaven and earth are united to the divine word as closely as the νοῦς; the kingdom of Christ will have an end. (13) The soul of Christ pre-existed like the soul of man, and He is similar to men in substance and strength. (14) All rational existences will ultimately become merged in unity, and material existence will be brought to nothing. (15) The future life of spirits will be like their former life, and so the end of all things will be the same as the beginning.

Having thus settled the preliminary question, it now remains for us to discuss whether Origen was condemned in any shape or form at the fifth general council; for the fact that specific anathemas have been erroneously attributed to that assembly does not prove that no condemnation whatsoever was there pronounced against Origen and his doctrines. The reported proceedings of the synod at first sight seem to give a plain answer to our enquiry. In the acts of the eighth session, which was held on 2nd June, A.D. 553, the name of Origen occurs in a list of heretics condemned in the eleventh canon. It

[y] There is great diversity of opinion as to the date of this council. Baronius sets it in 538, A.D. ad ann., note 34. foll., Garnerius, in 541, A.D. He discusses the question at length in connection with the date of Pelagius's visit to Gaza, vid. Migne, *P.* vol. lxviii. pp. 1053, foll., and in Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* vol. xii. (Liberatus). Hefele supports 543, A.D. vol. ii. § 255, of Noris, *Dissert. de Quint. Syn.* vol. iv. pp. 990 (Ballerini). The date has been fixed as late as 545, A.D.

[z] The Anathemas preserved by Nicephorus, *H. E.* xvii., cc. 27, 28 [Migne, vol. cxliv. p. 283 foll.] are those which we know to be Justinian's, and sent to the Home Synod.

there stands side by side with the names of Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, and Eutyches. There is reason, however, to suspect the genuineness of the reference. The name of Origen, unlike the rest, does not occur in its due chronological order. But for this exception, the list includes only those heretics condemned at the first four general councils. In the Roman copy of the acts, the name of Origen is here omitted, nor does it occur with the rest in the emperor's confession of faith (§ 10) (cf. Migne, vol. lxxxvi. pt. 1, p. 1018; Hefele, vol. ii. § 274, pp. 893–899). Even if we admit that the fifth council added the name of Origen to those anathematised by the four preceding councils, it is difficult to explain how or when the assembly could have decided upon the preliminary censure before inserting his name in the condemned list. The widest difference of opinion prevails among historians. Noris, for instance, admits that the council was convened solely to discuss the "three chapters," but he suggests that before proceeding to their real business, they considered the case of Origen as well. De Marca, on the other hand, thinks that the condemnation of Origen came at the close of the sittings, and that the synodical acts, as we have them, are mutilated (*De Epist., Vigil.* c. xxiii. pp. 36, foll.; Diss. iii. edit. by Baluze, Paris, 1669). This is the view of Natalis Alexander also (*H. E.* saecl. tert. Diss. xvi. § 11). Some historians, again, suppose that Origen's doctrines were condemned only after a fair trial and discussion; others, that they were condemned without any such formality.

The evidence against the supposition that Origen was condemned at the fifth general council has been summarised with great care by the Rev. H. N. Oxenham, in the work entitled "What is of the Truth as to Everlasting Punishment?" (Part ii.), a reply to Dr. Pusey's "What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?" The chief heads of the evidence are as follows:—(1) In the fifth council there is no mention of Origen except in one single place (canon xi.), and even this may possibly be an interpolated forgery. (2) No mention of Origen and his errors occurs in the edict of Justinian convening the fifth council, though he there enumerates the subjects for discussion (Labbe, vol. v. pp. 419, foll.; Mansi, vol. ix. p. 178, foll.), whereas in the letter to Mennas on the occasion of the home synod the errors are stated and the synod is asked to condemn them (Mansi, *ib.* p. 487, foll.). (3) Vigilius, the pope, in confirming the acts of the council, makes no allusion to any condemnation of Origen; and indeed throughout his letters from A.D. 540 to 554, there is no reference of the kind. Pelagius and Gregory are silent too, and it is not reasonable to suppose that if such a decision had been arrived at in the council three successive popes would have been silent on the point; the less so that Vigilius himself discusses at considerable length what the council had done (Mansi, vol. ix. pp. 414, foll.). (4) The reference supplied by the evidence of later councils (*e.g.* the seventh general council), historians and other writers is not sufficient to establish Origen's condemnation against the silence of the highest authorities.

The authorities quoted by Dr. Pusey (op. cit.) to sustain the opposite view may be divided into two sets. The first refer to a specific condemnation of Origen at the fifth council. The list includes (1) Cyril of Scythopolis (*Vita Sabae*, c. xc. vid. sup.) (2) Evagrius (*H. E.* iv. 37). (3) Maximus of Aquileia, in his address to the Lateran Council, A.D. 649 (Labbe, vol. vi. pp. 96, 97). (4) The acts of the Lateran Council itself (Labbe, vol. vi. pp. 75, foll. (5) Sophronius of Jerusalem in a letter to Sergius of Constantinople (Migne, vol. lxxxvii. part 3, pp. 3182–6). (6) Tarasius, in a letter read at the second council of Nicaea, and also an allusion in the definition of the council (vid. Conc. Nic. II. act. viii. Labbe, vol. vii. p. 684). (7) The profession of faith made by a bishop of Rome between A.D. 685 and A.D. 715 (Migne, *P*, vol. cv. p. 49). (8) Photius, cod. 18 and Ep. i. 8, ad Michael. Migne, vol. cii. pp. 643–6, and vol. ciii. pp. 42–58). (9) Nicephorus Callistus (*H. E.* xvii. 27, 28). Without giving all the passages quoted by Dr. Pusey, in which a general reference to a condemnation of Origen is to be found, but apart from any specific allusion to the fifth council, we may select two or three as illustrative of the whole body of testimony. (1) Victor Tununensis (Chron. ad ann. Migne, *P. L.* vol. lxviii. p. 959; Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* vol. xii. p. 231). (2) An imperial edict read at the sixth general council (Labbe, vol. vi. p. 1096). (3) A letter of Leo II. to the emperor Constantine (Labbe, vol. vi. pp. 1017, foll.).

It must be admitted that the value of each individual testimony taken separately is as a rule extremely slight, especially when we remember what intervals of time separated the writers from the events about which they wrote, and the ingenuous way in which one repeats the mis-statements of his predecessors. For all that, it is impossible to refuse to credit them with a certain amount of authority when taken collectively. They prove at the least the existence at a comparatively early date of a belief, that Origen had been condemned at or in connection with the Fifth Council. The evidence is not conclusive, but it is sufficient to deter us from a dogmatic denial that such a condemnation occurred. And without more convincing proof than any that has hitherto been given to support the theory, that the name of Origen as it stands in the Eleventh Canon is a subsequent interpolation, we must accept the clause as it stands. There is another passage in the proceedings of the council, which must not be left without notice. In the course of an argument supporting the legality of anathematising heretics after death, the following passage occurs: "Et multos quidem alios invenimus post mortem anathematizatos, necnon et Origenem; et si ad tempora Theophili sanctae memoriae recurrerit, post mortem inveniet anathematizatum; *quod etiam nunc in ipso fecit et vestra Sanctitas et Vigilius*, religiosissimus papa antiquioris Romae." Without the word "nunc," nothing would be more natural than to explain the passage as a reference to the Home Synod under Mennas; and Hefele, who does not obliterate a word when he is face to face with a difficulty, suggests that the reference in *nunc* is to past not contemporary history (vol. ii. § 270, p. 875). Vincenzi (vol. v. p. 88) has recourse to his usual theory of interpolation; while Noris, taking the word in its ordinary sense, supposes that the

speaker must refer to a condemnation of Origen passed at some earlier session, formal or the reverse (vol. i. p. 639). The passage at any rate makes against the theory, that the condemnation of Origen occurred at the close of the other business of the Council.

At this point it may be convenient to recapitulate the conclusions at which we have arrived, concerning the condemnation of Origen under the emperor Justinian. (1) That Origen was formally condemned at a meeting of the Home Synod held by Mennas at Constantinople about the year 541 A.D., and that the decrees were signed by many influential bishops elsewhere. (2) That to this council must be attributed the letter of Justinian, the anathemas which it contains, and the series of anathemas discovered by Lambeck. (3) That the Fifth General Council, though not commissioned to deal with Origen and his errors, may have passed judgment on the question incidentally, perhaps informally; and that, at any rate, we have no evidence sufficient to warrant us in expunging his name from the eleventh canon.

In whatever way the condemnation was pronounced, the practical measures taken to suppress the Origenist party in Palestine were most effective. The task was easier owing to the internal dissension which had appeared in their midst after the death of Nonnus, their leader, several years before the General Council. Cyril of Scythopolis, from whom we have already quoted, tells us that one of the sects into which the Origenist party split, called themselves "Protoktists" (Πρωτόκτιστοι), holding that the existing soul of Christ was the first and most perfect work of creation. By their opponents they were styled "Tetradites" (Τετράδιτοι), because by thus deifying the pre-existing soul of Christ, they added a fourth person to the Trinity. The other sect had the name of "Isochrists" (Ἰσόχριστοι) attached to them, on account of their characteristic doctrine that all human souls will finally become like unto Christ's. Of the latter party Theodorus Askidas was the most prominent adherent. So bitter was the strife between the two forces that the Protoktists were driven to combine with the orthodox leaders against their fellow heretics: especially when on the death of Peter, the patriarch of Jerusalem, Macarius, a partisan of the Isochrist section, was promoted to the vacant place, mainly through the influence of Askidas. In their extreme danger, the minority went so far as to surrender the doctrine of pre-existence which was so essential an element in their system. After this the issue of the conflict was decisive. Macarius was ousted by order of the emperor. Eustochius was appointed in his stead. The New Laura made an attempt to secede, but the disaffected monks were promptly ejected by Eustochius, and others settled in their room. The other monasteries in Palestine were also cleared of Origenists. Finally, all the bishops of the country, Peter of Abyla excepted, signed the imperial edict of condemnation, and Peter was dismissed from office for contumacy. (Cyril, *Vita Sabae*, cc. 89, 90.) Though Askidas some years later succeeded in ejecting Eustochius in retaliation, the incident hardly belongs to the history of the Origenistic controversy, which at this point comes to a close. Origenism had been crushed in its stronghold, and though the doctrine has survived, finding champions and assailants in every century of the world's history, there has never existed since then a party organised on a similar basis, and using the name of Origen as their title and battle cry.

Authorities.—Original authorities have been already mentioned in the course of the narrative. Of works which deal with the Origenistic controversies in whole or in part, the most important are the following: Doucin, *Histoire des mouvements dans l'Eglise arrivés au sujet d'Origène et de ses doctrines* (Paris, 1700); an anonymous work entitled *Examen de l'Origénisme, ou réponse à un livre intitulé Sentimens différents de quelques théologiens sur l'état des âmes séparées du corps* (1733); Halloix, *Origines Defensus* (Leyden, 1668); Horbius, *Historia Origeniana, sive de ultima origine et progressione haereseos* (Frankfort, 1670); Huet, *Origeniana*, most accessible in the edition of Origen published by Migne; Vincenzi, *In Sancti Gregori Nysseni et Origenis scripta et doctrinam nova defensio*, 4 vols. (Rome, *Morini*, 1865). This is perhaps the most elaborate work, though not the most satisfactory, written on the subject. Among English works, the most valuable are Canon Farrar's *Mercy and Judgment* (cc. xi., xii., especially); the Rev. H. N. Oxenham's *What is the Truth with regard to Eternal Punishment?* (part ii.); and Dr. Pusey's *What is of Faith with regard to Eternal Punishment?* (pp. 129–153), to which the preceding book is a rejoinder. The works of Hefele (*Conciliengeschichte*) and of Walch (*Gesch. d. Ketzereien*, vol. vii. pp. 363, fol., and vol. viii. pp. 280, fol.), are indispensable. Original documents and dissertations will be found in the collections of Labbe and Mansi. Of the historians the most serviceable are Doellinger, Neander, Herzog, Gieseler, and Schroeckh. Much information may also be obtained from Ceillier, Cave, Du Pin, and Tillemont. The dissertations of Garnerius, De Marca, and Noris, have been mentioned elsewhere. Of the special articles upon these controversies, by far the best is Dr. Hefele's in Wetzer und Welte's *Encyclopaedia* (*Origenesstreitigkeiten*). The articles by Dr. E. de Pressensé, in Lichtenberger's *Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses*, and by Moeller in Herzog's *Encyklopaedie*, are also worth consulting, with an article in criticism of Dr. Vincenzi's great work in the Tübingen *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1867, pp. 331, fol.; Migne's Dictionaries (*Hérésies—Conciles*) contain useful summaries. A treatise by Eberhard, *Die Betheiligung des Epiphanius an dem Streite über Origenes*, mentioned by Professor Lipsius of Jena, in his article on Epiphanius, I have unfortunately been unable to obtain. [A. W. W. D.]

ORION (1), bishop of Erythrum in Cyrenaica in the fourth century. When a very old man, his extreme gentleness brought him into contempt. On this account the inhabitants of two of the villages, Palaebisca and Hydrax, chose as their bishop in his stead Siderius, an officer of Valens, to protect them in their business affairs, and also to oppose a bold front to the Arians. Synesius (ep. 67) speaks of Orion as ὁ μακάριος. (*Pat. Graec.* lxvi. 1413 b; Tillem.

viii. 234; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 625.) [SYNESIUS.] [R. J. K.]

ORION (2), a wealthy and leading citizen of Aila on the Red Sea, said to have been restored after possession by a legion of devils through the prayers of Hilarion, the hermit of Palestine, in the end of the 4th century (Jerom. *Vit. Hilar.* § 18 [HILARION]). [W. H. F.]

ORION (3), addressed by Isidore of Pelusium in several letters (lib. i. epp. 264, 293), another (v. 193), a deacon (ii. 16), a monk (i. 181, 194, 195, 468, ii. 159, 268, iii. 45, iv. 137, 155). [C. H.]

ORONTIANUS (HORONTIANUS), addressed by St. Ambrose, *c.* 387, on the nature of the soul (ep. 34) and on some passages in St. Paul (35, 36); in 389 on the question why man, the most perfect of creatures, should have been formed last (43), and on the succession of God's creative acts (44); the epp. 77, 78 discuss the subject of the old and new dispensations, but their date is not apparent. (Ceill. v. 493, 496, 503.) [C. H.]

ORONTIUS (1), Jan. 22, martyr during the Diocletian persecution with Vincentius and Victor in Spain under the governor Rufinus. (*AA. SS.* Boll. Jan. ii. 390–393; Ceill. xi. 306.) [G. T. S.]

ORONTIUS (2), a man of rank and landed proprietor, a friend of St. Augustine, but probably not yet having made up his mind to become a Christian. In his state of doubt he appears to have consulted Augustine, and to have asked permission to pay him a visit. (Aug. *Ep.* 257 al. 123.) [H. W. P.]

ORONTIUS (3), an Italian bishop and a Pelagian. He accompanied Julianus, of Eclana, in his exile, and with him visited Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the patriarch Nestorius. Cf. JULIANUS (15) in t. iii. p. 470 of this Dictionary, where the story is fully told. He caused Anianus, the Pelagian, to translate St. Chrysostom's Homilies on St. Matthew. He dedicated the translation to Orontius. (Cf. Migne's *Pat. Lat.* xlviii. 626; Ceill. vii. 211.) [G. T. S.]

ORONTIUS (4), bishop of Seville, A.D. 462–472. (Florez, *Esp. Sagr.* ix. 138.) [F. D.]

ORONTIUS (5), bishop Elvira (Illiberitanus), subscribes the council of Tarragona in 516 (Hard. ii. 1044). But another reading makes him of Lerida (Ilerditanus). [C. H.]

ORONTIUS (6), bishop, probably of Lerida, signs seventh the canons of the Councils of Tarragona and Gerona, in A.D. 516, 517. In the former he is described as bishop "Eliberitanae civitatis" (Elvira, Granada), but this is probably a mistake for Ilerditanae (Ilerda, Lerida), as it is improbable that a bishop of Elvira should have attended so distant a council, whereas Lerida is near Tarragona. Further, the name Orontius is wanting in the lists of the bishops of Granada (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.*, ii. 115, 122; *Esp. Sag.* xlvi. 93). [F. D.]

ORONTIUS (7), bishop of Merida, was represented by a priest at the 6th Council of Toledo, in January A.D. 638. He also presided over the 7th and 8th Councils of Toledo, in A.D. 646 and 653. By his influence with king REKESVINTH he obtained the restoration of the province of Lusitania, of which Merida was the metropolis, to its ancient limits, which had been curtailed by the severance of the sees which fell within the Suevic dominions. These were Lamego, Viseo, Egitania, and Coimbra. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 349, 358, 385, 709; *Esp. Sag.* iv. 176, xiii. 214; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2) 140.) [F. D.]

OROSIUS, PAULUS, was a native of Tarragona, in Spain, as he himself says (*Hist.* vii. 22), though an expression in a letter of Avitus may be thought to connect him with Braga. (*Ep. Aviti*, Aug. *Opp.* vol. vii. p. 806; Baronius, vol. v. p. 435, A.D. 415.) When the Alani and Vandals were introduced into Spain, A.D. 409, Orosius, though his language is somewhat rhetorical, appears narrowly to have escaped their violence (*Hist.* iii. 20; v. 2; vii. 40). But a danger, more serious in his opinion than that of the barbarian invasion, soon threatened to disturb the church in Spain, viz., the heresies of the Priscillianists, and of the book by Origen περὶ ἀρχῶν, lately translated by St. Jerome, and which had been brought from Jerusalem by Avitus, presbyter of Braga in Portugal, at the same time as another book by Victorinus was brought by another Avitus from Rome. Both of these books condemned the doctrines of Priscillian, but both contained errors of their own. The book by Victorinus attracted but little notice, but the one by Origen, on which some remarks had been made by St. Basil, but whether the great father of that name is not certain, was much more widely read, both in Spain and elsewhere. Two Spanish bishops, Paulus and Eutropius, had already presented to the African church a memorial on heretical doctrines; but not including all that were now current in Spain, and to this St. Augustine had replied in his treatise *De Perfectione justitiæ Hominis* (*Opp.* vol. x. 294), and Orosius, in his zeal against error, proceeded, not as commissioned to do so by the church of Spain, but on his own account, to Africa, to consult St. Augustine as to the best manner of refuting these heretical doctrines, A.D. 415. Augustine speaks of him as young in years, but a presbyter in rank, zealous, alert in intellect, ready of speech, and fitted to be useful in the work of the Lord. He gave a partial reply to this appeal in his treatise *contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas*, saying but little on the subject which forms its title. He referred Orosius to his books against Manicheism, and for further satisfaction, recommended him to go on to Palestine, the seat itself of the errors in question, and there consult St. Jerome, to whom he made him the bearer of two letters, one on the origin of the soul (*Ep.* 166.) [OPTATUS], the other on the meaning of the passage James ii. 10. (*Ep.* 167; see also *Ep.* 169, 13; *Retract.* xi. 44; *Consultatio* or *Commonitorium Oros.* and the reply of Augustine to the same *c. Priscill. et Orig.* opp. vol. viii. pp. 666–678, and Oros. opp. p. 1211, ed. Migne.) The letters were conveyed

duly by their bearer, and their receipt acknowledged in due time by St. Jerome; who, however, excused himself from replying to them at length on the ground of the pressure of troublesome business, by which, no doubt, he meant the debates in Palestine on the Pelagian controversy. including the attack made upon him by John of Jerusalem. (Hieron. *Ep.* 134; Aug. *Ep.* 172.) On arriving in Palestine, Orosius was kindly received by St. Jerome, and took up his residence at Bethlehem, desiring to sit at his feet and listen to his instruction. But being summoned by the clergy, he attended a synod at Jerusalem on July 28, in which he took his seat under the direction of John the bishop, and informed the assembly of what had taken place in Africa respecting Coelestius and Pelagius, viz., that Coelestius had been condemned by a council held A.D. 412 (Aug. *Ep.* 175, 176), and had abruptly departed from the country, that Augustine had written a book against Pelagius, and further sent a letter to the clergy in Sicily, treating of this and other heretical questions, which letter Orosius read to the meeting at the request of the members. He also quoted the judgment of St. Jerome on the Pelagian question, expressed in his letter to Ctesiphon and his Dialogue against the Pelagians. (Hieron. vol. i. *Ep.* 133; vol. ii. p. 495.) The proceedings of the meeting and the decision given by bishop John, will be found above (vol. iii. p. 280), but it may be added to this account that Orosius, apparently on the information of Posserius, Avitus, and Dominus ex duce, perhaps Domninus, believed the interpreter to be both ignorant and dishonest. (Orosius, *Apol.* 3–6; Cod. Theod. vi. 30, 19; Tillemont, vol. xiii. 254.) Forty-seven days after this, viz., on Sept. 13, the feast of the dedication of the church of the Holy Sepulchre (Holy-Cross day), when Orosius presented himself for the purpose of assisting bishop John at the altar, he was at once attacked by him as a blasphemer, a charge which Orosius not only denied, but refuted on the ground that as he spoke only in Latin, John, who only spoke Greek, could not have understood what he said. That there should be false witnesses in Jerusalem is not unlikely, but Orosius did not venture to accuse the bishop of seeking such. The rest of the book is taken up with arguments against Pelagianism, including two long passages identical with some in the book of Aug. *De Natura et Gratia*, c. 12–19, and 3–12, vol. x. p. 249. At the council of 14 bishops held at Diospolis (Lydda) in December of the same year, Orosius was not present (Aug. *De Gest. Pelag.* c. 16); but he returned to Africa early in 416, bearing with him probably the answer of St. Jerome to the letter of St. Augustine, perhaps also his book against the Pelagians, and also the supposed relics of St. Stephen, which had been discovered in the course of the previous December, and which at the request of Avitus he was to convey to the church of Braga, in Portugal. [LUCIANUS (15) vol. iii. p. 349.] Tillemont, vol. xiii. 262. He was also the bearer of a letter from Heros and Lazarus, which he laid before a synod assembled at Carthage about the month of June. (Aug. *Epp.* 175–180; Tillemont, l. c. 263.) He had also received from St. Jerome a letter to St. Augustine concerning the resurrection of the body; which, however, he had handed to Orosius for transcription, and did not deliver to Augustine at the same time as the other letters. (Aug. *Ep.* 180.) About this time, on the request of Augustine, conveyed to him by a deacon named Julian, he undertook his history, chiefly in order to confirm by historical facts the doctrine maintained by St. Augustine in his great work *De Civitate Dei*, on the 11th book of which he was at that time employed. We learn these facts from what Orosius himself says in his 1st chapter, and from a passage in the 5th book, that he wrote his history chiefly if not entirely in Africa. It could not have been begun earlier than 416, and must have been finished in 417, for it concludes with an account of the treaty made in 416 between Wallia, the Gothic king, and the Emperor Honorius. (Oros. *Hist.* v. 2; vii. 43; Clinton, *F. R.*) Having finished his task, Orosius proceeded to fulfil his undertaking of conveying to Spain the relics of St. Stephen. On his way he touched at Port Mahon in Minorca, and being deterred by the accounts of the disturbed state of Spain through the occupation of that country by the Vandals, left his precious treasure there and returned to Africa, after which time nothing more is known of his history. (Ep. Severi, Aug. *Opp.* vol. vii. *App.* Baronius, 418. 4.) Written within the space of little more than a year, and for a special historical purpose, this work of Orosius deserves to be called a historical treatise rather than a formal history, which indeed, it does not pretend to be, though as it includes a portion of the subject belonging to Scripture and to Jewish affairs, its area covers wider space than any other ancient epitome. Besides the Old and New Testaments, he quotes Josephus, the church historians, and writers, as Tertullian, Hegesippus, and Eusebius; and of other writers, Tacitus, Suetonius, Sallust, Caesar, Cicero, and he was no doubt largely indebted to Livy. But he was perhaps not well acquainted with Greek, and for Greek and Oriental history made use of the works of Justin, or rather Trogus Pompeius, and Quintus Curtius, and for Roman affairs, the works of Latin compilers, as Eutropius, Florus, and Valerius Paterculus, together with others of inferior value, as Valerius Antias, Valerius Maximus, and Aurelius Victor. The work in later times became known by the name of Ormesta (mundi) a title which under its various forms of Ormista, Ormesia, Hormesta, Hormista, caused much difficulty and many conjectures to later writers. The most likely explanation is that it represents in a contracted form Or. m.'ista, i.e. *Orosii mundi istoria*, or perhaps *Orosii miseriarum* (mundi) *istoria*, but Pighius thought that the true word was Orchestra, i.e. a stage on which the affairs of the world are set forth, and to this conjecture Andrew Schott, one of the early editors, lent his authority, but the former view seems more probable. Written under the express sanction of St. Augustine, in a pleasing style and at convenient length, and recommended by church authorities as an orthodox Christian work, the history of Orosius became during the middle ages, the standard text-book on the subject, and is quoted largely by Bede, and other mediaeval writers. But while on the one hand he is for the last few years of his history a contemporary and so an original authority, and also undoubtedly supplies some points on which existing writers are defi-

cient (e.g. v. 18, p. 339, the death of Cato; vi. 3, 376, the acquittal of Catiline), it is disfigured by many mistakes, both as to facts and numbers, and by a faulty system of chronology, blemishes which in uncritical ages were not detected, but which more recent examination has brought to light. The general popularity which it enjoyed as the one Christian history, led no doubt to the translation of it made into Anglo-Saxon, by Alfred the Great, of which a portion was published by Elstob in 1690, and the whole, with an English version, in 1773, under the superintendence of Daines Barrington and J. R. Foster. This was reprinted in 1853 in Bohn's Antiquarian Library, under the direction of Mr. B. Thorpe. It was also translated during the 16th century into German and Italian. The 2nd chapter of the first book contains a sketch of universal geography, which is nearly identical with a work called the Cosmography of Aethicus, a writer of whom nothing certain is known. The system on which it is founded has borrowed no light from the work of Ptolemy, or other scientific geographers, but being protected by its supposed orthodoxy, became one of the principal authorities for mediaeval map-makers. (Bevan and Phillott, *Mediaeval Geography*. Introd.) The earliest printed edition of the history appeared at Augsburg, printed by Schüssler, 1471, from a good MS. Another, without a date, by Hermann of Cologne, at Vicenza, probably 1475, and others were printed in the 15th and the 16th centuries at Venice, Cologne, Paris and elsewhere. An edition by Fabricius, with notes, appeared in 1561, which was reprinted in 1575 and 1582. This was again reprinted, with additional notes, by Andrew Schott, at Mayence, in 1615, and embodied in the Bibliotheca Patrum, Lyons, 1677, vol. vi. But the best edition of the complete works of Orosius which has yet appeared is that of Havercamp, in 4to. Leyden, 1738, containing very many valuable notes, and engravings of coins illustrating the text. It was reprinted by Galland in his *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Venice, 1773, vol. 9; and by Migne, *Patrol.* vol. 31, Paris, 1846, with the engravings of coins. The history alone from Havercamp's edition, but without the engravings, edited by Dr. Brohm, was published in 2 vols. 8vo. at Thorn, 1877. Other works beside the history have been attributed to Orosius, but the only two which can claim good authority are the *Liber Apologeticus de Arbitrii Libertate*, and the *Commonitorium ad Augustinum*, already mentioned. The former is included in Havercamp's edition, and the latter in the works of St. Augustine, as mentioned above. [H. W. P.]

ORSISIUS (Orsiesius, Ἀρσίσιος), abbat of Tabenna, A.D. 350, in succession to Petronius. He soon transferred the burden to Theodorus, the favourite disciple of Pachomius (Soz. iii. 14; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* ix. 14; Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii. 292, 324, 325, ed. 1866, *De SS. Pachom. et Theod.* ii. 18, and *Acta* §§ 74, 76; Tillem. vii. 479, 481). Two epistles addressed by Athanasius to Orsisius are printed among the *Works* of Athanasius (*Pat. Gr.* xxvi. 978). [G. T. S.]

ORTIGIUS, bishop, was expelled from his see by the Priscillianists in consequence of his defence of the Catholic faith (Idatius, *Chron.*). He was present at the first Council of Toledo (A.D. 400), which commanded that the churches from which he had been expelled should be restored to him (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 197). There is a difficulty about the name of his see; Idatius gives it as Celenae near Iria, but in the *Acta* of the Council of Toledo, Exuperantius is named as bishop of that place. Gams (*Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. 393) conjectures that Idatius confused Aquae Celenae with Aquae Originum (Orense), and that Ortigius was really bishop of the last place. (*Esp. Sag.* xix. 9.) [F. D.]

OSA (Bosa, *M. H. B.* 618, note), the sixth bishop of Selsey; preceded by Aluberht, and succeeded by Giselhere (*M. H. B.* 618). Nothing is known of the date of Aluberht, and of Giselhere, only that he subscribed charters of 780 and 781. The name of Osa occurs in an undated grant of Nunna, king of Sussex, confirmed by Osmund the king and Osa the bishop, but very difficult to date (Kemble, *C. D.* 1001); in a dated grant of Osmund, Aug. 3, 765, attested by Osa, and probably genuine (*ib.* 1008); another grant of Osmund, attested by 'Osa archiepiscopus,' and evidently garbled (*ib.* 1009), but bearing the date of 770. All these are from the Chichester register and late transcripts. There is, however, in the Lambeth MS. 1212 (*the Canterbury Cartulary*), a grant made to Oswald, bishop of Selsey, of land in Sussex, dated in 772, and attested by Egbert king of Kent, Cynewulf king of Wessex, archbishop Jaenberht, Eadbert, Oswald, Diora and Wigheah bishops. This seems to be genuine, and to supply both a fixed date and a definite orthography for the name of the bishop. Osa, if this be genuine, was an abbreviation of Oswald, as Totta is of Torthelm, and Sigga of Sigfrith. [S.]

OSBALD, a "patrician" of Northumbria, addressed c. 793 along with king Ethelred and the dux Osberct by Alcuin (ep. 11 in *Pat. Lat.* c. 157), and no doubt the Osbald mentioned by Hoveden (t. i. p. 15, ed. Stubbs), anno 796, as succeeding Ethelred in the throne of Northumbria for 27 days, afterwards retiring to Lindisfarne, and finally taking refuge with the king of the Picts. The *Chronicle of Melrose* relates that "king Osbald," once a dux and patrician, became an abbat after his expulsion, died an abbat in 799, and was buried in the church of York. [C. H.]

OSBERCT, a dux, addressed c. 793, with Ethelred, king of Northumbria, and the patrician Osbald, by Alcuin (ep. 11 in *Pat. Lat.* c. 157); thought to be the Osbert, patrician of the Mercians, addressed in two other letters of Alcuin which are now unknown, but of which the fragments survive in William of Malmesbury (*G. R.* lib. i. §§ 70, 94, t. i. 103, 130, ed. Hardy), and are also printed at the end of Alcuin's letters. (*Pat. Lat.* c. 512.) [C. H.]

OSBRAN, anchorite and bishop of Clooncraff, co. Roscommon, died A.D. 752. (*Ann. Tig.*) [J. G.]

OSFRIDA, queen. [Osthryd.]

OSFRITH, son of Edwin, king of Northumbria, and Coenburga his wife, daughter of Cearl,

king of Mercia. He was born during the exile of his sire, and was baptized with his father at York on Easter day, 627 (Beda, ii. 14). He was a valorous soldier, and was slain with Edwin at Haethfelth in 633 (Id. ii. 20; *S. C.* 22, 45). [J. R.]

OSGEARN (OSGEOFU, OSGIFU, OSGIVA), a daughter of Oswulf, king of Northumbria in A.D. 758–9. In 768 she married Alchred, king of Northumbria (Symeon, *H. R.* sub anno). There is a letter from Alchred and Osgiva his queen to Lullus, preserved among the letters of Boniface (ed. Giles, 211–12). It is chiefly to ask his prayers for themselves and their friends, whose names they send, and to offer to him as a gift "duodecim sagos cum annulo aureo majori." Dr. Giles erroneously ascribes this letter to the year 758. There is nothing farther known of Osgearn. [J. R.]

OSHERE, king, viceroy, or ealdorman of the Hwiccii. He first appears in history as granting land at Ripple to Frithowald in 680, and in the charter terms himself king, although acting under the authority of Ethelred, king of Mercia (Kemble, *C. D.* 17). This charter is regarded as spurious, but in another (*ib.* No. 36), which has possibly a greater claim to authenticity, he again as king bestows lands at Penitanham for a monastery for Cutswitha. He also induced Ethelred to assent to a grant to Abbess Dunna at Withington, which many years after was confirmed by archbishop Nothelm (K. *C. D.* No. 82, 83). Little can be even conjectured of his history; he may have been a son of Oswald the brother of Osric [OSRIC, OSWALD], and have succeeded father or uncle in the viceroyalty, in or about 693. Between 704 and 709, we find the Hwiccii under the rule of Ethelhard and Ethelward (K. *C. D.* No. 55), who attest charters in conjunction with Ethelmund, Ethelric, and Ethelbert. Of these Ethelward (K. *C. D.* No. 56) and Ethelric (K. *C. D.* No. 57, 83) are called sons of Oshere, but they do not assume the royal title. A person of this name is mentioned by the lady Egburg in a letter to St. Boniface between the years 716 and 722, as her brother and as some time dead (*Mon. Mog.* pp. 63 and 64). If this Oshere could be identified with the king of the Hwiccii, Egburg might be the second abbess of Gloucester, who is called, however, the sister of Kyneburga and so of Osric. [EGBURGA, EADBURGA (4)] *Mon. Angl.* i. 542. [S.]

OSITHA, saint. [OSYTH.]

OSIUS, of Cordova. [HOSIUS.]

OSLAC, one of the younger sons of Ethelfrith, king of Northumbria (A.D. 593–617), and Acha, sister of Edwin. During the reign of Edwin, Oslac and his brothers were exiles in Scotland and embraced Christianity at Iona. They returned to Northumbria on Edwin's death. (Symeon, ed. Surtees Soc. 209, 218; Beda, iii. 3; *Vita S. Columbae*, i. 114; *S. C.* 20, 43.) [J. R.]

OSLAF (OSLAP), called in another place OSA, was a younger son of Ethelfrith and Acha, king and queen of Northumbria. When Edwin became king in A.D. 617, Oslaf and his brothers took refuge in Scotland and remained there during Edwin's life. It is believed that all of them embraced Christianity at Iona. (Symeon, ed. Surtees Soc. 209, 218; Beda, iii. 3; *Vita S. Columbae*, i. 113; *S. C.* 20, 43.) [J. R.]

OSLAVA, the wife of Eormenred, son of Eadbald, king of Kent, and mother of the martyrs Ethelbert and Ethelred, and of the saints Eormenberga, Eormenburga, Eormengitha and Etheldritha. She is called by Florence of Worcester, in the appendix to the Chronicle "regina" (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 635) and "reginula" (*ib.* p. 627, note), which, as her husband is by that author termed "regulus," may show that he exercised a delegated authority over part of Kent during the reign of his father or brother. Nothing is known of Oslava's extraction or history besides, but, if her title of "regina" represents any dignity not derived from her husband, it is possible that she was the head of one of the minor Kentish principalities which, although united for two or three generations under Ethelbert and his successors, are traceable in the later disorganisation of the kingdom of Kent. (See KENT, KINGS OF.) [S.]

OSMUND (1), the fourteenth bishop of London (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 617; W. Malmesb. *G. P.* § 73). Nothing but his name and place in the list of bishops is known of him. His predecessor Heathobert is mentioned by Simeon of Durham (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 672) as dying in the year 801. Osmund was then probably consecrated in 801 or 802 by Ethelheard, who had retained jurisdiction over the diocese of London, and who returned from Rome with restored authority early in 802. Osmund attended the council held at Clovesho in October, 803, in which the restoration of the provincial jurisdiction to Canterbury was recognised, and some other measures taken; his name appears in the list of clergy approving the act which forbade the election of laymen as lords of monasteries (K. *C. D.* 1024), and is attached to that by which the dignity of Canterbury was restored (K. *C. D.* 185); as also to a Worcester charter of the same date (K. *C. D.* 183; *Councils*, &c., Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 542, 544–547). On this occasion Osmund, who subscribes as "Ego Osmund Lundonensis civitatis episcopus," was attended by one priest abbat, Heahstan; three priests, Wighard, Tidhun, and Freothered; and Ethelhelm, who is not further described. Osmund was present at a synod at Acleah in 805, in which it is possible that archbishop Wulfred was elected or consecrated (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 558). After that year we lose sight of him; his successor Ethelnoth appearing in 811. (See Kemble, as above.) [S.]

OSMUND (2), the fourth of the seven fictitious priors of Westminster, who are said, by Sporley, who wrote the history of the abbey in the 15th century, to have governed between the death of Ordbriht, the first abbat in 616, and the appointment of the second abbat Ordbriht, in 785. Osmund is said to have been prior for twenty-one years, and to have died in 705. Sporley may have used an earlier account, but the whole is fabulous, and belongs to a class of fiction which affords no instruction even in the exploration (*Monasticon Anglicanum*, i. 266). [S.]

OSMUND (3), king of the South Saxons. This prince, of whom very little is known, is mentioned by Florence of Worcester as king of the South Saxons in 758 (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 544). No other ancient historian mentions him at all; and as the South Saxon kingdom had been, since the reign of Ethelwalch, subject to or absorbed in Wessex, it is a little difficult to account for the mention of him by Florence. But although the historians are silent about him, his name occurs in the Selsey charters which in transcript are preserved among the registers of the see of Chichester; which also have preserved the names of other South Saxon princes from the reign of Ine onwards. If these charters are in any respect trustworthy, a South Saxon king named Nothelm was contemporaneous with Coenred the father of Ine (K. *C. D.* 995); he grants lands to his sister Notgitha in the year 692, and the grant is confirmed or attested by Nunna, king of the South Saxons, Wattus, a king, Coenred and Ine. Nunna, the next in order, is a historical personage, mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as a kinsman of Ine and his companion in war against the Welsh in the year 710 (*M. H. B.* p. 326; Flor. Wig. *ib.* p. 540); and by Ethelwerd (*ib.* p. 507) he is called a king. As Nunna is thus prominently mentioned in connexion with Ine, it is a little curious that his name was not inserted in any of the fictitious charters attributed to that monarch. On the other hand, however, the charters which claim to be issued by Nunna himself are corrupt or fictitious, and serve to prove little more than that Ine's kinsman was by tradition said to be king of Sussex [see NUNNA]. They date from 714. Of Wattus, the succeeding or contemporary king, nothing is known. To Osmund several charters are assigned, dated about or referable to the date given by Florence. In one (K. *C. D.* 1001) he confirms a charter of Nunna, in company with bishop Osa, who lived in 765. In another charter dated Aug. 3, 765 (K. *C. D.* 1008) he gives to his *comes* or *gesith* Walhere, lands at Ferring, Coponora and Titlesham for the construction of a monastery; this is attested by Osa. In a third charter a similar grant is made to another comes, Warbald, and his wife Tidburga, of land at Hanefeld; this is dated in 770, attested by Osa (archiepiscopus) and other bishops whose names may have been badly copied by the transcriber, and present some difficulties as they stand at present (K. *C. D.* 1009). In a grant of Offa to Oswald, bishop of Selsey (MS. Lambeth, 1212), dated 772, there appear three names among the subscribers, important in this connexion, *Osmund dux*, *Oswaldus dux Suth-Saxonum* and *Oslac dux*; the lands given are at Bixley, and the reversion is to Selsey. Osmund the ealdorman of this charter may be the Osmund rex of the Selsey grants. In 774 Ethelbert "rex Sussaxonum" makes a grant to Diosza (K. *C. D.* 1010), which looks suspicious in its present form; in 780 Oslac, dux Suthsaxonum, appears in authority (*ib.* 1012), and in 791 Aldwulf uses the same form. None of these names appear in the Mercian charters of Offa, or in those of the Kentish kings, except that of Ethelbert, who may have been a claimant of royalty in Kent as well as Sussex. (See Kemble, *C. D.* 144.) [S.]

OSRED (1), son of Aldfrith, king of Northumbria, and Cuthburh, sister of Ine, king of Wessex, was eight years old at the death of his father in A.D. 705. Eadwulf, an usurper, assumed the sovereignty for two months, when Osred was placed on his father's throne by Berhtfrith, the ealdorman, who loyally maintained him there. He won also a great battle against the Picts and Scots. There is little known about Osred from Beda, who observes his customary reticence when there was anything painful to record about those of whom he wishes to speak well (Beda, v. 18, 19, 22). Boniface, however, in a letter to Ethelbald (ed. Giles, pp. 132–9) lifts the veil, and tells us that Osred, and Ceolred, king of Mercia, came to an evil end as a just punishment for their excesses, among which he enumerates the forcible entry of religious houses and the abduction of nuns. Osred was slain in A.D. 717 in an ambuscade which was laid for him by his kinsmen near the sea, on the southern border of his kingdom (*S. C.* 38, 69–71; Wendover, i. 211). Ethelwulf, in his curious poem on the abbats of a cell of Lindisfarne, speaks of Osred's boyish promise and his subsequent evil deeds. He put many persons to death, and compelled others to seek refuge from him in monastic life (Symeon, ed. M. R., i. 268). [J. R.]

OSRED (2), son of Alchred, king of Northumbria, and Osgearn, or Osgeofu, succeeded Alfwold on the Northumbrian throne in A.D. 788. His career was a strangely unfortunate one. He had been king for a year when Ethelred, son of Ethelred Moll, returning to Northumbria, was advanced to his father's throne, and Osred, abandoned by all, was declared to have forfeited his rights (Symeon, *H. R.*) More than that, he was treated with ignominy. His head was tonsured like a monk, and he was put into a monastery—to be out of the way. He managed, however, to make his escape to the Isle of Man (Symeon, *H. E. D.* ii. 4). In A.D. 792 he was tempted from his exile by the promises of some of the Northumbrian thanes and secretly returned; but his friends and soldiers failed him at the crisis. He was captured by Ethelred, and was put to death by that monarch's orders at a place called Aynburg, on Sept. 14th, and his body was carried to the monastery at the mouth of the Tyne, the modern Tynemouth, and was there interred. (*S. C.* 48, 99.) [J. R.]

OSRIC (1), son of Ælfric, and cousin of Edwin king of Northumbria, succeeded that monarch in A.D. 633, but his rule only extended over Deira. Osric had been converted to Christianity and baptized by Paulinus; but, on his accession to the throne, he relapsed into heathenism. His reign was very brief, as, in the summer of A.D. 634, he was slain by the British chief, Ceadwalla. Osric was besieging York when Ceadwalla made an unexpected sally and destroyed the beleaguering force and its leader. The few months of Osric's reign were afterwards added to the regnal years of Oswald to obliterate the memory of his apostasy. Oswin, afterwards king of Deira, was Osric's son. (Beda, iii. 1, 14; *Vita S. Oswini*, cap. 1; *S. C.* 22, 45.) [J. R.]

OSRIC (2), king of the Hwiccii, and traditional founder of the monasteries of Gloucester

and Bath. He is mentioned by Bede (iv. 23) as ruling the province of the Hwiccii at the time of the appointment of bishop Oftfor to the see of Worcester, about the year 691. The historian gives him the title of king, and, as the Hwiccii were at the time under the rule of Mercia, he must have been a viceroy under Ethelred. Osric's career as an ecclesiastical founder began some years earlier; the charter by which he bestowed on the abbess Berhtana, a hundred *manentes* adjacent to the city of Bath, is dated Nov. 6, 676, and, being attested by Ethelred as well as by Theodore and the other bishops, must have been issued or confirmed by a witenagemot or an ecclesiastical assembly. The foundation of Gloucester is fixed in the year 681 (*Mon. Angl.* i. 541, 542), and, in the account of it given in the annals of Winchelcomb, Osric is described as a "minister" of king Ethelred, having a brother Oswald and a sister Kyneburga, who was the first abbess of Gloucester. The same very questionable authority identifies Osric with the prince who in 718 succeeded to the Northumbrian throne (Bede, *H. E.* v. 23, 24). This Osric is said to have been the son of Alchfrith, the friend of Wilfrid and rebellious son of Oswy, who disappears from history in the early years of Wilfrid's troubles (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 14). If it is right to identify the two Osrics, the king of the Hwiccii was the son of Alchfrith, grandson of Oswy, and by marriage nephew of Ethelred; an inference confirmed by the Pershore tradition that Osric and Oswald, his brother, were nephews of Ethelred (*Mon. Angl.* ii. 415). It is not impossible that this was the case; anyhow, the king of Northumbria was regarded as the founder of St. Peter's Abbey at Gloucester, and is stated in the chronicle of the abbey to have been buried there before the altar of St. Petronilla, having died on the 7th of the Ides of May, 729, the date given by Bede (*H. E.* v. 23). According to the chronicle (ad ann. 731) the Northumbrian Osric was slain, and Ceolwulf, the friend of Bede, succeeded in 731; but Bede tells us that Osric had determined that Ceolwulf should succeed him. (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 23; W. Malmesb. i. § 53.)

If this identification is accepted, we may infer that Alchfrith, after his rebellion against Oswy, took refuge at his sister's court, and that his family were provided for in the remoter parts of Mercia until the tide changed, and the troubled times of Northumbria allowed Osric to compete for the crown. Even thus, however, it is difficult to account for Osric's disappearance from history from 691 to 718. Kyneburga, the first abbess of Gloucester, is said to have been his sister, and as her successor Eadburga was her sister, she must have stood in the same relation to Osric. But the whole of this material is very questionable, and little more can be inferred from it than that there was a traditional connexion between Gloucester and the Northumbrian kings, which was kept in memory by the later connexion with the archbishops of York, who claimed rights in Gloucester as late as the reign of Henry II. [S.]

OSSENI (OSSAEI), a sect which Epiphanius (*Haer.* xix., xxx. 3, liii. 1) describes as distinct from the Essenes. He got his information however about these sects from two distinct sources, and does not see that the same persons are intended (Bishop Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 349). [ESSENES; ELKESAI.] [G. T. S.]

OSSENIUS, abbat. [OISSENE.]

OSTALDUS, bishop of Tours from 765 or 6 to 777, according to the *Chronicle of the Archbishops of Tours.* (*Gall. Chr.* xiv. 33.) [C. H.]

OSTHRYD (OSTRITHE, OSTHFRIDA, OSTDRIDA, OSTRICH, OSTGIDA), daughter of Oswy, king of Northumbria, and wife of Ethelred, king of Mercia, 675–704, to whom she was married as early as the year 679, and by whom she was mother of Ceolred, who succeeded to the kingdom in 709. It was by her influence that her husband was induced to refuse an asylum to Wilfrid, whom her brother Egfrith had expelled from Northumbria in or about the year 681. (Edd. *v. Wilfr.* cap. 41.) She is said by Bede (*H. E.* iii. 11) to have been an especial patroness of the monastery of Bardney, in which she buried the remains of her uncle St. Oswald, and where she occasionally resided. The historian tells of her giving to the abbess Ethelhild a portion of the dust of the pavement on which had been spilt some of the water used for washing St. Oswald's bones, which dust worked miraculous cures. Little more is known of Osthryd except her tragical death in 697, at the hands of the Southumbrians. It is possible that Osthryd may have exercised some powers of government in Lindsey, which had been a debateable ground between Mercia and Northumbria in her early years: and that her death may have occurred in a faction war. Ethelred's sway in Southern Mercia was exercised by an ealdorman, his nephew, Berchtwald (Edd. c. 39), who favoured Wilfrid; and there would be little difficulty in accounting for internal complications in the less consolidated district of the South Humbrians. But on this it is useless to theorise. Five years after the death of his wife Ethelred made over this province to Coenred, who succeeded to the whole kingdom two years later. (*Chr. S.* ad ann. 702, 704.)

Osthryd's name appears among the attestations of the fabricated Peterborough charter in the Chronicle; (*M. H. B.* 320; *Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 160.) She is named likewise in a spurious or interpolated charter of her husband bestowing land at Fladbury on Oftfor, bishop of Worcester, in expiation of the sins of his late wife and his own. (Kemble, *C. D.* no. 33.) Later writers have added nothing material to what is known of her from Bede (*H. E.* iii. 11; iv. 21; v. 24) and Eddius. Alcuin, in his poem on the saints of York, has however versified and amplified Bede's account of the translation of St. Oswald and the devotion of Osthryd, whom he calls Osthfrida. (*Mon. Alc.* ed. Dümmler, pp. 92, 93.) [S.]

OSTRUS (OSTRYS), a Gothic count who commanded the barbarian guard with which Aspen, the powerful minister of the emperor Leo I. surrounded himself. He attempted to avenge the death of his master, but was obliged to fly into Thrace. The wits of Constantinople, unused to such fidelity to the unfortunate, remarked, according to the *Pasch. Chron.* p. 323

in Migne, *P. G.* t. xcii. col. 826, "No one is a friend of the dead save Ostrus alone." [LEO I.] [G. T. S.]

OSULFUS, a wayward disciple of Alcuin, mentioned in the Lives of Alcuin (ed. Duchesne, cap. viii. sec. 15, ed. Froben. cap. x. sec. 114), and supposed to be the person addressed by Alcuin in his Epp. 206, 207, Froben. 157, 158. (*Pat. Lat.* c. 64, 99, 481, 482.) [C. H.]

OSWALD (1) (OSUUALD, OSGUALD)—a name dear to the Northumbrian church and people—was a son of Ethelfrith, king of Northumbria by Acha or Acca, daughter of Ella, and sister of Edwin, both of them Northumbrian kings (Beda, iii. 6). Oswald was born circa A.D. 605. When his father Ethelfrith was slain in battle in A.D. 616, Oswald and his brothers sought refuge in Scotland where they continued during Edwin's reign. Ethelfrith and his children were heathens, but, during their exile, Oswald and twelve companions were converted to Christianity and were baptized by the monks of Iona (Beda, iii. 3; *Vita S. Columbae*, i. 113). Edwin fell in battle in A.D. 633, and his death was followed by the return of his kinsmen, two of whom, Osric and Eanfrith, had a brief tenure of royal authority. They were both of them slain by the British chieftain, Cadwallon, or Caedwalla, and then Oswald came to the forefront as the representative of his family and race. His first step was to collect an army and take the field against Caedwalla, encouraged, as Adamnan tells us, by an appearance and a promise of victory from Columba himself.

The contending armies met in A.D. 634, at a place called, by Beda, Hefenfelth, which has been identified with St. Oswalds, some seven or eight miles to the north of Hexham in Northumberland (*Memorials of Hexham*, Surtees Soc.; Nennius (54) calls the place Catscaul). In the early morning Oswald upreared with his own hands a wooden cross, hastily prepared, around which the king and his troops knelt in prayer. In the battle that followed soon after daybreak on the heath-clad hills which look down upon the valley of the Tyne, the Christians obtained a decisive victory. The host of Caedwalla was utterly routed, and its leader was pursued and slain at a brook called Denisesburna, a name which survived in the 13th century, and probably later. At a subsequent period, after Oswald himself had fallen in battle, the monks of Hexham made a yearly pilgrimage to Hefenfelth on Oswald's death-day, and prayed for his soul on the scene of his greatest triumph (Beda, iii. 2). A little chapel was reared by them on the spot, the representative of which still survives and perpetuates the victor's name. The cross itself was supposed to possess a peculiar sanctity. Before it was set up there was neither church, nor altar, nor cross in the whole of Bernicia.

The defeat of Caedwalla involved the recovery of Northumbria, the two parts of which were united in Oswald, and he added to them the northern parts of the island, Lindsey, and a preponderating influence in East Anglia, Wessex, and elsewhere, among the four races, which gave him the over-lordship of Britain such as was exercised by Oswy his brother, and Edwin their predecessor (Beda, iii. 6). Oswald was a valiant soldier when it was necessary to draw the sword, but in genius and disposition he was essentially a lover of peace, and the work of his life and heart was the diffusion of civilisation and religion. At York he resumed and completed the building of the minster which had been interrupted by Edwin's death (Beda, ii. 14, 20), but we hear of Oswald chiefly in connexion with the northern part of Bernicia. It was there that he resided, chiefly at Bebbanburg, the modern Bamborough. One of his first acts was to beg his old friends, the monks of Iona, to send a Christian missionary to labour among his people. A bishop was despatched to Northumbria of the name of Corman, who neither understood his flock, nor possessed the yielding persuasiveness that won men's hearts. He returned to Iona in disgust, and was replaced by Aidan, a man of a different calibre and a sweeter temperament, who became as popular as Corman had been distasteful (Beda, iii. 3). Aidan arrived in A.D. 635, and, to assimilate as far as possible his new home to his old, Oswald gave him the little island of Lindisfarne. In energy and devotion the king and the bishop were as brothers. When Aidan preached, somewhat in his northern accent and dialect, Oswald frequently acted as interpreter. The bishop was sometimes a guest at the royal table, not indeed as frequently as the king wished. One Easter day they were together when the tidings came that the banquetting hall was beleaguered by a crowd of beggars, dear to host and guest, waiting for what they could get. A silver dish filled with dainty cates had just been placed upon the table, when Oswald ordered its contents to be carried out to the expecting multitude, and the very dish itself to be broken into fragments and distributed in the same way. Catching hold of the king's hand, the good bishop exclaimed, "May this hand never decay" (Beda, iii. 6). I shall mention afterwards how this prediction is said to have been fulfilled.

Through the zeal and example of Oswald and Aidan, Christianity made rapid progress in Northumbria (Beda, iii. 3). But Oswald was also instrumental in spreading it in Wessex. Oswald sought as his wife a daughter of Kynegils, king of that district, and it was arranged that Kynegils should accept Christianity before the marriage took place. Oswald stood at the font as a sponsor for his future father-in-law, at Dorchester, in A.D. 635. One result of the marriage and the baptism was the establishment by the two kings of a bishop at Dorchester and the gradual evangelization of the district (Beda, iii. 7). Reginald (cap. 11), without stating his authority, gives Oswald's wife the name of Cyneburga, and says that they had an only son. This was Ethelbald, afterwards king of Deira.

Oswald had only a short reign. He was killed in battle on the 5th of August, 642, in the 38th year of his age "per dolum," as Nennius says (55). The fight took place at Maserfelth (Cocboy, in Nennius), an unknown site, but perhaps near Oswestry, i.e. Oswald's tree, in Shropshire. His foe was that bane of Northumbria the fierce Penda, the slayer of Edwin, and the friend of Caedwalla who fell at Hefenfelth in 634. Oswald and Penda were opposed in religion and everything else, and as Oswald had won Lindsey from Mercia, a struggle was sure to come sooner

or later. Nothing is told us of the battle, save that the gallant Oswald when, hemmed in by foes, he fell with his death-wound to the ground, implored the mercy of God on the souls of the soldiers whom he led (Beda, iii. 9, 12). Reginald gives a long account of Oswald's tree and how it acquired that name (capp. 17, 18). He says also that Whitchurch stands on Maserfelth. Penda, savage in his triumph, cut off the head and arms of his vanquished foe, and set them up on stakes or poles as a public spectacle. Within a little while they were taken down, and were carried into Northumbria. Oswald became, in course of time, one of the greatest of the Northern Saints. His noble achievements and blameless life, his intense zeal for Christianity gathered around his memory many loving sympathies. Beda mentions various miracles which were ascribed to him by the popular voice. The wooden cross on Hefenfelth, which was standing in the historian's days, was gifted with a wonder-working power (Beda, iii. 2). Out of Mercia, story after story came into the north, and even Willibrord of Frisia had his testimony to add (Id. iii. ix.–xiii., iv. 14; and Reginald, var. loc.)

The headless trunk of Oswald was removed by his niece, Osthryd, some thirty years after his death, to the monastery of Bardney in Lincolnshire. The monks, who were not exempt from tribal and national jealousies, refused to admit it at first within their walls, and ascribed their subsequent acquiescence to the appearance of a great column of light which they regarded as an interposition from heaven. They received the bones at last and duly enshrined them, hanging up over the coffin Oswald's royal banner of purple and gold which had been brought from Maserfelth (Beda, iii. 11). They erected also a stone cross at the head and feet of the grave (Reginald, cap. 43). Oswald's tomb was richly adorned by Offa, king of Mercia (Alcuin, *de SS. Ebor.* 388–90). In A.D. 909, the remains were carried from Bardney to Gloucester, where Archbishop Thomas II., of York, or Thurstan (*Mon. Angl. v. e.* i. 108) repaired the shrine in which they were placed (Reginald, cap. 44).

The hand (or hands), to which Aidan gave a promise of freedom from decay, possibly won for Oswald the title of Lamngwin, i.e. white or free hand (Nennius, 54). Beda says that they were carried to Bamborough, and were there reverently enshrined in a silver coffer, which was deposited in St. Peter's church, and that in his day the promise of Aidan was fulfilled (*H. E.* iii. 6). Symeon says, in two places (*Chron.* sub anno 774, and *H. E. D.* i. 1), that the right hand was preserved at Bamborough undecayed, and that an aged monk of Durham, of the name of Swartebrand, had frequently seen it; Reginald tells us that it was stolen from Bamborough and carried to Peterborough by a monk of that house (cap. 48).

Oswald's head was taken to Lindisfarne by Aidan, and was buried in the cemetery. Reginald (cap. 13) says that it was afterwards removed to Bamborough, and Aelred of Rievaulx told the same chronicler that it was afterwards taken from Bamborough by the direct order of Cuthbert himself (cap. 49). In A.D. 875, when the incursion of the Danes made the monks of Lindisfarne wanderers, the skull, with other reliques, was placed in Cuthbert's coffin, and went wherever it went. The founder of Lindisfarne became henceforth the companion of Lindisfarne's greatest bishop. At the translation of Cuthbert's remains in A.D. 1104, the head of Oswald was found and left with them (*Hist. Transl.*). In 1828, the last occasion on which Cuthbert's grave was opened, Oswald's skull was still there (Raine's *St. Cuthbert*, 187). The mediaeval sculptors always represented Cuthbert as holding the head in his hand, as if next to his heart, a pathetic memorial of undying love and gratitude.

The monks of Durham cherished among their reliques Oswald's sceptre and horn of ivory, and a portion of the coat of mail which he wore in vain at Maserfield, together with his banner or standard (List. in App. to Smith's *Beda*). Thrice a year they carried in solemn procession a figure of Oswald, of silver gilt, together with their most precious treasures (*Rites of Durham*, 88, 89). On one side of their conventual seal there was also a representation of Oswald's head. They picked up somewhere, after the fashion of the time, a Roman gem, a finely cut head of Jupiter Tonans, and the heathen deity did service for their great Christian patron and founder.

Several lives of Oswald are in existence, all of which are indebted to Beda. Reginald of Durham compiled a life, in three books, most of which is printed with the works of Symeon of Durham, by the M. R. It is remarkably diffuse. Reginald mentions several stories on the authority of (Aelred) abbat of Rievaulx, and a description of Oswald's personal appearance as narrated to him by Robert, of S. Peter's hospital at York, who had found it in an old book.

Among the Gale MSS. in Trin. Coll., Cambridge, there is a MS. Life of Oswald, in thirteen chapters, the first ten of which are copied from Beda. The eleventh chapter gives the curious story of a thief who broke into and plundered the church dedicated to St. Oswald at Farnham, in Yorkshire, and was struck with blindness. The twelfth chapter is the 44th of Reginald, largely added to by the record of a miracle said to have been wrought on a woman who preferred shearing corn to going to Gloucester to see the ceremony of the translation of Oswald's remains. Her sickle stuck fast to her hand.

There is also a MS. life in the library of the Dean and Chapter of Peterborough, which is wrongly ascribed by Sir Thomas Hardy to Archbishop Oswald.

Capgrave prints a brief life of the king derived from Beda. [J. R.]

OSWALD (2), the traditional founder of the monastery of Pershore. He is said to have been brother of Osric, and nephew of Ethelred, king of Mercia [OSRIC]; *Mon. Angl.* ii. 415. The date assigned to the foundation of Pershore is 689. Oswald may have been a viceroy or ealdorman of part of Mercia or of the Hwiccii, and if Osric was identical with the Northumbrian king of that name, Oswald may have been the ancestor of the Hwiccian dynasty to which the subsequent ealdormen belonged. [HWICCII.] [S.]

OSWALD (3), a West Saxon etheling, who had a struggle for the succession to the throne of Ine with Ethelhard, who, although of un-

recorded descent, obtained the crown on Ine's resignation. Oswald is described in the Chronicle (ad ann. 728) as the son of Ethelbald, the son of Cynebald, the son of Cuthwine, son of Ceaulin (*M. H. B.* 633). He was defeated by Ethelhard in 728, and died in 730. (*M. H. B.* 327, 328; Will. Malmesb. *G. R.* lib. i. § 38.) [S.]

OSWARD, brother of the Mercian king Kenred, in a spurious charter of Egwin, bishop of Worcester, A.D. 714. (Kemble, *C. D.* 64.) [C. H.]

OSWIN (1), son of Osric, who, after the death of his kinsman Edwin, had a year's tenure of the princedom of Deira. On his father's death, in A.D. 634, Oswin, then very young, was carried off for safety into Wessex, and there he remained until, on the decease of his uncle Oswald in 642, Oswy, another uncle, became Oswald's successor. But the people of Deira preferred the son of their old chief, Osric, to Oswy, and Oswin therefore became their king.

Oswin was just the person to attract the sympathies of Beda, who in a few touching words had delineated his character and personal appearance. Fair in face and tall in stature, with a pleasant address and a manner as courteous as his purse was open—these, for those rough times, were attractive words. Popular Oswin was besides, nay, so popular that all the best born in the district flocked to his court and service. Unlike his father, he was a devout Christian, and conspicuous among others by the grace of humility. Beda exemplifies this by the story of the gift of a horse to Aidan, which it is unnecessary to repeat (B. iii. 14). The simple-minded bishop recognised in Oswin a disposition congenial to his own, and told a companion of his that he was too good to live.

The words were prophetic. Seven years passed over and then the jealousy of Oswy, chafing at the division of his kingdom, broke out into war. The two kings took the field, but, before they met, Oswin, finding that the enemy far exceeded his own men in number, disbanded his army. This was done at a hill called Wilfaresdun, some 12 miles to the north-west of Catterick near Richmond, the position of which cannot now be traced.

Oswin left Wilfaresdun, accompanied by Tondhere, a most trusty knight, and made his way to the house of a still greater friend, as he thought, Count Hunwald, who lived at Ingetlingum, the modern Gilling, where he hoped to be able to conceal himself. Hunwald betrayed the secret of the two fugitives to Oswy, who sent Ethelwin, one of his attendants, to slay the refugees. This was done on the 20th August, 651 (Beda, iii. 14, 24).

As a small atonement for a great crime, queen Eanfleda induced her husband Oswy to give to Trumhere the site for a monastery at Gilling, in which prayer might be regularly offered for the eternal safety of Oswy and his victim (Beda, iii. 14, 24). Some remains of this religious house may be observed in the present church of Gilling. Authentic history ends at this point, but in the 12th century an anonymous monk of St. Albans wrote a life of Oswin, the object of which was to give a pedigree and renown to the monastery of Tynemouth, and under his facile pen new historical facts start into being. He tells us that after the murder at Gilling in 651, Oswin's body was carried by his murderers to the mouth of the Tyne, and was there interred in the oratory of the Blessed Virgin. There is satisfactory evidence of the existence of a religious house at Tynemouth at an early period, and there Osred king of Northumbria was buried in 792. Osred had no claim to sanctity, and the monk of St. Albans, finding his name in an old chronicle, may have converted Osred into Oswin, who was a different kind of person.

The monk of St. Albans records an appearance of Oswin (whose presence at Tynemouth was unknown) to a monk of the name of Edmund, bidding him tell Bishop Egelwin that he was interred there, and commanding him to translate his remains to a befitting shrine. All this, we are told, was done in the year 1065. In 1075 the church of St. Mary of Tynemouth, with the body of St. Oswin, was given by Waltheof, earl of Northumberland, to the prior and monks of Jarrow, or Durham, but in 1090 another earl of Northumberland, Robert de Mowbray, withdrew the gift of Waltheof, and made Tynemouth over to the abbey of St. Albans, greatly to the annoyance of Durham (Symeon, *H. E. D.* iv. 4). When Tynemouth was surrendered in the reign of Henry VIII., the visitors found there a feretory or shrine containing the body and vestments of Oswin, which, as he tells us, were held in great veneration (Gibson's *Tynemouth*, i.)

The *Life of Oswin*, which has been mentioned, is Julius A. x. in the Cottonian library. The greater portion has been published for the Surtees Society (*Biogr. Misc.*). The life consists of what we find in Beda, followed by an account of Oswin's translation and a number of miracles which are said to have attested his sanctity. The writer of the life was living at Tynemouth in the reign of Stephen, and gives us pictures of life and manners, which are of much value. There is an account of Oswin and his miracles in the Hagiology of John of Tynemouth. In the Cottonian library there was a very interesting relic of Oswin in Galba A, 5, which was cruelly damaged by the fire. It is described as "Psalterium Davidis characteribus Hibernicis vetustissimis: dicitur fuisse liber Oswini regis." [J. R.]

OSWIN (2) (OSWINI, OSWYN), a king of Kent according to some spurious charters in Kemble; one of which (*C. D.* 10) makes him a descendant of the royal line. On Jan. 27, 675, he grants the estate of Sturrie to his kinswoman the abbess Aebba (Kemble, *C. D.* 8; Elmham, *Hist. Mon. S. Aug.* 329, ed. Hardwick). He also grants her lands in Thanet (*C. D.* 10, undated). He subscribes the charter Suaebhard, king of Kent, Mar. 1, 676, without the title of king (*C. D.* 14). In July 689 he bestows lands in Liming on the monastery over which Adrian presides (*C. D.* 30). [SUEFRED.] There appears no good authority for this king. [C. H.]

OSWUDU (OSGUDU), one of the sons of Ethelfrith, king of Northumbria, who on the death of their father in A.D. 617, took refuge in Scotland to escape from Edwin. The exiles were converted to Christianity at Iona and came back to Northumbria when Edwin died. (Beda, iii. 3; *Vita S. Columbae*, i. 113; Symeon, ed. Surtees Soc., 209, 218; S. C. 20, 43.) [J. R.]

OSWULF (1), son of Eadberht king of Northumbria, succeeding him on the throne in A.D. 758. His father voluntarily resigned it to him. Within the year he was wickedly slain by his household at a place called Mechil Wongtune (possibly Market Weighton) on the 24th of July. (Symeon, *H. R.* sub anno; *S. C.* 44, 89.) [J. R.]

OSWULF (2), a presbyter who attests charters of archbishops Ethelhard and Wulfred in 805, 811, and 813. (Kemble, *C. D.* 189, 195, 200.) [C. H.]

OSWY (OSUUIU, OSWEO, OSBIU, OSGUID, OSWEGIUS), a son of Ethelfrith, and a younger brother of Oswald, both kings of Northumbria, Oswy himself being an energetic sovereign, and an earnest propagator of Christianity. In the *Life of Oswin* he is called *nothus*, a statement, perhaps, which shews the animus of the writer, as it is unsupported by historical evidence (*Vita Oswini*, p. 3). Oswy was born about A.D. 612, and was educated and baptized in Scotland, probably during the exile of the royal family of Northumbria after the death of Ethelfrith (Beda, iii. 14, 29). On the decease of his brother Oswald in A.D. 642, Oswy succeeded him on the throne of Bernicia, that of Deira falling to Oswin, son of Osric. Ethelbald, son of Oswald, was too young to succeed his father. This division could not be palatable to Oswy; but he had enough to do at first to maintain his hold on Bernicia, which was invaded by Penda, the slayer of Oswald, with the help, probably, of the Cumbrian Britons. Penda attacked Bamborough, and tried to set the castle on fire by heaping against the wall the materials of the wooden huts which he found near. Aidan, as Beda tells us, was watching on Farne, and saw the flames and smoke ascending: "See, Lord, what mischief Penda does!" was his ejaculatory prayer; whereupon, we are told, the wind changed, and the flames and smoke scorched and blinded the aggressors instead of their intended victims (Beda, iii. 16). When this peril was over and Penda had retired, Oswy's jealousy of Oswin led him to commit the great crime of his life. The two kings were about to settle their disputes on the battlefield, when Oswin, conscious of his weakness, disbanded his troops and retired with a single attendant to Gilling, near Richmond, where they were both slain by one of Oswy's retainers, in obedience to his master's orders, on August 20th, 651 (Beda, iii. 14). Some time before this event Oswy had brought from Kent and married Eanfleda, daughter of king Edwin, the first Northumbrian whom Paulinus had baptized (Beda, iii. 15). The queen, troubled by the murder, induced Oswy, as a kind of atonement, to give some land at the scene of the crime for the erection and endowment of a monastery, over which Trumhere became abbat. In it the slayer and the slain were both prayed for (Beda, iii. 24). After this we find Ethelbald, son of Oswald, acting as ruler of Deira under the charge of Oswy, his uncle. This was, probably, a concession to the independent spirit of the district, and possibly a further acknowledgment of the wrong that had been done to Oswin.

Oswy's most dangerous rival was Penda, who had taken possession of Lindsey, an old appanage of Northumbria, but he had permitted Cyniburga, his daughter, to marry Alchfrith, Oswy's son. Penda gave the rule of the Middle-Angles to his son Peada, whom Beda highly commends. Peada, visiting the Northumbrian count, asked Oswy to give him in marriage his daughter Alchfleda. Oswy refused unless Peada and his people would become Christians. The young man assented, and was baptized before he returned home, and admitted missionaries into his kingdom (Beda, iii. 21), among whom Cedd was one.

About the same time (653–4) another successful effort was made by Oswy towards evangelizing the East Saxons. Sigebert, their king, was a friend of Oswy, and frequently visited him. Oswy availed himself of the opportunity to prevail by argument with his guest to embrace Christianity. The result was the baptism of Sigebert, and the despatch of a mission to the East Saxons which had great success (Beda, iii. 22).

Penda all this while was an active foe or a false friend to Northumbria. Oswy did his best to live in peace with his too-powerful neighbour. The attack of A.D. 642 seems to have ended in a compromise, perhaps in the surrender of Lindsey. A double marriage ought to have knit the two kingdoms together, but it failed to do so. Inroad after inroad from Mercia harassed the Northumbrians, who were also charged with being the aggressors to such an extent that Oswy was obliged to send Ecgfrith, his second son, as a hostage for his good conduct, to the Mercian queen, Kynwise. This concession failed, and, to avoid ruin, Oswy promised to surrender to Penda a vast treasure, which he distributed, according to Nennius, among his British allies. It was in vain. Penda refused to return, and essayed the devastation and destruction of Northumbria. Oswy, deserted by his men, sought the divine assistance, and as a pledge of his earnestness vowed, if victory were his, to devote his daughter, Elfleda, with a goodly dower, to a religious life. Thirty chieftains marshalled Penda's army, whilst Oswy, with his son Alchfrith, had a force one-third of the size; and, in addition to the paucity of his numbers, he had the mortification of knowing that his nephew, Ethelbald of Deira, was acting as a guide to the invader. The two armies met at Winwædfield in the district of Loidis (Nennius says, in *Campo Gai*). The Winwæd is probably the Went. The battle was fought on the 15th of November, 655, and resulted in the death of Penda and the destruction of his host. The grateful victor fulfilled his vow by placing his infant daughter, Elfleda, under the charge of Hilda at Hartlepool, to be prepared for her future life (Beda, iii. 24). He pressed forward also the spreading of Christianity in Mercia, and is associated by tradition, with Peada, his son-in-law, as co-founder of the famous monastery at Medeshamstede, the Peterborough of the present day (S. C. 25, 50).

The defeat of Penda threw Mercia into Oswy's hands, and he put the South Mercians under the charge of Peada, retaining the rest for himself. Peada, however, was short-lived, and in A.D. 658 the Mercians rejected the rule of Oswy, and made Wulfhere, a son of Penda, their king. Wulfhere regained Lindsey from Northumbria

(Beda, iii. 24). The kingdom of Oswy, however, which was cut off in the South, was pushed in the North over a great part of the territory of the Picts. Ethelbald, as was to be expected, lost Deira, over which Oswy made his eldest son, Alchfrith, viceroy.

The agents in Oswy's ecclesiastical reforms and missions were, in the first instance, the bishops of Lindisfarne and the adherents of the Scottish church. He showed himself, however, amenable to religious as well as civil progress and development. Benedict Biscop, one of the officers of his court, was indebted to Oswy for the site of the monastery at Wearmouth (*Vita Abb. W.* Beda). Wilfrith, one of the chief movers in the change, owed his advance in life to queen Eanfleda and Oswy's court, and, as time went on, became the friend and adviser of Alchfrith, and the spokesman for the adoption of the Italian views of discipline and order in contradistinction to the Scottish. Alchfrith and Eanfleda took Wilfrith's side; Oswy showed a more judicial spirit, and would not as yet desert his old friends. The Paschal question was made the *crux* between the two sides, and a great ecclesiastical synod assembled at Whitby in A.D. 664, under Oswy's presidency, to hear the subject argued, and come to a decision (Beda, iii. 25–6). The result, as is well known, was a sentence from Oswy in favour of Wilfrith's party. Wilfrith was now chosen bishop, and went to France to be consecrated, but in his absence the Scottish influence revived somewhat, and Chad, with the consent of Oswy, filled up the vacant see (Beda, iii. 27). It is quite possible that this ecclesiastical change had something to do with the fall and disappearance of Alchfrith, which took place about this time. Beda (iii. 14) mentions the alliance of that young prince with the Mercians against his father, another instance of the want of unity between the two districts which made up the kingdom of Northumbria.

In 667 we find Oswy taking counsel with Egbert, king of Kent, about the condition of the English church, and to them was due the mission of Wighard to Rome to be consecrated archbishop (Beda, iii. 29; iv. 1). Beda ascribes this act on the part of Oswy to his gradual recognition of the imperial position of Rome. Pope Vitalian's reply is addressed to Oswy alone, and is due to his position as Bretwalda, which honour he undoubtedly held. The letter itself is beset with difficulties, which it is unnecessary to discuss. Oswy had made various offerings to St. Peter. Vitalian returned them by the gift of a cross, with a key of gold, made out of the chains of St. Peter and St. Paul for queen Eanfleda (Beda, iii. 29).

The last official act recorded of Oswy is the permission that he gave, at the request of Theodore, to allow Chad to leave Northumbria and become the bishop of the Mercians (Beda, iv. 3).

The close of Oswy's life beheld him more and more under the influence of Wilfrith, and smitten with the glamour of Roman imperialism. Worn out although he was by infirmity, his face was set Romewards, and he longed to end his days in the great city, worshipping in its sacred shrines. He appealed to Wilfrith to be his companion on the journey, promising him a large reward. But he never left England. He died on the 15th of February, 670 (Beda, iv. 5), and was interred at Whitby, where the remains of Edwin lay, and where his wife and daughter were to be laid to rest beside him (Beda, iii. 24). It was his family minster, the mausoleum of his race at that time. His descendants preferred York to Whitby. In Oswy Northumbria lost a judicious ruler, and England a wise Bretwalda. Oswy could act with firmness when he chose, but throughout his career he won more victories by concession. Christianity found in him a firm friend and patron, and if the words that Beda puts into his mouth from time to time were really used by him, Oswy was able to give good reasons for the faith which he professed.

Oswy married (1) Ricmmelth. (2) Eanfleda, daughter of king Edwin. He and Eanfleda had many children, four sons and three daughters. Of the sons (1) Alchfrith, prince regent of Deira, married Cyneburga, daughter of Penda. (2) Ecgfrith succeeded his father, and died in 685. (3) Aldfrith was king of Northumbria, 685–705. (4) Elfwine died 679. Of the daughters, Alchfleda married Peada, son of Penda; Ostryth married Ethelred, of Mercia; and Elfleda was abbess of Whitby, and died in 713. [J. R.]

OSYTH, ST. (OSITHA, OSGITHA), Oct. 7, virgin and martyr of the East Saxons, who has given her name to a village in Essex. She is not mentioned in the authors included in the *Monum. Hist. Brit.*, and the earliest occurrence of her name is in Malmesbury's *Gesta Pontificum* (lib. ii. p. 146, ed. Hamilton), a work completed in 1125. The passage states that Richard, bishop of London, placed canons regular at Cic, in his diocese, the resting-place of the blessed Osgitha, a virgin famous for miracles. (For this monastery, see *Mon. Angl.* vi. 308.) These words do not affirm the existence of any previous foundation there by Osyth (cf. Camden, *Brit.* ii. 46, 59, ed. Gough). Bishop Richard (1108–1128) was contemporary with Malmesbury. St. Osyth's *Vita* was No. 115 in the now lost *Sanctilogium* of John of Tinmouth, c. 1366 (Smith's *Cat. Libr. MSS. Bibl. Cotton.* p. 29), from whence Capgrave adopted it into his *Nova Legenda.* From Capgrave Surius printed it with a few verbal variations (Oct. 7), and from Surius it was taken into the *Acta SS.* (7 Oct. iii. 936), where it is accompanied with an introductory essay and notes by Suysken. The manuscript of which this *Vita* is an abridgment is one of those described by Hardy (*ubi infra*). The *Vita* is anonymous, and was composed at a period later than Maurice, bishop of London (1086–1108), who is mentioned in it. According to this authority Osyth's father was king Frithewald, and her mother Wilteburga, a daughter of Penda king of Mercia, but she was brought up by the abbess Modwenna. The latter had founded two monasteries, at Pollesworch and Streveshal, near the forest of Arverna, and one of these (it is not said which) she retained in her own charge, placing the other under St. Editha, the sister of king Alfred. From the care of Modwenna Osyth passed into the service of Editha, and was finally bestowed by her parents, much against her will, upon Sigerus (Sighere), king of the East Saxons. After the marriage she persisted in repelling her husband, and at length during his absence

on a hunting expedition seized the opportunity of obtaining the veil from two East Anglian bishops, Ecca and Bedwin. Sighere not only consented to her act but bestowed upon her an estate at Chich, where she built a nunnery, over which she became abbess. If such was the fact, this was the earliest monastery in Essex. In 653 a crew of piratical Danes, out of East Anglia, which those pagans had devastated, landed at Chich, beheaded Osyth, and sacked the place. She was interred at Aylesbury, in the vicinity of which her parents resided, but eventually Maurice, bishop of London, had her relics conveyed to Chich. The *Vita* is burdened with prodigies. While under Editha's charge Osyth was blown off a bridge in crossing a river, and after being submerged three days rose out from the water alive and well, as Editha and Modwenna were calling to her. After decapitation she carried her own head in her hands three stadia to the door of the neighbouring church of SS. Peter and Paul; and on the spot where she suffered there sprang up a fountain with miraculous virtues. As to the persons of the story, Milteburga, the daughter of Penda, is otherwise unknown. Frithewald is taken by Suysken to be the Mercian subregulus Frithewoldus in Florence of Worcester's *Chronicle*, ann. 675 (*M. H. B.* 535 a), while others make him the same as Redoald, king of East Anglia. The story labours under incurable anachronisms, defying all Suysken's art. King Sighere and the two bishops come some twenty years, Alfred and the Danes above two centuries, before their time. Suysken makes this last king the Northumbrian Alfred, fetching him from a long distance, a suggestion which could be tolerated if the story went straight in other respects, and if Alfred, the son of Ethelwulf, with a sister Edith, did not otherwise figure in Lives of Modwenna (cf. Hardy, *Cat.* i. 98). Streveshal is suspiciously like Streaneschalh (Whitby), which also occurs in Modwenna's story (Hardy, *Cat.* i. 99). Editha and Polleswordh appear copies likewise of king Egbert's daughter Edith and her foundation the Warwickshire Polesworth. As to the final removal of her relics from Aylesbury to Chich, we must observe that it is described in the *Vita* not as one of those ecclesiastical functions known as translations, but as a nocturnal and furtive proceeding of a neighbouring workman alleging the saint's commands given in a vision, narrated in a legendary manner with impossible facts, showing that there was no authentic burial at Chich of anything at all of Osyth's, genuine or ungenuine; that the saint in fact is a name and nothing more, imposed on the place to create a fictitious sanctity for bishop Richard's monastery. Leland (*Itin.* vol. viii. pt. 2, fol. 92, Hearne's, p. 41) gives the heads of a *Life of Osyth* which he found, bearing the name of Vere, a canon of St. Osyth, assigning her martyrdom to the year 600. Suysken, in spite of his author's own express date, places the saint at the close of the seventh century; while others, as Butler, put her death in the great Danish year 870. Petrus Galesinius allows her a place in his *Roman Martyrology*, but Baronius does not admit her into his, although he narrates the martyrdom in his *Annals* (ann. 653 x.). Outlines of the story, in its varieties and in English, may be seen in Hardy's *Descriptive Catalogue* (*u. s.*); in Camden (*u. s.*), Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, Oct. 7; Morant's *Essex*, vol. i. p. 456; Wright's *Essex*, vol. ii. p. 772. [MODWENNA.] [C. H.]

OTHMAR (AUDEMARUS, AUDOMARUS, AUTMARUS, OTMARUS), first abbat of St. Gall, and called also "abbas Durgaugensis," from the "pagus Durgaugia," in which the monastery stood. Chief authorities are Walafrid Strabo's *Vita S. Galli* and *Vita S. Othmari* (Pat. Lat. t. cxiv, 1012, sq. 1031, sq.) with *Mabillonii Observationes Braeviae* from *Acta SS. ord. S. Bened.* t. iv. The *Vita S. Othmari* is also in Goldastus (*Alam. Rer. Scrip.* i. pt. ii. 277-84), and is said to have been written at the request of abbat Gozbert in the beginning of the 9th century. Goldastus (*Ib.* i. pt. ii. 285, sq. 494, sq.) gives also two books of his miracles by Iso magister. Like his namesake, St. Audomar or Omer, he was a native of Alemannia and was presbyter with Victor, count of Chur, when Waltramnus presented him to Pippin, Mayor of the Palace, or more probably to Charles, his father, about A.D. 720. Receiving, with many other gifts, the decayed monastery of St. Gall, he renewed its vigour, but incurred the hatred of certain princes, Warin and Ruthard, who accused him of immorality before Pippin, then king of France, and he was driven into exile at a town called Potamum, where the Rhine leaves the Lake of Constance. When taken ill, he was removed by a friend to Stein, where still a prisoner, he died in the 7th year of king Pippin, A.D. 759, and is said to have been abbat forty years. His feast is Oct. 16 (Usuard, *Mart. Auct.*), and he is sometimes called bishop and martyr, but properly he was neither. [J. G.]

OTHO, Roman emperor, A.D. 69. M. Salvius Otho, born A.D. 32, the son of L. Otho, who had been Proconsul of Africa, was conspicuous in early youth for licentious profligacy, and after his father's death was associated with Nero in his worst excesses. On the day which the emperor had fixed for the murder of Agrippina, Otho gave a splendid banquet to both in order to disarm suspicion (Sueton. *Otho*, c. 2). Their intimacy was however broken by their rivalry in the affections of Poppaea, and the jealousy of the emperor led him to assign to Otho the honourable banishment of a *legatio* in Lusitania (Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 45, 46; *Hist.* i. 13) where he governed as *quaestor* with an unexpected equity and moderation (Tac. *Hist.* i. 13; Sueton. *Otho*, c. 2). On the death of Nero, and the election of Galba as his successor by the Praetorian Guards, Otho at first endeavoured to secure the favour of the new emperor in the hope of being adopted as his successor. Disappointed by Galba's preference of L. Piso, urged on by the pressure of heavy debts, and stimulated by the predictions of the soothsayers and magi, in whom he implicitly believed (Sueton. *Otho*, c. 4), gathering a band of soldiers, by whom he was saluted with the title of *imperator*, he led them to the forum to encounter Galba, who was deserted by his troops and murdered by a common soldier. Otho was welcomed by the populace in the theatre as another Nero (Plut. *Otho*, p. 1007), and joined that name to his own in his official letters (Plut. *Ibid.*). The night that followed found him

full of terrors and haunted by the spectre of the murdered emperor (Sueton. c. 7), but the senate had sworn fidelity to him, and so far things looked hopeful. Hearing that the legions in Germany had elected Vitellius as emperor before the death of Galba, and taken the oath of allegiance to him, Otho on the one hand proposed an alliance in marriage and a share in the empire, and on the other prepared for war. The chief strength of Vitellius, himself gluttonous and sluggish, lay in the support of Fabius Valens and Alienus Caesina, who commanded legions in Lower Germany. The provinces of Gallia Narbonensis, Gallia Lugdunensis, Aquitania and Spain declared for him, and Otho found it necessary to leave Rome for the north of Italy to check their progress. At first the army of Otho met with some partial and indecisive successes. His generals urged him to avoid a decisive action, but his impetuosity led him to risk all on the fate of a single battle. The two armies accordingly met not far from Bedriacum, near the confluence of the Adda and the Po, and Otho's troops were utterly routed. Making no further attempt at resistance he determined on suicide with a singular calmness, took leave of kinsmen and friends, wrote letters to his sisters, gave presents to his servants, burnt all letters that might have compromised his adherents, lay down for a few hours of sleep, and woke on the 15th of April to plunge a dagger in his heart. (Sueton. *Otho;* Plutarch, *Otho;* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii.; *Hist.* i. 2; Dion Cassius, lxiv., and we may add, as giving a vivid picture of the emperor's character and actions, Corneille's tragedy of *Othon.*)
[E. H. P.]

OTILO. [ODILO.]

OTREIUS (1), bishop of Melitina in Upper Armenia and metropolitan; one of the leading orthodox prelates in the latter part of the 4th century, the successor of Uranius. Euthymius, afterwards the celebrated abbat of Palestine, when a child of three or four years old was committed to his care by his parents, A.D. 379. He attended the orthodox council of Tyana, A.D. 367 (Labbe, ii. 99; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 12), as well as the oecumenical council of Constantinople, A.D. 381 (Labbe, ii. 955). At this time he was nominated, together with Gregory Nyssen and Helladius of Caesarea, one of the centres of orthodoxy for the diocese of Pontus (Soz. *H. E.* vii. 9; Socr. *H. E.* v. 8; *Cod. Theod. de Fid. Cathol.* xvi. tit. i. lex 3, tom. vi. p. 9). Basil wrote to Otreius, A.D. 374, after the exile of Eusebius of Samosata, suggesting that they should console one another under so great a calamity, Otreius sending him all the intelligence he could gain from Samosata, and Basil all he could learn from Thrace, the place of Eusebius's banishment. (Basil, *Ep.* 181 [316].)
[E. V.]

OTREIUS (2), bishop of Arabissus in Armenia, the place in which Chrysostom took refuge in 405 from the incursions of the Isaurians. Chrysostom had previously sent a presbyter, named Terentius, to him to obtain some relics of martyrs, of which he had a large store of undoubted genuineness (ἀναμφισβήτητα) for the use of Rufinus the missionary in Phoenicia, who required them for the consecration of the churches he was building. (Chrys. *Ep.* 126; Mansi, iii. 569; Le Quien, i. 445.) [E. V.]

OTRENUS ZOTICUS. [ZOTICUS.]

OTTILIA, abbess. [ODILIA.]

OUDOCEUS (OUDOC, OUDOCHUS, DOCHU), third bishop of Llandaff and one of the chief saints of Wales, being the last of the three, SS. Dubricius, Teilo, and Oudoceus. He was son of Budic, who had fled from Cornugallia (Cornouailles) in Brittany, and, finding refuge in Demetia, Dyfed, or West Wales, in the time of king Aircol Lawhir, had married Anauued or Arianwedd, daughter of Ensic and sister of St. Teilo. Oudoceus was born in Cornugallia after Budic had been called to the throne. He was brother of St. Ismael and martyr Tyfei, and early devoted to religion and learning. On the occasion of a visit by St. Teilo to Brittany, Oudoceus accompanied him to Wales, and ultimately succeeded him in the see of Llandaff, probably in the second half of the 6th century. If facts are to be inferred from the Llandaff charters, he was a powerful bishop, receiving many gifts to the see from his contemporaries Meurig ap Tewdrig, Athrwys ap Meurig, and Morgan ap Athrwys, kings of Glamorgan, and exercising discipline upon kings or reguli at the synods of Llandaff (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, 139, 143, 172; Wilkins, *Conc.* i. 17, 18). These synods appear to have been provincial and wholly disciplinary, the presence of the three great abbats, with their congregations, being specially registered. His consecration for the see has become a point of great interest, as it is said (*Lib. Land.* 84, 124, conf. Ussher, *Wks.* v. 109–10) that he was sent "ad Dorobornensem civitatem, ad beatum archiepiscopum, ubi sacratus est episcopus ecclesiae Landaviae, in honore Sancti Petri fundatae." But it is clear that this is a later controversial device for magnifying the position and prerogative of Llandaff in opposition to the rival sees; in itself it was impossible, if Canterbury were to be the place of consecration. He succeeded to a smaller jurisdiction than St. Teilo held, as Menevia was administered by St. Ceneu; he was partially a contemporary of SS. Cadoc and Gildas. But near the close of his life he retired from his see and lived in holy seclusion on the banks of the Wye. His feast is July 2. His dates are all uncertain, but his death probably occurred early in the 7th century, though Pinius (Boll. *Acta SS.* 2 Jul. i. 284) would prefer about A.D. 564.

Our authorities on the Life of St. Oudoceus are *Vita B. Oudocei Land. Archiep.* (in *Lib. Land.* by Rees, 123 sq.) and Capgrave's summary (*Nov. Leg. Angl.* f. 258), which appears also in the Bollandists' useful memoir (*Acta SS.* 2 Jul. i. 283–6); Cressy (*Ch. Hist. Brit.* xii. c. 9) translates from Capgrave and the Llandaff charters, and Ussher (*Wks.* vi. 81) quotes from them. (See also Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. 145–6; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 125; Wharton, *Angl. Sacra,* ii. 669; Godwin, *De Pr. Ang.* 619; Rees, *W. SS.* 253, 274.) [J. G.]

OUEN, ST. [AUDOENUS.]

OUSIA, recluse. [USIA.]

OVAN, ST., of Autun. [EVANTIUS (1).]

OWAIN ap Macsen Wledig, surnamed Vinddu, numbered among the Welsh saints, but of uncertain character and history; the Triads present him as a warrior chief, and elected to the throne of the Britons in the 4th or 5th century. (Rees, *W. SS.* 108, 115; Williams, *Em. Welsh.* 365.) [J. G.]

OWEN, ST. [AUDOENUS.]

OYAN, ST. [EUGENDUS (2).]

OZEAS, a presbyter, commended by Theodoret as a champion of godliness, by whom he sent a letter to Ibas, bishop of Edessa. (Theod. *Ep.* 132.) [E. V.]

P

PABO, surnamed **POST PRYDAIN**, Welsh warrior and saint about the beginning of the 6th century, buried at Llanbabo in Anglesey. (*Myvir. Arch. of Wales*, ii. 49; Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 503, 527, 558; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 103, 167.) For the Llanbabo inscribed stone see Westwood, *Lap. Wall.* 192. [J. G.]

PACATULA. [GAUDENTIUS (10).]

PACATUS (1), LATINUS DREPANIUS (otherwise LATINUS PACATUS DREPANIUS), a Gallic rhetorician of the 4th century, author of a panegyric pronounced before the senate on Theodosius the Great, Sept. 1st, 391, which contains much information upon the facts of that emperor's life. [DREPANIUS, in *Dict. G. & R. Biog.*] [G. T. S.]

PACATUS (2) (PARATUS), Gallic poet, probably near Bordeaux, c. A.D. 431. He obtained from URANIUS an account of the death of Paulinus of Nola (see it in Boll. *AA. SS.* Jun. v. 172), but the poetical life of St. Paulinus intended to have been written by Pacatus, and based on this, does not appear to have been composed. (*Hist. Lit. Franc.* ii. 202, 204; Fabricius, *Bibl. Lat.* v. 170, 195, ed. Mansi; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 54.) [J. G.]

PACATUS (3), an ecclesiastical writer against Porphyrius, cited by John the Roman deacon, afterwards (as some think) pope John III. in his *Exposition of the Heptateuch*, printed in Pitra's *Spicilegium Solesmense* (vol. i. pp. 280, 281). Nothing further is known of this Pacatus (Ceill. xi. 334). [C. H.]

PACHO (Παχών, PACHOMIUS in Cassiod.), a solitary in Scetis, from youth to extreme old age, in the latter part of the 4th century, famed for his strength in the monastic virtues, having never been seduced, writes Sozomen, by the appetites of the flesh, the passions of the soul, or the wiles of the evil one, to desire the things from which it behoves a philosopher to abstain, (Soz. vi. 29; Cassiod. *Trip. Hist.* viii. 1; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* xi. 36; *Laus. Hist.* c. 29 and note in *Pat. Gr.* xxxiv. 1084). The account of him in the *Lausiac History* has been wrongly attributed to St. Nilus. (Fabric. *Bibl. Gr.* t. x. p. 16, ed. Harles; Ceill. viii. 211.) [C. H.]

PACHOMIUS (1), ST., a monk of the Thebaid of Lower Egypt, in the 4th century A.D., the founder of the famous monasteries of Tabenna; one of the first to collect solitary ascetics together under a rule. Beyond a brief mention of him in Sozomen, who praises his gentleness and suavity (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 14), the materials for his biography are of questionable authenticity. His memory is specially revered in the Greek Church (*AA. SS.* Mai. 14; *Menol. Gr.* Mai. 15). Athanasius, during his visit to Rome, made the name Pachomius familiar to the church there through Marcella and others, to whom he held up Pachomius and his Tabennensian monks as a bright example (Hieron. *Ep.* 127, *ad Principium*). Rosweyd gives a narrative of his life in Latin, being a translation by Dionysius Exiguus, in the 6th century, of a biography said to be written by a contemporary monk of Tabenna (*Vit. Patr.* in *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 227).

If we may trust this writer, Pachomius was born of wealthy pagan parents in Lower Egypt, before the council of Nicaea. He served in his youth under Constantine in the campaign against Maxentius, which placed Constantine alone on the undisputed throne. It was, as often in the early days of Christianity, the kindness shewn by Christians to himself and to his comrades in distress, which led him to become a Christian. Like many enthusiastic converts of that day, he attached himself to a hermit, celebrated for his sanctity and austerities. The narrative tells how he and Palaemon supported themselves by weaving the shaggy tunics ("cilicia"), the favourite dress of Egyptian monks, not unlike the hair-shirt of later ascetics. He became a monk, and many prodigies are related of his power over demons, and in resisting the natural craving for sleep and food. (*Vit.* cc. 40, 44, 45, 47, 48, etc., ap. Rosw. *V. P.*)

His reputation for holiness soon attracted to him many who desired to embrace the monastic life, and without, apparently, collecting them into one monastery, he provided for them the organisation, without which disorder must have ensued. The bishop of a neighbouring diocese sent for him to regulate the monks there. Pachomius seems also to have done some missionary work in his own neighbourhood. Athanasius, visiting Tabenna, was eagerly welcomed by Pachomius, who, in that zeal for orthodoxy, which was a characteristic of monks generally, is said to have flung one of Origen's writings into the water, exclaiming, that he would have cast it into the fire, but that it contained the name of God. He lived to a good old age (Niceph. *Hist. Eccl.* ix. 14). The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii. 287) give the *Acta* of Pachomius by a nearly contemporary author, in a Latin translation from the original Greek MSS., with notes and commentary by Papebroch. Here (*Acta*, § 77) Pachomius died about the time when Athanasius returned to his see under Constantius, i.e. A.D. 349 as computed by Papebroch [ATHANASIUS, p. 191 *b*

note r], and as the same author reckons, aged 57. Miraeus (*Schol.* to Gennad. *Scr. Eccl.* c. 7) makes him flourish in 340; Trithemius in 390, under Valentinian and Theodosius. Sigebert (*Chron.* ann. 405) puts his death in 405 at the age of 110. Portus Veneris, now Porto Venere, a small town on the north-west coast of Italy, near Spezia, claims, that his body rests there.

What is called the Rule of Pachomius was published at Rome 1575 A.D., and, again, at Rome 1588 A.D. in a revised form by Petr. Ciacconius as part of his edition of Cassian's works. (Rosweyd, *Vitae Patrum*, Notae ad *Vit. Pachom.*) It is said to have been translated by Jerome from the original Greek or Coptic, 404 A.D. But Cave objects that Pachomius is omitted in Jerome's list of ecclesiastical writers (Cave, *Hist. Liter.* i. 208).

The same learned and accurate writer regards the Rule given by Palladius of Helenopolis in his *Historia Lausiaca* (c. 38, ap. Rosweyd, *Vit. Patr.* pp. 737), as an abridgment of a longer rule, and thinks, that the simple rule of Pachomius was amplified by his successors. The rule in Palladius agrees with the rule in the Life of Pachomius. Sozomen styles Pachomius the founder and ruler (ἀρχηγός) of Tabenna, and speaks of his system (πολιτεία) as aiming, like other monastic codes, at virtue and heavenly things (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 14). Palladius (*ib.*) relates, how an angel traced the Rule on a brazen tablet. Three monks were to share one cell; they were all to take their meals together, but were to wear their hoods at meals, so as not to see one another. They were to wear their white goatskins (cf. Hebrews xi. 37), day and night. Twelve times at least in the day, twelve in the evening, twelve in the night were to pray. Pachomius himself set them an example of working hard, both indoors and out. The probation for a novice was to last three years; the lay monks were to reverence those, who had been ordained; all were to be under the control of priors ("praepositi," cc. 22, 25, etc.), chosen not by seniority but by merit (c. 45).

The sister of Pachomius is said (like St. Scholastica) to have copied her brother's example by founding a convent near his monks, and prescribing a Rule for the female devotees there. A monk, with leave from those in authority, might visit a relative there, if accompanied himself by one of the older brethren. According to Gennadius (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 7, ap. Fabric. *Biblioth. Eccles.*), Pachomius wrote also several epistles, mostly lost (Rosweyd, *Not. ad Vit. Pach.*), and ordered the monks of the monasteries under his supervision to meet yearly at Easter and on another great festival.

The *Monita Spiritualia*, ascribed to Pachomius by Voss (*Opp. Gregor. Thaumat.* App. Mogunt. 1606) Cave pronounces spurious, but praises them highly as terse, and worthy to be written in letters of gold (*Hist. Liter.* s.v.). (In addition to the authorities cited above, see Honorius Augustodunensis, *De Scriptor. Eccl.*, ap. Fabric. *Biblioth. Eccles.*, Hamburgi, 1718; and Heraclides, *Paradisus*, ap. Rosweyd. *Vitae Patrum.* Antverpiae, 1628.) Rosweyd (*Vit. Patr.* lib. i. in *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 429) gives a *Vita* bearing some resemblance to the Life of Pachomius, but conjectures that it is the Life of some monk who, he thinks, should be named Posthumius Papebroch (p. 359) reprints it as a *Vita Apocrypha* of Pachomius. [I. G. S.]

PACHOMIUS (2), a disciple of the saint of that name. (*Vit. S. Pachomii*, c. 24 ap. Rosweyd. *Vit. Patr.* in *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 244.) [I. G. S.]

PACHOMIUS, of Scetis. [PACHO.]

PACHOMIUS (3), Greek monk, author of three works given in Migne, *Pat. Graec.* t. xcviii. 1333–63, entitled περὶ τῆς ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν ὠφελείας, Περὶ Καρταυίτων Αἱρετικῶν, and Προθεωρία εἰς τὴν γραμματικήν. He probably belongs to the 8th century (Ceillier, xii. 152). [J. G.]

PACHYMIUS (Παχύμιος), Egyptian bishop and martyr in the Diocletian persecution. [PHILEAS.] (Eus. *H. E.* viii. 13.) [G. T. S.]

PACIANUS, ST., Mar. 9, bishop of Barcelona. All that is known of him is derived from St. Jerome (*de Viris Ill.* 106, 132), who states that he was renowned both for the purity of his life and for his eloquence, and that he wrote various short works, of which some were against the Novatians, and one was called *Cervus*. He died at an advanced age in the reign of Theodosius and before A.D. 392, the date of St. Jerome's work, and therefore probably succeeded Praetextatus, bishop in A.D. 343. He was the father of Dexter, the pretorian prefect, to whom St. Jerome's book was dedicated. Three letters of his are extant, addressed to Sympronianus, a Novatian, in which the chief positions he defends are the use of the name Catholic, and the possibility of repentance and the right of the church to give absolution for post-baptismal sin. There are also extant an exhortation to repentance, and a sermon on baptism. In the former he alludes to the work now lost, mentioned by St. Jerome, which he calls *Cervulus*. It is supposed to have been directed against the New Year festivities, at which people dressed themselves up in the skins of various animals. Gams gives a list of the editions of St. Pacian, the princeps being that of Tillet, Paris, 1538. Migne's (*Patr. Lat.* xiii. 1051) is a reprint of Galland's. (Tillem. viii. 537; Gams, *Kirch. von Spanien*, ii. (1), 318; *Esp. Sag.* xxix. 91, 390.) An English translation of his works accompanies that of Cyprian's Letters in the Oxford Ang. Cath. Lib. [F. D.]

PADARN (PATERNUS, PATERO, PETERONE), founder and patron of Llanbadarn-Fawr, near Aberystwith, co. Cardigan, bishop of that see and one of the three chief saints of Wales.

The chief authority is *Vita Sancti Paterni*, belonging to the 11th or 12th century; it is published by Rees (*Cambr. Brit. SS.* 189–97, 502–14, with English translation), and John of Tinmouth's shortened form of it is given by Capgrave (*Nov. Leg. Angl.* f. 258–9), from whom it is printed, with important preface by Henschenius, in Boll. *Acta SS.* 15 April ii. 375–78. (For the bibliography see Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. pt. i. 129–30, pt. ii. 858; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 145–6, App. C, 159 App. E, carefully distinguishing the Lives of the bishops of Wales and Avranches.) Padarn was a Breton, son of

Pedrwn; in the company of his relative CADFAN (1), he came to Britain A.D. 516 (Ussher), was perhaps a pupil in the school of St. Iltyd at Llantwit Major, and finally built a church and monastery at Mauritana, now Llanbadarn-Fawr. He is then said to have visited Ireland, to which his father had retired for religion, and on his return built monasteries and churches throughout Cardiganshire. He was the first bishop of Llanbadarn, and by the legend is carried with SS. David and Teilo for episcopal consecration to Jerusalem. After a rule of twenty-one years, he removed to Brittany at the call of Caradog Vraichvras (a celebrated warrior and prince of Cornwall about the close of the 5th century, but whom we can hardly regard as a ruler in Brittany), and became bishop of Vannes, one of the seven dioceses into which Armorica or Brittany was divided. While he was there, Samson was bishop at Dol, and a synod took place at Vannes for the settling of some differences between Padarn and the neighbouring bishops, but the result was only partial, and Padarn soon after went among the Franks and died there, but the year is unknown. The Bollandists place his birth about the year 490, his arrival in Britain 516, his return to Armorica 540, and his death 560, but beyond his reputed connexion with certain contemporaries there is no evidence for dates, and the Paternus who, with Samson, signed the canons of the council of Paris, A.D. 557, was unquestionably the bishop of Avranches, in Lower Normandy. The Welsh portion of the legend taken by itself, and his burial at Bardsey, can be received without much question, but the remainder can with difficulty be accepted. The feast of the bishop of Llanbadarn is April 15, and that of the bishop of Avranches, April 16 (Usuard. *Mart. Auct.* Apr. 16; Ussher, Wks. vi. c. 14 and Ind. Chron. A.D. 516 sq.; Rees, *W. SS.* 215–7; Pryce, *An. Br. Ch.* c. 4; *Myv. Arch.* ii. 10, 24, 50, 472; Cressy, *C. H. Brit.* xi. c. 9; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 144). Padarn is patron and has given his name to Llanbadarn-Fawr, and many other places in Wales. The extent and duration of the see of Llanbadarn are uncertain. It probably occupied the counties of Cardigan and Radnor, the north of Brecknockshire, which had just belonged to the short-lived see of Llanafan-Fawr, and the southern parishes of Montgomeryshire. It is said to have been filled by Cynog after Padarn [CYNOG], but the succession is lost, and only Cynog, Curig, and Idnerth are even mentioned. It may have existed till 720, when its churches appear to have been devastated by the Saxons (*Brut. y Tywysog.* in *Myr. Arch.* ii. 472, but not in *M. H. B.* 842), but it ultimately became merged in the see of St. David's. [J. G.]

An early biographer quoted by Usher, says that three days were held sacred to his memory; April 15, being the anniversary of his death; June 20 in remembrance of his consecration as bishop, and Nov. 1, on account of his reconciliation with the prelates of Armorica. William of Malmesbury (*Gest: Pontificum*, v. § 249), gives a letter of Radbod, prior of the monastery of St. Sampson at Dol, to King Athelstan in 923, in which he says that he has sent the king the bones of St. Senator, St. Paternus, and St. Scubilo, who was Paternus's master, and that they lay in the same tomb with St. Paternus on his right and left hand, and that their festival is kept on September 23. This was the bishop of Avranches. The invasions of the Northmen threw the Breton and South Welsh churches upon Anglo-Saxon protection (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 96). The name Paternus also occurs as that of a Cornish king, the father of St. Constantine (Vol. I. p. 660), and some suppose that he gave name to the parish of Madron in Cornwall. The *Acta Sanctorum* give the Bishop of Vannes (who died about 560) under April 15, ii. 379–382, the bishop of Avranches (who died about 565), under April 16, ii. 427–430.

There are parishes in Cornwall and Devon called Petherwin, probably in honour of the bishop of Vannes. [C. W. B.]

PADDA, a priest who assisted Wilfrid in the conversion of the South Saxons (Bed. *H. E.* iv. 13). [PUCH, s. f.] [C. H.]

PAEANIUS, a lay friend and correspondent of Chrysostom, filling some high official position at Constantinople. Chrysostom gives him a very exalted character for zeal in defence of the truth, and courage united with respect, in resisting the bishops and others in authority by whom it was being betrayed. In the height of the storm, while some were being driven into exile, others were flying or hiding themselves for fear of persecution, and others were yielding to the menaces of the party in power, he stood firm, and by his almost unaided strength supported the falling church, encouraged the fearful, put the cowardly to shame, and proved himself a harbour to all the tempest-tossed. His interest and his exertions extended beyond Constantinople to Palestine, Phoenicia, Cilicia, and every part of the church that was affected by the recent calamities (Chrys. *Ep.* 205, 220). His fidelity to Chrysostom cost him the temporary loss of his official position, and his banishment from Constantinople. But after a short interval he was recalled and reinstated in his former rank (*Ep.* 220). We have four letters of Chrysostom to Paeanius (*Epp.* 95, 193, 204, 220). [E. V.]

PAEGA, an abbat in the diocese of Worcester, who attested the act of the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803. (Kemble, *C. D.* 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546.) [C. H.]

PAEONIUS, a prefect of Gaul, who, according to the somewhat malicious account of Sidonius Apollinaris, by whom he is nicknamed Chremes, had usurped the office in the first instance. According to the same authority he was a man of humble birth, who had advanced himself by stirring up sedition and posing as a sort of tribune of the people, and by contracting a fortunate marriage. The cause of the poet's ill-humour was an unfounded accusation which Paeonius had made against him of writing some satirical verses in which he and others were held up to ridicule (A.D. 461). The story of the charge and the reconciliation by the good offices of the Emperor Majorian, who asked them both to dinner, is amusingly told in one of Sidonius's letters (i. 11). [S. A. B.]

PAESIS (1) (Πάησις, Παΐσις. PAUSIS), March 24, Egyptian martyr with others in the second

year of the Diocletian persecution. They suffered under Urbanus, ruler of Palestine, at Caesarea. (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* c. 3.) [G. T. S.]

PAESIS (2), June 21, an Egyptian martyr in the Diocletian persecution, with his sister Thecla. They were natives of the Thebaid. Their names are not found in any martyrology save the Ethiopic as given in Ludolphi *Hist. Aeth. Comment.* p. 401, under the date of Dec. viii., but their original Acts will be found in Aug. Ant. Georgii *de Miraculis S. Coluthi*, Rom. 1793, p. cxxx., with which should be compared Georgii *Fragm. Evang. Johann. Graeco-Copto-Thebaic.* Rom. 1789, p. xcvii. According to the fuller version of their Acts in this latter reference, they suffered under Armenius the prefect of Egypt [MARMENIA]. These Acts show the efforts made by the governor to gain them over, as they were of noble birth. The Acts are clearly genuine records of that great persecution, and may be compared with those of Theodotus of Ancyra as regards the efforts made to win the martyrs by rewards. [G. T. S.]

PAIR, ST. [PATERNUS (9).]

PALAEMON, solitary in the Thebaid, who directed Pachomius abbat of Tabenna, in the spiritual life. (*Vit. Pachomii* in Boll. *AA. SS.* Mai. iii. 297–8, ed. 1866; Tillemont, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 167 sq., 674 sq.) [J. G.]

PALATINUS, a Christian, perhaps of Hippo, who appears to have embraced a monastic life at an early age, and sent to St. Augustine some hair-shirts, probably as indicative of his own mode of life. (Aug. *Ep.* 218; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 150.) [H. W. P.]

PALCHONIUS (BALCONIUS), bishop of Braga (Bracara) in Lusitania from before 415 till after 447 (Florez, *Esp. Sag.* xv. 102), recipient of a consolatory letter brought from Avitus the priest by Orosius the historian in 415. The letter occurs in the App. to St. Augustine's *Opp.* t. vii. (*Pat. Lat.* xli. 805; see also Baronius, *Eccl. Ann.* A.D. 415; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 3.) [J. G.]

PALLADIA (1), a lady of Cappadocia, a relative of Basil, whom for the excellence of her character he regarded as his mother. (Basil, *Ep.* 137 [366].) [E. V.]

PALLADIA (2), sister to PAULUS (107).

PALLADIA (3), wife of St. Salvianus, priest of Marseilles (circ. A.D. 390–485), is known from a letter written by her and her husband to her parents Hypatius and Quieta (*Ep.* iv. in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liii. 160; Ceillier, x. 360), earnestly deprecating their anger against Salvianus who had separated from her on religious grounds. [S. A. B.]

PALLADIA (4), lady of rank, condemned in the council held at Lyons A.D. 517 for incest with one named Stephen; six canons were passed against them. (Hefele, *Conc.* ii.667; Mansi, viii. 568.) [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (1), priest, correspondent of St. Athanasius about A.D. 371. He wrote to inform Athanasius that a number of the monks of Caesarea in Cappadocia were turned against Basil, and begged Athanasius to counsel the unruly brethren to cease from opposing the doctrine of their bishop. (Athan. *Ep. ad Pallad.*, in *Pat. Gr.* xxvi. 1167; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iv. 147.) [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (2), one of the principal officers of the court at Constantinople, where one of that name was "Intendens largitionum" in 381, and "magister officiorum" in that and the following years (*Cod. Theod.* tom. vi. p. 376), a highly prized friend and frequent correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen, who wrote to him during the Lent of 382 in behalf of a relation of his named Euphemius, who was going on business to Constantinople (Greg. Naz. *Epp.* 228, 231), and also on behalf of a presbyter named Sacerdos (*Ep.* 229). [E. V.]

PALLADIUS (3), a person who during Gregory Nazianzen's absence had inflicted violent injury on his house, of which Gregory in 380 makes complaint to Alypius, governor of Cappadocia, and begs him to prevent its complete ruin. (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 148 al. 82.) [E. V.]

PALLADIUS (4), Arian bishop, apparently of Dacia, who wrote a letter, not now extant, to St. Ambrose, and who is classed by that prelate (*De fide* l. 1, c. 6) among the leading Arians, was tried with Secundianus in the provincial council of Aquileia A.D. 381, and condemned for Arianism. (Mansi, iii. 599 sq. See Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xvi. 916 for St. Ambrose's account of the trial.) Vigilius of Thapsus uses him in his treatise in defence of the Nicene faith as disputing with Ambrose, against whom he had written [AMBROSIUS]. (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxii. 433 sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 483.) [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (5), magistrate of Suedra in Pamphylia, who united with the clergy of Suedra in the request to Epiphanius of Salamis for instruction upon the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; the *Ancoratus* is Epiphanius's reply. (Epiphanius, *Opp.* iii. 3.) [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (6), bishop of London (unhistorical) is given as the sixth by Godwin. (*De Praesul. Angliae*, 170, ed. Richardson; Stubbs, *Reg. Sacr.* 152.) [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (7), bishop of Helenopolis, the author of the *Lausiac History*, containing biographies of the leading ascetics with whom he was contemporary, the trusted friend of Chrysostom, in whose misfortunes he fully shared, was born c. 367, perhaps, though this is uncertain, in Galatia. He embraced an ascetic life in his 20th year, c. 386. His ascetic career can only be conjecturally traced from scattered notices in his *Lausiac History*. He never remained very long in one place, his object being to make the acquaintance of the leading solitaries and ascetics of his day, and to learn all that could be gathered of their manner of life and the miraculous deeds of which they were the reputed authors. Tillemont thinks that his earliest place of sojourn was with the abbat Elpidius of Cappadocia in the cavernous recesses of the mountains in the vicinity of Jericho (*Hist. Laus.* c. 106), and that he, about 387,

visited Bethlehem, where he received a very unfavourable impression of Jerome from the solitary Posidonius (*ibid.* c. 78), and passing thence to Jerusalem formed the acquaintance of Melania the elder, and Rufinus, the latter of whom he highly commends (*ibid.* c. 5, c. 118). In 388 Palladius paid his first visit to Alexandria (*ibid.* c. 1). Here he placed himself under the instructions of the presbyter Isidore, the Hospitaller of the Alexandrine church. Isidore, wisely judging that Palladius's ardent temperament needed manual labour more than spiritual counsels for its subjugation, sent him to pass three years with a solitary named Dorotheus, who was notorious for the austerity of his asceticism (*ibid.* c. 2). The discipline proved too severe for the young aspirant for ascetic honours, and a severe illness compelled him to curtail the period of his stay (*ibid.* p. 7). After having visited several of the monasteries near Alexandria and their inmates, including the famous Didymus, Palladius retired (c. 390) to the Nitrian desert, whence, after a year, he plunged still deeper into the district known as the Cells, *τὰ κελλία*, where he remained more or less for the space of nine years (*ibid.*). Here, for three years, he enjoyed the intercourse of Macarius the younger [MACARIUS, (17)] and subsequently of Evagrius of Pontus [EVAGRIUS (12) PONTICUS]. Palladius's eager desire to obtain information regarding the heroes of the ascetic life, and a naturally roving disposition, forbad his remaining absolutely settled long in any one place, and he appears during this period to have traversed the whole of Upper Egypt as far as Tabenna and Syene, and to have visited all the leading solitaries of that country. Outraged nature again asserted itself. Palladius once more fell ill (399 A.D.), and the dropsical symptoms with which he was afflicted caused the solitaries with whom he was sojourning to send him down to Alexandria to consult the physicians of that city, after he had assisted at the death-bed of Evagrius (*ibid.* c. 86). By their advice he returned to the purer air of Palestine, whence he soon passed to Bithynia, where, as he somewhat singularly remarks, either by human judgment or the Divine will, he knows not which, he was called to the dignity of the episcopate (*ibid.* c. 43). Palladius tells us neither when he was consecrated nor the name of his see. This (if we are right in identifying the author of the *Lausiac History* with the adherent of Chrysostom) we learn from other sources was Helenopolis, formerly called Drepanum, in Bithynia. He was ordained by Chrysostom, and the Origenistic opinions Palladius was charged with having imbibed from Evagrius, subsequently became a handle of accusation against his consecrator (Phot. *Cod.* 59, p. 57). The accusation of Origenism is also brought against Palladius by Epiphanius (*Epistola ad Joann. Jerus.* Hieron., *Opera*, i. col. 252, ed. Vallars.), and Jerome himself (*Procm. in Dial. adv. Pelagianos*), though Tillemont endeavours to shew that these passages refer to another Palladius. Palladius was present at the Synod held at Constantinople, May 400, at which Antoninus of Ephesus was accused by Eusebius, and he was one of the three bishops deputed by Chrysostom to visit Asia and make a personal investigation into the charges (Pallad. *Dial.* pp. 131–133). On the fruitless termination of this embassy, Chrysostom, at the opening of the year 401, resolving to go to Ephesus himself and apply a healing hand to the diseases of the Ephesine church, Palladius was one of the bishops selected to accompany him (*ibid.* p. 134).

Palladius's alleged Origenistic views having been one of the grounds of accusation against Chrysostom, he was one of the first to suffer from the persecution which, after his exile in 404, fell upon all the friends and adherents of the banished prelate. Palladius appears from a letter addressed to him by Chrysostom from Cucusus to have lain for some time in concealment in the hope of escaping persecution, in an enforced leisure which the saint reminds him allowed more time for intercessory prayer for the distracted church. It is to this that he may be referring when he speaks of having had to pass eleven months in a small dark room (*Hist. Laus.* c. 43). Concealment being no longer easy, and the magistrates having decreed that the house of any one who harboured bishop, priest, or even layman who communicated with Chrysostom, should be confiscated, Palladius, with many other ecclesiastics, took refuge in Rome, where he arrived about the middle of 405, bringing with him no letters, but a copy of the infamous decree which had driven him from Constantinople (Pallad. *Dial.* pp. 26, 27). Palladius and the other refugees were hospitably entertained by one Pinianus and his wife and by some noble ladies of Rome, a kindness of which he makes grateful mention in his history (Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* c. 121), and for which Chrysostom wrote letters of thanks from Cucusus. (PINIANUS.) He was honourably received, together with the other bishops Cyrianus, Demetrius, and Eusebius, who had come on the same business by pope Innocent, and his testimony enabled the pope to obtain a clear knowledge of the details of the transaction (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 26). Chrysostom wrote a grateful letter to the four bishops for all the labour and trouble they had encountered in his behalf (Chrys. *Ep.* 148). On the departure of the Italian deputation sent by Honorius to his brother Arcadius, requesting that the whole matter should be subjected to the decision of a general council, Palladius and the other refugees accompanied them (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 31). On their arrival the whole party received brutal and insulting treatment, and were forbidden to land at Constantinople. Palladius and his companions were shut up in separate chambers in the fortress of Athyre on the coast; and loaded with the utmost contumely, in the hope of breaking their spirit and compelling them to renounce communion with Chrysostom, and recognise Atticus (*ibid.* p. 32). All threats and violence proving vain, the bishops were relegated to distant and opposite quarters of the empire. Palladius's place of banishment was Syene, on the extreme border of Egypt (*ibid.* p. 194). On his journey thither, he suffered from the brutal treatment and foul language of his guards, who deprived him of the services of his attendant, and forcibly robbed him of his writing case and memoranda (*ibid.* p. 199). Tillemont considers that the death of Theophilus, in 412, brought some relaxation of Palladius's sentence, and that he was permitted to leave his place of exile, but not to return to his see.

During the interval between 412 and 420, when he wrote his *Lausiac History*, Tillemont places his residence of four years in the neighbourhood of Antinoopolis in the Thebaid, of which district and its numerous ascetics he gives copious details (*Hist. Laus.* c. 96–100; c. 137, 138), as well as the three years which he states he spent on the Mount of Olives with Innocent, the presbyter of the church built there. During the interval he may also have visited Mesopotamia, and Syria, and the other portions of the eastern world which he speaks of having traversed. The peace of the church being re-established in 417, it is possible that Palladius was restored to his see of Helenopolis. If so he did not remain there long, for Socrates informs us that he was translated from that see to Aspuna in Galatia Prima (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 36). He had, however, ceased to be bishop of Aspuna, either by death or by resignation, in the year 431, when Eusebius attended the council of Ephesus as bishop of that see (Labbe, *Concil.* iii. 450). Palladius composed his *Historia Lausiaca* in the twentieth year of his episcopate, c. 420. The work takes its name from the person at whose request it was written, and to whom it is dedicated. This was one Lausus or Lauson, the chief chamberlain in the imperial household, probably that of Theodosius II. Cedrenus says that he was an eunuch, a class of persons to which such officials usually belonged (Cedren. p. 335). Palladius describes Lausus as a very excellent person, who was not elated by his high place, employing his power for the glory of God and the good of the church and his riches for the relief of the poor and needy, devoting his leisure time to self-improvement and study. The *Lausiac History* is a collection of short biographical notices and characteristic anecdotes of the chief ascetics of the writer's time, both men and women. Though Palladius was credulous, especially with regard to supposed miraculous actions, his work deserves to be accepted as an honest and, with the exception named, trustworthy account of the mode of life of the solitaries of that age, and has a very real value as a faithful picture of the tone of religious thought then prevalent. It preserves to us many historical and biographical details which would otherwise have been lost, to which later writers have been indebted. Sozomen borrows many anecdotes from the *Lausiac History* without acknowledgement. Socrates makes special reference to Palladius as a leading authority on the lives of the solitaries, but is in error as to his profession and date, calling him a monk, and stating that he lived soon after the death of Valens (Socr. *H. E.* iv. 23). The *Historia Lausiaca* was repeatedly printed in various Latin versions, from very early times, the first edition appearing soon after the invention of printing. The first edition of the Greek text, with many lacunae, was that of Meursius (Lugdun. Bat. 1616). A more complete text was given in the *Auctarium* of Fronto Ducaeus (tom. ii. Rom. 1624), which was reprinted in the successive editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, in 1644 and 1654. Combefis supplies some additional material in his *Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta*, vol. iii. The complete work is contained in the Patrologia of Migne.

Another work has been, without sufficient authority, ascribed to Palladius of Helenopolis in several MSS., in one of which it is annexed to the *Historia Lausiaca*. This is a treatise on "the nations of India, and the Brachmans," *περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἰνδίας ἐθνῶν καὶ τῶν Βραγμάνων*. The work supplies nothing by which the writer can be identified, beyond the facts that he was a Christian who commenced his journey in company with one Moses, bishop of Adule, on the confines of Egypt and Ethiopia, and that at the time of his writing the Roman empire was still flourishing. Cave expresses grave doubts as to Palladius being its author, which Oudin directly denies.

The question whether the *Dialogue with Theodore the Deacon* is correctly assigned to Palladius of Helenopolis requires fuller discussion. This "Dialogue," which is our chief authority for the later history of Chrysostom and the events connected with his deposition and banishment and the persecution of his adherents, has been commonly ascribed to Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis, the author of the *Historia Lausiaca*. Whether the authorship may be correctly assigned to him is a question which has been much debated, and on which the opinions of scholars have been greatly divided. Photius, our earliest authority on the subject, mentions this Dialogue as the work of Palladius, whom he designates as a bishop, without naming his see (Phot. *Cod.* 96, p. 252). The title of the MS. in the Medicean Library at Florence of the 7th century, from which the Greek text was first printed, describes the author as "Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis," and the same description is repeated at the end of the work. The title is as follows: *Διάλογος Ἱστορικὸς Παλλαδίου Ἐπισκόπου Ἑλενουπόλεως γενόμενος πρὸς Θεόδωρον διάκονον Ῥώμης περὶ βίου καὶ πολιτείας τοῦ μακαρίου Ἰωάννου ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου.* In other MS. copies of the dialogue the author is designated bishop of Aspuna, to which see we know on the authority of Socrates that Palladius was translated from Helenopolis (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 36). Theodore, bishop of Trimithus in Cyprus, in the 7th century, also agrees in ascribing the work to Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis. There was no question as to the authorship till the first publication of the Greek text by Emeric Bigot, Paris, 1680. In a learned Latin preface Bigot expresses his opinion, that the work was originally published anonymously to escape the enmity of the persecutors of Chrysostom, and that the identification of its author with Palladius the adherent of Chrysostom is erroneous. To escape the force of the testimony for its being the work of the bishop of Helenopolis, Bigot invents a second Palladius who succeeded his namesake on his translation to Aspuna (Bigot, *Praef.* pp. 9, 10). Such an assumption is entirely gratuitous, and completely devoid of foundation. That the dialogue was written by Theodore of Helenopolis is strongly maintained by Dupin (*Auteurs Ecclés.* tom. iii. p. 296, ed. Paris, 1686), who finds an additional argument in favour of his view, in the similarity of its style with that of the *Historia Lausiaca*, both being written in a curiously debased Greek. This view of the authorship is also held by Cotelier (*Eccl. Graec. Monum.* tom. iii. p. 563), and

s regarded as probable by Cave who, however, shrank from deciding the question, saying "de dialogi hujus auctore multos inter eruditos lis est . . . verum omnia doctiorum judicio lubens submitto" (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 377).

Wastel, the learned Carmelite, invented another theory of the authorship, viz. that it was composed by the younger of the two interlocutors, Theodore the deacon: a shadowy personage of whose real existence we have no proof (Wastel. *Vindic. Joann. Ierosol.* tom. ii. p. 496). Tillemont strongly maintains that the name of the author of the Dialogue was Palladius, and that he was a bishop, but led astray by the false assumption that the narrator is speaking in his own character, and seeing that the bishop of Helenopolis is repeatedly referred to by him as a distinct person, calls into existence another Palladius, unknown to history, of whom he draws up an entirely imaginary history from the dialogue itself (*Mém. Ecclés.* tom. xi. pp. 520–533; 642–646). It is rather remarkable that so many learned men should have failed to perceive that this dialogue is essentially a literary composition, of the same character as the dialogues of Plato and Cicero and other ancient writers, and that the characters and framework are alike fictitious, invented by the author for the purpose of adding vividness and a dramatic air to his narrative. The bishop and the deacon are evidently imaginary personages brought upon the stage to tell what each knows of the transactions in reply to questions put to them by the other. One thing only is certain as to the authorship. It was undoubtedly written by one who was not only an eyewitness of the events he describes, but took an active part in them. There is no one who corresponds so closely to the ideal presented by the narration in all respects as Palladius of Helenopolis, nor is there any really weighty objection to regarding him as the real author. The supposed objection, based on Palladius of Helenopolis being spoken of in the third person, would be of equal weight against Caesar being the author of the "Commentaries" or Xenophon of the "Anabasis." With regard to the character of the work, interesting and valuable as it is, it owes its merit entirely to the subject, and not to the style or arrangement. It is impossible to echo Photius's commendation of it as a work "excellently and carefully composed," καλῶς τε καὶ ἐσπουδασμένως. It has all the characteristics of a heated polemical pamphlet, written under very excited feelings. The language is debased, the style involved, and the arrangement confused. The narrative is entirely deficient in orderly sequence. To follow the course of events one has to turn backwards and forwards, and it is difficult to conceive of a biographical treatise which more fully exercises our patience. But for the closing days of Chrysostom's episcopate and the events of that stirring time, with all its faults, this dialogue is simply priceless. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* tom. xi. pp. 500–530, pp. 638–646; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 376; Du Pin, *Auteurs Eccl.* tom. iii. p. 296; Cotelerius, *Eccl. Graec. Monum.* tom. iii. p. 563; Wastelius, *Vindiciae Joannis Ierosolymitani*, tom. ii. p. 499; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* i. 727; viii. 456; x. 98 sq.; Oudin, *De Script. Eccl.* i. 908.) [E. V.]

PALLADIUS (8), a solitary, commemorated by Theodoret in his *Religiosa Historia*, c. vii. [E. V.]

PALLADIUS (9), prefect of the east, A.D. 450–455. He held the office at the council of Chalcedon. (Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* i. 639; Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 78.) [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (10), thirteenth bishop of Bourges, was contemporary with pope Leo I., and joined with other Gallican bishops in sending to the pope the synodical letter from Ravenna A.D. 451 (Leo. *Epist.* 66. 99. 102; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* liv. 883. 969. 985, for the letter and reply). His feast is May 10 (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 8; Boll. *A. SS.* Mai. ii. 567). [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (11), July 6, the first bishop sent to Ireland, and the immediate predecessor of St. Patrick. The facts known about him are very few, though his memory has been surrounded with abundant legends. His birthplace has been disputed, some placing it in England, others in Gaul, others in Italy; some even making him a Greek. The fact is that we have no information at all on the subject; and as the name Palladius was common enough in those times, every author has a sufficiently wide field on which to exercise his power of identification or imagination. Ussher has pretty well exhausted this field in his *Eccles. Britann. Antiq.* t. vi. cap. xvi. of Elrington's edit. The ecclesiastical position of Palladius has also been disputed. Some have made him archdeacon of Rome, a cardinal, and apostolic nuncio; others believe that he was deacon of Germanus of Auxerre. He seems to have been an influential man in the earlier part of the fifth century, as Prosper of Aquitaine, who was a contemporary, mentions him twice, affording the only real record of his life which we possess. Under date A.D. 429, the consulship of Florentius and Dionysius at Rome, Prosper writes thus in his *Chronicle*:—"Agricola, a Pelagian, son of Severianus, a Pelagian bishop, corrupted the churches of Britannia by the insinuation of his doctrine, but by the instrumentality of the deacon Palladius, pope Celestinus sends Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, in his own stead, to displace the heretics and direct the Britons to the catholic faith." The probability seems great that Palladius was from Gaul or Britain, as two years afterwards, in 431, the pope consecrated him a missionary bishop for Ireland; and it is not likely he would have sent any person on such a mission except one who knew the language and customs of a Celtic people. Prosper's words under 431, the year of the consulship of Bassus and Antiochus, are, "Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatur a Papa Celestino Palladius et primus Episcopus mittitur." There is also a reference to this mission of Palladius in Prosper's work, *Contra Collatorem*, cap. xxi., where he says of Celestine, "whilst the pope laboured to keep the Roman island Catholic, he made also the barbarous island Christian, by ordaining a bishop for the Scots" (cf. opp. Prosperi, in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. li.). This mission of Palladius is referred to in the Book of Armagh, where Tirechan (*Analect. Bolland.* t. ii. p. 67), or more probably some writer towards the year 900, speaking first of

St. Patrick's mission and its date, then adds something to Prosper's statement. "Palladius is first sent as bishop, who was called Patricius by another name. He suffered martyrdom among the Scots, as the ancient saints declare; then the second Patrick is sent by the angel of God, Victor by name, and by pope Celestine, in whom the whole of Ireland believed." This notice has introduced great confusion into the history of Palladius. Tirechan calls him Patricius as his second name, and has thus introduced another Patrick into the numerous Patricks who were already claiming the honour of being the apostle of Ireland. The controversy is too long and involved to be here discussed. The reader will find ample details in Ussher, *l. c.*; Todd's St. Patrick, p. 270, and Petrie on the *History and Antiquities of Tara Hill*, p. 90. The Bollandists, *AA. SS.* Jul. ii. p. 286, give the Scottish traditions, and the Rev. J. F. Shearman in his *Loca Patriciana*, p. 25, Dub. 1879, has discussed with vast resources of legendary lore the different localities in Wicklow and Kildare where Palladius is said to have preached and built churches. His authorities are not however of much historical value on such a question, being specially the *Four Masters* and Jocelyn. His work contains, however, much interesting matter for the students of Irish ecclesiastical history and antiquities, the accuracy of which is guaranteed by the writer's extensive personal knowledge of the localities. [G. T. S.]

PALLADIUS (12), patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 488–498 (Clinton, *F. R.*). He had been a presbyter of St. Thecla in the Isaurian Seleucia. He succeeded Peter the Fuller in A.D. 488. He favoured the cause of Peter Mongus. He died in A.D. 498, and was followed by Flavian (Theophan. pp. 116, 117; Eutych. ii. 111; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 729). [E. V.]

PALLADIUS (13) (PELADIUS), eighth bishop of Embrun, succeeded Gallicanus c. A.D. 555, but his position, and hence his date, are doubtful, as in his *Acta* (given by the Boll. *AA. SS.* Jun. v. 84) he is said to have preceded Gallicanus, and ruled five years, A.D. 513–8 [GALLICANUS (2)] (*Gall. Christ.* iii. 1060). [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (14), ST., Oct. 7, bishop of Saintes in the latter half of the 6th century, was one of the intriguing self-seeking prelates so common in France at that epoch. Descended from an ancestor of the same name famed for his wealth (Greg. Tur. *de Glor. Conf.* lx.), he seems to have taken orders with no views beyond temporal advancement.

The city of Saintes was included in the territory of king Guntram, and against him, though a zealous patron of the Church and friend of the clergy, Palladius constantly plotted. In particular he joined the faction of the pretender Gundovald, at whose command he consecrated Faustianus as bishop of Dax in 584 (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* vii. 31, viii. 2). This action was a subject of discussion at the 2nd Council of Mâcon in 585, at which the bishops deposed Faustianus and sentenced Palladius, with two other prelates to pay a large annual sum for his future maintenance [*ibid.* viii. 20, FAUSTIANUS]. Undeterred by this punishment, Palladius appears to have intrigued two years later with emissaries of the notorious Fredegund, though the charge was not brought home to him (*ibid.* viii. 43).

Though lawless and immoral in his life (see Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* viii. 2, 7, 22), he was not insensible to the external interests of his diocese, and exerted himself zealously in the building of churches and obtaining of relics. (See Greg. Tur. *de Glor. Mart.* lvi.; *de Glor. Conf.* lvii.; *de Mirac. S. Martini*, iv. 8, and Greg. Magn. *Epist.* xlix., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 834, and *Gall. Christ.* x. 259; Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. iii. 924–35.

His signature is found to the canons of the 4th Council of Paris held in 573, while in 579 a council was held in his own see (Mansi, ix. 868, 921). How long he lived after 595, the date of Gregory the Great's letter cited above, is unknown. [S. A. B.]

PALLADIUS (15), ST., 20th bishop of Auxerre, between St. Desiderius and St. Vigilius, in the first half of the 7th century, was abbat of St. Germanus of Auxerre at the time of his election. He was present at two councils, that of Rheims held in 625 or 630 and that of Clichy about 628 (Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 5, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxxv. 102; Mansi, x. 591, 594, 612). He was an active builder and restorer of ecclesiastical edifices in his diocese, and his signature is found to the *diploma* of Clovis II. for the monastery of St. Denys of Paris in 653 (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 684). He was buried in a church he had built in honour of St. Eusebius, and is commemorated on the 10th April. In 943 bishop Guido removed his bones from their stone tomb to a silver coffin (Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. i. 864; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 269). [S. A. B.]

PALMAS, bishop of Amastris, in Pontus, towards the end of the second century. In the last decade of that century, he presided over a council of the bishops of Pontus, assembled in order to report to Victor of Rome the practice of their churches with regard to Easter celebration; and their decision was in conformity with the Roman usage and opposed to that of the Quartodecimans (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23). Palmas must then have been old, for it was as senior bishop he presided, no see in Pontus, apparently, at that time having metropolitan pre-eminence over the others. We find mention made of the episcopate of Palmas some years earlier, in the letter of DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH (see that article) to the church of Amastris (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23). [G. S.]

PAMBO (Πάμβω, Παμβώς, PAMBUS, PAMDAS), a monk of Nitria, a friend of Macarius and Isidore; mentioned by Jerome (*Ep.* xxii. 33, ed. Vall.), by Rufinus (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 8; *Apol.* ii. 12), and by Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* 10). Jerome attributes to him the judgment upon a monk, in whose cell after death the sum of 100 solidi was found. It was to be buried with him, with the words, Thy money perish with thee. He received Melania on her visit to Nitria (*Hist. Laus.* 117). He was one of those who stood out among the solitaries as defender of the Nicene doctrine, and died in 393 (Soc. iv. 23; Soz. iii. 14; Niceph. Call. ix. 14; Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Jul. i. 36). [W. H. F.]

PAMMACHIUS, a Roman senator of the Furian family (Jerome, *Ep.* lxvi. 6, ed. Vall.) prominent in the church of Rome in the 4th and 5th centuries. He was cousin to Marcella (Jer. *Ep.* xlix. 4), and is said by Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* c. 122) to have been related to Melania. He was also allied by friendship to Jerome, Paulinus, and afterwards to Augustine. He was a fellow student of Jerome at Rome (*Ep.* xlviii. 1), but appears to have not been specially connected with church affairs in early life. No mention is made of any intercourse between him and Jerome during Jerome's stay in Rome in 382–5: but they probably met, since it was in 385 that Pammachius married Paulina, the daughter of Paula, who the same year went with Jerome to Palestine. Pammachius was a man of learning, ability and eloquence (*Ep.* lxxvii. 1, xlix. 3). After his marriage, he seems to have occupied himself much with scriptural studies and church life. The controversy relating to Jovinian interested him, and he is thought to have been one of those who procured the condemnation of Jovinian from Pope Siricius (Tillemont, x. 568). But when Jerome published his books against Jovinian (in 392), they appeared to Pammachius to be too violent. He bought up the copies, and wrote a remonstrance to Jerome asking him to moderate his language. This Jerome refused to do; but he thanked Pammachius for the interest he had shewn, and hailed him as a well-wisher and defender, and promised him to keep him informed of his future writings (*Ep.* xlviii. xlix.). From this time their intercourse was constant.

Pammachius is said by Jerome (xlix. 4) to have been designated for the sacerdotium at this time by the whole city of Rome and the Pontiff. From this some have assumed that he was afterwards ordained. The words appear rather to imply, that he might on a vacancy be elected to the bishoprick itself. But he was never ordained. His growing convictions and those of his wife, the fact that all his children died at their birth, and that his wife died in childbirth (A.D. 397, see Jerome, *Ep.* 66, addressed to him two years later), led him to take monastic vows. He did not, however, forego his position as a senator, but appeared among the senators in their purple in the dark dress of a monk (Jerome, *Ep.* lxvi. 6). He showed his change of life by munificent gifts to the poor, and a great entertainment which he made for them (Paulinus, *Ep.* xiii. 11; see also Pall. *Hist. Laus.*, 122). He also, with Fabiola, erected a hospital at Portus, which became famous throughout the world (Jerom. *Ep.* lxvi. 11).

At the commencement of the Origenistic controversy, Jerome wrote to Pammachius his letter *De Opt. Genere Interpretandi* (*Ep.* lvii. ed. Vall.). This was in the year 395. On Rufinus coming to Rome Pammachius, with Occanus and Marcella, watched his actions in Jerome's interest, and, on his publication of a translation of Origen's Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, wrote to Jerome to request him to give a full translation of the work (*Ep.* 83 and 84). These friends also procured the condemnation of Origenism by the Pope Anastasius in 401, and to them Jerome's apology against Rufinus was addressed, and the book *Cont. Joannem Hierosol.* During the Donatist schism in Africa, Pammachius, who had property in that province, wrote a letter to the people of Numidia, where the schism had begun, exhorting them to return to the unity of the church. This letter brought him into relations with Augustine, who wrote to him (*Ep.* lviii.) congratulating him on an action which he considered likely to conduce to the healing of the schism, and desiring that he would read the letter to his brother-senators, that they might do as he had done. This was in the year 401. After this we hear of Pammachius only in connexion with the Bible-work of Jerome. Jerome dedicated to him his commentaries on the Minor Prophets (406) and on Daniel (407), and it was at his request that Jerome undertook the commentaries on Isaiah and Ezekiel (prefaces to Comm. on Am. Dan. Is. and Ezek.). But before the latter was finished, Pammachius had died in the siege of Rome by Alaric, A.D. 409. He is reckoned as a saint by the Roman church, his day being Aug. 31st (*Acta Sanctorum Aug.*, vol. vi. p. 555). [W. H. F.]

PAMMO (Πάμμων), anchoret, one of the solitaries around Antinoë, is said by St. Athanasius (*Narratio ad Ammonium*, Migne, *Pat. Graec.* t. xxvi. 980) to have concurred with Theodorus, abbat of Tabenna, in announcing to Athanasius by revelation the emperor Julian's death, A.D. 363. [ATHANASIUS, p. 199.] [J. G.]

PAMPHILUS (1), the celebrated presbyter of Caesarea, the founder of the famous library in that city, the intimate friend, ἀναγκαῖος φίλος (Hieron. de *Script. Eccl.* 75), and literary guide of Eusebius the church historian, who, after his martyrdom, manifested the depth of his devotion by adopting his friend's name as a surname, Εὐσέβιος Παμφίλου, "Pamphilus's Eusebius." Eusebius composed his friend's biography in three books. The work is entirely lost, and our only knowledge of this chief among the biblical scholars of his age is derived from a few scattered notices in the existing writings of Eusebius, and in those of Jerome and Photius. The statement of the late writer Nicephorus Callistus, that Pamphilus was Eusebius's uncle, his mother being the martyr's sister, wants all confirmation. Pamphilus was a native of Phoenicia, and, if we accept the somewhat doubtful authority of Metaphrastes, was born at Berytus, of a wealthy and honourable family. His worldly expectations were good, and his intellectual gifts might have ensured him a high position in public affairs. But an early devotion of himself with all his powers to the service of God led to the renunciation of all his worldly prospects, together with the voluntary surrender of his property for the aid of the needy, and the acceptance of a life of strict self-denial and unremitting study. Having received his earlier education in his native city, he passed to Alexandria, where he devoted himself to theological studies under Pierius, the head of the Catechetical school there (Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.* iii. 430; Phot. *Cod.* 118). Returning to Phoenicia Pamphilus settled at Caesarea, of which church he became a presbyter, probably during the episcopate of Agapius. Here he commenced that which became the work of his life, the gathering together a collection of books, especially MSS. of the Sacred Scriptures, and commentaries upon them. Jerome speaks of Pamphilus as emulating the

zeal of Demetrius Phalereus and Pisistratus in the domain of profane literature, in hunting for and obtaining possession of books illustrative of Holy Scripture from all parts of the world. The library thus formed was subsequently repaired and made good after the injuries it received during the persecution of Diocletian by Acacius and Euzoius, the successors of Eusebius in the see of Caesarea. (Hieron. *Ep.* 34, vol. i. p. 155.) Eusebius himself made a catalogue of it. (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 32.) This library was especially rich in codices of the Scriptures, not a few of which Pamphilus had transcribed or corrected with his own hand. In this work he had Eusebius as his zealous coadjutor. (Hieron. *de Script. Eccl.* c. 81.) Jerome speaks of Palestinian manuscripts of the LXX. current in the Syrian church, which, having been carefully prepared by Origen, were published by the two friends. "Ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt" (Hieron. *Praef. in Paralip.; adv. Ruffin.* ii. 27, tom. ii. p. 522). (See the colophons of a Vatican MS. given from Migne, Euseb. tom. iv. p. 875, after Mai, *Bibl. Nov. Patr.* iv. in the article EUSEBIUS in this Dictionary, Vol. II. p. 310 a). Among other priceless literary treasures, the loss of which we vainly deplore, was a copy of the so-called Hebrew text of the Gospel of St. Matthew (Hieron. *de Script. Eccl.* c. 3) and the *Tetrapla* and *Hexapla* of Origen in the original copy (Hieron. *in Tit.* iii. 9, tom. vii. p. 734). In the Catechetical school of Alexandria Pamphilus had conceived the most ardent admiration for its most distinguished son, the myriad-minded Origen, with whose works he made it his special object to enrich his library, copying the greater part of them with his own hand (Hieron. *de Script. Eccl.* c. 75). Jerome gloried in the possession of Origen's commentaries on the Minor Prophets in five-and-twenty volumes, in Pamphilus's autograph; which "as the footsteps of the martyr's sufferings," he valued as much as the riches of Croesus (*l.c.*). A very early MS. of part of the Epistles of St. Paul of the 5th or 6th century (Codex ccii. *Bibl. Coislin.*) is stated in the colophon to have been collated with an autograph of Pamphilus in the library at Caesarea (Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coislin.* pp. 251–262). He gave a proof of his zealous affection for the memory and good fame of his great teacher by devoting the last two years of his life, which were spent in prison during the persecution of Diocletian and crowned with martyrdom A.D. 309, to composing, with the assistance of his devoted friend Eusebius, an *Apology*, or *Defence* of Origen. Of this work, addressed to the "Confessors condemned to the mines in Palestine," five books were completed at the time of his death, the sixth being added subsequently by Eusebius (Photius, *Cod.* 118). Photius gives a brief summary of the work, of which we have the first book alone in the inaccurate Latin version of Ruffinus. (Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.* iv. pp. 339, 392.) An unfounded doubt has been thrown by Jerome in more than one place on the authenticity of this apology, which he hardly scruples to accuse Ruffinus with having forged. He bases this charge on the statement of Eusebius, "Pamphili "amator et praeco contubernalis," that Pamphilus wrote nothing but familiar letters, devoting himself exclusively to the study of and meditation on the Scriptures. (Hieron. *Ep.* 84, *ad Pammach. et Ocean.; adv. Ruffin.* lib. i. c. 2, p. 199, lib. ii. c. 6. p. 223.) Against this we may place, not only the express statement of Photius referred to above, but also Jerome's own words (*de Script. Eccl.* c. 75), and what is said by Eusebius as to their common share in the *Apologia* (*H. E.* vi. 33, 23), as well as the testimonies of Socrates (*H. E.* iv. 27), and of the author of "Praedestinatus," c. 43. (Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.* iii. 487–512.) It is not the only occasion on which Jerome's ardent partisanship and overfervid temperament led him to make accusations which it is difficult either to defend or to excuse. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* tom. v. p. 750, note 2, *Saint Pamphile.*) Montfaucon, in his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, pp. 78–82, printed from a codex (No. 25) a brief summary of the contents of the Acts of the Apostles, divided into thirty-nine sections, bearing the name of Pamphilus, which he does not hesitate to ascribe to the presbyter of Caesarea, though by others it is ascribed to Euthalius. Pamphilus was as far as possible from that selfishness which has sometimes been the opprobrium of scholars. What he knew and had acquired he regarded as the common property of those who desired to share it. Eusebius describes him as ever ready to help all who were in need, either in the matters of the body, the mind, or the soul. The copies of the Scriptures which he caused to be made by the body of students of which he was the centre, he distributed gratuitously, while he liberally supplied the temporal wants of those who were in distress (Euseb. *de Martyr. Palaest.* c. 11; Hieron. *adv. Ruffin.* i. 9, tom. ii. p. 465).

For the history of the persecution in which Pamphilus suffered, and of the companions, eleven in number, whom he animated by his example and encouraged by his words to meet their death, another article may be consulted [EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA, Vol. II. pp. 310, 311)]. The persecution began A.D. 307, when Pamphilus was committed to prison by Urbanus, the governor of the city. He continued two years in close confinement, cheered by the companionship of his second self, Eusebius, of whom St. Jerome wrote, "tantam inter se habuere concordiam Eusebius et Pamphilus ut unius animae homines putes, et ab uno alter nomen acceperit" (Hieron. *ad Pammach. et Ocean. Ep.* 84). With the assistance of his friend he devoted this period to the composition of his *Defence of Origen*, of which mention has already been made. At the end of the two years, while his "Defence" was still incomplete, Pamphilus sealed his life-long confession of his Master with his blood. "The centre of a brave company, among whom he shone out as the sun among the stars." This happened A.D. 309, when Firmilianus had succeeded Urbanus as governor. The library collected by Pamphilus was destroyed when Caesarea was taken by the Arabs in the seventh century. (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32, viii. 13, *de Mart. Palaest.* c. 11; Hieron. *de Script. Eccl.* c. 3, 75; Photius, *Cod.* 118; Metaphrastes apud Euseb. Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* tom. xx. col. 1497–1500; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. vi. pp. 418–427; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 150; Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* tom. x. p. 712; Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.* tom. iii. 417–512; iv. 339–392.) [E. V.]

PAMPHILUS (2), bishop of Amida, the modern Diarbekir, succeeded Asterius in the early part of the fifth century. A fragment of a letter written by him to John of Antioch at the time of the council of Ephesus is quoted by Le Quien, asserting that Christ was passible, not in what He was before His Incarnation, but in what He then became· οὐ τούτῳ παθόντα ὃ ἦν, ἀλλ' ὃ γέγονεν, τουτέστι τῇ σαρκί. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 991.) [E. V.]

PAMPHILUS (3), bishop of Abydos, in the latter half of the 5th century. A letter written by him to Peter the Fuller, vehemently denouncing his heretical tenets, was read in the council of Constantinople A.D. 483 (Labbe, iv. 1117). [E. V.]

PAN or **PANTA**. In one form of the Valentinian system Jesus is the perfect fruit of all the Aeons, each of whom contributes to him his own choicest excellency. Consequently, besides the names Soter, Christus and Logos, Jesus has the name Πάντα because ἀπὸ πάντων (Iren. I. ii. 6, II. xxi. 1). And Irenaeus reports that the Valentinian expositors found their doctrine on this subject in several texts of Scripture which with some looseness of quotation, they presented in the forms, πᾶν ἄρρεν διανοῖγον μήτραν (Exod. xiii. 2), αὐτός ἐστι τὰ πάντα (Col. iii. 11), πάντα εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα (Rom. xi. 36), ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος (Col. ii. 9), ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ χριστῷ διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ (*Eph.* i. 10). Irenaeus suggests that their doctrine was derived less from Scripture than from the Pandora of Hesiod. (II. xiv. 5, xxi. 2, xxx. 4; IV. ii. 2.) [G. S.]

PANCARIUS (1), deacon of Side, addressed by St. Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium. (St. Amphil. *Excerpt.* in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* vol. xxxix. col. 113.) [G. W. D.]

PANCARIUS (2), a Christian, who after some legal proceedings had come into possession of a property at Germanicia, or Germaniciana, a place in the province of Byzacene, and diocese of Hippo, 22 miles S.E. of Aquae Regiae (Ant. *Itin.* lv. 3). Before his arrival the priest of the place, Secundinus, had been on good terms with his parishioners, but after this, as Pancarius informs him, they had found fault with him, and threatened to destroy not only his house, but also the church. Augustine wrote entreating him to state his case fairly, so that he might not seem to be going beyond his right, and that the people might suffer no damage, and above all, to prevent violent measures (Aug. *Ep.* 251). [H. W. P.]

PANCHARIUS, an officer to whom Theodoret wrote in 449, exhorting him to contend earnestly for the maintenance of the apostolical faith (Theod. *Ep.* 98). [E. V.]

PANCRATIANUS, bishop of Braga (Bracara) said to have presided over the council of Braga, 411, when ten bishops met to consult for the defence of the church against the inroads of the Goths, &c., but the acts are doubtful (Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 1507; Hardouin, *Conc.* i. 1189.) [J. G.]

PANCRATIUS (1), (ST. PANCRAS), May 12 martyr at Rome on the Via Aurelia, A.D. 304. He was a Phrygian by birth, but was baptized at Rome by the pope himself. He suffered when only fourteen years of age with his uncle Dionysius. His martyrdom was very celebrated in the earlier ages. His church still gives a title to a cardinal, and the saint himself is even yet held in veneration at Rome. A well-known parish church in London is called after the English form of his name, St. Pancras. Gregory of Tours (*de Glor. Martt.* i. 39) tells us that his tomb was outside the walls of Rome, and that it was gifted with such powers that perjurers were at once seized by the devil if they swore falsely before it. Gregory the Great mentions the martyr in his epistles (iv. 18 and vi. 49), and in Homily (xxvii.) on S. John (Ceill. iii. 29; Tillemont, *Mém.* v. 260; *AA. SS.* Boll. Mai. ii. 17; Ruinart. *AA. Sinc.* p. 407: *Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuard.). [G. T. S.]

PANCRATIUS (2), a presbyter who accompanied Lucifer, bishop of Calaris, when the latter was sent by Liberius, bishop of Rome, with a letter to Constantius, asking him to summon a council [LUCIFERUS, i. p. 750 a; HILARIUS (31) p. 75 a]. He is mentioned in the letter of Liberius which was sent at the same time to Eusebius of Vercellae. Athanasius (*Ep. ad Solitar.*) mentions that Pancratius, for his loyalty to the orthodox faith at the council held at Milan, A.D. 354, was driven into exile. [J. Ll. D.]

PANCRATIUS (3), a friend of Gregory Nazianzen, who commended him to Nectarius, on his going to Constantinople (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 31). [E. V.]

PANCRATIUS (4), a vir illustris, to whom and to another named Viator pope Pelagius I., between 555 and 560, addressed a letter, urging upon them the duty of abstaining from the sacrifices of schismatics even more than from sacrilege. (Mansi, ix. 731.) [G. W. D.]

PANCRATIUS (5) deacon of the church of Vienne, had retired to a monastery. Gregory the Great at his request, when he went to Rome on a pilgrimage, wrote, in A.D. 601, to his bishop DESIDERIUS (9) forbidding him to recall Pancratius to the service of his church (*Epp.* xii. 35). [F. D.]

PANESNIU, sometimes called Macarius, an ascetic deacon and martyr in Egypt in the year A.D. 306. He was born in the same village as St. Paesis and his sister Thecla, which went by the name of Parva Civitas Apollinis. [PAESIS; THECLA.] (Cf. Aug. Ant. Georg. *Fragm. Evang. Johann.* p. xcix.) He suffered under the prefect Culcianus. His acts, which are genuine, contain many fragments of the Coptic version of the Scriptures, including the Lord's Prayer, with the doxology omitting the word kingdom, as in the version embodied in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, cap. viii. cf. Harnack's Edit. p. 26. They have been printed with an elaborate commentary and an account of his miracles in Aug. Ant. Georg. *S. Coluthi Miracula*, p. 163–

389. They are very important for the history of the Diocletian persecution. In the *Fragm. Evang. Johann.* by Georgius, p. 415, are learned notes on the version of the Lord's Prayer.

[G. T. S]

PANODORUS, an Egyptian chronologer, who wrote at the beginning of the 5th century. He is almost exclusively known to us through the use made of his work by Georgius Syncellus [GEORGIUS (68)], who states (p. 617, 18, Bonn edition) that Panodorus was an Egyptian monk who flourished in the reign of Arcadius (A.D. 395–408), and in the episcopate of Theophilus, the 22nd bishop of Alexandria, who died A.D. 412. Syncellus usually names Panodorus in company with another Egyptian monk and chronologer, Anianus; and states (pp. 61, 3; 62, 2) that the two were contemporary. He describes (62, 18) the work of Anianus as the more concise, and as agreeing with the tradition of the apostles and holy fathers. It contained Easter tables in 11 cycles of 532 years each, and probably contained little more than historical notes accompanying these tables. It placed the Incarnation on the 25th March at the end of the year of the world 5500, the same day being set down for the date of the Creation and of the Resurrection. The work of Panodorus on the other hand was fuller and more various, and exhibited greater knowledge of profane writers. He counted the years before the Incarnation as 5493 years instead of 5500. Unger has given reasons for concluding that the date of the death of the bishop Theophilus, which Syncellus quotes anonymously (p. 59, 5), was really taken from the work of Anianus. This work therefore must have been later than 412; and therefore the work of Panodorus, written in the reign of Arcadius, must have been the earlier of the two. The sources whence Panodorus chiefly derived his profane history were the works of Africanus, of Eusebius, and of Dexippus. Panodorus frequently criticizes Eusebius with great severity. A list of the principal points on which he founds censure will be found in the work from which most information about Panodorus can be obtained, viz. Gelzer's *Sextus Julius Africanus und die Byzantinische Chronographie.* Panodorus shows great interest both in Egyptian and in Chaldee learning, which he endeavours to harmonize with the scriptures, reconciling the long Chaldee chronology with the shorter chronology of the Hebrews, by the hypothesis that the Chaldee years were only days. Gelzer imagines that Panodorus was one of the Neo-Platonists who, by the end of the 4th century, had made their peace with the church, and who strove to incorporate with Christianity some of the ancient learning, on which they set the highest value.

[G. S.]

PANOLBIUS, bishop of Hierapolis (Mabug) and metropolitan, succeeded Alexander the champion of Nestorius, on his deposition in 435. Athanasius bishop of Perrha, a suffragan see of Hierapolis, having been accused by his clergy of various offences before Domnus patriarch of Antioch, Panolbius was commissioned to inquire into the matter. Athanasius however, instead of meeting his accusers, resigned his bishopric. Panolbius, who was very friendly to Athanasius, delayed the election of a successor, on which Athanasius resumed his see, and by the influence of Cyril of Alexandria and Proclus of Constantinople a synod was summoned at Antioch, A.D. 445, to examine into the matter, and Athanasius was deposed. Previous to this, Panolbius had been succeeded as metropolitan by John, and was probably dead. The whole matter came before the council of Chalcedon at its fourteenth session (Labbe, iv. 728 ff.; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 927). [ATHANASIUS OF PERRHA.]

[E. V.]

PANSOPHIUS (1), the subject of an alleged miracle wrought by St. Ambrose. He was the infant child of Decens and Pansophia, Christians living at Florence; and Paulinus relates that he was raised to life by St. Ambrose. *Life of Ambrose*, §§ 28, 50. [AMBROSIUS, p. 97 a. note.]

[J. LL. D.]

PANSOPHIUS (2), preceptor of the empress Eudoxia, ordained bishop of Nicomedia by Chrysostom in place of the adventurer Gerontius. His appointment was received with hostility by the people of Nicomedia, who were much attached to their former bishop, and it was necessary to have recourse to force to secure his admission. (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 6.)

[E. V.]

PANSOPHIUS (3), a bishop of Pisidia, see unnamed, who was deputed by Chrysostom to celebrate the Eucharist in his place, his spirit having been too much ruffled by the violent denunciations of Eusebius bishop of Valentinianopolis against Antonius bishop of Ephesus, to officiate himself (Pallad. p. 128). Pansophius was also one of the four bishops deputed to convey to pope Innocent in 404, the appeal of Chrysostom and that of the bishops of his communion (*ibid.* p. 10).

[E. V.]

PANSOPHIUS (4), a count, carried a letter of Leo the Great to Flavian of Constantinople. (Leonis *Ep.* xxvi.)

[C. G.]

PANTAENUS, chief of the Catechetical School of Alexandria, in the latter part of the second century, and perhaps the early years of the third. Of his previous life little is known with certainty. We are not informed whether he was originally a Christian or became one by conversion. Our authorities agree, however, that he was trained in the Greek philosophy, and owed to this training much of his eminence as a teacher. Origen, in a passage preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 19), names him as an example—the earliest, apparently, that he is able to adduce—of a Christian doctor who availed himself of his heathen learning. Eusebius tells us (*ib.* v. 10) that in his zeal for the faith he undertook the work of an evangelist in the East, and penetrated as far as India; where he found that St. Bartholomew had already preached the Word, and had left there a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel in Hebrew characters, which was still treasured by the Christians of that country. Jerome (*De Viris Ill.* xxxvi.) adds (but probably without authority) that Pantaenus brought back this copy with him to Alexandria. He also represents this mission as having been undertaken at the request of the people of India,

who had heard his fame as a teacher and sent a deputation to solicit his coming. This is by no means incredible, considering the celebrity of Alexandria as a seat of learning.[a] But Jerome raises a difficulty when he names Demetrius as the bishop by whom he was sent. For Eusebius places the accession of Demetrius to the patriarchate in the tenth year of Commodus (*H. E.* v. 22; cp. *Chron.*), A.D. 189; while he represents Pantaenus as head of the Alexandrian School in the first year of that reign (*H. E.* v. 9, 10), and distinctly conveys that his appointment to that position took place after his return from his Indian mission.

There is a like conflict of authority concerning the relation in which Pantaenus stood towards Clement of Alexandria. Eusebius (v. 11) unhesitatingly assumes that Pantaenus is the unnamed master whom Clement in his *Stromateis* (i. p. 322, Potter), places above all the great men by whose teaching he has profited, "last met, but first in power," in whom he "found rest." Eusebius also tells us (vi. 13) that Clement in his *Hypotyposes* (now lost) "made mention of Pantaenus as teacher" (διδασκάλου), and inserted into that work "many of his interpretations (ἐκδοχὰς) and traditions." In the *Eclogae e Propheticis* appended to the works of Clement, we find reference made to "*our* Pantaenus" (ὁ Πανταῖνος ἡμῶν): but this expression does not necessarily convey that the writer (even if he were Clement, which is uncertain) spoke of Pantaenus as his *teacher*. It is clear, however, that Eusebius, with full access to the works of Clement, regarded him as the avowed disciple of Pantaenus. To this authority we may add that of his friend Pamphilus, who was principal author of their joint *Apology for Origen*; for Photius (*Biblioth.* cxviii.) states on the authority of that work (now lost) that Clement "was the hearer of Pantaenus and his successor in the School." This information Pamphilus no doubt had from his master Pierius, himself Head of the same school, a follower of Origen and probably less than fifty years his junior. To the same effect Maximus the Confessor (*Scholia in S. Greg. Naz.*)[b] styles Pantaenus "the Master" (καθηγητὴν) of Clement. Against these authorities we have to set Philip of Side (circ. A.D. 427) who in his *Historia Christiana*, as we learn from a fragment first published by Dodwell,[c] made "Clement the disciple of Athenagoras, and Pantaenus of Clement."

If we must choose between these opposing accounts, we cannot hesitate to prefer that of Eusebius. Dodwell's attempts to discredit it are ineffectual;[d] and we may well suppose that Philip's statement is an instance of the "confusing of dates" for which Socrates blames him (τοὺς χρόνους τῆς ἱστορίας συγχέει, *H. E.* vii. 27).

This contradiction, however, and with it the difficulty concerning the dates of the life of Pantaenus above pointed out, may be in great measure solved or at least accounted for, if we suppose Pantaenus to have been head of the school both before and after his sojourn in India, and Clement to have filled his place in his absence. We know that Origen afterwards quitted and resumed the same office in this manner. Thus, when Eusebius in the place above cited (v. 10) introduces Pantaenus as presiding over the school at Alexandria, then proceeds to relate his Indian mission, and finally reverts to the description of him as head of the school, we are to understand him as expressing accurately (though awkwardly) the facts of the case. In the opening of the chapter he speaks of Pantaenus's first tenure of the office (dating in or before the year 180); at its close, of his second tenure of the same (beginning perhaps some fifteen years later): and there is room between for his mission by Demetrius in 189 or 190. And in this way Clement may be regarded as the predecessor as well as the successor of Pantaenus. Then, having been his deputy he may have continued in the school as his colleague. They were probably not far from being of an age. If Pantaenus was the senior, Clement was the more brilliant; and in the eyes of the Church of Alexandria at the close of the second century, it may well have seemed a question which was the master and which the disciple. This hypothesis agrees with the probable date of Clement's headship [CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA]; and likewise with the note in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, under year of Pertinax, or second of Severus (circ. 193), where we read that at that time Clement was in Alexandria, "a most excellent teacher (διδάσκαλος) and shining light (διέλαμπε) of Christian philosophy," and Pantaenus "was distinguished as an expositor of the Word of God" (ἐν τῷ θείῳ λόγῳ διέπραττεν, Syncell.). Thus also Alexander Bishop of Jerusalem (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14), in a letter to Origen, couples the names of Pantaenus and Clement (placing, however, Pantaenus first), as "fathers," and speaks of them both as recently deceased (τοὺς μακαρίους ἐκείνους τοὺς προοδεύσαντας). This letter shows, further, that whatever question may be raised as to Clement, we may safely reckon not only this Alexander, but the illustrious Origen himself, among the scholars of Pantaenus.

We have no information as to the date of his death, but the passage above cited from the *Chronicon* confirms Jerome in prolonging his

[a] Halloix (*Vitae PP. Or.* II. p. 852) appositely quotes Dion Chrysostom, who writes (circ. A.D. 100) of "Ethiopians, Arabians, Bactrians, Scythians, Persians and *Indians*, flocking to Alexandria." This passage also shows that the India where Pantaenus preached is probably to be taken to be India proper. So Jerome (*Ep.* lxxiv. *Ad Magnum*), "Pantaenus... missus est in Indiam, ut Christum apud *Brachmanos* praedicaret."

[b] Gale's ed. p. 19 (quoted by Routh, *Rell. S.* I. p. 379); also Oehler ap. Migne, *Patrologia Gr.* t. xci. col. 1085.

[c] *Diss. in Iren.*, Appx. p. 488. From a MS. in the Bodleian Library, Cod. Barocc. 142.

[d] He argues that when Clement writes of Pantaenus as "teacher" in the *Hypotyposes*, it is in relation, not to the writer, but to the School which Pantaenus taught. But even if this were so; it remains that Clement derived "traditions" from him, and therefore was his junior. He argues further that Origen's mention of Pantaenus (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 19) as τὸν πρὸ ἡμῶν conveys that he was Origen's immediate predecessor; and that the combination of his name with that of Heraclas, implies that they were contemporaries. But it rather seems that Origen is here citing Pantaenus as his earliest and Heraclas as his latest instance. The order of succession in the School seems to have been (according to Dodwell's fragment) Athenagoras, Pantaenus, Clement, Origen, Heraclas, Dionysius, Pierius.

activity into the reign of Severus (193-211). And it is in no way improbable that he may, as Jerome states, have lived on into the following reign—a statement repeated in the (later) Roman Martyrology. His commemoration is on the 7th of July.

From the facts above stated it follows that Photius is wrong in believing Pantaenus to have been a hearer not only "of those who had seen the apostles" (which he may well have been), but also "of some of the apostles themselves." A man who was living after the year 193, and who was not the senior of Clement by more than a generation, could not possibly have been born so early as to have been a hearer even of the last survivor of the twelve. Photius was probably misled by a too literal construction of what Clement (*Strom.*, ut supr.) says of his teachers,—that they "had received the true tradition of the blessed doctrine straight from the holy Apostles Peter, James, John and Paul."

His philosophic training, according to Eusebius (followed by Jerome) was in the Stoic school. Philip of Side, on the other hand, describes him as "an Athenian, a Pythagorean philosopher." There is no incompatibility between these statements; for, as Mosheim well suggests (*Dissertt. ad H. E. pertt.* p. 94), a Christian divine could not implicitly follow any one heathen school, but must necessarily become such an Eclectic as Clement claims to be (*Strom.* I. vii. p. 338), adopting from each sect "such of its tenets as teach righteousness together with godly knowledge." Thus from the Stoic he would gather views of human duty; from the Pythagorean and Platonist, conceptions of God and things spiritual. Whether Philip means to convey that he was "Athenian" by birth or merely by education, does not appear. Assuming that Pantaenus is the "teacher" described in the *Stromateis* (p. 322), it may be inferred from the title of "Sicilian bee" there given to him, that Clement believed him to have come from Sicily. The notion that he was of Jewish origin (Halloix, *Vitae Scrr. sacrr.* ii. p. 840) is baseless, and arose from a misreading of the above passage of the *Stromateis*, through which the last of Clement's teachers was confounded with a former one whom he calls "the *Hebrew* by origin." [e]

Of his literary works, Eusebius tells us that in them he "interpreted (ὑπομνηματιζόμενος) the treasures of the divine dogmas;" Jerome, that he left "many commentaries on the Scriptures." Both however give us to understand that the church owed more to his spoken utterances than to his writings. And to all appearance the two fragments which alone have reached us as from him (see Routh, *Relliquiae*, i. p. 378) are relics of his oral rather than of his written teaching. One bears the character of a verbal reply to a question proposed to him; it is preserved by Maximus the Confessor [f] (*Scholia in S. Greg. Naz.*, as above referred to), who, in illustration of the teaching of Dionysius the Areopagite concerning the Divine will, tells us that Pantaenus when asked by certain philosophers, "in what manner Christians suppose God to know things that are?" replied, "Neither by sense things sensible, nor by intellect things intelligible. For it is not possible that He who is above the things that are, should apprehend the things that are according to the things that are. But we say that He knows the things that are, as acts of His own will (ὡς ἴδια θελήματα); and we give good reason for so saying; for if by act of His will He hath made all things (which reason will not gainsay), and if it is ever both pious and right to say that God knows His own will, and He of His will hath made each thing that hath come to be; therefore God knows the things that are as acts of His own will, inasmuch as He of His will hath made the things that are." The other, contained in the *Eclogae* (as above) is introduced by "Our Pantaenus used to say" (ἔλεγε), and lays down as a principle in interpreting prophecy, that it "for the most part utters its sayings indefinitely [as to time], using the present sometimes for the future and sometimes for the past." This maxim is adduced by the writer in support of his interpretation of the words "In the sun He hath set His tabernacle" (Ps. cxviii. 4, LXX.) as meaning the Church taken into God; the passage being one of a continuous series of excerpts taken apparently from a Commentary on that Psalm. And it is noteworthy that Anastasius of Sinai [ANASTASIUS SINAITA (3)], in the 7th century, in his *Contemplations on the Hexaëmeron* (quoted by Routh, t. I. p. 15), twice cites Pantaenus as one of his authorities for a kindred interpretation, according to which Christ and his Church are foreshown in the history of the Creation of Paradise (I. p. 860; VII. *cont.* p. 893 in *Bibl. Max. PP.* tom. ix. ed. Lyons, 1677). But the true inference from these references seems to be, not that Pantaenus wrote commentaries on Genesis, or on the Psalms, [g] but that he led the way in the method of spiritual or mystical interpretations of the Old Testament, which is usually associated with the names of his more famous followers, Clement and Origen.

In the former of the passages above referred to, Anastasius describes him as "Priest of the church of the Alexandrians (τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἱερεύς);" [h] which is noteworthy, in the absence of all direct information concerning the time and place, or even the fact, of his ordination. That he was a priest may be inferred—not indeed from his headship of a school, as we learn from the case of Origen, but—from the fact that he was sent by his bishop to evangelize India.[i]

---

[e] Ἀνέκαθεν. Halloix is wrong also in rendering this word "*ex alta stirpe oriundus.*" Cf. for it Eus. *H. E.* i. 2, and *passim*.

[f] Maximus however must have known of writings of Pantaenus; for in accounting for the fact that Eusebius makes no mention of the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, he remarks that he is equally silent concerning those of Pantaenus (οὐδὲ μὴν Πανταίνου τοὺς πόνους ἀνεγράψατο. *Prol. in Opp. S. Dion. Ar.* p. xxxvi. ed. Plantin., 1634).

[g] We know from Photius (*Bibl.* cix.) that Clement in the *Hypott.* dealt largely "in the interpretation of *Genesis*, Exodus, and the *Psalms*."

[h] The Greek of this passage is given by Halloix, p. 851. The complete work is extant in Latin only.

[i] Routh quotes from the *India Orientalis Christiana* of Paulinus a S. Bartholemaeo, a description of one of the groups engraved on the bronze doors of the Basilica di S. Paolo fuori le mure (built by the Emperor Theodosius, A.D. 383), representing St. Thomas the Apostle and Pantaenus; the latter holding in his hand the Gospel of St. Matthew. But the engraving of this group as given by Ciampini (*Vetera Monumenta*, t. I.

Besides the authors already quoted, see Nicephorus Callistus (14th century) IV. xxxii., who however adds little to the information given by earlier writers; Baronius, *Annales*, s. a. 183; Cave, *Primitive Fathers*, p. 185 (1677); *Hist. Litt.* t. I. p. 51 (1688); Du Pin, *Auteurs Ecclés.*, t. I. pt. i. p. 184; Lardner, *Credibility*, ch. xxi.; Le Quien, *Oriens Chr.* t. II. coll. 382, 391; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. III. p. 170. [J. Gw.]

PANTALEON (1), July 17, a physician and martyr at Nicomedia, in the Diocletian persecution. His relics were carried to Africa, and thence were translated with those of St. Cyprian to the Church of St. John Bap. in Lyons (Ado. *Mart.*). [G. T. S.]

PANTALEON (2), notary, mentioned in several letters of Gregory the Great. The first, in A.D. 593, directs him to inquire into the case of EVANGELUS (4). In A.D. 598 Gregory sent him to Sicily to recover communion plate which had been sold there by certain clerics from Italy. The next year Gregory charged the defensor, Sergius, to see that Pantaleon's mother-in-law's claims to the property of her uncle, who had died childless and intestate, were not prejudiced by the absence of her son-in-law on the business of the church. In A.D. 600 Gregory sent him to Genoa about the consecration of the new bishop of Milan. In A.D. 602 Gregory wrote to him about the church estates in Sicily under his management, and directed him to restore to the *coloni* on them any sums which had been unjustly exacted from them. (*Epp.* iii. 41; viii. 26; ix. 46; xi. 3; xii. 41; xiii. 34.) [F. D.

PANTALEON (3), rebuked, in a letter addressed to him by pope Martin I., for sending untrue information of a disparaging character about Stephen, bishop of Dorus. (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxvii. 169.) [G. W. D.]

PANULVIUS, an Egyptian bishop, who assisted in the consecration of Timotheus Salophaciolus. (Leonis *Ep.* clxxiii.) [C. G.]

PAPAS (PHAPAS), 8th catholicus of Seleucia on the Tigris, skilled in the Greek and Persian tongues. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1105.) He is said to have been present at the council of Nice, A.D. 325, or more probably only represented by his suffragans Simeon and Sadost, and to have died A.D. 326 (Greg. Barhebr. *Chron. Eccl.* iii. 27 sq. in Assem. *Bibl. Or.* i. 186, ii. 397, iii. 346, 612). [J. G.]

PAPGEN, catholicus of Armenia A.D. 487–492. (Saint-Martin, *Mém. sur l'Arménie.* I. 437.) [G. T. S.]

PAPHNUTIUS (1), deacon of the church of Boou, a military station in Egypt, and martyr under Culcianus the prefect in the persecution of Diocletian. He and a soldier named Silbon, welcomed the martyr Panesniu when he was cast into prison, as recorded in Aug. Ant. Georgii *de Miraculis S. Coluthi et S. Panesniu*, pp. 183, 322. [G. T. S.]

PAPHNUTIUS (2), Sep. 11, bishop in Upper Thebais, who suffered mutilation and banishment for the faith (Socrates, *H. E.* i. c. 11; Theodoret, *H. E.* i. c. 7). At the council of Nicaea A.D. 325, he was much honoured as a confessor, and specially by Constantine (Socrates, *ib.*). When at that council it was proposed to enforce the law of clerical celibacy [*D. C. A.*, CELIBACY, p. 325] Paphnutius rose up and earnestly opposed it, on the ground of both principle and expediency, and prevailed (Socrates, *ib.*). He closely adhered to the cause of St. Athanasius, and attended him at the council of Tyre, A.D. 335. As to his appearance there Rufinus (*H. E.* i. c. 17), followed by Sozomen (*H. E.* ii. c. 25), tells a dramatic story of his going up to Maximus of Jerusalem, reproaching him for being in Arian company, and explaining to him the exact position of affairs [MAXIMUS (13)]. (Fleury, *H. E.* xv. c. 26; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iii. 420, 450; Boll. *Acta SS.* 11 Sept. iii. 778.) [J. G.]

PAPHNUTIUS (3), an anchoret of the Meletian schism, called by Epiphanius μέγας ἀνήρ, whose mother had been a confessor. After the death of Meletius, he and others of the party [JOANNES (239), CALLINICUS (4)] being hard pressed by Alexander patriarch of Alexandria, sought permission from the emperor Constantine, but in vain, to continue their separate assemblies. (Epiph. *Haer.* lxviii. 5, 6; Tillem. vi. 234.) [C. H.]

PAPHNUTIUS (4), (Παφνούτιος Σάεως), bishop of Saïs in Lower Egypt, present at the council of Alexandria in 362 (Athanas. *Tomus ad Antioch.* in *Pat. Gr.* xxvi. 795, 807; Tillem. vi. 588). C. H.]

PAPHNUTIUS (5) (PAFNUTIUS, PYNUPHIUS, surnamed BUBALUS, and CEPHALA), an anchoret and priest in the Scetic desert in Egypt. Cassian's words (*Coll.* iv. c. 1) regarding his promotion of abbat Daniel [DANIEL (2)] to the diaconate and priesthood have been held to prove that a presbyter had the power of ordaining, but Bingham (*Ant.* Bk. ii. 3, 7) will not admit that Cassian is to be understood in that sense. When Cassian visited him in A.D. 395, he was ninety years of age, but hale and active, never leaving his cell but on Saturday and Sunday for attendance at church five miles distant, and for carrying home his week's supply of water; his chief graces, often alluded to by Cassian, were patience and humility (*Coll.* iii. c. 1). He seems to have fled twice from the Scetic into Syria for greater solitude and perfection (Cass. *De Coen. Inst.* iv. cc. 30, 31), and with some others, A.D. 373, he had already found refuge at Diocaesarea in Palestine. [MELANIA (1)] Tillem. vi. 250–1, ed. 1732.) When the anthropomorphic controversy arose between Theophilus bishop of Alexandria and the monks

iv. pl. 38, qu. 27), to which Paulinus refers, by no means bears out this description; for the figure holding the volume (?) is evidently Thomas, and the other figures seem disciples. Ciampini himself takes it to represent the Apostle's martyrdom. Moreover, the doors bore an inscription dated 1070, stating that they were made for Alexander IV. (II.) in Constantinople. Their evidence therefore could not have weight. They were partly destroyed in the fire which ruined this venerable church in 1824.

in the Egyptian desert, Paphnutius took the side of the bishop and orthodoxy (Cass. *Coll.* x. c. 2); his attempt to convert the aged Serapion and his failure, till Photinus came, is very curious (Cass. *Coll.* x. c. 3). To him there is attributed (*Vit. Patrum*, ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 211 sq.) a *Life of St. Onuphrius.* Cassian also represents Paphnutius as giving instruction on the duty of self-abnegation to a new disciple whom he had admitted into his monastery (Cass., *De Coen. Inst.* iv. cc. 32 sq.), and again the whole of his third *Conference* at Scetis is on the same subject *De tribus abrenuntiationibus* (*Coll.* iii. cc. 1–22). He treats first of the several forms of God's call, and then of the spiritual, personal, and material renunciations, confirming his arguments by texts of Scripture, and meeting objections (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* vi. 291, viii. 164, 176; Fleury, *H. E.* xx. c. 7, xxi. cc. 1 sq.). [J. G.]

PAPHNUTIUS (6), an anchorite of the Thebaid in the 4th century, commemorated by Palladius and Rufinus, who describe especially the esteem in which he held men who were living an upright secular life. (Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* 62–5; Ruf. *Hist. Mon.* 16; Sozom. iii. 14; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* ix. 14.) [W. H. F.]

PAPHNUTIUS (7), an Egyptian bishop who assisted in the consecration of Timotheus Salophaciolus. (Leonis *Ep.* clxxiii.) [C. G.]

PAPIANILLA, wife of Sidonius Apollinaris, and daughter of the Emperor Avitus. She brought her husband as dowry a house and lands at Avitacum in the Auvergne, which with the country life of the time are charmingly described in one of Sidonius's letters (*Epist.* ii. 2; Roscia (v. 16). She bore him three or four children before they separated, as is said, on his becoming bishop of Clermont, in obedience to the canons. She seems to have been still living in the year 474 (Grégoire et Collombet, *Œuvres de Sidoine traduites, pref.* xx. xxvi.; Ceillier, x. 379). [S. A. B.]

PAPIAS (1), bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 36) in the first half of the second century. With regard to the name, Lightfoot says (Coloss. p. 48), "Papias, or (as it is very frequently written in inscriptions) Pappias, is a common Phrygian name. It is found several times at Hierapolis, not only in inscriptions (Boeckh, 3930, 3912 a, add.), but even on coins (Mionnet, iv. p. 301). This is explained by the fact, that it was an epithet of the Hierapolitan Zeus (Boeckh, 3912 a, Παπίᾳ Διὶ σωτῆρι)." As applied to the god the name would express his fatherly character; as applied to a mortal it would be equivalent to the Greek Diogenes. There is, in fact, one inscription (Boeckh, 3817) in which we find a Papias also called Diogenes. The date of Papias used to be regarded as determined by a notice in the *Paschal Chronicle*, which records his martyrdom at Pergamus under the year 163. Accordingly, the later Greek writers give Papias the title of martyr (Photius, *Cod.* 232). Lightfoot, however, (*u. s.*) has convincingly shewn that this notice in the *Paschal Chronicle* is derived from a passage in Eusebius (iv. 15), where mention is made of the martyrdom at Pergamus of one Papylus, together with Carpus and Agathonice; and it appears from still extant Acts of these martyrs that it was considerably later (viz. in the Decian persecution) that they suffered. The identification, therefore, of Papylus with Papias is found to be a mere blunder. We have therefore no ground for asserting that Papias lived so late as A.D. 163, and we shall presently see reason for at least placing his literary activity considerably earlier in the century.

What has given celebrity to the name of Papias is his authorship of a treatise in five books called "Expositions[a] of Oracles of the Lord" (Λογίων Κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις), on which title we shall make further remark presently. The object of the book seems to have been to throw light on the Gospel history, and in particular to do so by the help of oral traditions which Papias had been able to collect from those who had come in contact with surviving members of the Apostolic circle. The fact that Papias lived at a time when it was still possible to meet such persons, has given such importance to his testimony, that though only some very few fragments of his work remain, they have given occasion to whole treatises; every word of these fragments being rigidly scrutinised, and, what is less reasonable in the case of a book of which so little is known, arguments being built on the silence of Papias about sundry matters which it is supposed he ought to have mentioned and assumed that he did not. It is necessary to give at length the first and most important of the fragments, a portion of the preface preserved by Eusebius (iii. 39); from which we can infer the object of the work and the resources which Papias claimed to have available. "And I will not scruple also to give for thee a place along with my interpretations to whatsoever at any time I well learned from the elders and well stored up in memory, guaranteeing its truth. For I did not, like the generality, take pleasure in those who have much to say, but in those who teach the truth; nor in those who relate their strange commandments, but in those who record such as were given from the Lord to the Faith and come from the Truth itself. And if ever any one came who had been a follower of the elders, I would enquire as to the discourses of the elders, what was said by Andrew, or what by Peter, or what by Philip, or what by Thomas or James, or what by John or Matthew or any other of the disciples of the Lord; and the things which Aristion and the elder John, the disciples of the Lord, say. For I did not think that I could get so much profit from the contents of books as from the utterances of a living and abiding voice."

From the use of the singular 'for thee' in the opening words, we infer that the work of Papias, like those of St. Luke, was inscribed to some individual. The first sentence of the extract had evidently followed one in which the writer had spoken of the "interpretations" which appear to have been the main subject of his treatise, and for joining his traditions with which he conceives it to be necessary to make an apology. Thus we see that Papias is not making

[a] The authorities leave it uncertain whether this first word in the title is singular or plural.

a first attempt to write the life of our Lord or a history of the apostles, but that he assumes the previous existence of a written record on which he comments, and which he tries to illustrate. Those whom Papias enumerates as the ultimate sources of his traditions are divided by him into two classes: Andrew, Peter, and others, of whom he speaks in the past tense; and Aristion and John the Elder, of whom he speaks in the present. As the passage is generally understood, Papias does not claim to have more than a second-hand knowledge of what any of these had related, but had made it his business to enquire from any one who had conferred with elders, what Andrew, Peter, &c., *had* said, and what John and Aristion *were* saying; the difference being that the two last were the only two surviving at the time of his enquiries. But considering that there is a change of pronouns, the τί of the first clause being replaced by ἅ in the second, we are disposed to think that there is an anacoluthon, and that Papias did not intend this ἅ to depend on the adjacent verb ἀνέκρινον. We believe his meaning, however ill expressed, to be that he learned, by enquiry from others, things that Andrew, Peter, and others had said, and also stored up in his memory things which Aristion and John said in his own hearing. Certain it is that Eusebius here understands Papias to claim to have been a hearer of this John and of Aristion, and intimates that he does so because several of the traditions given in the course of the work are stated to have been derived from one or other of these two authorities.

The question arises, in what sense does Papias use the word "elders" in this passage? It is quite an ordinary use of the word to apply it to the men of a former generation; and so it would be most natural to understand it here as used of the men of the first generation of Christians, if it were not that in the second clause the title seems to be refused to Aristion, who is nevertheless described as a disciple (by which we must understand a personal disciple) of our Lord. And as those mentioned in the first group are all apostles, there is room for doubt whether the word "elder," as Papias used it, did not include, besides antiquity, the idea of official dignity. On the question whether the John mentioned along with Aristion is different from John the apostle previously mentioned, see JOANNES PRESBYTER, Vol. III., p. 398.

The fragment quoted enables us to fix within certain limits the date of Papias. He is evidently separated by a whole generation from the apostolic age; he describes himself as living at a time when it was no exceptional occurrence to meet a person who had been a hearer of the apostles, and (if we understand him rightly) he had met two who professed to have actually seen our Lord Himself. Eusebius tells that Philip the apostle (some suppose that he ought to have said Philip the deacon) came to reside at Hierapolis with his daughters; and that Papias, on the authority of these daughters, tells a story of a miracle performed by Philip of raising a man from the dead. Eusebius certainly understood Papias to describe himself as contemporary with these daughters, and as having heard the story from themselves. If these were the same whom St. Luke describes as prophesying at Caesarea in the year 58, and if we suppose them to have been young women then, they might have been still alive at Hierapolis between 100 and 110. This is quite as late as persons were likely to be met with in Asia who had been hearers of Peter and others who, according to all tradition, died before the destruction of Jerusalem; and even the year 100 is later than we should expect to find a person alive who could be called a personal disciple of our Lord. On the other hand, Papias speaks of his enquiries in the past tense; and therefore we may easily believe that a considerable time elapsed before he published in his treatise the results of these enquiries. On the whole, we think that we shall not be far wrong in dating the work of Papias about A.D. 130.

There is every appearance that Papias lived after the rise of Gnosticism, and was not unaffected by the controversies to which it gave occasion. Strong asceticism was a feature which characterised some of the earliest of the Gnostic sects; and their commandments, Touch not, taste not, handle not, may well have been "the strange commandments" to which Papias refers. And Lightfoot is probably right in thinking that the sarcasm in the phrase "those who have so very much to say" may have been aimed at the work on the gospel by Basilides in twenty-four books, and some similar productions of the Gnostic schools of which the later book "Pistis Sophia" remains as a sample.

Of the traditions recorded by Papias, what has given rise to most discussion and has been made the foundation of most theories is, what he relates concerning the gospels of Matthew and Mark, which he is the first to mention by name. We quote the passages at length. Concerning Mark he says, "This also the elder [John] said: Mark having become the interpreter of Peter wrote accurately everything that he remembered of the things that were either said or done by Christ; but however not in order. For he neither heard the Lord nor had been a follower of His; but afterwards, as I said, was a follower of Peter, who framed his teaching according to the needs [of his hearers], but not with the design of giving a connected account of the Lord's discourses [or oracles]. Thus Mark committed no error in thus writing down some things as he remembered them. For he took heed to one thing: not to omit any of the things he had heard, or to set down anything falsely therein." Concerning Matthew, all that remains of what Papias says is, "So then Matthew composed the oracles in Hebrew, and every one interpreted them as he could." Until quite recent times no doubt was entertained that Papias here speaks of what we now know as the Gospels of Matthew and Mark; and mainly on the authority of these passages was founded the general belief of the Fathers, that Matthew's gospel had been originally written in Hebrew, and that Mark's gospel is founded on the teaching of Peter. But some modern critics have contended that our present first two gospels do not answer the descriptions given by Papias of the works of which he speaks. There is a striking resemblance between these two as we have them at present; but Papias's description, it is said, would lead us to think of them as very different. Matthew's gospel, according to

Papias, was a Hebrew book, containing an account only of our Lord's discourses; for so Schleiermacher would have us translate τὰ λόγια, the word which we have rendered "oracles." Mark, on the other hand, wrote in Greek, and recorded what was done as well as what was said by Christ. Again, Mark's gospel, which in its present state has the same claims to orderly arrangement as Matthew's, was, according to Papias, not written in order. The conclusion then which has been drawn from these arguments is, that Papias's testimony does not relate to our present gospels of Matthew and Mark, but to certain unknown originals out of which these gospels sprang; and accordingly there are several who constantly speak of "the original Matthew" the "Ur-Marcus," though there is no particle of evidence beyond what may be extracted from this passage of Papias that there ever was any gospel by Matthew or Mark different from those we have got. Renan even undertakes to give an account of the process by which the two very distinct works known to Papias, Matthew's collection of discourses, and Mark's collection of anecdotes, came into their present mutually resembling forms. In the early times, every possessor of anything that purported to be a record of our Lord, desired to have the story complete; and would write into the margin of the little book which was his own property, anything he met elsewhere that touched his heart; and so the book of Mark's anecdotes was enriched by a number of traits from Matthew's "discourses" and *vice versa*.

If this theory were true, we should expect to find in early times a multitude of gospels differing in their order and in their selection of facts, according as different possessors of MSS. had differently inserted the discourses or events which touched their hearts. Why we should have now exactly four versions of the story is hard to explain on this hypothesis. We should expect that, by the process of mutual assimilation which has been described, all would in the end have reduced themselves to a single gospel. The solitary fact to which Renan appeals in support of his theory in reality refutes it; the fact, namely, that the pericope of the adulteress (John vii. 53—viii. 11) is absent from some MSS. and differently placed in others. Such a state of things is so unusual that critics have generally inferred that this pericope cannot be a genuine part of St. John's gospel; but if Renan's theory were true, the phenomena which present themselves in a small degree in the case of this story ought to shew themselves in a multitude of cases. There ought to be a multitude of parables and miracles with respect to which we should be uncertain whether they were common to all the evangelists or special to one; and what place in that one they ought to occupy. Further, according to the hypothesis stated, Mark's design was more comprehensive than Matthew's. Matthew only related our Lord's discourses; Mark, the "things said or done by Christ;" that is to say, both discourses and anecdotes. If this were so, Mark's gospel would differ from Matthew's by excess, and Matthew's gospel would read like an abridgment of St. Mark's. Exactly the opposite is the case.

To deal first with the last point, we count it a mere blunder to translate λόγια discourses as if it were the same as λόγους. In the New Testament (Acts vii. 38, Rom. iii. 2, Heb. v. 12, 1 Pet. iv. 11) the word has its classical meaning "oracles," and is applied to the inspired utterances of God in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Nor is there any reason to think that when St. Paul for example says that to the Jews were committed the oracles of God, he confined this epithet to those parts of the Old Testament which contained Divine sayings and refused it to those narrative parts from which he so often drew lessons (Rom. iv. 3, 1 Cor. x. 1, xi. 8, Gal. iv. 21). So likewise Philo quotes as a λόγιον the narrative in Gen. iv. 15, 'The Lord set a mark upon Cain,' &c., and as another oracle the words (Deut. x.), 'The Lord God is his inheritance.' The word is used in the same way by the Apostolic Fathers. Thus in Clement (1 Cor. 53) τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ is used as equivalent to τὰς ἱερὰς γραφάς. (See also c. 19, Polyc. *ad Phil.* 7.) Knowing as we do from Papias's younger contemporary Justin Martyr that the reading of the gospels had in his time become part of the Christian public worship, we may safely pronounce the silent substitution of one gospel for another to be a thing inconceivable; and we conclude that, as we learn from Justin that the gospels had been set on a level with the Old Testament in the public reading of the Church, so we know from Papias that the ordinary name τὰ λόγια for the Old Testament books had in Christian use been extended to the gospels which were called τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια, the "oracles of our Lord." There is no reason to imagine that the work of Papias himself was limited to an exposition of our Lord's discourses; we translate therefore its title Κυριακῶν λογίων ἐξηγήσεις Expositions of the Gospels.

The manner in which Papias speaks of St. Mark's gospel quite agrees with the inspired authority, which the title, as we understand it, implies. Three times in this short fragment he attests Mark's perfect accuracy. "Mark wrote down accurately everything that he remembered." "Mark committed no error." "He made it his rule not to omit anything he had heard or to set down any false statement therein." And yet for some reason Papias was dissatisfied with Mark's arrangement and thought it necessary to apologise for it. No account of the passage is satisfactory which does not explain why, if Papias reverenced Mark so much, he was dissatisfied with his order. Here the hypothesis breaks down at once, that Papias was only in possession of two documents unlike in kind, the one a collection of discourses, the other of anecdotes. Respecting Mark's accuracy as he did, Papias would certainly have accepted his order if he had not been in possession of some other document, to which, in this respect, he attached more value, going over the same ground as St. Mark's, but giving the facts in a different order. The question then remains to be answered, If Papias held that Mark's gospel was not written in the right order, what, in his opinion, was the right order? Strauss considers and rejects three answers to this question, as being all irreconcileable at least with the supposition that the gospel known to Papias as St. Mark's was that which we receive under the name: (1) that the right order was St.

John's; (2) that it was St. Matthew's; (3) that Papias meant to deny to Mark the merit, not only of the right order, but of any orderly arrangement whatever. The first of these three solutions is defended with great ability by Lightfoot (*Contemp. Rev.* Oct. 1875, p. 848). Besides these three there remains another, which we believe to be the true one, namely that what Papias regarded as the right order was St. Luke's. The reason why this solution has been generally set aside is that no mention of St. Luke's gospel is made in any of the fragments of Papias which have reached us, from which it has been assumed to be certain that he was unacquainted with Luke's writings. If we had the whole work of Papias and found he had said nothing about St. Luke it might be reasonable to build arguments on his silence; but we have no right to assume that he was silent merely because Eusebius found in Papias no statement about St. Luke which he thought worth including in the few brief extracts which he gives. Lightfoot has shewn (*Coloss.* p. 52) that it is not the habit of Eusebius without some special reason to copy references made by his predecessors to undisputed books of the Canon. Hilgenfeld finds in the preface of Papias echoes of the preface to St. Luke's gospel which induce him to believe that Papias knew that gospel. To us this argument does not carry conviction, but there is every appearance that Papias was acquainted with the Acts. In one fragment he mentions Justus Barsabas: in another he gives an account of the death of Judas Iscariot, which seems plainly intended to reconcile the story in St. Matthew's gospel with that told in the Acts. One of the extant fragments has every appearance of having been part of a comment on our Lord's words preserved by St. Luke, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." At all events, if in explaining the language used by Papias we have to choose between the hypothesis that he was unacquainted with Luke's gospel, and the hypothesis that the Matthew and Mark which he knew perished without leaving any trace of their existence, and were in the next generation silently replaced by another Matthew and Mark, the former hypothesis is plainly to be preferred if it will give an equally good account of the phenomena.

But if we assume that Papias recognised St. Luke's gospel, his language with respect to Mark's is at once accounted for. Luke's preface declares it to be the Evangelist's intention to write in order, γραψαί καθεξῆς; but even a careless reader must perceive that his order is neither the same as Mark's nor as Matthew's. On this difference we conceive Papias undertook to throw light by his traditional anecdotes. And his account of the matter in the case of St. Mark's gospel is that Mark was but the interpreter of Peter, whose teaching he accurately reported: that Peter had not undertaken at any time to give an orderly account of our Lord's words and deeds, but had merely related some of them from time to time as the immediate needs of his hearers happened to suggest; that Mark therefore was guilty of no falsification in faithfully reporting what he had heard; and that if his order was not always accurate it was because it had been no part of the Evangelist's plan to aim at accuracy in this respect. With regard to Matthew's gospel his solution seems to be that the church was not then in possession of the gospel as Matthew had written it; that the Greek Matthew was but an unauthorised translation from a Hebrew original which individuals had translated, each for himself as he could. Thus, in place of its being true that Papias did not use our present gospels, we believe the fact to be that he was the first to harmonise them, and to proclaim the principle, that no apparent disagreement between them can affect their substantial truth. Taking in connection the solicitude which Papias here displays to clear the gospels from all suspicion of error, and the recognition of inspired authority implied in the title λόγια, we find it impossible to admit the inference which has been drawn from the last sentence of the fragment, that Papias attached little value to the gospels as compared with the *viva voce* traditions which he was able to attest himself; and we willingly accept Lightfoot's explanation, that it was the Gnostic apocryphal writings which Papias found to be useless to him in his attempts to illustrate the gospel narrative accepted by the church.

It has been already stated that the extant fragments of Papias mention the gospels of Matthew and Mark by name, but not those of Luke or John. Eusebius tells us, however, that Papias uses testimonies from St. John's first epistle. There is therefore very strong presumption that Papias was acquainted with the gospel, a presumption, as we have already said, not in the least weakened by the fact that Eusebius did not think it worth while to mention that this, in his time, undisputed book, had been used by Papias. This presumption is strengthened by the fact, that the list of the apostles in the fragment of the preface already quoted, contains names in the order in which they occur in St. John's gospel, placing Andrew before Peter, and includes some, such as Thomas and Philip, who outside of that gospel have little prominence in the gospel record, and that it gives to our Lord the Johannine title, the Truth. Irenaeus (v. 36) has preserved a fragment containing an express recognition of St. John's gospel; and though Irenaeus only gives it as a saying of the elders, Lightfoot (*Contemp. Rev.* Oct. 1875) has given convincing reasons for thinking that Papias is his authority, a conclusion to which Harneck assents as highly probable. An argument prefixed to a Vatican (9th century) MS. of St. John's gospel quotes a saying of Papias about that gospel, and goes on to speak of Papias as having been John's amanuensis. On the latter statement, see Lightfoot, *u. s.*, p. 854; but the evidence seems good enough to induce us to believe, that the work of Papias contained some notices of St. John's gospel, which Eusebius has not thought it worth while to mention. It must be remembered that Papias belonged to Asia Minor, where the fourth gospel according to all tradition was written, and where its authority was earliest recognised; and is described by Irenaeus as a companion of Polycarp, of whose use of St. John's gospel we cannot doubt.

Eusebius does not mention that Papias used the Apocalypse; but we learn that he did from other trustworthy authorities, and it is certain that on the subject of Chiliasm, Papias held

views most distasteful to Eusebius. We learn from Irenaeus (v. 33) that Papias, in his fourth book, told, on the authority of "the Elder" [John], how our Lord had said that "the days will come when there shall be vines having 10,000 stems, and on each stem 10,000 branches, and on each branch 10,000 shoots, and on each shoot 10,000 clusters, and in each cluster 10,000 grapes, and each grape when pressed shall give 25 measures of wine. And when any of the saints shall take hold of a cluster, another shall cry out, I am a better cluster, take me, and bless the Lord through me." The story goes on to tell of similar predictions concerning the other productions of the earth; and relates how the traitor Judas expressed his unbelief and was rebuked by our Lord. It has recently come to light that the ultimate original of this story of Papias was a Jewish apocryphal book made known by Ceriani, *Monumenta sac. et profan.*, in 1866. See the Apocalypse of Baruch, c. 29, in Fritzsche, *Libri Apoc. Vet. Test.* p. 666. To this, and possibly to other stories of similar character, Eusebius no doubt refers when he says that Papias had related certain strange parables and teachings of the Saviour, and other things of a fabulous character. Amongst these Eusebius quotes the doctrine, that after the resurrection the kingdom of Christ would be exhibited for a thousand years in a sensible form on this earth. And he expresses his opinion, that things spoken mystically by the apostles had wrongly been understood literally by Papias, who "was a man of very poor understanding as his writings shew." The common text of Eusebius balances this unfavourable judgment on Papias by elsewhere (iii. 26) calling him a very learned man and deeply versed in the Holy Scriptures; but the weight of evidence is against the genuineness of the clause containing this encomium, which probably expresses the later current church opinion concerning one who was regarded as a venerable father.

Concerning the use by Papias of the Acts of the Apostles we have spoken already. Eusebius tells nothing as to his use of St. Paul's epistles, and though, as has been already remarked, the silence of Eusebius goes a very short way towards proving that Papias does not quote these epistles, yet it seems more likely than not that he found no occasion to mention them in a work on the gospel history. The later and longer residence of the apostle John in Asia Minor is likely to have obliterated the recollections of the Pauline visit; and in looking for traditions of our Lord's life, Papias would naturally enquire after the testimony of those who had seen Him in the flesh. The very gratuitous inference from the assumed fact that Papias does not quote St. Paul, that he must have been Ebionite and anti-Pauline, is negatived by the fact that, as Eusebius testifies, he used the epistle of Peter, a work the teaching of which, as all critics allow, is completely Pauline.

With regard to the silence of Eusebius as to the use by Papias of John's gospel and Paul's epistles, it may be added that if it affords any presumption, it is that Papias gave no indication that his opinion about the undisputed books differed from that which, in the time of Eusebius, was received as unquestioned truth. For Eusebius thought meanly of Papias, and if he had known him to hold wrong opinions about the canon, would be likely to have mentioned it in disparagement of his authority in support of Chiliasm.

Eusebius relates that Papias tells a story of a woman accused before our Lord of many sins, a story also to be found in the gospel according to the Hebrews. There is a reasonable probability that the story here referred to may be that of the woman taken in adultery, now found in the common text of St. John's gospel. It must be remarked that Eusebius does not say that Papias took this story from the gospel according to the Hebrews. And the presumption is that Papias gave the story as known to him by oral tradition, and not as delivered from a written source. If this be so, it would follow that Papias had no direct knowledge of the gospel according to the Hebrews. We have incidentally mentioned that Papias has a story about Justus Barsabas having taken a cup of poison without injury. If Papias's copy of St. Mark contained the disputed verses at the end, this story might appropriately have been told in illustration of the verse, "If they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them," a promise instances of the fulfilment of which are very rare, whether in history or legend. A story of the kind is told of the apostle John, but is likely to have been later than Papias, else we should have been apt to hear of it here.

Georgius Hamartolus quotes Papias as saying, in his second book, that the apostle John had been killed by the Jews. That there is some blunder is clear; but Lightfoot has made it very probable from comparison with a passage in Origen, that a real saying of Papias is quoted, but with the omission of a line or two. Papias, in commenting on Matt. xx. 22, may very well have said, as does Origen, that John had been condemned by the Roman emperor to exile at Patmos, and that James had been killed by the Jews.

In the article JOANNES PRESBYTER (iii. 399) we have quoted several authorities (including Irenaeus) who speak of Papias as a disciple of John the Evangelist. He is called by Anastasius of Sinai ὁ πάνυ and ὁ πολύς, and passed in the church as an authority of the highest rank. Jerome (*Ep. ad Lucinium*, 71 Vallars.) contradicts a report that he had translated the writings of Papias and Polycarp, declaring that he had neither leisure nor ability for such a task. He does not, in his writings, shew any signs that he knew more of the work of Papias than he could have learned from Eusebius. The latest trace of the existence of the work of Papias is that an inventory, A.D. 1218, of the possessions of the cathedral of Nismes (Menard. *Hist. civil. ecclés. et littér. de la ville de Nismes*) contains the entry "Item inveni in claustro—librum Papie librum de verbis Domini." No trace of this MS. has been recovered. The fragments of Papias have been assembled in various collections, by Grabe in his *Spicilegium*, by Galland, by Routh (*Rell. Sac.*), but at present they can best be read in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. Dissertations on Papias are so numerous that we can only select a few for mention: important articles in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* by Schleiermacher, 1832, Zahn, 1867, Steitz, 1868; an essay by Weiffenbach, Giessen, 1876, a reply by Leimbach, Gotha, 1878, and a rejoinder by Weiffenbach,

Jahrbuch f. prot. Theol. 1877; Hilgenfeld in his *Journal*, 1875, 1877, 1879; Lightfoot, *Contemporary Review*, 1867, 1875.

Others of the name of Papias are—a martyr with Victorinus (Assemani, *Act. Mart. Or. et Occ.* ii. 60); a martyr with Onesimus at Rome, Feb. 16; a physician at Laodicea (Fabric. *Bib. Gr.* vii. 154); and it is necessary to add that there was a grammarian Papias in the 11th century, because a note of his on the Maries of the gospel had been published by Grabe among the fragments of Papias of Hierapolis, and had been accepted as such until Lightfoot established the true authorship. [G. S.]

PAPIAS (2), Jan. 31 (Bas. *Men.*), Feb. 25 (*Mart. Rom.*; Usuard.), a companion of the martyr Quadratus in the Decian persecution under the proconsul Tertius. The Latin martyrologies make him suffer in Egypt under the Duke Sabinus, in the persecution of Numerian. Sabinus was ruler in Egypt under Decius, and persecuted Dionysius Alexandrinus (Eus. vi. 40). [G. T. S.]

PAPIAS (3), Feb. 26, martyr in the Decian persecution at Attalia. He suffered with Deodorus, Claudianus, and Conon (Aubé in *Rev. Arch.* 1884, pt. i. p. 219; *AA. SS.* Boll. Feb. iii. 627; *D.C.A.*). [G. T. S.]

PAPINIANUS, Nov. 28, bishop of Vita and martyr in Africa by fire in the Vandal persecution, cent. v., with many other bishops. *Mart. Vet. Rom.* Adon.; Vict. Vit. *Hist.* [GENSERIC]. [G. T. S.]

PAPISCUS. [JASON (2)].

PAPPOLUS (1), 19th bishop of Chartres, between St. Chaletricus and St. Bertharius, towards the close of the 6th century. The 4th council of Paris was principally occupied with a plaint of his against Egidius, archbishop of Rheims, who had invaded his jurisdiction by consecrating Promotus as bishop of Châteaudun, in the diocese of Chartres, by order of king Sigebert. On Sept. 11, 573, the council decided in favour of Pappolus, ordered Egidius to withdraw his countenance from the usurper, against whom they threatened excommunication, and wrote to Sigebert begging him not to encourage the lawless proceeding (Mansi, ix. 865 seqq.; Greg. Tur. *Appx.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1168 seqq.; Ceillier, xi. 892). Promotus afterwards applied to Guntram to reinstate him, but on Pappolus resisting and exhibiting the sentence passed by the bishops, the king refused his aid (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* vii. 17).

In 585 his signature is found to the canons of the Council of Paris (Mansi, ix. 957).

In the miracles of St. Caraunus, Pappolus is eulogized as the founder of a monastery at Chartres, while a little later in the same narrative he appears in an odious light as a persecutor (Boll. Mai, vi. 753). This production, however, is quite untrustworthy. [S. A. B.]

PAPPOLUS (2) (PAPOLUS), bishop of Metz, c. A.D. 614. He built a monastery in honour of St. Innocent (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 691; Boll. *A. SS.* Sept. vi. 185). [J. G.]

PAPPUS (1), a Syrian bishop of an unnamed see, one of the four bishops deputed in 404 to convey to pope Innocent the appeal of Chrysostom, and that of the 40 bishops of his communion (Pallad. p. 10). On the persecution against Chrysostom's adherents in 406, Pappus took refuge with Elpidius of Laodicea, and when Palladius wrote the two holy men were reported not to have descended the staircase of their house for three years, spending their time in prayer (*ibid.*). [E. V.]

PAPPUS (2), bishop of Cythra, or Cythros, in Cyprus, only known to us from the religious romance, which passes as the life of St. Epiphanius, ascribed to Polybius, bishop of Rhinocurara. We there find it stated that Pappus and his brother bishop, Gelasius of Salamis, had been confessors in a former persecution, and that he was reverenced as a father by the other bishops of the island, on this account and also from his great age, having held his see of Cythra—"a miserable city," πόλις οἰκτρά—fifty-eight years. The writer goes on to say that it was miraculously revealed to Pappus that Epiphanius was to be bishop of Salamis, and that he had to ordain him by force. This part of the story may be safely rejected; how much of it is true is doubtful. (*Vit. S. Epiphan.* cc. 34, 35, pp. 347–9; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.*; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* x. 497, notes.) [E. V.]

PAPULA (PAPPULA, PAPPOLA), left her father's house, and betook herself to a monastery, where for thirty years she lived as a monk, about A.D. 500 (Gregorius Tur. *De Glor. Conf.* c. xvi.) [J. G.]

PAPYLUS (PAPIRIUS or PAPYRIUS, as Rufinus, and Ado after him, write), April 13. Under CARPUS (2) will be found the Acts of this martyr so far as they were known till the year 1881, when Aubé brought some new facts to light as the result of his explorations among the Greek MSS. in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*. Papylus is mentioned by Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 15) at the end of his account of Polycarp's martyrdom. Ruinart (p. 27) in his preface to the Acts of Polycarp, says that according to Eusebius Papylus and his companions Carpus and Agathonice suffered about the same time as Polycarp. This is a mistake made by the Bollandist Henschenius, arising out of the Latin version of Eusebius, which inserts the words "sub id tempus," which have no equivalent in the Greek original. Eusebius does not say that Carpus and Papylus suffered at the same time as Polycarp, but that Pionius and Metrodorus did, and that their martyrdoms were recorded in the copy of Polycarp's Acts which he consulted. [PIONIUS.] Of Papylus his notice is simply thus: "There are also records extant of others that suffered martyrdom in Pergamus, a city of Asia, Carpus and Papylus, and a woman Agathonice, who were gloriously perfected after numerous and illustrious testimonies." However, though Eusebius does not expressly affirm that they suffered with Polycarp, he seems by introducing them at the conclusion of his narrative about Polycarp, to imply that they suffered about that period, while Ado, who seems to have had the lost work of Eusebius on the martyrs before him, says that

they suffered at the time when Justin Martyr was slain. (Adon. *Mart.* April 13; LYONNESE MART.; and Le Blant, *Les Actes des Martyrs*, p. 5.) The Acts of Papylus contained in Metaphrastes assign his martyrdom to the Decian persecution. These Acts are, however, in Aubé's view, utterly worthless. In the *Revue Archéologique*, Dec. 1881, p. 350, he published a Greek manuscript containing Acts which he thinks may be those seen by Eusebius. He first points out the numerous historical mistakes in the existing Acts, and then the evident marks of truth borne by the newly found document. The express mention of the Acts by Eusebius suggested to Aubé the idea of searching the Greek manuscripts at Paris for a purer text than that of Metaphrastes. He found ten MSS. containing the corrupt and legendary text, and one giving a shorter and more rational one. It came into the library in 1669 from the East, and is numbered MSS. vol. 1468, fol. 134. This MS. gives no names of emperor, proconsul, or pope, under whom Papylus suffered. It says nothing of Papylus being a deacon or Carpus a bishop. It is devoid of the legendary miracles which figure in Metaphrastes. It represents Papylus simply as a citizen of Thyatira. Aubé notes several other points in which these Acts seem to him more authentic than those of Metaphrastes, and gives a Latin translation of the Greek text which he discovered. Aubé seems to concur in the verdict which places the martyrdom of Papylus in the Decian persecution. But Lightfoot points out (*Ignatius*, i. 625) that in the Acts mention is made of emperors in the plural number, thence he infers that this rather points to the reign of M. Aurelius or of Severus. If the martyrdom were as early as M. Aurelius, the possibility suggests itself of an identification of Papylus with the PAPIRIUS mentioned by Polycrates, who however is not called by him a martyr. Lightfoot also notes the answer of Papylus to the question, 'Hast thou children?' 'Yes, many, by God's grace;' as making it probable that Papylus was a bishop. According to Euseb. iv. 15, Papylus suffered at Pergamus, though a citizen of Thyatira. He may have been forwarded to the regular proconsular court from Thyatira. Le Blant (*l. c.* p. 50) has an interesting passage on the assizes held by the proconsuls at various important centres. [G. T. S.]

PARACODES, ST., 7th bishop of Vienne, between St. Dionysius and St. Florentius I., about the commencement of the 3rd century, is said to have been, like his predecessor, a Greek. According to Ado he lived on till the times of the emperor Maximin, i.e. 235 (*Chronicon*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxiii. 85), but if the Chronicle of the Viennese bishops (see *Gall. Christ.* xvi. 9) is to be trusted, he suffered martyrdom in the reign of Severus (A.D. 193–211). There is a letter purporting to be addressed to him by Pope Victor on the subject of the Paschal feast (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. i. 20), but it is undoubtedly spurious. His day of commemoration is Jan. 1, and in the Appendix to Ado's Martyrology are the words "Eodem die sanctissimi Paragodae septimi Viennensis episcopi" (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiii. 419). [S. A. B.]

PARACONDACES, an abbat, Paulician persecutor and inquisitor in Asia Minor and Armenia, by imperial commission in the reign of Leo the Armenian. The cruel severity with which the sect was treated led to the usual reprisals in such cases. He was assassinated by some of the Astati, Sergiote fanatics, at Cynoschora in Armenia. (Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 41; Phot. c. *Man.* i. 24; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 353.) [M. B. C.]

PARALIUS, bishop of Andrapa (Claudiopolis) A.D. 431–451 (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 539), subscribes Nestorius's condemnation at the council of Ephesus A.D. 431 (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1364). [J. G.]

PARCENTIUS, a Manichean leader discovered at Merida, in Spain, by Antoninus its bishop, in the Manichean persecution of A.D. 447, inaugurated at Rome by pope Leo, A.D. 444, (Idat. Chron. p. 26; Ceill. x. 667.) [G. T. S.]

PARCHOR. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vi. 6) states that Isidore, the son of Basilides, wrote a book called *Expositions of the Prophet Parchor.* On this name see BARCABBAS. [G. S.]

PARDUS, bishop of Arpi, in Apulia, present at the Council of Arles A.D. 314. (Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iv. 94.) [H. W. P.]

PAREDRI, a name by which those who professed the art of magic designated the familiar spirits through whose aid they claimed to do their wonders. The name seems to have been introduced into Christian literature by Justin Martyr (*οἱ λεγόμενοι παρὰ τοῖς μάγοις ὀνειροπομποὶ καὶ πάρεδροι*, *Apol.* i. 18). From this passage, apparently, are derived the *πάρεδροι καὶ ὀνειροπομποί* of Irenaeus (I. xxiii. 4, xxv. 3) and of Euseb. (*H. E.* iv. 7), and also the paredri of Tertullian (*De Anim.* 28). And Tertullian, probably, had the same two words in his mind (*Apol.* 23): "Si et somnia immittunt, habentes simul invitatorum angelorum et daemonum adsistentem sibi potestatem." The explanation of *πάρεδρος*, as an assisting power, is adopted by Rufinus, *Hist.* ii. 13: "Utens adminiculo adsistentis sibi et adhaerentis daemoniacae virtutis, quam *πάρεδρον* vocant. But in non-ecclesiastical writers, *πάρεδρος* is interpreted *σύνθρονος* or assessor, and *θεοὶ πάρεδροι* are new gods admitted to share the dignity of the old ones. [G. S.]

PAREGORIUS (1), Feb. 18, mart. with Leo about the time of the emperors Gallienus and Valerian, A.D. 260. He suffered at Patara, a city of Lycia, under Lollianus, governor of the province, for refusal to worship Serapis. Spartianus often mentions Avitus Lollianus as one of the thirty tyrants who lived at that time. Trebellius Pollio also mentions him in his account of them. (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* 535.) [G. T. S.]

PAREGORIUS (2), an aged presbyter of Basil's diocese, who had a woman living with him as housekeeper. Basil on being informed by the chorepiscopus of the district, of this violation of the Nicene canons commanded Paregorius at once to make her leave his house, and interdicted him from all ecclesiastical functions until he obeyed. Paregorius in vain pleaded his ad-

vanced age, the innocence of the connection, and his need of the woman's services, and charged Basil with being too ready to listen to ill-natured stories. Basil reiterated his mandate; ordered that the female should be sent to a nunnery, and threatened that if Paregorius presumed to exercise his sacerdotal office he would be anathema, and all who availed themselves of his ministry would be excommunicated (Basil, *Ep.* 55 [198]). [E. V.]

PARERMENEUTAE, heretics who perverted Scripture in a contentious spirit, putting aside the plainest and most unobjectionable interpretations (Joan. Damasc. *Haer.* 97). [C. H.]

PARMENIANUS, successor to Donatus the Great, who followed Majorinus as Donatist bishop of Carthage. Optatus calls him "peregrinus," *i.e.* probably not a native of Africa. Having adopted Donatist opinions, he succeeded Donatus about 350, and having been banished A.D. 358, he returned under the decree of Julian A.D. 362 (Aug. *Retract.* ii. 17; Euseb. *Chron.* ap. Hieron. *Opp.* vol. iii. p. 687). About this time, if not earlier, he published a work, not now extant, in five parts, in defence of Donatism, to which the treatise of Optatus is a reply. [Optatus, DONATISM, Vol. I. p. 885.] About 372 Tichonius, a Donatist, but well versed in Scripture, becoming sensible of the narrow and exclusive views of the sect, wrote a book to condemn them, but without abandoning his party. To this Parmenian replied, condemning the doctrine of Tichonius, as tending to connect the true church, that of the Donatists, with the corrupt one, the Catholic, especially its African branch. A council of 270 Donatist bishops was convened at Carthage, which sat for seventy-five days, and at last resolved that "traditors," if they refused to be re-baptized, should nevertheless be admitted to communion (Aug. *Ep.* 93, 43).

The time of this council is not known. Parmenian died, and was succeeded by Primian about 392; but his book against Tichonius fell into the hands of St. Augustine, who, at the request of his friends, discussed it in a treatise divided into three books, about 402–405 (Tillemont, xiii. 128, and note 32).

I. In the first book he considers chiefly the ecclesiastical side of the question, including also its civil aspect, *i.e.* that of church and state. In Parmenian's view, Gallic, Italian and Spanish Christians, in a word, all church members who were not Donatists, were no better than the African traditors; but of this he brought no Scripture proofs, only assertions of some of his own sect. Are such witnesses as these to be preferred to the Scriptural testimony as to the universality of the church, brought forward by Tichonius, or did the seed of Abraham die out before it reached distant parts? Parmenian thought the world was polluted by traditors, because no separation took place in Africa, but this was impracticable, unless in Africa the traditors had outnumbered the honest men. Let those who wish to know the facts read the treatise of Optatus, especially what he says about Lucilla, the mock condemnation of Caecilianus, and the ordination of Majorinus, performed in order to frustrate God's grace and condemn people who had never even heard of Caecilianus. Augustine then cites the case of Hosius, condemned (for signing the creed of Sirmium) by Spanish, but upheld by Gallic bishops (Hosius, vol. iii. p. 172). How can this be explained, unless we suppose that the former condemned him in error, and afterwards yielded to their colleagues in order to avoid such a schism as that which the Donatists have created? In blaming these Spanish bishops for changing their minds, the Donatists show their own inconsistency, for the Maximianists, of whom one hundred bishops condemned Primian (at Cabarsussis), refused afterwards to yield to three hundred and ten of their own party, who acquitted him at Bagaia. Parmenian, if he were now alive, could not condemn the Spanish bishops, for he would thus offend those of his own party who returned to Primian after the judgment of the three hundred and ten, and acquit Praetextatus and Felicianus, who did so, and were received by their own party unconditionally. If his views were carried out, he would have created a new sect of Parmenianists, and divided still further the already divided body in Africa. Further, in accusing Hosius of helping Caecilianus at the trial in order to "drive many saints into Catholic communion," he virtually admitted that his own party appealed to Constantine, but after the adverse decision they accused the president (Melchiades) of "tradition;" and virtually the various Catholic nations who knew nothing of the whole matter, and preferred to communicate with Christians whom the Donatists called traditors, but whom, after that decision, Augustine preferred to consider innocent. They also accused the emperor of partiality, but how much less to be blamed are they who refuse to believe these rash accusations! Parmenian complained that, at the suggestion of Hosius, Constantine ordered the Donatists to be punished; but the truth was that Hosius recommended a punishment milder than the one previously proposed. If Donatists are martyrs, then all law-breakers are so; but has the emperor no concern with religion? If he put Catholic Christians to death for disobedience to the law, would they be martyrs, or were the people martyrs to whom the idol temples belonged which he ordered to be destroyed, and whose worship he forbade under pain of death? It was not without reason that, in pronouncing a blessing on the persecuted, our Lord added the words "for righteousness' sake." Are the outrages of the Circumcellions, or ought rebels and poisoners to be disregarded? Donatists themselves persecuted Maximianists, nor can the cruelties practised by Firmus on the Rogatists be forgotten. Donatists affect to disbelieve the charges against the Circumcellions, but refuse to accept the judgment of the whole world, when it disclaims knowledge of African matters. The council of Bagaia condemned the Maximianists, and when they refused to give up their churches, the Donatists appealed to the law, which compelled them to do so, and punished some who were obstinate. Their only supporter was Julian, but other emperors enacted laws against conventicles, and imposed heavy fines on those who ordained in them, with confiscation of the buildings, and incapacity either to make or to receive bequests

for their benefit, of which Augustine mentions a case in point (c. *Parm.* i. 12. 9.) Yet Christians do not object to their retaining their churches, for the separation of wheat from chaff ought not to take place until the final judgment.

II. In the second book Augustine discusses at length the Scriptural argument, which may be divided into three parts. Donatists argue :—

(*a*) That no benefit can be conferred on others by unholy teachers; their sacrifice is unholy and unacceptable to God.

(*b*) That a man cannot impart what he has not received; if the giver be unholy he can impart no benefit.

(*c*) That corruption of a portion infects the whole mass, for which there is no remedy but separation.

In reply, Augustine argues that in their zeal for purity Donatists forget what Scripture says about the unity of the Church, *e.g.* Ps. cxxxii., cxxxiii. 1; Ecclus. ii. 16 (14). Such a passage as Is. lxvi. 3 tells against those who set up altars of their own. Sacrifices offered by bad men (Prov. xxi. 27) injure not those who partake in, but those who offer them, and the One sacrifice is profitable or not according to the condition of heart of those who receive it (1 Cor. xi. 29). Let Donatists judge whether they eat and drink worthily who separate themselves from many heirs of the kingdom of heaven. The purity of priests under the law (Ex. xix. 22; xxx. 20; Lev. xxii. 21) typified the perfect purity of the great High Priest. Christian people pray for each other, but not as mediators, and the One Mediator prays for all. Sacraments are not invalid by reason of the unworthiness of ministers, but they injure those who receive them unworthily, as our Lord implied Matt. xxiii. 3; and in this sense must Jer. ii. 13 be understood, not as if baptism were void, but that they who received have abused it, and made themselves "broken cisterns." Donatists quoted Ecclus. xxxiv. 25 (30) to shew that a "dead" minister cannot confer true baptism, to which argument Augustine replies by saying that "dead" means heathen, and defers his judgment on the question of baptism administered by one who is not a Christian. But we may remark that in this case both the Donatists and St. Augustine argued on the meaning of the Vulgate reading of the passage—*qui baptizatur à mortuo, et iterum tangit, quid proficit lavatio illius?* whereas in the Greek version, which is nearest to the lost original, the passage stands ὁ βαπτιζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ κ.τ.λ. *i.e.* "he who washes himself after touching a dead body," &c. (Lev. xxii. 4, 6; Numb. v. 2). Donatists maintained that baptism was valid only when the minister was holy, but that if he were not so, God himself or an angel supplied the deficiency. If so, argues Augustine, it were better always to be baptized by a bad man, for then what is wanting would always be made up. It is Christ alone who baptizes with the Holy Ghost, and He alone gave his commission to the apostles (Matt. x. 20; John xx. 21–23). In the case of ministration by unholy men, the Holy Ghost will desert not the receiver of the sacrament but the minister (1 Cor. ix. 17; Phil. i. 15, 18). As to God hearing sinners (John ix. 31; Psa. xlix. (l.) 16, 20) we know that He does sometimes hear them, as appears in the cases of Balaam and Caiaphas, as also of Daniel and the publican, confessing themselves to be sinners. And would it not be well for the Donatists to apply to themselves this term, for what malefactors could be worse than Optatus of Thamugada and the Circumcellions? It was said in the council of Bagaia that the Maximianists were like the Egyptian corpses of Ex. xiv. 31. If so, Felicianus must be one of such corpses, for he, being "dead," baptized. Again, what do men mean when, in the Lord's prayer, they ask that their sins may be forgiven, a petition which refers not to baptism but to sins committed after baptism? If Donatists think that they have no sins, their prayer must be hypocritical; if they are not free from sin, how can they baptize?

But, say the Donatists, how can a man give what he has not received? 1 Cor. iv. 7. Can a man be said to receive properly from them: if he can, does he lose this by leaving them? If he does and he returns to them, he ought to be re-baptized, but if he need not be re-baptized, he cannot be said to have lost anything. And how can any one be deprived of the benefit of God's promise to Abraham by the fault of any "traditor"? Some perceive this difficulty, and say that they who depart from the Donatist church lose not their own baptism, but only the right of conferring it. But both baptism and ordination are sacraments which cannot properly be repeated: even men who return to the church from a schismatical body are not re-ordained, or if this be done in ignorance, the fault may easily be pardoned. 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

If even a layman administers baptism in case of extreme necessity, his act, though irregular, must not be judged invalid. The case of baptism by one who is not a Christian was mentioned before, but as to baptism by Separatists there can be no doubt of its validity, though they are to blame for administering it; and how came it to pass that after his condemnation by 310 bishops, Felicianus lost nothing? After all, Tichonius described well the rule of Donatists in this matter, *quod volumus sanctum est.* Even Judas went forth to teach, and our Lord desired people to listen to the teaching of the Scribes and Pharisees. In quoting 1 Cor. iv. 7, the Donatists, to be consistent, ought to add the words "from a righteous man," by which means Parmenian would have proclaimed himself to be righteous; but there must be many bad men among the party, and from whom does even a righteous man receive ultimately except from one who is not man? If none but righteous men can confer baptism, how could any receive it from such men as Optatus (of Thamugada) or Felicianus, while he was cast out! Parmenian extended the exclusion even to holders of speculative opinions, but what would he say of them if they changed their minds? Our Lord, he says, went for baptism, not to the Pharisees but to the Baptist; yet, says Augustine, he frequented the Temple, which he once called "a den of thieves"; and from whom did such men as John and Cornelius receive their holiness?

As to infection of the whole body by the fault of some members (Eccl. i. 15, x. 1; 1 Cor. v. 6; 2 Cor. vi. 14–18; Eph. v. 11, 12; 1 Tim. v. 22), Augustine is never weary of reminding his opponents of the crimes of Optatus, and that to live among bad people does not imply participation in their sins, for if it did so, how could they be

pure who returned to Primian? The true separation will take place at the last day.

III. In the 3rd book Augustine pursues farther the point urged by Parmenian, of the duty of separation founded on such a passage as 1 Cor. v. 12, 13, which Augustine said ought not to be strained too far, and in quoting which Parmenian left out v. 12. Relying on the Vulgate, Augustine, who was only moderately acquainted with Greek, endeavours to shew that its ambiguous *malum* may be understood of subjective evil, not only of an objective offender. But this notion he was led afterwards by a better understanding of the Greek original, τὸν πονηρὸν, to abandon. *Retract.* ii. 17. Awaiting the final separation, Christians ought to endeavour to correct and reconcile offenders, as St. Paul himself recommended (2 Cor. ii. 6–11). Donatists were fond of quoting Ps. cxl. (cxli) 5, but it was not in any meek spirit that they persecuted Caecilian and supported Gildo. When St. Paul blamed the Corinthians for boasting, he added presently after "a little leaven," &c., and in this seems to condemn the infectious example of those who by exulting over the faults of others sought to clear themselves (1 Cor. v, 6, 7). But are there no bad men among the Donatists? If there are why do they communicate with them, and how will they defend Optatus (of Thamugada); or do they think their church is purer than the church of Africa in the time of Cyprian, who denounced strongly its covetous members, yet continued to communicate with them? Cypr. *de Laps.* c. 6. The same principle is shewn in the conduct of the man mentioned by Ezekiel (Ezek. ix. 4). Separation ought to take place only in extreme cases, after every opening for repentance and restoration has been made, and even then to be rather personal than official, in the spirit of our Lord's declaration (Matth. v. 9). Parmenian quotes Jer. xxiii. 28 against Tichonius, but were he himself, Donatus, and Majorinus, handles of the fan for winnowing the world: if so, where were the Circumcellions? and even this winnowed mass was sifted again by Primian, in order to separate the Maximianists. But the winnowing ought not to take place before the last day, and why did our Lord compare the church to a net? Such passages as Ps. xxv. 26, iv. 10, and Is. lii. 11, ought to be explained of personal participation: if Jeremiah desired a separation in this life, of chaff from wheat, Jer. xxiii. 28, how came St. Paul to hold a different doctrine, for were not those impure of whom he speaks in Phil. i. 15, 17? They ought to beware of pride (Phil. iii. 20; Col. iii. 1–3). The true safeguard of unity is the church set on a hill. But Donatists think penalties suffered by their zealot partisans are martyrdoms, and Parmenian exhorts Tichonius to remain with them and suffer persecution. But such language is used by all schismatics who are punished by the civil power. Even Salvius of Membresa probably would have said so; but if they speak lightly of what he suffered from men of his own party, what would they say if one of them had suffered punishment by the law? Let them ask what was done, and then judge of the punishment.

In this treatise St. Augustine had of course a great advantage in dealing with a defunct opponent, but his arguments are applicable to the living Donatist party as well as to their advocate now deceased. His arguments derived from the conduct of the Donatists themselves are irrefragable and urged with an unsparing pressure; but those which are derived from scripture are, as we have seen, sometimes founded on erroneous readings of the text, and are often strained and fanciful, but not more so than was the practice of the day, and of which abundant instances may be found both in the writings of other writers as well as in his own. We ought not to pass by without notice the moderation of Augustine in respect of excommunication. A full account of the treatise, with a list of scripture quotations, will be found in Ribbek, *Donatus und Augustinus*, pp. 348–366. (See also vol. i. pp. 889, 890. Aug. *Retract.* ii. 17.) [H. W. P.]

PARRE, ST. [PATROCLUS (2).]

PARTENIUS, a Catholic bishop, maligned by the Donatists. (Opt. 2, 25.) [H. W. P.]

PARTHENIUS (1), bishop of Lampsacus on the Hellespont. His Life written by Crispin, one of his presbyters [CRISPINUS (1)] is given by the Bollandists (*AA. SS.* Feb. ii. 38–42). His first work was to purge the city from idolatrous worship, and build churches, for which he is said to have visited the Emperor Constantine and procured his hearty aid. He died about A.D. 360; his feast is Feb. 7. (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i.; Tillemont, *H. E.* vi. 166–7; Baron. *A.E.* ann. 337, xxxviii.) [J. G.]

PARTHENIUS (2), a priest, commissioned by Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, to inform St. Augustine about some land presented by him for his monastic establishment at Hippo. (Aug. *Ep.* 22.) [H. W. P.]

PARTHENIUS (3), abbat in Constantinople and correspondent of Alexander of Hierapolis during the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. He was a Nestorian [ALEXANDER, Vol. I. p. 84]. [G. T. S.]

PARTHENIUS (4), master of the offices and patrician, as he is called in the laudatory epistle of ARATOR, whom he led into the ways of reading, and of writing verse. He lived in Ravenna in the first half of the 6th century (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxviii. 55 sq. 245 sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 197). [J. G.]

PASCENTIUS (1), steward or controller of imperial property in Africa, *comes domus regiae*, very severe in the execution of his office, and being an Arian, and a bitter opponent of the Catholic faith, and very fond of talk, very troublesome to the simple-minded, and perhaps not very highly educated, clergy of Carthage. (Possidius, *Vit. Aug.* c. 17; Böcking, *Not. Dign.* c. 11, vol. ii. p. 374–393.) Having requested St. Augustine to confer with him at Carthage on the subject of religion, A.D. 406, Pascentius at first agreed that written notes of the discussion should be made, but after dinner he changed his mind, refused to allow this to be done, and further asserted that Augustine was afraid to declare his opinions. Augustine therefore wrote two letters in succession both to disprove this unfounded assertion, and to give Pascentius an opportunity of reply. Again and again he com-

plains of the change in the plan and the inevitable mistakes to which it led, due no doubt, as with a courteous irony he says, to his opponent's want of memory, though if they had been made by himself he might justly have been charged with falsehood. The account which Augustine gives of the discussion, in which he was supported by his friend Alypius, is too long to be represented with any fulness, but is well worth careful study, as illustrating 1. The shuffling and slippery tactics of the Arian disputant, and as Augustine delicately insinuates, his ignorance of the true method of interpreting scripture. 2. His coarse, personal attacks on his opponent, when he was himself defeated in argument. 3. His use of the word "ingenitus" to describe the nature of God, and the defence of it by himself and some of his clamorous party who were present, on a principle precisely the same as that on which the word ὁμοούσιος was used, viz. as expressing the sense, though not itself an actual word of scripture. 4. The manner in which Augustine, compelled by his opponent's repeated evasions to declare his own belief, exhibits this in terms which closely resemble the Athanasian Creed, its method of illustration, and sometimes its very words. (Aug. *Ep.* 238, 239.) In reply to these letters Pascentius taunts Augustine with want of confidence in his faith, asks him, when he speaks of the three Persons in the Trinity, which of them is the One God, or whether there is a threefold person called by this name; and expresses a wish that he would settle down quietly, and with his colleagues confer on him on matters tending to the glory of God, for there is no use, he says, in writing again and again to him what does not edify him. (*Ep.* 240.)

In reply to this, Augustine refuses to return railing for railing, but says, that if Pascentius has read what he has written, he could not justly accuse him of believing in a threefold God. He repeats some of his former arguments on the Trinity of Persons in one God, and adverting to the appeal made by Pascentius on the inutility of frequent writing, urges that if *scribo* and *scribis* does not tend to edification, still less does *dico* and *dicis*, when no record is preserved of what was said. (*Ep.* 241.) The record of the controversy exhibits in a strong light St. Augustine's power in argument, his command of temper before a coarse and overbearing opponent, his exquisite courtesy combined not unfrequently with a delicate irony, and his unflinching strictures on the dishonest evasion by Pascentius of the condition originally laid down.

These letters probably contain all that is known for certain about this controversy, and Possidius in his life of Augustine points to no further communications; but in his index to his works he mentions a letter by him "in reply to various questions." This statement has led some persons to suppose that another letter was written by Augustine besides those which we have; but, as Tillemont remarks, the letter thus described may very well be No. 238 mentioned above. Three MSS. which do not contain the letters 238–241, contain an account of a discussion, ("altercatio,") between Augustine and Pascentius, held at Hippo, under the presidency of one Laurentius. But there is no reason to believe that this is authentic, nor does Augustine himself mention any other discussion than the one which was held at Carthage. (Aug. *Opp.* vol. ii. *App.* pp. 1153–1162, ed. Migne; Tillemont, *Mém.* vol. xiii. 164, 165 and note 41; Ceillier, vol. ix. pp. 185, 186, 194.) [H. W. P.]

PASCENTIUS (2), a Manichean leader discovered at Merida, in Spain, by Antoninus its bishop, in the Manichean persecution of A.D. 447, inaugurated at Rome by pope Leo, A.D. 444 (Idat. *Chron.* p. 26). [G. T. S.]

PASCENTIUS (3), eighteenth bishop of Poictiers, was appointed by command of Charibert, king of the Franks at the death of Pientius A.D. 564 (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. c. 18; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 145). Fortunatus dedicated his life of St. Hilary of Poictiers to him (Migne, lxxxviii. 439), and Maroveus was bishop about A.D. 584. [J. G.]

PASCHALIS, anti-pope, elected, but not ordained, in opposition to Sergius, after the death of Conon in Sept. A.D. 687. Anastasius (*in Vit. Conon.*) relates as follows. The pope Conon having left, by will, thirty pounds of gold to the clergy and monasteries, his archdeacon, Paschalis, during the pope's last illness, wrote offering this sum to John (called Platys), the new exarch at Ravenna, if he should himself obtain the popedom. Seven days after Conon's death, the Roman people were divided into two parties, the one choosing as his successor the above-named Paschalis, while the other chose the archpresbyter Theodorus. The latter party having first got possession of the inner part of the Lateran palace, the other seized the remainder of it; and there the two fortified themselves, neither being disposed to yield. Thereupon the magistrates, with the army and the greater part of the clergy, and a large multitude, elected Sergius, a presbyter, in the imperial palace on the Palatine, and thence took him amid acclamations to the Lateran palace, which, though closed and guarded, they succeeded in entering. Theodore at once renounced his claim, and Paschalis was compelled, against his will, to salute Sergius as the pope elect. But he sent word of what had occurred to the exarch at Ravenna, who forthwith came to Rome in person, arriving so unexpectedly that there was no time to receive him with the accustomed honours. Finding it, however, impossible to oppose the general voice in favour of Sergius, he allowed his election, but demanded from him the thirty pounds of gold which had been promised by Paschalis. Sergius, though pleading his inability to raise the sum, and the fact that he had not himself promised it, was compelled to give it, having to use for the purpose precious crowns and vessels from the shrine of St. Peter. Not long after the ordination of Sergius, Paschalis was deposed from his archdeaconry on the charge of practising incantations and frequenting groves and oracles, and was secluded in a monastery, where, after five years, he died (says Anastasius) impenitent. [J. B—Y.]

PASCHASINUS (1), one of the leading supporters of the anti-pope Ursicinus in his struggle against Damasus [DAMASUS] (Ceill. iv. 633; Hefele's *Councils*, sec. 91). [G. T. S.]

PASCHASINUS (2), bishop of Lilybaeum in Sicily, circ. A.D. 440, at the time when that

country was devastated by Vandal raids and the income of his church largely appropriated by the invaders (see Leonis Magni *Ep.* iii. cap. i. Migne's edition, note *e*). Leo the Great sent him pecuniary assistance in his trouble, for which he expresses the profoundest gratitude to his "dominus venerabilis Papa" (Leo Magn. *Ep.* l.c.). Leo, at the same time, consulted him about the Paschal cycle (A.D. 443). He replies in favour of the Alexandrian computation against the Roman, but in an abject strain of deference to his patron (Leo I. Pope, p. 666). At the same time he relates in confirmation of his view a miracle which used to take place in the baptistery of an outlying church on the property of his see, on the true Paschal Eve every year the water rising miraculously in the font (Leonis *Ep.* iii. cap. 3). In 447 we find him conveying to the Sicilian bishops generally some disciplinary injunctions of the pope (LEO I. pope, p. 661; *Ep.* xvi. cap. 7). In 451 he receives another letter from Leo again desiring him to make enquiries as to the Paschal cycle (*Ep.* lxxxviii. cap. 4), and sending him the Tome to stir up his energies in the cause of orthodoxy. Immediately after this he is sent as one of Leo's legates to the council of Chalcedon (LEO, p. 659; *Ep.* lxxxix.), and presides on his behalf. (Labbe, *Concilia*, vol. iv. p. 580 E, etc. The phrase "synodo praesidens" however does not occur in the Acta of the council, but only in the signatures of the prelates representing Rome.) He acts for him with the other legates, first objecting to the presence of Dioscorus (Actio i. p. 94 D), and afterwards interposing again and again, pronouncing the sentence in Dioscorus (Actio iii. p. 424 B), reading the record of the Nicene canon beginning "Romana Ecclesia semper habuit primatum" (p. 812 A), etc. etc. For the conduct of the legates in regard to the 28th canon, see LEO, p. 663; Labbe, iv. pp. 793–794. We notice that Paschasius could not speak Greek, and used an interpreter (p. 380 B). After the council we hear no more of him. [C. G.]

PASCHASIUS (1), a deacon of Rouen, who about the year 399 was a messenger between St. Victricius, bishop of Rouen, and St. Paulinus of Nola. (Paulin. *Epist.* xviii. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 237.) [S. A. B.]

PASCHASIUS (2), Nov. 13, a Catholic confessor under Genseric. (Victor. Vit. *Opp.* ed. Ruinart, p. 433.) [G. T. S.]

PASCHASIUS (3), deacon of Rome, saint and confessor, flourished at the end of the 5th century, and the beginning of the 6th century. Gregory the Great in his *Dialogues*, bk. iv. chap. 40, speaks of him as "a man of great sanctity, much given to alms-deeds, a considerer of the poor, and a forgetter of himself." He was a firm supporter of the anti-pope Laurentius to the day of his death, and his adhesion was a great source of strength to the opponents of Symmachus (cf. Baronius, ann. 498). [LAURENTIUS (10).] Gregory in the fourth book of his *Dialogues*, gives an account of his deliverance from Purgatory, where he was expiating his sin of resisting the judgment of the church in the matter of Laurentius. This he says was effected by the intercession of Germanus, bishop of Capua, because Paschasius had erred owing to ignorance, and not maliciously. There is also a story in the same place, which illustrates the high repute in which Paschasius was held, to the effect that when he died, in the time of Symmachus, his dalmatic was touched by a demoniac, who was healed at once. There is extant a work of his in two books, *De Sancto Spiritu* (*Pat. Lat.* lxii. 9–40), to which Gregory alludes in this same passage from his *Dialogues* as "libri rectissimi ac luculenti." Casimir Oudinus, in his work *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiae* (*vide* Leipsic edition, 1722, vol. i. p. 1304), argues that the treatise generally ascribed to Paschasius is really the work of Faustus of Riez, referred to by Gennadius (*De Script. Eccl.* c. 85; cf. *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 1109), and that Paschasius's book is lost to us. His arguments hardly, however, seem convincing, and have not been generally accepted by editors. We have, besides this, a letter from Paschasius to Eugippius declaring his own inability to improve in any way a life of St. Severinus, which Eugippius had written, and sent for revision, and urging him to publish it as it stood. (*Pat. Lat.* lxii. 39, 40.) The date of Paschasius's death is fixed at about A.D. 512. [G. W. D.]

PASCHASIUS (4), bishop of Naples, succeeded Fortunatus in the autumn of A.D. 601. There are three letters to him from Gregory the Great. The first, dated February A.D. 602, desires him to consecrate an oratory erected in honour of St. Severinus; the second relates to the mode in which 400 solidi, the portion of the revenues of the church of Naples assigned to the clergy and the poor, are to be divided; in the third, written in A.D. 603 or 604, Gregory, after repeating the complaint addressed to him by the Jews of Naples that attempts had been made to prevent them from celebrating their festivals, consistently with his tolerant policy on other occasions [GREGORIUS I., Vol. II. 781], advises Paschasius to try to convert them by arguments and kindness, not by force, and orders that they should be allowed in future to keep their festivals without molestation. In a letter to his sub-deacon Anthemius, Gregory blames Paschasius for preventing the condemnation of the sub-deacon Hilarius for falsely accusing the deacon John, and orders that Paschasius should depose him from the sub-diaconate, have him publicly flogged, and banish him. Paschasius is also to be admonished to maintain watchfully the discipline of his church. He is also to appoint a major-domo to see after the entertainment of strangers and other business. (Gregorii *Epist.* lib. xi. ind. iv. 31, 34; lib. xiii. ind. vi. 12; lib. xi. ind. iv. 71, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1144, 1146, 1267, 1210.) [F. D.]

PASCHASIUS (5), vir magnificus, and Plancho, vir clarissimus, complained to Gregory the Great in 602 that JOANNES (389), bishop of Syracuse, would receive the rents of the Roman church, which he collected, only at two specified places (*Epp.* xii. 43; Jaffé, *R.P.* num. 1477). [F. D.]

PASICRATES, May 25, mart. at Dorostorum in Moesia Inferior. He suffered with one Valentio. They are mentioned in the Acts of Julius, May 27. Hesychius, soon after a martyr, sent salutation to Pasicrates, through Julius, when suffering. His expression was a remark-

able one as shewing the belief of cent. iv. in personal recognition in the Spirit World, "Plurimum etiam saluta Pasicratem et Valentionem famulos Dei, qui nos jam per bonam confessionem praecesserunt ad Dominum." It also shows their sense of the nearness of that world, for Julius replies to Hesychius that the persons he wished to salute had already heard his greetings. Invocation of saints easily sprang up in such a soil. (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 549.) [G. T. S.]

PASSALORHYNCHITAE. Epiphanius, in his article on the Montanists (*Haer.* xlviii. 14) treats of the Tascodrugitae, whom he counts as a branch, or a kindred sect; and he explains the name as meaning the same as Passalorhynchitae. The latter name he derives from πάσσαλος and ῥύγχος, and states that these people were so called because in prayer they put their finger to their nose, meaning no doubt by this ceremony of their own choosing, to express downcast humility. Epiphanius here seems to assume that the name Passalorhynchitae was likely to be better known to his readers than that which he explains by it. And in fact we hear of these people, it would seem independently, from Philaster (*Haer.* 76). This writer says that these devotees laid their finger to their nose and mouth, by way of imposing silence on themselves; desiring to imitate David (Ps. cxli. 3) and the prophets, but having really for their model the vain silence of Pythagoras. Jerome (in the preface to the second book of his *Commentary on the Galatians*) states from personal knowledge that there were in his time Passalorhynchitae at Ancyra in Galatia.

It must be borne in mind that the primitive attitude of prayer was that the suppliant stood with his hands raised up to heaven. It is intelligible therefore that those who first took notice of men who in praying covered their face with their hands should think the new practice strange, offensive, savouring of heresy, and one which deserved to be stigmatized by a nickname. Yet the nickname actually devised is by no means a natural one; and St. Augustine has reason in saying (*Haer.* 63) that if it were intended to describe men who put their finger to their nose, Dactylorhynchitae would have been a more suitable name. It seems likely therefore that the account of Epiphanius may be so far correct, that the Greek name took its origin, as meant to be a literal translation (possibly a mistaken one) of a name in another language. See ASCODRUGITAE, and Lightfoot, *Ep. Galat.* p. 32. [G. S.]

PASSARION, chorepiscopus and archimandrite of a monastery which was probably in Jerusalem, as well as superior of all the monks in the diocese, in the time of Juvenal patriarch of Jerusalem. A few months prior to his death, which Tillemont places in 428 or 429, he was present with HESYCHIUS (25) at the dedication of Euthymius's laura near Jerusalem. In spite of his great reputation as a saint, Tillemont can find no church dedicated in his honour. (Cyril. Scyth., *Vit. S. Euphymii* ap. Coteler. *Mon.* iv. 31; Boll. *Acta SS.* 20 Jan. ii. 308; Tillem. x. 196, 197.) [EUTHYMIUS (4).] [J. G.]

PASSERIUS (POSSERIUS), priest, present at the council held at Jerusalem A.D. 415 (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 309; Orosius, *De Arb. Lib.* § 6 ap. *Pat. Lat.* xxxi. 1178.) [J. G.]

PASTOR (1). This name is connected with traditions of the Roman Church, which, though accepted as historical by Baronius and other writers, including Cardinal Wiseman (*Fabiola*, p. 189) must be rejected as mythical. These traditions relate to the origin of two of the oldest of the Roman *tituli*, those of St. Pudentiana and St. Praxedis, which still give titles to Cardinals, and the former of which claims to be the most ancient Church in the world. The story is that Peter when at Rome, dwelt in the house of the Senator Pudens in the vicus Patricius, and there held divine service, his altar being then the only one at Rome. Pudens is evidently intended as the same who is mentioned 2 Tim. iv. 21. His mother's name is said to have been Priscilla, and it is plainly intended to identify her with the lady who gave its name to an ancient cemetery at Rome. The story relates that Pudens on the death of his wife, converted his house into a church, and put it under the charge of the priest Pastor, from whom it was known as "titulus Pastoris." This *titulus* is named in more than one document, but in all the name may have been derived from the story we are citing. Thus in the acts of Nemesius, pope Stephen is said to have held a baptism there (Baronius, A.D. 257, n. 23). Our story relates that the baptistery had been placed there by Pope Pius I., who often exercised the episcopal functions in this church. Here the two daughters of Pudens, Pudentiana and Praxedis, having given all their goods to the poor, dedicated themselves to the service of God. This church under the name of Ecclesia Pudentiana is mentioned in an inscription of the year 384, and there are epitaphs of priests *tituli Pudentis* of the year 489 and 528 (De Rossi, *Bull.* 1867, n. 60; 1883. p. 107). The original authority for the story appears to be a letter purporting to be written by Pastor to Timothy (see Boll. *AA. SS.* May 19, iv. 299). He informs Timothy of the death of his brother Novatus, who, during his illness, had been visited by Praxedis, then the only survivor of the two sisters. He obtains Timothy's consent to the application of the property of Novatus to religious uses according to the direction of Praxedis: and baths possessed by Novatus in the vicus Lateritius, are converted into a second titulus, which is that now known as of St. Praxedis. This titulus is mentioned in an epitaph of the year 491 (De Rossi, *Bull.* 1882, p. 65); and priests of both tituli sign in the Roman Council of 499. On this letter are founded false letters of Pope Pius I. to Justus of Vienna, given in Baronius (*Ann.* 166, i.), a forgery later than the Isidorian Decretals. Those who maintain the genuineness of the letter of Pastor, have in various ways tried to get over the chronological difficulty of connecting Pudens with St. Paul on the one hand, and with Pius I. on the other. It has been tried to show that such longevity is not impossible; and it has been suggested that Praxedis and Pudentiana were not daughters but grand-daughters of Pudens. But the spuriousness of the whole story has been abundantly shown by Tillemont (ii. 286, 615). Later writers who repeat the story make Novatus and Timothy brothers of Pudentiana, but there

is no authority for this in the original story. In the Acts of Justin, the martyr states that the only meetings of Christians he knew of were held in Rome, in what, according to one reading, is the *balnei Timothini*. It is possibly hence that the name Timothy comes. The connection of the name of Pius I. with that of Pastor, is derived from the *Liber Pontificalis*," which describes Pius as brother of Pastor; but this is a mere blunder, originating in the statement made in earlier lists of Roman bishops, that the book called the *Shepherd* had been written by Hermas, brother of the Roman bishop Pius. A confusion arose between the name of Hermas and of his book, which was known as "Liber Pastoris." The statement just referred to appears in the poem of Pseudo-Tertullian against Marcion in the form

"Post hunc deinde Pius Hermas cui germine frater
Angelicus Pastor quia tradita verba locutus."

And a Vatican MS. of the Latin Hermas ends "explicit liber Pastoris discipuli beati Pauli apostoli." If there were better evidence of the existence of a Roman presbyter called Pastor, the name, which is common enough, would present no difficulty. A Junius Pastor was consul in the year 165, and the name is also found in Christian Inscriptions (De Rossi, *Roma Sotterranea*, i.). In addition to the references already given, may be consulted, Baronius *Martyr. Rom.* Jan. 16, May 19, June 20, July 26; Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, p. 133. [G. S.]

PASTOR (2), an African bishop in the 5th century, who wrote a confession of faith, accompanied by anathemas of the opposing heresies (Gennad. *de Vir. Illust.* cap. lxxvi.). [G. T. S.]

PATAPIUS, solitary of Constantinople, native of Thebes, the subject of three homilies written upon him by ANDREAS CRETENSIS. He lived before the 8th century: his feast is Dec. 8. (Migne, *Pat. Graec.* t. xcvii.) [J. G.]

PATERIUS, notary, to whom Gregory the Great dictated a letter (v. 29), the same as the Paterius Secundicerius, mentioned in the grant of testamentary power to PROBUS (St. Greg. *Epp.* app. 9, 1297, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1345) and the Paterius, who is mentioned by John the Deacon (*Vita Gregorii*, ii. 11) among Gregory's intimate friends. He collected from the various writings of Gregory all the passages of scripture quoted by him with his comments upon each, and arranged them in their proper order. He had commenced the work for his own edification, but Gregory, hearing of it, commanded him to finish and publish it. It is divided into three parts, of which the first contains the commentaries on the historical books of the Old Testament, the Psalms, Proverbs, the Song of Solomon; the second, those on Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus and the Prophets; and the third, those on the New Testament. It is usually printed as an appendix to the works of Gregory, as in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* (lxxix. 677–1136.) [F. D.]

PATERMUTHIUS, Sep. 19, mart. in the eighth year of the Diocletian persecution. He suffered in Palestine by fire under the governor Firmilianus, together with the Egyptian bishops Peleus and Nilus and an anonymous presbyter. They appear to have been the leaders of the Christians consigned to the copper mines of Palestine. (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* c. xiii.) [G. T. S.]

PATERNIANI, heretics who, according to Augustine (*Haer.* 85; *Cont. Julian.* v. 26), taught that the lower half of man's body had been made, not by God, but by the devil, and who in consequence of this doctrine, freely practised impurity of life; holding that all that was required of man, was to keep the upper parts of his body pure, and that what was done by the lower did not regard him. But quite the opposite practical conclusion was certainly intended by the first inventors of this notion, who were Encratites (Epiph. *Haer.* xlv. 2). Augustine states that the Paterniani were also called VENUSTIANI, and that they were akin to the Manichaeans. "Praedestinatus" (*Haer.* 85) who copies Augustine, adds a history of the condemnation of these heretics by Pope Damasus, and of a subsequent civil law visiting them with capital punishment; but nothing stated by this writer as to the authorities by whom different heresies were condemned, can be received without independent confirmation. [G. S.]

PATERNUS (1), ASPASIUS, pro-consul of Africa A.D. 257, at the time of the persecution under Valerian and Gallienus. When St. Cyprian was brought before him, he only pronounced upon him a sentence of banishment to Curubis, but when further he asked for information about Christians, with a view to punishment, Cyprian replied that he must decline to act as an informer. (Aug. *Serm.* 309, 2; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* ii. p. 144; CYPRIANUS, Vol. I., p. 753.) [H. W. P.]

PATERNUS (2), first bishop of Elusa, perhaps in the third century (*Gall. Christ.* i. 967). [J. G.]

PATERNUS (3), fourth bishop of Périgueux, between Chronopius I. and Gavidius about the middle of the 4th century, was an Arian. He was associated with Saturninus of Arles, and probably assisted him at the council of Béziers (A.D. 356) which resulted in the banishment of Hilary of Poitiers. When, after the council of Rimini, orthodoxy had finally triumphed in France, and Hilary was restored, Paternus and Saturninus alone of the French bishops persisted in their heretical opinions, which brought about their deposition from their sees (Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* ii. 45; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 1448; Mansi, iii. 251–4; Ceillier, iii. 524). [S. A. B.]

PATERNUS (4), a correspondent of St. Ambrose. He had written to ask whether it would be right for a son of his to marry his own sister's daughter, the granddaughter of Paternus. St. Ambrose replies to him, disapproving of such a marriage. (Ambros. *Ep.* 60.) [J. Ll. D.]

PATERNUS (5), a presbyter of Constantinople, one of Chrysostom's bitterest enemies. He may be probably identified with one of the two presbyters specially mentioned by Palladius as leaders of the cabal under Acacius and Antiochus, and the other bishops of that party

(Pallad. p. 35). After Chrysostom's banishment he was sent with letters to pope Innocent, charging him with having set fire to his church (*ibid.* p. 25). Palladius dwells with not unnatural satisfaction on the smallness of his stature, the ugliness of his face, and the indistinctness of his utterance (*ibid.*). [E. V.]

PATERNUS (6) a Christian mentioned by Augustine in a letter to Celer. (Aug. *Ep.* 57.) [H. W. P.]

PATERNUS (7), first known bishop of Braga, was one of the Priscillianist bishops consecrated by SYMPHOSIUS of Astorga. At the first council of Toledo, A.D. 400, he recanted his errors, declaring that he had been converted by the works of St. Ambrose, and was allowed to retain his see, but was not to be admitted to communion till the opinion of the pope was known. (*Esp. Sag.* xv. 100; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 195; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (1) 393.) [F. D.]

PATERNUS, bishop of Vannes and Llanbadarn. [PADARN.]

PATERNUS (8), bishop of Tomi, accused by the monks of false teaching on the doctrine of the Incarnation. But the emperor Justin in 519 heard all the parties, acquitted Paternus, and reconciled him with Vitalian, the magister militum (Hormisdas, *Epp. et Decr.*, ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxiii. 473). [J. G.]

PATERNUS (9) (PAIR or PATIER), **ST.**, 5th bishop of Avranches between Aegidius and St. Senerius about the middle of the 6th century, was of sufficient importance to have his life written by Venantius Fortunatus, which, with much that is incredible, preserves a few facts. It was written at the request of Marcian, abbat of Enesio (Ansion, afterwards Saint-Jouin-en-Poitou), his first monastery. He was born at Poitiers, where his father held some public office, and, after being piously educated, entered the monastery of Ansion, where he became cellarius. Desiring however a life freer for meditation, he withdrew with a friend named Scubilio to the uninhabited forests round Coutances, and finally established himself at Sesciacum (Scicy) where paganism was still flourishing. Here they spent three years in the conversion of the heathen, not without persecution and even danger to their lives, till sought out by Generosus, their old abbat at Ansion, by whose influence Paternus was ordained deacon and priest by Leontianus, bishop of Coutances (circ. A.D. 510). During a period of more than thirty years he founded monasteries in the districts of Coutances, Bayeux, Le Mans and Avranches, and became so famous by his miracles and austerities that he was once summoned to the presence of king Childebert at Paris. At the age of seventy he was elected bishop of Avranches (circ. A.D. 552), and after an episcopate of thirteen years spent in building and restoring churches and relieving the poor, he died during the Paschal feast, and, according to the story, on the same day as his friend Scubilio (circ. A.D. 565). The two were buried at the oratory they had founded at Scicy.

The bishop Paternus who was present at the third council of Paris held about 557, was probably identical with the subject of this article (Mansi, ix. 747, 8; Bar. *Ann.* 559. xxxii.). On the other hand, the dates are an obstacle to the Paternus addressed by Fortunatus in the 32nd Ode of the Third Book (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 149) being the same (see *ibid.* note; Pagi, an. 559. vi.)

His day is April 16, on which he is recognised by the Roman *Martyrology*. He was taken as the patron-saint of many Norman churches, and the oratory in which he was buried became afterwards a parish church, and took the name of Saint-Pair-sur-mer. For his cult, see Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. ii. 425, 6; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 469.

Fortunatus's life may be seen in Boll. *ibid.* p. 427 seqq., the end of the 2nd vol. of Mabillon's *Acta SS. Benedict.*, and in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 487–98. An abbreviation was published by Surius. [S. A. B.]

PATERNUS (10), thirty-third bishop of Ausci, c. A.D. 718, but very obscure (*Gall. Christ.* i. 976). [J. G.]

PATIENS (1), ST., Jan. 8, bishop of Metz, according to the local legend, a Greek, and a disciple of St. John the Evangelist (Boll. *Acta SS.* 8 Jan. i. 469–70). In the catalogue of Paulus Diaconus he appears as fourth bishop without comment (*De Ordine Episc. Metens.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcv. 701). The authors of the *Gallia Christiana* would place him in the 3rd century, and attribute to him the erection of a church in honour of St. John (xiii. 680–81). [S. A. B.]

PATIENS (2), ST., Sep. 11, bishop of Lyons, in the latter half of the 5th century, and a friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, to whose letters we are principally indebted for our acquaintance with him. Of his pre-episcopal career we know nothing, but it is plain that he was a man of wealth and probably of high rank. Sidonius calls him "vir sanctus, strenuus, severus, misericors;" and again, addressing him in a letter, "sic semper humanum, sic abstemium ut constet indesinenter regem praesentem prandia tua reginam laudare jejunia." He was a zealous restorer and builder of churches, and successful in converting the sect called Photinians and the heretic barbarians.

About the year 470 Châlon-sur-Saône lost its bishop. The city was torn with faction by three candidates who fought for its temporalities. The firmness of Patiens and St. Euphronius of Autun, who consecrated John by a sort of *coup de main*, ended the scandal.

St. Patiens is chiefly remembered by his munificence to the poor. An incursion of the Goths had produced a famine which desolated Burgundy (A.D. 473–74). The bishop fed the people for some time at his own cost. Arles, Riez, Avignon, Orange, Viviers, Valence, Trois-Châteaux, and Clermont, are enumerated by Sidonius among the cities which shared his bounty. His fame spread through all Aquitaine, and Gregory of Tours a century later praises his humanity.

Patiens was present at the council of Arles in 475, and his signature is found with those of other prelates to the letter written by Faustus to Lucidus, in which has since been discovered the taint of Semipelagianism. He also assembled a council at Lyons on the same matter shortly

afterwards. Some orthodox writers have attempted to throw doubt on these facts, on the ground that they rest on the testimony of the heretical Faustus only. The Life of St. Germanus of Auxerre was undertaken by Constantius at his suggestion and dedicated to him. The date of his death is given variously between 480 and 491. He was buried in, or translated to, the church of St. Just. (Sidon. Apoll. *Epist.* ii. 10; iv. 25; vi. 12; Constantius, *Vita S. Germ. Autiss.*, Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. vii. 200; Faustus, *Epist.* i., ii., iii., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 835 seqq.; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 24; Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. iii. 791 seqq.; Mansi, vii. 1010–1012; *Gall. Christ.* iv. 25–27.) [S. A. B.]

PATIER, ST. [PATERNUS (9).]

PATRICIANI and **PATRICIUS.** Philaster (*Haer.* 62) enumerates a sect of heretics, taking their name from a Patricius who had taught at Rome, whose doctrine was that man's body had been made not by God but by the devil, and that consequently ill-treatment of the body was a duty. Some of them are said to have carried out their principles to the point of suicide. The sect is named by Ambrosiaster (*in 1 Tim. iv.* 1) in connection with Marcionites and Manichaeans; and also by Augustine (*Cont. advers. leg. et proph.* ii. 12, § 40); other notices of the sect seem to be all derived from Philaster. [G. S.]

PATRICIUS (1), first known bishop of Malaga, present at the council of Elvira in A.D. 306. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 31; Gams, *Kirch. von Sp.* ii. (1) 10; *Esp. Sag.* xii. 304.) [F. D.]

PATRICIUS (2), vicar of Africa, appointed by Constantine to put down those troubling the church A.D. 312. (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* x. 6.) [J. G.]

PATRICIUS (3), father of St. Augustine, a citizen of Tagaste, of very small means. While he was at school at Madaura, his son, a boy of lively disposition, more inclined to play than to work, and hating Greek, sometimes received chastisement for his idleness, at which, though he stood in great dread of the stripes, his parents, by which term his father may perhaps be chiefly understood, only laughed. For this they were probably not much to blame, but Patricius, who was not yet a Christian, appears to have shewn no anxiety for his son to become one, nor to train him in purity of morals. When he became old enough to leave school, Patricius, who in this matter was encouraged by his wife, though not for the same reason, made an effort beyond his means to send him to Carthage to receive advanced instruction in literature and education, being desirous that he should distinguish himself in the world. This was about A.D. 370, about which time, or rather sooner, Patricius became a catechumen, but in the following year he died, having received baptism a short time before his death A.D. 371. He was not unkind in disposition, but passionate, sensual, fond of display and of drink, and not always faithful to his wife, who however never talked of his infidelities, and by her discreet behaviour never provoked him to violence. See MONNICA, vol. iii. p. 932. Aug. *Conf.* i. 9, 11, 14, ii. 3, iii. 4. ix. 9 [H. W. P.]

PATRICIUS (4), a notary commissioned by Arcadius to signify his condemnation to Chrysostom, and to bid him leave his palace and church. (Pallad. p. 88.) [E. V.]

PATRICIUS (5), a person by whom Olympias sent letters to Chrysostom. (Chrys. *Ep.* 14 ad init.) [E. V.]

PATRICIUS (6), nephew of St. Augustine, a subdeacon in the church, and living at Hippo, in a clerical community of which his uncle was the head. He was the elder brother of his family, having one brother, who like himself was a subdeacon under Severus, bishop of Milevis, and also a sister or sisters. There was a family property, in which their mother had a life interest. Patricius wished to devote his share of this to the church for the common maintenance of his community, but was unable to do so until his mother died, partly because a portion of the property consisted in slaves, whom he wished to release, but could not do so until the division took place. She died A.D. 425, and Augustine informs us that he then determined to carry out his intention. Aug. *Serm.* 356, 3. [H. W. P.]

PATRICIUS (7), a count, to whom Theodoret wrote a commendatory letter on behalf of Celestiacus, a senator of Carthage, who, by the invasion of the Vandals, had lost all that he had, and was driven a beggar with his family from his native land. (Theod. *Ep.* xxxiv.) [E. V.]

PATRICIUS (8), a deacon of Constantinople, messenger to Leo the Great. (Leonis *Ep.* lxxx.) [C. G.]

PATRICIUS (9), senior (SEN-PATRICK), Aug. 24, said to have been a monk of Glastonbury and tutor of St. Patrick of Ireland. His existence, labours, and distinction from four or five, if not more, other Patricks are discussed at great length in Petrie's *History and Antiquities of Tara Hill*, p. 90. Cf. also Colgan, *AA. SS.* p. 366, and Ussher's *Antiq. Eccl. Britt.* t. vi. 445–463, Elrington's edit. *passim*, cf. t. xvii. Index, s. v. Patrick; and Moran on St. Patrick's birthplace, *Dub. Review*, April 1880, p. 332. He is commemorated in the Felire of Aengus the Culdee on Aug. 24, and distinguished from his namesake. The annals of Ulster notice his death in 457, thus "quies senis Patricii, ut alii libri dicunt." Cf. Shearman's *Loca Patriciana*, p. 395, for an elaborate essay on this topic. A glance, however, at the Index of the Roman Martyrology will show how many Patricii are commemorated, and how hard it is to distinguish between them. [G. T. S.]

PATRICIUS (10) (ST. PATRICK), March 17, the national apostle of Ireland, has been the subject of much controversy. He had four names—his baptismal name Succat, his name in captivity Cothraighe, a third name Magonus or Imigonus or Maun which he exchanged at his ordination for Patricius (Ussher, *Antiq. Britt. Ecc.* opp. t. vi. cap. xvii.; *Analect. Bolland.* i. 548, ii. 35; Dr. Todd in *Proceed. Roy. Ir. Acad.* vi. 292.) His existence has been doubted, his name has been ascribed to seven different persons at least, while the origin and authority

of his mission have been warmly disputed between what we may for convenience call the adherents of the Roman and Protestant views. We propose now to take our subject thus:—1. We shall give an account of the documentary evidence. 2. We shall trace the history of the saint so far as it can be recovered. 3. We shall give a brief account of the legends which have grown up round the historical facts. 4. We shall notice very briefly the controversies which have centred round St. Patrick.

I. *The Documents.*—The materials for St. Patrick's history which have a claim to be regarded as historical are, in the first place, of course the writings of the saint himself. We have two works ascribed to St. Patrick, his Confession and his Epistle to Coroticus. Both of these seem genuine.

We have a copy of the Confession more than a thousand years old preserved in the Book of Armagh, one of the great treasures of the library of Trinity College, Dublin. This copy professes to have been taken from the autograph of St. Patrick himself, as stated in the colophon appended to it. "Thus far the volume which St. Patrick wrote with his own hand." *Huc usque volumen quod Patricius manu conscripsit sua.* Dr. Todd, in his life of St. Patrick (p. 347), thus sums up the case for the Confession of St. Patrick. "It is altogether such an account of himself as a missionary of that age, circumstanced as St. Patrick was, might be expected to compose. Its Latinity* is rude and archaic, it quotes the Ante-Hieronymian Vulgate; and contains nothing inconsistent with the century in which it professes to have been written. If it be a forgery, it is not easy to imagine with what purpose it could have been forged." This is strong testimony, but it might have been made stronger, and applies as clearly to the Epistle to Coroticus as to the Confession. Not only may we say negatively that they contain nothing inconsistent with the century when they profess to have been written, but farther still, we may affirm positively that they contain statements and refer to a state of organisation and discipline, secular and ecclesiastical, which could only have found a place in the fifth century, and could not have been imagined at a later date. Le Blant, in his *Actes des Martyrs*, has taught us how to apply the rules of historical criticism to the acts and lives of the saints. His rules apply equally well to the epistle and the Confession of St. Patrick. We have noticed from Dr. Todd that the Confession uses the Ante-Hieronymian Vulgate. This is strong evidence of its early date, but it is not conclusive, as there is abundant proof that the use of the Ante-Hieronymian version continued in Ireland for several centuries after Jerome's time, a use too, strangely enough, combined at times with that of Jerome's Vulgate, as indeed seems the case in two or three places even in Patrick's Confession. Several other instances of this curious admixture of texts will be found in the learned work lately published by Professor T. K. Abbott, of Trinity College, Dublin, styled *Evangeliorum Versio Ante-Hieronymiana ex codice Usseriano*, Dub. 1884. There are, however, two other lines of evidence which seem to me conclusive as to the early date of the Confession. The one deals with the State Organisation, the other with the Ecclesiastical Organisation there alluded to and implied. They are both such as existed in the earlier years of the fifth century, and could scarcely have been imagined afterwards.

Let us take the State Organisation first. In the epistle to Coroticus he describes himself thus. "Ingenuus fui secundum carnem, decurione patre nascor." This one point alone seemed to Dr. Lanigan (*H. E.* i. 125) conclusive against St. Patrick's birth in North Britain. "I believe," he says, "it would be difficult for the sticklers for St. Patrick's birth in North Britain to find a curia or Decurion in Kilpatrick, or any place near it in the fourth century." But when Lanigan wrote, the antiquities of the Roman Empire had not been investigated, and we now know that Decurions—who were not magistrates but town councillors rather, and members of the local senates—were found all over the Roman empire to its extremest bounds by the end of the fourth century. Some discoveries in Spain about ten years ago showed that Decurions were established by the Romans in every little mining village, and were charged with the care of the games, the water supply, sanitary arrangements, education, and the local fortifications; while Hübner in the *Corp. Ins. Lat.* t. vii., num. 54 and 189, has proved that Decurions existed in Britain (cf. Marquardt and Mommsen, *Handbuch der Römischen Alterthümer*, t. iv. pp. 501–516 and *Ephem. Epigraph.* t. ii. p. 137, t. iii. p. 103). The Romans, in fact, used the order of Decurions as an instrument to establish a thorough system of local government for administrative purposes, while retaining a vigorous control in the hands of the imperial authorities. This institution was flourishing about the year 400 along the British and North Gallic coasts. It necessarily vanished amid the barbarian invasions of the following century. Now this is our first point. St. Patrick's writings imply the existence of Decurions. Again the Confession calls England Britanniae, using the plural Britanniae, not Britannia, which is strictly accurate and in accordance with the technical usage of the Roman empire at the close of the fourth century, which then divided Britain into five provinces, Britannia prima and secunda, Maxima Caesariensis, Flavia Caesariensis and Valentia, which were collectively called Britanniae, and so appear in St. Patrick's writings (cf. Böcking's Notitia Dig. t. ii. cap. iii. pp. 12–14). Then again the ecclesiastical organisation implied is such as the years about A.D. 400 alone could supply. St. Patrick tells us in the opening words of his confession that his father was Calpurnius, a deacon, his grandfather Potitus a priest. It is evident that the law of compulsory clerical celibacy was unknown to St. Patrick, though at the same time the Monastic life was popular, as we see from his epistle to Coroticus, where he speaks of the "filii Scotorum" and the "filiae regulorum" becoming "monks and virgins of Christ" (cf. the Confession, where he uses exactly the same

* The Latin text of Gregory of Tours has lately been reconstructed in an edition of that writer published in the *Monumenta Germaniae Hist.* by Arndt and Krusch, 1883–85. It is rude and barbarous in style, just like St. Patrick's.

expressions). It has been said indeed that Patrick's father and grandfather lived separate from their wives after ordination, and that their children had all been born previously. No doubt there are numerous examples of such conduct in the ecclesiastical history of Gaul during the fifth century. But a careful review of the councils and canons will show, that in Britain or the north of Gaul there existed no prohibition of clerical marriage in the last quarter of the fourth century. One proof of this must suffice. Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse, wrote a letter in the year 404 to pope Innocent I. asking how he was to deal with married priests who had begotten children since their ordination. We have Innocent's reply still. It is dated Feb. 20, 405. It shows two things, first that the prohibition of marriage was only a late innovation, as he refers not to any ancient legislation, but to the decree of pope Siricius, passed not quite twenty years before (Mansi, iii. 670; Hefele, ii. 387, Clark's ed.); and secondly that the ancient tradition had not yet quite died out in Rome, as Innocent permits the clergy of Toulouse to live with their wives if they had contracted marriage in ignorance of papal legislation. If married clergy and children born to them as such were found at Toulouse in 405, it is absolutely certain that about the year 365 Patrick's grandfather, the priest Potitus, may well have been living in lawful marriage, and yet fulfilling all his sacerdotal functions away in distant Britain.

The aspect of the political horizon, and the consequent action of the church as depicted in these writings, are such, too, as correspond with their alleged age. In the Epistle to Coroticus Patrick says, "It is the custom of the Roman Gallic Christians to send holy men fitted for the work to the Franks and other nations with many thousand solidi, to redeem baptized captives." Now the use of the word Roman here is noteworthy, for it is strictly in accordance with the usus loquendi of Latin and Greek writers of that age, such as Ammianus Marcellinus, Socrates, Sidonius Apollinaris or Salvian of Marseilles. It has nothing to say to the Church of Rome, or obedience to its ecclesiastical ruler, as some modern writers seem to think, arguing apparently from modern to ancient usage, and knowing but little of the current literature of the time. The term Roman was then used to express a citizen of the Roman empire, no matter where Roman citizens were found, whether on the banks of the Euphrates or in Gaul and England. So that what St. Patrick here says is, "it is the custom of the Gallic Christians who are subject to Roman rule, and therefore Roman citizens, to redeem the captives made by the Franks." But the custom itself referred to is one of the strongest evidences as to the age of our writings. The writings of Zosimus, lib. vi., of Salvian, of Sidonius Apollinaris, prove the ravages of the Franks in Gaul about the middle of the fifth century. Salvian mentions the rescue of a captive taken at Cologne in *Epist.* 1. Severinus, the Apostle of Austria, a little later in the century, devoted his life to the same work in another neighbourhood, and introduced the payment of tithes for this special end and object. (See his Life in Pez. *Scriptores Rerum Austriacarum*, t. 1, and lately in Pertz, *Monumenta.*) [SEVERINUS.] By the end of the fifth century, the Franks had been converted, and Clovis was the one orthodox sovereign of Christendom, the ally and champion of Catholic bishops. The redemption of captives from his hands would be then no longer necessary. This passage could only have been written about the middle of the fifth century at the latest. These instances will show how capable St. Patrick's own writings are of standing the newest tests of historical criticism.

But we have other documents relating to his life. Next in importance to Patrick's own writings stand the collection of Patrician documents contained in the Book of Armagh, derived from another document which certainly comes from the first half of the seventh century. That volume has often been described, as by Bishop Graves in the Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, by Dr. Reeves in a memoir, by Mr. Gilbert in his "National MSS. of Ireland," fasc. 1, p. 23, while an exhaustive analysis of it will be found in the *Analecta Bollandiana*, t. 1, p. 532, contributed by Father Hogan. The contents of the Book of Armagh may be divided thus: 1st Patrician documents, including the oldest copy of the Confession; 2nd, the New Testament in Latin; 3rd, the Life of St. Martin of Tours. The New Testament is remarkable as the only complete copy which has come down from the ancient Celtic church; while again the respect in which the volume was held nine centuries ago is evident from an entry which Gilbert has reproduced on plate xxv. It purports to have been written in the year 1002 in the presence of Brian Borumha, "Emperor of the Scots," and conveys on his part twenty ounces of gold to the church of Armagh. The Patrician documents are those with which we are chiefly concerned. "The collections," says Mr. Gilbert, "concerning St. Patrick in the first part of the Book of Armagh, constitute the oldest writings now extant in connexion with him, and are also the most ancient specimens known of narrative composition in Irish and Hiberno-Latin. They purport to have been originally composed, the annotations by Bishop Tirechan out of a book called *Scripta Patricii*, written by Ultan, bishop of Ardbraccan, towards A.D. 650, and the *Life* by Muirchu Maccu Machteni at the request of his preceptor, Aedh, bishop of Sletty in the same century." These documents are all now accessible in print, though a critical edition of them, and indeed of the whole Book of Armagh, is a desideratum in Celtic literature demanding, however, a width and range of scholarship seldom found in combination, for there would be necessary skill in deciphering manuscripts, in comparative philology, in Celtic and cognate tongues, and in mediaeval Latin texts of the New Testament. Sir W. Betham made the first attempt to print St. Patrick's life in *Irish Antiquarian Researches*, part ii. Dub. 1827. His version, however, is full of mistakes, though he deserves credit for having called attention to a most valuable work.

Father Hogan has printed a considerable portion of the Patrician documents in the *Analecta Bollandiana*, including the Life by Muirchu Maccumactheni in t. i. p. 531, where Hogan has ingeniously supplied some missing portions of the Book of Armagh from a Brussels MS. of the 11th or 12th century. In t. ii. p. 35 and 211, he

has printed Tirechan's Annotations, which are short biographical notes of St. Patrick's actions without special chronological order. These profess to have been written by Tirechan, a bishop and disciple of St. Ultan, bishop of Ardbraccan. Ultan died in 657. Tirechan says he wrote his notes "Ex ore vel libro Ultani." This would fix the date of these notes to the latter half of the 7th century, while the original authority for them, St. Ultan's book, would belong to the first half of the same century. Dr. Whitley Stokes, however, in his *Goidelica*, prints some of the Irish notes with an English translation, and maintains, p. 83, that a portion of them at least were probably written in their present shape by some 9th century author, and are, at any rate, later than A.D. 700, while Dr. Reeves in his *Antiquities of Down*, p. 224, relegates them to the 9th century, if not the 10th. They are, however, very ancient, and are manifestly one principal source of any historical elements in subsequent lives, specially in that celebrated one called the Tripartite about which we treat below. Tirechan's annotations—when combined with the life by Maccumacthenius—written, as it informs us, at the dictation of Aedh, Anchorite of Sletty, who died in 698, afford ample means for ascertaining the state of the Patrician tradition within two centuries of the saint's death. We have in addition two hymns in praise of St. Patrick, those of St. Fiacc and St. Sechnall, which are ascribed to disciples of our saint. They were published, first of all by Colgan in the 17th century, and have been critically discussed by Dr. Todd in his *Book of Hymns of the Ancient Church of Ireland*. They are both evidently much later than the 5th century. St. Fiacc's hymn refers to the desolation of Tara, which took place in the 6th century, and the claim of Armagh to sovereignty over all Ireland. The traditions about Patrick, which are mentioned, are identical with those contained in the Book of Armagh, and simply confirm its statements. It is, however, a most interesting document from a philological as well as a historical point of view, and as such has been discussed by Dr. W. Stokes in *Goidelica*, p. 126; Windisch, *Irische Texte*, p. 11; Zeuss's *Grammatica Celtica*, ed. Ebel, p. 957, and by Zimmer in his *Keltische Studien*, Hft. 2, p. 160, all of whom agree in dating it between the years A.D. 700 and 900. The only remaining documents with any claim to notice as historical sources are the lives published by Colgan in his *Trias Thaumaturga*, which are seven in number. The first is the poem of St. Fiacc just described. The other lives are as follows:—The second life attributed to a Patrick junior, or some disciple of the saint who lived in the 7th century; the third life attributed to St. Benignus, a disciple of St. Patrick; the fourth to St. Aileran of Clonard, some of whose writings are still extant in Migne's *Pat. Lat.*; the fifth life was written by Probus; the sixth by Jocelyn, a Cistercian monk of the abbey of Furness, in the early part of the 12th century, while the seventh and last life is the most important of all. It is called the Tripartite life, from its three divisions, and, according to Colgan, was written by St. Evin in the 6th century. Dr. Reeves, however, points out (*Ecclesiast. Antiq. of Down and Connor*, p. 203), that it bears evidence on its face of having been written later than the 9th century, an opinion in which the learned Roman Catholic historian, Lanigan, coincides. The 6th century was credulous enough, as the writings of Gregory of Tours proves, but still a very slight acquaintance with the acts of the saints suffices to show that the later Middle Ages alone could have produced the legends which abound in Colgan's Lives.

II. *Life and History*.—The authorities commonly used for the life of St. Patrick have been now detailed. We shall now briefly tell the story of his life as it may be derived from the primary authorities, his own writings and the Patrician documents which really belong to the 7th and 8th centuries, relegating Colgan's Lives to the department of legend which has grown up round St. Patrick's history. St. Patrick was born probably at Kilpatrick, near Dumbarton in Scotland. Bannavem Taberniae is St. Patrick's own description in the *Confession* of the residence of his parents, a name which cannot now be identified. (Cf. Archbishop Moran in *Dublin Review*, April 1880, pp. 291–326.) He was carried captive into Antrim when sixteen years of age, in one of those raids which Roman writers like Ammianus Marcellinus and Irish Annalists like the *Four Masters* show us were so prevalent during the second half of the 4th century. He became the slave of Milchu, the king of Dalaradia, the commencement of whose reign the *Four Masters* assign to the year 388, so that if St. Patrick became his slave in the very first year of his reign, he must have been born at earliest in the year 372. The locality in which he then lived is well marked. Dalaradia was the most powerful kingdom of North-Eastern Ireland. It extended from Newry, in the south of the county Down, to the hill of Slemish, the most conspicuous mountain of central Antrim. In the 7th century the traditions about his residence there were abundantly current in the locality, as indeed they are still. The exact spot where he lived is near the village of Broughshane, five or six miles east of Ballymena, where a townland Ballyligpatrick, the town of the hollow of Patrick, commemorates probably the position of the farm where St. Patrick fed Milchu's swine. (Cf. Dr. Reeves's *Antiq. of Down and Connor*, pp. 78, 83, 84, 334–348.) After seven years Patrick escaped. He then went to Gaul, and studied under Germanus of Auxerre. He remained for a very long period, some say thirty, others forty years, in Gaul, where he was ordained priest and bishop. He then returned to Ireland, visiting England on his way. He landed at the mouth of the river Vartry—the stream which now supplies Dublin with water—where it flows into the sea at the town of Wicklow, as Palladius had done before him. It was a very natural point for mariners in those days to make, though now a port diligently avoided by them. To ships sailing up the Irish coast, one of the most notable objects is Wicklow head, offering shelter along a coast singularly destitute of harbours of refuge. The Danes three centuries later soon learned its advantage, and founded a settlement there, whence the modern name of Wicklow. The nature of the harbour, too, formed a natural attraction to navigators like Palladius and Patrick. One of the striking features of Wicklow is its strand and murrough or common, extending for some miles northward from the

Vartry, offering special opportunities for dragging up the small ships used by the travellers of those times. St. Patrick was received in a very hostile manner by the pagans of Wicklow. He landed, and quite after the fashion of modern times was received with a shower of stones, which knocked out the front teeth of one of his companions, St. Mantan, whence the Irish name of Wicklow, Killmantan, or Church of Mantan. (Joyce's *Irish Names*, p. 103; Colgan, *AA. SS.* p. 451; Reeves's *Antiquities*, p. 378.) St. Patrick then made his way northward. He was compelled with true missionary spirit to seek first of all that locality where he had spent seven years of his youth, and had learned the language and customs of the Irish. We can even still trace his stopping-places. Dublin existed not in those days except as a small village beside a ford or bridge of hurdles over the Liffey, which served as a crossing-place for the great South-Eastern road leading from Tara to Wicklow, a bridge, by the way, not like our modern stone bridges, but such as are still found in the bogs of Ireland, composed of branches woven together, which serve to sustain very considerable weights indeed. St. Patrick sailing northward landed, according to Tirechan, at an island off the northern coast of the County Dublin, still called Inispatrick, as in the 7th century it was called the Insula Patricii, whence he made his way to the coast of the County Down, where he found his frail bark stopped by the formidable race which runs off the mouth of Strangford Lough. He sailed up this Lough, which extends for miles into the heart of the county Down, and landed at the mouth of the river Slaney, which flows into the upper waters of the Lough, within a few miles of the Church of Saul, a spot which has been successfully identified by Mr. J. W. Hanna in a paper on the "True Landing Place of St. Patrick in Ulster." Downpatrick, 1858. There he made his first convert Dichu, the local chief, and founded his first church. Dichu gave him his barn for this purpose, whence the name Sabhall (which is Celtic for barn) or Saul in its modern shape, which has ever since continued to be a Christian place of worship (cf. Reeves, *Antiq.* pp. 40, 220). From Dichu he soon directed his steps towards Central Antrim and King Milchu's residence, where he had spent the days of his captivity. His fame, however, had reached Milchu, and his Druids warned him that his former servant would triumph over him. So he gathered all his household goods, and setting fire to them perished in the midst just as St. Patrick appeared. St. Patrick now, A.D. 433, determined to strike a blow at the very centre of Celtic Paganism; he therefore directed his course towards Tara. He sailed to the mouth of the Boyne, where, as the Book of Armagh tells us, he laid up his boats, as to this day it is impossible for the smallest boats to sail up the Boyne between Drogheda and Navan, a canal, made in the last century, affording a waterway between these towns. Patrick proceeded along the northern bank of the river past the great Pagan territory of Brugh-na-Boine, still marked by those pyramids of Western Europe, Dowth, Knowth and New Grange, till he reached the hill of Slane, the loftiest elevation in the country, dominating the vast plain of Meath. The ancient life in the Book of Armagh is now marked by touches of geographical exactness which guarantee its truth. They can, indeed, be fully grasped only by those acquainted with the locality. The hill of Tara is a well-marked elevation, some twelve miles in a direct line south from Slane Hill, with a plain between, so that there is no interruption of the view. Patrick determined to celebrate Easter on the Hill of Slane, and according to the custom of the early Christians lit his Paschal fire on Easter Eve, a custom which we know from other sources was universal at that time; (cf. Martene, *De Antiq. Ritib.* t. iii. lib. iv. c. 24, pp. 144, 145, and articles on EASTER, Ceremonies of, and FIRE, Kindling of, in the DICT. OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES, Vol. I.).

This fire was at once seen on Tara, where the king of Ireland, Laoghaire, son of Niall of the Nine Hostages (King of Ireland, A.D. 428–463, *Four Masters*, and Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 252), was then holding a convention of the chiefs of Ireland. Part of the ritual of the convention was, that no fire should be lit in his dominions on this precise night till the king's fire was lit on Tara. St. Patrick's act was a direct challenge of the king's edict, who thereupon proceeded to Slane to punish the bold aggressor. Then commenced a conflict between St. Patrick on the one side and king Laoghaire and his priests on the other, the narrative of which is marked by a series of miracles and legends, terminating, however, with the defeat of paganism and the baptism of great numbers of the Irish, including Laoghaire himself, who yielded a nominal adhesion to the truth. Before we pass from this part of our subject we may refer our readers to the great work of Mr. Petrie on the Hill of Tara, where the whole subject has been exhaustively discussed. With Mr. Petrie's aid the visitor to Tara can reconstruct the whole scene of St. Patrick's conflict, as set forth in the Book of Armagh; the vast earthworks there remaining bear witness to the rude hospitality of the kings of Tara, while the wells in which St. Patrick baptized are still flowing, or their sites at least well ascertained. The whole neighbourhood of Tara is in fact still redolent with the fame and actions of St. Patrick. Ten miles to the north-west are the remains of the great rath of Teltown, where he converted Laoghaire's brother, and where he founded the church of Donaghpatrick, on a site where ever since there has been a Christian church, the modern building though built in the Georgian epoch, reproducing the very dimensions of sixty feet which Patrick is said to have assigned to the original one (Tirechan, in Book of Armagh, see *Anal. Bolland.* t. ii. p. 40). After his triumphs at Tara and its neighbourhood, St. Patrick went first of all to Connaught, following the line of the great western road which led across the island. His visit to Connaught is amply proved. It is referred to by Patrick himself in his *Confession*, where he tells us that before he came to Ireland at all he heard the voices of the children from the wood of Fochlat, near the western sea, crying, "We intreat thee, holy youth, come and walk among us"; and then when we turn to Tirechan's *Annotations*, we find his journey described to the neighbourhood of Killala, where that wood was situated, together with circumstantial notices of the churches he founded on his way

thither, many of which can still be identified. Space will not permit us to describe St. Patrick's labours even so far as the Memoirs of the Book of Armagh would enable us, much less to enter upon those fuller details which the imaginations of the later chroniclers, collected by Colgan, have invented. He spent seven years in Connaught, passed thence into Ulster, where he founded the metropolitan church of Armagh in A.D. 445 (cf. *Annals of Ulster;* Todd, p. 470; Reeves's memoir on *The Ancient Churches of Armagh*, and his paper in the *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Acad.* t. vi. p. 447, on the System of Abbatial Succession in the Irish Monasteries). He then proceeded towards the south, where he spent seven years in Munster, paying, according to the later writers, a visit to Dublin, where wells are still shown in the gardens of Trinity College, and in St. Patrick's Cathedral, in which he is reputed to have baptized the inhabitants of that city, whose future eminence as a metropolis Patrick is said to have predicted. History, however, is obliged to confess that Dublin had then no existence as a city; it owes its origin to the military and naval instinct of the Danes, who first settled there nearly three centuries after his death. St. Patrick gets credit for a great deal of activity during the later years of his life. He is credited with legislating both for Church and State, upon which subject we must refer the student to the writings of Wasserschleben, Petrie's *Tara*, p. 69, and the introduction to the Brehon Laws as translated by Richey and O'Mahony. The ancient Celtic laws of Ireland, their language and their nature, are far too delicate a subject for any save the most profound Celtic scholars to touch. St. Patrick died at Saul, near Strangford Lough, where he founded his first church. Ussher, in his *Index Chronologicus*, attached to his *Antiquitates Britann. Eccles.* opp. t. vi. ed. Elrington, makes 493 the year of his death, and his age 120 years, a number which is evidently based on a desire to parallel his career with that of Moses, a desire quite manifest in the structure and style of the ancient life in the Book of Armagh. The reader may, indeed, be referred to that index for a convenient synopsis of the facts and legends connected with St. Patrick, as Ussher had access to that Book of Armagh which we have so largely used. In giving this brief sketch of St. Patrick's life and labours, I have omitted all mention of the controversy touching his Roman mission, and I have done so because the controversy is interminable; those who wish to see what can be said on either side must be referred to Dr. Todd's life on the one hand, and to Cardinal Moran's *Essays on the Early Irish Church*, and his article in *Dub. Review*, April 1880, for the opposite view. I may, however, just mention that St. Patrick's own writings omit all reference to the Roman mission, the Life in the Book of Armagh also omits it, but Tirechan's *Annotations* notice it, and ascribe it to pope Celestine in the 13th year of the emperor Theodosius. This portion, however, of the *Annotations* seems clearly a 9th or 10th century addition, as the removal of St. Columba's bones to Saul, in the county Down, is mentioned in the sentence immediately preceding, an event which happened so late as the year 877 (Reeves' *Antiq.* p. 224).

III. *Legends.*—The legends which have grown up round the life of St. Patrick are innumerable. The best known will just be mentioned here. He is popularly said to have freed Ireland from demons, snakes, and toads, and even imparted such efficacy to the soil of Ireland that a portion of it carried to a land infected with poisonous animals, frees it from the plague. Mediaeval authorities, however, ascribed this action to a still earlier saint, Joseph of Arimathea, as Ussher relates in his *Antiq. Eccles. Britt.* opp. t. vi. p. 299. The legend arose thus, for it is simply a legend, as the exemption enjoyed by Ireland is mentioned by Solinus, a geographer of the 3rd century in his *Polyhistor* [Solinus in DICT. GREEK AND ROM. BIOG.] Reeves's *Adamnan*, p. 200, cf. p. 142). Tirechan tells us that Patrick resorted to Croagh Patrick, a mountain occupying a magnificent position over Clew Bay in Mayo. He spent the fifty days of Lent there in fasting and prayer, tormented at the same time with clouds of black-birds. This story was improved upon by Jocelyn. The black-birds became the demons and venomous reptiles of Ireland who came to assault St. Patrick. He drove them first of all into a deep hollow on the northern face of the mountain, still called Lugnademon, and thence into the sea. (Cf. Joyce's *Irish Names of Places*, p. 160, and Adamnan's *Life of Columba*, ed. Reeves, p. 206.) The story of St. Patrick's purgatory embodies another celebrated mediaeval legend. Patrick's purgatory is still, as for the past seven centuries, a famous place of pilgrimage for the Irish people. It is a cave on an island in Lough Derg, near Pettigo, in the county Donegal. According to Ussher, *Religion of Ancient Irish*, c. iii. opp. t. iv. p. 263, the earliest mention of it is in Henry of Saltrey, a monk of king Stephen's day. It was, however, then a place of celebrated resort, as Henry relates the adventures of a soldier named Owen, who went to make trial of it. Baring-Gould, *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages*, 1st series, pp. 230–250, London, 1868, and T. Wright, *St. Patrick's Purgatory*, London, 1844, give a full account of this curious survival of the middle ages which even Giraldus Cambrensis recognised as only a device on St. Patrick's part to enforce upon a rude people the sense of eternal realities. (Girald. Camb. *Topogr. Hibern.* dist. ii. cap. 5.) Another legend concerns the Staff of Jesus, said to have been given to St. Patrick at Lerins, or some other island in the Mediterranean, prior to his Irish mission. Joceline and the Tripartite Life tell the story thus: St. Patrick landed on an island where he saw a withered old woman at the door of a house, bowed down with infirmities. A young man told him she was one of his descendants, while the mother of the girl, as he called the aged woman, was still more infirm. Patrick wondered exceedingly, contrasting the young man's state with the aged and infirm appearance of his alleged children, till the young man explained that Christ, when upon earth, had come to visit them, and conferred the gift of immortality upon them, but without adding the gift of youth and health to any but Himself. He further informed Patrick that he had left his staff or crozier to be given to him. Patrick refused to receive it unless from Christ's own hands, which took place a short time after.

This crozier was used by Patrick to drive the noxious animals into the Atlantic, and was preserved till the time of Giraldus Cambrensis at Armagh. It was transferred, after the Norman Conquest, to Christ Church, Dublin, where Archbishop Brown destroyed it at the Reformation, A.D. 1538, when many a relic of antiquity perished (cf. *Obit. and Martyrol. of Christ Church*, ed. Crosthwaite, and Todd, Introd. p. viii.). Perhaps the most celebrated legend of all, deals with the Shamrock, which has been adopted as the national emblem of Ireland, and yet there is none with less historical foundation. The popular story is that St. Patrick illustrated the mystery of the Trinity for the incredulous Laoghaire by stooping down and picking a piece of Shamrock which was growing at his feet. None of the histories down to the 12th cent. make any mention of this legend. The story formed the subject of a prolonged controversy in the third and fourth series of *Notes and Queries*, A.D. 1864 and 1869. (Cf. Moore's *Cybele Hibernica*, p. 73.) Mr. F. R. Davies, M.R.I.A., offered the best explanation of the origin of the legend, referring it to the reverence of the Druids for the trefoil. There are many other questions connected with St. Patrick which we can only glance at, but which are abundantly discussed in the works already quoted, or in those mentioned below. We cannot enter upon the controversy concerning the seven different persons with whom our St. Patrick has been confounded. The reader interested in that topic may turn to the index to Ussher's works in t. xvii. of Elrington's edition, and on p. 134, under the title St. Patrick, he will obtain abundant references on this point, which has also been discussed by Todd, Lanigan, Moran, Shearman, and every other biographer of our saint. It is necessary, however, to say a few words upon one point. The existence and work of the saint have been doubted because Bede makes no mention of him in his history. The argument from silence is notoriously an unsafe one; there are so many reasons which may lead a writer to pass over even a burning topic in his day. Thus, Josephus never mentions Christianity, though a contemporary of the apostles. There are sufficient reasons, too, which explain Bede's silence. He was an adherent of the Roman party in England, and had a horror of Celtic irregularities. He was a thorough Englishman, and hated the Britons with whom he identified the Celtic Church of Ireland. He took no interest then in the history of the Celtic church, which he looked upon as schismatical if not heretical. The silence of St. Columba and Adamnan—with one exception in his preface to Columba's life—concerning St. Patrick has also been objected. The following considerations appear to solve the difficulty. Patrick, in the first place, did not probably occupy the same place then in popular estimation which he does now. He may have been regarded as the founder of Armagh, but not as a national apostle. Distance has had its enchanting effect on St. Patrick's position. The documents in the Book of Armagh evidently prove that the position of Armagh was a disputed point in the 7th and 8th centuries. Armagh, indeed, only attained its present undisputed precedence in the Irish Church so late as the 17th century, when three archbishops, Ussher, Macmahon and Plunkett, the two latter Roman Catholics, wrote learned treatises concerning its position. (Cf. Ussher, t. i. p. cxxix–cxliii; Plunkett's *Jus Primatiale*.) In the earliest ages St. Patrick's Trim seems to have claimed an equal, if not superior position to that of Armagh, a claim which may have somewhat to say to the position and precedence still claimed by Meath among Irish bishoprics, a point contested so lately as the past year January 1886. (Cf. Todd, pp. 149, 257.) But St. Patrick's existence is guaranteed not only by Adamnan's incidental notice, but also by the express acknowledgement of one writer of the Columban age and order, who must have been a contemporary of St. Columba himself. Cummianus, A.D. 634, in his Epistle to Segienus, abbat of Iona, on the paschal question, expressly mentions St. Patrick, and calls him "Sanctus Patricius papa noster." (Ussher's *Sylloge*, opp. iv. 440; cf. Todd, *l. c.* p. 96.)

The paschal controversy again, about which Cummian wrote, throws an interesting light upon the date of the introduction of Christianity into Ireland. The Irish have sometimes been accused of Quartodeciman practices about Easter, which is quite a mistake. They simply adhered to the old Roman cycle, which was superseded in 463 by the Victorian cycle. [EASTER in DICT. OF CHRIST. ANTIQ., Vol. I. p. 594.] The invasions of the barbarians then cut off the Celtic church from a knowledge of the more modern improvements in the calendar, which they afterwards resisted with a horror natural to simple people. The English surplice riots of Bishop Blomfield's time show how a much shorter tradition may raise a popular commotion. This determines the introduction of Christianity into Ireland to the first half of the 5th century. The alleged connection of the Irish church with Egypt and the East, as shown in art, literature, architecture, episcopal and monastic arrangements, would form an interesting article by itself on the peculiarities of the Irish Church. I can, however, only refer to Butler's *Coptic Churches of Egypt*, Oxford, 1885, where many interesting coincidences are pointed out; to Wasserschleben's *Die Irische Kanonensammlung*, 2nd ed., 1885, Introd. p. xlii.; Warren's *Celtic Liturgy*, and the *Contemporary Review* for May, 1885, p. 742, and December, 1885, p. 906, where other references are given. The introduction of eastern practices from Gaul is conceivable, through, as Le Blant, in his *Christian Inscriptions of Gaul*, has proved, the wide spread of Syriac, Egyptian, and even Persian influences in Gaul when Patrick was studying there; the most striking instance being the existence of St. Abraham as set forth in Le Blant's 557th Dissertation. He was born on the Euphrates, was a confessor in the Persian persecution under Isdegerdes, and died an abbat in Central Gaul, Sidonius Apollinaris writing his Epitaph; cf. Diss. 211, 225 and 613, Salvian. *de Gub. Dei*, iv. 14, and the *Rev. Critiq.* Aug. 3, 1885, p. 100, which shows the prevalence of Oriental influences in cent. ix. a much more unlikely period.

Authorities.—(1) *Sources.* These have been already mentioned, the Book of Armagh as published in the *Analecta Bollandiana*, the Lives published by Colgan, St. Patrick's own writings,

found in a convenient shape in Migne *P. L.* t. liii., and the Annals of the *Four Masters* (O'Donovan's edition), being the most important. Colgan's Lives are not indeed all equally accessible. The *Tripartite Life*, which is most frequently quoted, has been translated by one of the most accomplished of modern Celtic scholars, Mr. Hennessy, of Her Majesty's Record Office, Dublin, for Miss Cusack's *Life of St. Patrick*, constituting, with translations of St. Patrick's genuine works, his *Confession* and *Epistle to Coroticus*, and other Patrician documents, the valuable elements in a work otherwise marked by the most amazing spirit of credulity. Jocelyn's life was translated about 80 years ago by Swift, and is a convenient edition of another 12th century life, which has considerably influenced modern traditions.

(2) *Literature*.—This division of our subject is immense. I can only mention the latest works on the subject, together with a few of the more prominent of the older writers. The latest work on St. Patrick is Sir Samuel Ferguson's treatise on the *Patrician Documents* in the *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, Dec. 1885, and the next Benjamin Robert's *Étude Critique sur la vie de St. Patrice*, Paris, 1883, where a diligent use has been made of modern authorities, and, pp. 3–7, a convenient summary given of the literature of the subject. Warren's *Celtic Liturgy*, and Skene's *Celtic Scotland*, Wasserschleben's work quoted above, the writings of Todd, Whitley Stokes, Moran, Reeves, Petrie, Graves and Lanigan, scattered in the Proceedings and Transactions of the Irish Academy, as well as in independent volumes, should also be consulted. Lanigan's History, though written by an Irish Roman Catholic, and before many modern discoveries, is marked by a spirit of fearless honesty and courage. Shearman's *Loca Patriciana* is marked by an intimate personal knowledge of all the localities which lends a certain charm to his dry details. Bishop Graves's papers on the Book of Armagh in *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, t. iii., are models of acumen and research. Among the older writers we need only refer to Ussher's writings, specially his work on the *Antiquities of the British Churches*, t. v. and vi., of Elrington's edition, from which we have so often quoted, Ware's Works, ed. by Harris, and, from another point of view, the writings of Colgan. [G. T. S.]

PATRICIUS (11), abbat of Croyland, to whom Offa king of Mercia granted a charter of protection in 793 (*Monast. Anglic.* ii. 91, 108). [C. H.]

PATRICIUS (12), April 28, bishop and mart. at Prusa, in Bithynia, under a proconsul Julius. His acts exhibit marks of authenticity such as Le Blant, in his book *Les Actes des Martyrs*, lays special stress upon. His date is uncertain. (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 554.) [G. T. S.]

PATRIMUS, monk, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. ep. 14), who advised him to follow the spiritual life. [J. G.]

PATRIPASSIANS. Origen, in his commentary on the Epistle to Titus, which we possess only in Rufinus's version, defines Patripassiani as those who identify the Father and the Son and represent them as one person under two different names. One of the earliest consequences deduced from the teaching of Noetus and Praxeas by opponents like Hippolytus was this, if Christ was the same as the Father, then the Father had been born, had suffered and died; cf. Hippol. *adv. Noet.* c. i.; Tertull. *adv. Prax.* c. i. Patripassianism in fact was the Western name for the Sabellian heresy viewed from this particular point of view, Philast. *de Haeres.* c. 53; August. *de Haeres.* c. 41; cf. August. Ser. 52; Ceillier, ix. 237; cf. Hilgenfeld's *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, p. 615 [SABELLIANS]. The error seems to have revived among the Priscillianists of Spain in cent. v.; Ceill. x. 207. [G. T. S.]

PATROCLUS (1), legendary [LINUS, Vol. II. p. 728]. A Greek version of the Passions of Peter and Paul has been published from a Patmos MS. by Lipsius (*Jahrbücher f. prot. Theol.* 1886), but this is not the original of the Latin Acts, but rather itself a translation from the Latin. [G. S.]

PATROCLUS (2) (ST. PARRE), 21 Jan., a martyr, supposed to have suffered under Aurelian, and commemorated by Greg. Turon. *Glor. Mart.* c. 64. His acts are told at length by the Bollandists, *AA. SS.* Jan. ii. 342–349. A curious story is told by Gregory *l.c.* which shows how his acts originated. Patroclus had a chapel in Gaul served by a solitary priest. The populace did not however esteem this chapel because it possessed no acts of his passion, and the priest saw the tide of popularity, with all its profits, passing away from him. A traveller came to him one day, and showed him a book which proved to be the very thing he required, the acts of his own saint. He sat up all night and copied them out, and then returned the book to the traveller, who went his way. The priest at once sought out his bishop to whom he showed the acts. The prelate was suspicious, however, taxed him with forgery, and, according to the stern discipline of the Gallic church, flogged him on the spot. An army, however, shortly afterwards invaded Italy, and brought back an identical copy of the acts, thus proving the good faith of the priest. The people thereupon built a splendid church in honour of Patroclus. [G. T. S.]

PATROCLUS (3), bishop of Arles, between St. Heros and St. Honoratus (A.D. 412–426). In 412 the people of Arles drove out Heros and elected in his place, Patroclus, a creature of Constantius (Prosper Aquit. *Chronicon*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* li. 590). As bishop he is said to have sold ecclesiastical offices (Prosper Tyro, *Chronicon*, in Bouquet I. 638) and hoarded up stores of ill-gotten wealth (cf. the funeral sermon of Hilary of Arles upon St. Honoratus, cap. vi., *Patr. Lat.* l. 1265). He seems however to have commended himself to pope Zosimus, who conferred upon him unprecedented privileges of jurisdiction, and his history illustrates the relations of the French dioceses. On the ground that Arles was the fountain-head of Gallic Christianity, the pope confirmed to the see all parishes it had ever held, whether within the province or not, and gave Patroclus exclusive rights of ordination over the independent provinces of Vienne, Narbonensis Prima, and Narbonensis Secunda, and deposed Proculus bishop of Marseilles for infringing

these privileges by ordaining in his own diocese. On the ground also of Patroclus's personal merits, the pope in a letter addressed to all the Gallic bishops, forbade any cleric of whatever rank to visit Rome without first obtaining *literae formatae*, or letters of identification and recommendation, from the bishop of Arles. See the pope's correspondence from March 22, 417 to Feb. 5, 418, which is chiefly occupied with Arles, *Epp.* i., v., vi., vii., x., xi., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 643, 665, 666, 668, 673, 674. These privileges were productive of great dissatisfaction in the neighbouring provinces, and in the matter of the jurisdiction Zosimus's orders were virtually rescinded by his successor, Bonifacius I., who, in a letter written Feb. 9, 422, asserted the right of Hilary bishop of Narbonne, to consecrate the bishop of Lodève in his province, as against Patroclus, who had usurped it (*Epist.* xii. *Patr. Lat.* xx. 772–4). In 425 he was ordered by Theodosius to assemble for discussion the Gallic bishops who professed the Pelagian and Coelestian heresies, the emperor decreeing exile for such as should not recant within twenty days. Patroclus was murdered in the year 426 by a barbarian officer, probably one of the Goths who overran that part of Gaul in the previous year, at the secret order, as was said, of Felix, magister militum (Prosper. Aquit., *Chronicon*, *Patr. Lat.* li. 593–4). [S. A. B.]

PATROCLUS (4), ST., Nov. 10, a recluse in Berri, celebrated in the sixth century for his austerities and miracles. Gregory of Tours gives his life in the rustic language in which he heard it. Born in the neighbourhood of Bourges, he was employed by his father, Aetherius, as a shepherd, but stung by the taunts of a brother who was destined for a learned profession, at the age of ten he deserted his flock, sought instruction, and applied himself to the acquisition of learning. As a youth he was attached to the service of Nunnio, one of Childebert's courtiers, to whom he endeared himself by his diligence and humility. On his father's death he devoted himself to conventual life, receiving the tonsure from Arcadius bishop of Bourges, and after a long life of austerity and solitude, interrupted only by the institution of religious houses, he died in his eightieth year, about 577, and was buried at Colombière, one of his foundations, in spite of the efforts of another of them, Néris, to obtain his body. (Greg. Tur., *Vit. Patr.* cap. ix.: *Hist. Franc.* v. 10.) [S. A. B.]

PATRON SAINTS AND ANGELS. The worship of the saints in its later form originated in the honours paid to martyrs at the shrine of their relics, *i. e.* in the worship of patron saints; while the selection of angels as patrons and their worship as such followed, as a corollary, on the establishment of saint worship. The present article is therefore an historical introduction to the whole subject of creature worship. Hence our first object must be to ascertain the practice of the first Christians; our next, to show how later ages gradually drifted into something very different.

I. *The Practice of the Apostles.*—With reference to the angels, St. Paul (Col. ii. 18) says: "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen." "Voluntary," or gratuitous, "humility" appears to express the very feeling which men professed, as we shall see, in the 5th century, when they declared themselves unworthy to go to Christ without a mediator, and therefore placed themselves under the patronage of the martyrs. It will be shown, as we proceed, that this was the meaning originally given to it in the church. St. John, in Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 8, was not "intruding into those things which he had not seen" (for he plainly saw in his vision and conversed with the angel before whose feet he fell down to worship); yet the act was forbidden: "See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God." We may add that this was in accordance with the traditional teaching of the Jewish church. Thus the Jerusalem Talmud says that, when one has a request to make of a great man, he first applies to "his favourite slave or his son, who then goes and tells the master inside, 'The man N. N. is left standing at the gate of the hall; shall he come in or not'? Not so the Holy: praised be He. If misfortune comes on a man, let him not cry to Michael, and not to Gabriel, but unto Me let him cry, and I will answer him right speedily" (*Quarterly Review* on the Talmud, No. 246, p. 457). We shall see the same illustration used by Christian writers.

Nor is there any trace in Holy Scripture of the invocation of martyrs, or of a belief that they exercised a special power on behalf of those who cherished their remains. Of John the Baptist, we only read that "his disciples came, and took up the body and buried it" (St. Matth. xiv. 12; St. Mark vi. 29). So again of the first martyr after Christ: "Devout men carried Stephen [to his burial] and made great lamentation over him" (Acts viii. 2); but not a word is said of any special value set on his remains, or of any posthumous honours paid to him. There is no reference whatever to the disposal of the body of St. James, the brother of John, whose death is also recorded in the Acts (xii. 2). Nor have we in or out of Scripture any authentic information of any special reverence shown to the remains of the Blessed Virgin, or of any of the immediate followers of Christ.

II. *Early Accord with Scripture.*—In the 2nd century we meet with facts which indicate a growing regard for the mortal relics of the martyrs. Such few remains of the body of Ignatius as had been left by the lions, A.D. 107, or of Polycarp by the fire, probably about 155, were carefully gathered, "a priceless treasure, left, as they were, to the holy church by the grace that was in the martyr" (*Martyr. S. Ign.* 6), "more precious than costly gems, and better proved than gold" (*Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. de S. Polyc. Mart.* 18). The bones of Ignatius were carried from Rome to Antioch, but in neither case is any motive for such care suggested other than an affectionate pride in the Christian hero, intensified as well as hallowed by religious enthusiasm. "We worship Christ," declared the church of Smyrna, "because He is the Son of God, but we love, as they deserve, the martyrs, as the disciples and followers of the Lord, on

account of their exceedingly good affection to their proper King and Master—whose partners and fellow disciples may it be our lot to become" (*ibid.* 17).

The idea of a patron saint could not be built only on the opinion that the departed were pleased with the honour shown to their remains. It required, also, a belief in their particular intercession, of which we find no trace in the writings of the first ages.

The general teaching of the early fathers, as bearing on the worship of angels and martyrs, may be gathered from the following testimonies.[a] Irenaeus, A.D. 167, declares that the church "does nothing by invocation of angels . . . . but purely and openly directs its prayers unto the Lord the Maker of all things, and invokes the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (*c. Haer.* ii. 32, § 5). Tertullian, A.D. 202, "I cannot pray to obtain these things [the safety of the emperor, and the empire, &c.] from any other than Him from whom I know that I shall obtain them; because it is He who alone grants them, and I am one to whom that answer to prayer is due, as being His servant, who wait upon Him alone" (*Apol.* 30). Clemens of Alexandria, A.D. 211: "It is the extremity of folly to ask things from those who are not gods, as if they were gods . . . . Wherefore, with good reason, seeing that the good God is one, do both we and the angels pray that some things may be given, and some assured to us, from Him alone" (*Strom.* vii. 7, § 39). Origen, writing about 247: "We must pray to God over all alone and the Only-begotten, born before all creatures, the Word of God, and we must entreat Him, as the high-priest, to offer to His God and our God the prayer that reaches Him from us" (*c. Cels.* viii. 26). "We must, therefore, seek to make the God over all well disposed to us, and to have Him propitious to us, who is made favourable by piety and all virtue. But if one wish also that others should be well disposed to him after the God over all, let him consider that, as the motion of the shadow of a body follows that body as it moves, so in the same manner does the possession of the good favour of all the friends of God, angels, and souls, and spirits, follow the good favour of the God over all. For they have a communion of feeling with those who are worthy of the favour that is from God. And not only are they themselves well disposed to those worthy of it, but they also co-operate with those who desire to serve the God over all, and are very favourable to them, and pray with them, and join their entreaties with them. So that we venture to say that ten thousand sacred powers, without being invoked, are praying with those men who have heartily chosen the better part, when they pray to God" (*Ibid.* 64; comp. v. 5, where he teaches that a good disposition towards God is sufficient to make the angels love us and do all for us). Again: "If the saints out of the body who are with Christ do aught and labour for us, as the angels do, who minister to our safety, ... let this also be classed among the hidden things of God and mysteries not to be committed to writing" (*Comment. in Ep. ad Rom.* ii. 4). Hilary the Deacon A.D. 354: "Men obtain access to a king through tribunes and officers; because the king is a man, and knows not to whom he ought to intrust the care of the state; but to obtain the favour of God, from whom nothing is hid (for He knows the deserts of all men), there is no need of a supporter [suffragatore], but of a devout mind" (*Comm. in Ep. Rom.* i. 22). By the worship of angels in Col. ii. 18, Hilary understood that of the stars, or perhaps astrology: "Inflantur enim motum pervidentes stellarum, quas angelos vocat" (*Comment.* in loc.). He is unconscious of any practice among Christians with which the language of St. Paul might seem to clash. In the East, however, the council of Laodicea, held probably about 365, found it necessary to forbid "Christians to forsake the church of God, and go away and invoke [ὀνομάζειν] angels, and make [separate] synaxes" (can. 35). This worship it calls "clandestine idolatry." The several angels could not be invoked, unless names were given to them, as by the Essenes (Joseph. *de Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, § 7). Epiphanius, A.D. 374: "What Scripture hath discoursed about this? Which of the prophets hath permitted a man to be worshipped, not to say a woman? For she [the Blessed Virgin, who was worshipped by the heretics whom he is confuting] is a chosen vessel indeed, but a woman still, and in nowise changed in her nature, &c. . . . . Nor is Elias to be worshipped, though among the living, nor is John, although through his own prayer he made his departure wonderful, or rather received that grace from God; nor is Thecla, nor any of the saints, to be worshipped . . . . For if He will that none of the angels be worshipped, how much more she that was born of Anna?" (*C. Haer.* lxxix. 5.) "Let Mary be held in honour, but let the Father and Son and Holy Ghost be worshipped. Let no man worship Mary." (*Ibid.* 7.) St. Chrysostom, A.D. 387: "When we have to prevail on men, we must first treat with door-keepers, and persuade parasites and flatterers, and go a long way from home; but there is nothing of this sort with God; but He is prevailed on without a mediator [χωρὶς μεσίτου], and will assent to our petition without money, without cost" (*Hom. de Poenit.* iv. § 4; comp. *Ecloga de Orat.* § 1, tom. xii. 444, ed. Ben.; and *Hom. in Ev. S. Matth.* 52 (or 53), § 2). This father was equally ignorant of the existence of angel-worship in his day; for interpreting Col. ii. 18, he only says, "There *were* some [in the Apostle's time] who said that we ought not to be brought [to God] through Christ, but through the angels; for that the former method is greater than becomes us" (*Hom.* xii. *in Ep. ad Col.* § 1). In 400, St.

[a] We prefer to give in a note the much vexed statement of Justin Martyr, A.D. 140: "We reverence and worship Him (the Father), and the Son, who came from Him and taught us about those things and the host of the others imitating and made like unto Him, good angels, and the prophetic Spirit" (*Apol.* i. 6). This may mean (1) that the Son taught the angels as well as men, or (2) that He taught men about the angels as well as "those things" mentioned, or (3) that Christians reverenced and worshipped (σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν) the angels. The last is the most natural rendering of the author's words, though the sense which it yields to modern ears could not have been that which he intended to convey. The words which we render by "worship," "adore," &c., were so vaguely used that they as often signified some low indication of respect as they did the highest acts of devotion.

Augustine writes thus of the angels: "Whom could I find to reconcile me to Thee? Was I to solicit the angels? With what prayer? With what sacraments? Many endeavouring to return to Thee, and, not being able, have tried these things, as I hear, and fallen into a desire for curious visions, and been held deserving of illusions" [which he ascribes to evil spirits] (*Confess.* x. 42, § 67). Elsewhere he says of them, "We honour them in charity, not by service; nor do we build temples to them. For they will not be thus honoured by us; for they know that we ourselves, when good, are temples of the most high God. Rightly, therefore, is it written (Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 8) that a man was forbidden by an angel to worship him, but [commanded] to worship the one Lord under whom he also was his fellow-servant" (*De Vera Relig.* lv. § 110). Although in the 4th century undue honour began to be paid to martyrs at their tombs, we nevertheless find this father speaking as distinctly and decidedly on the subject of saint-worship as any of his predecessors. Thus in 389 he says: "I have known [among the bad Christians] many worshippers of tombs and pictures" (*de Moribus Eccl.* i. xxiv. 75). "Let not our religion be the worship of dead men; for if they lived piously, they are not such as to desire honours of that kind, but they would have Him to be worshipped by us, enlightened by whom they rejoice at our being partakers in their reward [meriti sui consortes]. They are therefore to be honoured by imitation, not worshipped from a motive of religion" (*De Vera Relig.* lv. 108). The later teaching was that they were to be worshipped as well as imitated. Later on, too, within our period, they were called intercessors; but St. Augustine (about 415), as well as Origen (see above), denies them the office implied by that title: "He is the priest who, having now entered within the veil, alone there of all who have borne flesh intercedes for us" (*Enarr. in Ps.* 64, § 6). And with regard to the angels, many years later in the East, Theodoret could still give this explanation of Col. ii. 18: "The advocates of the law introduced the worship of the angels to them. For this disease remained a long time in Phrygia and Pisidia. On which account, the council that met at Laodicea in Phrygia [see before] forbad by a decree that prayer should be made to the angels. To this day we may see oratories of the holy Michael among them and their neighbours. And this they would have done by common counsel under the plea of humility, saying that the God of all is invisible, and unattainable, and not to be taken hold of; and that it is meet to conciliate the divine clemency through the angels" (*Interpr. Ep. ad Col.* in loc.).

III. *Such Worship was held to imply Divinity.*—This was a principle inherited by the first Christians from their heathen, as well as Jewish, ancestors. "Varro says that all the dead were accounted by them *manes dei*, and proves it by the sacred rites which are bestowed on nearly all the dead, in which passage he also mentions the funeral games; as if this were the chief proof of their divinity, that games are not wont to be celebrated, except unto deities" (Aug. *de Civit. Dei*, viii. 26, § 1). The retention of this principle during the first three or four centuries is another proof that patron saints were unknown to the ante-Nicene church. It will be seen that Christian writers so express themselves as to exclude patron angels also. Clemens of Alexandria, A.D. 192: "Believe, O man, in Him who suffered, and is worshipped, the living God" (*Protrept.* x. § 106). Novatian, 251, more directly: "If Christ be only a man, how is He present everywhere when invoked? . . . Why is a man invoked in our prayers as a mediator, since the invocation of a man is deemed of no avail to ensure safety?" (*De Trin.* 14.) When the heathen objected to Christians, that they worshipped a man, Arnobius, 303, declares Him to be God also, and says: "Seeing that He is certainly and without any manner of doubt God, do you imagine that we are likely to deny that He is in the highest degree worshipped by us?" (*Disp. adv. Gent.* i.) St. Athanasius infers from the prayer of Jacob, "The angel which redeemed me from all evil bless the lads" (Gen. xlviii. 16), that the angel must be "the Word of God whom he joined with the Father in his prayer" (*Or.* iii. *c. Arian.* § 12, i. 561). Similarly, on 1 Thess. iii. 11, he remarks: "No one would pray to receive aught from the Father and the angels or from any of the other creatures, nor would any one say, 'God and an angel give thee,' but from the Father and the Son because of their unity," &c. (*ibid.*).

Hence the Arians were charged with idolatry, because, holding Christ to be a creature, they nevertheless worshipped Him. Athanasius "We do not worship a creature: God forbid. That is the error of the heathen and the Arians" (*Ep. ad Adelph.* § 3, ii. 912). "Let them [the Arians] know, that, worshipping the Lord in the flesh, we are not worshipping a creature [as they do], but the Creator clothed with the created body" (*ibid.* 96, 15). Gregory of Nazianzus "What shall I say to them who worship Astaroth, or Chemosh the abomination of the Sidonians, or the figure of the star, . when either I do not worship the two [the Son and Holy Ghost] into whom I have been baptized, or worship my fellow-servants, for fellow-servants they [the two] are [on the Arian hypothesis], even if a little more honourable than myself" (*Orat.* 40, § 42)?

The utter inconsistency of language like the foregoing with the practices to be mentioned in later sections in relation to patron saints or angels is too obvious to require comment. It is evident that for more than three centuries after Christ the whole church would have declared with Tertullian: "It is commanded me that I call no other person God, that I make none other God even in speech—not by tongue any more than by hand; that I do not adore or *in any way whatever* worship [quoquo modo venerer] any one other than that One [unicum illum] who enjoins this on me" (*c. Gnost. Scorp.* 4).

IV. *The Witness of the Liturgies.*—An undeniable proof that the primitive church did not worship the martyrs or other saints is the fact that she actually prayed for them. The evidence is extant in the ancient liturgies. Thus in the Clementine: "We offer unto Thee also on behalf of the saints who from the beginning have been well pleasing unto Thee, patriarchs, prophets, righteous men, apostles, martyrs," &c. (*Constit. Apost.* viii. 12); St. Mark: "Give rest to the souls of our fathers and brethren who have

fallen asleep in the faith of Christ, remembering our forefathers from the beginning, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs," &c. (Renaudot, *Collect. Liturg. Orient.* i. 149); St. James: "Remember, O Lord, . . . the orthodox whom we have commemorated and whom we have not commemorated from Abel the righteous unto this day," &c. (Assem. *Codex Liturg.* v. 46); St. Chrysostom: "We also offer unto Thee this reasonable service for those who rest in faith, forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, . . . especially for . . . the Virgin Mary, for St. John the prophet, forerunner," &c. (Goar, *Eucholog.* 78); the Armenian: "We pray that the mother of God, the holy Virgin Mary, John the Baptist, the first confessor St. Stephen, and all saints be commemorated in this liturgy. *Choir.* Remember them, O Lord, and have mercy upon them" (Neale, *Introd. Hist. East. Chr.* 594). Similar petitions are found in the Ordo Communis of the Syro-Jacobites (Renaud. ii. 18), in the very ancient liturgies of Theodore and Nestorius (*ibid.* 620, 633), &c. In the West the Mozarabic "offers on behalf of the spirits of those at rest, Hilary, Athanasius, Martin, Ambrose, Augustine," &c. (*Miss. Moz.* Leslie, 4). For many hundred years the Roman collects for the days of SS. Leo and Gregory contained this petition: "Grant . . . that this oblation may profit the soul of thy servant Leo," (or) "Gregory" (*Liturg. Rom. Vet.* ii. 25, 101). Innocent III. A.D. 1198, defended the alteration of this by pleading a sentiment of St. Augustine (*Serm.* 149, § 1; see also *Tract.* 84 *in S. Joan. Evang.* 15), which he alleges for Scripture, that it is "wrong to pray for a martyr to whose prayers we ought to be commended" (Innoc. *Opp.* ii. 764, ed. 1575).

V. *Predisposition of Converts from Heathenism.*—We need not be surprised at the foregoing sentiment of St. Augustine; for it was during his life that the tendency which already existed to turn the martyrs into patrons and objects of worship became more marked and general. In the 4th century multitudes of semi-converts flocked into the church, whose prepossessions gradually led both to the corruption of doctrine and to the subversion of discipline. They had believed in the *genii locorum*, and in gods and heroes the especial patrons of cities and professions. They entered the church, therefore, ready, from their old associations, to attach a sacred presence to localities, and to elevate great men after their death into the especial protectors of classes and countries, if not at first of persons. If we clearly understand their previous opinions, we shall better see how these bore on the Christian superstition, and how natural was the transference of honour from the hero to the martyr. A few testimonies to the prae-Christian tradition are therefore desirable.

There was a widely spread belief among the Greeks and Romans in the presence of the spirits of the departed, especially of those who had died a violent death, about their tombs, and places which they had much frequented in life. Thus Plato says of those that had contracted great earthliness through habits of sensuality, "Such a soul is weighed down and dragged back again to the visible place through fear of the unseen and of Hades, as it is said, wandering about the monuments and tombs, about which indeed certain dark shadows, phantoms of souls, have been seen, the *idola* that such souls present as are not thoroughly set free, but still partake of the visible, by reason of which they are also seen" (*Phaedo*, 30). Plotinus, speaking of those who have committed suicide under the influence of weak or base passions, says, "It must be that the soul on this forced departure should be bound yet more closely to the body, and in very deed for that reason is it that souls thus thrust out wander a long time about the body, or its tomb, or the place in which violence was done to it" (in Macrobius, *in Somn. Scipionis*, i. 13). Macrobius affirms that a carnal soul "either wanders about its own body, or seeks the habitation of a new body, and that not human only, but also bestial, a kind being chosen suitable to its habits when in the flesh" (*u. s.* i. 9). So Porphyry held that "a depraved and irrational soul, when it leaves the body, is still compelled to adhere to it," and that the souls of those "who die by violence are detained about the body" (*de Abstin.* ii. 47, Taylor's tr. 82). This opinion of the Platonists was extended by popular superstition to all departed souls. "The vulgar," says Lactantius, "imagine that the souls of the dead wander about tombs and the remains of their bodies" (*Div. Instit.* ii. 2). Hence Tibullus represents himself as going to a tomb to intreat the aid of its occupant (*Eleg.* ii. vi. 33):

> "Illius ad tumulum fugiam, supplexque sedebo,
> Et mea cum muto fata querar cinere.
> Non feret usque suum te propter flere clientem."

The belief that the manes of the dead could either hurt or help the living was universal, and, combined with a belief in their local presence, led to their worship as patrons. Hesiod says that the men of the golden age at their death became δαίμονες, "good, dwellers on earth, guardians of mortal men, watching over both acts of justice and wicked deeds, clothed with air, going everywhere to and fro on the earth, the givers of wealth" (*Opera et Dies*, 121). A part of this passage, with some difference of reading, is quoted by Plato (*de Republica*, Ast. iv. 292), who thus comments on it: "We will certainly accept this sentiment. For having consulted the deity how, and with what variety of rite, we ought to make both heroes (δαιμονίους) and gods, we will so make them, and with such difference as he may teach us in reply. And why are we not to do so? From that time we will serve them as men who have become δαίμονες, and will worship their tombs, and we will observe the same custom when one of those who are deemed to have been excellently good in their life shall die from age or any other cause." This he asserts to have been done annually by the state, as well as by private persons at their will (*Menex.* Ast. 102). Examples are very numerous; *e.g.* "The inhabitants of Amphipolis having enclosed the monument [of Brasidas] both sacrificed to him as a hero and gave him honours, games, and yearly sacrifices, and made the colony over to him as to a founder" (Thucyd. v. 11). Τὸ θύειν Βρασίδᾳ is instanced by Aristotle (*Eth. Nicom.* v. 7; Zell. i. 235) as an example of positive law. The citizens of Aenia "every year offered sacrifice with great ceremony to Aeneas their founder"

(Livy, xl. 4). Aelius Aristides, in his oration on the four heroes Miltiades, Themistocles, Pericles, and Cimon, says that they were "in a manner inhumed guardians and protectors of the Greeks, averters of evil, and good at all needs, and that they defended the country in no inferior degree to Oedipus, who was buried in Colonos, or any one who is believed to be buried in any other part of the country to the good of the living" (*Orat.* 44 *in Quat. Vir.* Dindorf, ii. 230). Pausanias, after telling us that the Oropii were the first to make Amphiaraus a god, in which they were followed by the rest of the Greeks, adds, "I can enumerate others also who were men at that time who have the honours of gods with the Greeks" (*Perieg.* i. 24, § 2).

Plato, as we have seen, would "consult the deity" in reference to those who were to be thus canonised. To shew that this was actually done, we need only refer to Plotinus, who declares that the gods had by their oracles "ordered the anger of injured souls to be appeased, and that men should give honour to the dead, as yet conscious (which, indeed, all still observe towards the departed). And many souls," he adds, "formerly among men, after quitting the body, have not ceased to do good to men" (*Ennead.* iv. 7; Creuzer, ii. 871).

In these opinions and practices of the heathen in relation to departed heroes and others, we see the deep and broad foundation of the corrupt worship of the martyrs as the patrons of places, classes, and persons, and of its later offshoot, the worship of patron angels.

VI. *Avowals of Christian Writers.*—In ascribing to these opinions and rites a marked influence on the practice of the half taught Christians of the 4th century, and in time on that of the whole church, we are not following conjecture or probability. Eusebius of Caesarea, some time after 325, having cited Plato *de Republicâ* as above, remarks that such honours as he assigns to his heroes are especially suitable "on the death of those dear to God, whom you would rightly call soldiers of true godliness. Wherefore it is our custom also to go to their tombs, and to make prayers at them, and to honour their blessed souls, which things are with good reason done by us" (*Praep. Evang.* xiii. 11, p. 663). To the same effect Theodoret, after citing Plato and Hesiod, as above, argues: "If then the poet called those who had led excellent lives, and then died, both 'good and averters of evil and guardians of mortal men,' and the best of the philosophers sanctioned his dictum, . . . why do you find fault with our practices? For we call men averters of evil and healers who have shone in godliness and been slain for it, not calling them δαίμονας (may we never be so insane), but friends and loving servants of God who are bold of speech with Him, and promise us abundance of good things" (*Graec. Affect. Curat.* viii. ed. Schulze, iv. 915). The same writer says: "The Lord has brought His own dead into them (the temples converted into martyria) in the place of your gods, and has caused the latter to disappear, but assigned their honour to the former"; for, he adds, the heathen festivals of the Pandia, &c., have been replaced by those of Peter, Paul, &c., "and the other martyrs" (*ibid.* 923). Such being the language of writers esteemed Catholic, we cannot be surprised at the effect on an independent mind, such as that of Vigilantius, to whom the cultus of relics, which was the practical root of patron-worship, appeared very like a return to heathenism, or, more correctly, the covert retention of one great feature of it: "Prope ritum Gentilium videmus sub praetextu religionis introductum in ecclesiis. . . . Ubicunque pulvisculum nescio quod in modico vasculo pretioso linteamine circumdatum osculantes adorant" (Apud Hieronym. *c. Vigilant.* 4).

VII. *The Marvels of the Temple and of the Martyrium.* — Wonderful things (*miracula*, θαύματα), not to be referred to any merely natural cause, were said to happen in the temples and at the tombs of heroes. The mass of converts would expect phenomena of the same kind to attach themselves to the shrines of the martyrs, and what they expected, they would find. Such wonders would, moreover, be both multiplied and intensified by the excitement that frequently arose on the discovery or acquisition of the bodies of supposed martyrs (see *e.g.* Ambr. *Epist.* xxii. 9; Chrys. *Laud. Mart. Aegypt.*; Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 18, or Theodoret, iii. 10; Theod. iv. 36; Luciani *Epist. de Rev. S. Steph.* 8, in App. vi. ad *Opp.* Aug.; Greg. Tur. *Mirac.* i. 44, ii. 33; &c.). There appear to have been some real miracles of healing in the 4th century, as, for example, the sudden cures of a fistula and a cancer mentioned by St. Augustine (*de Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8, §§ 2, 3), but these and others of the class had no connexion with relics, nor are they ascribed in any way to the merit of martyrs. They were granted to earnest faith and prayer alone. Those said to have been wrought by the martyrs have a more suspicious air. They are mysterious, and (assuming their truth) not to be explained with our present knowledge; but they are often only Christian counterparts of the old wonders of the temple. The resemblance was not denied, and Christians, believing in both, had to content themselves with pointing out the elements of difference. Thus St. Augustine: "The miracles which are reported to have taken place in their temples are in no wise to be compared to those which occur in the memoriae of our martyrs. Or if any seem alike, as the magicians of Pharaoh were conquered by Moses, so have their gods been overcome by our martyrs. The demons did those things in the same presumption of unclean pride in which they desired to be their gods, but the martyrs perform the other miracles, or rather God does them, they praying or co-operating, for the promotion of that faith by which we believe that they are not our gods, but have one God with us" (*Ibid.* xxii. 10).

Some of the alleged miracles on which the worship of patron saints (and through that of all saints) was founded, remind us of stories of modern "spiritualism"; others find a parallel in such phenomena (for instance) as were believed even by thoughtful and learned men to have been exhibited in 1727 at the grave of the deacon François Paris in the cemetery of St. Médard. They were, in a word, I would suggest with reverence, instances of a less common accident of human nature evoked and shaped by the condition of mind into which an enthusiastic multitude of half trained and half taught converts had been thrown by the change which they

had passed through, and the public calamities in which they all had a share. The occult cause of such manifestations is still unknown both to theology and science. To the early Christians, even with the highest knowledge of their day, but two alternatives were presented. They must either deny the fact, which, with the evidence before them, was in some cases impossible, or they must accept the solution which the traditions of the temple suggested to the multitude, and ascribe the wonder to the martyr whose relics sanctified the place. To the latter conclusion all at last came after some perplexity and struggle of mind, of which in the case of St. Augustine some proof is afforded both by his silence and his utterances (*u.s.* §§ ix.–xi.). His belief in the miracles said to have been wrought by the relics of St. Stephen, discovered in 415, would lead him a good way towards the popular view, but the extent to which he at last sympathised with it is not clearly defined. His testimony and that of many others will be given in the two following sections, to enable the reader to trace the rapid though gradual change which this new element of superstition effected in the opinions and practices of East and West alike.

VIII. *Growth of Superstition in the East.*—St. Basil and the two Gregories, his brother and friend, who flourished about 370, all show a belief in the particular intercession and assistance of martyrs. Thus St. Basil says of Mamas, "Remember the martyr, as many of you as have been visited by him in dreams. Let all remember him, who being settled in this place have had him for their helper in prayer, to whom, invoked by name, he hath been present at their work, whom he hath raised from sickness, to whom he hath given back their children already dead, to whom he hath granted a longer term of life" (*Hom.* xxiii. *in S. Mam.* § 1). Of the forty martyrs whose ashes had been mingled together and cast into a river, he says: "These are they who having taken possession of our land protect it, like closely set towers, from the inroads of the enemies, not confining themselves to one place, but already guests in many, and adorning many countries. He who is in affliction flies to the Forty; he who is in joy runs to them; the one that he may find deliverance from his troubles, the other that his better fortunes may be secured to him. There is found the devout woman praying for children, asking for the return of her husband, or recovery for him in sickness. Let your prayers be in conjunction with the martyrs" (*Hom.* xix. *in* xl. *Mart.* § 8). Gregory of Nyssa, in his *Oration on Theodore the Martyr:* "This, as we believe, is he who during the past year calmed the stormy fury of the barbarians, and stopped the terrible war of the savage Scythians" (*Opp.* ii. 1010). He thus addresses him: "Intercede for thy country with the king of all. For the country of a martyr is the place of his passion, and his fellow-citizens and kindred are they who have guarded him and possess and honour him" (1017). He further asks him to intercede with other saints less interested in the place: "Remind Peter; stir up Paul, and John the divine and beloved disciple also; to be careful of the churches which they have established" (1018). He buried his parents by some relics of the Forty Martyrs, whom he styles, "strong champions against the enemies, and trustworthy advocates to intercede with the Lord" (*Orat.* 3 *in* xl. *Mart.* App. 214), "that at the time of the resurrection they might be raised in company with those allies full of good assurance" (*ibid.* 211). Gregory of Nazianzus, in a homily on Cyprian of Antioch, who, being confounded with him of Carthage, was more honoured at Constantinople than any of the other martyrs, appeals to him thus: "But do thou look down on us propitious from above, and be a shepherd to this sacred flock, or tend it with the shepherd, both directing other things for the best and driving away the grievous wolves" (*Hom.* 24 *in Cypr.* § 18). St. Chrysostom, before 397, referring to the chains of St. Paul, alleged to have been preserved at Rome, only says, "I would behold those chains at which devils are fear-struck and tremble, but which angels reverence" (*Hom.* viii. *in Ep. ad Eph.* § 1). Speaking of a destructive fall of rain at Constantinople in 399, he tells us that "the whole city ran like a torrent to the places of the Apostles and took the holy Peter, and the blessed Andrew . . . . Paul and Timothy for their advocates" (*Hom. c. Ludos,* 1). The following passage, unlike his general language, exhorts to an invocation of the martyrs "Not on the day of this festival alone, but on other days, let us entreat them, let us implore them to become our patronesses" (*de SS. Bernice et Prosdoce,* 7). On occasion of some new relics being brought to the city, he says: "The bodies of these saints wall our city round, more securely than any adamantine and impregnable wall, and like lofty rocks, standing out all round, they not only repel the assaults of these sensible and visible foes, but overthrow the plots of the invisible demons and every crafty device of the devil. . . . If our common Lord be angry with us for the multitude of our sins, opposing these bodies (to His wrath), we shall soon be able to make Him propitious to the city" (*De Laud. Mart. Aegypt.* § 1). So any one in trouble is to fly "to His friends, the martyrs, the saints, who have pleased Him, and who have much freedom of speech with Him" (*Hom.* viii. *adv. Jud.* § 6). He especially dwells on the power of St. Ignatius at Antioch: "The blessed Ignatius sends home those who have recourse to him loaded with blessings, full of confidence, a generous spirit, and great courage; wherefore let us go to him, not this day only (his festival), but every day. . . . Not the bodies only, but the very coffins of the saints, are full of spiritual grace. . . God hath therefore given us the relics of the saints, because He desires by their means to lead us to the same zeal, and to give us a harbour and sure comfort in the troubles that at any time befall us. Wherefore I exhort you all that, if any of you be in any distress of mind, or afflicted with sickness, or have met with injurious treatment or any other trouble of life, or be overwhelmed with sins, he come here with faith, and he will put off all those troubles, and return home with great joy. So that this treasure is useful to all," &c. (*Hom. in Ignatium Mart.* § 5). Asterius Amasenus, a contemporary of St. Augustine, says, "It is manifest that God, ever glorifying His own, even after death, works strange wonders at their tombs and resting-places" (*Hom. ad Sanct. Mart.* p. 197, ed. 1648):

"Though the stones cover their bodies," says Basil of Seleucia, 448, "they are yet able to save those in trouble who draw near them worthily" (*In S. Deiparam*, p. 598, ed. 1648). Theodoret, writing in 427, says of the martyria, "We frequently hold our assemblies (in their memoriae), and often even daily offer up hymns to their master, and those who are in health ask for the preservation of their health, those who are struggling with any disease, for deliverance from their sufferings; the childless ask for children, and the barren that they may become mothers; and those who receive the boon, that it may be secured to them. Persons going abroad beg earnestly for them to be their fellow-travellers and guides by the way, and those to whom a return has been granted offer an acknowledgment of the favour; not having recourse to them as gods, but entreating them as godlike men (θείους), and begging them to become intercessors for them" (*Graec. Aff. Cur.* viii. Sch. iv. 921). Thus, according to this writer, prayer was already addressed to martyrs in the East. He further says: "The generous souls of those who have conquered now walk the heavens, and mingle with the choirs of the unembodied; but with regard to their bodies, no single tomb covers that of each, but cities and villages having divided them among themselves entitle them preservers of their souls and healers, and honour them as guardians of their city, and their protectors; and employing them as intercessors with the Lord of all, obtain the divine gifts through them. And though the body be divided, the grace remains undivided, and the small and minute relic has equal power with the wholly undivided body of the martyr" (*Ibid.* 902). The tokens of gratitude for answer to prayer, with which the heathen temples had been filled now reappear in Christian churches; but they are spoken of as offerings to God: "Some offer figures of eyes, some of feet, others of hands; and some those formed of gold, others of the material of silver. For their Lord accepts things small and cheap, measuring the gift by the ability of the giver. . . . These things proclaim the power of those lying there; but their power shews that their God is the true God" (*Ibid.* 922).

IX. *Progress of the Error in the West.*—Our first witness is St. Ambrose, who, writing in 377, says: "The angels are to be intreated for us, who have been assigned to us for a guard. The martyrs are to be intreated whose patronage we seem to claim for ourselves by some bodily pledge (relic). They can ask forgiveness of our sins, who, even if they had sins, have washed them in their own blood; for they are God's martyrs, our chiefs, and witnesses of our life and actions. Let us not be ashamed to make them intercessors of our infirmity, because they themselves were conscious of the infirmities of the body, even when they conquered" (*De Viduis*, ix. § 55). St. Jerome, about 390, tells us with approbation that a devout woman was wont to spend nights in watching at the tomb of Hilarion, and conversing with him as if present (compare Tibullus, as above, § v.), "ad adjuvandas orationes suas" (*Hilar. Vita*, 47). His body had been buried in a garden in Cyprus, but stolen thence and carried into Palestine; and yet, observes Jerome, "great signs are wrought in both places daily, but especially in the garden in Cyprus, perhaps because he loved that place better" (*ibid.*). Paulinus of Nola says of the saints buried at Rome (*Poem.* xxi. 27):

> "Pluribus haec etenim causa est curata patronis,
> Ut Romana salus et publica vita maneret."

Speaking of the distribution of the bodies of the apostles, he says, with unconscious sarcasm (*P.* xxx. 26):

> "Inde Petrum et Paulum Romana fixit in urbe (sc. Deus),
> Principibus quoniam medicis caput orbis egebat."

Constantine transferred the bodies of St. Andrew and St. Timothy to his new capital:

> "Ut sua apostolicis muniret moenia laetus
> Corporibus" (*ibid.* 43).

Prudentius, 401, magnifies St. Laurence as one of the patrons of Rome. He had suffered there, and from his shrine in that city "tristis haud ullus redit." To him the poet prays (*de Cor.* ii. 529) in language which shews how fervid superstition can destroy the sense of incongruity:

> "Ceu praesto semper adsies,
> Tuosque alumnos urbicos,
> Lactante complexus sinu,
> Paterno amore nutrias."

St. Augustine, about 400, recognised the advantage of praying at the shrine of a martyr: "The Christian people frequent together the memoriae of the martyrs with religious solemnity, both to encourage imitation of them, and that they may be associated with their merits and helped by their prayers" (*c. Faust.* xx. 21). In 404 he had been taught by Paulinus to believe that, at the shrine of St. Felix of Nola, God for his sake manifested His power in a miraculous manner; nor was he led to suspect the allegation by the fact, on which he remarked, that, although Africa was full of the relics of martyrs, nothing of the sort had happened there (*Epist.* 78, § 3). In 415 the burial-place of St. Stephen was thought to have been found, and Africa could soon boast of wonders as great as those of Italy (*Ep.* Luciani *de Revel. Corp. S. Steph.* &c. in App. vi. ad *Opp.* Aug.; *Ep.* Severi, *ibid.*; Evodius *de Mirac. S. Steph. ib.*). St. Augustine accepted these stories in good faith, and they evidently influenced his speculations. Of this discovery and the subsequent miracles, he speaks thus: "The place was shown by signs preceding, and as it had been revealed, so also was it found" (*Serm.* 318, § 1; see also *Tract.* 120 *in S. Joan. Ev.* § 4); "His body was hidden for so long a time, it came forth when it pleased God; it enlightened the earth; it performed so mighty miracles; though dead, it makes the dead to live, for it is not dead" (*Serm.* 319, § 6); "At Uzalis, where our brother Evodius is bishop, what great miracles are done, seek and ye will find" (*Serm.* 323, § 3). Of these miracles and others at Hippo, he gives many examples both in his sermons (322–324) and in his *City of God* (xxii. 8). Nevertheless there is no suggestion of prayer to the martyr. That was offered over his relics and heard for his sake; that is, because he prayed for the petitioner (*Serm.* 119, § 6): "Ipsum (Deum) habemus; ab Ipso petamus. Et si minus digni sumus, per amicos Ipsius . . . petamus. Orent ipsi pro nobis, ut donet et nobis" (*Serm.* 332, § 3). The martyrs were not

to be invoked ("suo loco et ordine nominantur, non tamen a sacerdote, qui sacrificat, invocantur," *de Civ. Dei*, xxii. 10), but moved to intercession by compassion for those who thus honoured them. "I prayed daily," says one, "with abundance of tears in the place where is the memoria of the most glorious martyr St. Stephen." Being healed, he thanked, not the martyr, but God (*S.* 322; *Libell.* ad fin.). St. Maximus of Turin, 442: "All the martyrs are to be treated [colendi] most devoutly. But especially are those whose remains we possess to be reverenced by us. For they assist us by their prayers; they assist us even by their passion. With them we have a familiarity. For they are always with us, abide with us; that is to say, they both guard us while living in the body and receive us when we depart from it. . . . For therefore was it provided by our ancestors that we should mingle our bodies with the bones of the saints, that while Christ gives them light, the gloom of darkness may fly from us. Resting, therefore [in the cemeteries], with the holy martyrs, we escape the darkness of hell; by their proper merits indeed, yet partners in their holiness. . . . Therefore, brethren, let us venerate them in this life, that we may have them as defenders in that to come" (*Serm.* 61, p. 161, ad calc. *Opp.* Leon.). Valerian, bishop of Cemela in 450, betrays an opinion directly opposed to that of St. Chrysostom, Hilary, &c. cited above (§ II), when he declares that it is "unpardonable not to know how to intreat the friends of the King" (*Hom.* xv. *Opp.* 21, ed. 1633). Gregory the Great, 590, assigns to the saints, as Maximus (above) also appears to do, power to procure the forgiveness of sin, even in the day of judgment: "Hos ergo . . . in causa vestri examinis, quam cum districto judice habetis, patronos facite; hos in die tanti terroris illius defensores adhibete. . . . Adsunt defensores nostri sancti Martyres; rogari volunt; atque, ut ita dixerim, quaerunt ut quaerantur. Hos ergo adjutores vestrae orationis quaerite; hos protectores vestri reatus invenite" (*In Evang.* ii. *Hom.* 32, § 8).

X. *Could the Dead hear and see the Living?*—During the period which we have traversed, though direct addresses to the departed were frequent, it was nevertheless still a question with many whether they know what is passing on earth, or can exercise direct power for the benefit of their votaries. All might be done by God, even unknown to them, though for their sake.

In the vision of Macarius, A.D. 373, which probably represents opinions widely spread in Egypt, the soul separated from the body is permitted "for two days to go wherever it likes on the earth with the angels who attend it." The soul that loves the body, he adds, spends the two days at the house of death or at the tomb, "but the virtuous soul goes to those places where it was wont to perform its deeds of righteousness." On the third day every soul passes from the earth. Until the 40th it is variously employed, but on that its final place is allotted to it (*de Exitu Animae*, Cave, *Hist. Litt.* v. *Macar. Polit.*). Opinions like these were clearly inconsistent with superstitions already existing and daily gaining strength. St. Augustine, about 421, says: "It must be confessed that the dead are ignorant of what passes here, yet only while it is passing here; but that they hear of it afterwards from those who dying go to them; not everything, indeed, but what they are permitted to tell, who are also permitted to remember those things, and what it is fit for them to hear to whom they tell them. The dead are also able to hear something from angels who are present at things done here; *i.e.* what He to whom all things are subject judges that each ought to hear. . . . The spirits of the dead may also know some things which it is necessary for them to know; *i.e.* those to whom such knowledge is necessary; not only things past and present, but even future, by revelation of the spirit of God" (*De Cura pro Mort.* xv. § 18). Comp. xiii. 16, where he denies in particular that they can see their own tombs or bodies. He concludes that, as the martyrs are thus cut off from us, "per divinam potentiam vivorum rebus intersunt;" but he does not understand "how the martyrs help those who certainly are helped by them—whether they are themselves present at one time in so many places, and those so distant from each other, at their memoriae, or wherever else they are found to be present," or whether they being altogether withdrawn from contact with the living but praying generally for us, God hearing their prayers sends relief by the ministry of angels as He judges fit, and so "commends the merits of His martyrs," and that "chiefly at their memoriae, because He knows that it is good for us, to build up the faith of Christ" (xvi. § 20; comp. *de Civ. Dei*, xxii. 9). In one of his sermons, however (if it be genuine), apostrophising St. Paul and St. Stephen, he speaks more confidently: "Ye both see us there, ye both now hear our discourse. Do ye both pray for us" (*Serm.* 316, § 5). Gregory of Nazianzus shared the doubts expressed by St. Augustine in his more careful writings: "If thou hast any thought about our doings, and this reward is to holy souls that they can take cognisance of these things, receive this one oration instead of many, and in preference to many funeral gifts" (*Orat.* viii. § 23; sim. to Constantius, *Orat.* iv. § 3); but in one passage, he is bolder: "I am persuaded that the souls of the saints perceive what befalls us" (*Epist.* 223, *ad Theclam*). St. Jerome seemed to have had no misgivings. On the other hand, he ascribes a virtual ubiquity to the saints: "Wilt thou cast chains on the apostles, that they be held in ward until the day of judgment, and not be with their Lord, of whom it is written [Rev. xiv. 4], 'They follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth'? If the Lamb is everywhere, they who are with the Lamb are therefore to be believed to be everywhere" (*C. Vigilant.* 6). Vigilantius, to whom this argument is addressed, had denied that the souls of the apostles and martyrs could "de suis tumulis, et ubi voluerint adesse praesentes" (*ibid.*). That they heard immediately and directly was probably the belief of Prudentius, 405. At least it appears to me a just inference that he held this, after making due allowance for the language of poetry:

> "Non sinunt inane ut ullus voce murmur fuderit:
> Audiunt statimque ad aurem Regis aeterni ferunt."
> (*De Coron.* i. 17.)

> "Illa Dei sita sub pedibus
> Prospicit haec, populosque suos,
> Carmine propitiata, fovet." (*Ibid.* iii. 213.)

"Audit, crede, preces martyr prosperrimus omnes,
Ratasque reddit quas videt probabiles."
(*Ibid.* ix. 97.)

To the same effect Severus, his contemporary: "Believe me, he will not fail us. No, he will not fail us. He will be among us as we discourse of him. He will stand by us as we pray. . . . He will protect us, as he did a little while agone, with his constant benediction" (*Epist.* ii. *ad Aurel.* pr. fin.).

XI. *Did the Martyrs themselves appear, and work the alleged miracles?*—An anonymous Greek writer, whose *Quaestiones ad Antiochum* are found among the works of Athanasius, says: "The shades and visions observed in the temples and tombs of the saints are not from the action of the souls of the saints, but from holy angels transfigured into the likeness of the saints. For how, I pray you, can the single soul of the blessed Peter, or Paul, appear at the same moment in a thousand temples sacred to him throughout the world" (*Quaest.* 26, iii. 274)? Similarly Anastasius Sinaita (*Quaest.* 89), who either borrows the words of Pseudo-Athanasius or is copied by him. St. Augustine thinks it possible that sometimes a martyr may himself appear or act, and sometimes an angel, "ut aliquando ista fiant per ipsam praesentiam martyrum, aliquando per angelos suscipientes personam martyrum" (*De Cur. pro Mort.* xvi. § 20).

XII. *The Effect on the Heathen.*—The heathen were not slow to observe and to ridicule the extravagant honours paid to the dead, even before they reached to invocation. In the scornful language of Libanius, about 350, Christians are already *οἱ περὶ τοὺς τάφους* (*Orat. adv.* xxv. *Apolog.* ii. 592). With him churches are tombs, and he expresses a hope that "the tombs will give way to the temples" (*Or. Funebr.* in fin.). The emperor Julian, 363, used the same language, speaking contemptuously of "the old women who frequent the tombs" (*Misop.* p. 344, ed. 1696), and of Christian worship as the worship, "not of one man, instead of many gods, but rather of many wretched men" (*C. Christ.* in Cyr. Al. c. *Julianum*, vi. 201, *ibid.*). Again: "Who could execrate, as they deserve, your later inventions, your adding fresh dead men to that ancient dead man (Christ)? Ye have filled every place with tombs and monuments, although it has been nowhere prescribed among you, that you should frequent the tombs and occupy yourselves with them. . . . If Jesus declared the tombs to be full of uncleanness, how is it that ye call upon God at them" (*Ibid.* x. 335)? It will be observed that he does not charge any with calling on the martyrs themselves. This excess was certainly as yet unknown. A heathen grammarian writing to St. Augustine about 390, after mention of certain martyrs of Madaura, where he lived, Migdon, Sanaë, and "the arch-martyr Namphanio," says, "The fools, if it is worth telling, deserting the temples and neglecting the graves of their ancestors, frequent the tombs of these persons" (*Ep.* 16, inter *Epp.* Aug. § 2). So again in Eunapius, 404 (*Sophist. Vit.* in *Aedesius*, ed. Boissonade, i. 45): "Collecting the bones and heads of persons who have been convicted of many offences, whom the civil judicature punished, they both exhibited them as gods and, grovelling at their tombs. fancied themselves made more than human by defiling themselves at their graves" (see Boiss. note, ii. 158).

Thus early did an unhappy corruption enable the heathen to retort the charge that their religion was the worship of dead men (urged by Minutius Felix, *Octav.* 6; by Arnobius, *adv. Gent.* vi. 4; Lactantius, *Div. Instit.* i. 15; Augustine, *Epist.* xvii. 3, *Serm.* 273, § 3, *de Civ. Dei*, iv. vii. 1; &c.), and that the temples of their gods were only glorious sepulchres (Clemens Alex. *Protrept.* iii. 44, 45; Arnobius, *u. s.*; George the Cappadocian in Ammian, xxii. 11; &c.). Hermes in his writings, observes Augustine (*de Civ. Dei*, viii. xxvi. 1), "hoc videtur dolere quod memoriae martyrum nostrorum templis eorum delubrisque succederent; ut videlicet qui haec legunt animo a nobis averso atque perverso, putent a paganis deos cultos fuisse in templis, a nobis autem coli mortuos in sepulcris."

XIII. For details of practice, see PATRON SAINTS in the DICT. OF CHR. ANTIQ., 1578.—I am not acquainted with any book that treats exclusively or especially of patron saints. Works on the general cultus of the saints are, among others, J. Camerarius, *de Invocatione Sanctorum*, Graece, Lips. 1545; R. Montagu (bp.), *Treatise of Invocation of Saints*, 1624; Will. Forbes (bp.), *Considerationes Modestae de Invoc. Sanct.* Lond. 1658, Helmst. 1704, Frankfort, 1707; Oxf. A. C. L. 1856; G. Morley (bp.), *Epistolae duae de Inv. Sanct.* Lond. 1683; Dean Freeman (Samuel), *Discourse concerning the Invocation of Saints*, in bp. Gibson's *Preservative against Popery*, vi. 4, Lond. 1738; W. Clagett, *Discourse concerning the Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints*, Lond. 1686; reprinted in Gibson, *u. s.*; Caspar Sagittarius, *Dissert. de Natalitiis Martyrum*, Rotterd. 1699; J. E. Tyler, *Primitive Christian Worship*, Lond. 1840, 1847.

On the patronage of angels especially, see Steph. Clotz, *Tractatus de Angelolatria*, Rostoch. 1636; Joh. Prideaux, *The Patronage of Angels*, Oxf. 1636. [W. E. S.]

PATROPHILUS (1) of Scythopolis, one of the original Arian party, who took a leading part in all their principal acts, and proved himself one of the most relentless opponents of Athanasius, by whom he is designated as a *πνευματόμαχος* (*Adv. Serap.* iv. 7, p. 360). (3.) He enjoyed considerable reputation for theological learning, and trained Eusebius of Emesa in the exposition of Scripture (Socr. *H. E.* ii. 9). When Arius, driven from Alexandria, took refuge in Palestine, Patrophilus was one of the Palestinian bishops who espoused his cause most warmly, and wrote in support of his teaching (Athanas. *de Synod.* p. 886) and in A.D. 323 joined with Paulinus of Tyre, and Eusebius of Caesarea, in summoning a local synod, which granted to Arius permission to hold private religious assemblies (Soz. *H. E.* i. 15). At Nicaea he was one of the seventeen episcopal partisans of Arius, and united with them in drawing up a creed which was indignantly rejected by the council (Theod. *H. E.* i. 7). His enmity to Athanasius being embittered by defeat, he became one of his most relentless persecutors. In A.D. 330 he took part in the synod at Antioch, by which Eustathius was deposed

(Theod. *H. E.* i. 21). At the Synod of Tyre in A.D. 335 he was one of the most active in bringing about the condemnation of Athanasius (Labbe, ii. 436; Athanas. *Apolog. c. Arian.* c. 73, 74, 77), and in the same year he attended the abortive synod of the Dedication at Jerusalem (Socr. *H. E.* i. 33; Soz. *H. E.* ii. 26; Theod. *H. E.* i. 31), and passing thence to Constantinople at the empress's command, denounced Athanasius as having threatened the imperial city with starvation by preventing the sailing of the Alexandrian corn ships, and procured his banishment to Treves (Socr. *H. E.* i. 35. Theod. *H. E.* i. 31; Theophan. p. 26; Athanas. *Apol. c. Ar.* c. 87). We find him again in A.D. 341 taking part in the ambiguous council of Antioch, *in Encaeniis* (Soz. *H. E.* iii. 5). He was one of the ordainers of George, the violent heterodox intruder into the see of Alexandria in A.D. 353 (Soz. *H. E.* iv. 8), and he and his leader Acacius kept entirely aloof from Athanasius when Maximus of Jerusalem welcomed him on his return from banishment in A.D. 346, and before long contrived to establish Cyril in Maximus's place as their own nominee (Theophan. p. 34; Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 145). He was one of the few Eastern bishops who attended the council of Milan in 355 (his name appearing erroneously in the lists, as Stratophilus), and he took part in the condemnation and deposition of Eusebius of Vercellae, on whose banishment much against his wish to his episcopal city of Scythopolis, Patrophilus "his jailer," as Eusebius calls him, vented his annoyance by studied insults and ill-treatment (Euseb. Vercell. *Epist.* apud Baronium *Annal.* 356, No. 93). According to Philostorgius (*H. E.* iv. 8–10) Patrophilus poisoned the mind of Constantius against Basil of Ancyra, who had at one time exercised unbounded influence over him, and was the proposer of the specious but mischievous scheme of breaking up the proposed general council into two. When the Eastern division met at Seleucia, Sept. 27, 359, Patrophilus was a leading member of the shifty Acacian party pledged to the Homoeousion. An attack of ophthalmia prevented his attending the first session (Socr. *H. E.* ii. 39). Finding the majority of the synod against them he and his party refused to take part in the later sessions, and at the fourth sitting, Oct. 1, he shared in the sentence of deposition passed on Acacius and his followers. The nominal charge on which Patrophilus was deposed was that of contumacy, in not having appeared to answer an accusation brought against him by the presbyter Dorotheus (Socr. *H. E.* ii. 40; Soz. *H. E.* iv. 23). He immediately returned home, where he was kept informed by Acacius of the course events were taking in the Synod held at Constantinople the next year (Jan. A.D. 360), when Aetius and the Anomoeans were condemned, and several of the leading Semiarians deposed, the Ariminian creed was imposed and Eudoxius enthroned bishop of Constantinople (Socr. *H. E.* ii. 43). He must have died very soon afterwards, for his grave was desecrated during the temporary pagan reaction under Julian in 361, when his remains were scattered and his skull was mockingly used as a lamp (Theoph. p. 40; Niceph. x. 13; *Chron. Pasch.* ed. Ducange, 1688, p. 295) (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. vi. vii.; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 683. [E. V.]

PATROPHILUS (2), bishop of Ægeae, in Cilicia, a friend of Eustathius of Sebaste and of Basil, who after Basil's breach with Eustathius remained a long time without writing to him, and at last sent a letter expressing his surprise that Basil should regard Eustathius as an enemy after having so long been his friend and protector. Basil, in his reply narrates at considerable length the circumstances and occasion of his separation from Eustathius, and requests Patrophilus to inform him whether he desires to remain in communion with him or to join that of his enemies (Basil, *Ep.* 224 [82]; Labbe, vii. 489). After some delay Patrophilus expressed his desire to retain Basil's friendship, and urged him to resume his former relations with Eustathius. Basil, in his reply, gives his reasons for retaining his former attitude towards one who had adopted heretical views, and had engaged in a schismatical course of action. (*Ibid. Ep.* 250 [85]), (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 895). [E. V.]

PATRUINUS, bishop of Merida, succeeded IDACIUS (1) c. 387, and presided at the first council of Toledo held in A.D. 400 against the Priscillianists. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can., de la Igl. Esp.* ii., 174; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (1) 389.) His see is not there mentioned, but Innocent I. mentions his successor Gregorius as bishop of Merida. (*Epp.* 3, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 491.) As the letter was written c. 404, Patruinus must have died soon after the council. (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 161.) [F. D.]

PAULA (1). (Cyp. *Ep.* 42.) A "sarcinatrix" excommunicated at Carthage as an adherent of Felicissimus by Rogatian. The employment is often mentioned in inscriptions, and was one of the offices of the Domus Augusta. See Orelli, Inscrr. 645, (5372), 7275; a fine monument ap. Gruter, p. m.cxvii, 9, "Fausta Saturnia Sarcinatrix ProculeioVernae suo puero ingeniosissimo," and five inscriptions on p. MDCXXX, where two of them have Greek names, and three are libertae; one is of "Julia Jucunda Aug. l. sarcinatrix a mundo muliebri," etc. Archbishop Lavigerie communicates to De Rossi one from Caesarea in Mauritania viz., "Rogata Sarcinatr. Saturno v. l. a. s. (Mommsen, viii. 2, 10938).

What the office was seems scarcely doubtful, if the passages quoted by Forcellini are compared. *Frontin*, p. 2192, *Putsch*, "Sartrix quae sarcit, sarcinatrix quae sarcinas servat;" *Non.* c. i. 276, "Sarcinatrices non, ut quidam volunt, sarcitrices quasi a sarciendo, sed magis a sarcinis *quod plurimum vestium sumant*;" but, as Paulus, *Dig.* l. 47, tit. 2, 83 (82), says, "Sarcinator, qui polienda aut sarcienda vestimenta accipit," etc., it seems that, though the grammarians are anxious about the formation of the words, their account is consistent with the employment being that of a "seamstress" or "mender," their *sarcinae* being packs of clothes. In *Dig.* l. 15 tit. 1, 27 (Gaius), it is coupled with that of "textrix," as an "artificium vulgare." So in Plaut. *Aulul.* iii. 541, the "sarcinatores" are named with the "fullones," and in Lucil. *Ap. Non.* c. 2, n. 818, the sarcinator makes a

patchwork quilt, "centonem suit." What the *machinae* are in Varro, *Ap. Non. l. c.* "Homines rusticos in vindemia incondita cantare, sarcinatrices in machinis," is not so clear. This is of use with other passages [cf. AUGENDUS] only to mark the class in which the faction of Felicissimes prevailed. [E. W. B.]

PAULA (2), a noble and wealthy Roman lady, who accompanied Jerome to Palestine in 385, and lived the rest of her life at Bethlehem, dying in 404. The chief facts relating to her life were given in Jerome's Epitaphium of her addressed to Eustochium (Jerome, *Ep.* 108, *Ed. Vall.*) She was born in 347, and while quite young was married to the senator Toxotius, of the Julian family, who traced their descent from Æneas. Through her mother Blæsilla she was connected with the Scipios, and the Gracchi, through her father Rogatus with a Greek family, who traced their descent from Agamemnon. Her family was also connected with the Æmilian gens, and her name was taken from that of the illustrious Paulus. Jerome records these ancestral glories in her epitaph,

Scipio quam genuit, Pauli fudere parentes,
Gracchorum soboles, Agamemnonis inclyta proles.

She was possessed of great wealth, owning, amongst other properties, the town of Nicopolis or Actium. During her early married life, though always without reproach in her character, she lived in the usual luxury of Roman patricians. She gave birth to four daughters, Blæsilla (*q. v.*), who married, but lost her husband and died early in 384; Paulina, wife of Pammachius (*qq. v.*); Julia, called Eustochium (*q. v.*) and Ruffina, who died early, probably in 386; and one son, called after his father Toxotius. After the birth of a son, she appears to have adopted the practice of continency (Jer. *Ep.* cviii. 4), but to have still lived with her husband, whose death (probably in 380) she deeply lamented. In 382, during the synod held at Rome (following on the council of Constantinople), she entertained in her house the bishops Epiphanius of Salamis and Paulinus of Antioch, and by them her ascetic tendencies, already considerable, were heightened. Through them Jerome, who had come to Rome with them, became intimate with her. She imbibed through him her love for the study of Scripture, and, with her daughter Eustochium, attended his readings at the palace of Marcella. She gave vast sums to the poor, spending not only her own fortune but that of her children in charity. She assumed a coarse dress and a sordid appearance, and undertook all sorts of menial duties in the relief of distress. But her mind was set upon the monastic life, and upon the country of the Eastern hermits. After the death of her daughter Blaesilla in 384, she determined to quit Rome, and, early in 385, disregarding the tears of her son Toxotius, then a child, who was left to the wardship of the praetor, and the entreaties of Ruffina, then a girl of marriageable age, who begged her mother to wait till she was married, she sailed for the east. After visiting Epiphanius in Cyprus, she rejoined Jerome and his friends at Antioch. In his company she passed, braving the winter's journey through Lebanon, on to Palestine [see the account of their journey in the article HIERONYMUS — Section on *Emigration to Palestine*], and to Egypt, from whence returning the whole party settled in Bethlehem in the autumn of 386.

Their life there is related in the article on Jerome, and only personal details need here be given. Her letter to Marcella inviting her to come to Palestine (Jerome, *Ep.* 46) shows the enthusiastic delight with which these Roman ladies, to whom the scriptures were like a newly found treasure, regarded every place and association in the Holy Land. Paula and Eustochium lived at first in a cottage till their convent and Hospice (Diversorium) were built. They then founded a monastery for men, and a convent of three degrees for women, who lived separately, though having the same dress, and met for the services. Paula's capacity of management, her patience and her tact, are warmly praised by Jerome (*Ep.* cviii. c. 19). She is said by Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* 79) to have had the care of Jerome, and to have found it a difficult task. Her scriptural studies, begun in Rome, were carried on earnestly at Bethlehem. She had (through her father's family) a good knowledge of Greek as well as of Latin, and she learnt Hebrew in order to be able to repeat and sing the Psalms in the original (c. 26). She read constantly with Jerome, so that they went through the whole of the Bible together (*Ib.*) In his account of his writings in the catalogue (*De Vir. Ill.* 135) written in 392, Jerome says: "Epistolarum ad Paulam et Eustochium, quia quotidie scribuntur, incertus est numerus." She was remarkably teachable, and imbibed Jerome's instructions so thoroughly that when doubts were suggested to her by Origenistic teachers, she was able at once, with his help, to put them aside. Her incessant charities had consumed her fortune and much of her children's, so that Jerome states that she left Eustochium with a great debt, which she could only trust the mercy of Christ would enable her to pay (c. 15). It is believed that Jerome himself, who had in vain counselled her prudence and moderation (*Ib.*), gave pecuniary help in her later years to one who had been among the wealthiest women in Rome. Her health was weak, and her body slight; her mortifications and frequent illnesses, against many of which Jerome remonstrated, and which gave occasion to some scandals, had worn her away; and it was not to be wondered at that in her 57th year (404) she should have sunk under a severe attack of illness. Jerome describes with the deepest feeling the scene at her death, the personal attention of her daughter to all her wants, the concern of the whole Christian community. The bishops of the surrounding cities were present. John, of Jerusalem, who only four years before, had been at strife with the convents of Bethlehem, was there. Her funeral was a kind of triumph, the whole church being gathered together to carry her to her resting place in the centre of the cave of the Nativity. She is reckoned as a saint by the Roman church, her day, that of her death, being the 26th of January. [W. H. F.]

PAULA (3), granddaughter of foregoing, daughter of Toxotius, and of Laeta, the daughter of Albinus, who was still a heathen and a priest.

Laeta embraced Christianity, and wrote to consult Jerome as to the education of her child. This advice is given in his letter to Laeta (*Ep.* 107), written in the year 401. He desires that she should lead the ascetic life, and prepare to consecrate herself to Christ in virginity; and he begs that, if it is found impossible to carry out the system of instruction in scriptural knowledge, which he prescribed, at Rome, she might be sent to Bethlehem. We find that Paula had thoughts of returning to Rome to instruct or to bring back her granddaughter, and it is probable that the younger Paula was sent, while still a child, to Bethlehem, though not till after the death of her grandmother. Several of Jerome's commentaries are dedicated to her with her aunt Eustochium, and she is mentioned by both Jerome and Augustine in their correspondence in the year 416. (Jerome, *Ep.* 134 to Aug. 143, to Augustine.) [W. H. F.]

PAULIANISTS (Pauliani, Aug. *Haer.* xliv. Samosateniani, Fabric.; alias Samosatitae, Suicer. *Thes.* s. v.; Παυλιανισταί, alias Παυλιανοί, Suidas s. v. Μάνης), the followers of Paul of Samosata. We first notice them as an organized sect in one of Constantine's earliest laws against the Marcionites, Montanists, and other heretics, Eus. *Vit. Const.* iii. 63-66. We next find mention of their clergy, deaconesses, &c., in the 19th Canon of Nice, where their baptisms and ordinations were all rejected and ordered to be repeated. Athanasius (*Or. c. Ar.* sec. 48) mentions them as using the formula of baptism in a deceitful sense. In later times they were often confounded with the Paulicians and Manicheans. Georg. Cedrenus in fact (*Compend.* i. 756-57) tells us the reason; the Paulianists were merely Manicheans who adopted Paul's name because he was the son of a Manichean woman named Callinice. They were still in existence in the seventh century, as Sergius the Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople sought the assistance of a Paulianist theologian, one George, in his struggle with orthodoxy (Ceill. xii. 922). [G. T. S.]

PAULICIANI, an ancient sect of the Eastern church.[a] It originated in the 7th century on the south-western borders of Armenia, in the countries sometimes assigned to Syria and sometimes to Asia Minor. It spread its ramifications with varying fortunes through all the provinces of Asia Minor, and held its ground with more or less success during at least the three centuries from Constantine IV. to John Zimisces, 668–976. More has been preserved in detail of the history of the Paulicians than is usually the case with the ancient sects. We owe this mainly to their later military exploits, when they for a while challenged the whole force of the empire. The Paulicians are noticed at greater or less length by almost all the historians of the Romans of the East, and referred to in the ecclesiastical documents. The rise and development of the Paulician sect are one of the rare oases in the Great Sahara of the Byzantine ecclesiastical annals. The two original authorities to whom we have recourse for the most complete information are Petrus Siculus (*Historia Manichaeorum*, with three discourses in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* vol. civ.) and Photius (*Contra Manichaeos*, Books I.–IV. in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* vol. cii.). Petrus Siculus in 870, under the reign of Basil Macedo, was sent ambassador to the Paulicians in their stronghold of Tephrice (Divriki) to treat for an exchange of prisoners. He lived there nine months. He collected his account of the Paulicians, he tells us, during this residence at the capital of the insurgent sect. His treatise is addressed to an unnamed "archbishop of the Bulgarians." Photius states that he derived his information from confessions of Paulician converts, who applied to him for baptism. Probably Photius embodies materials collected when he was ambassador from the Byzantine Emperor to the caliph, before his patriarchate (Dedicatory letter to Tarasius prefixed to the "*Bibliotheca*," Migne, *Patr. Gr.* vol. ciii.). The Paulicians were making incursions into the Roman provinces; they were infesting the frontiers of both empires; negotiations on the subject would be certain to come into diplomatic discussion. The travels of Photius through Asia Minor from Constantinople to Bagdad gave rich opportunity for observation and enquiry. After his deposition from the patriarchate, the last years of his life were spent by Photius in Armenia at a monastery in the Paulician neighbourhood, where he died 891. Later Byzantine histories mainly repeat the same details, occasionally supplying fresh material; viz., Theophanes, *Chronographia;* Theophanis Contin. iv.; George Hamartolus, § 238; Josephus Genesius, 120–125; Constantin. Porphyrog. *Vita Basil.*; Georgius Monachus (Script. *post* Theoph.); Georgius Cedrenus, i. and ii.; Joannes Zonaras, xv. xvi. xvii.; Anna Comnena, *Alexiad.* xiv.; Michael Glycas, *Annal.*; Joannes Scylitzes, *Hist.*; Nicetas Choniates; Euthymius Zigabenus.

1. Paulicianism has attracted attention as one important stage in the descent of the Manichaean tradition. The Paulicians did not adopt fully from the older Manichaeism its wild, half-poetic, half-rationalistic theory of Christianity, with its cumbrous and fantastic mystic machinery. They were probably, at least most of the sect, not altogether Manichaean. They adhered only to the broader principles of Orientalism. Yet they embraced opinions sufficiently resembling Manichaean tenets to justify their being included under the name, like other branches of the ancient Gnostic sects, so extremely numerous and diversified, who were finally lost in the common term of opprobrium. Though the application of the name has been keenly contested, it is clear that all the original authorities call the Paulicians "Manichaeans" in origin and doctrine. They were the Albigenses of the East.

2. An interest attaches to the Paulician sect from the place it occupies in ecclesiastical his-

[a] See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vols. v. vi.; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* vol. ii.; Gibbon, ch. 54; Milner, cent. ix.; Milman, *Lat. Chr.* vol. iv.; J. C. Robertson, *Ch. Hist.* vols. iii. iv. v.; Hallam, *Middle Ages*, vol. ii. 439; Finlay, *Greek Hist.* vols. ii. iii.; Bossuet, *Hist. des Var.* lxi. 13; Schmidt, *Hist. des Cathares, &c.*, 2 vols.; Page's Baronius; Schröckh's *Christ. Kirch.* xx.; Gfrörer, *Kirchen Gesch.* ii.; Döllinger's and Gieseler's *Lehrbuch*; Guericke's *Handbuch*; Engelhardt's *Handbuch*; Matter, *Hist. Univ. de l'Egl. Chrét.*; Henke, *Gesch. der Christl. Kirche*; Beausobre, *Hist. Man.* ii. 762, 777; Trench, *Lect. Eccl. Hist.*

t ry as an early "Protestant" element. The Paulicians persistently rejected the vast fabric of traditionary belief, which in the Greek and Latin church had grown up around the Gospel. With all disadvantages they were in truth a stronger reactionary party in favour of first principles than the Iconoclasts, their contemporaries. Iconoclasm was essentially negative and merely destructive, as its name expresses. The Paulicians. as their name implies, combined, with their partial Gnosticism or Manichaeism, a powerful and enduring element of good in their peculiar reverence for the writings of St. Paul. Consequently they represented and upheld, amidst their many errors, a powerful and enduring Protestant principle. Amidst their singular fusion and confusion of St. Paul's high moral antagonism of sin and grace in the soul of man, with the eternal war of the impersonated and deified powers of good and evil throughout the worlds, and other such admixtures of Oriental thought, they were a steady protest in favour of the right of the laity to the possession and use of the Holy Scriptures. They were, in this respect, under the Byzantine despotism, what the Donatists, Lollards, Waldenses, and Puritans have been in other times and places.

3. The severe persecutions which the Paulicians endured constitute a marked epoch in the tragic history of intolerance. The wars carried on by the Byzantine emperors against them are the first great example of an orthodox crusade against heretics. They are the earliest and not the least sad chapter of a dark and cruel history, the record of the series of internecine struggles between a dominant ecclesiastical system and as it were the outer barbarians assailing its ancient theological empire. In the East the traces of ill consequent on the barbarities of the Paulician persecutions and rebellions have been direly marked and permanent. The attendant distraction, depopulation, and disaffection of Asia Minor, especially between the Halys and the Euphrates, directly prepared the way for the Mohammedan invasion. As in the West, the kingdoms that repelled the Reformation and trampled out its various germinant seeds, paid the penalty in political as well as religious declension, so the cold orthodoxy and dead formalism of the Byzantine church and empire was "the curse of helplessness" that followed upon its intolerance and merciless use of authority in its dealings with enquiry and heresy. The Mohammedan conquest was its merited Nemesis.

4. The historical connexion between the Paulicians and the mediaeval sects of Western Europe has been often mooted. The Paulicians in the East, with their heroic faith and desperate bravery in the 9th century appear to be something more than the prototypes of the Hussites in Bohemia, and the Camisards in the Cevennes, and the Vaudois in the Alps, under the Ziskas, and Rolands, and Arnauds of later days. The subject is, from its nature, necessarily obscure, but the amount of truth and fact in such a connexion between Eastern and Western Anti-Sacerdotalists is an interesting problem of history. The ranks of the Byzantine armies, in which many Paulicians were enrolled, whose battalions were stationed in so many various districts, added to the opportunities and gave fresh facilities for proselytism, far beyond the original seats of the sect.[b] The chain of imperial Paulician colonies in Thrace, Macedonia, and Epirus, planted the heresy in Europe. Thence, by the routes of pilgrimage, or by the channels of commerce, the mystical speculations, allegorical methods, and free spirit of the Paulicians made their way over the Balkans into Bulgaria; and along the Danube, through Hungary and Bavaria, into Germany; by Lombardy, into Switzerland and France; by the Mediterranean, to Venice, and Italy, and Sicily. The sect of the Paulicians may thus claim a distinct relation to the wide history of the progress of religious thought in Western Europe.

5. Regarded thus from various points of view, the history of this ancient sect has excited an unusually vivid interest. It has more than once formed a subject of controversy. Party interests led Romanist writers to profess to discover in the Paulicians the forefathers of the Protestant Reformers. It was but a few steps further to detect, and expose, and condemn in these their descendants, the virus of the old Manichaean errors, however latent they might be, and diluted in the transmission. Party enthusiasm similarly led Protestants to take up the gauntlet, accept the ancestry, and vindicate the orthodoxy of the sect. If the partisans of the Paulicians are to be believed, in defiance, however, of the facts of the original evidence, these ancient sectaries were simply strict Evangelical Christians, who, recoiling from the simony, corruption, and superstition of the church of the East, reverenced the teaching and person of St. Paul, called themselves by his name, and proposed him as their sole spiritual guide and legislator. The celebrated mystic, Godfrey Arnold, thus vindicated Paulician orthodoxy long ago. This *réhabilitation* of the Paulicians has been in vogue in England, with similar paradoxical statements, amongst some modern writers.[c]

We now proceed to the general history of the sect.

I. The search for the true origin of Paulicianism lands us in the second half of the 7th century.[d] Its birth and infancy may be traced to the neighbourhood of Samosata, not far above the cataracts of the Euphrates mentioned by Pliny, and about a day's journey north from Edessa, the

---

[b] For the theory of the derivation of the name of "Tsiganes" from the Paulician sect of the Athingani and the support of the argument by a variety of quotations from a catena of writers, see Dr. Franz Miklosich's *Ueber die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner in Europa* (part vi. § 3, *Zusammenhang der Zigeuner mit den Athingani*), Vienna, 1876. Also Bataillard's *L'Origine des Tsiganes* (Paris, 1877), p. 33–40, cf. Le Beau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, xii. 442. For English aspects of such lore, see *In Gipsy Tents*, by F. H. Groome (Edinburgh, 1880), p. 281–283.

[c] Godfrey Arnold's *Kirchen und Ketser Historia*, 1688; Milner, *Ch. Hist.* ixth cent.; Vaughan, *Life of Wycliffe*, i. 110–122; Turner, *Hist. of England during Middle Ages*, v. 123–126; Blair, *Hist. of Waldenses*, Edinburgh, 1833; G. S. Faber, *Sacred Calendar of Prophecy;* Elliott, *Horae Apoc.* vol. ii. See the subject well canvassed between Faber and Dowling, in a series of letters, *British Magazine*, vols. xiv.–xv. Also in Dr. Maitland's *Albigenses and Waldenses*, § 3 p. 61–81, &c.

[d] For story of John and Paul, sons of Callinice, see Art. CONSTANTINE—SILVANUS, Vol. I. p. 660. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v.

ancient Ur of the Chaldees, the birthplace of Abraham. There in the village of Mananalis, among the southern spurs of the chain of Taurus, within sight of the snows of their central heights, lived, in the reigns of the Byzantine emperors Constans II. and Constantine IV., the patriarch of the Paulician creed and system, Constantine Silvanus. We ask in vain about Constantine's race, language, condition, or kindred. There is no record of his origin or antecedents. He comes before us, in his secluded mountain home, bearing the courtly name of Constantine, an Armenian or Syrian provincial living under the tolerating government of the Arabs. It is conjectured that he was brought up as a Gnostic; probably, as Neander and Gibbon suggest, he may have belonged to a Marcionite sect, and may also have been in contact with Manichaean books or teachers. An interesting story is told of his earliest possession of the New Testament. A deacon, returning home from Syria from captivity among the Saracens, in return for Constantine's hospitality, gave him as a token of gratitude two volumes, one containing the Gospels, the other the Epistles of St. Paul. This gift was the turning-point in the development of the Paulician doctrine. The precious manuscripts were eagerly studied, especially the Pauline Epistles. The fervent and original mind of Constantine, already preoccupied by the Oriental Dualism, discovered in the high moral antagonism of sin and grace in St. Paul, a *point d'appui* for a new phase of religious speculation. He devoted himself entirely to the study of the Christian Scriptures, rejecting all other writings. By allegorical interpretation and mystical adaptation, he interwove and harmonised the Oriental Theosophy with the Christian text, still especially attaching himself to the writings of St. Paul, and referring to these as the only source of his knowledge. His life of active missionary labour dates from about the year 657, and continued for twenty-seven years. From the neighbourhood of Samosata, Constantine removed a long distance northwards. We are not told at what call, at what age, or with what views, or with what resources or companions, this new patriarch forsook his kindred and his father's house, and went in search of a land of promise. Ascending the Euphrates, crossing with it the mighty barrier of the range of Mount Taurus, he ventured himself and his new scheme of faith among the races and regions of Asia Minor, then as much more nearly allied to the West as they are at present more nearly akin to the East. He settled at Cibossa, a fortified town, near Colonea, between Pontus and Armenia Minor, above Neo Caesarea, in the country through which the Lycus flows. His exchange of the tolerant rule of the Arabs for the dominions of the orthodox Byzantine emperors led to important results in the history of persecution. The new sect spread rapidly round Cibossa. Constantine's missionary zeal and activity drew upon himself about A.D. 684 the attention of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. By this time the peculiar sobriquet of "Paulicians" had sprung into existence. Constantine also had assumed the scriptural name of "Silvanus," to denote himself as an apostolic reformer and direct follower of the doctrine of St. Paul. The chief centres of the sect were named on the same plan among themselves after the principal churches which St. Paul founded, or to which he addressed his Epistles. This idea, adopted in the first religious enthusiasm and infancy of their organisation, was extended afterwards in singular detail.* It may have proved a useful shelter and some aid to privacy of intercommunication amidst the persecutions. About A.D. 684 the emperor Constantine Pogonatus sent Simeon, an officer of his household, into the districts of Pontus or Armenia, where the Paulician sect was spreading, with orders to have the ringleaders stoned and their adherents brought over to the orthodox church. With the aid of Tryphon, a local chieftain, he took captive Constantine-Silvanus and many followers at Cibossa. There, on the south side of the town, at Simeon's command, Constantine was placed before a line of his disciples to be stoned to death by them as the price of their safety. Most of them refused pardon on these conditions, and adhered to their faith. At length a treacherous disciple, Justus, whom Constantine had adopted as his son, was found willing to comply. Constantine was slain, and a great heap of stones was raised on the spot. The memory of his death was still preserved, two centuries afterwards, by the name Soros or heap (Σωρός) given to the place where it occurred. There, as the Catholics began to boast, Justus, like a new David, had overthrown the Goliath of heresy (Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* 25). Simeon, using his legal and military powers, continued to assist the bishops in their efforts to reclaim the sectaries. Their Christian fortitude and sincerity produced a profound impression on him. When he returned to the imperial court at Constantinople, he was at heart a convert to the Paulician opinions. After a stay there of three years, he could no longer conceal or deny his convictions. He secretly repaired to Cibossa in A.D. 687. There Constantine's remaining followers were still to be found. Simeon, who now took the apostolic name of "Titus" in the Paulician fashion, was placed at the head of the sect. Ere long the Paulician apostate, Justus, who had been the first to take part in the stoning of Constantine-Silvanus, accused Simeon before the bishop of Colonea. The result was an investigation by order of the emperor Justinian II. in A.D. 690. Simeon-Titus, with many other Paulicians, suffered at the stake near the Soros, the scene of Constantine's martyrdom. (Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 25–27; Photius, *c. Man.* i. 17–18; Neander, v. 342; Gibbon, ch. 54.)

II. The 8th century was a disturbed and critical time internally to the Paulicians. Their history is a tangle of controversies. The Iconoclast period promised to be a favourable era for them externally, and partly realised the promise. But the sect was, as it were, come of age. In its juvenescence, corresponding traits of self-

* As the names of St. Paul's disciples, Silvanus, Titus, Timothy, Epaphroditus, Tychicus, were applied to Constantine and his successors, so the apostolic churches were represented by the Paulician communities—Achaia (Mananalis), Macedonians (Cibossa), Philippians (Antioch in Pisidia), Laodiceans (Argaeum), Ephesian (Mopsuestia), Colossians (Cynochoritae) (Photius, *c. Man.* 5).

confidence, self-will, and impetuous waywardness are betrayed. Dissensions arose. Rival claimants to leadership sprang up asserting opposite principles. Rival communities or congregations of followers rallied round them. Early in this century a new leader became conspicuous, named Paul the Armenian. He had escaped from the persecution under Justinian II., and taken refuge at Episparis, in the great plain of Phanarea. There, in the lands watered by the united streams of the Lycus, Scylax, and Iris, near Amasus, the old capital of the kings of Pontus, and birthplace of Mithridates and Strabo, amidst the valleys full of fruit-trees and beech-woods, a transplanted offshoot of the Paulicians rooted itself. The name of Paulicians was traced by many to this Paul the Armenian, an association which serves rather to shew that the so early general acceptance of the title may be dated from the public attention bestowed on the heresy in the earlier persecutions a generation before. Paul the Armenian left two sons, Gegnoesius and Theodore. The sect now divided into two parties, headed by the two brothers. At his father's death, Gegnoesius, the elder, who took the apostolic name of Timothy, was appointed by him his successor. Theodore, the younger brother, headed an opposing party. The differences of opinion between these led to a lasting schism. The schism, to use Neander's comparison, grew out of the antagonism betwixt a Catholic and a Protestant principle. Gegnoesius, as appointed by his father, and believing in the transmission of spiritual gifts and grace, laid claim to be the principal leader, on the Catholic theory that these were connected with regularity of succession. Theodore, holding that such traditional mediation was not essential, with Protestant courage, traced all grace upward directly to the one heavenly source in every case, and claimed to have received his vocation and spiritual life immediately from the same Divine origin with their father. (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 341; Phot. i. 18; Pet. Sic. 28.) The activity of the controversialists drew on the sect at Episparis for the second time the attention of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. New complaints were laid against the Paulicians at the capital. About A.D. 722, Gegnoesius was summoned to Constantinople and there interrogated by the emperor Leo the Isaurian. A characteristic account is preserved both by Photius and Petrus Siculus of the trial before the patriarch. Gegnoesius had fallen on fortunate times. Those were the days of the first fervour of the Iconoclasts. In the examination before the aged Germanus, the allegorical and mystical explanations of the Paulician, usually so easy of detection, were pronounced harmless. His escape from the tests and toils of orthodoxy was not made difficult. He was finally dismissed with letters of protection under the emperor's seal. Leo III., the rugged mountaineer, the second founder of the Byzantine empire, who had found Constantinople besieged by the Saracens, had defeated them by sea and land, and driven them beyond Mount Taurus, was now seated firmly on the orthodox throne. Born at Germanicia, his own Syrian or Armenian extraction would lead him to some sympathy with the primitive Eastern simplicity of the rural sectaries from among their mountain pasturages. The Paulician abhorrence of image-worshippers and of the orthodox formalism was not greater than the emperor's. Leo's iconoclastic enthusiasm, with the stern wisdom and purity of his character and administration, made him willing to reserve his severities for more widespread evils nearer home, that had brought down the empire to the verge of dissolution. He was not, like some of his successors, compelled through the ignorant superstition of the populace and the bigotry of the monks to be the tyrant of heretics in order to escape being thwarted on all sides as the accomplice of heresy. We hear no more of the dispute between Gegnoesius and Theodore. Perhaps owing to this, or more probably in fear about the imperial favour and mistrust of the ecclesiastical power, Gegnoesius, with many followers, migrated from Episparis back to Mananalis, the original seat of the sect, on the extreme eastern limits of the empire. There he lived till A.D. 745, when he died, after having completed his thirty years of ministry. His death took place during a season of great mortality in those districts. Gegnoesius with unwearied activity had laboured for the spread of the Paulician sect and doctrines from A.D. 715 to A.D. 745, previously at Episparis northward in Phanarea of Pontus, and latterly around Samosata and the region to the westward of the Upper Euphrates.

After the death of Gegnoesius-Timothy, the sect was again rent by divisions. He had appointed as his successor his own son Zacharias. Another leader, Joseph the Bastard, who took the Pauline title of Epaphroditus, headed a party against him. Each arrogating to himself the Divine Spirit's call, and deriding the claims of the other, various scenes of violence followed. After a personal collision between them, in which Joseph narrowly escaped with his life from the stones of his assailants, they agreed to a mutual separation. Danger then threatened from the Saracens, who were engaged at that time in constant hostilities with the empire; their troops were hovering round, and their vigilance was aroused by the movement from Mananalis of the two bodies of Paulicians with their flocks and herds. On their hostile approach, Zacharias in alarm fled away alone from his followers, secured his own safety at their expense, and in reward for his cowardice was afterwards known as "The Hireling." His company were slain or dispersed. Joseph, with more tact, conciliated the Saracens, averted their attack by friendly overtures, and was allowed to go on his way. For a while he temporised, professing to be seeking only a change of pasturage. At length, taking advantage of a favourable opportunity, he recrossed the imperial frontier and successfully carried out his design of removing with all his friends and disciples to Episparis. Thus began a second impulse to the sect from Mananalis, which led to its being spread in new countries of Asia Minor.

Joseph-Epaphroditus was warmly received at Episparis. Probably, as the opponent of the son of Gegnoesius, he was welcomed by the partisans of Theodore, who still kept up the remembrance of the earlier schism. His arrival with his Paulicians was the signal for an outburst of enthusiasm. The strangers were met in procession with torches and lanterns, and the event was

celebrated with public festivities. All appeared to go well, till a local chieftain named Cricoraches was induced by the orthodox party of the neighbourhood to attack the heretical community at their worship and expel the newcomers. Joseph and his party turned their faces southward, traversed Phrygia, and at length found a resting-place in Antioch of Pisidia. There, like Gegnoesius at Mananalis, he completed his thirty years of successful ministry, and died about 775 in a suburban hamlet of the town known by the name of Chortocopium.

Not long before, occurred the earliest known point of contact between the Paulicians and Europe. It was in the eleventh year of the reign of Constantine V., the second of the Iconoclast emperors. The constant threatenings of the Bulgarians from their settlements about the Danube, and the no less frequent incursions of bands of Saracens across the Euphrates, called and recalled this fiery and active "Cœur de Lion" repeatedly to the head of his armies and the defence of his frontiers. At this time the empire of the caliphs was distracted by the civil wars between the Ommiades and Abbassides. It was a few years only before the founding of Bagdad. Constantine reconquered Melitene and replanted the Christian standards on the banks of the Euphrates, but finding it impossible to retain secure possession of the country, removed large portions of the Christian population into the West. There he settled them in colonies as a barrier against the Bulgarians and Sclavonians. Among these many Paulicians in 752 were transplanted from Asia Minor to Constantinople and Thrace (Cedrenus, *Syn. Hist.* Theoph. 345, 360). The Asiatic colonists long continued to flourish and multiply, still distinguished by their religious opinions among the surrounding population. They made also many proselytes. Their doctrines, stigmatised as heretical by the dominant church, were recommended, as often amongst later mediaeval sects, by commercial skill, industry, and probity. They are said thus to have spread some of their Oriental opinions from thence into Western Europe.

In the earlier homes of the sect, in Asia Minor, the later years of the eighth century were a time of depression. Bad leaders rose up. The sect became subject to injurious influences. Inward divisions multiplied. The whole name and party were brought into bad repute. During this period a certain Baanes arose, whom his enemies record with disdain to have been sprung from a Paulician mother and a Jewish father. He was born during the life of Joseph-Epaphroditus. Some while after Joseph's death, Baanes acquired great local influence, and originated the name of "Baanites" to a part of the Paulician community. The names, Baanes, Baanites, occur conspicuously in the old Greek orthodox forms of Manichaean abjuration, used at the reception of heretical converts into the Eastern church. The name of Baanes is usually associated with the epithet "The Filthy" (ὁ ῥυπαρός). This the Byzantine writers interpret as well merited by the immoral tendencies of the teacher, and made deservedly more notorious by the loose principles and practice of his disciples (βaaνῖται), who perpetuated his name and teaching. Later authors have suggested that this may have originated in the coarsely ascetic and severely cynical mode of life which Baanes adopted and encouraged. (Jacob Tollius, *Insig. Itur. Ital.* p. 105–177; Phot. *c. Man.* i. 21; Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* 31; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii.; Cotellier, *Patres Apost.* i. 545; Neander, v. 346.)

III. At the opening of the ninth century, with the life of Sergius, Paulicianism reached its climacteric. After this period of vigorous maturity, with the middle years of the century followed years of persecution, rebellion, and dispersion. Sergius was a native of Ania, or Annia, a village near the old Galatian town of Tavia. His father's name was Dryinus. Probably his parents belonged to the orthodox church, though the account of Photius (i. 21) would suggest that Sergius sprang from a family connected with the sect. He seems to have been carefully nurtured, to have received a good education, and to have led an unblemished life. His bitterest enemies can only reproach him with hypocrisy, as if he wore the virtues of a pure and benevolent life as a cloak for the defects of his faith. Amidst all the dearth of originality of Byzantine chronicles, Sergius is a lifelike portrait. His vivid individuality, even through the bitterness, taunts, and calumnies of hostile criticism, makes itself felt and understood. There were associated in him, with a practical piety and gentle tenderness of spirit, a Greek subtlety and eloquence, a luxuriance of imagination worthy of Persian or Indian poetry, a Roman strength of conviction, will, and purpose. His ministry was persuasive and affectionate, capable of attracting and instilling the deepest personal attachment and devotion. The account of the early instruction of Sergius in the Paulician doctrine is interesting as an illustration of Sergius's character and as an example of the way in which Paulicianism frequently made its conquests. While still a young man, he was attracted and won over to the Paulicians through the impression produced on him by conversation with a woman belonging to the sect. At her advice he diligently studied the Gospels and the writings of St. Paul. His teacher meantime strenuously prejudiced his mind against the orthodox church and clergy, drawing especial attention to their withdrawal of the Scriptures from the people. At the same time she warmly prepossessed his mind in favour of the speculative and mystical theories of the Gnostic dualism. Apprehending Christianity under these forms, Sergius started about the year 800 on his 34 years' career as an apostolic reformer. He adopted the name Tychicus, in the Paulician style, to designate his adhesion to the principles and doctrines of St. Paul. The reign of Nicephorus, 802–811, an orthodox but tolerant emperor, was favourable to his designs. Nicephorus, himself a native of Seleucia in Pisidia, greatly to the dissatisfaction of the church party, refused to persecute the growing Paulician community. He allowed them with the Athingans to exercise their religion in peace, promising them the rights and security of citizens, so long as they violated no laws of the empire (Theoph. *Chron.* 413; Finlay, *Gr. Hist.* ii. 115). During his missionary labours, Sergius penetrated almost every portion of the central plateaus of Asia Minor. He could boast in one of his epistles to a Paulician community, "I have run from East to West, and from North to South, till my knees were weary, preaching the Gospel of Christ"

(Phot. i. 22; Pet. Sic. 36). Thus traversing Asia Minor, he successfully promoted the spread of his reformed Paulicianism. Amidst the license of the Baanites, his irreproachable life and strict moral teaching won even the praise of opponents. Many monks, nuns, priests, and others from among the various lower ecclesiastical grades, were converted to his simple and practical, though alloyed, Christianity. Proclaiming to all ranks the hitherto almost unknown words of the Evangelists and Apostles, in wide districts where the rigid formal orthodoxy and tawdry picture-worship of the dominant church, and the too frequent ignorance, corruption, and simony of the clergy had alienated the laity, the fervid preaching of the gentle conciliatory Sergius, full of confidence and consciousness of his mission, overcame all hearts. In imitation of the great Apostle, Sergius maintained himself during his ministry by his own hands, working as a carpenter. His disciples rapidly outnumbered the Baanites. The controversy between these and Sergius and his followers was necessarily an irreconcilable one. Clouds began to gather overhead on the accession of Michael I., 812–813. This emperor was a man of mild and weak character, but what he wanted of religious zeal might have been supplied by the influence of Nicephorus, then patriarch of Constantinople. Happily these counsels were moderated by the more merciful influence of Theodore, the famous abbat of the Studion. Nicephorus sought to persuade Michael to persecute both Paulicians and Iconoclasts. A proposition was even made in an assembly of the senate to put all Paulician and Athingan leaders to death, in order to intimidate their followers and persuade them to become orthodox Christians (Theoph. *Chron.* p. 419). However, this method of conversion having excited a strong opposition, the patriarch and his clergy had to content themselves with securing the enactment of some severe laws, which might be turned to account as occasion served. The sect continued to spread. But the outlook became once more gloomy, when Leo V., the Armenian, began his reign, 813–820. In his ecclesiastical counsels, Leo, though an Iconoclast, was inclined to prudence and moderation. However, resolute as he was, through the almost universal intolerance round him, he was forced to choose his side. First, the Iconoclast council of Constantinople, 815, reversed the council of Nicaea, 787, and renewed the decrees for the abolition of images, as in the days of Leo III. in 754. Further, to satisfy the church party, he consented to be the tyrant of heresy in preference to being vituperated as its accomplice. Thus the tempest broke. A new Paulician persecution was inaugurated. A commission was issued in the name of Leo V., with full powers of investigation and process. Thomas (bishop of Neocaesarea in Cappadocia) and the abbat Paracondaces were entrusted with the inquisitorial mission. They were bidden to make strict search after all Paulicians. The repentant were to be handed over to the bishops for instruction and restoration to the church. Those who persisted were to be put to the sword. The cruelty with which they executed their mission drove the suffering sectaries to retaliation and vengeance. The people of Cynoschora in Armenia, where some of Sergius's chief disciples, called Astati, were settled, rose up against the persecutors (Phot. c. *Man.* i. 24; Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* 41; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 366). The Astati cut off the abbat Paracondaces by treachery, while the populace of the place, headed by one of the Sergiote fanatics, attacked and slew the bishop Thomas. After these wild scenes, reminding of the murder of the Abbé du Chaila by the Camisards or of Archbishop Sharpe at St. Andrews, the storm was allayed, the persecution was dropped, and a period of tranquillity followed. As many of the Paulicians as could fled to Melitene and escaped beyond the empire into Saracen territory. Monocherares, a Saracen emir, received the fugitives, promised them safety, and assigned them a place called Argaeum[f] for their settlement. Numerous other fugitives were soon attracted thither through the protection and favour thus granted. Under Michael II., 820–829, a Phrygian by birth and native of Amorium, there was some degree of religious toleration. This continued into the reign of his son, Theophilus, 829–842. The scattered congregations of Paulicians were left undisturbed. The sect was well known and widespread amongst the cities and villages of Asia Minor, and the influence of Sergius and his disciples was unbounded over the communities. He could appeal, as the credentials of his apostleship, not only to his own indefatigable activity, but to the general response this met with and the wide demand for his presence and efforts—"I have run from East to West and from North to South, till my knees were weary, preaching the Gospel of Christ." To this time of elation belongs the language of self-exaltation with which his enemies charge him, and which it is not easy to comprehend or explain.[g] These expressions, which may in his case have been little more than Oriental hyperbole, appeared to his opponents to approach nearly to self-deification. Sergius undoubtedly spoke of himself, with reference to his doctrine, in the highest possible strain of confidence and commendation. e. g. "I am the porter and the good shepherd and the leader of the body of Christ, and the light of the house of God. I too am with you always even unto the end of the world" (Phot. i. 21; Pet. Sic. i. 37). But we have to set beside these counter phraseology, as where he represents St. Paul as the great teacher by whom alone Christianity was displayed in its plenitude of light and truth; and where he places himself contrasted with the Apostle only on a par with a Tychicus, the messenger and disciple, sent forth as the ambassador and herald of the doctrine of his master. It has been suggested that he may have used the term "Paraclete" in a secondary sense with self-application. But we may dismiss at once as "not proven" such additional charges as where his adversaries attribute to the sectaries the use of a prayer to Sergius as the Holy Ghost (Ph. i. 114). Sergius, at one time escaping from

[f] Probably Arcas (so Neander and Gieseler), now Arka, a village on a high mound on the verge of the great plain of Malatiyah (Melitene). See Ainsworth, *Researches in Asia Minor*, i. 251. Strabo, xii. 2, calls it, "ἔρυμα ὑψηλὸν πρὸς τῷ Ταύρῳ." "The recesses of Mount Argaeus" (Gibbon) were too far west for the Saracens.

[g] Compare the visionary fancies of Servetus about himself and the archangel Michael, which partly led to his condemnation to the stake, by the Romanists at Vienne, by the Protestants at Geneva, in 1553.

persecutions, at another bent on carrying out his mission, visited at intervals the fugitive colonies at Melitene, Argaeum, Amara, and elsewhere, and spent some time amongst them. With his usual moderation and goodness of heart, he dissuaded his co-religionists from retaliatory measures against their Roman neighbours, but with little success. The Paulicians from the Saracen frontier too often acted as the vanguard of the Saracen power. They continually made fresh inroads into the nearer Byzantine provinces, dragging away captives for proselytism or slavery. At length the opportunity of a victim offered itself. In 835, in the reign of Theophilus, while Sergius was felling wood for his carpenter's work in one of the mountain forests near Argaeum, he was assailed alone and off his guard and murdered with his own axe by an orthodox church zealot, Tzanio of Nicopolis. When the strong influence of Sergius in favour of conciliation was withdrawn, the work of disintegration soon began again. The oppositions of opinion and practice between the Baanites and Sergiotes became more clearly marked. Violent strife ensued between the different parties. This lasted some time with some bloodshed, till the factions were in part overawed by the local military authorities, who declared on the Sergiote side, and in part reconciled by the mediation of Theodotus the Sergiote. The writings of Sergius, which long perpetuated his name and authority as a Paulician reformer, are now only known by five or six sentences quoted by Photius and Petrus Siculus. He had sent "Epistles" from time to time during his life to the principal Paulician centres, in the Paulician fashion, addressing them by their titles derived from the writings of St. Paul in the New Testament, the Ephesians, Colossians, and others. These *Epistles of Sergius*, which have perished like most of such literature, were accepted as authoritative writings by the sect. They were widely multiplied and circulated. As long as Paulicianism lasted as a sect, they were quoted for faithful expositions of its doctrine both by friend and foe.

IV. We now pass into the last stage of the history, the final period of Paulician persecution, rebellion, and dispersion. After the death of Theophilus, during the regency of his empress Theodora, 842–857, Leo, son of Argyrus, Andronicus, son of Ducas, and Sudalis, with some others, were sent into the Paulician districts on the errand of reclaiming or extirpating the heretics. Theodora's relentless enthusiasm for orthodoxy thus opened a new page in church history. A cruel religious war began of Christians upon Christians, parallel only in former time to the persecutions of the church by the pagan emperors—an *auto de fé* of many days, prophetic of the barbarities of later Europe, such as the Albigensian crusades, or the Inquisition in Spain. The royal commissioners resorted in haste to severe measures. The details are recorded, not without a shade of triumph, by the Byzantine chroniclers. Those who resisted the imperial invitation to ecclesiastical union, were either condemned to death or their property confiscated. We hear of hanging, crucifying, beheading, drowning. Many thousands perished in this manner. Some reckon the sufferers at 100,000. A good deal of chivalrous valour, not unusual in such cases, was displayed by the sectaries. The history reads like an anticipation of the sufferings of the Protestants of the Cevennes, of the Low Countries, of the valleys of Piedmont, or the Covenanters of Scotland. Many refugees escaped into the province of Melitene, where Omar, the Saracen emir, assisted them in their plans of revenge. These were established, by the caliph's order, in the two towns of Argaeum and Amara. The arrival of fresh emigrants with Karbeas led to the founding of Tephrike (Divriki) in the district of Sebaste (Sivas).[h] This Karbeas, one of the chief officers of Theodotus Melissenos, the general of the Anatolic theme, exasperated by the impaling of his own father, resolved by revolt to avenge his fate. Gathering 5,000 of his co-religionists, he fled to the frontier, and from the Saracen border rewarded his followers by an organised system of rapine and plunder in the territories near. The queen's brother, Petronas, governor of the Thrakesian theme, was sent against them. The Byzantine troops contended during the reign of Michael III., 842–867, without any decided success. They mostly limited their operations to defence, and were contented with checking these forays. Meanwhile other bodies of Paulicians still remained in the several provinces, who escaped persecution by outwardly conforming to the Greek church and paying the dues demanded by the clergy. In the reign of Basil I., 867–886, the whole force of the empire was again directed against the Paulicians. The existence of the little republic at Tephrike had become a serious danger to the emperors of Constantinople. It was a place of refuge for the fugitives and malcontents from their dominions. Chrysocheir, the son-in-law of Karbeas, succeeded him in the command of the armed bands of Tephrike. A romantic border war went on for many years, till Basil I., in 871, seriously undertook the task of destroying the Paulician strongholds. In Asia Minor in that age, as in the island of Sicily to recent times, owing to constant wars, frequent predatory incursions, and general insecurity of the country, it was unsafe for the peasantry to live scattered in villages. This class, therefore mainly contributed to the number and population of the squalid towns, and amidst these the Paulicians were often in strong force. The great number of prisoners taken by the borderers induced the emperor to send an embassy to Tephrike for the redemption of the captives. Petrus Siculus, the ambassador, lived at Tephrike for nine months, during which time he collected the materials for his treatise on the sect. He was not able to bring about any satisfactory and peaceable arrangements with Chrysocheir. The ill-success of these negotiations, the ravages committed by the Paulician inroads, and the fear of alliances between them and the Mohammedans, led to the two expeditions of Basil. This Paulician war is the principal military operation of his reign. In 871 his first attack was unsuc cessful. The Paulicians gained decided advantages and inflicted severe loss on the imperial

[h] For picturesque descriptions of this strong country and the modern town, Divriki, see Ainsworth, *Researches in Asia Minor*, vol. ii. 7–9; Burnaby, *On Horseback through Asia Minor*, vol. i. 334–340; Saint Martin, *Mémoires sur l'Arménie*, i. 188; Otter, *Voyage en Turquie*, ii. 306, in 1743.

forces. The emperor himself escaped with difficulty. Fortunately for Basil, the power of the caliphate was at a low ebb at the time, a succession of revolutions and seditions at Bagdad occupied the attention of the Saracens, the Paulicians could obtain only uncertain support from them. Basil turned from the siege of Tephrike to capture and destroy the frontier towns towards the Euphrates, which had assisted his insurgent subjects. After a variety of incidents, he returned to Constantinople disheartened, leaving Christophorus, his general, to conduct the difficult and desultory war. Meantime, to quote Gibbon's *résumé* of the career of Chrysocheir:—"He boldly penetrated into the heart of Asia; the troops of the frontier and the palace were repeatedly overthrown; the edicts of persecution were answered by the pillage of Nice and Nicomedia, of Ancyra and Ephesus. The cathedral of St. John at Ephesus was turned into a stable for mules and horses; and the Paulicians vied with the Saracens in their contempt and abhorrence of images and relics" (*Decl. and Fall*, ch. 54). Basil made overtures of peace to Chrysocheir, offering him royal donatives of gold and silver, and silk garments and captives. Chrysocheir's defiant and boastful reply left Basil no choice but to continue the war, sending no answer to the Paulician. In the course of two years Chrysocheir inflicted great losses on the neighbouring provinces. He was unable to maintain his troops without plunder, and relied on this system of successful rapine, much as the Danes and Normans about the same time were doing in France and England. At length the superior military skill of the Byzantine general made itself felt. Having invaded Cappadocia, Chrysocheir was overtaken by Christophorus at Agranes. He found himself forced to retreat, with an active enemy watching his movements. A sudden assault by night threw the Paulician camp into panic and flight. Chrysocheir himself fled, attended by Diaconitzes and a few other comrades. In the thirty miles' pursuit, he was overtaken at last by Pylades, formerly a captive at Tephrike, beheaded, and his head sent as a trophy of war to the emperor.[1] Tephrike was taken not long after and destroyed. Catabatala and other Paulician strongholds were captured in the following campaign. The power of the Paulicians was dissipated. They were unable to continue their ravages. Some retired into Armenia, or were scattered over the neighbouring countries. Others entered the imperial service and fought in South Italy against the African Saracens. (Const. Porph. *Basil.* 192; Genesius, *Chron.* iv. 120–126; Cedrenus, *Hist. Comp.* ii 206–213; Finlay, *Gr. Hist.* ii. 243–6; Gibbon, ch. 54.) Long afterwards, on a less conspicuous scale, the Paulicians were still a powerful and enduring sect, though the chief interest of the sect passes over into Europe. Even in Asia, Paulicianism cast down was not destroyed. Their oasis of political and religious freedom flourished no more, but their faith and their communities still survived. Bands of heretics driven to the mountains continued to assert their independence, and to infest the Roman borders for above a hundred years. Wherever the Paulicians were to be found, a national feeling was now added to religious motives. The ruin of the Paulicians, like the downfall of the Iconoclasts, in each case a victory of the Greek race and church over the native Asiatics, was a victory not soon forgotten or forgiven. A national hatred fostered the religious zeal. The local disorganisation of society, and destruction of property and capital, that resulted from the Paulician war, the hatred for the Greek church and government engendered among the Asiatics, prepared a beaten track through Asia Minor for the Saracen and the Turk, and long after facilitated the entrance and progress of the Seljouk power, and so in ultimate consequence contributed to the final waning of the cross before the crescent in Constantinople itself.

Further traces of the Paulicians are to be found (1) in Armenia and Asia Minor; (2) in Bulgaria and the Byzantine provinces south of the Danube; (3) in mediaeval Europe.

1. In Armenia and the adjacent Byzantine territory, scattered embers of Paulicianism, smouldering everywhere, burst out into new flame, more or less vigorously in various directions as time went on, deriving fresh fuel from new admixtures of Christian elements with Parsism[k] or the other religions of the East. There were the Armenian Arevurdis, or children of the sun, who had long been a semi-Zoroastrian sect of heretics, worshippers of Ormuzd (Tsamtschean's *Hist. Arm.* P. i. p. 765; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vi. 341). A new phase of their history began with Sembat, a Paulician. Under the influence of Medschusic, a Persian physician and astronomer, Sembat formed a new combination of Parsism and Christianity. His opinions among his followers are said to have taken a pantheistic and antinomian direction. Between 833 and 854, Sembat established himself at Thondrac, in the province of Ararat. His sect thus obtained the name of Thondracians. These people, who spread their doctrine in secret, and accommodated themselves openly to the requirements of the orthodox church, were fiercely persecuted by the bishops. The sect of Athingani (Ἀθίγγανοι) are also associated with the Paulicians. (Theoph. 413;

[1] The continuation of Const. Porph. is the only writer who mentions the story of the head of Chrysocheir being brought to Basil and his manner of treating it. On the head being presented at the foot of the throne, Basil, in accordance with a former vow and prayer, called for his bow and shot three arrows at his lifeless enemy.

[k] Early in the eighth century, John Oznicnsis, so called from his birthplace Oznun, in the province of Tascir in Greater Armenia, who became Catholicos or primate of the Armenian church about 718, wrote a controversial tract against the Paulicians. He ascribes to those at that time in his vicinity a certain adoration of the sun, p. 87. This harmonises little with the other doctrines of the sect. Still that even Mohammedans, in the old Parsee regions, are addicted to such a usage, the following modern testimony will serve as some indication:—"I have often wondered whether something connected with the old fire-worshippers' superstition has a lurking-place in the minds of the Persians or Kurds. Day after day and at the same hour, I have seen the entire inhabitants of a village turn out and gaze intently upon the great orb of light slowly sinking into space on the distant horizon. I have questioned them about this subject. They indignantly repudiate the idea of any sort of worship to the sun; they say that they do so because it is their habit, and because their fathers, grandfathers, and ancestors did the same thing before them." (Burnaby's *On Horseback through Asia Minor*, vol. ii. 201.)

Zonaras, *l.* xv.; Finlay, *Gr. Hist.* ii. 97, 109; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 372, vi. 347.) Their opinions appear to have arisen out of a mixture of Judaism and Christianity. They may have been a remnant of the old Judaizing Christian sects, who had maintained themselves from the apostolic times in Phrygia. They are principally spoken of in association with Amorium, where many Jews resided. Their name arose from their Gnostic or Manichean principles, leading them to hold that the touch of many things was defiling. Possibly they were descendants of the false teachers with whom St. Paul contended, who corrupted the apostolic teaching at Colosse (cf. μὴ θίγῃς, Col. ii. 21). Thus the Paulicians and other kindred sects, though occasionally suppressed, continually sprang up afresh in Armenia and the neighbouring countries till the middle of the eleventh century.

2. From these Paulicians of Asia Minor, and from such eclectic sects that grew out of them or united with them, great numbers of offshoots gradually spread into Europe. Paulicianism, says Gibbon, "shook the East and enlightened the West." Amidst the violent translocations of population not unfrequent in those times, as in the Caucasus and other parts of Russia in modern days, Paulician colonies were planted in Thrace and Bulgaria. They were established as guards of the western frontiers of the empire, with permission to retain their religion. Amidst a native population sensibly diminishing, these military colonies were marked by the industry and vigour displayed in local affairs, their lands were well cultivated and bravely defended, and the moral training of the people was good. Their busy trading, aided afterwards by the commercial influences of the crusades, helped to spread their religious opinions into many parts of western Europe. This colonisation began in 752. Constantine V., after reconquering the Armenian province of Melitene, transported into Thrace numbers of Asiatic colonists from Germanicia, Doliche, Melitene, and Theodosiopolis (Theoph. 354–360). Many of these were Paulicians. Another such colony was brought from the eastern provinces of Asia Minor, by John Zimisces in 969, and settled in the important strategic position of Philippopolis (Zonaras, *Ann.* l. xvii.). It was in order to guard the then newly founded church of Bulgaria from the infection of their Thracian Paulician neighbours, that Petrus Siculus, about 870, addressed to the archbishop of the Bulgarians (name unknown) his treatise, which is now one of the chief sources of our information as to the sect (Pet. Sic. i. 1). The recognised bravery of the Paulicians obtained them frequent admission into the imperial armies. Among the hireling troops of the failing and hard-pressed empire, they found ample opportunities of diffusing their doctrines. Colonists also established themselves in fixed settlements beyond the limits of the Greek empire, with the same zeal for proselytism. In the cities, towns, or country villages, they had no difficulty in getting hearers. Laymen, ecclesiastics, and monks, received their doctrine and discipline.

Though the Paulicians had ceased to be formidable, they still could on occasion assert themselves. In the reign of Nicephorus III., 1067–1081, two of their leaders took up arms in Thrace, and committed many cruelties to revenge themselves for the persecutions they had suffered. In 1081, when Alexius Comnenus marched against the Norman, Robert Guiscard, 2,800 Paulicians under Xantas and Kuleon joined his army as the military contingent they were required to furnish. Having lost 300 men in the defeat at Dyrrachium, the rest returned home. Alexius determined to punish their desertion and destroy their communal system. The chief men were summoned to the emperor at Mosynopolis, 90 miles from Philippopolis. The Paulicians were ordered to be disarmed, many had their property confiscated, and whole families were driven from their homes. Among these were the four sisters of Traulus, a Paulician convert, baptised during the reign of Nicephorus III., who had attained to the rank of Domestikos. When Alexius took reprisals against the Thracian Paulician community, Traulus, in revenge for the wrongs of his relatives, seized a fort called Veliatova, joined the Patzinaks in their marauding expeditions from the Danube, secured himself by their alliance, and plundered the orthodox Greeks over all Thrace. The Patzinak war ensured their impunity. Traulus repelled the forces sent against him in 1086, under Pakuvian, the Grand Domestikos of the West, and Branas, and maintained his independence for some years (Anna Comn. 157; Finlay, *Gr. Hist.* iii. 65). Towards the end of his reign, Alexius, learning how the numbers of the Paulicians increased in Thrace and the adjacent provinces, and observing how ineffectual violent means had been against them, had recourse to argument and controversy with the leaders. Finding the important position of Philippopolis to be the place of rendezvous for the sects hostile to the church, he fixed his winter-quarters there, and spent whole days in succession disputing from morning to evening with the sectaries. Some of the imperial converts were brought to Constantinople. Others were established in a new city, which Alexius named after himself Alexiopolis (Alexius, l. xiv.). The imperial conversions many of them proved to be insincere. They were however partially successful, especially as rewards and punishments were among the arguments Alexius employed. In the issue he was disappointed, and his efforts are said to have contributed to the spread of the heresy by the dispersion of the heretics. Frederic Barbarossa and the crusaders in 1189 found them still at Philippopolis. (Nicetas, 258; Geoffrey de Villehardouin, 208; Matthew Paris, *H.M.*, p. 267; Finlay, *Gr. Hist.* iii. 234; Gibbon, ch. 54; Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 578; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* viii. 295.)[1]

3. In Mediaeval Europe.—As the earlier persecutions tended to drive back the Paulicians to their first seats and promote the spread of the sect in the Eastern regions, where it was sheltered by Saracen protection, so the later efforts at violent repression resulted in the dispersion and settlement of the sectaries in new spheres of activity towards the West, and opened Europe to their movements. By merchants, monks, pilgrims, soldiers, gipsies, as well as direct missionaries, and later amidst the returning

[1] Interesting modern traces of descendants are recorded. Elliott, *Horae Apoc.* vol. ii. 550; Spenser, *Travels in European Turkey*, vol. ii. 352.

armies of the French crusaders, Paulician tenets were introduced into Liguria, Lombardy, Sicily, France, Germany, and the Netherlands. We hear of their descendants, through mediaeval chroniclers, and in the records of councils and persecutions, at Albi, Thoulouse, Turin, Milan, Orleans, Chalons, Cambray, Arras, Cologne, Oxford. They probably spread also from Italy to Sardinia and Spain. No doubt the principles and doctrines received from abroad were elaborated and wrought out often in an independent manner. Many peculiar modifications were introduced, but the names of sects, Bulgari, Sclavoni, Publicani, Catharists, Bogomiles, and other such, point southeastward to their Byzantine origin, as in their so-called "Manichean" tenets is traceable their semi-oriental and Paulician ancestry.[m]

We must now proceed to some concluding particulars as to *the doctrines* of the Paulicians.

1. The first thing on record about them, as to heretical tenets, is their Dualism. The second book of the treatise of Photius is chiefly occupied with disproving this. Like their remote descendants, the mediaeval sects, the early Paulicians, with whom we have to do, undoubtedly shared in this respect "the ghastly dream of the Gnostic and Manichean." Their Dualism was their λαμπρότατον ψεῦδος. To their view the physical universe, the world of Nature, the κόσμος, including all τὰ αἰσθητά, is not a Divine world, not the architecture or work of the Supreme God, the Lord of the heavens (Phot. i. 6; Pet. Sic. 16–18). Photius quotes a statement, probably of Sergius, that "the Evil Spirit, or Demiurge, sprang into being out of darkness and fire" (Phot. ii. 3). In such a view, "darkness" was the proper principle of evil, and "fire" the principle of the sidereal world, both being principles opposed to the spiritual life. The combination of these formed the essence of the Demiurge, the creator of the visible and sensible world. The Paulicians accused the dominant church of confounding together the Demiurge and the Perfect God, and of worshipping the Demiurge only. In their teaching, as in the instance of the conversion of Sergius, they were always ready to start with impressing upon their proselytes this controversial axiom, so much to the prejudice of the Catholics (Phot. i. 21). It is doubtful whether there may have been allowed at all in the sect a distinction between the Evil Principle and the Creator of the World. Some may have adopted the idea of an intermediate Principle, as some of the older Gnostic systems did. Since no "Apology" of their own survives, we have to be content with the meagre and indefinite statements of doctrine given by their adversaries. These offer only a bare outline of their cosmical theories, invidiously coloured for polemical purposes.

2. The Paulician ideas about the origin and nature of man were closely connected with their system of the universe. Their psychology was involved in their cosmogony. The soul of man, according to them, proceeded from the author of good, the Supreme and Perfect God (Phot. ii. 1). The body was the work either of an inferior, imperfect, and intermediate power, or directly of the absolutely evil one. Photius quotes an obscure and singular extract of Sergius comparing the relation between soul and body to an unlawful marriage, branding it with the degradation and opprobrium of an unholy union (Phot. i. 22). We do not gather with any exactness how this πορνεία was brought about, but it evidently originated according to the Paulician scheme in the malice of the Demiurge. They must have held the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls. Thus, the sequence of ideas would be, either that these souls were constantly being drawn away from the higher world at every birth, and entangled with the bodily and material world by the Evil Power, or they started with the idea of one such original abduction, and imagined a constant, consequent, and subsequent process of spiritual evolution, apparent in our multiplied individualised humanity. They plainly held, that the soul of man is of Divine origin. It is a germ of life, akin to the essence of the God of the higher world. The recollection of the lost prior immortality floated still like a dream before the soul in its bodily thraldom in the kingdom of the Demiurge (Phot. ii. 3). The soul embodied and captive could thus never be so completely overborne by matter and debased in this world of sight and sense and darkness, that its innate light and revelation of God should be finally obscured and altogether lost. The soul of man was always capable of a mystical redemption.

3. The Christology of the Paulicians is a matter of interesting speculation. Their views as to the person and nature and work of Christ were in harmony with their Dualism. They were ardent opponents of any such thing as the Mariolatry of the Catholics. They scoffed at the church teaching about the perpetual virginity or even the superior sanctity of Mary, and undervalued her agency at the Incarnation. They equally and on similar principles stood aloof from the church veneration of the cross, describing it as mere "wood," an instrument for the death of malefactors, and in St. Paul's language "accursed" (Gal. iii. 13). The true cross of their worship was their mental image of Christ, as if crucified, expanding His arms in prayer or in blessing in the form of the crucifix. The true Virgin-mother of their faith was the pure privileged church of their communion realised in antitype in the "Jerusalem above; which is free, which is the mother of us all" (Gal. iv. 26). According to their views, and so contrary to the church view, redemption by Christ had nothing to do with sin-bearing. There is no such thing as atonement or expiation by His death and sufferings. The Paulicians were not strictly Docetic, though nearly so. The Redeemer was to them, not an incarnation, but rather a bright reflection, radiation, or emanation of God. This spiritual revelation in human nature

---

[m] Muratori, *Ant. It.* v. 83; Limborch, *Hist. Inq.* 31; Du Fresne, *Gloss. Lat.* M. A. i. 1338; Du Chesne, *Script. Hist. Fr.* v.; *Bibl. Patr.* Lugd.; Luc. Dacherius, *Spicileg. Veter. Script.* i. 604; Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, i. 366; Ricchini's *Moneta c. Cath.* p. 17; Glabr. Rodulph. *Hist.* l. iii. 8; Matt. Paris; *Codex Tolosanus*, 13–131; Villehardouin, *Hist. Const.* 169; Du Cange, *Lat. Gloss.*; Maitland, *Facts and Documents*, pp. 83–93; Roger Hoveden, *Ann.* 585; Reiner in Martene, *Thesaur.* v. 1767; Hen. Huntingd. vii. 374; Will. Neubrig. lib. ii. 13; Robert Monach. lib. iii. iv.; *Baldric. Dolens. Hist. Hieros.* lib. ii.; Tudebodus, l. iii. Hallam, *M. A.* ii. 439.

of the invisible incomprehensible God was manifested for the liberation of *souls* in bondage in the kingdom of the Demiurge. The redemption that was to follow was the illumination of the darkened souls in their bodily captivity, offering them once again release, and restoration to the light of life. Redemption was the promise of renewed spiritual liberty and communion with the Supreme God of the spiritual creation. The Christ, according to the Paulician creed, descended and brought with Him from the heavenly world His own ethereal body of no earthly stuff or material. Born of the Virgin Mary, ὡς διὰ σωλῆνος, not of her substance, He invaded and occupied the kingdom of the Demiurge. He so lived, as man among men, till His Ascension, and diffused Himself and His heavenly radiance and redemptive influence through this world. The faithful, ever aspiring to mystic union with His light and truth, are raised to spiritual union with the Redeemer, and in Him into perfect communion with the Supreme God, and so are brought to the perfect freedom of His service, till finally "delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. viii. 21). Consistently with their theology, the church view of the sacraments was impossible and unintelligible to the Paulicians. They allegorised these in their usual figurative and typical style, interpreting the water in baptism and the elements in the Lord's Supper, in the way so congenial to them, as parables, similar to such texts of Scripture, as where Christ called Himself the bread of life, the water of life, the true vine, or illustrates in such language the benefit and efficacy of the Divine Word. The account of the examination of Gegnoesius before the patriarch of Constantinople gives us an exposure of the Paulician position in such aspects of it (Phot. i. 19; Pet. Sic. 29). Similar statements occur also in the six articles of controversy prefixed by Photius and Petrus Siculus to their histories of the sect (Phot. i. 6–10; Pet. Sic. 10).

4. The canon of Scripture among the Paulicians is an important consideration with respect to an estimate of their doctrinal errors. It is evident that they made a great display of veneration for the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul. The four Gospels were highly esteemed among them, especially those of St. Luke and St. John. They also received the Epistles of St. James, St. John, and St. Jude, and the Acts of the Apostles. The Book of Revelation does not appear to have formed part of their canon. The two Epistles of St. Peter were rejected by them, mainly on account of his opposition to St. Paul (Gal. ii. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 14–16), partly also on account of his denial of his Lord. For authoritative statements of their system the Epistles of Sergius must be added. These are known to us only through five or six fragmentary extracts, quoted by their opponents in their controversial treatises (Pet. Sic. 36–39; Phot. i. 21). It is evident that the Paulicians promoted to the utmost, and set high value on general access to the written records of the truth. Through all its history the sect was honourably marked by a staunch adherence to the Protestant principle of the free right of the laity to the unrestricted possession and use of the Scriptures. They had nothing to do with any of the spurious and apocryphal books. The Gnostic and Manichaean writings were repudiated by them. Their Bible, as Gibbon says, was pure, though not perfect. Their great difference with the church was their rejection of the Old Testament, conceiving it to be the fabulous invention of men or demons, calling the prophets deceivers and robbers. The third book of Photius is occupied with the vindication of the Old Testament against the Paulicians, proving that the Old Dispensation was from the same Author as the New, against the Paulician position that they are contrary and hostile to one another. Such an eclecticism about the Scriptures, and free handling of the sacred volume, was consistent with and partly arose from their grotesque exaggerations and misinterpretation of Pauline doctrine. Paulicianism was not founded on scriptural simplicity and harmony of faith. The Paulicians had no church-consistency of creed. The perverse example of their still more visionary forerunners, the Gnostic and Manichaean sects, had been inherited by them. Like these, their spiritual ancestors, though in a far less degree, they turned to Scripture with minds preoccupied by the Oriental and metaphysical speculations prevalent in those regions. Mentally involved already in this intricate maze, apparently unconsciously, they thrust upon Scripture their own conclusions instead of evolving from Scripture its own profound and majestic evangelical principles. They thus used the Scripture, not so much to learn from it its own divine language as to compel it to speak theirs. They read the Scripture, less to hear about sin, grace, redemption, and God, than to derive an outward Christian varnish and colouring for a mystical and metaphysical theosophy essentially antichristian, unscriptural, and of independent growth. Their Oriental theories about the origin of creation, the genesis of evil, the birth of souls, having little or no counterpart in the actual world of reality, it both exercised all their dexterity, and required great latitude of interpretation to connect these with the literal sense. Like Swedenborg, for a modern example, the Paulicians attempted to graft upon Scripture another sense. They alloyed Scripture with a *quasi-higher* spiritual sense, above and previous to the actual sense. They dexterously adapted Orientalism to the Scripture, and then brought forward Scripture thus manipulated as a witness and an argument for the truth of what they taught. Some allowance may be made for the Paulician, yet the Paulician appeal to the sacred authority, as far as doctrine went, was but a later example of Irenaeus's striking image. In the 2nd century, he compares the early Gnostic manner of dealing with the divine rule of faith to the fault or fraud of breaking up a noble ancient mosaic and then fitting in the pieces anew, with the same gems and marbles composing an indifferent or vulgar modern imitation on a different plan, and finally claiming from the simple for the clumsy transposition the admiration due to the original masterpiece (Trench *On the Parables*, p. 41–44; Iren. *adv. Haer.* i. 15).

5. Our knowledge of the organisation and institutions of the Paulicians can be gathered only from such scattered hints and allusions as we find on record respecting these. They appear to have been of a simple and unpretending

description, suited to the rustic character of the provincial country people, who formed the great proportion of their communities. The eponym of Paulicians, so honourable in the eyes of the sectaries, was probably invented by their enemies to satirise the excessive devotion of the sect to the name and authority of St. Paul.[n] They retaliated on the churchmen by calling their adversaries Ῥωμαῖοι, Romans, as having merely a political religion, while arrogating to themselves the sole right to the name of Christians, or sometimes Χριστοπολῖται (Pet. Sic. 10; Phot. i. 6; Jacob T. M. *Anath.* p. 122). Beyond this we find little trace of higher or lower class distinctions within the sect. There is no indication of anything like Manichaean esoteric and exoteric organisation of their communities into "elect" and "auditors." In harmony with their aim at a reformation of church institutions in the sense of a return to primitive apostolical simplicity, they refused to call their places of worship ἱερά or ναοί, as suggestive of Jewish or pagan temples. They were to be merely προσευχαί or "houses of prayer." In the same way they would have no sacerdotal caste among them. In their anti-hierarchical spirit they allowed in their ministers no distinguishing dress or badge of office or other outward mark of their calling. They would have no ἱερεῖς or πρεσβύτεροι, names engrained with the recollections of the betrayal and condemnation of Christ by the Jewish rulers (Phot. i. 9; Pet. Sic. 6). At the head of the sect were their four first and original teachers and founders, distinguished by them as their "Apostles" or "Prophets." Subordinate to these ranked their ministers, called "teachers" and "pastors," διδάσκαλοι and ποιμένες. In the next age, when a general reformer like Sergius, who commanded the reverence of the whole sect, no longer survived, their immediate disciples the συνέκδημοι,[o] or "associate itinerants," took the first place in the general superintendence of the sect. Next came the νοτάριοι or copyists, who, as Gieseler points out, were like the scribes of the New Testament. These were occupied with multiplying the sacred writings and expounding them. In process of time these are said to have ranked highest in the Paulician ecclesiastical offices, and obtained the first authority in the sect as the surest depositaries of the sacred knowledge. Neander considers the ἄστατοι mentioned by Photius (i. 24) as elect disciples of Sergius, to have been a higher portion of the συνέκδημοι.

6. As to ethical system, a serious moral spirit mainly characterised the teachers and teaching of the sect, but combined with opposition to the traditional ascetic prescriptions of the church. The Paulicians, as has been already pointed out, were enthusiastic iconoclasts. Their numbers are said to have been often recruited from these (John of Oznun, p. 76, 89). They were inveterately opposed to the church fasts, feasts, and all admixtures of Jewish, pagan, and political corruptions, such as they considered the orthodox church to represent and embody. Contrary to this, however, they were the subject of violent invective from their enemies on the subject of their dissimulation, hypocrisy, and bad faith, from the readiness with which on occasion many of their people united in the sacramental rites, and assented to other demands of the dominant church. If such compliance did not arise out of cowardice, like many other sectaries, the Paulicians allowed a great extent of this justifiable accommodation (οἰκονομία). They often had recourse to it, as it were, to merit or purchase neglect or toleration, and so avoid being molested. The permission of baptism to their children, as a sort of magical charm of possible benefit to the body, and the medicinal use of the cross by laying it on the body in times of sickness as a practice suitable to their present bodily thraldom in the kingdom of the Demiurge, was similarly allowed by the ruder and less enlightened Paulicians. They had been accustomed to hear great things said amongst the orthodox about the efficacy and potency of these church usages. In times of urgency they superstitiously made this sort of ignorant compromise with the powers that were, in order to the possible averting of felt evil and securing possible imaginary good (Neander, Gieseler, on Phot. i. 9). We have a graphic example of their equivocation and laxity of principle as to veracity in the evasive answers of Gegnoesius in his examination before the Greek patriarch at Constantinople (Phot. i. 19; Pet. Sic. 29). In the respect of practical morality, if we followed the clamorous accounts of their opponents, nothing was too bad to be said about them. But even amidst these authors, a distinction is made between the scandalous followers of Baanes and the rest of the Paulicians. It is not improbable, that as the sect grew popular, and its numbers multiplied, the charges may have had a foundation in various particular instances. Among the mixed multitude, who gathered round such a departure from the established order of things, and so gravitated towards the Paulician schism, there were likely to be the baser sort, who discredited the sect as they would have disgraced the church. The original spirit and true tendency of the Paulicians was no doubt in favour of a sober morality, a homely purity of family life, not rigid or ascetic, but such as would result from their close practical self-direction according to the teaching, as they understood it, of the New Testament Scriptures. [M. B. C.]

PAULINA (1), daughter of Paula the friend of Jerome, and wife of Pammachius (*q.v.*). She married about the time when her mother and her sister Eustochium went with Jerome to Palestine in 385. Her own desire was, after giving birth to children, to lead a life of continence; but her children died in the birth, and she herself probably died in childbirth in the year 397. Her merits are described in consola-

[n] The origin of the name "Paulician" from St. Paul has been controverted. That the Paulicians themselves accepted such a derivation and prided themselves upon it, see in Phot. ii. 11, iii. 10, iv. 6. Their opponents in controversy advocated an inferior source, as Paul and John the sons of Callinice, as if the name were from Παύλου καὶ Ἰωάννου, see Phot. I. i. 2; Zonaras, xvi. 2; Ann. Comn. Alex. xiv.; Mich. Glyc. *Ann.* part iv. p. 336; Euthym. Zig. *Panopl. Dogm.* The Paulicians anathematised the sons of Callinice as Manicheans, with whom they had no connection. Another suggestion was to trace the name to Paul the father of Gegnoesius, Phot. i. 19.

[o] The word occurs Acts xix. 29; 2 Cor. viii. 19 of companions in travel of St. Paul.

tory letters to Pammachius from Jerome (*Ep.* 66, ed. Vall.) and Paulinus (*Ep.* 13, Migne's *Patrol.* vol. 61). [W. H. F.]

PAULINA (2), a Christian lady, wife of Armamentarius. She and her husband made a vow to renounce the world, on which, St. Augustine, who heard of this through their kinsman Ruferius, wrote a letter, approving heartily of their resolution, c. A.D. 411. They had also added one of mutual continence, of which he also approved, but reminds Paulina that such a vow is permissible only on the condition laid down in 1 Cor. vii. 3–5. Her husband ought not to shrink from a course to which his wife consents, but the course thus adopted ought to be made an offering to God. (Aug. *Ep.* 127.) Paulina had also requested Augustine to explain to her the doctrine about "seeing" God, on which he appears to have written to her a short letter (*Ep.* 147, 17). He therefore replies to her at great length, so much so that he elsewhere calls his letter a book, *de Videndo Deo.* Retract. ii. 41. c. A.D. 413. In the course of the letter he quotes St. Ambrose on Luke i. and St. Jerome on Is. vi. and goes over much of the same ground as he does in his letters to Fortunatianus (4) (*Ep.* 148, vol. ii. p. 550) and to Italica (1) (*Ep.* 161, vol. iii. p. 322), and he treats a branch of the subject in the treatise *de Civ. Dei*, xxii. 29. Aug. *Ep.* 147. [H. W. P.]

PAULINIANUS, younger brother of Jerome. He was still young in 385 (adolescens, Jer. *c. Ruf.* iii. 22), when he left Rome in company with his brother and their friend Vincentius, and he was under thirty years old when ordained in 394 (Jer. *adv. Joan. Hier.* § 8). He shared his brother's journeys in Palestine, and settled with him in Bethlehem, where he remained with him probably to the end of his life. He was modest, and aspired to nothing more than to help his brother in the monastery. But Epiphanius, coming to Jerusalem in 394, and finding (or rather promoting) a schism between the monasteries of Bethlehem and their bishop, John of Jerusalem, determined to ordain him priest. He took him, therefore, to the monastery which he had founded at Ad, and there, against the protests and even resistance of Paulinian, ordained him priest. (See in Jerome, *Ep.* li. 1, ed. Vall. the translation of Epiphanius's explanatory letter to John of Jerusalem.) Paulinian may perhaps have acted as presbyter in the monasteries for a time, but he felt it prudent during the vehement controversy which sprang up between Jerome and the bishop of Jerusalem to go to Epiphanius in Cyprus. Jerome declares in his book *Contra Joannem* (§ 41), that, notwithstanding the bishop's interdict, there were priests of his diocese who officiated in the monasteries, and that his brother was in Cyprus. In the year 398, when Rufinus had gone to Rome, Jerome sent his brother, together with Eusebius of Cremona, and another Rufinus to counteract the proceedings of Rufinus (Cont. Ruf. iii. 25). Paulinian had also the duty of proceeding to their old home at Stridon, near Aquileia, to sell what remained of their property (semirutas villas, *Ep.* lxvi. 14) which had been ruined by the Gothic invasion. In the letter of reconciliation which Jerome wrote to Rufinus, but which never reached him (81, A.D. 399), he speaks of his brother as not having yet returned, and thinks it probable that Rufinus has seen him at the house of the bishop Chromatius at Aquileia. He probably returned the next year to Bethlehem, and, peace having been made between Jerome and his bishop, and the parish of Bethlehem having been committed, as we learn from Sulpicius Severus (*Dial.* i. 4), to Jerome, his brother probably undertook the details of administration. The relations of the brothers seem to have always been cordial, though Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* 79) insinuates the contrary. Augustine in his letter (see Jerome, *Ep.* 101) to Jerome in 402, sends his salutations to Paulinianus. He probably survived Jerome, but of his after history no traces appear. [W. H. F.]

PAULINUS (1), a layman, allowed by Celsus, bishop of Iconium, to preach in his presence (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19). See NEO (4). [G. S.]

PAULINUS (2), bishop of Antioch, A.D. 321–325 (Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* ii. 548). He is omitted by Theodoret, who makes Eustathius the immediate successor of Philogonius (*H. E.* i. 7), but he appears in the *Chronicle* of Jerome, and under the name of Paul in that of Nicephorus, and of Apollinus in that of Eutychius, p. 431, and is mentioned by Theophanes, p. 11, and Nicetas, and is accepted by Valois (notes on Sozomen, *H. E.* p. 116) and Tillemont (*Mém. Ecclés.* tom. vii. p. 649, *notes sur Saint Eustathe*) and Clinton (*u.s.*). He is distinctly named by Sozomen, and united with his successor Eustathius as bishops of Antioch, friendship with whom was one of the reasons for the deposition of Hosius by the Eastern bishops at Philippopolis (Soz. *H. E.* iii. 11). If the scandalous charges brought against Paulinus by the malcontents at Philippopolis in their encyclical, of magical arts, a debauched life, and of being the author of books which had been burnt for the impieties they contained, for which he had been deposed from the episcopate (Hilar. *Frag.* ii. p. 663) refer to this Paulinus, they are probably as devoid of foundation as those against Eustathius or other orthodox prelates in the same document. The reading, however, is doubtful, and though Valois in his notes on Sozomen (*H. E. u.s.*) reads "Antiochiae," and bases his argument on it, all other editions of the encyclical read "Daciae." Pagi accepts the deposition of Paulinus without being able to throw any light on its cause (*Critic. in Annal. Baron.* tom. i. p. 292). [E. V.]

PAULINUS (3), bishop, first of Tyre and then of Antioch for six months, A.D. 328–329 (Clinton, *F. R.*). He appears to have been a native of Antioch, and, according to his friend and panegyrist Eusebius (Eus. *in Marcell.* i. 4, p. 19), having filled the office of bishop of Tyre with great splendour, and after the cessation of the persecution rebuilt with great magnificence the cathedral elaborately described by the historian in the inaugural oration delivered by him at its dedication (Eus. *H. E.* x. 4) was "claimed by the church of the Antiochenes as their own property," ὡς οἰκεῖον ἀγαθοῦ μεταποιηθῆναι, and chosen their bishop. According to Philostorgius he only held his new dignity for half a year

before his death, μετὰ μῆνας ἐξ ἀπεβίω (Philost. *H. E.* iii. 15). Paulinus, like his friend Eusebius of Caesarea, was an Arianizer, claimed by Arius in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia as one of his sympathisers (Theod. *H. E.* i. 5). Eusebius of Caesarea lavishes unstinting praise on his fellow-partisan, styling him τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπον, τὸν θαυμαστὸν, τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς τρισμακάριον (*in Marcell. u.s.*), and dedicating to him his *Ecclesiastical History* (Eus. *H. E.* x. 1). He also speaks with great indignation of the unfounded charges brought against him by Marcellus, with the view of fixing on him the impious tenet that our Blessed Lord is no more than a created being (*in Marcell. u. s.*). There is no little uncertainty as to the succession of the bishops of Antioch immediately before and after the council of Nicaea, and it has been seriously questioned, and that on no insufficient grounds, whether there were two bishops of the name of Paulinus, one immediately preceding, the other immediately succeeding Eustathius, or only one; and also whether that one is to be placed before or after Eustathius. Dr. Lightfoot decides that there was only one, and makes him Eustathius's predecessor (*D. C. B.* vol. ii. p. 322 *b*). But he seems to overlook the statement of the Eusebian bishops at Philippopolis (Hilar. *Frag.* ii. p. 26), supported by Sozomen (*H. E.* iii. 11) that Paulinus was the friend of Hosius, and had been deposed for magic, and other alleged crimes.

[E. V.]

PAULINUS (4), ST., sixth bishop of Trèves, between St. Maximinus and St. Bonosus, holds an important position as one of the foremost Gallic champions of orthodoxy against Arianism. Tradition says that he was a disciple and fellow-countryman of his predecessor, whom he accompanied from Aquitaine to Trèves. He was probably consecrated in the year 349, and must have proceeded almost immediately to Rome, if he was the Paulinus who conveyed to Athanasius the letter in which the two Arian bishops, Ursacius and Valens, announce to Julius of Rome their return to orthodoxy. See the passages from Athanasius collected in Boll. Aug. vi. 669, seqq. The Greek word Τριβέρων, however, is somewhat doubtful, and the bishop has been by some attributed to Tibur, Tivoli (see Boll. ibid.). In 351 was held the Council of Sirmium, at which Paulinus seems to have boldly championed the orthodox cause. The letter of condemnation of Athanasius tendered for his signature he scornfully rejected, with the exclamation that he would sign the condemnation of Photinus and Marcellus, but not of Athanasius (Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* ii. 37, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 150). It was however at the Council of Arles held in 353 that Paulinus's fate was decided. The emperor Constantius, who was present, decreed the penalty of exile for the bishops who should refuse to subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius. Paulinus remained steadfast, and after being condemned by the bishops, was driven into exile in Phrygia, to parts inhabited by heathen and heretics. This occurred in 353 or, at latest, in 354, not 356, as Jerome gives it. He died in 358 or 359. Patriotic chroniclers of Trèves have asserted that he suffered the violent death of a martyr, but there is no evidence of it (see Boll. *Acta SS.* vi. 672). The belief that his body was brought home from Phrygia by Felix, a later bishop of Trèves, seemed improbable (see Rettberg, infra), but the coffin is said to have been discovered quite recently (1883) at Trèves. His day of celebration is Aug. 31 (Boll. ibid. Aug. vi. 668). The church of his name outside the walls was one of the earliest at Trèves (Wilmowsky, *Der Dom zu Trier*, p. 11).

From a passage in Athanasius he is believed to have left some treatises against the Arians which have been lost (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, tom. i. part ii. p. 123, 112).

For his life see, in addition to the authorities above cited, the passages from the works of Athanasius collected, Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. vi. 669 seqq.; Hilarius *ad Const. Aug.* lib. i.; *Lib. contra Const. Imp.* 11; *Fragmentum*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* x. 562, 588, 631; Hieronymus, *Chronicon* in Bouquet, i. 610; Mansi, iii. 179 seqq., 231; *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 376–7; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 189 seqq.; Diel, P. *Der hl. Maximinus und der hl. Paulinus*, Trier, 1875, p. 179 seqq. The life published by the Bollandists (ibid. 676–9) is from internal evidence, at least as late as the end of the 9th century, and can only be trusted where corroborated by older testimony.

[S. A. B.]

PAULINUS (5) (PAULONAS), a priest, and a disciple of Ephraem Syrus. Gennadius (*De Script. Eccl.* c. iii. in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 1062) gives a short account of him, speaking of his great talent, his knowledge of Scripture, and his power as a preacher. After his master's death he "separated from the church, and wrote much against the faith," being of an ambitious temperament, and eager for renown. St. Ephraem on his death-bed warned him of the danger of giving free play to his speculative powers, having previously shewn how well he understood the talents and proclivities of his pupil by speaking of him often as "Bardesanes novellus."

[G. W. D.]

PAULINUS (6), bishop of the Eustathian or old Catholic party at Antioch, A.D. 362–388, a man of the highest estimation for his piety and personal character. He was one of Eustathius's presbyters, and according to Philostorgius (*H. E.* iii. 18) was with him deposed by Leontius, the Arian bishop of Antioch, and accompanied his bishop into exile. Subsequently to the death of Eustathius, a too notorious schism arose from the unwillingness of the old Catholic party to recognise as bishop, or to hold communion with Meletius, with whom they were doctrinally agreed, in consequence of his having been appointed and consecrated by Arians. Paulinus was recognised as the head of the Eustathians, who remained some time without a bishop, holding their meetings for worship in a small church within the walls of Antioch, the use of which had been granted by the Arian bishop Evagrius, out of respect for Paulinus's high character. The authority he enjoyed, though still only a presbyter, is evidenced by his having sent two deacons to represent him at the synod summoned by Athanasius in Alexandria (Athanas. tom. i. p. 580; Soz. *H. E.* vii. 15). One of the first concernments of the church after the recall of the orthodox bishops from exile consequent on the accession of Julian, A.D.

361, was to take measures for healing this unhappy breach between those who were united in faith. The wise and Christian course, which would at once have put an end to the schism, would have been for the acephalous Eustathians to have recognised Meletius as bishop of the whole orthodox body at Antioch. But the old suspicions of one who had commenced his career amid Arian environments, embittered by personal jealousies and exasperated by the dogmatic intolerance of a self-constituted peace-maker, effectually frustrated this healing measure. The "firebrand" Lucifer of Calaris, on his way home from his banishment in Upper Egypt, instead of accompanying his brother-exile, Eusebius of Vercellae, to the council held at Alexandria, A.D. 362, where his presence was eagerly anticipated, went at once straight to Antioch, confident of his powers of restoring unanimity. Finding it impossible to reconcile the two contending parties on the terms proposed by him, Lucifer rashly took the fatal step of ordaining Paulinus bishop of the old Catholics. This rendered union impossible. When Eusebius rejoined his hot-headed associate, he had to lament the complete frustration of the plans he had been deputed by the council of Alexandria to carry into effect. Respect for Lucifer kept him silent, and he took the earliest opportunity of leaving the city where his presence would only exasperate contentions already too bitter (Soc. *H. E.* iii. 6, 9; Soz. *H. E.* v. 12, 13; Theod. *H. E.* iii. 4, 5). But the mischief done could not be undone, and the church had to lament the fruits of the rash act of Lucifer in a schism which continued to weaken the Catholic cause at Antioch for more than half a century, and to furnish a subject of controversy between the churches of the West and of Egypt which supported Paulinus, and that of the East which adhered to Meletius, which was not finally healed till Alexander became bishop of Antioch, A.D. 413. The whole history of this protracted schism has been fully detailed in other articles, and it is needless to repeat it here. [LUCIFERUS of Calaris; EUSTATHIUS (3) of Antioch; MELETIUS (3) of Antioch; EUSEBIUS (93) of Vercellae; FLAVIAN.] One or two points only need to be noticed. When Valens a second time drove the orthodox bishops into exile, A.D. 364, Paulinus's reputation for supereminent piety caused him to remain unmolested at Antioch, when his rival Meletius was expelled (Socr. *H. E.* iv. 2; v. 5). The year 376 introduced a fresh element of division among the Catholics of Antioch in the ordination to the episcopate by Apollinaris of his disciple Vitalius, a former presbyter of Meletius. The orthodoxy of Paulinus had been recently recognised by pope Damasus, on the perusal of a formulary of faith sent by him to Rome, and being unable to satisfy himself completely as to the soundness in doctrine of Vitalius who had personally applied for communion with him he remitted the question whether he should be received by Rome or no to Paulinus, whose judgment he expressed his intention of following (*Epist. Damas.* Labbe, ii. 900). The issue of this affair, the vain attempts of Epiphanius to bring about an agreement between Paulinus and Vitalius, the ordination of Vitalius as bishop, the complete breach between Paulinus and him, and the perplexity caused to Jerome which of the three professedly orthodox bishops he was to hold communion with, are narrated in another place. [VITALIUS.] The reader may also be referred to other articles for Paulinus's rejection of Meletius's proposal on his return from his last banishment, A.D. 378, of a joint episcopate to be continued to the survivor (Theod. *H. E.* v. 3, 23; Socr. *H. E.* v. 5) [MELETIUS (3) of Antioch]; for the "self-denying ordinance" agreed to by the six leading presbyters of Antioch, that the survivor of the rival prelates should be recognised by both parties as their bishop, and its frustration by the hasty action of the Eastern bishops at Constantinople, A.D. 381, in the ordination of Flavian [FLAVIANUS (4) of Antioch] followed in his turn by Paulinus in his uncanonical solitary ordination of Evagrius as his successor in his sick chamber (Theod. *H. E.* v. 23) [EVAGRIUS (5) of Antioch]. The death of Paulinus may be placed in A.D. 388. [E. V.]

PAULINUS (7), writer of the life of St. Ambrose, a work erroneously ascribed by Erasmus to Paulinus of Nola, but which Paulinus says himself that he undertook at the request of St. Augustine. He was well qualified for his task by his intimate acquaintance with St. Ambrose, and attendance upon him in his last illness, and also by information gathered from well informed persons, and especially his sister Marcellina. His intimacy is evident from the work itself, in which he seems to call himself the bishop's secretary (notarius) and he was certainly with him at the time of his death (c. 33, 35, 38, 42, 47). In his introduction he expresses his great anxiety to adhere strictly to the truth and to deliver what he has to say impartially, an intention which he appears to have carried out with fidelity. After the death of St. Ambrose he went to Africa, which, according to Baronius, he did at the desire of Venerius, bishop of Milan, next bishop but one of that see, but this is altogether unlikely (Baron. ann. 401, vii.; Marius Mercator, *Comm.* p. 68, note, ed. Migne). He was well received by the church there, and distinguished himself by defending the memory of his friend and patron against an attack upon him by Muranus, bishop of Bollita, during an entertainment at the house of Fortunatus, a deacon, brother to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage. It was perhaps this passage of arms which brought him into acquaintance with St. Augustine, and to become the biographer of St. Ambrose. He was present at the council held at Carthage, A.D. 412, against Coelestius, and took a prominent part in its proceedings, pressing him very hardly when he claimed the authority of Catholic presbyters on his side. The acts of the Council are lost, but a record of the proceedings was preserved by Aug. (*de peccato Aug.* 3, 4, 8; *c. ep. Pelag.* ii. 6). Five years later, when after the death of Innocent I. Coelestius endeavoured to persuade Zosimus his successor to sanction his doctrines (Baron. vol. v. 417, 24), Zosimus wrote to Aurelius and the African bishops, sending them a confession of faith drawn up by Pelagius, but they sent back to him in reply a document (libellus) containing the heads of the charges brought by Paulinus against Coelestius, and declaring their resolution to abide by the decision of Innocent (Prosper Aquit. *c. Collat.* 3). Several letters passed to and fro between Rome

and Africa (Aug. *c. Ep. Pel.* ii. 3), and in one sent by Basiliscus a subdeacon, and delivered Nov. 2, 417, Zosimus desired Paulinus to appear at Rome, reminding him of his former bond to do so; but in his reply dated Nov. 8, sent by Marcellinus, a subdeacon of Carthage, who also carried a letter from the bishops, Paulinus declined to do so, on the ground (a) that the time named in his bond had expired; (b) that his adversary had withdrawn from Rome, but expressing his willingness to appear if the case should be decided, not in his favour but against him. This document (libellus) is lost, but what has been stated just now is gathered from a later one, copied by Baronius from a MS. in the Vatican, and published by him, vol. v. 418, 11, and also by Labbe and Cossart, *Concil.* ii. 1578. In this Paulinus thanks Zosimus for having decided in his favour.

Nothing more is heard about Paulinus after this. He was thought by Erasmus to have been a bishop, but this statement is disproved by his own words in c. 42 of his life of St. Ambrose, and by the description of him by Marius Mercator, *Common.* 2, and there is no evidence to show that he advanced beyond the diaconate. He is said to have been the author of a work entitled "*de Benedictionibus Patriarcharum*," but this belonged to another Paulinus of Aquileia. Besides the authorities already quoted the reader may be referred to Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. pp. 57, 80; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. p. 402; Ceillier, vol. vii. p. 533, viii. 549, ix. 453; Tillemont, who has a few words about him, x. p. 81.

[H. W. P.]

PAULINUS (8), PONTIUS MEROPIUS, and perhaps ANICIUS, ST., bishop of Nola, sprung of a patrician family, of whom some had been Christians (Ausonius, *Ep.* xxiv. 103; Paulin. *Ep.* xl. Prudentius, Symm. i. 558, 560; Baronius, 394, 78, 79). They had property in Aquitania, and probably resided there habitually (Ambros. *Ep.* lviii. 1). His father was *praefectus praetorio* of Gaul, had large possessions in the province in which he lived, and was the founder of the town of Burgus (Bourg) on the Dordogne, and as well as his wife appears to have been a Christian.

I. *First Period.* A.D. 353–394.

Besides Paulinus his parents had an elder son, and a daughter. Some have supposed that Paulinus was born at a place called Ebromagus, Hebromagus, or Ebromanus, where certainly in later days he possessed property, and which was situate either at a short distance from the Garonne, or may perhaps answer to *Brau*, a place about 14 miles from Carcassonne, a situation to which his request to Sulpicius about sending him wine stored at Narbonne seems more nearly to answer (Ausonius, *Ep.* xxi. 15, xxii. 25; Antoninus, *It.* 551, 7; Paulin. *Ep.* v. 22, xi., 14; Sidon. Apoll. *Carm.* xxii. 117; *Dict. G. & R. Geog.* i. 1033; Richard, *Guide*, p. 470). But he was probably born at Bordeaux, A.D. 353 or 354, and though in a poem, whose authenticity there is no reason to doubt, he describes himself as dedicated from his earliest years to St. Felix, it was not until many years after his birth that both he and his brother received baptism (Paul. *Carm.* xxi. 350). His tutor was Ausonius, who not only thought very highly of him as a pupil, but regarded him with warm affection, and addressed to him many of his poetical epistles. The affection of Ausonius was fully returned by his pupil, who declares that he owed to him all the distinction which he had ever attained in the world.

> Tibi disciplinas, dignitatem, literas,
> Linguae, togae, famae decus,
> Provectus, altus, institutus debeo,
> Patrone, praeceptor, pater.

Among his early efforts in verse was an abstract of three books of the history of Suetonius, a subject which can hardly be called poetical, but of which a few lines remain quoted by Ausonius with approval, which must be regarded as more partial than discriminating (Aus. *Ep.* xix.; Paulin. *Carm.* iii. x. 89–96; 149–153). But whatever merit his Latin compositions possess, he was by his own admission not strong in Greek, and in a letter to Ruffinus, A.D. 408, regrets his inability to translate accurately an epistle of St. Clement (*Ep.* xlvi. 2). He entered early into public life, became a member of the senate, filled the office of consul for a portion of the official year, in the place of some one who had vacated it, but in what year is not known as his name does not appear in the Fasti. It must, however, have been before 379, in which year Ausonius held the office, who says that his pupil attained the dignity of the ivory chair earlier than himself (Aus. *Ep.* xx. 4, xxv. 60). He has been supposed also to have held the office of prefect of New Epirus, a supposition consistent with his own mention of frequent and laborious journeys by land and sea, but of which there is no direct evidence, though an edict of the joint emperors Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian, undoubtedly exists, addressed to a praefect of that province of his name, A.D. 372. We may add that a man named Paullinus filled the office of *praefectus urbi*, A.D. 380, but there is no evidence to identify him with Paulinus of Nola (Cod. Theodos. xv. tit. 7, 4, 5, xvi. tit. 2, 22). That he held a judicial office is certain, for in one of his poems he expresses satisfaction at having condemned no one to death during his tenure of it. Lebrun conjectures that after his consulship he became *consularis* of Campania and resided at Nola (*Carm.* xxi. 396; Tillemont, vol. xiv. p. 8). Possessed of easy fortune, and enjoying the best society of the day, he lived a life free from outward reproach, but one for which he afterwards found great fault with himself. His health was never good, and he suffered much from fatigue in his journeys (*Carm.* x. 134, xiii. 2, 10, *Ep.* v. 4). In the course of them he fell in with Victricius, bishop of Rouen, and with Martin, bishop of Tours, at Vienne in Gaul, and ascribed to the latter the restoration of his sight, the loss of which was threatened, as the narrative seems to say, by cataract (*Ep.* xviii. 9, Sulpic. Ser. *Vit. S. Mart.* xix. 3, ed. Halm.). He also regarded St. Ambrose with great veneration, calling him "father" (*Ep.* iii. 4). But his chief object of veneration was Felix of Nola, to whom, besides the early dedication mentioned above, he devoted himself specially when he visited Nola at about 26 or 27 years of age, A.D. 379 (*Carm.* xiii. 7, 9, xxi. 350, 381). It was about this time, but not later than 389, that as well as his brother, but perhaps rather later than he, he received baptism at Bordeaux, from Delphinus, bishop of that place (*Ep.* iii. 4, xx. 6, xxxv. xxxvi.). Not long

after this he began to think of retiring from the world, and in 389 or 390 went to Spain, residing chiefly at Barcelona. During this time he married a Spanish lady of good fortune and irreproachable character, named Therasia, and a son was born to them, who however died after a few days, and was buried near the graves of the martyrs, no doubt Justus and Pastor, at Complutum (Alcalá). Whether they had any more children does not appear, though a passage in one of his poems shews that at one time he desired to have a family. (Prudentius, *Peristeph.* v. 41, 44; Dexter, *Chron.* A.D. 296, *Carm.* v. 66, xxi. 400, xxxv. 599, 610.) There seems to be good reason for placing the death of his brother about this time, earlier than the date assigned by the recent editors, for a passage in the twenty-first poem plainly places this event before his own retirement. His brother lost his life by a violent death, perhaps in the contest between Arbogastes and Theodosius, A.D. 392; and after his death not only his property, which was of importance to his children, was in danger of confiscation, but the property also of Paulinus and even his life, dangers from which he was delivered, as he believed, by the intercession of Felix (*Carm.* xxi. 414–427, Buse, vol. i. p. 157). It was perhaps partly due to the impression made on his mind by these events that during his stay in Spain he was led to reflect more deeply than ever on the vanity of worldly aims, and to feel much alarm at the prospect of final judgment, and having been blessed by God with light, he determined to give up the senate and worldly business, and notwithstanding the remonstrances of Ausonius refused to take any further interest in "profane" literature, even apologising, though perhaps not quite seriously, for quoting Virgil (*Ep.* iv. 2, xxii. 3, *Carm.* x. 304, 316). But he continued to write verses to the end of his life, though only on sacred subjects. Ausonius taunted him with neglect of his old friend, imputing it to the domineering influence of his wife, whom he called Tanaquil, but after long silence he replied, defending her from his friend's reproaches as being no Tanaquil but a true Lucretia (Auson. *Ep.* xxii. 3, Paulin. *Ep.* xxxv. xxxvi. *Carm.* x. 192, xi. xxii. 414, 425). Determined to renounce the world, he took measures for parting with a large portion of the property belonging both to himself and to his wife, with whom he entered into a vow of continence. Some of the money thus realised he employed in redeeming captives, releasing debtors, and the like, but some he retained for future use in similar purposes. Towards the end of his stay at Barcelona, in compliance with a sudden popular demand (multitudine strangulante compulsus) by no means in accordance with his own desires, for he wished to have begun with the lowest office, even of door-keeper (aedituus) in the service of God, he received ordination to the priesthood, but without any especial care of souls, from Lampius, bishop of Barcelona, on Christmas Day, A.D. 393 (*Ep.* i. 10, ii. 2, iii. 4). Writing to his friend Sulpicius Severus, to inform him of this event, he begs him to come to him before Easter, that they may celebrate the festival together, or at any rate not to put off his coming much longer. Writing to Amandus, then a priest, at Bordeaux, on the same subject, he begs his prayers for guidance in the work which he has undertaken, and seeks for instruction in the way of carrying it out. He appears, however, to have been already well acquainted with some of the most eminent of the African clergy, Alypius, Augustine, Aurelius, and others. To Alypius he writes by Julianus in reply to a letter received from him, acknowledging the receipt of a work by Augustine in five books, and informing him that he had been able to borrow for him, from Domnio at Rome, the Chronicle of Eusebius, which he wished to see, and which he sends with his letter to Aurelius, at Carthage, requesting him to get the book copied there by Comes and Evodius, and to transmit the copy to Alypius, in order that the borrowed one may be returned to its owner. In a subsequent letter addressed to St. Augustine he mentions the work in five books as his Pentateuch against the Manicheans, i.e. probably his work, in four books, *de doctrina Christiana*, together with the single volume *de vera Religione*, which last Augustine mentions distinctly as having been sent to Paulinus, and in which Manichean doctrine is discussed, though no mention of it is made in the other work (Aug. *Ep.* xxvii. 4). In the same letter Paulinus speaks of his own abandonment of the world, and the choice that has been made of him notwithstanding his unworthiness to be placed among the "princes" of God's people, and requests Augustine to write to him in order to instruct and direct him, and he concludes this letter, as he had the one to Alypius, by requesting Augustine to accept a loaf as a token of unity yet containing the solidity of the Trinity. A similar present with similar meaning was sent by him to other friends at other times (*Ep.* iii. 6, iv. 5, v. 21, vii. 3).

II. *Second Period.* A.D. 394–409.

In the course of this year, 394, he determined to retire to Nola, where he had property, including a house, and which was the burial of his patron Felix, to whom he says in one of his birth-day poems that he had long mentally dedicated himself, to whom he regarded himself as indebted for assistance and protection on many occasions, whom he invokes for like favour on his journey thither, whether to be made by sea or by land, and in whose service, even as a sweeper of the floor, he hopes to spend the remainder of his life. Of these poems, all of them dated Jan. 14, the anniversary of the death of Felix, fifteen are extant, either wholly or in part, and from them we gather nearly all that is known about Felix (*Carm.* xii. 34, xiv. 3; *Dict. of Chr. Ant.* vol. ii. 1379, NATALE). In the poem for the anniversary of the year after his arrival (395) Paulinus implies that he made his journey by sea, and ascribes to Felix its safe accomplishment (*Carm.* xiii. 14). On his way he saw St. Ambrose, probably at Florence, and in a letter to Sulpicius, whom he entreats to visit him at Nola, he speaks of his reception at Rome, where much jealousy towards him was shewn by the pope, Siricius, and others of the clergy, probably on account of the unusual circumstances of his ordination, whereas at Nola, where not long after his arrival he had a serious illness, he was visited after his recovery by nearly all the bishops of Campania, either in person or by deputy, by clergy of all sorts, by some of the laity, and

also received friendly letters from many African bishops who sent messengers to visit him. Sending his friend a loaf of Campanian bread, and as a proof of his wealth a dish of box-wood, he asks him to send him in return in the earthen vessels with which his messengers were furnished, some "nigellatum" (probably a sort of oil made from *nigella sativa*, *μελάνθιον*, Plin. *N. H.* xx. 17, 71, 182), and also requests him to cause some old wine to be conveyed to him, which he had left stored up at Narbonne (*Ep.* v. 13, 14, 21, 22, vii. 1, Ambros. *vit.* c. 133, vol. i. p. 106–108, ed. Migne, Baronius, 394, 90). Having now fulfilled his wish of taking up his residence at Nola, he entered with his wife at once upon the course of life which he had marked out for himself, and which he pursued as far as possible until his death, A.D. 431. Many of his friends and acquaintances blamed him greatly for giving up his worldly prospects, possessions and occupations, but men of higher aims, like St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome regarded his conduct and that of his wife with high respect and admiration for their self-sacrifice (Ambros. *Ep.* lviii. 1–3; Hieron. *Ep.* lviii. 6, cxviii. 5). In particular, Augustine writes to him in terms of warm admiration and affection, commending to him not only the bearer of his letter, Romanianus, his old friend, and the kinsman of Alypius, but also Licentius, son of Romanianus, whom he had exhorted to visit Paulinus, and over whom he hopes that he will exert a wholesome and religious influence (Aug. *Ep.* xxvii.). This latter was written in reply to a former one by Paulinus, but did not reach him so soon as might have been expected, and Paulinus, before he had received it, wrote again by Agilis and Romanus to complain, in a friendly way, of Augustine's silence (*Ep.* vi.). Augustine therefore writes a second time, acknowledging the receipt of both letters, announces his own appointment to the office of coadjutor to Valerius, bishop of Hippo, and urges Paulinus to visit him in Africa (Aug. *Ep.* xxxi). St. Jerome writes in terms of commendation not less warm, exhorting both himself and Therasia to persevere in their course of self-denial, and praises highly his panegyric on the emperor Theodosius, a work which he himself mentions, but which has perished (Hieron. *Ep.* lviii. Paul. (*Ep.* xxviii. 6, Gennadius, c. 48). In reply to the letter of Augustine and to those of the African bishops, Paulinus writes to Romanianus, congratulating the African Church on the appointment of Augustine, and hoping that his "trumpet" may sound forcibly in the ears of Licentius, to whom also he addressed a letter partly in prose and partly in verse to exhort him to a holy life, ending with the following lines, which seem to be worthy of quotation.

> Vive precor, sed vive Deo, nam vivere mundo
> Mortis opus, vera est vivere vita Deo.

At the time when Paulinus took up his residence at Nola, the burial-place of Felix, situate at a place called in the Martyrology of Bede *in Pincis* or *in Pineis*, distant about a mile from the town, and still called "the cemetery," containing a tomb of a humble character, discovered in a miraculous manner, but left undisturbed, had become in course of time the site of four churches (basilicae), one of them built by Pope Damasus, and also a chapel. The four churches bore the names of St. John, St. Stephen, the martyrs, as well as that of St. Felix, and the chapel, at any rate in the 18th century, was called by the name of St. Julian. Probably none of these buildings were of any great size, and to them he added a fifth. To three of them there was a common access, though in what manner this was effected it is not very easy to understand in all respects. Two of them are described by himself in a letter to Sulpicius, and in some of the birth-day poems which he addressed to his beloved patron (Dominaedius). (Ep. xxxii. *Carm.* viii. 167–190; xxi. 586–635, xxvii. 360 et seq. xxviii. Remondini, *della Nolana ecclesiastica storia*, vol. i. p. 399, J. Caesar Capaccio, ap. Graevius *Thes.* vol. ix.). The church whose dedication he mentions in Ep. 32 is described by him as having a triple apse (*trichorum*, i.e. *τρίχωρον*). Whether the word *apsidem* should be so spelt, or *absidem*, or again *absidam*, was at this time and until much later a doubtful point. (*Ep.* xxxii. 17, Isid. *Orig.* xv. 8, 7.) It was perhaps on the site of the one built by Damasus, and contained not only the tomb of Felix, but beneath the altar (altaria) remains of various saints and martyrs, including St. John Bapt., St. Andrew, St. Luke, St. Thomas, and others of less note, including St. Nazarius, of whom some relics were sent to him by St. Ambrose (*Ep.* xxxii. 17, *Carm.* xxvii. 436, 439), but above all the precious fragment of the True Cross, brought from Jerusalem by Melania, and presented by her to Paulinus A.D. 398, and of which he sent a chip (astula) enclosed in a tube of gold, to Sulpicius, as a special offering from Therasia and himself, to Bassula, his friend's mother-in-law, to honour the churches built by him at Primuliacum[a] (*Ep.* xxxi.). The pavement, walls, and columns of this apse were of marble, and the vaulted roof, from which lamps were suspended by chains, was ceiled with mosaic work representing the Trinity in a symbolical manner, and also the twelve apostles, with an inscription in verse describing the subjects represented. Of this mosaic some remains were visible in 1512. Another inscription, also in verse, on the plaster band below the spring of the vaulting indicated that the precious fragment of the Cross was deposited beneath the altar, and recorded the history of its arrival at Nola. Besides the suspended lamps and the silver lamp always burning before the altar, tall candles of parti-coloured wax stood in various parts of the building, and when lighted sent forth a sweet odour. The nave of the church was lofty and ceiled in panels (lacunatum). On each side were aisles, probably two, as the existing remains seem to show (geminis utrinque porticibus dilatatur), supported by columns, of which and to each arch there were two, i.e. they were set either in pairs on the same level, or in tiers, one upon the other, so as to form a sort of triforium gallery (duplex per singulos arcus columnarum ordo dirigitur), containing on each side four chambers or chapels (cubicula, coenacula) for people to pray in and meditate on Holy Scripture, and from which they might see the altar through latticed openings intended for the purpose (spectant de su-

[a] A place in Aquitaine, not far from Eluso (Eauze), perhaps Plaisance on the Adour.

peris altaria tota fenestris). They were also suited to be memorials of departed friends or holy persons interred beneath the ground-floor. (*Ep.* xxxii. 12, *Carm.* xviii. 35, xix. 408–411, xxvii. 362–402.) Each of the chambers bore in front an inscription in verse, as was the case with the entrances, and of these inscriptions he sends copies of two to his friend, in case he should wish to make use of them for his own churches lately built. Another church, altogether new, to which there was a private entrance through his own garden, with inscriptions on each side of the door, looked, not as was usually the case, to the east, but to the restored one containing the tomb of Felix, which may still be seen in its original place. With this church, the new one built by Paulinus, appears from the remains to have stood at right angles, in such a manner that the entrance of the one looked directly upon an opening in the side of the other, with only a small space between them, enclosed by open screen-work. In the sides of this and opposite to each other were three arches, bearing inscriptions in verse, through which when the folding doors were open a view might be obtained from the interior of the one church into the interior of the other, and in the open space there was a receptacle for water (cantharus) that people might wash their faces and hands before they entered the other church. (*Ep.* xiii. 13.) Like the church described above, this one had also an apse with semicircular recesses on each side, bearing inscriptions in verse, one for the ministering priest to make preparation for celebrating the Eucharist; the other a place of prayer for ministers and others after its conclusion. It had also three entrances in front, all bearing inscriptions, and the two on each side of the centre one had over them crosses painted in vermilion. That there were three churches there can be no doubt (*Carm.* xxviii. 37), but the situation of the third is not very clear, though, if we may judge from the existing remains and the plans of Remondini and Canina, it would seem to be the one bearing the name of the martyrs (dei martiri), at the south side of the older church of St. Felix. To all three, however, there was access from a paved court (atrium) surrounded by cloisters, in which were fountains for people to wash in before entering the church, and also a large reservoir (cantharus) with a lofty cover of perforated metal. Between the columns by which the roofs of these cloisters were supported there were railings or partitions, on which people might lean to rest themselves and enjoy in summer the shade, and in winter the shelter of the roof. Beyond this court outside there was another larger court (vestibulum) open, but, like the inner one, also surrounded with cloisters, and the junction of the gabled roofs presented the appearance, Paulinus says, of a castle (*Ep.* xxxii. 10–16; *Carm.* xxvii. 395–462, xxviii. 2–59). In both courts there were cells, and to those in the outer one three openings, of which the one in the middle was adorned with figures of saints of both sexes, while on those to the right and left respectively were represented the histories of Job and Tobit, and of Esther and Judith. The cells in the inner court (atrium) communicated with the principal church, so that they who wished to pray there might enter it either by day or night. There was no separate building for a baptistery, a point in which Paulinus acknowledges willingly that his friend surpassed him, but the font was placed in a vaulted chamber having three recesses of a circular form. (*Ep.* xxxii. i. 5; *Carm.* xxviii. 180–195.) All the buildings, both churches and cloisters, were adorned with pictures representing Scripture subjects, in the older church from the N. T. and in the newer one from O. T., for the introduction of which Paulinus apologises on the score of their utility in occupying the attention of the illiterate people who flocked to the grave of Felix in large numbers at all times of the year, and sometimes spent whole nights there in the winter, watching and fasting, having brought torches with them. By means of these pictures Paulinus hoped to employ their minds, and prevent them from subsequent excess either in eating or drinking. (*Carm.* xxvii. 552–598.) In beginning his work of bringing his new church into close proximity to the tomb of Felix, Paulinus was hindered by the obstinate refusal of the occupiers of two poor cottages which stood in the way, to remove from them under any conditions whatever. But fortunately a fire broke out in one or other of them, which, after resisting all efforts to extinguish it, yielded at last only to the exhibition of the fragment of the Cross. On examination, it was found to have consumed only such parts of the cottages as obstructed the new work, and the occupiers were induced by what had taken place to abandon their opposition. Another difficulty arose in the course of construction from a deficiency of water to supply the various fountains and reservoirs. The people of Nola appear to have been unwilling to allow him to share in their own supply, and he prepared tanks and receptacles for rain-water, but the zeal of the people, especially of Abella, in their devotion to Felix, removed the difficulty. They set to work to improve an old watercourse near Abella (Malifera Abella, Virg. Aen. vii. 740), now *Avella*, a town in the mountains, six miles from Nola, and obtained an abundant supply both for the establishment of Paulinus and for the town of Nola, notwithstanding its churlish opposition. Of all this, the credit was due to Felix. (*Carm.* xxi. 650–794, xxvii. 463–479, xxviii. 180–195.) The dedication of the new buildings by the bishop of Nola took place on the birth-day of Felix, A.D. 403, but he was able to show them in a state approaching completion to his dear friend Nicetas, bishop of the Dacians, whose second visit, in 402, he celebrated with special delight.[b] (*Carm.* xxvii.)

Besides these works Paulinus also devoted much pains and cost to the erection of a new church at Fundi, a place endeared to him by early recollections, and at which he possessed property. He also enriched it with relics of mar-

[b] The writer of this article cannot pretend to have satisfied himself entirely as to the position and arrangement of the buildings, partly from the absence of precision in the terms used to describe them, and partly from the difficulty of providing a common access to three buildings, not all of them looking in the same direction. The kindness however of a friend who has examined the site carefully, has furnished information which removes much of the difficulty. Reference will be made at the end of the article to various authorities on the subject.

tyrs and apostles, including St. Andrew, St. Luke, SS. Nazarius, Gervasius, and Protasius (*Ep.* xxxii. 17).

His own residence was a house which he had formerly either built or enlarged as an asylum for the poor, and to which he added a second story for his own use and that of his associates, and the friends who visited him; but reserving the ground-floor for the poor, so that by their ascending prayers the building above might be strengthened. (*Ep.* xxix. 13; *Carm.* xxi. 390.) His companions, at first, were Proforus, a Jew by birth, and Restitutus, and afterwards Theridius, Agilis, and Romanus: but though he carried out the monastic rule with full severity, he received his friends hospitably, and spared no pains to induce them to visit him. (*Ep.* v. 19, vi. 3, xv. 4, xviii. 1–3; *Carm.* xxi. 385–394, xxiii. 106; Aug. *Ep.* xxvi. 5.) In particular the two visits paid to him by Nicetas in 398 and 402 were occasions of great rejoicing. (*Carm.* xvii. xxvii.)

The mode of life adopted by Paulinus was monastic in the fullest sense, and he himself calls his house a monastery. (*Ep.* v. 15.) The inmates dressed themselves in hair cloth, with a rope round their waists instead of a girdle, cut their hair in a manner studiously unbecoming, were perhaps not careful as to personal cleanliness, observed strict rules of silence and fasting, even during Easter-tide did not eat until about 3 P.M., and used for the most part a vegetable diet, lying down to sleep on the ground or the floor, wrapped only in a coarse cloak or patch-work blanket, and abridging the time usually devoted to sleep. (*Ep.* xv. 4, xxii. 1, 2, 3, 6, xxix. i. 13; *Carm.* xxxv. 445–497.) In one of his letters he thanks his friend Sulpicius for sending him a dress of camel's hair as being suited by its roughness to be an instrument of discipline to the skin and to remind the wearer of his sins (*Ep.* xxix. 1); in another for sending him a cook, Victor by name, who was skilful in dressing vegetables for monastic diet, and who also condescended to shave him, (*Ep.* xxii. 3, xxiii. 7, 9, 10), and wished to be allowed to wash his feet and clean his shoes, the former of which services was accepted by Paulinus because it reminded him of the apostles, receiving the like service from their Master. Victor was frequently employed in carrying letters, and became much endeared to Paulinus (*Ep.* xxiii. 5, xxviii. 1, 3, xxxiii. 17). Another carrier of letters sent by Delphinus, bishop of Bordeaux, and Amandus, a priest of that diocese, Cardamas, an actor by profession, and not remarkable for sobriety, arrived during Lent, and at first complained of the meagre diet of the season, but afterwards submitted to it cheerfully, and even to the wine drunk by the brethren, and appears afterwards to have been admitted to one of the minor orders of the church, as an exorcist. (*Ep.* xv. 4, xix. 4.) Both Paulinus and his wife were lavish in almsgiving, though the latter was more thrifty than himself, and a story is related by Gregory of Tours, but concerned with an earlier period of his life than his residence at Nola, to show how, when he wished to give some money to a beggar, she objected on the ground that there was only one loaf in the house. "Give it then," said her husband, "for God will replace it for us." Presently came a message to announce the loss of a ship expected to arrive with a cargo of grain and wine, a calamity which he interpreted to be a punishment sent from God for the refusal of the loaf. (Greg. Turon. *de Glor. Confess.* cx. [cvii.].) One of the first of the messengers who brought letters to him and carried back his replies was Vigilantius, probably the same as he who afterwards became notorious for his controversy with St. Jerome. He brought letters from Sulpicius, soon after the arrival of Paulinus at Nola, but fell ill on his journey, and in consequence of this was detained there longer than would otherwise have been the case. It is plain that at this time Paulinus esteemed him highly, and had no suspicion of any unsoundness in his opinions. (*Ep.* v. 11, Hieron. *Ep.* 61, *contr. Vig.* Opp. ii. p. 339 (387), *adv. Ruff.* 14, Gilly, *Vigilantius*, pp. 173, 176.) All the bearers of letters for him were not equally trustworthy: one of them, called Marracinus—if indeed this word be a personal and not a tribal name—came as far as Rome, but whether from fear of monastic diet, or from some other cause, abandoned his charge there and handed it over to his companion Sorianus, who was more faithful than himself (*Ep.* xxii. 1). On the other hand, Paschasius, a deacon who brought letters from Victricius, bishop of Rouen, found Paulinus at Rome, and made himself so acceptable that he took him with him to Nola, where he was able not only to nurse him during a severe illness, but also his companion Ursus, whose recovery Paulinus attributed to the influence of Felix, and whom Paschasius, with the approval of Paulinus, baptized on his sick bed. (*Ep.* xviii. 1–3.) It is perhaps worth noticing that some of these messengers—e.g., Sanemarius and Victor, had only lately been set free from servitude, the former by Paulinus, the latter by Sulpicius. (*Ep.* xii. 12, xxii. 3, xxiii. 4.) For Sanemarius, who carried a letter to Amandus, Paulinus requested that his friend would make interest with Exsuperius, a priest of Bordeaux, afterwards probably bishop of Toulouse, to obtain for him a piece of ground as a means of living, on condition of his taking care of the burial-place of his parents. (*Ep.* xii. 12, Baronius, 405, 61, 62.) In the same letter he requested his friend to forward to Daducius, a Christian, but of whom nothing more is known, a letter pleading the cause of Basilius, an aged presbyter of Capua, whom he wished to get reinstated in his home, from which he had been driven by the encroachments of some wealthy persons of that neighbourhood, and with whom Daducius was in some way connected. In subsequent letters he expresses his thankfulness for the accomplishment of his wish, at which he says that all Capua rejoices. (*Ep.* xii. 12, xiv. 4, xv. 2, 3.)

Having once settled at Nola, he seldom, if ever, left his abode there, except to pay a visit once a year to Rome, to join in the festival of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, on June 29, the day of their martyrdom (beatorum apostolorum natalem) (*Ep.* xvii. 2, xviii. 1, xx. 2, xliii. 1, xlv. 1; *Carm.* xxi. 132–166; Aug. *Ep.* xcv. 6.) As the distance between Rome and Nola is about 160 miles, a longer distance than he himself states, he doubtless took many days for making the journey; and on one occasion he tells us that he stopped a day at Formiae, in order to enjoy

there the reading of a letter received from St. Augustine, at Rome, by the hands of Quintus, a deacon. On these occasions, however, his time was so much occupied, not only by the special employments of the festival and visits paid to the churches of the martyrs, but in receiving visits from many people, personal friends and others, who came to consult and converse with him on religious subjects, that he had little or no time to spare even for the perusal of a letter from so valued a correspondent. (*Ep.* xvii. 2, xlv. 1; *Carm.* xiv. 66–70.) It was just after one of these annual pilgrimages, in 399, that he became ill, as has been mentioned above, and when so much sympathy was shown towards him by the bishops and clergy of Campania.

But though he took great pains to attend at this great general festival, and to do it all the honour in his power, the event which in all the year was the chief subject of interest for him and his little community at Nola was the festival of St. Felix, on January 14. For many years he did not omit to compose a poem in honour of the day, setting forth either the praises of the saint or his own endeavours to do him honour. We have already seen that the popularity of St. Felix, and the great numbers of the people who flocked to his shrine, led eventually to the building of the churches described above; and in one of the earlier of the poems Paulinus tells us how multitudes came from all parts of Southern Italy, either to be cured of their ailments, and be relieved of their troubles of various kinds, or to thank God for cures already performed or relief obtained; how even Rome itself sent forth its thousands on the Appian road, which became encumbered by the crowds of pilgrims, and how Nola, for a short time, became, he says, almost as populous as Rome. (*Ep.* xiv.) When the Goths invaded Italy, A.D. 400, 401, as a punishment, Paulinus says, for the sins of the Roman people, he exhorted Christians to trust for protection, not to human arms but to the mercy of God, whose favour they ought to seek in penitence and prayer; and as Isaiah was sent to comfort and encourage Hezekiah, so may Felix become an intercessor with God for the deliverance of His people. (*Carm.* xxvi. 74, 195.) In a poem written five years later, A.D. 406, of which a fragment only remains, he speaks with thankfulness of the defeat of the invaders, no doubt that of Rhadagaisus by Stilicho, A.D. 405, a deliverance which he attributes to the intercessions of the patron saints of the church, including Felix (*Carm.* xxxi.; Aug. *Civ. D.* v. 23).

III. *Third Period.* A.D. *c.* 409–431.

At some time during the next four years, Paulinus became bishop of Nola, and though it is impossible to fix the date exactly, it must have been before the autumn of 410, at which time Alaric laid waste Campania, for St. Augustine speaks of him as being then bishop of Nola. Therasia was probably dead, though not very long before this time, for a letter of Paulinus to Augustine superscribed, as was frequently though not invariably the case, both with his own name and that of his wife, *Paulinus et Therasia pe catores*, appears to belong to the year 408; and certainly to the month of May, and later still in the same year, the reply of Augustine, conveyed in all probability by Possidius, bishop of Calama, is addressed to both names. The letter, however, of Paulinus, just mentioned, is the last which bears the double superscription; and as there is no subsequent mention of Therasia, even in connection with the capture of Nola, we may perhaps conclude that her death took place in the latter part of the year 408, though Tillemont and Buse seem to place it a year or two later than this; and Gregory of Tours seems to speak of her as alive during a part at any rate of his episcopate. (*Ep.* xlv. p. 8, Aug. *Civ. D.* i. 10; *Ep.* Gregorius Tur. *de Glor. Conf.* cx. (cvii.); Baronius, 410, 45; Gams, *Series Episc.*, p. 907; Tillemont, vol. xiv. 50, p. 156; Buse, vol. ii. pp. 192, 193.) His diocese was a small one, and appears, at any rate in former times, to have been notorious for drunkenness and immorality. (*Ep.* xlix. 14; *Carm.* xix. 164–218.) Without adopting the whole of the glowing panegyric applied by Uranius to his behaviour as bishop, we may well believe that he shewed himself in this, as in other respects, a faithful, devout, humble, and munificent follower of his divine Master; and when Campania was laid waste by the army of Alaric, A.D. 410, Paulinus devoted all that he had to the relief of the sufferers and captives. In reference to this calamity, Baronius, in contradiction to the plain statement of St. Augustine, thinks that the people of Nola, through the influence of Felix, escaped from it, but the prayer which he offered at the time when he was in the hands of the captors shows sufficiently both the fact and also his habit of life and temper of mind. "Lord, let me not suffer torture for the sake of gold or silver, for whither all these are gone that were mine Thou knowest." The story which St. Gregory the Great, 200 years later, relates, that Paulinus gave himself as a captive in exchange for a widow's son, though accepted by M. Lagrange, seems hardly worth consideration. (Aug. *Civ. D.* i. 10, *de cur. mort.* xvi. 19; Greg. Mag. *Dial.* iii. 1; Baronius, 410, xlv. xlvi., Gaston Boissier, *Revue des deux Mondes*, *Vie de S. Paul par l'Abbé Lagrange*, vol. xxviii. 1878.) See also (FELIX (186), vol. ii., p. 499.) The barbarian occupation did not last long, and made no difference to Paulinus as to his residence, nor, as it seems, to his buildings, for the treatise of Aug. *de cura pro mortuis gerenda*, written A.D. 421, addressed to Paulinus, and sent to him by Candidianus, speaks of the burial of a young man named Cynegius, in the Church of St. Felix (c. i. 1, and xviii. 23). From this time until his death, in 431, there are few events to record in the life of Paulinus. A letter addressed to him by St. Augustine, probably in 417, seems to hint at a tendency on his part to adopt some, at least, of the erroneous doctrines of Pelagius, with whom he had been on friendly terms (Aug. *Ep.* 186 i. 1, and xii. 41). He may perhaps have taken part in the proceedings at Rome and at Ravenna, A.D. 418, which led to the condemnation of Pelagius and the deposition of Julianus, bishop of Eclanum, on whose marriage with Ia Paulinus had written a poem (*Carm.* xxv.; JULIANUS (15), vol. iii. 469-472.) When after the death of Zosimus, in December of the same year, the appointment of his successor in the see of Rome became a matter of dispute, the emperor Honorius, having summoned a council

of bishops to meet at Ravenna, and afterwards at Spoletum, to settle the question, invited Paulinus to attend at both of these places, but he excused himself on the first occasion on the ground of ill-health, and was probably prevented by the same cause from appearing on the second. (Baronius, 419, 19, 20.) After a residence of thirty-six years in his retirement at Nola, a period devoted both by himself, and during her lifetime by his wife, to unsparing self-denial, to religious observances, and to works of piety and charity without stint, he died June 22, A.D. 431, aged 77 or 78. An account of his last illness and death has been left by Uranius in a letter addressed to Pacatus. Uranius was perhaps the same man as he who, 22 years before this time, had incurred the displeasure of Paulinus by long delay in conveyance of a letter to him from Delphinus (*Ep.* xix. i.). As the account is not very long, it may, perhaps, be well to give it with some abridgment, as follows:— "Three days before his death he was visited by two bishops, Symmachus (of Capua) and Acyndinus, by whose conversation he was much refreshed. He desired the sacred mysteries to be exhibited before his bed, so that the sacrifice having been offered in their company, he might commend his own soul to the Lord, and at the same time recall to their former peace those on whom, in the exercise of church discipline, he had pronounced sentence of exclusion from communion. When this was over he called for his brothers, by whom the bystanders thought that he meant the bishops who were present; but he said that he called for Januarius, bishop of Naples, and Martin of Tours (both of them deceased), who, he said, had promised to be with him. He then raised his hands to heaven, and repeated Psalm cxx. (cxxi.), 'I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills,' &c. Being reminded by Posthumianus that 40 *solidi* were due for garments given to the poor, he replied, smiling, 'Be not disturbed, my son; believe that one will not be wanting to discharge the debt of the poor.' And presently came in a presbyter from Lucania, sent either by Exsuperantius or his brother Ursatius, bringing 50 *solidi*. He blessed God for not deserting him, and having given 2 *solidi* to the presbyter, gave the rest to the tradesmen who had supplied the clothes. He then slept till midnight, but was awakened by the pain in his side, which was much increased by the violent means (ustiones) employed by the physicians. As his custom was, he celebrated matins, and when day broke, after the Lord's example, he pronounced the commandment of peace (pacem hereditariam). Later in the day, as if the hour for vespers were come, perhaps at that time (lucernariæ devotionis tempus agnoscens), he recited slowly, with outstretched hands, the words, 'I have prepared a lamp for my anointed' Ps. cxxxi. 17 (cxxxii. 17). At about the fourth hour of the night, while all were watching, the cell was shaken by an earthquake, which was felt nowhere else, and during this he expired." He was buried in the Church of St. Felix, in Pincis, and his funeral was attended not only by Christians, but by Jews and Pagans. His body is said to have been afterwards removed to Rome and interred in the Church of St. Bartholomew. (Uranius, *de ob. S. Paul* ap. Migne *Patrol.*, vol. liii.; Baronius, 431, 193–197; Remordini, vol. i. p. 399.)

Writings of Paulinus. a. Prose.

He has left behind fifty-one letters and thirty-six poems, and besides these and the Panegyric on Theodosius already mentioned, is said by Gennadius to have written several letters to his sister (?) about contempt of the world, also various discourses on a description of the martyrdom of Genesius of Arles, one on almsgiving, one on repentance, and one in praise of all martyrs; also to have composed a Hymnary, a statement which seems to rest chiefly on a passage in the letter to Alypius (*Ep.* iii.). The same writer says, that he was eminent not only for his learning and holiness of life, but also for his power in expelling evil spirits. (Gennad. c. 48.) Excepting the letters and the poems mentioned above, which are some of them imperfect, the other works have perished, but there are sufficient to give us a full idea of the man's character and abilities, and also incidentally some pictures of the state of society, both high and low, during his lifetime. Of the letters, 13, some of them very long, are addressed to Sulpicius Severus, the first in 394, and the last of them in A.D. 403, 5 to Delphinus, bishop of Bordeaux, 6 to Amandus his successor, 4 to Augustine, 3 to Aper and Amanda, 2 to another Amandus and Sanctus, 2 to Ruffinus, 2 to Victricius, 3 to persons unknown, and single letters to Alethius, Alypius, Desiderius, Eucherius and Gallus, Florentius, Jovius, Licentius, Macarius, Pammachius, Romanianus, Sebastianus, besides the account of the martyrdom of Genesius which comes as a sort of postscript to the letter to Eucherius and Gallus, *Ep.* 51. One to Marcella, and one to Celancia are probably not genuine. The double superscription to many of his letters has been already mentioned. It does not appear that he ever saw Sulpicius after his visit to Spain, but the love of the two men for each other never failed. Again and again he entreats Sulpicius to come and see him, "veni ad nos," he says in one letter, "et si potes advola." (*Ep.* xi. 14.) Many times he laments over delay in hearing from him, and expresses his own affection and also that of his wife both for himself and his mother-in-law Bassula. Sulpicius on his side sends him his life of St. Martin, which he reads to Melania, and also to his friend Nicetas, lately arrived from Dacia. (*Ep.* xxix. 14.) The cook has already been mentioned. He also asked Paulinus to let him have his picture to place in the church which he was building. This last request, Paulinus with much earnestness declined to grant, "erubesco pingere quod sum, non audeo pingere quod non sum," but rejoices that a picture of himself is painted in his friend's heart. (*Ep.* xxx.) In return Paulinus sends to Sulpicius various presents, loaves of unity, a fragment of the Cross, a dress, blessed by Melania, and which he had worn himself that he might share the blessing with his friend (*Ep.* xxix.), poems frequently, and his panegyric on Theodosius. The last letter describes the churches at Nola, and their dedication. (*Ep.* xxxii.) His letters to Delphinus and Amandus, though they exhibit the same deep humility and also the cheerful humour which was a part of his character, are chiefly

remarkable for the earnest request made to both of these friends, that they will offer their prayers on behalf of his deceased brother, of whom he speaks with great affection. but with deep regret for his neglect in spiritual matters, and hopes that by their prayers he may obtain some refreshment in the other world. (*Ep.* xxxv. xxxvi.) Of those to St. Augustine the first two (iv. vi.) contain nothing of special importance, beyond some gracious expressions of profound respect; the third is chiefly occupied with remarks on the grief of Melania for the loss of her only son Publicola, and a reply to Augustine on the condition of the soul in celestial glory, which he thinks will be one of highly exalted powers and beauty resembling the condition of our Lord after His resurrection. He asks Augustine for his own opinion on the same subject. (*Ep.* xiv.) To this letter Augustine replied, and speaks of the pleasure which Possidius, the bearer, must be enjoying in the society of Paulinus and Therasia, regretting his own inability to cross the sea to visit them. As regards this question, he agrees with Paulinus that it is more important to attend to our own life and conduct in this world, for as is our life here so in the main will our condition be hereafter. He points out some of the difficulties by which our life among men is beset, begs his advice, and requests him to ask for the advice of others on the subject of Christian behaviour in society. He has little doubt that the condition of just men made perfect will be one of enlarged and exalted bodily faculties, but in a spiritual condition. (Aug. *Ep.* xcv.) In the 4th letter Paulinus asks for the opinion of Augustine as a doctor of Israel on various passages in scripture according to the Latin version. (1) Ps. xv. 3 (xvi. 4), *sanctis . . . . multiplicatae sunt infirmitates eorum, postea acceleraverunt* who are meant by the "saints," and how are their infirmities multiplied? (2) Ps. xvi. 15, 16 (xvii. 14) what is meant by *de absconditis tuis adimpletus est venter eorum*, and *saturati sunt porcina*, or, as he hears is read by some, *filiis*. (3) Ps. lviii. 11 (lix. 11) *ne unquam obliviscantur legis tuae* (Vulg. *populi tui*). He cannot understand how knowledge of the law can be sufficient without faith in Christ. (4) Ps. lxvii. 23, 25 (lxviii. 21, 23). *Deus conquassabit capita inimicorum suorum, verticem capilli &c.*, which last expression he thinks to be void of sense, though he could understand *verticem capitis*, who are the "dogs," v. 25, and what is the meaning of *ab ipso*? Some questions follow on passages in St. Paul's epistles. (1) Eph. iv. 11, What are the special functions of each order named by St. Paul, what difference is there between "pastors" and "teachers." (2) 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, What difference between "prayers" and "supplications," &c. (3) Rom. xi. 28. How can the people of Israel be at the same time friends and enemies; why enemies for the sake of Christians, friends for that of the fathers? (4) Col. ii. 18, *nemo vos seducat in humilitate et religione angelorum.* What angels does St. Paul mean: if bad angels, how can there be any *humilitas* or *religio* connected with them? Paulinus thinks that heretics must be intended. (5) Col. ii. 18. 21. He asks Augustine to explain to him these two passages from the Epistle to the Colossians, which seem to him to contradict each other: what "show of wisdom" (ratio sapientiae) can there be in "will worship" (superstitio) and how can "neglect of the body" (non parcendum corpori) agree with "satisfying of the flesh" (saturitas carnis), which seems contrary to St. Paul's own practice as mentioned 1 Cor. ix. 27. He also asks Augustine to explain to him how it came to pass that our Lord was and was not recognised by the women and disciples on the Day of Resurrection, how He came to be known by the latter in the "breaking of bread;" what did He mean by bidding Mary not to touch Him until after His ascension (John xx. 17), as to which he supposes that He meant that He was to be touched by faith hereafter, though not then by the hand. Again, what did Symeon mean by his words to the Virgin Mother (Luke ii. 34, 35), what "sword" was it that was to pierce her soul, was it the word of God; and how could this cause the "thoughts of many hearts" to be "revealed"? These questions he doubts not that Augustine will be able to explain to him. (*Ep.* L.) In replying to them, St. Augustine says, that he has consulted MSS., in order to consider various readings of some of the passages, especially how they stand in the original Greek, (of N. T.) (1) Ps. xv. 3 (xvi. 4), he explains by reference to Rom. v. 20, if sins abounded, mercies abounded still more. (2) Ps. xvi. 15 (xvii. 14), the "world" here means the church, from which the ungodly must be rejected, and *de absconditis*, &c., means the evil harboured in the consciences of the bad. In v. 16 of same Psalm (xvii. 15), the reading *porcina*, which proceeded from one of LXX. ὑῶν or ὑειῶν instead of υἱῶν or υἱέων, Augustine mentions as erroneous, and shows that the true reading must imply that the evil of bad men must descend to their children. (See Hieron. *Brev. in Ps.* xvi. vol. vii. p. 862.) (3) Ps. lviii. 11 (lix. 11). Augustine shows that in speaking of Jews the passage means, that the people would not be destroyed lest the law would be forgotten. (4) Ps. lxvii. 23. (lxviii. 21.) The expression refers to the pride of some people, and by *canum tuorum* (v. 25) the enemies are meant, who had become by conversion God's servants, faithful like watch-dogs to their masters. The words *ab ipso* imply God's grace. Turning to St. Paul's Epistles, he shows (1) that the prophets mentioned in Eph. iv. 11, are men like Agabus, and the evangelists are such as St. Luke or St. Mark. Pastors and teachers are the same in different aspects of their office. (2) 1 Tim. ii. 1. The Greek must be consulted, whose meaning the translators have scarcely reached. MSS. differ as to the reading, some reading *deprecationes* for *obsecrationes* (δεήσεις) and *postulationes* for *interpellationes* (ἐντεύξεις). Though the difference between the words is very slight, he prefers to agree with the church that *precationes* (δεήσεις or εὐχαὶ) are to be understood of such prayers as are made before the consecration of the elements in the Eucharistic Service; *orationes* (προσευχαὶ) after this, which is almost everywhere followed by the Lord's Prayer, and after all come *gratiarum actiones* (εὐχαριστίαι) which St. Paul places last of all. (3) Rom. xi. 25, 26. There is no real difficulty in this passage. Those who become Christians are "beloved," while the rest are "enemies." The "beloved" according to elec-

tion are the predestinated, but those who fail to persevere to the end in faith working by love are not included in the call, as is the case with some infants who otherwise would undoubtedly be saved, but that they afterwards fell away. The case is not in all its parts thoroughly intelligible to us. (4) Col. ii. 18, 23. He confesses the obscurity of the passage, and would prefer to talk it over with Paulinus. By "philosophy" is meant attention to useless subjects, including Judaism: by angels are meant those of them who devote their attention to the world, and *religio*, *cultus* of them answers to θρησκεία. By *rationem habentia sapientiae* is meant, things of which another account can be given by worldly philosophy; *ad non parcendum corpori*, &c., implies a superstitious humiliation by which the body is defrauded of the food from which it is compelled to abstain, though we know that no one sort of food is more honourable than another. (5) As to our Lord's appearances after His resurrection, no doubt He presented more than one bodily appearance at different times, e.g. at the transfiguration. In the meaning of His words to Mary *noli me tangere*, Augustine agrees with Paulinus: the "breaking of bread" was no doubt a sacrament which unites us in acknowledgment of Him. (6) The "thoughts of many hearts to be revealed" includes thoughts of all kinds, bad and good; the "sword" must mean sorrow. This correspondence is interesting and also valuable, as showing (1) the opinions of St. Augustine on certain passages of scripture, and (2) his just conception of the true principles of biblical criticism, and though the imperfect nature of his own qualifications for the task especially as regards O. T., must be admitted, the acuteness of his perception and clearness of his judgment together with his firm grasp of the true function of scripture in the system of the church give great weight to his opinions on all the points submitted to him. (3) We may add also, from the view which it gives of the attention paid by a diligent intelligent and devout man like Paulinus to the text of scripture in its Latin version, the only one accessible to him, and of the difficulties with which he met in his study of it. The three letters to Aper and Amanda, a priest and his wife, who had adopted a rule of life similar to that of Paulinus with Therasia, contain nothing worthy of special remark, except a wish for the welfare of their children, combined with approval of their own way of life (*Ep.* xxxviii. xxxix. xliv.). In one of two to Amandus and Sanctus he mentions an observation by his friend Ruffinus in natural history, as to the pelican in Egypt feeding on serpents, and ventures on an etymology in Greek as to the word *nycticorax*, which can hardly be called successful. He also founds some remarks on the Latin reading of Ps. cxl. 6, cxli. 5, (*impinguet caput meum*) on which so much perverse discussion arose in the Donatist controversy. (*Ep.* xl. 6; xli. 5.) In the first of the two to Ruffinus, he laments his imperfect acquaintance with Greek, and asks him to explain the blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix.), an explanation which in the second of them he asks him to complete. (*Ep.* xlvi. xlvii.). In the letter to Alypius, besides what has already been mentioned, Paulinus asks him to give an account of his life and conversion, and wishes to know what hymn of his own composition he has seen. (*Ep.* iii.). On the letters to Florentius and Alethius, bishops successively of Cahors (*Ep.* xlii. iii.), to Desiderius in answer to one from him which has perished *Ep.* xliii. (vol. i. p. 818) to Sebastianus, a hermit, (*Ep.* xxxvi.) and to Romanianus (*Ep.* vii.), no special remark need be made. In the first of the two to Victricius, bishop of Rouen, he tells him how he had learned from his messenger Ursus, who, as was seen above, had fallen sick at Nola, of his successful labours among the distant Morini and Nervii, how the city of Rouen has become filled with holy persons, how he had suffered persecution, and of the miracles performed in connection with the same (*Ep.* xviii.). In the second he declares very clearly the true faith in the Trinity (*Ep.* xxxvii.). The one to Licentius is partly in prose and partly in verse, and consists mainly of an exhortation to him to leave the army and devote himself to Christ, and to remember Augustine. (*Ep.* viii. LICENTIUS (1), vol. iii. 724.) The one to Macarius (m. 23, vol. iii. 775) describes the miraculous preservation of an old man named Valgius, afterwards at his baptism called Victor, who after a shipwreck, was carried about in the vessel to various places, until on the 23rd day it was cast on the shore of Lucania. He begs him to show Christian love to this man, by assisting Secundinianus, the owner of the ship which had been seized by the agent of Posthumianus, on whose property it was cast away, and emptied of its contents The case had been laid before the provincial judge, but his heart was hardened, and he went to Rome to be out of the way, whither Secundinianus and Valgius had followed him. He begs his friend to use his influence with Posthumianus to obtain redress for the injustice. (*Ep.* xlix.) The letter to Pammachius is a very long one of condolence and exhortation on the loss of his wife Paulina, daughter of Paula, and sister of Eustochium. He asks forgiveness for delay in writing on the ground, that seeing so few people he had not heard of the loss until some time after it took place when the news was brought by Olympius, and then after this of his own weak health during winter. Feeling deeply for him in his loss, he nevertheless doubts whether he ought to write more in sorrow or in thankfulness for the faith which he has shewn, in honouring her funeral, not with ostentatious pomp or gladiatorial shows, but with alms and good works, first presenting the sacred oblation to God and the pure libation (sacras hostias et casta libamina) with commemoration of her whom he had lost, and then providing a meal for the poor of Rome, collected in great numbers in the church of St. Peter, following in this the example of scripture saints of Christ himself, and of the first Christians. But faith is a greater comfort than any words of his, by means of which we can walk in paradise with the souls of the departed. Relying on the truth of scripture we can have no doubt as to the resurrection, his only doubt is as to his own claim to admission into the heavenly kingdom. Yet the door, he knows, is open to all, and the departed wife of his friend is a pledge to himself of the future in Christ. Happy is she who is honoured

by his charity, fed with his loaves, abounding in his riches, for whom so many prayers intercede, whose head is crowned with flowers from her own household. (*Ep.* xiii. see Hieron. *Ep.* lxvi.) In a letter to Jovius his kinsman, he reproves him for complaining of the weather, as a part of God's work which is beyond our understanding, exhorts him to find time for studying scripture and becoming a Christian, for which his previous training has prepared him (*Ep.* xvi.). The last letter is one to Eucherius and Gallus, who had taken up a monastic life at Lerins, and from whom three of the brothers Augendus, Gelasius, and Tigridius had visited Paulinus at Nola (*Ep.* li.). At the end of this letter is an account, whether by way of postscript to the letter, or as a separate narrative, of the martyrdom of St. Genesius of Arles. Two letters addressed to him by St. Jerome exist, in the first of which, besides the topics already mentioned, he makes remarks on the style of Tertullian, Cyprian, Victorinus, Lactantius and Hilarius, and of that of Paulinus himself, which he commends highly, as is also the case in the other of his letters. in which replying to some questions addressed to him, by Paulinus as to the meaning of some scripture passages, one of them concerning the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, he describes his style as equal to that of Cicero, an opinion copied by Erasmus. He also disclaims entire condemnation of the works of Origen, though he finds great fault with the one περὶ ἀρχῶν, (Hieron. *Ep.* lviii. lxxxv.). Without accepting the somewhat exaggerated encomium of St. Jerome, we may say that the letters of Paulinus are generally speaking clear and intelligible, pleasing as regards style, remarkable for humility of mind, an affectionate disposition, and a cheerful playful humour, free from all moroseness or ascetic bitterness. Many of his remarks both on scripture and on other subjects bear the marks of good sense and sound judgment, and though free from any pretension to learning, show him to have been an industrious student and careful enquirer in the sacred writings in their Latin dress.

b. Verse.—But he also wrote much in verse at all times of his life, and, as we have seen, sent many of his poems to his friends. The earliest of those which are extant is addressed, together with a short letter in prose, and a present of ortolans to a friend named Gestidius, the second with one of oysters to the same friend. Both of them are in Hexameter verse. The third in Hexameter, a fragment of the Suetonian poem has been already mentioned, the 4th also in Hexameters, consists of devout Christian prayers and reflections with an outline of scripture doctrine and of the Christian faith. The next is a longer composition concerning St. John the Baptist, the 7th, 8th, and 9th are paraphrases on the 1st, 2nd, and 136th (137th) Psalms, the first of these in Iambics; a metre evidently suggested by the 2nd of the epodes of Horace, the other two in Hexameters. The 10th and 11th poems are letters to Ausonius in reply to his reproachful appeals on the change of life adopted by Paulinus, and the consequent change in behaviour which he attributed to him. The 10th is partly in Elegiacs, a second portion in Iambics, and the rest in Hexameters, the 11th partly in Hexameters and the remainder in Iambics. They contain earnest remonstrances against his friend's imputations, a defence of his own and his wife's behaviour, and entreaties to him to follow his example. Of the remaining poems seventeen are more or less directly in praise of Felix, all of them dated on his birth-day January 14, i.e. the day of his death, and have consequently been called Natalitia, though not by Paulinus himself. The first (*Carm.* xii.) was written by him in Spain, but with a full intention of retiring to Nola, A.D. 394, the second, shortly after his arrival there (*Carm.* xiii.). The third describes the concourse of people resorting from all parts to the tomb of Felix, and the power which he manifested of casting out devils and curing diseases (*Carm.* xiv. 21–43):

immensi Felix gloria Christi.

The 15th and 16th poems relate the legend of Felix (FELIX, 186, Vol. II. p. 499). The 17th is a Sapphic ode to Nicetas, who was about to return to his see after his visit to Nola, A.D. 398. (*Carm.* xvii.) He came a second time, A.D. 402, and his visit is mentioned with much satisfaction in the 27th poem. The 18th poem, 6th in honour of Felix, describes in Hexameters the discovery of his tomb, mentions the five churches built around it, and how the country people not only come themselves, but brought their animals also to be cured of their maladies by the saint's influence. He relates a wondrous tale of a countryman whose two oxen, his whole property, were stolen from him, but restored by night unexpectedly after long prayer at the saint's tomb continued in spite of the opposition of the guardians of the church. Nor was this all, for by much weeping he had injured his sight, and this also he prayed might be restored to him:

miseratus, Sancte, meorum
Damna boum, miserare itidem mihi damna oculorum.

The people laughed at him, but his prayer (Paulinus says) was heard, his eyes regained their sight, and he went home rejoicing over his oxen recovered and his eyesight restored. (*Carm.* xviii.) The 19th, 20th, and 21st poems, of which a few lines are quoted by Dungalus in the 9th century, all of them in honour of Felix, were discovered by Muratori in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, and published by him in 1697. In order of the series they stand as 11, 12, 13, and belong to the years 404, 405, 406. The first of these, a poem of 730 lines, describes how the relics of martyrs had been transferred to other places than those in which they died, especially the more notable among them; how Nola was honoured and benefited by the grave of Felix, and how a thief who had stolen an ornament in the church containing a figure of the cross was discovered, partly by the agency of Felix, and partly by the miraculous operation of the sacred emblem. (*Carm.* xix.) The 20th poem, 12th in honour of Felix, contains three marvellous tales, one of a man who professed to offer a pig on the festival day, to be eaten by the poor, but fraudulently withdrew the greater part of it, and having been as a punishment deprived of the use of his limbs, on confession of his fraud was restored to their use by Felix, as he said, in the name of Christ (v. 1–303). The second story is also about a pig which had been devoted to Felix by a man from beyond Beneventum, but was unable to

move on account of its size. One of its progeny was therefore substituted; but to the man's astonishment the original pig appeared at the place where he had rested for the night (v. 304–387). The third is about a heifer, also devoted, but which being fraudulently put in harness for the use of the owners refused the yoke, but accompanied the cart which bore them to the shrine of Felix, and there calmly submitted itself to the knife of the butcher. (*Carm.* xx. 388–444.) The 21st poem, 13th in honour of Felix, A.D. 406, expresses thankfulness for the return of peace, after the victory of Stilicho over Rhadagaisus, A.D. 405, a blessing which Paulinus attributes in great measure to the influence of Felix, whose praises he celebrates partly in Iambic verse, mentioning the names of those who had taken refuge with him in his retreat at Nola, when Rome was threatened with invasion, Turcius Apronianus, with his wife Avita, sister of the elder Melania, and their children, Asterius, also probably called Suerius, and Eunomia; his own wife, Herasia, or Therasia, Albina, widow of Publicola, son of the elder Melania, and her daughter Melania, with her husband Pinianus; and lastly, Aemilius, perhaps bishop of Beneventum, and son of the Julianus, on whose marriage Paulinus wrote a poem. He then relates in Hexameters the story of his own early attachment to Felix, and devotion to him for Christ's sake (v. 445); the discovery of his tomb and erection over it of a mausoleum, the unexpected supply of water from Abella, for which the city of Nola was indebted to Felix. (*Carm.* xxi.) The 22nd poem, addressed to his kinsman, Jovius, A.D. 399 or 400, contains an account of Scripture doctrine compared with statements of heathen writers. (*Carm.* xxii.) The 23rd, 7th in honour of Felix, A.D. 400, describes his power over evil spirits, and the manner in which by an accidental wound in the dark Theridius lost his eye, but recovered its use through Felix. (*Carm.* xxiii.) The 24th poem, addressed to Cytherius, relates the shipwreck of Martinianus, with instances from Scripture of divine preservation. (*Carm.* xxiv.) The 25th is in honour of the marriage of Julianus, bishop of Eclanum, with Ia, mentioned above, and describes the circumstances of some of the marriages mentioned in Scripture. (*Carm.* xxv.) The 26th, 8th in honour of Felix, speaks of the expected invasion of the Goths and his own entire trust in God and in Felix for protection. (*Carm.* xxvi.) The 27th, 9th in honour of Felix, speaks of his pleasure in receiving a second visit from Nicetas, and describes his churches. (*Carm.* xxvii.) In the 28th poem he continues this description, and describes also his own dwelling and the fire mentioned above. (*Carm.* xxviii.) The 29th is a fragment of nine lines. The 30th, in honour of Felix, is imperfect, but describes how the relics of saints have been carried into various parts of the world, and the benefit derived from them. (*Carm.* xxx.) The 31st poem is a fragment from the 13th, in honour of Felix, and mentions the victory of Stilicho. (*Carm.* xxxi.) The 32nd is the 14th in honour of Felix, A.D. 407, and is also only a fragment. (*Carm.* xxxii.) The 33rd is a fragment of the 15th in honour of Felix, as is also the 34th. (*Carm.* xxxiii., xxxiv.) The 35th is a long letter of condolence, in elegiac verse, to Pneumatius and Fidelis his wife, on the loss of their son Celsus, and enlarges on the comfort to be derived from the doctrine of the resurrection. It mentions the loss of his own child, and assures his friends of the warm affection entertained for them both by himself and Therasia. (*Carm.* xxxv.) The poem last in order is dedicated to a friend whom he calls Antonius, by which name he has been thought to denote Ausonius, and consists of a discourse of the insufficiency of the old mythological systems and of the advantages of the true one which he has himself adopted, whose Trinitarian doctrine he has described, and also that of final judgment, and of redemption through Christ, and invites his friend to consider the blessing of eternal life opened to all who avail themselves of the offer. (*Carm.* xxxvi.) A poem entitled *Conjugis ad uxorem*, sometimes attributed to Prosper of Aquitaine, has also been attributed to Paulinus.

As a writer of prose, Paulinus has been compared to Cicero, as a writer of verse to Virgil; but though his writings show that he had studied both Cicero, Virgil, and Horace, no impartial judge can place him on a level with either of those great masters, either in style or in power. Nor as a writer of verses can the writer of this article regard him as equal either to Claudian, to Ausonius, his own master, or even to Prudentius, though M. Gaston Boissier is of a different opinion. As Bose remarks, the laws of versification and prosody were undergoing a great change in his day, and either of this or of intentional neglect of those laws, the verses of Paulinus afford abundant evidence. Still less can it be said truly that they show much poetic power, though many of them are graceful and pleasing, especially his letters to Ausonius and his address to Nicetas. He wrote them with facility, took great pleasure in writing them, and frequently wrote them well, but they cannot justly claim a high rank as poetry. Ozanam however expresses a very favourable opinion of his verse-writings. (*Civilisation au cinquième Siècle*, vol. ii. p. 238–247.) Of the amiable and affectionate disposition of Paulinus, his love for his friends, his profound humility, and entire abnegation of self, his earnest piety, and devotion to the service of God, sufficient evidence has been already given. He was studiously orthodox on the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which he states clearly on many occasions, but seems in one of his letters to favour the views of the semi-Pelagians. (*Ep.* xxix. 7.) That he believed devoutly in the power and influence of departed saints, including their relics, there can be no doubt; his whole life from the time of his retirement to Nola may be said to turn upon this belief, and it is difficult, or perhaps, as Dr. Gilly says, impossible, to rescue his memory from the charge of saint-worship, or at least an amount of veneration for his own patron saint, and belief in his power, derivative, no doubt, but direct in its exercise, equivalent in the ordinary use of language to worship, and carried, as the stories in his poems mentioned above show plainly, to the utmost bound of human credulity. In reading them, as I. I. Ampère remarks, one might imagine oneself to be seeing and listening to a Neapolitan peasant of our own day. (*Revue des deux Mondes*, 1837, vol. xii. p. 66.) See also his work, *Littérature Chrétienne au 5ᵉ siècle*, vol. i. p. 288.

The works of Paulinus were first published in

a very incorrect form at Paris, in 1516, and republished at Cologne 1560. A life of him, by Andrew Schott, appeared in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* in 1618, but the first formal life of him, written with great care by Sacchini, a Jesuit, was published without his name in an edition of the works of Paulinus, with "Amoeboean" notes, by Fronto Ducaeus and Herbert Rosweyd, also Jesuits, at Antwerp, 1622. Forty years later, Peter Francis Chifflet published a work in two parts, called *Paulinus Illustratus*, in which some of the mistakes of the Antwerp edition were corrected, Dijon, 1662; and this was followed by a more complete and careful work by Lebrun des Marettes, embodying the labours of Chifflet, and which has formed the basis of all subsequent editions, 2 vols., Paris, 1685. Of this a reprint was published by Muratori, at Verona, in 1736, but containing four more poems discovered by himself at Milan, which had been published by him in 1698. A new and more careful edition of these, by Mingarelli, together with some additions discovered by him at Bologna, and published at Rome, 1756, was included in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, of Galland, vol. viii., in 1772. Cardinal Angelo Mai, in vol. v. of his *Classici Auctores*, Rome, 1827, published two more pieces in verse, (1) *ad Deum, post conversionem et baptismum suum*, (2) *de domesticis suis calamitatibus* taken from a MS. in the Vatican (Dowling, *Notitia Scriptorum*, p. 230), but M. Emile Chatelain, in his pamphlet entitled *Notice sur les MSS. des Poésies de S. Paul de Nole*, says that he has been unable to find the MS. in the Vatican Library. Doubts have been entertained as to the genuineness of these poems. The edition of the works of Paulinus published by the Abbé Migne, in vol. lxi. of his *Patrologia*, is chiefly a reprint of the Verona edition, and contains the matter of most of the former editions, including two letters and two poems of doubtful authority, but not the two poems published by Cardinal Mai. This work, however, is in all matters of reference edited so carelessly as to make the process extremely difficult, and the index which it contains is remarkable chiefly for its inaccuracy. An account of St. Paulinus is contained in the 4th volume of the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum* for June, but it only makes scanty reference to the poem discovered by Muratori. An account of him is given by Cave, *Historia Literaria*, vol. i. p. 288; by Dupin, *Hist. Eccl* vol. iii.; by Tillemont, vol. xiv.; by Ceillier, vol. viii. A little book was published in 1654, entitled, "The Life of blessed Paulinus, the most reverend and blessed bishop of Nola, collected out of his own works and other primitive authors, by Henry Vaughan, Silurist." It consists of a panegyric on Paulinus, with translations of portions of his poems. Dr. Gilly, in his work, London, 1844, entitled, *Vigilantius and his Times*, describes the mode of life of Paulinus, giving him full credit for his piety, but blaming greatly both his mode of life and his theology. A full account of him and of his works will be found in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, vol. ii. An article by I. Ampère, in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, vol. xii. 1837, has an account of him, with critical remarks on his works, and in the same Review for 1878, vol. xxviii., there is one by M. Gaston Boissier, on a Life of Paulinus by the Abbé Lagrange, published in 1877. A chapter is also devoted to him by Ampère in his *Littérature Chrétienne*, mentioned above, vol. i., pp. 271-295. The work on the MSS. of his works, by M. Emile Chatelain, has been already mentioned. An account of him will be found in Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, June 22. One by M. Rabanis was published at Bordeaux in 1840, and another by M. Fabre, at Strasburg, in 1862. Dr. Adolf Bose, professor at the Seminary of Cologne, has written a book in two volumes, *Paulin und seine Zeit*, Regensburg, 1856, which answers fully to its title, contains all or nearly all that is known about him, and is written with great care, moderation, and critical judgment. He avoids most of the legends, and also shows that the use of bells in churches, an invention credited to him by tradition, is not due to him, nor even to the town of Nola.

Reference may be made on the subject of the buildings to the following authorities: *Canones Apostol.* ii. 57; Eusebius, *H. E.* x. 4; *Vit. Const.* ii. 36, 39; Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 31 Vitruvius, vi. 10; Bingham, *Eccl. Ant.* pp. 392, 400, 415, vol. ii. 392, 400, 415, 8vo. ed. Ambrosius Leo, a physician of Nola in the 16th century, described, but not very accurately, the buildings and relics of Paulinus existing in his time, Naples, 1738. The treatise is to be found in the 9th volume of the *Thesaurus Antiquitatum* of Graevius, pp. 4, 72, in which volume are also contained papers about Naples, Nola, and other neighbouring places, by I. Caesar Capaccio, who contradicts Ambrosius Leo in some points. Gian Stefano Remondini, a Neapolitan priest, wrote a book in three volumes, in great detail, entitled, *Della Nolana Ecclesiastica Storia*, dedicated to Pope Benedict XIV., Napoli, 1747, and in vols. i. and ii. of this he describes at length the buildings, with plates representing the ground-plans of them, according to his views of their arrangement, and including the ancient bell called the bell of St. Paulinus. Remondini places the two principal churches in a line with each other, with the tombs between them, and the others in other parts of the general enclosure, an arrangement which is followed, for the most part, by Canina, who measured the old remains himself before the building of the modern church on the same site. *Ricerchi dell'Architettura dei Tempi Cristiani*, Roma, 1846. A similar view is taken by Zestermann, de Basilicis, in *Mémoires couronnés de l'Académie Royale de Bruxelles*, 1847, vol. xxi. p. 138, et seq.; but Bunsen thought the two churches were at right angles to each other, which, as mentioned above, appears to be the true state of the case, *Basiliken des Christlichen Roms*, p. 38; Gilly, *Vigilantius and his times*, p. 178. Rheinwald, *Kirchl. Archäol.* s. 52, p. 134. Bose, *Paulin u. seine Zeit*, book 14, pp. 69, 112. [H. W. P.]

PAULINUS (9), a priest, probably of Hippo, mentioned by St. Augustine as having joined the society of S. Paulinus of Nola. (Aug. *Ep.* 149, 34.) [H. W. P.]

PAULINUS (10), a deacon under S. Ambrose, whose zeal in denouncing the errors of Coelestius led to the Council of Carthage, A.D. 412. (Aug. *de Peccato Orig.* iii. iv. vi., c. duas epist. Pelag. ii. 4, 6.) He presented a memorial on the subject to Pope Zosimus, A.D. 417. (Opp. Aug. Appendix, vol. x. 1724.) [H. W. P.]

PAULINUS (11), bishop of Béziers. In the year 419 many terrifying portents occurred in Béziers, of which Paulinus gave a description in a circular letter (Idatius, *Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxiv. 715). This letter has not been preserved. Dupin identifies this bishop of Béziers with a disciple of St. Ambrose of the same name, but without authority (*Ecclesiastical Writers*, i. 502, Dublin, 1722; *Gall. Christ.* vi. 295; *Hist. Litt.* ii. 131-2; Ceillier, viii. 432.) [S. A. B.]

PAULINUS (12) of Pella, the son of a prefect (probably a vicarius) of Illyricum, born at Pella. His father was soon afterwards removed to Carthage as proconsul, and the young Paulinus was before long sent to Bordeaux to be brought up in the house of his grandfather, who is supposed by some, but without much probability, to have been the poet Ausonius. Late in life, in his 84th year (probably about A.D. 460), he wrote a poem called "Eucharisticon Deo sub Ephemeridis meae textu," in which he returns thanks to God for his preservation and for many blessings throughout a long and rather eventful life. The poem, which he describes, not inappropriately, as "carmen incultum," is perhaps more finished than we might expect to find the work of one whose mother-tongue was Greek. It is interesting as a piece of autobiography, and though referring, of course, especially to the personal experience of the writer, it throws some light on the history of his times, and particularly on the movement of the northern nations. This work, originally written, it would seem, for private circulation, has been erroneously attributed, like certain works of Paulinus of Perigueux, to St. Paulinus of Nola. It is to be found in De la Bigne, *Bibl. Patr.* (Appendix, col. 281, Paris, 1579), and was edited by Daumius (Lips. 1686). (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 363, where the events of his life are traced in some detail, from the account given in the poem itself; Alzog, *Handb. der Patrologie*; Ebert, *Gesch. der Chr. Lat. Lit.*; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 290; Teuffel, vol. ii.) [H. A. W.]

PAULINUS (13) of Perigueux (PETROCORIUS or PETRICORDIUS), a poet of the second half of the 5th century, to whom properly belong certain works sometimes attributed to St. Paulinus of Nola, viz. Vita Martini in six books, a poem, "de visitatione nepotuli sui," and a short poem composed as a dedicatory inscription for the basilica of St. Martin at Tours. Nothing can be clearly made out concerning his life, or his parentage, save the inference from the name of Petrocorius, that he was most likely a native of Perigueux. It may be that Venantius Fortunatus refers to him in the lines:

> "Stemmate, corde, fide, pollens Paulinus et arte
> Versibus explicuit Martini dogma magistri."

But it is perhaps more likely that he has fallen into the same error as Gregory of Tours, and confounded the real author of the Vita S. Martini with his more celebrated namesake, to whom certainly the phrases are applicable enough. The poem on St. Martin was probably written about 470, certainly during the episcopate of Perpetuus of Tours (who presided at the council of Tours in 461), since it is dedicated to that bishop, and is partly based on a document drawn up by him.

The work is in the main a rather rough versification of the Life of St. Martin by Sulpicius Severus, and of parts of the dialogues of the same writer; the last book has a more especial interest, as representing a formal account by the bishop of Tours of the miracles wrought at his predecessor's tomb.

The short dedication poem for the new basilica was written later, at the request of Perpetuus. The poem "de visitatione nepotuli sui" records a miraculous cure of the author's grandson, by the joint agency, as he appears to consider, of St. Martin and Perpetuus.

The works of this poet were at first published under the name of St. Paulinus of Nola. They are to be found in the patristic collections (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxi.), having first been edited by Juretus, on whose work a later edition by Daumius was based (Lips. 1681). (Ebert, *Gesch. der Chr. Lat. Lit.* 385; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 449; Teuffel, vol. ii.; Greg. Turon. *de mir. B. Mart.*, and Ruinart's note in the Benedictine Ed.) [H. A. W.]

PAULINUS (14), (PAULUS), patriarch of Aquileia, died about the end of A.D. 569, or beginning of A.D. 570, after an episcopate of twelve years (Paul. Diac. *Hist. Lang.* ii. 25). He was therefore consecrated in A.D. 557, or 558. His episcopate is remarkable for two reasons. On the Lombard invasion in A.D. 568, he fled from Aquileia to the island of Grado, carrying with him all the treasures of the church, and the relics of various saints. (Paul. Diac. ii. 10; *Chron. Patr. Grad.* in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 393.) Hence came the translation of the see of Aquileia to Grado, and ultimately its division into the patriarchates of Aquileia and Grado, which last became the patriarchate of Venice. Like the other Venetian and Istrian bishops he was a strenuous defender of the Three Chapters. Soon after his election he convened a synod at Aquileia which dissented from the decrees of the 5th General Council. Pope Pelagius I. was exceedingly indignant at these proceedings, and wrote several letters to Narses demanding that he should arrest Paulinus, who, he further alleged, had been consecrated by the archbishop of Milan, not at Aquileia, but elsewhere, such a consecration being uncanonical, and send him in custody with his consecrator to the Emperor. Nothing however, followed from these demands. It appears that Narses had been excommunicated by Paulinus and his party. (Pelagii I. *Epp.* 1–4, and fragment in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxix. 393, 411). He is called Paulinus by Pelagius, Paulus by Paulus Diaconus; the authority for the former name being contemporary is the preferable. [F. D.]

PAULINUS (15) II., patriarch of Aquileia, a prominent figure in the Adoptionist controversy, is first mentioned in a grant dated June 17, 776 at Eporea (Ivrea), by Charles the Great, to him of the forfeited property of one Waldand, who had joined in the unsuccessful rebellion of Rodgaud, duke of Friuli, early in that year and had been killed (Sickel, *Acta Kar.* ii. 33, 246). He is there styled "grammaticae

artis magister," and was already, or then became, one of the band of scholars that frequented the court of Charles. On the death of SIGUALDUS Paulinus was appointed Patriarch. The date is uncertain. Madrisi (50) argues that it was late in A.D. 776, but Jaffé (*Mon. Alc.* 162) contends that it was in A.D. 787, inasmuch as Paulinus died in A.D. 802 (*Ann. Lauriss. Min.* and Einhardi *Ann.* in Pertz, *SS.* i. 120, 363), and the chronicle printed by De Rubeis (*Mon. Aquil.* App. 8) assigns him an episcopate of 15 years. His close friendship with Alcuin, who first became attached to the court of Charles in A.D. 782, is strong evidence in favour of the later date. The account of the Monk of St. Gall (ii. 17 in Jaffé, *Mon. Car.* 693), besides being written 100 years later, unfortunately leaves the date undetermined, as though Charles was in Friuli early in A.D. 776, the grant shows that Paulinus was not patriarch in the following June, and Charles may have visited Friuli again in his journey to Italy late in A.D. 786.

Paulinus was at the council of Ratisbon in A.D. 792, when FELIX (176) of Urgel recanted his Adoptionist tenets (c. *Felicem*, i. 5), and on this occasion obtained two grants from Charles, dated August 4th, the first conceding to the clergy of Aquileia the right of freely electing the patriarch and exemption from certain burdens, the second confirming to that church all its possessions, especially the monastery of St. Maria ad Organum at Verona, the church of Biue in Friuli, and the hospice of St. John at Friuli (Sickel, ii. 54, 270). Felix having recanted his recantation, another council was held at Frankfort in the summer of 794. At the first session, after a letter of ELIPANDUS had been read, and Charles had addressed the council, the bishops asked for an adjournment in order to draw up a reply, which was composed by Paulinus with the assistance of the archbishop of Milan and the North Italian bishops, was adopted by the council, and ordered to be published throughout Gaul and Spain, a copy being sent to ELIPANDUS (*Libellus Sacrosyllabus*). On the same occasion was written the letter to one Heistulf, who had killed his wife on suspicion of her having been unfaithful to him. If he desired to be saved, said Paulinus, two courses were open to him, either to enter a monastery, or to do penance all his life in the manner Paulinus prescribed (*Ep. ad Heistulfum*).

Immediately after Easter A.D. 796 he assembled a council of his suffragan bishops at Friuli, in which the Adoptionist doctrines were again condemned, and the addition of the *Filioque* to the creed defended, and several canons were passed, some of which related to the discipline of the clergy; by others marriages within the prohibited degrees were forbidden, and also those of persons below the age of puberty; another forbade a man who had divorced his wife to remarry in her lifetime, while others related to the conduct of nuns, to the observance of Sunday and to tithes.

In the same year a new field of activity was opened to Paulinus by the victories of Pippin, king for Italy, and Eric, duke of Friuli, over the Avars and Huns, and the submission and baptism of Tudun, a man of great power among the Avars with a great part of his race (*Ann. Lauriss.* in Pertz, *S. S.* i. 182). In the summer Pippin summoned a meeting of bishops, presided over by Paulinus, at his camp on the Danube, to deliberate about the baptism and conversion of the Huns and Avars. With regard to the first, Paulinus decided that it should be deferred till the converts had received some instruction in the faith; and with regard to the second, that they should be won by gentle teaching, not driven to the font at the sword's point. The length of their probation was to be left to the discretion of the priest, but was not to be less than seven or more than forty days, and directions as to the preparation before baptism were given. Infants, unless in peril ot death, were to be reserved for the regular seasons for baptism, Easter and Pentecost. The case of converts whose previous baptism was doubtful was also dealt with (*Mon. Alc.* 311–318). Paulinus, notwithstanding the exhortations of Alcuin (*Ep.* 56 in *Mon. Alc.* 284), does not appear to have personally taken part in the missionary work.

On September 1st, 799, Eric, duke of Friuli, was killed in Liburnia. He was the intimate friend of Alcuin and Paulinus, who some years before had addressed to him a treatise on the Christian life (*Liber Exhortationis*), in which he made considerable use of the treatise of JULIANUS (72) POMERIUS on the Contemplative Life. Paulinus now lamented the untimely death of his friend in an elegy, which shows how deeply he felt his loss (Dümmler, 131).

In the early part of A.D. 800 (Alcuin, *Ep.* 147 in *Mon. Alc.* 557) a gross outrage was committed at Grado. Maurice, the son of the doge of Venice, attacked the place and cruelly murdered the patriarch, an atrocity to which Paulinus alludes in his letter giving Charles an account of the business transacted in the synod he had held at Altinum at Easter in that year.

About the same time he composed and sent to Charles a treatise in three books against Felix of Urgel. The mystical explanation of the number of days in the year in the letter of dedication shows that it was written in a leap-year, while in a letter of Alcuin's (*Ep.* 148 in *Mon. Alc.* 561), written after June 800, it is alluded to as a recent work, and spoken of in terms of high approbation. Paulinus died, as has been mentioned, in A.D. 802 on January 11th, on which day he is commemorated (*AA. SS.* Jan. i. 713).

Besides the works already mentioned, Paulinus wrote a metrical version of the creed and a poem on the miracle of the raising of Lazarus. Walafrid Strabo (*De Exordiis Eccl. Rer.* c. 25, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxiv. 954) asserts that Paulinus composed hymns. Madrisi from the resemblance of style attributed six hymns and one rhythm, and fragments of two others to him. These have been recently edited in a complete form by Dümmler (who gives a full account of them and their MSS. in *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, iv. 113) in *Mon. Germ. Hist. Poet. Lat. Med. Aevi*, i. 1, 123, who doubts whether any except the *de Regula Fidei*, the poem on Lazarus, and the lament for Eric, as to which there is MS. authority for the authorship of Paulinus are rightly ascribed to him. His collected works were published in 1737 by his fellow

countryman Madrisi, with an exhaustive life, disfigured however by a tendency to conjecture, and illustrated with elaborate dissertations. This edition is reprinted in *Patr. Lat.* xcix. [F. D.]

PAULINUS (16), bishop of Taurianum, on the N.W. coast of Bruttium, had been obliged by the Lombards to retire to Sicily about A.D. 590, where his monks had also taken refuge. As they were wandering about under no discipline, Gregory the Great, early in A.D. 591, ordered them to be collected in the monastery of St. Theodore at Messina, and, with those already in the monastery, to be placed under the care of Paulinus (*Epp.* i. 40, 41). In March, 592, Gregory directed the bishop of Syracuse to appoint Paulinus to the vacant see of Lipara, from which he was to visit his own see when opportunities presented themselves (*Epp.* ii. 16, 17). Finally, in 599, Gregory commissioned him with certain other bishops to hold an inquiry into certain charges made by the clergy of Rhegium against their bishop. (*Epp.* ix. 47, 48.) [F. D.]

PAULINUS (17), priest of the monastery of St. Erasmus on mount Soracte. Gregory the Great, early in 591, directed the sub-deacon, Anthemius, to pay him two solidi. (*Epp.* i. 24.) [F. D.]

PAULINUS (18), bishop of unknown see, and HONORATUS (28), refused to communicate with MAXIMUS (18), bishop of Salona, and were in consequence persecuted by him, and obliged to give bail not to leave the city or their own houses. Gregory the Great, early in 596, wrote to Maximus ordering him to cease persecuting them, and to allow them to go to Rome or elsewhere as they wished. (*Epp.* vi. 25, 26.) [F. D.]

PAULINUS (19), bishop of Tegessis, an otherwise unknown see in Numidia, was accused of simony and violent treatment of his clergy. Gregory the Great, early in A.D. 602, directed Victor the primate, and Columbus, a bishop of Numidia, to hold an inquiry into these charges. (*Epp.* xii. 28, 29.) [F. D.]

PAULINUS (20), the first Christian missionary from Rome to Northumbria, and the bishop who begins the recognized succession in the archiepiscopal see of York.

Alcuin (*De SS. Eccl. Ebor.* 135–6) says that Paulinus was a citizen of Rome, and, on the wall of the famous monastery of St. Andrew on the Coelian hill, his name is inscribed among the most illustrious inmates of that house. The Pseudo-Nennius, however, ascribes the evangelization of Northumbria to Rum, the son of Urien. Mr. Hodgson Hinde (*Hist. of Northumberland*, 77) has suggested the identity of this person with Paulinus. He thinks it possible that, after the fall of Urien and his family, Rum may have been educated at Rome, changing his name when he was ordained, as was frequently the case. If this were so, there would be a peculiar propriety in his subsequent mission into Northumbria from the Kentish Court.

Paulinus was sent from Rome by Gregory in A.D. 601, with Mellitus, Justus, and Rufinianus. They joined Augustine in Kent, and would take an active part in the evangelization of that kingdom. They brought with them a letter from Gregory to Augustine, in which he expressed his wish that York should be made a metropolitical see with twelve suffragans.

The British succession at York had disappeared with the coming of the English, and the North had relapsed, for the most part, into heathenism. It is probable enough that Columba and Kentigern and their disciples made themselves felt in Cumbria and the Lothians, and possibly farther south, but to what extent we have no means of ascertaining. British Christianity found a home in Wales, and had no hold upon Bernicia and Deira in the 7th century. But the sites once consecrated to religious worship were remembered, and reclaimed, in part, by Wilfrid.

Between 593 and 617, the King of Northumbria was Ethelfrith, who slew the monks at Bangor. He had usurped the throne of Edwin, his wife's brother, whom he dreaded on that account [EDWIN]. To calm his fears he sought Edwin's life, who fled for safety to the court of Redwald, king of East Anglia. It was there that he was the subject of a marvellous appearance or dream. Edwin sat, or fancied he was sitting, on a stone bench in front of Redwald's palace, sick at heart as his life was in peril, and almost hopeless, when a stranger suddenly stood before him, and sought the cause of his distress. Edwin told his tale, and then the stranger announced his coming deliverance and future triumph, and when Edwin promised that he would not be remiss in manifesting his gratitude, the stranger obtained from him an assurance that, when the proper time arrived, he would accept and follow a better rule of life than any of his fathers had practised. To seal the promise, as it were, the visitant's hand was laid upon the fugitive's head, and he then disappeared as suddenly as he came. The first part of the prediction of the stranger was soon realized, and, through the interposition of Redwald, Edwin was seated, in 617, on the Northumbrian hrone.

In 625, Edwin sought in marriage the hand of Ethelburga, daughter of Eadbald, king of Kent, who refused to accept a pagan son-in-law. A second embassy from the north revealed Edwin's eagerness. He promised not merely to allow the princess and her suite entire freedom in their religious worship, but stated also that he himself would [adopt the lady's faith, if his wise men should consider it to be right and just. Here was an opportunity for evangelizing Northumbria, which was not to be despised, and Eadbald sent his daughter into the north. Paulinus accompanied the princess as her religious adviser, and, to add dignity and importance to his mission, Augustine consecrated him bishop before he set out, on the 21st of July, 625.

Paulinus, however, found no field in Northumbria for spreading his religion. The king was respectful but quiescent; the people paid no attention. Paulinus had enough to do to preserve his little party from the taint of heathenism. Month after month passed away until the feast of Easter, 626, arrived, when an attempt was made upon Edwin's life. That act probably accelerated the birth of Ethelburga's

first child, a daughter, and Paulinus, with a grateful heart, thanked God for the preservation of his master and mistress with such fervour that Edwin, touched at last, promised to become a Christian if he could be avenged upon those who had sent forth the assassin; and, to show that he was in earnest, he permitted Paulinus to baptize the new-born princess, with eleven courtiers who chose to accompany her to the font.

Edwin obtained his revenge, but loitered over the fulfilment of his promise. Such conduct might be expected from one who, by long and painful experience had learned the necessity of caution. A letter from Pope Boniface arrived, urging Ethelburga to accelerate, if she could, the happy end, showing that many hearts in distant places were longing and praying for it. But Edwin still held back. Then it was that Paulinus reminded the hesitating monarch of what had taken place twelve years before at Redwald's court. He laid his hand upon Edwin's head, and asked him if he remembered that sign and his pledge. Now was the time for its fulfilment. Whether Paulinus was the stranger himself, or had gathered from the queen, or some courtier, that Edwin had seen and heard all this in a dream, is a matter of doubt. Edwin recognized the token and acknowledged his vow, merely asking for a little delay that his courtiers and subjects might, if possible, become Christians with him. A national gathering took place at Goodmanham, near York, to consider the subject. The arguments which were used and the part which Coifi, the pagan high-priest, took on the occasion are too well known to be repeated [COIFI]. The result was that the Northumbrian king and court and many of the people became Christians. A little chapel or oratory of wood, dedicated to St. Peter, was hastily constructed at York, and in it, on Easter Sunday, 627, the king and many of his relatives and friends were baptized. The thankful monarch began immediately to enclose this in a large church of stone, but the chapel was for a long time preserved as a sacred relic. The builders of the glorious minster at York were not ashamed of its humble beginning.

Northumbria was now opened to the missionary work of Paulinus, and his time seems to have been fully occupied. The kingdom of Edwin was a very extensive one, and his influence as Bretwalda was wider still. We hear of Paulinus making a convert of Blecca, the reeve of Lincoln, and through his means a church was erected on the summit of that noble hill in which Paulinus consecrated Archbishop Honorius in 627. Soon after this he is said to have founded Southwell minster, and his appearance was described to Beda as he stood in the river baptizing convert after convert in king Edwin's presence.

> Mark him, of shoulders curved, and stature tall,
> Black hair, and vivid eyes, and meagre cheek.

At Donafeld, probably the modern Doncaster, amid the remains of the Roman camp, there was a Christian basilica with a stone altar, which may be ascribed to Paulinus. At Dewsbury, in the West Riding, was a stone cross bearing an inscription which stated that he preached there; whilst at Whalley in Lancashire and near Easingwold, close to York, there were other crosses connected with his name. He is said to have baptized very many at Brafferton and Catterick. In Bernicia, we have a streamlet in the northern part of the present county of Northumberland, which, in Pallinsburn, retains the great preacher's name, who is said, also, to have been occupied in instructing and baptizing for thirty-six continuous days at Adgebrin or Yeavering. Of actual churches there would be very few in existence, and these, in the first instance, were chiefly baptisteries on the banks of rivers. There the catechumens were assembled and taught, and thence they went down with their instructor, like the Ethiopian eunuch, into the water below.

In 633, after six years of unceasing and successful exertion, the labours of Paulinus in the north came abruptly to a close. His master and lord, Edwin, was slain in battle at Hatfield near Doncaster, and the disaster was so complete that the new-born Christianity of the north seemed to be utterly overwhelmed by the idolatry which it had displaced. Paulinus thought that he owed his first duty to the widowed queen who had come with him into Northumbria. Accordingly he took her back, with her children and suite, to her old home in Kent. They carried with them the treasure of Edwin, including a cross of gold, and a chalice of the same precious metal, which were afterwards preserved at Canterbury. One friend alone remained behind in the north, James the deacon, as he was called, to keep some of the fragments together, and to let the believers see that there was a hope at least of better days to come. [JAMES THE DEACON.] In the villages of Richmondshire, where Paulinus had made so many converts, James sang the old hymns, and his very presence was an encouragement and a comfort.

Paulinus reached Kent with his precious charge in safety, and was there made Bishop of Rochester, a see which had been vacant for some time. In the autumn of the same year (633) he received by a messenger from the pope a pall designed for his use as archbishop of York. The pope had not then heard of the great disaster in the north. Whether or no, by virtue of the gift and the possession of this pall, he had a just claim to be considered an archbishop, is a matter for argument; but Paulinus never went back into Northumbria. He is said to have been a benefactor to the monastery of Glastonbury, rebuilding the church and covering it with lead, and to have spent some time within its walls. He died on Oct. 10, 644, and was buried in the chapter-house at Rochester, of which place he became the patron saint. Lanfranc translated his remains, depositing them in a silver shrine, and giving a cross to hang over it. Among the relics in York minster were a few of his bones and two of his teeth, and there was nothing else in that sacred fane to commemorate his great work in the north, save an altar which bore his name and that of Chad conjoined.

The life of Paulinus has been carefully drawn up in Dr. Bright's *Chapters of Early English Church History*, and in the *Lives of the Archbishops of York*, vol. i. The authorities on which the life depends are so fully stated and sifted in those two works that it is unnecessary to repeat them. [J. R.]

PAULUS APOSTOLUS, APOCRYPHAL ACTS OF [ACTS OF THE APOSTLES (APOC.), p. 29].

PAULUS.—Bishops whose Sees or Countries are not named.

PAULUS (1), a bishop mentioned, together with Eutropius, by Orosius as having been disturbed by the errors of the Priscillianists and the followers of Origen. (Oros. *Common.* 1; Aug. Opp. viii. 665.) To the same two bishops Augustine addressed his book against Pelagius. (*De perfectione justitiae*, Opp. x. 292.) [H. W. P.]

PAULUS (2), deposed bishop, mentioned in a letter of Gregory the Great to Theodorus, bishop of Lilybaeum, in A.D. 593. He directs that he was to continue to do penance in the monastery where he was, and that the church property found in his possession was to be deposited in the treasury of the church, and an inventory taken of it. (*Ep.* iii. 50.) [F. D.]

Bishops arranged by Sees or Countries, including Africa, East, Spanish, &c.

PAULUS (3), bishop of Acci. On a stone inserted in the wall of the church of St. Mary in the Alhambra, is an inscription recording the consecration by him in A.D. 607 of a church of St. Stephen at a place called Nativola. (Hübner, *Insc. Hisp. Christ.* n. 115; *Esp. Sag.* vii. 34.) Gams (*Kirch. von Sp.* ii. (2), 21) discusses the probable locality of Nativola. [F. D.]

PAULUS (4), bishop of unknown African see. In A.D. 594, Gregory the Great directed him to be sent to Rome, that he might give him information about the increase of Donatism in Africa, by which Paulus had been personally a sufferer. By letters, two years later, it appears that Paulus had been delayed in going to Rome by the prefect of Africa, who brought similar counter charges against him. The chancellor, whom the prefect had sent to Rome, however, refused to go into these charges before Gregory, and the latter permitted Paulus to go to the emperor at Constantinople. The next year Paulus returned to Africa, taking Rome on the way, and bringing with him letters of commendation from Gregory to three African bishops. (*Epp.* iv. 34, 35; vi. 63,65; vii. 2; viii. 12, 13.) [F. D.]

PAULUS, bishop of Ahwaz, *vid.* num. 44.

PAULUS (5), of Aila (Elath, the modern Akaba), born in the district of Melitene, in the latter half of the fifth century, the uncle of Theodorus, appointed by Sabas the head of his monastery of Castellius, and admitted by him to a chief position in that monastery. He afterwards became bishop of Aila (Cyrill. Scythop. *Vit. S. Sab.* viii. No. 27; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 759). [E. V.]

PAULUS (6), patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 538 to 541. A native of Tarsus and a monk of the order of Tabenna. He was appointed patriarch by the emperor Justinian, in place of Theodosius, deposed for his opposition to the synod of Chalcedon. [THEODOSIUS.] He was consecrated by Mennas patriarch of Constantinople, this being the first instance of such a consecration. Justinian sent him to Alexandria, armed with ample power to suppress by force the Monophysite party. Through the influence, however, of the empress Theodora, who was in secret a Monophysite, Paul was deposed by the council of Gaza when he had held his see about two years. The story of his fall is involved in much confusion, cf. Procopii *Hist. Arcan.* c. 27; Theophan. *Chronograph.* i. 345, ed. Bonn. He was succeeded by Zoilus. Le Quien identifies him with a Paulus mentioned by Timotheus C. P. *de Haeret. Recipiend.* as the founder of the Paulianists. [ZOILUS.] (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 433; Liberati Diac. *Breviar.* c. xxiii.; Asseman. *Bib. Orient.* ii. 331; John of Ephesus, *Hist. Eccles.* ed. Payne Smith, p. 250; Neale's *Hist. Alex. Pat.* ii. 35; Renaudot, p. 143.) [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (7), bishop of Alexandria Minor in Cilicia Secunda (the modern Scanderoon), a Monophysite at the time of Severus of Antioch, deposed by Justin in 518 (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 904; Assemann. *Dissert de Monophys.*) [E. V.]

PAULUS (8), Nestorian bishop of Anbara in Chaldæa, flourished A.D. 740 and wrote epistles, paracletic addresses, and a disputation. (Assem. *Bib. Or.* ii. 431, 486, iii. 172, 342.) A homily of his for Pentecost is extant in MS. [J. G.]

PAULUS (9) OF SAMOSATA, patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 260–270. A celebrated Monarchian heresiarch, "the Socinus of the third century" (Bishop Wordsworth), deposed and excommunicated for his heretical teaching with respect to the Divinity of our Blessed Lord, A.D. 269. Of the early life of Paulus we are totally ignorant. We may conclude from his designation that he was a native of Samosata, the royal city of Syria, where he may not improbably have become known to Zenobia, the celebrated and brilliant Queen of Palmyra, to whom his quick and ready intellect would recommend him, and through whom Cave and others ascribe his advancement to the highest post in the Syrian church. Dr. Newman calls attention to the fact, that the beginning of Paul's episcopate synchronizes with the commencement of the successes of Zenobia's husband Odenathus against Sapor (*Arians of the Fourth Cent.* p. 4, note 6). Athanasius distinctly calls her Paul's patroness —Παύλου προέστη τοῦ Σαμοσατέως (Athan. *Hist. Ar.* c. 71). To Zenobia we may certainly attribute his appointment to the civil office of "Procurator Ducenarius" (so called from the holder receiving a salary of 200 sestertia), on which we are told he prided himself much more than on his office as bishop. At Antioch he would form one of the brilliant intellectual circle, of which Longinus the rhetorician was one of the most distinguished members, the influence of which could not fail to be injurious to the maintenance of rigid orthodoxy. Zenobia was herself a Jewess, and Paul's divergences from the orthodox faith may be partly attributable to his desire to make the doctrines of Christianity more palatable to his patroness and to the professors of the neo-Pla-

tonic philosophy by whom she was surrounded. Although the influence of his imperial protectress was insufficient to prevent the condemnation of Paul's heresies or ultimately to secure him from deposition, yet through her means, after his excommunication, he remained in possession of the cathedral and the episcopal residence and the temporalities of his see, until Zenobia's defeat by Aurelian deprived him of her powerful support (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30).

Our only knowledge of the career and character of Paul of Samosata is derived from the encyclical letter of the bishops and clergy by whom he was condemned. We may perhaps be warranted in making some deduction from the passionate language of heated polemical opponents, but the charges made are too definite, and, as Neander remarks, unhappily accord too well with what we learn from other sources concerning the bishops and leading clergy of the chief cities of the Eastern world at that time, to allow us to set them wholly aside or even to look upon them as seriously exaggerated. Besides, it cannot be regarded as probable that circular letters addressed by the leading prelates of the East to all the churches of the Empire would contain ungrounded calumnies against a brother bishop; a conclusion to which even Gibbon has remarked, we should be "driven," if we were desirous of "extenuating the vices of Paul."

The picture drawn of Paul in this synodical epistle is a most unfavourable one. He is described as haughty, ostentatious, vainglorious, worldly-minded, a lover of pomp and parade, avaricious and rapacious, self-indulgent and luxurious, and one whose manner of life laid him open to grave suspicions of immorality. He is set before us as a person originally of humble birth and extreme poverty, who having neither inherited anything from his parents nor gained anything by honest industry in any trade or profession, had adopted the ecclesiastical career as a lucrative speculation, and by the abuse of its opportunities and the secular office he had obtained by the favour of Zenobia, had amassed a large fortune. He harassed his flock by extortionate demands, brought unfounded charges against them by the unscrupulous use of his authority, and obtained verdicts against them to his own advantage. He received money from suitors for the promise of his aid, and then left them in the lurch. "His ecclesiastical jurisdiction," writes Gibbon, "was venal and rapacious; he extorted frequent contributions from the most opulent of the faithful, and converted to his own use a considerable part of the public revenue." He was charged also with the sacrilegious diversion of religious funds to his own use. When he appeared in public, he affected the pomp and parade of a secular magistrate rather than the grave and modest bearing of a Christian bishop. He stalked through the forum preceded and followed by a band of attendants, making a way for him through a crowd of petitioners whose memorials he made a display of despatching with the utmost celerity, dictating the replies without halting a moment. In his ecclesiastical assemblies he adopted an almost imperial dignity. He sat on a throne raised on a lofty tribunal (βῆμα), with a cabinet (σήκρητον) for private conferences screened from the public gaze. His bombastic harangues, more like those of a rhetorician or a mountebank than of a Christian bishop, were delivered with extravagant action, striking his thigh and stamping his feet. When preaching, his gestures were equally offensive to the sober-minded, who incurred his displeasure and laid themselves open to his persecutions if they refused to join in the unseemly tokens of admiration—the waving the handkerchief, the starting up from the seat, and the shouts of applause, as in a theatre, which at a later date were so indignantly reprobated by Chrysostom. He was also charged with depreciating the departed teachers of Antioch, and contrasting with them his own superior spiritual insight. He is said to have suppressed the psalms which were sung to Christ as God, which had ever proved a great bulwark to the orthodox faith, as modern novelties, not half a century old (cf. Caius apud Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* ii. 129), and to have introduced others in praise of himself, which were sung in full church on Easterday by a choir of women, causing the hearts of the faithful to shudder at the impious language in which Paul was extolled as an angel come down from heaven. By his flatteries and gifts, as well as by the fear the unscrupulous use of his power inspired, he induced the bishops and presbyters of neighbouring churches to adopt his form of teaching and other novelties. His private life is described in equally dark colours. He indulged freely in the pleasures of the table, and enjoyed the society of two beautiful young women, as spiritual sisters, "subintroductae," and encouraged other clergymen to follow his example to the scandal of all and the moral ruin of not a few. However, disgraceful as his life was, he had contrived to lay so many under obligations and to intimidate others by his threats and violence, that it was with the utmost difficulty that any person could be found to venture to appear as witnesses against him (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30).

But however great the scandals attaching to Paul's administration of his episcopal office may have been, it was his unsoundness in the faith which, chiefly by the untiring exertions of the venerable Dionysius of Alexandria, led to the assembling of the synods through which his name and character have chiefly become known to us. These synods were three in number,[a] all

[a] This has been called in question, and the number of synods reduced to two. But the synodical letter distinctly tells us that Firmilian went twice (δίς) to Antioch to attend a synod in the matter of Paul, while it is certain that he died on his way to the synod of 269, at which Paul was condemned. (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* iv. 296.)

The letter of Dionysius to Paul containing his answers to the ten queries propounded by the latter, embracing most of the passages of the New Testament in which Christ is spoken of according to his humanity, given in Labbe (*Concil.* i. 850–893), was not known to any ancient writers, and though accepted by Tillemont and Burton (*Bampton Lectures*, note 102) may safely be rejected, together with the letter of the Bishops of the first Synod (*ibid.* 843–850). (See Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, vol. i. p. 119, note 5, p. 120, note 4.) Their genuineness is also rejected by Valesius (in Euseb. p. 155), Harduin, Dupin (i. 214), Pagi, Mosheim, Cave, Routh, Ceillier (iii. 607), and Lumper (*Hist. Theol. Crit.* xiii. 711); cf. Möhler, *Patrol.* i. 632; Walch, *Ketzengesch.* ii. 71, 83; Newman's *Select Treatises of Athanas.* p. 176.

held at Antioch. The first was held in A.D. 264, of which Firmilian, of the Cappadocian Caesarea, was the president. Dionysius was prevented being present by age and infirmity; but a few days before his death (Hieron. *de Vir. Ill.* 69), he wrote an elaborate letter in defence of the orthodox faith to the church of Antioch, in which he abstained from sending any salutation to Paul, as bishop, but urged him to adopt the course duty dictated (παρῄνεσε τὰ προσήκοντα, Theod. *Haer. Fab.* ii. 9), and sharpened the orthodox zeal of the assembled bishops (*ibid.*; Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 27). The second synod, the date of which is not precisely known, was also presided over by Firmilian, who, when on his way to the third synod, in 269, was suddenly taken ill and died at Tarsus, the bishop of that city, Helenus, taking his place as president. In the first two synods Paul, through his dialectical subtleness and crafty concealment of his real opinions, (κρυψίνουν ὄντα καὶ ἀπατηλὸν, Euseb. *H. E.* 29) managed to elude condemnation. At the former synod, after the assembled prelates in many protracted discussions had sought to demonstrate Paul's errors, ἀπογυμνοῦν καὶ εἰς φανερὸν ἄγειν τὴν αἵρεσιν (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 28) and to bring him back to orthodoxy, he asserted that he had been misunderstood, and that his language bore a perfectly orthodox meaning, and that as for himself he had never entertained the erroneous opinions attributed to him, but had consistently followed the doctrine of the apostles. His protestations were accepted by his judges, who after having united in a solemn act of praise to God for the unanimity of their belief returned to their flocks. Before long, however, they learned that they had been deceived, and that Paul was promulgating the same errors as to the mere humanity of Christ as those with which he had been previously charged. Accordingly they made a second attempt to bring back their erring brother to the truth. They first, as before, made trial of correspondence, but to no effect. They then met a second time in synod, and passed an explicit condemnation of Paul's new doctrine. But as Paul promised to renounce his errors (μεταθήσεσθαι ἐπαγγειλαμένου) (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30) they condoned them a second time and abstained from any decisive measure (Euseb. *u.s.*; Theod. *Haeret. Fab.* ii. 8). Paul, however, kept this new promise as ill as he had done his previous ones. It reached the ears of the members of the synod from all quarters that his teaching was unaltered, and that there would be no want of testimony to prove it if the opportunity of bringing it forward were granted. The matter had now reached too great importance to admit of any half measures. Nothing less than the orthodoxy of one of the chief chairs in Christendom was involved in it. A synod, therefore, was convened a third time at Antioch, towards the close of the year 269. Of this, as we have said, Firmilian having died *en route*, Helenus, of Tarsus, was the nominal president. The leading part, however, was taken by Malchion, a presbyter of Antioch, who had at one time been the president of the school of rhetoric in that city. Athanasius sets the number of bishops assembled at seventy (Athanas. *de Synod.* vol. i. p. ii. p. 605, ed. Patav.), Hilary at eighty (Hilar. *de Synod.* p. 1200). Malchion, as a skilled dialectician, was chosen by them to conduct the discussion. The result proved the choice a wise one. Hitherto Paul had been examined as to what he held, and by his adroit selection of ambiguous phrases and the use of vague generalities he had succeeded in masking his heresy. Malchion's line of examination was directed to discovering what he did not hold, and he succeeded "in exposing the subterfuges of the heretic, pursuing him to his last shifts, and reducing his dogmas to their naked deformity" (Neale, *Patriarchate of Antioch*, p. 52). Some fragments of Malchion's disputation are preserved by Leontius (*de Sectis*, iii. p. 504). His heresy being plainly proved Paul was unanimously condemned, and the synod pronounced his deposition and excommunication, which they notified to Dionysius, bishop of Rome, Maximus, bishop of Alexandria and to the other bishops of the church, in an encyclical letter, probably the work of Malchion, large portions of which are preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 30). In the same letter the assembled fathers announced that they had of their own authority appointed Domnus, the son of Paul's predecessor, Demetrianus, to the vacant chair. Such an invasion of the rights of the clergy and the people of the diocese would hardly have been ventured on by the assembled prelates but for an apprehension of the strength of the partisans of the deposed bishop by whom their condemnation would be reversed, either by the re-election of Paul himself or the substitution of an adherent of his. The result proved the justice of their fear. The sentence of deposition was easier to pronounce than to carry into effect. Popular tumults were excited by his partisans. Zenobia supported her favourite in his episcopal position, while the irregularity of Domnus's appointment alienated many of the orthodox party. For two years Paul retained possession of the cathedral, and of the bishop's house of residence attached to it, and asserted his rights as the ruler of the church of Antioch. On the defeat of Zenobia by Aurelian towards the end of 272, the Catholic prelates made a representation to him of what they termed Paul's "audacity" (τὴν τοῦ Παύλου θρασύτητα, Theod. *u.s.*). Aurelian, though still a pagan, acknowledged the justice of their plea, "deeming it," writes Theodoret, "only just that one who refused to submit to the decree of those of the same faith with himself should be cut off from their fellowship" (Theod. *H. E.* u. s.). As a safeguard, however, against mistake, Aurelian, conscious of his own ignorance of ecclesiastical law, shrewdly relegated the decision of the point to the bishop of Rome and the Italian prelates, decreeing that the residence should be considered to belong to the person whom they recognised by letters of communion (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30). The remark of Gibbon on this deserves attention. "While we applaud the justice, we should not overlook the policy of Aurelian; who was desirous of restoring and cementing the dependence of the provinces on the capital by every means which could bind the interest or prejudices of any part of his subjects." Aurelian's decision sealed Paul's fate. The Italian bishops were not slow in signifying which of the rival prelates was recognised by them, and Paul was driven with the utmost ignominy (μετὰ τῆς ἐσχάτης αἰσχύνης) from the temporalities of the church, and so, in Cyril's words, "came to a most shameful end," and

Domnus, in spite of the irregularity of his appointment, was generally recognised as patriarch (Eus. *u. s.*; Cyril Alex. *Hom. de Virg. Deip.*; Routh, iii. 358.)

The teaching of Paul of Samosata was a development of that of Artemon, with whose heresy it is uniformly identified by all early writers.[b] Like the Eastern heresiarch Paul held the pure humanity of Christ, "He was not before Mary, but received from her the origin of His being" (Athan. *de Synod.* p. 919, ch. iii. s. 10). His pre-existence was simply in the Divine foreknowledge. He started with the unity of God, denying the existence of a σοφία or λόγος distinct from the Father, and representing the Logos in God as merely that which intelligence or reason is in the human heart, ὥσπερ ἐν ἀνθρώπου καρδίᾳ ὁ ἴδιος λόγος, ἄνθρωπος ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνέπνευσεν ἄνωθεν ὁ λόγος—καὶ ἀνῆλθε πρὸς τὸν πατέρα (Epiphan. *Haer.* 65). He allowed of no difference in kind between the indwelling of the Logos in Christ and in any other human being, only one of degree, the Logos having dwelt and operated in Him after a higher manner than in any other man: ἐνοικῆσαι ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν σοφίαν ὡς ἐν οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ. This indwelling was not that of a person, but of a quality: οὐκ οὐσιωδῶς ἀλλὰ κατὰ ποιότητα. There is no evidence that he denied the supernatural conception of Christ. Athanasius distinctly asserts that he taught Θεὸν ἐκ παρθένου, Θεὸν ἐκ Ναζαρὲτ ὀφθέντα (Athan. *de salut. adv. Apoll.* tom. i. p. 635); but he laid no particular stress upon it. His inferior Being was ἐκ παρθένου; his superior Being was penetrated by the Logos, whose instrumentality by it was continually advancing itself towards God, until the "Jesus Christ from below" (κάτωθεν) became worthy of union with God (ἐκ προκοπῆς τεθεοποιῆσθαι). Therefore, although he called Christ God it was not as God by His nature, but by progressive development, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γέγονε Θεός. The Deity of Christ grew by gradual progress out of the humanity. He was convicted, according to Eusebius, of asserting that Christ was mere man deemed specially worthy of Divine grace (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 27). He taught also that as the Logos is not a Person, so also the Holy Spirit is impersonal; a Divine virtue belonging to the Father, and distinct from Him only in conception.

It deserves special notice that Paul's misuse "σωματικῶς et crasso sensu," of the term ὁμοούσιος, "consubstantial," which afterwards at Nicaea became the test word of orthodoxy, is stated to have led to its rejection by the Antiochene Council (Athan. *de Synodis*, tom. i. in pp. 917, 922). This is allowed by Athanasius, though with some hesitation, and only on the testimony of his semi-Arian opponents, as he had not seen the original documents, ὡς αὐτοί φασι, τὴν γὰρ ἐπιστολὴν οὐκ ἔσχον ἐγώ (*de Synod.* tom. i. pp. 918–920), and by Hilary (*de Synod.* § 81, p. 509; § 86, p. 513), on the ground that it appeared that "per hanc unius essentiae nuncupationem solitarium atque unicum sibi esse Patrem et Filium praedicabat" (in which words he seems mistakenly to identify the teaching of Paul with that of Sabellius), and still more emphatically by Basil (*Ep.* 52 [30]). According to the clear statement of the last-named writer Paul alleged that if Christ was not made God out of a man, but was consubstantial with the Father, there must have been some common substance of which they both partook, and which consequently was distinct from and prior to the Divine Persons themselves, and that out of it two Beings, the Father and the Son, were produced, like two coins struck out of the same lump of metal. If that term therefore was allowed, it followed that the Father was not eternal, and that there was a pre-existent οὐσία (Athan. *de Synod.* i. 919 sq.). Dr. Newman designates this as "a wretched sophism which of course could not deceive Firmilian and Gregory, but which being adopted to perplex weak minds might decide them on withdrawing the word" (*Arians*, ch. ii. p. 192). "The Council of Antioch abstained from the word because they rejected the heresy that there is One only person in the Godhead; the Council of Nicaea used it because they affirmed the Oneness of Substance in the Persons of the Godhead; and both Councils agreed in the essence of the doctrine." (Bp. Wordsworth, *Ch. Hist.* i. 400; cf. Petav. *de Trin.* lib. iv. c. 5 n. 2; Bull. vol. v. p. 81, 88; *Def. Fid. Nic.* ii. 1, 9–13; Waterland, vol. i. p. 330; Newman, *Select Treatises of Athan.* pp. 165–176.) On the points of correspondence or of difference between the teaching of Paul and that of Nestorius the learned note of Dr. Newman may be consulted (*Select Treatises of Athan.* Library of the Fathers, vol. viii. p. 175). These points are clearly drawn out by the clergy of Constantinople in the "*Contestatio adv. Nestorium*" (Labbe, iii. 338, cap. xiii.; Baluz. 402,) and in Liberati, *Breviarium*, c. ii. (Labbe, v. 741). The chief distinction was that Paul denied the personality of the Word which the Nestorians held. "Nestorius circa Verbum Dei *non* ut Paulus sentit, qui non substantivum sed prolatitium (προφορικός) potentiae Dei efficax Verbum esse definit" (Mar. Mercator, p. 50; cf. also Facund. vi. 3, iii. 2; Leontius, *de Sectis*, iii. p. 504).

The alleged confession of the Council of Antioch against Paul's teaching (Labbe, ii. 979; Routh. *Rell. Sacr.* iii. 524; ii. 365), though accepted as genuine by Baronius, and Feuerlin, and in later times by Burton (*Testimonies*, pp. 397–399) and Faber (*Trinitarianism*, vol. ii. p. 257), is regarded as of a long subsequent date (probably, according to Dr. Routh, "post lites exortas Nestorianas") by Tillemont, Dupin, Routh, and Newman, whose verdict may safely be accepted. The question is exhaustively discussed in a learned note by Dr. Newman (*Select Treat. of Athan.* Libr. Fath. viii. pp. 163–176), and by Dr. Routh (*Rell. Sacr.* iii. 365).

Fragments of Paul's writings are to be met with in the *Contestatio adv. Nestorium*, in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (Labbe, iii. 338), in Leontius Byzantinus (*Contr. Nest. et Eutych.* lib. iii.); and in Justinian (*Lib. contr. Monophys.* Maii *Nov. Collect.* vii. i. 299.) Fragments of his sermons, πρὸς Σαβῖνον, are also given by Mai (*ibid.* 68). Many of these are also to be found in Gieseler's *Eccl. Hist.* vol. i. p. 222, Clark's Translation.

[b] The synodical letter of the bishops who condemned Paul closes, in Eusebius, with the request that the orthodox bishops would exchange letters of communion with Domnus, adding the ironical observation that Paul if he wished might do the same with Artemon (Eus. *H. E.* vii. 30).

Dr. Newman regards Paul of Samosata as "the founder of a school rather than of a sect" (*Arians*, p. 6). A body was called by his name Paulianists, or Pauliani, or Samosatensians, who existed in sufficient numbers at the time of the Council of Nicaea for the enactment of a canon requiring them to be rebaptized and their clergy to be reordained on their return to the Catholic Church, on the ground that orthodox formulas were used with a heterodox meaning (*Canon. Nic.* xix. Hefele, i. 43). The learned presbyter Lucian, who may be considered almost the parent of Arianism, was a friend and disciple of Paul, and, as being infected with his errors, was refused communion by each of the three bishops who succeeded the heresiarch. We see from many references to them in the writings of Athanasius, that for a considerable period after the Nicene Council it was felt necessary for Catholics to controvert the Samosatene's errors, and for semi-Arians to disown complicity in them (Athan. *de Synod.* 918–920). The Paulinians are mentioned by St. Augustine as still existing (Aug. *de Haeres.*), though Pope Innocent spoke of the heresy as a thing of the past in 414 (Labbe, ii. 1275), and when Theodoret wrote, c. 450, there did not exist the smallest remnant of the sect. (Theod. *Haer.* Fab. ii. 11; Epiphan. *Haer.* 65; August. *Haer.* 44; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. iv. pp. 289–303; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 134; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. ii. pp. 362–367, Clark's Transl.; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, div. i. vol. ii. pp. 10–15, Clark's transl.; Newman, *Arians of the Fourth Century*, pp. 3, 27, 192, ed. 1876; *Select Treatises of Athanasius*, Libr. of Fath. vol. viii. pp. 163–176; Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, vol. i. pp. 118–126; Neale, *Hist. of Patr. of Antioch*, pp. 45–54; Schwab, *de Paul. Samos. vit. atque doctr.* 1839; Feuerlin, *Disp. de Haeres. P. S.*; Walch, *Ketzergesch.* ii. 64–126; Ehrlich, *de Error. P. S.* Lips. 1745; Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* vol. iii. pp. 288–367; Bp. Wordsworth, *Ch. Hist.* vol. i. pp. 396–398; Bright, *Notes on Canons of Four General Councils*, p. 65.)

[E. V.]

PAULUS (10) II., patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 519–521 (Clinton, *F. R.*). On the expulsion of the Monophysite Severus by Justin after wearisome negotiations with pope Hormisdas extending over a whole year, Paulus, a presbyter of Constantinople, warden of the hospice of Eubulus, was nominated by the emperor to the vacant see, and was canonically ordained at Antioch. He strictly attended to Justin's commands to enforce the decrees of Chalcedon, and by his excessive zeal in inserting in the diptychs the names of the orthodox bishops of that synod he caused a schism in his church, many of the Antiochenes regarding the council with suspicion, as tending to Nestorianism. His conduct rendered him so unpopular that the whole body of the Antiochenes, clergy, laity, and resident foreigners, joined in laying an accusation against him of conduct unbecoming a bishop before the papal legates, who were at that time in Constantinople. On their departure without coming to any conclusion in the matter, they repeated the charge before Justin. Paul, being unable to clear himself, asked leave of the emperor to retire from his bishopric, A.D. 521. This was granted. He was succeeded by Euphrasius, and, in the words of Evagrius, "he went the way of all flesh by a natural death" (Evagr. *H. E.* iv. 4; Theophan. p. 141; Joann. Malal. lib. xvii. p. 411; Eutych. ii. 152; *Epistola Justini*, Labbe, iv. 1555; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 732).

[E. V.]

PAULUS (11), surnamed THE BLACK, Jacobite patriarch of Antioch from about the middle of the sixth century to 578. He was by birth an Alexandrian (Assem. *B. O.* ii. 331), and like most other Egyptians in faith a Monophysite. His monastery, Guba Baraja, placed in Egypt by Le Quien (*Or. Chr.* ii. 1358), is shown by Assemani (ii. 74, 75) to have been in Mesopotamia on the Euphrates. Before his elevation to the episcopate we find him at Constantinople maintaining a successful public disputation in the patriarchal palace with the Tritheites Conon and Eugenius (Assem. ii. 329). Either Mennas or Eutychius must then have been patriarch. He was at some time, probably then, syncellus to Theodosius, the Jacobite patriarch of Alexandria, who was residing in nominal exile at Constantinople, but exercising full authority over the Jacobite congregations there and in Egypt. Paulus's connection with Theodosius, and his success as a disputant, were sufficient to mark him out for the titular see of Antioch and the patriarchate of the whole Monophysite body, then beginning to be called Jacobites, and it was by Jacob Baradaeus himself, who originated the name, that he was consecrated. But the exact date cannot be determined. It was in succession to Sergius, but (as John of Ephesus states, p. 81, *u. inf.*), "after an interval"; nor is the date of Sergius's death settled [SERGIUS of Antioch]. We cannot feel sure that he was consecrated before 550. Paul, notwithstanding that he was the ecclesiastical chief of the whole Jacobite body, aspired to succeed Theodosius in the see of Alexandria, and thither he went accordingly to make interest for himself, but how soon after Theodosius's death, which occurred in 567, cannot be ascertained exactly within two or three years. He failed, however, through the opposition of Athanasius, a son of the empress Theodora's daughter, a man of great wealth and influence, and a Tritheite (Assem. ii. 331). Retiring from Egypt he visited the Arab Monophysite king Aretas or Harith (ob. 572). In a list of celebrities who were flourishing in 571 occurs the name of Paul. All that we hear of him afterwards is disastrous. The great persecution of the Monophysites by the patriarch John Scholasticus broke out at Constantinople, if the year is right, on March 20, 571, and our Paul was one of four bishops who were subjected together to the most barbarous treatment at his hands, the others being Elisha of Sardis, John of Ephesus, Stephen of Cyprus, besides Paul of Aphrodisias who suffered earlier, and under whose name [PAULUS (13)] some general particulars of the persecution will be found. Our Paul was inveigled out of the monastery of the Acoemetae in Constantinople into the patriarch's palace, whither the others also were brought, under pretence of conferring on the unity of the church. Here the *History* of John of Ephesus, from which we draw (Dr. R. Payne Smith's trans., p. 33) gives us an opportunity of

verifying the date A.D. 571. The patriarch, remonstrating with the four bishops, says:—"It is you who hinder the unity of the church; after all our efforts for fifty years, you are still driving it away." He was probably reckoning the fifty years from the early part of Justin I.'s reign, in and about 520, when great efforts were made for the peace of the church and the maintenance of the Chalcedonian decrees. [HORMISDAS, p. 159.] The four bishops were kept in close custody, and the cruelties they underwent overcame their patience so far, that they agreed to communicate with the persecutor on condition of his ejecting the synod of Chalcedon from the church (John of Eph., p. 42). They then twice received the communion with him, loudly anathematising the obnoxious synod; but when they looked to the patriarch to fulfil his part of the compact he put them off with the excuse, that he must first obtain the consent of the bishop of Rome. Thus they unawares "fell into communion" with the deceitful "synodite," and on their loading him with reproaches the severity of their treatment was increased, and they were thrown into prison in the monastery of Beth Abraham in Constantinople, where their sufferings were protracted further. After a time Paul was allowed to escape, and made his way to Syria, where he was received with great displeasure by Jacob Baradaeus, who, after keeping him three years in suspense, on his humble submission, and on the intercession of Mondir, the son and successor of Aretas, restored him to communion. This was, as far as can be determined, in 575. In that year occurred the unfortunate double election among the Jacobites of Alexandria [THEODORUS], in which Paul's complicity was asserted; then followed, A.D. 576, in consequence, the sentence of Peter of Alexandria, deposing Paul, so strangely acquiesced in by Jacob, and the convulsion of the Jacobite sect all over the East [JACOBUS BARADAEUS, p. 331]. In 578, a new patriarch of Antioch, Peter of Callinicus, was appointed, and Paul withdrew into concealment at Constantinople, where he died in 582, as detailed by John of Ephesus (pp. 327–333). Paul is mentioned by Timotheus, the presbyter of Constantinople, in his *De Recept. Haeret.*, in the section on the Διακρινόμενοι or *Haesitantes*, num. 7, 8, 9. (*Pat. Gr.* lxxxvi. 57–60.) Here it is stated that Paul had the surname of BLACK, which serves to identify him with a Paul occurring in the enumeration of Sophronius (Hard. iii. 1289 C), who calls him Black, not only in name, but in very truth. [C. H.]

PAULUS (12), bishop of Apamea and metropolitan of Syria Secunda, after the deposition of Peter by Justin for his Monophysite tenets, A.D. 513. He attended the synod summoned by Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 536, at which, in the name of the bishops of his province he presented to Justinian a confession of the orthodox faith as set forth by the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and in the tome of Leo; and an anathema pronounced on Anthimus, Severus, and his predecessor Peter, and on all tainted with the same Monophysite views, which had been previously laid before pope Agapetus on his recent visit to Constantinople. (Labbe, *Concil.* v. 22.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (13), surnamed OF ASIA, Jacobite bishop of Aphrodisias and metropolitan of Caria in the reign of Justin II. We are indebted for our knowledge of him to the *Ecclesiastical History* of John of Ephesus (Dr. R. Payne Smith's translation). As his persecution by John Scholasticus, patriarch of Constantinople, marks a period in the history of the Monophysite body, it is important to fix its date. John of Ephesus says (p. 3) that, having brought down the second part of his history to the sixth year of Justin II., he was induced to enter on a third part by the outbreak of this persecution. The sixth year of Justin II. ended in Nov. 571. The outbreak, therefore, was in or after that year, and circumstances lead us to conclude that it was in that year. The congregations of the "orthodox," writes the Monophysite historian, had for more than forty years (from about 530 therefore) enjoyed peace and tranquillity, both in Constantinople and the suburbs, when, suddenly, "in the holy days of the Lenten fast, on Saturday before Palm Sunday" the emperor, at the instigation of the patriarch John, issued an angry decree commanding their churches to be closed, their altars to be razed, their priests and bishops to be imprisoned, and the worshippers to be dispersed; and this decree was followed by others like it (p. 4). If 571 was the year, the Saturday was March 20. The persecution fell chiefly on the numerous Monophysite monasteries, of both sexes, which had sprung up, in and around Constantinople while the empress Theodora lived. These were burst into to give admission to the "synodite" clergy bearing the consecrated bread, which the inmates were compelled to partake of, though it might be necessary to bind their hands and force it into their mouths. When a monastery had been reduced to obedience by personal visits from the patriarch himself and his clergy, and the recalcitrants imprisoned, the emperor and empress would go and carry gifts to all who had been submissive (p. 8). The Jacobite clergy had their orders annulled, and if they submitted to be reordained they might be received into the dominant church, but in numerous instances they were reduced to the ranks of the laity. While the violence of the persecution was felt chiefly at the capital, the provinces were not overlooked. The chief difficulty was with the bishops, and Paul of Aphrodisias was singled out for the first example (p. 13). The historian describes him as an honest and simple-minded old man, dwelling quietly in his monastery in Caria, when the patriarch had him brought to Constantinople and imprisoned in his own palace, until overcome by harsh treatment he was compelled to receive the communion at his hands, besides signing an act of submission, which he was not allowed to read (given by the historian), to the effect that he accepted the decrees of Chalcedon, and the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. He was then sent back, but the "synodite" bishop of Aphrodisias had instructions to depose him from the episcopal office and consecrate him afresh to the see of the Carian Antioch, on the Maeander, at the far east of the province and not very distant from Aphrodisias. All this was done, to the extreme grief and indignation of the venerable bishop, and it could not have been long after-

wards that "death overtook him, and his old age descended in affliction and misery to the grave" (p. 16). For other bishops who suffered in this persecution see JOANNES (160), PAULUS (11), STEPHANUS of Cyprus. [C. H.]

PAULUS (14) CALLINICENSIS, Monophysite bishop of Callinicus in Osrhoëne; flourished circ. 503, according to Dionysius (*Chron.*, ap. Assem. *B. O.* ii. p. 46), who also relates that he was one of the bishops expelled by Justin in 519 for refusing to accept the council of Chalcedon. He fled to Edessa, where he translated some of the writings of Severus of Antioch into Syriac. A MS. in the Vatican Library (Cod. Nitr. 29) contains his version of the controversial letters that passed between Severus and Julian of Halicarnassus, *Concerning the Corruptibility of the Body of Christ*, of the treatise of Severus *Against Julian* (also in Cod. Nitr. 30), his *Questions and Answers*, his *Letter to the Monks of the East*, and his other tracts on the same controversy (including Julian's ten *Anathemas*, with the *Reply* of Severus); also his treatise *Against the Manicheans*, and his *Apology* for his *Philalethes*. To these is prefixed a *Preface* by Paul. The subscription to the MS. describes him as Mar Paulus Callinicensis (ܩܠܝܢܝܩܝܐ), but not expressly as bishop; and assigns Edessa, A. Gr. 839 (= A.D. 528), as the place and time of the translation. Assemani takes this to be the date of the MS., which no doubt is a mistake. He is wrong also in attributing to him the translations made by PAUL OF EDESSA. Portions of the above translations are to be found in the British Museum, Add. MSS. 12158 (6th century), 17200 (7th century). The *Homilies* of Severus, in a version older than that of Jacob of Edessa, contained in Add. MS. 14,599, and in Codd. Nitr. (Vat.) 32–34, are probably also translated by him. See Wright's *Catal.*, pp. 336, 546, 554, 555; Assem. i. pp. 569, 571. [J. Gw.]

PAULUS (15), bishop of Cataqua in Numidia (Böcking, *Not.* i. 644), concerning whom St. Augustine wrote to Olympius. Augustine wrote to him a letter of grave but severe rebuke for his misconduct and neglect of duty, A.D. 405. (Aug. *Epp.* 85, 96; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 131.) [OLYMPIUS.] [H. W. P.]

PAULUS (16) II., third in the list of the bishops of Châlon-sur-Saône in the latter half of the 5th century. From the circumstance of Sidonius Apollinaris, who mentions the consecration of his successor Johannes I. by Patiens, archbishop of Lyons, calling him junior episcopus, it has been conjectured by some that he was the second of the name at Châlon, but nothing is known of his predecessor. (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* iv. 25, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 531; *Gall. Christ.* iv. 862.) [S. A. B.]

PAULUS (17), bishop of Cirta, A.D. 303, during the persecution under Diocletian. Being interrogated by the inquisitors as to sacred books and implements, he endeavoured, but without success, to parry the enquiry, of which the result was to fix both upon him and upon Silvanus the charge of "tradition." The question was discussed in the enquiry held by Zenophilus, A.D. 320. (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 29, 33; *Ep.* cliii. 4; *Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. p. 169, ed. Oberthür.) [H. W. P.]

PAULUS, of Constantina; *vid.* of Tella.

PAULUS (18) I., sixth bishop of Constantinople, elected A.D. 336 (or 340), died after three exiles and two restorations about the year 351, four or five years after the council of Sardica. He was a native of Thessalonica, a presbyter of Constantinople, and secretary to the aged bishop Alexander, his predecessor in the see. Alexander died in the twenty-fourth year of his episcopate and the ninety-ninth of his life. For his parting advice of a choice between Paulus and Macedonius, see MACEDONIUS (2). No sooner had he breathed his last, than the two parties came into open conflict. The orthodox party prevailed; Paulus was elected, and he was consecrated by bishops happening to be at Constantinople in the Church of Peace, close to what was afterwards the Great Church of St. Sophia. The consecrating bishops should have been Eusebius of Nicodemia and Theodorus of Heraclea, who were the nearest neighbours; but it is said that they would take no part in the matter.

The emperor Constantinus had been away while all this was going forward. On his return he was angry at not having been consulted. He summoned a synod of Arian bishops, declared that Paulus was quite unfit for the bishopric, banished him, and translated Eusebius from Nicomedia to Constantinople. This is thought to have been in A.D. 338. Eusebius died in 341. Paulus was at once restored by the people to his see. But the Arians seized the occasion; Theognis of Nicaea, Theodorus of Heraclea, and other heterodox bishops, consecrated Macedonius in the church of St. Paul; and again, the city became the prey of a civil war amongst Christians, as Socrates calls it with mournful emphasis; violence and tumults blazed forth, and many lives were lost. The emperor was at Antioch. He was greatly exasperated, and ordered Hermogenes, his general of cavalry, to see that Paulus was again expelled. Hermogenes was on a mission to Thrace, and could take Constantinople on the way. The people would not hear of violence being done to their bishop; they met force by force, rushed upon the house where the general had taken up his quarters, set fire to it, killed him on the spot, tied a rope round his feet, pulled him out from the burning building, and dragged him in triumph round the city.

The emperor Constantine was not likely to pass over this rebellion against his authority. He rode on horseback at full speed to Constantinople, determined to make the people of that capital suffer heavily for their revolt. They met him, however, on their knees with tears and entreaties, and he contented himself with depriving them of half their allowance of corn. He turned his anger on Paulus, and ordered him to be driven from the city. He was also highly indignant with Macedonius, as the origin of the death of his general and of so much trouble, and because he had been consecrated without his leave. Without either confirming or annulling the election, he returned to Antioch.

Athanasius was at this time in exile from Alexandria, Marcellus from Ancyra, and Asclepas from Gaza; with them Paulus betook himself to Rome, and consulted Julius the bishop. Julius examined into their cases severally, found them all staunch to the creed of Nicaea, admitted them to communion, espoused their cause, and wrote strongly to the bishops of the East. Athanasius and Paulus recovered their sees; the eastern bishops returned to bishop Julius an answer altogether declining to act on his advice.

The emperor Constantinus was again at Antioch, and was as resolute as ever against the choice of the people of Constantinople. Philippus, prefect of the East, was then at that city; to him was entrusted the task of once more expelling Paulus. This time Macedonius was definitely to be put in his place. Philippus was not ready to incur the risks and fate of Hermogenes; he said nothing about the imperial order. By the shore of the Hellespont was a palace, and joining the palace was a splendid public bath, called Zeuxippus. He asked the bishop to meet him here, as if to discuss some matter of public business. The bishop came; Philippus showed him the emperor's letter, and ordered him to be quietly taken through the palace to the water-side, placed on board ship, and carried off to Thessalonica, his native town. He allowed him to visit Illyricum, and the remoter provinces, and only forbade him to set foot again in the East. The disastrous restoration of Macedonius belongs to the story of that prelate. Paulus was afterwards loaded with chains and taken to Singara in Mesopotamia, afterwards to Emesa, and finally to Cucusus in Armenia, and there died. Sozomenus is not certain of the particulars of his end, but he mentioned the report that he was strangled by the adherents of Macedonius. The same account is given by Athanasius. His followers suffered grievously at the hands of the heresiarch. First he drove them from their churches, then he forced them to communicate with him; many who refused were beaten to death; some were deprived of their property, others of their rights as citizens; some were branded on the forehead, to be the sport of the Arian mob. It is due to Constantinus to record that he blamed Macedonius for this cruel treatment of the defeated friends of the unfortunate Paulus.

The emperor Theodosius afterwards ordered his remains to be brought back from Ancyra, where they were lying. The emperor himself received the corpse with the greatest honour and reverence, and buried it in the church of St. Paul, which had been in the hands of the party of Macedonius, and in which Macedonius had himself been consecrated. (Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 6, etc.; Soz. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 3, etc.; Athanas. *Hist. Arian. ad Monach.* 275; Mansi, *Concil.* i. 1275; *L'Art de vérifier les dates*, iv. 66; Theoph. *Chronogr.* 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 59, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* cviii.) [W. M. S.]

PAULUS (19) II., patriarch of Constantinople, thirty-eighth in the succession of the see, Monothelite, successor of Pyrrhus in Oct., A.D. 641, and himself succeeded by Pyrrhus again.

The emperor Heraclius died in 641, leaving the empire jointly to Constantinus, son of his first marriage, and Heracleonas, son of his second by his niece Martina. In about three months' time Constantinus was dead, and the popular verdict declared his stepmother guilty of poisoning him. She and Heracleonas were deposed by the senate, and Constans, son of the dead Constantinus and grandson of Heracleonas, was placed on the throne. Pyrrhus the patriarch was regarded as the accomplice of Martina, relinquished his dignity, and fled to Africa. Paul, his successor, was a presbyter at Constantinople, and treasurer of the great church. He sent the usual synodal letters, together with letters from the bishops who had consecrated him, to pope Theodore I. There was nothing in these letters contrary to the orthodox faith; but the bishops happened to call Pyrrhus very holy, saying that he had only left his see on account of the revolution and the popular animosity. The pope replied to the patriarch that revolution and popular animosity could not deprive a man of his bishopric; that to make the patriarch's consecration valid, it was necessary that Pyrrhus should be deposed in a council after his cause had been canonically examined by the nearest bishops; that the presence of Pyrrhus was not at all necessary, as his excesses were notorious and his writings at hand; and that if his partizans tried to delay his condemnation, it would be easy to counteract their plots by getting an order from the emperor for sending Pyrrhus to Rome, there to be judged by a council. Pope Theodore wrote in the same strain to the bishops who had ordained Paulus, and sent a decree to Constantinople, which was to be publicly read, in which he rejected all that Pyrrhus had taught contrary to the orthodox faith, and without naming it anathematised the Ecthesis of Heraclius. In the letter to Paulus the pope quotes a letter which he had written to the emperor asking him to send Pyrrhus to Rome.

In A.D. 645 Pyrrhus came to Rome with Maximus, a monk of noble birth, and the ablest of all the opponents of Monothelism, with whom he had been for some time discussing the question, and by whom he professed to have been convinced. Pope Theodore admitted him to communion, and treated him as patriarch, ignoring the position of Paulus. But Pyrrhus soon after went to Ravenna, and there retracted his recantation, on which pope Theodore called a synod, obtained the condemnation and excommunication of Pyrrhus, and to give all solemnity to the sentence, subscribed it in the wine of the eucharist cup, and laid it on the tomb of St. Peter.

Pope John IV. and pope Theodore had both urged the different emperors to withdraw the *Ecthesis*, which was still displayed by authority. In 648 the emperor Constans put forth a new formulary, intended to supersede the *Ecthesis*; it was called the Typus, or Model of Faith, and was the composition of the patriarch Paulus. The gist of it was that to talk either of one will or of two wills in the person of Christ was quite a modern invention, and perfectly unnecessary; no indication was betrayed to either party, and all controversy on the subject or mention of the terms was strictly forbidden.

Paulus had carried on some unsatisfactory correspondence with Rome on the subject of the controversy, when at length pope Theodore in formal synod declared him excommunicate. When the Roman decree arrived at Constanti-

nople Paulus was evidently extremely angry. He overthrew the altar of the papal chapel in the palace of the papal envoy Martin (himself to be the next pope), called Placidia, forbade the Roman envoys to celebrate the eucharist, treated them with harshness, and persecuted their partizans. He could hardly have submitted to the mere authority of the Roman pope in an opinion which he held conscientiously, but the retaliation only made matters worse. It was at this time that the *Typus* appeared; in spite of it the controversy raged even with greater fierceness.

Pope Theodore died in May, 649, and Martin, who had been envoy at Constantinople, was chosen to succeed him. He immediately held a council at Rome, known as the first Lateran; the council was intended to dispose of the Monothelite controversy. The history of the council belongs rather to the life of pope Martin than to that of the patriarch Paulus; it is enough to say that the expression "*one* theandric operation" was denounced, and anathemas were passed against Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, and Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paulus of Constantinople, together with "the most impious Ecthesis" and "the most impious Typus" which Sergius and Paulus respectively had persuaded Heraclius and Constans to issue. While the council was sitting the exarch Olympius arrived to enforce subscription to the Typus, and to carry pope Martin to Constantinople. Olympus did not perform this office, but in 633 the exarch Theodore Calliopas seized the pope and despatched him towards the East. The tedious journey, the public mockery, the imprisonment, exile, starving and death of the unhappy pope belong to his own biography. It was owing to the intercession of the patriarch Paul that he was not executed. The patriarch was dying, and the emperor came to tell him what had happened to his old opponent. Paul in deep grief turned round towards the wall, and said: "It is to increase my condemnation." The emperor was surprised at this remark; when the dying patriarch added, "Is it not a deplorable thing thus to treat a bishop?" He died the day after Christmas, A.D. 654. What followed the death of Paulus belongs to the biography of Pyrrhus. The letters of Paulus to pope Theodore remain. (S. Theodori et Martini *Epist.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 75–99, 106, &c.; Theoph. *Chronogr.* 275, 283, in *Patr. Graec.* cviii.; S. Niceph. Patriarch C. P. *De rebus post Mauric.* 36, in *Patr. Graec.* c; Baron. *Ann. Eccl.* 641, vii; Pagi, 642, i., 643, iv. 648, ii. iii. iv. xiv.; Mansi, *Concil.* x. 609, 610, 673, 678, 696, 777, 787, 863.) [W. M. S.]

PAULUS (20) III., patriarch of Constantinople, 45th in the succession of the see, successor of Theodore I., and followed by Callinicus; elected in A.D. 686; died in 693, having held the episcopate six years and eight months. On the death of Theodore, Paulus, a layman, who had distinguished himself as one of the secretaries of the sixth council eleven years before, was elected in his place. Nothing is known about him, except that he presided at the council of Constantinople called In Trullo and Quinisext. This council has been placed in 686, 692, and 706; the most probable date is 692. It was summoned by the young emperor Justinian, who had succeeded his father Constantine Pogonatus in 685, for the purpose of passing canons on matters of practice, as the fifth and sixth general councils had enacted canons only on matters of faith. The discussion of its hundred and two canons belongs to the account of the Trullan council. As illustrating the position of Paulus III., it must be stated that we gather that the eastern bishops were bent, as at Chalcedon, on moderating the late doctrinal triumphs of Rome by legislating on other matters which would be unpalatable to the pope; and that the recognition of these canons by the east only, where they were quoted as the work of the sixth general council, was the first manifest step towards the separation of the Greek and Latin churches. (Mansi, *Concil.* ii. 922–1018; Baron. *Ann. Eccl.* 684. xiv, 691. iv; S. Niceph. Patriarch. *Chronogr. Brevis*, viii. in Migne, *Patr. Graec.* t. c 1048.) [W. M. S.]

PAULUS (21) IV., patriarch of Constantinople, fifty-third in the succession of the see, successor of Nicetas I., and followed by Tarasius; elected Feb. 20, 780 (*L'Art de vérifier les dates*), and died 784. His short episcopate occurred amidst the distractions of the Iconoclast controversy. Like his predecessor, he belonged to the Iconoclast party. He was consecrated on the second Sunday in Lent. He is described as an honoured and venerable reader, born at Salamis in Cyprus, distinguished for learning and high character. He had a secret leaning towards the cause of Image-worship, but feared the emperor Leo IV. At length on August 31st, 784, after the death of Leo, having fallen into bad health, he suddenly resigned his see, retired to the monastery of Florus, and took the cowl of a monk. As soon as the empress Irene heard the news, she hurried to him with her son Constantine VI., a boy of ten years old, and complained with no assumed grief of the step which he had taken: "Oh, why did you do this?" Bursting into tears, the old man answered, "Would that I had never sat on the sacred throne of Constantinople! The church of God has been tyrannically governed; for that reason she is cut off from the other thrones of Christendom, and heaped with dire anathemas!" The empress proceeded to summon to her palace the patricians and the principal men of the senate. She commissioned them to go to the monastery and hear what Paulus had to say. "Unless," he admonished them, "you call a general council and correct the error which prevails amongst you, there is no salvation for you." They asked him why, when he was elected patriarch, he had declared amidst the solemnities of his consecration that he intended never to worship images? "Ah, that," said he, "is the cause of my tears! That has driven me to repent and entreat my God that He would not punish me as a priest who had till now been silent, and who had refrained from fear of your madness from preaching the truth." Not long after he died, deeply lamented by the empress and by the pious men of the empire. He was highly esteemed, generous beyond measure to the poor, and had won the confidence both of Irene and of the public. (Theoph. *Chronogr.* 382, 385, 386, Migne, *Patr. Graec.* cviii.; Baron. *Ann. Eccl.* 780. ii. 784. i. iv.) [W. M. S.]

PAULUS (22), Novatian bishop of Constantinople. He had been a teacher of oratory before his ordination. He founded a Novatian monastery, and was noted for his ascetic life. Socrates (*H. E.* vii. 17) describes him as a typical recluse "in continued fastings, silence, abstinence from animal food, and a very sparing use of oil and wine." [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (23), bishop of Crateia, one of the forty friendly prelates who threatened the empress Eudoxia with the wrath of heaven on her children for her treatment of Chrysostom. (Pallad. p. 83, v.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (24), bishop of Crete, a contemporary of pope Vitalian, who in A.D. 668 revoked in a Roman council the decision that Paulus had pronounced in a Cretan council upon Joannes bishop of Lappa in Crete [JOANNES (227)]. Vitalian addressed two letters to Paulus, especially directing him to restore the bishop of Lappa, and reproaching him for not sending a legate to plead in the appeal at Rome. Le Quien (*Or. Christ.* ii. 260) dates the second letter Jan. 27, A.D. 669. (Vitalianus, *Epp.* 1 and 3, ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxxvii. 999, 1003; Mansi, xi. 16, 99; *Jaffé, R.P.* num. 1614, 1616.) [J. G.]

PAULUS (25), Jacobite bishop of Cyprus A.D. 624; translated many Homilies of Gregory Naz. into Syriac. (Assem. i. 171.) Many copies of this work survive in MS.; *e.g.* Br. Mus. Add. 12153, 14549. (Wright, *Catal.*, pp. 423, 428.) [J. G.]

PAULUS (26), bishop of Doclea (in what is now Montenegro), mentioned in two letters of Gregory the Great to Constantinus and JOANNES (328), bishops of Scodra and Prima Justiniana in A.D. 602. He had been accused among other offences of incontinence, had been convicted, and had confessed himself guilty, and had then been deposed, and Nemesion appointed in his place. Paulus, however, had with the aid of the civil authorities forcibly entered the bishop's house, had carried off various things, and treated Nemesion with great violence. Gregory ordered Joannes to inquire into the matter, and compel Paulus to restore any of the property in question that belonged to the church. What was his own, however, he was to be allowed to retain on condition of making good thereout any dilapidations. If contumacious, he was to be confined in a monastery. If it was true that he had tried to reassume his office, he was to be deprived of communion for the rest of his life, and confined in a monastery (*Epp.* xii. 30, 31). [F. D.]

PAULUS (27), Jacobite, 9th maphrian of the East, appointed by Athanasius III., the patriarch, A.D. 724. He "reconciled the people at Tagrit, and other Orientals, with one another and with the Westerns," and died A.D. 757. (Gregory Barh. *Chron. Eccl.* ii. p. 155 (ed. Abbel. and Lamy); Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* ii. 430, iii. 111). [J. G.]

PAULUS (28) EDESSENUS, Monophysite bishop of Edessa; consecrated A.D. 510 in succession to Peter. In the first year of his episcopate he took part with Gamalinus, bishop of Perrha,[a] against certain sectarians who refused the use of bread, water, and wine, except in the Eucharist. When Justin, on his accession to the empire, undertook to force the decrees of Chalcedon on Severus of Antioch and his followers, he committed the task to Patricius, who came in due course to Edessa (November, 519), and put before Paul the alternatives, to subscribe the council or resign. Paul refused, and took sanctuary in his baptistery; whence he was dragged by Patricius and sentenced to go into exile to Seleucia. Justin, however, hoping to overcome the bishop's resistance, reinstated him after forty-four days; acting under the advice of the patriarch Paul who occupied the seat of the deposed Severus: the design being, as Dionysius (writing in the Monophysite interest, circ. 775) alleges in his *Chronicon*, to induce Paul of Edessa to conform inwardly to the Chalcedonian doctrine, while making an outward show of opposing it. But when he proved to be sincere and persistent in refusing submission, he was at length deposed and banished to Euchaita in Pontus, in July, 522. Dionysius adds that this was brought about by Asclepius, a presbyter of Edessa, who, when disappointed in his expectation of being raised by Paul to the vacant see of Charrae, revenged himself by reporting the bishop's persistency (through his brother who was Praefectus Praetorio at Constantinople) to the emperor. The result was an imperial order to Pharesmanes, military prefect, to expel Paul and place Asclepius in the see.

It was no doubt in his days of exile that he translated the Greek hymns of Severus and other Monophysite writers, and arranged them so as to form a Syriac hymnal. A MS. of this collection as corrected by Jacob his famous successor in this see—dated in the lifetime of that prelate (A.D. 675), and probably written by his hand — is in the British Museum (Add. MS. 17134). Of the hymns it contains, one (the second *On the Holy Chrism*) is noted by Jacob as an original composition of Paul's. A subscription (in the same hand) informs us that "Paul bishop of Edessa" executed the work "when he was in the island of Cyprus in his flight from the Persians." The reference is apparently to the troubles mentioned by Procopius, *De B. P.* (i. 12), and by Theophanes, *Chronogr.* (pp. 143, 144), which arose in the years 521–3 in the territory of the Lazi, formerly called Colchis, bordering on Pontus. A few years before, Macedonius Patriarch of Constantinople had in like manner been forced by an irruption of the Huns to fly from Euchaita, to which place he too, and his predecessor Euphemius, had been banished by the emperor Anastasius (Theoph. pp. 120, 134, 138). On the death of Asclepius (June 525), Paul "repented" (as the orthodox author of the *Chronicon Edessenum* states), and made submis-

[a] So Assem. i. 409 n. (quoting the *Chron.* of Dionysius). But a letter against this sect is extant (Wright, *Catal.* p. 1061; Overbeck, *S. Ephr.*, *Rabulae*, &c., *Opera*, p. 230) addressed to "Gamalinus, bishop of Perrha," by Rabulas, who died 435. It follows therefore that Assem. wrongly understands Dionysius to mean that Paul and Gamalinus were contemporary. His words must be taken merely to convey that each had in his time opposed the error in question.

sion to Justinian, then acting for Justin. From him he obtained a letter in support of the petition he then addressed to Euphrasius, then patriarch, praying to be restored to his see. He was accordingly permitted to return to Edessa as bishop in March 526. He survived this his third inauguration less than eight months, dying on 30th October of the same year, less than a year before the death of Justin. The Jacobites, however, cannot have regarded him as a renegade, for he is commemorated in their calendar on 23rd August, as "Mar Paulus, bishop of Edessa, Interpreter of Books," a title likewise given to Jacob of Edessa. J. S. Assemani (*B. O.* ii. p. 46) falls into the natural mistake of supposing the Paul thus commemorated to be PAUL OF CALLINICUS, his contemporary, suffragan, and fellow-sufferer, who he thinks may have been called "of Edessa," not as bishop, but as residing there; and of ascribing to him the translation of the hymns as well as of the prose writings of Severus. But he overlooks the title "*Bishop* of Edessa," expressly given in the calendar to the person commemorated, and likewise in the MS. above described, and in two Bodleian MSS. (see below) to the translator of the hymns. Paul of Callinicus was alive in 528, whereas Paul of Edessa died in 526. These two Pauls have so much in common that one feels tempted to reverse Assemani's conjecture, to suppose an error of a few years in one of the Chronicles, and to assign the translation of all the works of Severus, prose as well as verse, to Paul of Edessa, —with the explanation that he may have been also designated "of Callinicus," as born in that city, or resident in one of its monasteries, or possibly as having occupied the two sees together simultaneously (as Thomas of Harkel is supposed to have held Germanicia along with Mabug its metropolis). But the dates seem too well authenticated to admit of this identification; and, moreover, it is plain from Assemani's extracts (cp. *B. O.* i. p. 409 n. 1, with ii. p. 46) that Dionysius in his *Chron.* treated of them as distinct persons.

The hymnal above mentioned consists of 365 hymns; 295 being by Severus, the rest by his contemporary John Bar-Aphtunaya, abbat of Kinnesrin, John Psaltes his successor there, and others. Though the translation is no doubt in the main the work of Paul, it comprises a few hymns of obviously later date. Among its commemorations of "Holy Fathers" we find not only some in praise of his contemporaries,—as of Severus by John Bar-Aphtunaya, and of this John by John Psaltes,—but also one "concerning Peter the Patriarch, called the Callinicene" (d. 591), and one "concerning Julian the Patriarch" (d. 596), both by John Psaltes. These of course were inserted by Jacob when he revised the collection. A few which contain interesting reference to events early in the 6th century may well be regarded as composed by Severus and translated by Paul;—as *e.g.* three "On the War with the Persians" (probably that of 502–506); six "On the Earthquakes of the year 562" (A.D. 514); two "On the Invasion of the Huns" (516). That "On the Himyarite Martyrs" (523) is assigned to John Psaltes. The collection concludes with a version by Paul of the *Gloria in Excelsis*. There are among the Add. MSS. of the British Museum many copies complete or otherwise of this hymnal, ranging in date from the 7th to the 13th century (Wright, *Catal.* pp. 330–374). A similar collection, ancient but undated, with a subscription to the like effect with that above cited from Add. 17134, is in the Bodleian [Hunt. 586]; and another MS. in the same library [Poc. 10] contains Paul's version of the *Gloria*, amplified and embodying the Trisagion with its Monophysite interpolation (Payne Smith, *Catal.* pp. 513, 63). Assemani, *B. O.* i. p. 613 (cp. 487) describes a copy of the same in the Vatican Library, No. xv., made about the year 1000.

Bishop Lightfoot (*Ignatius*, vol. i. p. 185) gives the hymns of this collection "On Ignatius" at length, with a translation.

See, on the question of identity, Wright's *Catal.* i. p. 336; Payne Smith's *Catal.* p. 63.

The extracts from the Edessene *Chronicle*, and that of Dionysius, above referred to, are given by Assem. *B. O.* i. pp. 407–414. [J. Gw.]

PAULUS (29), a bishop (as must be understood from his "sacerdotium") in Egypt, whom the patriarch Theophilus, while an Origenist (*i.e.* not later than 395), deposed for his opposition to the party. Paulus found refuge at Bethlehem with Jerome, who describes the bitter sufferings his guest had undergone. He afterwards obtained reinstatement by an order from the emperor, but was yet in Palestine when the Origenist monks expelled by Theophilus (now become their opponent) arrived there in 401, and in vain sought to attach him to them (Hieron. *Apol. adv. Lib. Rufin.* lib. iii. 17, 18 in *Pat. Lat.* xxiii. 469; Tillem. xi. 459, 476, xii. 648.) [C. H.]

PAULUS (30), bishop of Emesa, one of the most deservedly respected of the prelates of the period of the Nestorian controversy, the contemporary of Cyril and John of Antioch, the peacemaker between the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch after the disastrous close of the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. On his way to Ephesus Paul visited the aged Acacius, bishop of Beroea, by whom, being prevented by his years from attending the council, he was commissioned to act as his representative (Labbe, iii. 724). He reached Ephesus together with John of Antioch and the other Oriental bishops, and joined in the act of deposition of Cyril and Memnon (*ibid.* 597) and in all the other proceedings of the Oriental party. He was one of the eight Oriental deputies despatched to the emperor with plenipotentiary powers (*ibid.* 724). The moderation he displayed in these difficult and delicate negotiations was condemned by the uncompromising Alexander of Hierapolis as proceeding from a mean desire for reconciliation at the cost of the truth (Baluz. *Concil. Nov. Collect.* 800). The subsequent proceedings have been so fully narrated in other articles that it is needless to detail them here at any length. [CYRILLUS OF ALEXANDRIA, i. 769, 770; JOANNES OF ANTIOCH, iii. 354.] Paul was a sincere lover of peace, and above all things anxious to put an end to the disputes on points of faith, the mutual violence of which was a disgrace to the church, a scandal to the faithful, and a stumbling-block to unbelievers. He was a man of vast experience in ecclesiastical

matters, an accomplished theologian, possessed of great tact and courtesy, and one who—for the unblemished holiness of his life, and his conspicuous piety, as well as for his advanced age—enjoyed the confidence and reverence of both of the contending parties. Weary of conflict and anxious to obtain peace, John of Antioch, after consultation with the aged Acacius of Beroea, despatched Paul as his ambassador to Alexandria to confer with Cyril on the terms of mutual concord, A.D. 432. The selection of one so moderate and of such high reputation, as mediator, was greatly pleasing to Cyril, who accorded a reception to Paul the friendly and pacific character of which surprised him (Labbe, (iii. 1106, 1090). After appeasing Cyril's irritation at the tone of John's letter to him, Paul presented in his own name and John's a confession of faith originally drawn up by Theodoret. The formulary was accepted by Cyril as orthodox, and he in his turn exhibited a formulary of faith which Paul approved as consonant with the creed of the Orientals (*ibid.* 1090). Paul was then received into communion by Cyril, on his exhibiting a written document in which he expressed his acquiescence in the deposition of Nestorius, anathematized his writings, and recognized his successor Maximian (Cyrill. *Epp.* 32, 40, tom. ii. pp. 100–102, 152). On this, Paul was permitted by Cyril to attend the services of the church, and was invited by him to preach. The first occasion was the Sunday before Christmas Day, the second, Christmas Day itself. On the festival the chief church of the city was crowded, who when Paul, having commenced with the "Gloria in excelsis Deo" and passed on to Is. vii. 14, concluded his exordium with words decisive of the whole controversy, "Mary the mother of God brings forth Emmanuel," τίκτει οὖν ἡ Θεοτόκος Μαρία τὸν Ἐμμανουήλ. The test title was received with loud acclamations by the congregation, "This is the true faith; This is the gift of God," which were repeated when he proceeded to enunciate the doctrine of "the combination of two perfect natures in the one Christ," with shouts of, "Welcome orthodox bishop, the worthy to the worthy" (Labbe, iii. 1095). Paul preached a third time the following Sunday, New Year's Day, 433, with equal acceptance. Portions of all these sermons are still extant (*ibid.* 1091, 1095, 1097). Referring for the details to the articles already mentioned, it is sufficient to state here, that to quicken John's delay in accepting the terms of peace proposed by Cyril, Paul accompanied Aristolaus and a deputation of two of Cyril's clergy to Antioch, to lay before John for his signature a document recognising Nestorius's deposition and the anathematizing of his teaching. This, eventually, was signed by John, and brought back with great joy, by Paul, to Alexandria in the following April (*ibid.* 1091). The happy reunion of the long divided parties was published by Cyril, in the chief church of Alexandria, Ap. 23, 433. Cyril acknowledged the receipt of John's formulary in a well-known letter—conveyed to him by the aged and successful peacemaker—commencing with the words of Ps. xcvi. 11: "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad," "*Laetentur caeli*," &c., by which it was subsequently known (*ibid.* 1106. Baluz. 786). The period of Paul's death is uncertain. (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xiv. (index); Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 419; Coteler. *Mon. Eccl. Graec.* i. 48; Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* ii. 240; Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* lxxvii. 1433; Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, Clark's Trans. iii. 127–137.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (31), bishop of Ephesus, in succession probably to Stephen when deposed in the synod of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. He was at some date afterwards ejected. But Timotheus Aelurus, patriarch of Antioch, returning to his see from exile in 476 under the protection of Basiliscus, called at Ephesus, and there held a Eutychian synod at which Paul was reinstated. On that occasion the jus patriarchicum was restored to Ephesus, giving Paul the title of archbishop (Evag. *H. E.* iii. 5, 6; Baron. *A. E.* ann. 476, xl, xlv; Pagi, ann. 476, xv, xviii). Valesius, in his note on Evagrius, explains the jus patriarchicum here spoken of as the right of consecrating metropolitans, a right which the synod of Chalcedon in its sixteenth action (Hard. ii. 628) took away from the Asian diocese and bestowed on Constantinople. On the original patriarchate of Ephesus see the *Canones Arabici* (xxxvii, xxxviii) of the Council of Nicaea (Hard. i. 484) and Wiltsch's *Handbook* (i. 162). After Zeno had, in 477, displaced Basiliscus pope Simplicius wrote to him (Oct. 8, 477) to press that certain bishops whom Basiliscus and Aelurus had supported, Paul of Ephesus among them, might be condemned by a synod at Constantinople (Pagi, 477, xiii; Jaffé, *R. P.* 344). The synod was held, as Valesius shows, in 478; and we find from a letter of Simplicius in 478, the patriarch Acacius (Pagi, 477, xiv; Jaffé, 345), as also from a statement of Evagrius (iii 8), which Baronius (477, xi) quotes, that Paul had been then expelled (Tillem. xvi. 294, 299, 300, 305). [C. H.]

PAULUS (32), bishop of Epiphania in Cilicia, deposed and banished by Justin in 518, at the same time as Philoxenus and Peter of Apamea, for Monophysitism. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 893.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (33), a bishop of Erythrum in the Libyan Pentapolis, mentioned in the Paschal letter of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, in 402, as successor to Sabbatius. (Jerome, *Ep.* xcviii. 26, ed. Vall.) Palladius, describing him as a "wretched young bishop," relates that he was sent with Dioscorus, by Theophilus, to summon Chrysostom to the Council of the Oak (Pallad. p. 70; Theoph. Alex. *Ep.* 1, p. 94). He was again deputed by Theophilus (*ibid.* 75, 76), with his former companions, and a third unnamed bishop, to produce the canons of Antioch, forbidding the return of a bishop after deposition (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 618).

[E. V. and W. H. F.]

PAULUS, of Gandisapor, *vid.* num. 44.

PAULUS (34), bishop of Heraclea, one of the leaders of the party opposed to Chrysostom. Tillemont gives weighty reasons against his see being Heraclea in Thrace, the metropolitical see of Constantinople (Tillem. tom. xi. p. 597–8, *Note* lxix., tom. xv. 701). Paulus at one time enjoyed the confidence of Chrysostom, who made use of his offices to endeavour to reconcile

Antoninus of Ephesus with Eusebius of Valentinianopolis, who had accused the former of simony and other crimes at the commencement of Chrysostom's Asiatic troubles (Pallad. p. 128). When at a later stage of those troubles Chrysostom personally visited Asia, Paul was one of the three bishops who received him on his landing at Apamea and whom he took as his companions in his visitation (*ibid.* p. 134). Three years afterwards we find Paul in the ranks of the enemies of Chrysostom, and at the Council of the Oak he was the first to give his vote for his deposition (Phot. *Cod.* 59, p. 60). He also joined in the letters to pope Innocent conveyed by Paternus, charging Chrysostom with having set his church on fire (Pallad. p. 25). [E. V.]

PAULUS (35), ST. (S. Pol de Léon in Brittany), born of noble parents in Cornwall, and a cousin of St. Sampson, bishop of Pol. They are said to have been fellow disciples under the charge of St. Iltutus at Laniltid in Glamorganshire. Armorica, from whence a large number of saints had emigrated in the past generation, now received help from the greater Britain. Sampson's successor in the see of Dol was St. Maglorius, who had come with him from Wales. Machutus or Maclovius, also from Wales, became bishop of Aleth (St. Malo). To the number may be added Paulus and Leonorius, the former of whom became bishop of Leon (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 256). Sampson is said to have died in 565, and Paulus on 12th March 573, at the age of 100 (*Acta Sanctorum*, 12th March, ii. 108–120). The MSS. of the life of St. Paulus, written by a monk of Fleury, are enumerated in Hardy's *Catalogue of Materials*, i. 157–158. Usher 290 quotes from Aymoin that Paulus lived as a hermit "on the isle of Osa, which is separated in a direct passage from the continent of Armorica, called Cornu Galliae, by a sea of sixteen paces." Whitaker (*Cathedral of Cornwall*, i. 15) would identify Osa with the island of Saintes, a little south of the opening into Brest harbour, and "Cornouailles" (Cornu Galliae) is the peninsular projection of the coast south of Brest. The parish of Paul in Mount's Bay in Cornwall is probably named from him and not from St. Paulinus of York, but the names were early confused. Bishop Grandisson dedicated the church to St. Paulinus in 1336, and the parish feast of Paul is now on the nearest Sunday to Oct. 10, which is St. Paulinus' day. The day of St. Pol de Léon was March 12. There was always a close connection with the opposite coast, and this is even shown in the names of the parishes. Mont St. Michel on the opposite side of the bay to Pol de Léon is in the parish of St. Hilaire, and St. Michael's Mount in Cornwall (on the opposite side of the bay to the parish of Paul) is in the parish of St. Hilary. [C. W. B.]

PAULUS (36), bishop of Merida, known only by *De Vita et Miraculis Patrum Emeritensium*, c. 4, 5, attributed to Paulus Diaconus (in *Esp. Sag.* xiii. 345), is placed by Florez between A.D. 530 and 560. According to the above-mentioned work he was a Greek, and a physician by profession. He came from the East to Merida, and after living there many years, he was chosen bishop. Thereupon all the troubles from which the church had suffered vanished. A long story is told of his curing the wife of a rich nobleman, who gave him in return the whole of his property, reserving only the life interest in a moiety during his wife's life and his own. For the adoption of his nephew and successor FIDELIS (6) see that article. After resigning his bishopric in his old age, he lived for some time a devotional life in a cell by the basilica of St. Eulalia (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 170; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. 1, 421. [F. D.]

PAULUS (37), Mar. 22, bishop of Narbonne, one of the seven bishops said by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* i. c. 28, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 175) to have been ordained and sent from Rome to preach in Gaul in the reign of Decius c. A.D. 250 [MARTIALIS (1)] (*Gall. Christ.* vi. 6; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, i. pt. 304–6, ii. 689–690; Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 442, 443, 469, 724). His acts (Boll. *A. SS.* Mart. iii. 369 sq.), which are very fabulous, assert that he was at Bourges before going to Narbonne. The Martyrologies say that the first bishop of Narbonne was Sergius Paulus, the proconsul whom St. Paul converted. [J. G.]

PAULUS (38), bishop of Neocaesarea, a military station on the banks of the Euphrates, and confessor, who in the persecution under Licinius had been deprived of the use of his hands by the application of red-hot iron to the muscles of the fingers (Theod. *H. E.* i. 7). He attended the Council of Nicaea in 325 (*ibid.*; Labbe, ii. 51). His name also appears among those present at the Council of Antioch in 341 (Labbe, ii. 560). [E. V.]

PAULUS (39), bishop of Nepi, sent by Gregory the Great at the end of A.D. 591, to administer the see of Naples, vacant by the deposition of Demetrius. Paulus found his post a troublesome one, and was anxious to return, which was at first refused by Gregory. At last, after some gross outrage had been perpetrated upon him, Gregory in May 593, allowed him to return to Nepi, ordered him to be paid a hundred solidi, and permitted him to choose one orphan boy as his servant. Paulus' name appears among the signatures to the decrees of the Council of Rome in A.D. 595 (*Epp.* ii. 9, 10, 15, 26; iii. 1, 2, 35; *Appendix ad Epp.* 5). [F. D.]

PAULUS (40), of NISIBIS, Nestorian metropolitan of Nisibis in the middle of the sixth century. In the article JUNILIUS it has been stated that that writer acknowledges, that the work by which he is known to us is translated from a work by a certain Paul whom he had met with, "A Persian by nation, who had been instructed in the school of the Syrians, in the city of Nisibis." Kihn, in his work *Theodor von Mopsuestia*, cited in the article just mentioned, has carefully discussed the few notices that can be found concerning this Paulus, and has arrived at the following results.

There are but two Pauls whose claims to have been the instructor of Junilius deserve to be taken into consideration. The first, known as Paul the Persian, was the author of a treatise on the Aristotelic Logic. The knowledge of his history is exclusively derived from a notice in the chronicle of Barhebraeus (Assemani *Bibl. Or.* III. i. 439). "At this time (viz. about

A.D. 570) Paul the Persian became celebrated for his knowledge, both of ecclesiastical science and of heathen philosophy; from whom we possess an admirable introduction to Logic. He wished to become metropolitan of Persis; but when the people would not agree, he made common cause with the Magians, and went over to them." This treatise on Logic has been recovered, being found in one of the Nitrian MSS. brought to the British Museum. It contains a dedication to king Chosroes I. (A.D. 531–581), which was translated into French and commented on by Renan (*Journal Asiatique*, ser. iv. vol. xix. 310, 1852). The whole compendium has been published with a Latin translation and notes by Land (*Anecdota Syriaca*, iv.). The MS. gives the birthplace of this Paul, and though the name has been disfigured by transcribers' errors, Kihn has no hesitation in identifying it with Ardeschir, the seat of the metropolitan of the province of Persis, the dignity to which we are told this Paul had aspired. He would have received his instruction in Greek philosophy at Nisibis. A little before the end of the fifth century, orthodox zeal had closed, on account of its Nestorianism, the celebrated school of Edessa, and banished the professors. On political grounds, the expelled Nestorians naturally found a welcome in the Persian dominions, and the theological school of Nisibis rose on the ruins of that of Edessa.

Against the identification of this Paul the Persian with the instructor of Junilius the date is a serious objection. We have every reason to think that the work of Junilius was published about 550, if not earlier; and we should expect his instructor to have gained celebrity some time before that. But, as has been already mentioned, 570 is given by Barhebraeus as the time when Paul the Persian flourished. But there is another Paul, whom Assemani (III. ii. 92) had already identified with the Junilian Paul. This Paul, the subject of the present article, was born at Bassora, a commercial town a little below the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates. He was instructed at Nisibis by Mar Abas,* and on the elevation of the latter to the Nestorian patriarchate about 535, Paul succeeded to the presidency of the school. We find Paul in 553 taking part as bishop of Nisibis in a Nestorian Council held by Joseph, who, in 552, had succeeded Mar Abas as patriarch. Of the bishops who joined with Joseph in that council, Paul's is the only name thought worthy of being recorded; and we are told that on that occasion the see of Nisibis was elevated to the second place after Seleucia. Paul was known as a writer, and Ebed Jesu, in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, names Paul of Nisibis as the author of a commentary on scripture, of a disputation with Caesar, and of various epistles. The "Commentary on Scripture" may be identified with the work translated by Junilius, and light is thrown on what is meant by the "disputation with Caesar" by an independent statement by the Egyptian priest Abulbacatus, in his book *Declaratio officiorum, &c.*, that Paul, the metropolitan of Nisibis, had written a letter containing an account of a theological discussion on the principles of the faith, held by him with the Emperor Justinian, who had summoned him to an interview. This agrees well with the well-known fondness of this emperor for theological discussions. The time might possibly have been 533, when we know that Mar Abas, who might have been accompanied by Paul, was summoned to Constantinople; but it is much more probable that Paul's discussion with the emperor took place on a later visit. Kihn conjectures the date to have been 543. On this visit to Constantinople he would naturally meet Junilius, who held high office at the Court, and who took much interest in theology. The authorities for the foregoing statements will be found in Assemani (*Bibl. Or.* II. 412, 458: III. 87, 435, 632; ii. 928).

The facts which have been stated agree so well with the hypothesis, that Paul of Nisibis was the Junilian Paul that it only remains to notice a conjecture thrown out by Nestle (*Theol. Literaturzeit.* 1876, p. 668) that Paul of Nisibis, and Paul the Persian, may have been the same person. But *for* the identification there is only the common name Paul (on which much cannot be built, the name being a usual one), and the fact that the Junilian Paul exhibits familiarity with logic; but this was a common accomplishment with those educated in the school of Nisibis. *Against* the identification is the twenty years difference of date already mentioned, the fact that no theological writing is ascribed to Paul the Persian, whose name does not occur in Ebed Jesu's catalogue; that the birthplace of the two was different, Paul the Persian really belonging to that nation, having been born in Ardeschir, Paul of Nisibis having been born at Bassora and only called by Junilius a Persian because residing in Persian territory; but what decisively distinguishes Paul of Nisibis from the Paul who apostatized to Parsism is the honour in which the memory of the former was preserved among the Nestorians. A commemoration of this Paul is made in a Nestorian Lectionary contained in a Syriac MS. at the British Museum (see Wright's Catalogue of Syriac MSS. I. 182–188). [G. S.]

PAULUS (41), an African bishop in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. iv. de Basilide, A.D. 254, Cyp. *Ep.* 67. He is possibly the same as bishop of Obba in Mauritania, 47th suffrage at Syn. vii. sub Cyp. de Bap. 3, A.D. 256. [E. W. B.]

PAULUS (42), bishop of Paraclus, one of the Palestinian bishops who attended the council summoned by Juvenal at Jerusalem, in 453, after the expulsion of the intruder Theodosius, and signed the synodic epistle addressed by Juvenal to the presbyters, abbats and monks of his diocese, contradicting the calumnious statements of Theodosius respecting the council of Chalcedon. (Labbe, iv. 889.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (43), bishop of Rome after Stephanus II. (commonly called Stephanus III.), from May A.D. 757 to June A.D. 767. He was a native of Rome, the son of one Constantine, and younger brother of his predecessor, both having been educated together in the Lateran palace under pope Gregory II., and ordained deacons together by Zacharias. It

* Concerning this Nestorian patriarch see the article THOMAS OF EDESSA.

was often the case that the archdeacons of Rome were commended by their position and influence as successors to the popedom; and in this case also, after the death of Stephen, the archdeacon Theophylact was selected by one party of the Roman people, who assembled at his house in his support; but the choice of a larger and more influential party fell upon Paul, who does not seem to have courted promotion, having remained in the Lateran, where he attended his brother during his illness. He is said to have been preferred to the archdeacon as being a stronger man (probably less advanced in years), and he was elected and ordained (probably May 29) without opposition from the other party. (Anastas. *in Vit. Pauli.*)

At the time of his accession two main subjects had lately occupied the attention of the popes:—the Iconoclastic controversy (see under GREGORIUS II. and III.), and the temporal jurisdiction of the Roman see over the exarchate of Ravenna. With respect to the first, the emperor Constantine Copronymus had in 754 assembled a council at Constantinople, which had condemned and forbidden the use of images; and cruel persecution of the monks there who would not give them up was going on during Paul's pontificate. He is said by Anastasius to have sent frequent remonstrances to the emperor, which are alluded to also by pope Hadrian in his letter on the same subject to the empress Irene and her son Constantine, and also by Paul himself in one of his letters to king Pippin (*Ep.* 20, *Cod. Carol.*);—"Nequaquam siluimus ei praedicandum ob constitutionem sanctarum imaginum et fidei orthodoxae integritatem." But no such letters of his have been preserved. They were not likely to be of any avail in the then state of the relations between Rome and the Greek empire, which the Iconoclastic disputes themselves had helped to bring about.

It will be seen under GREGORIUS III., how that pope had appealed to Charles Martel for aid against the Lombards, thus taking the first step towards breaking off the old political dependence of Rome on the Eastern empire, and transferring it to the rising kingdom of the Franks. Then pope Zacharias had (A.D. 752) given the sanction of the apostolic see to Pippin's consecration as king of the Franks, and the latter had in return (A.D. 755) bestowed on Stephen II. the temporal government of the exarchate, which, at the pope's request, he had in two campaigns recovered from the Lombard king Aistulph. When Paul became pope, Aistulph was dead, having failed to give up to Stephen all the territories that he had been bound by treaty to concede; and Desiderius, who through the intervention of Pippin and the pope had been elected to succeed him, still delayed to do so. Such was the state of things: and what we principally know of the activity of Paul during his popedom is derived from his correspondence on this subject, and on that of his temporal power over the exarchate generally under the protection of Pippin. Thirty-one letters of his, bearing mainly on these questions, are preserved in the *Codex Carolinus*, so called from Charlemagne, who is said to have first collected the letters it contains. The headings and purport of these letters are given also by Baronius from a Vatican Codex (*ad ann.* 767 I.) Immediately after his election, and before his ordination, Paul lost no time in writing to Pippin a letter expressing his devotion to him as being after God his helper and defender, and his earnest desire ever to maintain, even to the shedding of blood, the terms of peace and amity that had been established between him and the late pope (*Ep.* 13, *Cod. Carolin.*). He wrote also in similar strain to the Franks generally, thanking them warmly for their support (*Ep.* 22). Pippin replied in a similar spirit of cordiality, expressing his intention to maintain St. Peter and his successors in full and undisturbed possession of what had been granted to them.

Desiderius meanwhile was acting a double part. He not only delayed giving up the cities that had been ceded by treaty to the pope; he had also invaded the Pentapolis, and the duchies of Spoletum and Beneventum; he had imprisoned the duke and others of Spoletum, who had submitted to the pope; and had even made overtures to the Greek emperor, inviting him to send an army and fleet for recovering the exarchate, promising on certain conditions to assist him. But notwithstanding this he had gone to Rome, and in reply to the demand that he should cede at once the territories he retained had declared his earnest wish to come to friendly terms with the pope, but desired that time should be allowed him, and that the hostages who had been given to Pippin should first be restored to him.

Paul despatched two epistles successively to the king to represent the state of things, in which he recommended the rendering of the hostages as desired by Desiderius; but afterwards sent a third letter by special legates accompanied by Pippin's own emissary Robert, in which he implored the king to retain the hostages, and also to come to his aid against the Lombards. He explains in this last letter that his former ones had been written as they were for fear of their being intercepted by the Lombards, and not allowed to reach their destination if otherwise expressed. As is usual with him in all his letters, he abounds in laudation of Pippin as being, after God, the great bulwark of himself and of the church, and invokes the blessing of heaven on all his warfares. In a postscript he begs his acceptance of a sword and belt set with gems, a cloak adorned with peacocks, and three hyacinth rings, for himself and his two sons, Charles and Carloman (*Ep.* 15, *Cod. Carol.*) The main drift of most of his other letters is similar;—to court the continued favour of the king of the Franks for securing to the see of Rome the full possession and retention of the territories that had been granted to it against the unfaithfulness of the Lombard king and the Greek emperor's schemes for reconquest. By letters and embassies he kept Pippin informed of the doings and designs of both, and again and again appealed to him as the champion of God and St. Peter, complaining often of the failure of Desiderius to fulfil his promises, and in still stronger language of the machinations of those "most wicked Greeks," which he attributes to heretical pravity in the matter of image-worship. In one letter (*Ep.* 34, *Cod. Carol.*) he informs Pippin of a plan of the Greeks to attack

Ravenna, with the design (he says) of destroying and trampling on the holy orthodox faith, and the pious tradition of the fathers, and asks for an ambassador to be sent to him from France for the purpose of compelling Desiderius and the dukes of Beneventum, Spoletum, and Tuscany, to help in resisting the anticipated attack. Many mutual courtesies were, in the course of these negotiations, exchanged between the pope and Pippin. For instance, the latter had sent a table as a present to pope Stephen II., and this Paul informs the king he had himself conveyed with solemn litanies to St. Peter's shrine, had celebrated the holy mysteries upon it for the benefit of the king's soul and the stability of his kingdom, and dedicated it to remain there for ever as a witness and memorial. On another occasion Pippin had sent the pope a baptismal robe (*sabanum*) which had been used at the baptism of his daughter Gisla, and this Paul had deposited with religious ceremonies in the oratory of St. Petronilla.[a] (*Ep.* 27.) One Simeon had been sent into France for teaching the Franks church music, but had been recalled to Rome, to preside over the Roman song-school. Pippin's brother Remedius had been chagrined at this, and had sent some monks to Rome to complete their musical education. Thereupon Paul wrote to Pippin apologizing with regret for having been obliged to recal Simeon, expressing his earnest desire to accede in all ways to the wishes of the king and his brother, and promising that the monks should be well taken care of, and fully instructed in Simeon's song-school. (*Ep.* 43, *Cod. Carolin.*) In the year 762, Paul, at the request of Pippin, granted to him perpetually the monastery of St. Sylvester on Mount Soracte together with the three dependent ones of St. Stephen, St. Andrew, St. Victor, for the reception of strangers, the relief of the poor, and the maintenance of the monks there abiding (*Ep.* 12, *Cod. Carol.*) A further special favour accorded by Paul to France was the gift of certain relics of saints. He had been piously active in collecting the bodies of various saints and martyrs from the cemeteries about Rome, which had been profaned and ravaged by the Lombards; and he had founded on the site of his own private patrimony within the walls a monastery dedicated (A.D. 761) to St. Stephen and Sylvester for the honourable custody of these remains, which included those of the said saints. (Pauli *Ep.* xii. *ap.* Labbe.) Sigebert, in his chronicle, states that in the year 764 a bishop Grodogand was sent to Rome from Gaul to ask for some of the precious relics, and that Paul granted the bodies of the martyrs Gorgonius, Nabor, and Nazarius, which were transferred (probably in the following year) to Gaul, and deposited in three several monasteries. Baronius (*ad ann.* 764, I.) is at pains to explain that it could have been only little bits of these bodies that were thus translated, inasmuch as the bodies themselves, whole or divided, were known to be elsewhere, that of Gorgonius especially being in his own day preserved and venerated in the Vatican basilica. It may have been as he supposed, though the supposed preservation of the same relics in different places is not in fact so uncommon a marvel as to excite surprise. All Paul's letters to Pippin are marked by exuberant laudation of the king, and expressions of gratitude to him, showing an earnest desire to please him in all possible ways, so as to secure his continued protection, and prevent any alliance with the Greek emperor. He wrote also three letters in a similar strain to the princes Charles and Carloman, who had been anointed with their father, exhorting them to follow his example, and that of their grandfather, Charles Martel.

On the other hand the emperor Constantine Copronymus also made overtures to Pippin. Einhard and other annalists of the Franks speak of his having sent him on one occasion an organ, which was an instrument previously unknown in France: and legations appear to have been sent more than once between the two courts. One of these was from the emperor for proposing a marriage between his son Leo and Pippin's daughter Gisla. This proposal is referred to in a letter from the next pope Stephen III. (or IV.), written after Pippin's death to Charles and Carloman, which is preserved in the *Codex Carolinus:* "Constantinus Imp. nitebatur persuadere sanctae memoriae mitissimo vestro genitori ad accipiendam conjugio filii sui germanam vestram, nobilissimam Gisilam." It may have been on the occasion of this embassy that a council was held by Pippin at Gentilli, a royal villa near Paris (A.D. 766 or 767), at which the emissaries of the pope and of the emperor disputed on the two questions of image worship and the procession of the Holy Ghost (Einhard *in Chron.; Annal. Franc. Bert. ad ann.* 767; Ado Vienn. l. 4, c. 37). It would seem that the Greeks being accused, on the pope's behalf, of heresy in the matter of images, they retorted by similarly accusing the Latins for their addition of *Filioque* to the creed, and that the king wished the arguments on both sides to be heard and considered. There is no record of the decision of the council on the disputed questions. Maimbourg concludes, but with no sufficient reason, that it was in favour of the adoration of images. It is more likely that the views already prevailed which found expression afterwards at the council of Frankfort (A.D. 794), under Charlemagne, and afterwards (A.D. 824) at that of Paris; which were to the effect that the retention of images was lawful, but not the adoration. However that might be, no breach ensued of the friendship, mutually advantageous, between the popes and the Frank kings, which was notably continued and cemented by Charlemagne. Of course any matrimonial alliance with the Greek emperor was inconsistent with this policy; and nothing came of the proposal made by Constantine. One of pope Paul's letters to king Pippin (*Ep.* 20, *Cod. Carolin.*) is supposed, with probability, to have been written on the occasion above referred to. From it we learn that legates having been sent to France from the emperor, Pippin had refused to give them an audience except in the presence of those who had been sent by Paul—that they had disputed in the king's presence on "the observance of the orthodox faith and the

[a] The chapel, or oratory of St. Petronilla (believed to be the daughter of St. Peter) appears from Anastasius (*in vit. Pauli*) to have been constructed by Paul within the Church of St. Peter on the Vatican. In the letter referred to in the text, the pope declares it to be now dedicated in perpetual memory of king Pippin.

pious tradition of the fathers"—and that Pippin had sent to the pope a full account of what had taken place, together with a copy of the letter which he had thereupon sent to the emperor. Paul died in June, A.D. 767, in the church of St. Paul (according to Anastasius), having been seized with sickness while lingering there during the extreme heat of summer, and was there buried. But his body was removed within three months to the oratory of the B. Virgin which he had himself constructed in St. Peter's on the Vatican, and there finally laid. He is described by Anastasius as a man mild and merciful, and rendering no one evil for evil, as having been in the habit of visiting prisons and the abodes of the poor in the silence of night, redeeming debtors, and relieving the distressed. He is commemorated as a saint in the Roman Martyrology on the 28th of June. [J. B—Y.]

PAULUS (44), a Nestorian, is first mentioned as one of those who at the death of Silas the catholicus joined in opposing both the claimants who thus competed for the succession. At the termination of the schism which ensued, he was chosen catholicus (535 or 538). He had been Archdeacon of Seleucia under Silas, but is stated to have been raised to the episcopate in the interval as bishop of the Huzites (= Ahwaz), or (according to another account) metropolitan of Gandisapor. It is uncertain whether we are to understand that these are but two different descriptions of one and the same preferment, the designations of the sees being imperfectly fixed at the time (see Assem. iv. 421); or that Paulus was first made bishop of the suffragan see when vacated by Jozachus, and afterwards promoted to the metropolitan rank as successor to Jacob. (See for these persons and circumstances, SILAS, Catholicus.) Such translations, though uncanonical, appear to have been permitted in the Nestorian Church (ib. 638): and in the exceptional case of Seleucia, the elevation of an inferior prelate to the throne of the catholicate was usual. This Paulus, like his predecessors, was married, and had children; and his daughter's husband, Ezekiel, became catholicus in 567. He died within the year of his final promotion, which (according to some authorities) he enjoyed for but two months; and was succeeded by Mar Abas (see under THOMAS OF EDESSA. (Greg. Barh., *Chron. Eccl.* ii. 89; Assem. ii. 409, 410; iii. 615; iv. 746, 758.) Le Quien (*O. C.* ii. 1116) confuses Paulus with his successor, Mar Abas. [J. Gw.]

PAULUS (45), bishop of Sidon, after the Arabian invasion. He had previously been a monk at Antioch, and is mentioned by Abraham Ecchellensis, *De Origine Nominis Papae*, as the author of many books of no contemptible learning, especially a defence of the Christian religion, written in Arabic at the request of a Mohammedan friend (see No. 3), which is stated to exist among the MSS. of the Vatican, and those of the Oratoire at Paris. Assemani gives the following list of his works, all still in MS. (1) *Epitome Theologiae*, in twenty-two chapters; (2) *de Adventu Messiae ad Judaeos*; (3) *Epistola ad quemdam Mahometanensem quid Christiani sentiunt de Mahometo et de Christianae Religionis veritate*, (4) *de Haeresibus pro fide Melchitarum adversus Nestorianos, &c.* (5) *De Trinitate et Incarnatione ad Abuscrurum Taniotam* (Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* tom. ii. 511). He is to be identified with the "Saidensis Episcopus" surnamed "Anthaki," i.e. the Antiochene, mentioned by D'Herbelot *Bibl. Orientale*, as defending Christianity against the Mussulmans. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 813.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (46), bishop of Sinnara in Africa, of eminent virtue, whose vision premonitory of Hunneric's persecution in 484 is recorded by Victor Vitensis. He seemed to behold a magnificent tree reaching to heaven and shading nearly all Africa brought to the ground by the violence of an ass. He was one of three bishops left out of one hundred and sixty-four belonging to Zeugitana and the Proconsular when Victor was writing, c. 487. (Vict. Vit. i. 9, ii. 6, in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 193, 208; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 282; Tillem. xvi. 527, 546.) [C. H.]

PAULUS (47), a Spanish bishop, always mentioned in connection with Eutropius, but neither of him nor of Eutropius are the sees known. They joined in a warning treatise (*commonitorium*) against heresies in general, about 414, which has not survived, but which appears to have been presented to Augustine, and to which he replied in his book addressed to them, entitled *de Perfectione Justitiae Hominis*, a treatise on Pelagian doctrine. (Aug. *Opp.* til. x. 292, ed. Migne.) Their treatise is mentioned by Orosius in his *commonitorium* or *consultatio*, and the work of Augustine, as being addressed to them, by Prosper of Aquitaine. (Aug. *Opp.* viii. 666; Prosper, *c. Coll.* xxi. 3.) [H. W. P.]

PAULUS (48) TELLENSIS, Jacobite bishop of Tella in Mesopotamia. He is mentioned as the translator of the Septuagint into Syriac, by Gregory Barhebraeus in a well-known passage (*Prooem. in Horr. Mystt.*); and the same statement is found in a much earlier author, Moses Barcephas[a] (*d.* 903) apparently on the authority of Jacob of Edessa (d. 708). A MS. Catena Patrum, in the British Museum, containing extracts from several books of the Old Testament in the version known as Syro-Hexaplar (see above, vol. iii. p. 31), names "the reverend Father Mar Paulus, Bishop of the Faithful" as the author of that version, thus identifying it with that indicated by the writers above referred to; and further assigns Alexandria as the place where it was made, and A. Gr. 928 (= A.D. 616-7) as its date,—the Catena itself being almost contemporary, having been compiled before 651 (Wright, *Catal. of Add. MSS.*, p. 905, no. 12168; the MS. itself seems to be of 8th century). Another MS., in the National Library, Paris (no. v., *Catal.* of 1739), of 4th Kings in the same version, has a subscription, naming and describing Paul in the same terms, with the date A. Gr. 928; and adding other important circumstances, of which the first is, that the work was done "by the command of the holy Mar Athanasius Patriarch of the Faithful." The date distinguishes this Paul from PAUL OF CALLINICUS, and PAUL OF EDESSA, with one or other of whom J. S. Assemani conjectured that

[a] *Comm. in Hexaëmeron*, cited by the Abbé Martin, (*Introd. à la Critique du N. T.*, tom. i. p. 101), from MS. 241, Nat. Libr., Paris.

he might be identical (*Bibl. Or.*, i. p. 409); and it farther determines that the Patriarch named is Athanasius I. (Camelarius) of Antioch, who presided over the Jacobite Churches of that patriarchate 595–631[b] (Greg. Barh. *Chron. Eccl.* i. 50), and who in 616 and for some years previous must have been a fugitive, Syria being overrun by the Persians (Greg. Barh. *Chron. Syr.*, p. 98; Theophan., *Chronogr.*, p. 250). This Athanasius, with five of his bishops, went to Egypt to visit the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, Anastasius Apozygatius, in response to his overtures towards a reconciliation of their Churches [see COPTIC CHURCH, in Vol. I. p. 667] between which, under their predecessors Peter and Damian, a breach had occurred. This visit is dated by Gregory Barhebraeus (*Chr. Eccl.*, l. l.) 615-6, but must have taken place two or three years earlier; for Anastasius died, according to Severus of Ashmunin, in December 613.[c] Of the Bishops who accompanied Athanasius, it may safely be assumed that Paul was one. Another perhaps was THOMAS OF HARKEL. He is apparently the "Mar Thomas" mentioned in the subsequent part of the subscription to 4th Kings, as chief of those who "gave their labour and care" with Paul in his work. Dr. Ceriani questions this identification, but on grounds which seem hardly sufficient (*Monumm. S. & P.*, I. i. p. v.) Thomas of Harkel is known to have completed his cognate version of the New Testament into Syriac, A. Gr. 927—the year before that mentioned in this subscription: indeed, the subscription of another Syro-Hexaplar MS., containing 3rd Kings, now in the British Museum (Add. MS. 14437b), assigns the completion of that book to this very year 927. This latter subscription moreover brings the two translators together in place, as well as in time; for it tells us that 3rd Kings was "translated at the Enaton[d] [ܐܢܛܘܢ or "Anton"] of Alexandria, in the monastery of the Antonines,"—the same house which similar subscriptions appended to the Harklensian New Testament name as the scene of the literary labours of Thomas. This version of the New Testament is in fact one in style and method with the Syro-Hexaplar Old Testament: together they form a retranslated, and Graecised Syriac Bible.[e] The manner in which Gregory Barhebraeus (*l. c.*) mentions them together indicates that he regarded them as one work. The time, place, and circumstances, show that a desire for assimilation between the newly reconciled Syrians and Egyptian branches of the Monophysite Communion, was the common motive of Paul and Thomas in executing (as of Athanasius in enjoining), the laborious task of producing such a version,—if not to supersede, yet to take co-ordinate place beside the Peshitto.

Athanasius was received by Anastasius "in a monastery by the Eastern seashore" (his host being excluded from his metropolis); spent with him but one month, and "afterwards returned to his own city": according to the narrative of Severus (Renaud. *ut supr.*) But the subscription to 4th Kings represents Athanasius and Paul as still "dwelling in Alexandria" in A. Gr. 928, (A.D. 616-7); which implies a sojourn of some three years. It thus appears that Paul may have entered on his task as early as 613 and the extant MSS. enable us to trace his progress. The date of 3rd Kings in the MS. already referred to is "Shebat, A. Gr. 927" (February 616). No month is specified in the case of 4th Kings; its year, A. Gr. 928, allows us to assign it to the autumn of 616: but in the great Milan Syro-Hexapla (see below), the Minor Prophets and Daniel alike bear date "Canun the latter, A. Gr. 928 (January 617)."[f] Ezekiel and Isaiah (which as arranged in this MS. follow Daniel and close the book) are undated. But he must have completed them within that year, if Gregory Barhebraeus is right in assigning it as the date of the sack of Alexandria by the Persians (*Chron. Syr.*, p. 99). Others (as Le Quien, ii. p. 450) date this event in 619 or 620, which would give Paul longer time. The work of translation could not possibly have been carried on in the face of this calamity, in which 600 monasteries in Alexandria and its neighbourhood were destroyed, and 700 monks with 80,000 citizens fell victims to the savage captors (Renaudot, p. 154, from Severus);—a havoc which might seem incredible, if it were not paralleled by the well attested account of their butcheries in Palestine, after the capture of Jerusalem a few years before (Antioch. Monach. *Ad Eustath.* p. 1022; *Hom.* 107, p. 1266). We may assume that this undertaking, if broken off at Alexandria, could not have been completed elsewhere. All the evidence concurs in fixing on that city as the scene of his labours; and there alone were to be found the necessary Greek MSS. of the Hexaplar LXX. Thus the years 613 and 617 (or possibly 620) define the limits of the time within which the version must have been executed, a space of

[b] Dionysius in *Chron.* (ap. Assem. ii. pp. 102, 103) dates him 604–644.

[c] Assem. ii. p. 332, also p. 70; Renaudot, *Hist. Patrr. Alex.* p. 152. He says: "22 Kohiac, anno 330 Diocletiani," but wrongly makes it Dec. 614, forgetting that the era of Diocletian is reckoned from 29th August. Le Quien (*Or. Chr.* ii. p. 444) says "*circa annum* 614." See for the life of this patriarch, note k, p. 268, below.

[d] Evidently the name of a ward of the city: probably the ἔνατον ("Ninth") ward, in which the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, Severus, found refuge nearly a century before (Leont. *De Sectis*, Act. 5, p. 470). That the word is a numeral is proved by the mention of the "Eighteenth" in another account of Severus (Anast. Sin., *Hodeg.*, Schol. in c. 22, p. 152). Cp. Liberat., *Breviar.* c. 19. Both "Ninth" and "Eighteenth" are spoken of repeatedly as the abodes of monks by Joann. Moschus (*Prat. Spirit.* 146, 162, 176, 177, 184), from whom it appears that the "Eighteenth" extended 20 (? 15) miles outside the city proper. See also like instances from the *Apophthegg. Pp.* in Cotelier's *Monumm. Eccl. Gr.* i. pp. 460, 520; and cp. p. 809. See also Wright, *Catal.* pp. 34, 586, 641. Some have understood "Ninth [Milestone]." The name has been usually written *Anton*, as if derived from that of the convent. For other explanations see Assem. i. p. 41 n.; and Cave, *Hist. Litt.* p. 499 (ed. 1740).

[e] (Cp. Adler, *N. T. Verss. Syr.*, *p.* 50.) Björnstähl, writing of the Milan Syro-Hexaplar MS. before the name of Paul had been learned from that of Paris, acutely conjectured that Thomas of Harkel was the translator of the Old Testament as well as of the New. (See in Eichhorn's *Repert.* iii. p. 172.)

[f] The dates given by these subscriptions, themselves written in the 8th century, may be relied on; and prove that Theophanes (l. l.) is wrong in dating the capture of Alexandria A.M. 6107 (= A.D. 615); as also Severus Ashm. (ap. Ren.) Gibbon follows these (*Decl. and F.* c. xlvi.); also Lebeau (*Hist. du Bas Emp.* t. xi. p. 13).

four, or at the utmost seven years:—at most, not more than sufficient for so great a work.

Concerning his previous or subsequent life, we have no information. Gregory Barh. (*Chron. Eccl.* i. 50) mentions that, in the time of Athanasius, Isaiah was intruded into Edessa, Samuel into Amid, and a third into Tella, by Chosroes II., the Persian king; but that all three were rejected as having been irregularly consecrated by the Maphrian of the East. Assemani (ii. 334, and *De Monoph.*, s. v. *Tela*) dates this occurrence, as regards Tella, A.D. 616. But this date can hardly be correct. If it were, the intruder must have been a usurper as well; for the see of Tella was full in that year, Paul (as we have seen) being then Bishop; and thus a still graver defect would attach to the title of his rival, which Gregory Barh. could not well have omitted to notice. Besides, the expatriated Athanasius cannot have had in 616, nor is it probable that he ever recovered, such control over the Mesopotamian churches as Gregory here ascribes to him. The true date is probably 10 or 12 years earlier, when Chosroes II. (Phocas being Emperor) first attacked the eastern cities of the empire, about 603 (Dionys. ap. Assem. ii. p. 102; Theoph., pp. 245 ff.). In that year Edessa was taken, and its Bishop stoned to death; and the consequent intrusion of Isaiah is assigned by Assemani (*De Monoph.*, s. v. *Edessa*) to 604. It is natural to suppose that the intrusion of the bishop, whom Assemani names Jonas, into Tella, took place under like circumstances, and about the same time as Gregory implies. Paul may well have been appointed by Athanasius in the room of Jonas; and we thus arrive at 604 as the earliest probable date of his consecration.[g] Like Athanasius, he must have been driven from his see when the Persians overran the country. It is to be noted that in MS. subscriptions Paul is not described by the name of his see, but only as "Bishop of the Faithful"; likewise Athanasius (in the Paris MS.) is "Patriarch of the Faithful, in the convent of Mar Zachai of Callinicus."[h] The latter words no doubt mean that Athanasius had fixed his seat, perhaps from the first, in that city and convent, as two of his successors are said to have done, Dionysius I. in 818 and John III. in 846 (Assem. ii., *De Monoph.* s.v. *Monast. S. Zachae.*). So another of them, Cyriacus (798), is described as "Patriarch of the convent of Astuna (= the Column) of Callinicus" (Wright, *Catal.*, p. 418). It is not likely that either prelate was ever able to re-establish himself in his see. As to Athanasius, we know that the rest of his life was spent in vain efforts to recover his position. So he is shown to us in the hostile declamation of Antiochus (*Hom.* 130, p. 1244) written while Palestine was beginning to recover from the Persian invasion, as "the forerunner of Antichrist by name Athanasius, but more justly Undying Death (θάνατον ἀθάνατον), desiring *to occupy the throne of Antioch.*" And so late as 629–30, close on the end of his life, we find him still seeking restoration in a remarkable interview with the Emperor Heraclius, who (according to Theoph., *Chron.*, p. 274) offered "to make him Patriarch" (no successor having been appointed to the orthodox Patriarch Anastasius II., who died 607), if he would acknowledge the decrees of Chalcedon. Athanasius consented to admit the Two Natures of Christ; but "with a Syrian's cunning" raised the question of the *Twofold Operation* or *Will*, whence arose the Monothelite controversy [PERSON OF CHRIST, p. 320]. The account of this interview, however, given by Gregory (*Chr. Eccl.* l. l.) is very different. And the death of Athanasius the year after prevented the carrying out of this compact, if compact there was. Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, in his Synodical Letter (*Patrol. Gr.* lxxxvii. p. 3193) written soon after, pursues him and his brother of Alexandria, with the vigorous but untranslatable denunciation; "Be Athanasius the Syrian and Anastasius Apozygarius, Anathema and Catathema, they and all who have entered ignorantly and ἀσυμβάτως into their ἀσύμβατον σύμβασιν."[i]

Grave as was the doctrinal error of the

[g] The maphrian Kamjesu (578–609) is recorded by Greg. Barh. (*Chr. Eccl.* ii. 25) to have "consecrated many bishops in divers places." His date shows that he was the consecrator of Isaiah for Edessa. But Gregory conveys that the same Maphrian consecrated all the three. It follows therefore that 609 is the latest admissible date for Jonas's consecration, and it was probably much earlier.

[h] The following words of the subscription, "in the days of Theodore, head of the convent," appear merely to date the version with reference to the succession in that convent; but it is possible that they rather give us the name of the head of the house in Alexandria where Paul was lodged. A Theodore is one of the visitors of the convent of the Antonines of Alexandria, addressed in a letter by Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, who died 591 (Wright, *Catal.* p. 952).

[i] Of the early history of this prelate we learn from Gregory Barh. (*Chron. Eccl.* i. 50) that he was a monk of Kennesrin (or of Samosata). As he was driving the camels (whence his appellation) of the convent with a supply of salt, he was stopped by the assembled bishops, in consequence of a vision sent in answer to their prayers, and was chosen by them Patriarch in succession to Julian (595 or 597), and forthwith consecrated, in spite of his struggles and tears, at Kennesrin. He prevailed on them however to conceal the fact and suffer him to remain a monk for a year. At the end of that time the bishops proceeded to his convent, where they found him as before occupied with the camels, and summoned him to enter on his high office, to the amazement of the fraternity, from whom (even from his own brother who was one of them) he had concealed his elevation. As a crowning instance of his humility, it is related that he used to go secretly by night, clean out the latrine to which the brethren resorted, carry away the filth in a basket, and empty it into the Euphrates. Of his moderation and wisdom he gave proof afterwards, in a form more satisfactory to our notions, by his success in winning back the bishops "of the East" (*i.e.* of the regions beyond the boundary of the empire) into communion with the patriarchate, through the mission (629) of his deacon John of Beth-elaia to the monastery of Mar Mathai (Nineveh);—and again by his scrupulous fidelity to the Nicene decrees when he declined the request, preferred on behalf of these bishops by Christopher, Metropolitan of Mar Mathai, and four others, that he should consecrate bishops for the vacant sees of the East, and urged them instead to consecrate for themselves a Maphrian. They accordingly chose Maruthas, and consecrated him as Maphrian of the East and Chief Metropolitan, with Tagrit for his see. Thus Athanasius shows himself in this matter as rigid in respecting the rights of the Maphrianate, as formerly (see above) in resisting the encroachment of a former Maphrian on those of the Patriarchate.

Monophysites, it is impossible for us now to sympathise with these bitter utterances of theologic hatred against the men who live for us mainly in the scholarly and laborious works they have left behind. Theology and biblical literature owe a deep debt to the Jacobites for their zeal in translating from the Greek; but to none of them so much as to Paul of Tella. His few years of shelter in the Alexandrian monastery were but a brief breathing time between the invasion that drove him from Syria and the invasion that well-nigh overtook him in Egypt; and one cannot too much admire the diligence of the refugee Bishop who employed his enforced leisure in seeking out the best MSS. of the Greek Old Testament in the libraries of his city of refuge, and rendering their contents with conscientious accuracy into his native tongue. A few years later such a work would have been no longer possible, when all that the Persian had spared in Alexandria perished in the more sweeping and utter ruin brought by the Saracens (640). His version, as well as the Harklensian N. T., though little suited for public use by reason of its Graecised and artificial diction (contrasting unfavourably with the idiomatic or "simple" Peshitto), appears to have been welcomed by the Jacobites in Syria, and even read in their churches; as is proved by the extant MSS. of portions of it, some of the 7th and more of the 8th century, many of them arranged for ecclesiastical lessons after the Jacobite use,—as well as by several Lectionaries of the same (from 8th to 10th century) in which Hexaplar Lessons are mixed with Lessons from the Peshitto (Wright, *Catal.* pp. 146 ff.). In one (Add. MSS. 12139, ib. p. 154), which is mainly from the Peshitto, the few Hexaplar Lessons from the O. T., and the equally few Harklensian Lessons from the N. T., are paired together. In these Lectionaries, the Hexaplar portions are often superscribed "according to the Seventy." Gregory Barh. frequently cites the version he ascribes to Paul, in *Horreum Mystt.*, usually as "the Greek;" and his citations are found to agree accurately with the text found in the existing Syro-Hexaplar MSS., thus confirming the identification of that text as Paul's.

The first European scholar who called attention to this version was Andreas Masius, who in his edition of the Greek text of Joshua, published some 300 years ago, used a MS. of the O. T. in Syriac bearing a subscription to the effect that its contents were "translated in Alexandria A. Gr. 927, from a copy made by Eusebius with the help of Pamphilus from Origen's books in the library of Caesarea" (*Josuae Historia*, Antw. 1574; pp. 6, 123). He possibly obtained it, as he obtained his copy of the *Paradise* of Moses bar-Cephas, from his Syrian teacher, Moses of Marden (see his *De Paradiso*, p. 3, and cp. p. 9), but it has not been forthcoming since his death. He describes it as containing "Joshua, Judges, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Esther, Judith, and part of Tobit, also part of Deuteronomy." It must therefore have been a copy, mutilated at the beginning and end, which, when perfect, contained all the historical books of the O. T.; no doubt including Ruth with Judges, Nehemiah (and probably 3 (1) Esdras) with Ezra, and perhaps also Maccabees at the close Thus it was the exact complement of the MS. already referred to (which may even be the second volume of the same Syro-Greek O. T.), still happily extant at Milan in the Ambrosian Library (C. 313, *inf.*), where it was placed early in the 17th century by Cardinal Borromeo (having been "purchased from the monastery of St. Mary Deipara, at Scete," in the Nitrian desert); containing all the poetical and prophetical books, apocryphal included. The two subscriptions which give the date of its text agreeing with that given in the MS. of Masius, have been already noticed: it contains many others which claim as that MS. does, and sometimes almost in the same words, the great names of Eusebius, Pamphilus, and Origen as its authorities.[k] Of late years, the loss of the Masian MS. has been in some measure compensated by the recovery (in various degrees of completeness) of several portions of the historical books of the Syro-Hexaplar O. T. (including some which that MS. lacked), among the MS. acquired for the British Museum in 1841–51, from the same Nitrian collection; namely, Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Joshua, Judges with Ruth, 3 Kings,—with two copies of the Psalms, and sundry fragments of other books. Thus the only canonical book of this version not extant or known to have been extant in European libraries, is Leviticus; and of it a fragment is forthcoming in the Lectionary above referred to (Add. MS. 12139). From other Lectionaries, especially 14485, 14486, other parts of books now lost may be recovered. In the Catena, 12168,[l] already noticed, considerable fragments of 1 and 2 Chron., and of Nehemiah, are preserved. It also contains large extracts from 3 (1) Esdras, which on examination prove, what the internal evidence of diction[m] had previously suggested as probable, that the 3 (1) Esdras, found in late MSS. and first printed in Walton's Polyglott (headed "according to the LXX.;" this book never having been included in the Peshitto), is of Paul's version. Dr. Ceriani has shown (*Le Verss. Sir.* p. 22), by comparison with citations in the *Syrorum Peculium* of Masius, that the early chapters of Tobit in this Polyglott are likewise due to Paul. So also is the apocryphal Psalm 151.

None of the extant MSS. of this version is later than the 8th century. That of Exodus is dated A. Gr. 1008 (A.D. 697), that of 3 Kings six years later; Judges belongs to the same set with the latter, as does also 4 Kings (Paris); and that of Genesis appears to be oldest of them all;—all being written within 100 years of the date of the version. Many of these last named

[k] There is a like note at the end of the Syro-Hex. Isaiah in the Parham (Lord de la Zouche's) Library, which is also a Nitrian copy.

[l] This MS., which appears hitherto to have attracted little notice, has been found by the writer of this article to contain the following Hexaplar extracts: — From 1 Chron., i. 1–4, 17–28, 34; ii. 1–17; iii. 1–20; vi. 1–15, 31–40; xxxiii. 15–17. From 2 Chron., xxvii. 16–21; xxix. 30–xxx. 5, 13–20; xxxii. 30–xxxiii. 16; xxxvi. 20–25. From Nehemiah, i. 1–4; ii. 1–8; iv. 7–9, 15–22; vii. 15, 16; viii. 1–ix. 3. From 3 Esdr., ii. 1–16, 24, 25; iv. 38–40, 49–57; v. 47–vi. 2; vii. 6–viii. 29, 69–73; 93–ix. 10, and 46, 47.

[m] *E.g.*, cp. 3 Esdr. i. 41, ii. 10, with the parallel Daniel i. 2 (Hexaplar), especially noting the unusual ܩܘܕܫܐ for *ἱερά* (never in Pesh.); also 3 Esdr. vi. 18, viii. 18 (see Payne Smith's *Thesaur.* s.v.).

contain evidence like that of the Masian and Ambrosian MSS., that they derive through the autograph copies of Eusebius and Pamphilus from the original work of Origen in the Caesarean Library. Comparing all the extant subscriptions, we find that Judges and Ruth, Job, the Twelve Prophets, and Daniel are from the Tetrapla; from the Hexapla, Exodus ("collated with the Samaritan"), Joshua ("collated with Tetrapla"), 3 Kings, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes (apparently), Canticles, Jeremiah and Baruch (apparently), and Lamentations; 4 Kings alone refers to two Heptaplar MSS. Of the rest the subscriptions are wanting, or fail to give like information; but all the canonical books abound with the characteristic obeli and asterisks of the Origenian text, and all (except Judges) have their margins more or less thickly set with renderings from the "Three Interpreters," the "Fifth" also appearing on that of 4 Kings; while both "Fifth" and "Sixth" occur on that of the Psalms, which implies the presence in this instance of an Octaplar copy. They also are furnished with some scholia, and have Introductions prefixed in many cases, from the writings of various divines:—the whole forming an *apparatus criticus* far more complete than exists in any known Greek MS. of the LXX. Accordingly, the Syro-Hexapla has been now for a century prized as the best surviving representative of Origen's vast work, and as yielding the amplest materials towards its reconstruction;—since Branca of Milan, about 1767, first invited scholars to examine the MS. there preserved. From it, Norberg, a Swede, transcribed many books, of which he published Jeremiah and Ezekiel in 1787 (at Lund); Bugati of Milan followed (in 1788) with Daniel,[a] and the Psalms (posthumously in 1820); and Middeldorpf (in 1835) with the rest of the canonical books from Norberg's transcript, together with 4 Kings from the Paris MS. Since then, the text of Judges and Ruth (from the British Museum copy) has been edited by Skat-Rördam (Copenhagen, 1861). Dr. Ceriani has undertaken to bring out the whole in his *Monumenta Sacra et Profana*; in the first series of which Baruch and Lamentations have appeared; in the second, Genesis and most of Exodus (Milan, 1861–68): while (as the 7th volume of the same) he has given an admirable reproduction in photolithography of the entire Ambrosian MS. (1874). A glance at its pages is enough to shew how large was the bulk of material accumulated by Paul's industry; but the laborious fidelity of his translation cannot be appreciated without examination of it. It reproduces its original word for word, so exactly, that by its aid the Greek can readily be restored with approximate certainty; as has actually been done by some editors in parts,—notably by Skat-Rördam for the whole of Judges and Ruth. But this accuracy has been attained by Paul at the cost of violence done to the Syriac idiom, naturally so widely distant from the Greek,—so great that one cannot but wonder how such a version could have been used as it was in public reading. Skat-Rördam doubts not unreasonably concerning some passages of it whether they could be intelligible to one who was not acquainted with the Greek. He has actually drawn up a grammar of the Syriac as remodelled by Paul after the Greek: and he justly pronounces this version to be, by reason of its servile manner of rendering, at once the worst as regards literary style and the best as regards critical value, of all existing versions. This criticism may be taken as applying in hardly less degree to the work of Thomas on the N. T. Both these men seem to have aimed at constraining their Syriac to represent the Greek, with the same painful exactness as that with which Aquila forced his Greek into conformity with Hebrew.

The unity of style throughout the translation marks it as the work of one mind; and we are therefore to understand the statement of the Paris subscription concerning assistance given in the work by Thomas and others, in a limited way, as referring to the minor matters of collating, correcting, and copying. But a note extant in two MSS., ascribing to Paul the version (as ordinarily printed) of John vii. 53—viii. 12, makes it probable that Paul assisted Thomas in his translation of the N. T. (See THOMAS HARKL.) It is a question how far Paul's work may have been executed independently of previous translators, and not (like that of Thomas) a recension of an earlier version. We have evidence that Syrian divines had not failed to notice the many discrepancies between their Peshitto O. T. and the Greek text, and that in consequence sundry translations of the Septuagint into Syriac were attempted from time to time. Notably, the Philoxenian version, on which the Harklensian N. T. is founded, included the Psalms, and apparently other O. T. books, "from the Greek;" and it appears that the Isaiah of this version was in Paul's hands, for a verse of it (ix. 5) is cited *in loc.* on the margin of the Ambrosian MS. And Paul's Isaiah bears internal evidence of having been wrought on the basis of an earlier one of which some ten chapters are extant, and which is probably the Philoxenian. But it is not known whether this version extended to the whole O. T.; and we have no reason to think that Paul used any other;—least of all that which is said to have been made by Mar Abas, a Nestorian. Further information concerning these earlier versions will be found in the article POLYCARPUS (5).

Paul also translated an Order of Baptism from the Greek of Severus (Add. MSS. 14495, 14499).

Most of the authorities for the subject of this article have been referred to above. Farther discussion of it will be found in the Introductions prefixed to the editions of the Syro-Hexaplar above mentioned, especially in Ceriani's *Monumenta*, vols. I. and II.: while the earlier essays on the Milan and Paris MSS., of P. J. Bruns, J. G. Eichhorn, and J. B. de Rossi (in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, 1778–1782) are still worth reading. See also Field, *Prolegg. in Hexapla Orig.*

[a] Special value attaches to this version of Daniel as representing not the usual Greek which is that of Theodotion, but that received by Origen as the LXX. version; else only known from the Greek Cod. Chisianus whence it was published at Rome in 1782. This MS. and the Syro.-Hex. version must come from a near common archetype, for they coincide (inter alia) in the remarkable order in which they arrange the Prophets; and the subscriptions, &c., attached to Daniel agree verbatim.

ch. vii. (appx. 2); ch. xi.; Ceriani, *Le Versione Siriache del V. T.*, Lagarde, *V. T. Fragmenta apud Syros servata;* and Plüschke, *De Psalt. Syr. Mediol. Usu;* also Nestle's article, *Syrische Bibelübersetzung*, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* The editions of Gregory Barh. cited are, for the *Chron. Syr.*, that of Bruns, 1789; for the *Chron. Eccl.*, that of Abbeloos and Lamy, 1872. Many of the citations are to be found in Assemani, *B. O.* ii. [J. Gw.]

PAULUS (49), bishop of Thessalonica, deposed for Monothelitism in 649 by pope Martin [MARTINUS (3), iii. 853] (Martinus, *Epist.* 12, 13; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 40; Jaffé, *R. P.* num. 1605). [J. G.]

PAULUS (50), bishop of Tibur, was the consecrator of the anti-pope Ursinus (Marcellinus and Faustinus, *Lib. Prec.* preface in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiii. 82). Rufinus (*H. E.* ii. 10 in *Patr. Lat.* xxi. 521) calls him "satis imperitus et agrestis." [DAMASUS.] [F. D.]

PAULUS (51), bishop of Tyre, who identified the living Arsenius at the council held at Tyre to investigate the charges against Athanasius, in 335. (Socr. *H. E.* i. 29; Athanas. *Apol.* ii. p. 783; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 805.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (52), ST., Feb. 8, bishop of Verdun, according to tradition a Belgian of high birth, who, after being liberally educated, adopted a hermit's life on the Mons Cebenna or Gebenna (afterwards Paulsberg or Bulisberg), opposite Trèves, on the other side of the Mosel. Attracted thence to the neighbouring monastery of Theolegium, Tholey) he was set over the monastery school, and is said to have become in time the second abbat. By the influence probably of one of his scholars Grimo, also called Adalgisus, a grandson of king Dagobert, he was made bishop of Verdun against his will. This diocese he found in the most necessitous condition. Even the bishop's own church at Verdun had no funds for the support of its clergy, and was dependent for curtailed services on the casual offices of itinerant priests. Grimo here came to his help by himself presenting the see with an estate, and obtaining further endowments from Dagobert. Henceforth Verdun was closely connected with Tholey, from whose abbats many of its bishops were drawn. Paulus died in 647 or 648, and was buried in the suburban church of St. Saturninus, which he had built (Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. ii. 169 seqq.; *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 562, 1169; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 528).

A letter is extant from St. Desiderius of Cahors to Paulus, inviting him to be present at the dedication of a monastery church, and hoping to renew former conversations on the happiness of the life to come. Two epistles also from Paulus to Desiderius of small interest, and written in the most barbarous Latin of the period, are published with the correspondence of Desiderius (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 254, 260, 261). Their date is about 641.

The anonymous biography of Paulus to be found in the *Acta SS.* (*ibid.* 175–178) was probably written about the middle of the 11th century (*Hist. Litt.* vii. 504), certainly not before the 10th, from internal evidence. [S. A. B.]

Presbyters.

PAULUS (53), one of four presbyters of Alexandria, banished through the machinations of the Eusebians, probably about the time of Athanasius's first exile, 336 (Ath. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 40; Tillem. viii. 64, 105). [C. H.]

PAULUS (54), a presbyter of Rome, sent to Athanasius in 352. [LUCIUS (20).] [C. H.]

PAULUS (55), a presbyter by whom Basil sent letters to Eusebius of Samosata in 378 (Basil, *Ep.* 268 [9]). [E. V.]

PAULUS (56), presbyter and archimandrite in conjunction with Acacius, asked Epiphanius to write against heresies. [ACACIUS (3).] [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (57), a presbyter and monk of Dalmatia, sent by Melania the younger, in her twentieth year (*i. e.* c. 403), to the East, with her munificent gifts in gold and silver, for the churches there, ten thousand solidi for Egypt and Thebais, fifteen thousand for Palestine, ten thousand for Antioch and its neighbourhood (Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* c. 119; Tillem. xiv. 238). [C. H.]

PAULUS (58), presbyter, perhaps of Pannonia, author of *De Virginitate servanda et contemptu mundi, ac vitae institutione vel morum correctione*, addressed to a virgin of rank named Constantia. He flourished *c.* A.D. 430, but his works are lost (Gennadius, *De Vir. Illust.* c. lxxv.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 414; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 469). [J. G.]

PAULUS (59), a priest of Beneventum, A.D. 448. [EPICARPIUS.] [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (60), probably Roman priest, commissioned by Marcian the emperor, A.D. 453, privately to request pope Leo I. (*Ep.* 117 al. 88; *Pat. Lat.* liv. 1038, cap. 3) to induce the empress EUDOCIA (4), widow of Theodosius II., who was then in Palestine, to withdraw her countenance from the heretical faction there. [J. G.]

Deacons.

PAULUS (61), a deacon, who flourished at the end of the 4th century. To him Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia, addressed his nineteenth discourse, in the form of a letter, expounding against the Arians the passage, "My Father is greater than I." He speaks of Paulus as "frater, carnis ac spiritus germanitate clarissimus" (*Pat. Lat.* xx. 981–2). It is inferred from this, and the general tone of the letter, that he was actually the brother of Gaudentius. [G. W. D.]

PAULUS (62), deacon in Egypt, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. ep. 475), who begs him to bestow one of his superfluous tunics on Isidore's friend Simon, then visiting Egypt. [C. H.]

PAULUS (63), the deacon of Aemilius bishop of Beneventum, one of the Western deputies to Constantinople in the cause of Chrysostom (Pallad. p. 33.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (64), one of Chrysostom's deacons, who accompanied the deputation which conveyed his letters to pope Innocent in the spring of 404 (Pallad. p. 11). His faithful service exposed the deacon to the risk of persecutions, which he sought to avoid by joining the Joannite bishops Cyriacus, Demetrius, &c., who had remained at Rome, towards the end of 405, in company with John the presbyter (Chrys. *Ep.* 148). Their departure seems to have been postponed till the following year, when they were the bearers of another letter from Chrysostom to pope Innocent (Chrys. *Ep. Innocentio*, ii.). [E. V.]

PAULUS (65), a deacon of the Anastasia at Constantinople, who took refuge at Jerusalem during the Joannite troubles in 406. (Pallad. p. 196.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (66), a deacon of Constantinople, assistant to the oeconomus. During the Joannite troubles in 406 he took refuge in Africa. (Pallad. p. 196; Tillem. xi. 329.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (67), a deacon, bearer of a letter from St. Augustine to count Boniface, A.D. 427. (Aug. *Ep.* 220). [H. W. P.]

PAULUS (68) deacon. Gregory the Great in a letter to JOANNES (130) in A.D. 595 pardons him for having been induced to desist from accusing the deposed bishop Anastasius, and directs that he should be restored to the rights and privileges of his position and repaid the three pounds of gold and whatever else he had spent for the benefit of the church of Corinth. (*Ep.* v. 52.) [F. D.]

PAULUS (69), deacon of Merida, author, c. 610, of *De Vita Patrum Emeritensium*, his object being, he says, to give an account, from what he has heard, of the great characters and saints of his church, and to do for Merida what Gregory the Great did for the church in Italy in his *Dialogues*. The work was first printed at Madrid, A.D. 1631, and afterwards at Antwerp, in 1638, edited by Thomas Tamains de Vargas, historiographer of Philip IV. of Spain, with notes and comments. This edition has been reproduced by Migne, occupying fifty columns of his *Patrologia Latina* (lxxx. 111). What little is known of the author will be found there. He treats copiously of some of the bishops of Merida, and especially of Paulus, Fidelis, and Masona. [FIDELIS (6), MASONA.] [G. W. D.]

PAULUS (70) DIACONUS, (so called in his Homily on St. Benedict, and in the letters of Charles prefixed to the Collection of Homilies. There is no authority for calling him "Paul Warnefrid"), monk, historian, and ecclesiastical writer.

Authorities.—Almost the only sources for his life are his own writings, and the poems addressed to him by Peter of Pisa. His epitaph by his scholar Hildric, which is not free from mistakes, is preserved by the monk of Salerno (*L.* 23)[a]. For nearly two centuries after his death only two short notices of him are found (Erchempert, *Hist. Lang.* i., and Joannes Diaconus, *Gesta Ep. Neap.* 42 in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 234, 425). For all modern researches Bethmann's exhaustive article (*Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, x. 247–334 cited as *A.* x.) is the starting-point. Dahn (*Des P. D. Leben und Schriften*) has gone over the same ground, and come to different conclusions on some points. A short but useful life by Waitz is prefixed to his edition of *L.*, and he gives a full account of the MSS. of *L.*, and of the grammatical peculiarities of Paulus in *Neues Archiv* (*N. A.*) i. 535. As to separate works Bauch (*Ueber die H. R. des P. D.*) has endeavoured to trace the sources of *R.* and Jacobi (*Die Quellen der L. des P. D.*), and Mommsen (*N. A.* v. 53) those of *L.* Dümmler (*N. A.* iv. 102) gives an account of *P.* and their MSS. A short summary of recent researches on the life and *L.* is given by Professor del Giudice (*Lo Storico dei Langobardi*). The collected works are published in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcv. Special editions of separate works will be mentioned under each.

Life.—Paulus sprang from a Lombard family, probably noble, of Friuli. His great-great-grandfather, Leupchis, was one of Alboin's host. His five sons were carried off prisoners by the Avars, when they invaded Friuli, c. 610. One of them, Lopichis, escaped, and after many adventures got back to Italy. His grandson Warnefrit and his wife Theudelinda had three children, Arichis, a daughter who became a nun (*P.* 10), and Paulus (*L.* iv. 37). Paulus was born c. 720–725, as between 781–786 he speaks of himself "jam gravante senio" (*P.* 12). His master's name was Flavian (*L.* vi. 7); and he learnt Latin thoroughly, and a very little Greek and Hebrew (*P.* 12). He was at the royal court during the reign of Ratchis; but the statements that he was educated there, and that he was notary or chancellor to Desiderius, though not absolutely impossible, rest only by late authority, the earliest for the latter being Leo of Ostia (c. 1100), and are mixed up with a good deal of certainly legendary matter. It is certain, however, that he was on intimate terms with Adelperga, Desiderius' daughter, duchess of Beneventum, whose studies he assisted, and her husband Arichis; and this fact points to a residence at the court, either of Pavia or Beneventum. To her, probably, his first poem, that on the six ages of the world, (*P.* 1, *L.* 13) was addressed in A.D. 763. The conquest of the Lombards by Charles, in A.D. 774, and the overthrow of Rodgaud, the rebel duke of Friuli (before Easter, A.D. 776), closely affected Paulus and his family. His brother had been captured in one of these wars, probably the second, had been sent a prisoner across the Alps and his property confiscated. Though we have no positive evidence for the date of Paulus becoming a monk, it was probably after, and in consequence of these events (c. 774–776) (Dahn, 21–27), though it has been supposed, we think erroneously, that he followed King Ratchis to the cloister. Evidence is also wanting as to what monastery he entered, though in all probability it was his beloved Monte Cassino. We next find him at the court of Charles, whom he had probably gone to sue for his brother's pardon, who was now in the seventh

[a] The references will be to Waitz's edition of the *Historia Langobardorum* (*L*), to Droysen's of the *Historia Romana* (*R*), and to Dümmler's of the Poems (*P*).

year of his imprisonment (*P.* 10). The date of this poem was therefore probably the second half of A.D. 782. A letter to the abbat of Monte Cassino shows that on January 10th, probably of 783, he was on the Moselle, and he had then been absent for some time from M. Cassino (*L.* 16). Probably the letter to Adalhard (*L.* 21) the abbat of Corbei, in which he regrets having been unable to visit him the preceding summer, and mentions that he had been confined to his bed by illness from September to December, was also written about this time (Dahn, 36). It was prefixed to a collection of fifty-three letters of Gregory the Great, of which Paulus had himself corrected thirty-four.[b] He was for some years one of the group of scholars at the court of Charles, with whom he was on intimate terms. There are several poems, which passed between Paulus and Peter of Pisa, the grammarian who wrote in the king's name. One of them (*P.* 11) compliments Paulus on his learning, and requests him to teach some Greek to the clerics, who were to accompany the king's daughter Rothrud, who had been betrothed to the emperor (c. 781), a task for which he modestly declares himself incompetent, but promises to do his best (*P.* 12). He visited various parts of Gaul, amongst which Diedenhofen and Poitiers are mentioned (*L.* i. 5, ii. 13). After some years, probably accompanying Charles, when he went to Italy in A.D. 786, and visited Rome and M. Cassino early in the following year, he returned to Italy. It was at Rome that he composed his *Life of Gregory the Great*, but most of his remaining life was passed at M. Cassino. His epitaph on Arichis (*P.* 33) shows that his intimacy with Charles had not diminished his affection for his old friends at Beneventum. He spent part of his time in teaching (*Gesta*, *Ep. Neap.* 42 in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 425), but he was chiefly occupied on his principal work, the *History of the Lombards.* The necrology of Monte Cassino gives April 13th as the day of his death; the year is uncertain, but he apparently died before the coronation of Charles as emperor, and therefore not later than A.D. 800. The epitaph by his pupil Hildric is given in *L.* 23, and Dahn. From an incidental observation (*L.* i. 5) it appears that he was a tall man, nearly six feet high.

Works.—1. *Historia Romana.*—Its nature and origin are described in the prefixed letter to Adelperga, which shews it was composed after A.D. 765, and probably before November 774, when Arichis assumed the title of Princeps (Hirsch, *Herz. Benevent.* 47 n.), as she is addressed as duchess—at any rate it was written before his journey to the court of Charles. In the course of her studies he had given her Eutropius to read. She complained of its brevity, and also of the absence of any notices of sacred history and Christianity, the author having been a heathen. These defects, Paulus undertook to correct by adding—(i.) some of the events of sacred history at their proper chronological places; (ii.) additional details; (iii.) by prefixing an epitome of events in Italy from Janus to Romulus; (iv.) by adding six books, which continued the history to the death of Totila. Paulus simply added his new matter, in Mommsen's opinion placing it in the margin of his MS., and then having the whole copied out, without altering the words of Eutropius, except where the insertion made it absolutely necessary, which was seldom the case. The authors from whom Paulus borrowed were, in the first six books, chiefly Orosius, Jerome and Jordanes (*Rom.*); in the remaining four in which the additions are few, chiefly the epitome known as Victor's, and here also Orosius, Jerome, and Jordanes are each used twice. From Solinus and Frontinus there are a few extracts. The book from which the historical summary from Janus to Romulus was taken had also been used by Jerome. The sources of a few additions cannot be traced. In books xi. and xii. and xiii. ch. 1 and 2, Paulus takes Orosius as his groundwork, treating him as he had treated Eutropius, occasionally abridging him, and supplementing him with extracts from Jerome, Victor and Jordanes. From a lost ecclesiastical writer he makes three extracts. The groundwork of the remainder of book xiii. was a chronicle closely akin to the two recensions of Prosper, but yet differing from both. Droysen therefore considers that Paulus had before him the full chronicle of Prosper, which is now lost. The chronicle of Bede is for the first time cited, and also Jordanes (*Get.*). The sources of the last three books are a more difficult problem. They contain, like the former, passages more or less resembling parts of Bede, Jordanes (*Rom.*), Prosper, and Isidore; but we cannot, as in the former books, name one author as the groundwork in which extracts from others are inserted. It has been generally supposed that Paulus in these books made a patchwork from various authors, altering and adding freely; but Droysen argues that this is quite inconsistent with his method elsewhere. He therefore considers that the groundwork of these three books was sources now lost. Of these the principal was a work closely resembling Jordanes (*Get.*); and in book xvi., one like the *Liber Pontificalis*, while certain passages seem to be extracts from lost annals. He therefore considers that Paulus either had before him recensions of Jordanes and the *Liber Pontificalis*, different from ours, or else that he added to them from sources now lost.

By a singular accident the treatment that Paulus had applied to Eutropius was applied to his own work by Landolf the Wise, a person only known by the mention of him in MSS. as the author, who lived c. 1000. He largely interpolated from various sources the sixteen books of Paulus, and made them into eighteen, by dividing the seventh and sixteenth into two. Mommsen (*N. A.* v. 100) supposes that Landolf's additions were partly made from unused materials collected by Paulus himself, either for the original work or for a new edition of it. To these he added eight more, bringing the history down to the year A.D. 813. To the whole compilation in modern times the name of *Historia Miscella* has been given. It has been several times edited, but the first complete edition, in twenty-six books, is that of Eyssenhardt in 1869, all preceding ones being taken from MSS., which, omitting book

[b] Ewald (*N. A.* iii. 474) argues that the letter and collection were the work of another Paulus.

sixteen and parts of fifteen and seventeen, leave only twenty-four, but the omission was supplied by Gruter, and following editors, in the notes. It will be seen that a critical edition of the work of Paulus was much needed. The want has been supplied by the edition of Droysen in *Mon. Germ. Hist., Auct. Ant.* ii., from the preface of which the preceding account is taken. At the end of book sixteen Paulus promises to add a book relating the remaining events of Justinian's reign, and in the letter to Adelperga to continue the history to his own times. This design he never executed, but in some MSS. a seventeenth book is added, going down to the reign of Leo the Isaurian. It is a cento of unknown authorship, taken from *L.*

2. The *Historia Langobardorum* extends from the mythical origin of the Lombards to the death of King Luitprand, in A.D. 744, thus unfortunately breaking off just where Paulus became a contemporary. It was written at Monte Cassino (i. 26, vi. 40), and was probably left unfinished, as in the last chapter Paulus declares his intention of narrating in the proper place a miracle of the bishop of Pavia. It also lacks a preface and dedication. It is divided into six books, of which (i.) goes down to the conquest of the Gepidae by the Lombards; of (ii.) ch. 1–5 describe the victories of Narses over the Goths and Franks, and his government of Italy (c. 552–568), ch. 6–12 narrate the Lombard invasion, ch. 13 is a digression about Venantius Fortunatus, ch. 14–24 contain a description of Italy, while the remaining chapters contain the rest of Alboin's reign, and that of his successor Cleph (c. 574); (iii.) (c. 574–591) narrates the wars with the Franks, and the reign of Authari; iv. ch. 1–40 (591–616) the reign of Agilulf, and ch. 41–51 (c. 616–661) the reigns of Adeloald, Arioald, Rothari, Rodoald, Aripert I. and the joint reign of Godepert and Perctarit, ending with the usurpation of Grimoald; (v.) goes down to the death of the usurper Alahis (c. 661–688); and (vi.) to the death of Luitprand (c. 688–744).

We have seen that Paulus concluded *R.* with a promise to narrate in the next book the remaining events of Justinian's reign, and in the dedication to Adelperga declared his intention of continuing the history to his own time. He was, however, interrupted, perhaps by the fall of the Lombard kingdom; then followed his sojourn beyond the Alps, and when he resumed the work, probably c. 790, he changed the plan, and substituted for a universal history one of his own nation, inserting in it, however, many notices of events in general; but he so far carried out his intention, that, after narrating in (i.) the early Lombard history, he begins (ii.) just where *R.* concludes. The last event recorded in *R.*, the destruction of Totila and the Gothic kingdom is the first in (ii.), and then follow the other exploits of Narses, while after just referring to the Persian war and the conquests of Italy and Africa, which are narrated in *R.*, he mentions the victory over the Moorish king, Antalas, and Justinian's achievements in architecture and legislation (i. 25).

In examining the sources of *L.* it will be convenient to consider first those of books i.–iii. and iv. 1–40, omitting the description of Italy (ii. 14–24), and a few other passages such as the digression about St. Benedict (i. 26). In the texture of the remainder three strands are apparent; a Frankish (A), a Lombard (B), and a Romano-Byzantine (C).

A. This comes almost entirely from Gregory of Tours, who is first used in ii. 6. Thence to A.D. 591, where his history ends, Paulus uses him very freely, in fact most of (iii.) consists of extracts from him. For his period he seems to be Paulus' sole authority for Frankish affairs, excepting the legend of GUNTRAM (2) (iii. 34), which Paulus had probably heard during his travels in Gaul.

B. The source of the Lombard element is by no means so simple. In three MSS. there is prefixed to the edict of King Rothari an abstract of previous Lombard history, known as the *Origo Gentis Langobardorum*, beginning like *L.* with the legend of Gambara and her sons, and ending with the accession of Perctarit; the fifty-five years from Agilulf to Perctarit being given very shortly indeed, and in one MS. another recension of the same is found continued to A.D. 807 (*Mon. Ger. Hist., Script. Rer. Lang.* 1, 7). As the *Origo* contains incidents not found in *L.*, *e.g.* in the legend of Gambara Freya's trick of turning round Woden's bed, it cannot be, as was at first supposed, merely an epitome of *L.*, while the close connection between the two shows that Paulus had the *Origo* in some form before him, and he twice expressly refers to the prologue found in most MSS. to the edict of Rothari (i. 21, iv. 42). Further, Mommsen (*N. A.* v. 60, etc.) by a comparison of parallel passages of the *Origo* and *L.* proves that the *Origo*, as we now have it, is an abridgment.

Abbat SECUNDUS of Trent (died 612) wrote a short history *De Gestis Langobardorum*, which came down to his own times (iv. 40), and which went back at least to A.D. 588 (iii. 29), which Paulus once expressly refers to (iii. 29), but though he says of him, "de quo saepe jam diximus," he mentions him only three times in all. But the above summary of *L* shows strikingly his obligations to Secundus. The sudden change after iv. 40, from comparative fulness to absolute baldness coincides with the death of Secundus. Paulus himself owns his ignorance of the reign of Arioald (626–638). Further, there is a great mass of matter in *L.* relating to subjects which would be personally interesting to Secundus, *e.g.* his sponsorship of Theodelinda's son (iv. 27), the numerous notices about Trent and its neighbourhood, and the events that happened there (iii. 9, 10, 31, iv. 1, 2, 10), whereas after A.D. 612 Trent is only once mentioned (v. 36); above all the notices of the patriarchs of Aquileia, and of the controversy about the Three Chapters, of which we know that Secundus was a zealous champion. The paradox that Paulus, the admirer of Gregory the Great, in one passage (iii. 26) writes as a strong partisan of the schismatic defenders of the Three Chapters, is solved at once, if we suppose the passage to be an extract from Secundus. What then is the relation, if any, between the *Origo* and Secundus? The close connexion between the *Origo* and Paulus continues as before between A.D. 588 and 612, for which he certainly had Secundus before him. It has been generally supposed, *e.g.* by Waitz (*L.* 25), that the *Origo* and Secundus are inde-

pendent sources, but Mommsen is of opinion that the *Origo* is neither more nor less than an epitome of Secundus shortly continued to A.D. 688, and that it was probably the abridged or unabridged work of Secundus with a short continuation that was prefixed to the edict, so that finally the Lombard element in *L.*, down to iv. 40, comes wholly from the lost work of Secundus; that, in fact, in that part of *L.* Secundus takes the place that we have seen Eutropius and Orosius occupy in parts of *R.* The chief objection to Mommsen's view is that Paulus, who cites both works, gives no hint of any connection between them; one he calls the *Prologus Edicti*, the other *De Gestis Langobardorum.* Subtracting, says Mommsen from *L.* down to iv. 40 all that comes from Roman, Byzantine, or Frankish sources, and adding the additional matter of the *Origo*, the result will be a Lombard chronicle, resembling in character Gregory of Tours. He further notices the close resemblance of the legendary origin and wanderings of the Lombards with those of the Goths as described by Jordanes. Both came from Scandia (Scandinavia) described as a thickly-peopled island, the first enemies both encounter are the Vandals, in the history of both the Amazons figure. Are both stories fragments from a primitive legend common to the Teutonic tribes, or are the common incidents borrowed from Jordanes by an author who wished to emulate the glory of the Goths?

C. A few historical passages remain relating to the Eastern emperors, which show close affinity with the Copenhagen continuation of Prosper, and above all with Bede's *Chronicle*, making in some cases the same mistakes as the last, while here and there notices are found that apart from Paulus exist only in Byzantine sources (*e.g.* the name of Antalas i. 25, the notice of Aming ii. 2, the first found only in Procopius and Corippus, the second only in Menander, Bonn edd. 345). In one passage a few lines coincide, word for word, with the Chronicle of Isidore, which is used nowhere else. The same phenomenon of passages agreeing with, yet differing from, Bede's *Chronicle* (Isidore and the Continuation having ended), and of others with the *Liber Pontificalis* (which is apparently used in books ii.–iv. very sparingly, and very largely used in v., vi.) presents itself in the two remaining books, *e.g.*:

His diebus Domnus, papa Romanae ecclesiae, locum qui Paradisus dicitur ante basilicam beati apostoli Petri candidis et magnis marmoribus mirifice stravit. v. 31.	Hic (Donus) atrium beati Petri apostoli superius, quod est ante ecclesiam in quadriporticum, magnis marmoribus stravit. *Lib. Pont. Donus.*

Again we observed the same phenomena in the last three books of *R.* The usual explanation as to Paulus and the three chroniclers is that one copied from another. Mommsen, however, considers this unsatisfactory, and supposes they all borrowed from a common source, namely, a chronicle or annals composed in Byzantine Italy. Possibly the same explanation may apply to the passages which appear to be taken from the *Liber Pontificalis*, but it is impossible here to examine this question fully. With regard to the part of *L.* after iv. 40, almost the only sources (if they are really sources) which can be recognised are the *Liber Pontificalis* and Bede's *Chronicle.* For the concluding chapters of iv. the *Origo* is used as far as it goes. The narrative of the conversion of the Persian king and queen (iv. 50) comes from Fredegarius or a common source; the pilgrimage of CAEDWALLA (2) to Rome (vi. 15), from Bede, *H. E.* v. 7; the foundation of the monastery of St. Vincent (vi. 40), from Autpert's life of the founders. The considerable notices in vi. relating to the duchies of Friuli and Benevento probably came from local records. Isidore's Etymologiae are frequently used in the earlier books, the Dialogues, Letters, and Homily on Ezekiel of Gregory the Great are cited; Pliny is twice referred to, and Virgil and Eugyppius' *Life of Severinus* each once. In ii. 14–24 Paulus gives a description of Italy and its provinces. The list is identical with the seventeen provinces of the *Notitia Dignitatum;* except that Paulus by a mistake, whose origin Mommsen indicates (87), adds an 18th "Alpes Apenninae." This he amplified with short geographical and etymological notices. The origin of the former is apparently a map of Italy; of the latter, twelve come from Isidore's Etymologiæ, seven from Festus, and two from Jordanes (*Get.*). He quotes Justin for the invasion of Italy by the Gauls.

The large number of extant MSS. (of which Waitz enumerates about 100), shows the great popularity of the work during the middle ages.

3. *Life of Gregory the Great*, composed at Rome (1, 8, &c.). The date is uncertain, but it was written some years before *L.* (iii. 24). Dahn (56) not improbably supposes that he accompanied Charles in 786, who kept Christmas at Florence, went on to Rome and thence to Monte Cassino, and that the life was written during his short stay in Rome early in 787. It is composed from the works of Gregory himself, and from Bede, *H. E.* ii. The account of the miracles (§§ 23–28 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxv. 52–58) is considered by Bethmann (A. x. 305) to be an interpolation from the life written in England.

4. *Gesta Episcoporum Mettensium*, which he wrote at the request of bishop Angilram (*L.* vi. 16) probably at Metz, after October 783, the date of the marriage of Charles and Fastrada, but before they had a child (265). His model was the *Liber Pontificalis.* With a few exceptions the lives are very meagre. The skeleton of the work was apparently a list of the bishops which he supplemented with extracts from Gregory of Tours, Fredegarius, a life of Bishop Arnulf, and with oral information from Charles and others. The chief interest of the work is its account of the rise of the Carolingian house, whose founder was Arnulf, bishop of Metz. It likewise contains the epitaphs composed by Paulus at the request of Charles on his queen, Hildegard, his two sisters and his two infant daughters. The latest edition is in Pertz, *S. S.* ii. 260.

5. *An epitome*, or extracts from Sextus Pompeius Festus *De Significatione Verborum*, dedicated to Charles, and written probably at the beginning of their acquaintance (*L.* 19 *n.* Exc. 1). Bethmann indeed (A. x. 320) and others have considered the work to be unworthy of Paulus from its carelessness and mistakes, and

also because he is called "Pontifex" in the title, and have assigned it to some other Paulus. The oldest MS., however, omits the word "Pontifex," the dedicatory letter in its style and in certain phrases, *e.g.* "urbs Romulea," for Rome resembles known works of Paulus, and Paulus was acquainted with the work of Festus, and, as we have seen, used it freely in *L.* By the "*Glossae Pauli Diaconi*," mentioned in a catalogue of the library at Lorsch (Mai, *Spic.* v. 193), probably this epitome is meant. Further, no other known author of the name lived in the reign of Charles. Waitz, therefore (*L.* 19), and Mommsen (*N. A.* v. 58, 59) both consider this a genuine work of Paulus. He had before him the complete work of Festus, of which only fragments from *M.*, onwards, now remain. The best edition is that of K. O. Müller.

6. *A Book of Homilies.*—This work was compiled at the request of Charles, perhaps commenced before, but certainly completed after his return to Monte Cassino (*P.* 34. *L.* 20. Cf. Dahn, 52). It consists, in its present form, of 298 sermons in all. For each Sunday there is one, and for most two. One or more is appointed for each feast, and there are also sermons for each day in Lent, for each day in Easter and Whitsun week, and for special occasions, such as the dedication of a church, or the commemoration of an apostle or a martyr. The sermons are selected from those of various fathers, SS. Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, Gregory, Jerome, and Leo being the largest contributors. As was natural with a work of the kind, additional sermons were afterwards added, so that in its present form it includes some by writers such as Eric and Haymon, who lived after Paulus Diaconus.

7. In addition to this collection, three Homilies of Paulus himself are preserved, on the Assumption of the Virgin, on Martha and Mary, and on St. Benedict, which in preparing Bede's homilies for use at Monte Cassino, he substituted for the last, which was on Benedict Biscop.

8. *Poems.*—Of these several have already been noticed. Of the rest, the most remarkable are the elegiacs and iambics in honour of St. Benedict (*P.* 2, 3), the praises of the Lake of Como, and the verses interchanged between Paulus and Petrus of Pisa. The hymn in honour of St. John Baptist, from which the names of the musical notes were taken,

"Ut queant laxis resonare fibris,"

has been attributed to Paulus, but probably wrongly. His verses show a thorough acquaintance with Virgil and Ovid, and abound with imitations of them. They have been recently edited by Dümmler in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Poetarum Latinorum Medii Aevi* i.

9. *Letters.*—Those to Adelperga, Theudemar, Adelhard and Charles have already been noticed. The letter prefixed to the copy of the Rule of St. Benedict sent by abbat Theudemar to Charles (c. 791, Dahn, 62) was written by Paulus. Whether the Exposition of the Rule of St. Benedict is correctly ascribed to him is at least doubtful. (Dahn, 62.)

From the previous account it will be seen that while Paulus was, for his time, a man of considerable learning and industry, he has no pretensions to rank as a scientific or philosophical historian, his only merit is that of a compiler. Though he makes occasional mistakes, such as setting down, side by side, independent and divergent narratives of the same events, *e.g.* making the battle of the Colline Gate into two, one before and one after Sulla's entry into Rome (*R.* v. 8), he generally copied faithfully what he found in his authorities, and we are indebted to him for many fragments from authors now lost, above all from Secundus. Though he loved and admired his own race, he writes, on the whole, impartially. Though he is by no means free from grammatical mistakes, *e.g.* accusative absolute (especially in *L.*, perhaps because it never received his finishing touches), his style is decidedly good for his age. Take for instance, the passage from Gregory of Tours, cited by Mommsen (*N. A.* v. 54) and compare it with the form it takes in *L.* The one is rude and bald, the other has some pretensions to style, and reads like very tolerable Latin. His poems show that he had diligently studied the classical poets, especially Virgil, and his imitations are often by no means infelicitous. [F. D.]

Reader and Cleric.

PAULUS (71), a reader of the church of Constantinople, summoned along with Chrysostom to the Council of the Oak, according to Socrates and Sozomen, but not mentioned by Palladius. (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 15; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 17.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (72), cleric of Sardinia, who, having been convicted of practising magical arts, and assuming the dress of a layman, had fled to Africa. Gregory the Great in a letter to JANUARIUS (25) in A.D. 594, directed he should receive corporal punishment and be obliged to do penance (*Ep.* iv. 27). [F. D.]

Monks.

For monks who were priests or martyrs, see under those heads.

PAULUS (73), ST. (called THEBAEUS; ὁ Θήβηθεν, Niceph.), Jan. 10. He is called by Jerome the founder of the monastic life ("auctor vitae monasticae," *Ep.* 22, *ad Eustoch.* "princeps vitae monasticae," *Vit. S. Pauli*, Prol.). He is said to have been the first, in Egypt at least, to lead the life of a hermit, preceding even the celebrated Antony (Rosweyd, *Vitae Patrum*, in *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 105 and notes). He lived in the desert of the Thebaid, whither he fled in youth from the terrors of the Decian persecution, and where he died, at an extraordinary age, hale and hearty to the last (Hieron. *Ep.* 21, *ad Paul. Concordiens.*). The palm-tree at the mouth of his cave supplied him with food and clothing (Hieron. *Vita Pauli*, cap. 6). Miracles are recorded of him as of other solitaries. The ravens are said to have brought him bread, and two lions dug his grave (Hieron. v. s. cc. 9, 13). Antony is said to have paid a visit to his venerable brother in asceticism, shortly before the death of Paulus, and ever afterwards to have worn his tunic, made of palm leaves stitched together, on great festivals. Jerome adds (c. 13), with characteristic fervour, that

such a garment, the legacy of so great a saint, was more glorious than the purple of a king (Niceph. Call. *H. E.* ix. 14; Boll. *Acta SS.* 10 Jan. 1, 603; Butler, Jan. 15). [I. G. S.]

PAULUS (74), Mar. 7, surnamed SIMPLEX, a disciple of Antony, and, like his master, a hermit, in Lower Egypt. He was memorable, as his name imports, for the childlike docility, of which several instances are related by his biographer, Ruffinus (*De Vitis Patrum*, c. 31, ap. Rosweyd. *Vit. Patr.*). When he first sought admission into the cave of Antony, he had to wait three days and nights at the mouth of it before receiving any reply at all. Then came a voice from the cave, bidding him remain there, standing and praying, for twenty-four hours more. All this he bore without a murmur. On another occasion, having asked, in the presence of some saints of the desert, the foolish question, whether Christ or the prophets lived first, he was ordered by his teacher to go and be silent. He obeyed literally, and stayed apart, in silence, several days, till he was set free from his self-imposed penance. His patience and submission were tried, on other occasions, by his being ordered to pour water all day through a sieve, and to unweave the mats, which he had been busy in weaving (*ib.*). He was famous for his prolonged fasts, and for other austerities; and, notwithstanding his dulness of intellect, was reputed to have a strange insight into the hearts of those who worshipped with him (Gr. Inc. c. 20, ap. Rosw. *Vit. Patr.*; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 13; Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca*, and Heraclides, *Paradisus*, apud Rosweyd, *Vitae Patrum*; Boll. *Acta SS.* 7 Mart. i. 635). [I. G. S.]

PAULUS (75), of Oxyrinchus in Egypt, a monk who headed, about A.D. 360, a secession from the communion of the local bishop Theodorus, because of his connexion with the Arian George of Alexandria. His followers belonged to the Luciferian party. We only know of them from the *Libellus Precum* [FAUSTINUS (33)] whence we learn that they formed a presbyterian community, and possessed no bishop (cf. Ceill. v. 154). [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (76), one of the Syrian monks to whom Basil wrote in 376 to express his sympathy in the destruction of their cells by fire at the hands of the enemies of the truth (Basil, *Ep.* 256 [200]). [E. V.]

PAULUS (77), an Egyptian monk of the 4th century. In company with two others, Syrus and Isaias, he was on his way to visit a famous solitary, when the latter met them, and by divine revelation, as he alleged, told them their respective merits. Paulus, alleging a similar revelation, predicted that the solitary would go to heaven in three days and requested him to say, for their future profit, by what good works he had pleased God. A full reply followed. (Ruf. *Hist. Mon.* 10 in *Pat. Lat.* xxi. 428; Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 55–7.) [C. H.]

PAULUS (78), a solitary of Mount Pherme in Scetis, late in the 4th century. Abstaining entirely from manual labour and depending upon charity for his food, he spent each day in reciting three hundred prayers, regulating the number by means of as many pebbles in his bosom, one of which he cast away at each prayer. Owing to the various readings of ἔχων (agreeing with Παῦλος) and ἔχον (with ὄρος), two statements occur, one by Sozomen and Cassiodorus that Paulus had five hundred monks under him, the other (which is more probable) by Palladius and Nicephorus that the mountain was tenanted by that number. Palladius further relates his consulting Macarius of Alexandria in great distress of conscience, for that he, though a man, only made three hundred prayers a day, while he had been told of a woman, an ascetic of thirty years, who made seven hundred, eating only on Saturdays and Sundays. Macarius said he had been serving God sixty years and made but one hundred prayers a day, yet without any self-reproach, employing his time in labour, and he advised Paulus, if his conscience was dissatisfied, to make more prayers or better ones (Soz. vi. 29; Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* c. 23; Cassiod. *Trip. Hist.* lib. viii. c. 1 in *Pat. L.* lxix. 1109; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* lib. ii. c. 36 in *P. G.* cxlvi. 701). Concerning the readings see the notes of Valesius on Sozomen, and Tillem. viii. 813. [C. H.]

PAULUS (79), (called ὁ Κοσμίτης, COSMETA) a solitary in Scetis, with Timotheus his brother, in the 4th century. They were called Adorners, as Tillemont thinks, on account of some art they practised among the solitaries. Finding themselves frequently at variance, they provided against an open breach by agreeing that they would tolerate each other's outbreaks and tempers (*Apophth. Pat.* in Coteler. *Mon. Gr. Ecc.* i. p. 651; Tillem. x. 471). [C. H.]

PAULUS (80), a solitary in the desert of Porphyrio in Egypt, and apparently visited by Cassian (*Inst.* x. 24, 25), near the end of the 4th century. His garden supplied him with food, and he rigorously employed himself each day in fabricating the usual articles out of palm leaves, for the sake however of the employment alone, for being seven "mansiones" or days' journey from a town he could not dispose of what he made, and at the end of the year gave them all to the flames. Where the desert of Porphyrio, also called that of Calamus (*Collat.* xxiv. 4), was is not known. Tillemont (xiv. 170) suggests that if it was in Thebais this Paulus could have been the same as No. 83. See the following. [C. H.]

PAULUS (81), a solitary in the desert adjacent to the city of Panephysis in the east of Lower Egypt mentioned by Severus to Cassian (*Collat.* vii. 26). He was so resolute in avoiding the very sight of women that once while going with another solitary Archebius to visit an aged father of the desert, and a woman chanced to approach, he fled back with all speed to his cell regardless of the entreaties of his companion. In the last four years of his life when helpless from paralysis in every limb, he was entirely dependent on the assiduous ministrations of women from a neighbouring coenobium. Cassian's commentator Alardus Gazaeus is inclined to identify him with the preceding, but Tillemont (xiv. 168, 169) is of a different opinion. [C. H.]

PAULUS (82), a monk whose coenobium, containing above two hundred brethren in Egypt, was visited by Cassian (*Collat.* xix. 1; Tillem. xiv. 163, 164). [C. H.]

PAULUS (83), of Lower Egypt, a solitary in the Thebais in the fourth or fifth century. He would take up serpents, horned serpents, and scorpions with his hand, and nip them in two in the midst unharmed, and when asked how he had obtained such grace replied, "To him who has attained to purity all things are subject." (*Apophth. Pat.* in Cotelér. *Mon. Gr. Ecc.* p. 651.) [C. H.]

PAULUS (84), a solitary, c. 400, in the Thebais, a disciple of Hor. (*Apophth. Patr.* in *Coteler. Mon. Gr. Eccl.* i. p. 708; Tillem. vii. 600.) Another Paulus (85) [called of Galatia and THE GREAT] is mentioned in the *Apophthegmata* (p. 652) and in the *Verba Seniorum*, c. 2 (Rosweyd, *Vit. Patr.* p. 666). [C. H.]

PAULUS (86), the name of two Egyptian solitaries visited by Rufinus in the 4th century, one "in Apeliote," the other "in Focis" (Rufin. *H. E.* ii. 8; Tillem. xiv. 169). [C. H.]

PAULUS (87) (called HELLADICUS), a solitary near the Jordan mentioned in Moschus as daily feeding a lion who came to his cave at meal times (*Prat.* c. 163 in Rosw. *V. P.* p. 911). Moschus mentions another PAULUS (88) from Galatia, a solitary of Porphyrites, who handled serpents, at the end of the 6th century (*Prat.* c. 124; Tillem. xiv. 171). [C. H.]

Martyrs.

PAULUS (89) Mart. Carthag. A.D. 250. [See ARISTO.] It was on his dying request that LUCIAN began the system of dispensations to the Lapsed. *Ep.* 22 Cyp. (4) also Martyr. Carth. same year. [E. W. B.]

PAULUS (90), May 15, martyr at Lampsacus, a city of the Hellespont, with Peter, Andrew and Dionysia a virgin. They suffered in the Decian persecution under Optimus or Opitimus, a proconsul. The Acts offer an example of the judicial circuit made by the governors through the Roman provinces on which Le Blant lays stress in his work *Les Actes des Martyrs*, p. 122 et pass.; Ruinart. *AA. Sinc.* p. 146–149. [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (91), March 10, martyr at Corinth in the Decian persecution with Quadratus and several others. His acts in a Greek version have been found by Aubé in an incomplete state in a MS. of the National Library at Paris. Cf. *Rev. Archéol.* 1884, pt. i. p. 222; *Mart.* Rom. [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (92), Mar. 4, Aug. 17, martyr under Aurelian [JULIANA (2)] (Boll. *Acta SS.* 17 Aug. iii. 448; Tillem. iv. 354). [C. H.]

PAULUS (93), July 25, martyr at Caesarea in Palestine under the governor Firmilianus during the Diocletian persecution. He was condemned to the sword with two women who were burnt. At the moment of the execution he begged for a few moments' respite, when he prayed aloud for the peace of the Church, for the conversion of the Jews, of the Samaritans, and of the Gentiles, for the emperor, the judge, and the executioner. (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* c. viii.) [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (94), June 1, martyr at Caesarea in Palestine, under Firmilian in the Diocletian persecution. He was a layman, of the city of Jamna, and was associated in suffering with Pamphilus and Valens. They were imprisoned for two years before execution. (Eus. *Mart. Palest.* c. xi.) [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (95), an Egyptian martyr in the Diocletian persecution. He is noted in the Ethiopic Calendar under Feb. 9 (Ludolph. *Hist. Aethiop. Comment.* p. 403). His acts are given in Aug. Ant. Georgii *Fragm. Evang. Johann.* p. cviii. He was a friend of St. PAESIS and THECLA. [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (96), abbat of Raithu near the Red Sea, and martyred with forty-three disciples by the Arabs, about A.D. 373. His sufferings are narrated by an eyewitness, one Ammonius, a monk, in Combefis (*Illust. Christ. Martt. lecti triumphi*, p. 88–139). [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (97), Jan. 14, a solitary of Mt. Sinai slain by Arabs A.D. 373, with a priest Theodulus. (*AA. SS.* Boll. 14 Jan. 954–960; Ceill. viii. 231.) [G. T. S.]

Miscellaneous.

PAULUS (98) L. SERGIUS, Cos. Suff. 147; Cos. ord. ii. 168; City prefect under M. Aurelius about 168; descendant of Sergius Paulus proconsul of Cyprus in the Acts. He was proconsul of Asia between 163 and 168, when St. Sagaris suffered under him. (Eus. iv. 26, where his name is corrupted in the Greek text into Servilius; Borghesi, *Œuv. Comp.* viii. 504–506, ix. 310–313; Waddington, *Fastes des Prov. Asiat.* num. 148; Lightfoot, *Ignatius* i. 494.) [MELITO, Vol. III. p. 495 b.] [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (99), a noted heretic and a man of great eloquence, of Antiochene birth, but residing at Alexandria as an adopted son of the wealthy lady who had befriended Origen in his early days. (Euseb. vi. 2; Tillem. iii. 500.) [C. H.]

PAULUS (100), a confessor in Egypt in the Decian persecution along with DIONYSIUS (6), bishop of Alexandria, CAIUS (11), PETRUS (73), and FAUSTUS (15) (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 40, vii. 11; Tillem. iv. 247). [R. J. K.]

PAULUS (101), colleague of Macarius, A.D. 348, said by the Donatists to have been less ferocious than his colleague. (MACARIUS (21), Vol. III. 774, 775; *Mon. Vet. D.* xxvii. p. 227, ed. Oberthür.) [H. W. P.]

PAULUS (102), an Egyptian, the disciple of Peter the martyred patriarch of Alexandria, mentioned by Rufinus as one of the learned company of which Didymus was the chief at Alexandria. He was an old man when Rufinus knew him, about the year 374. (Ruf. *Apol.* ii. 12.) [W. H. F.]

PAULUS (103), of Concordia, a town between Aquileia and Altinum, in the fourth century, spoken of by Jerome as Paulum quendam (*De Vir. Illust.* 53). He was a student of scripture and of ecclesiastical writers, and was known to

both Jerome and Rufinus, the latter of whom was a native of Concordia. Jerome probably saw him about the year 370, when returning from Treves and about to settle at Aquileia. He corresponded with Jerome, when in the desert of Chalcis, in the year 374, asking him for a MS. of Tertullian which Rufinus had taken away. Jerome asks him to send him from his copious library Fortunatianus's Commentaries, the History of Aurelius Victor, the Epistles of Novatianus and Cyprian, and in return sends him his Life of Paulus the Hermit, recently composed. He was then enjoying a prolonged but healthy old age. It was from him that Jerome heard the story, which Paulus had heard from a secretary, that Cyprian, in asking for Tertullian's books, would say, "Da magistrum." (Jerome, *Ep.* 5 and 10, and *De Vir. Ill.* 53; Tillem. xii. 11, 27.) [W. H. F.]

PAULUS (104), a lawyer to whom Nilus of Sinai wrote a letter on the nature and power of habits and of sin. (Nili *Epist.* ii. 239 in Migne's *Pat. Graec.* t. lxxix. col. 322.) [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (105) a friend of Augustine, the bearer of his second letter to Jerome. (Jerome, *Ep.* lxvii. end, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

PAULUS (106), bearer of a letter from S. Augustine to Alypius, about the baptism of Gabinianus and the conversion of Dioscorus. (Aug. *Ep.* 227.) [H. W. P.]

PAULUS (107), according to St. Augustine cured of a disease at the church at Hippo, in which the relics of St. Stephen were deposited. This occurred on Easter-Day, A.D. 425, and three days afterwards his sister Palladia also was cured. (Aug. *Civ. D.* xxii. 8, 21.) [H. W. P.]

PAULUS (108), son of Callinice, born at Samosata in the 4th century. He and his brother John were trained by their mother as followers of Gnosticism or Manichaeism. They laboured in those districts to spread their opinions. Some derived the name and doctrines of the PAULICIANS from them, though probably this connection is simply fiction. (Phot. c. *Man.* i. 1, 16; Pet. Sic. i. 21; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 337-9; Mosheim, ii. 363.) [M. B. C.]

PAULUS (109), THE PERSIAN, or THE CHRISTIAN, the opponent of Photinus the Manichean. [PHOTINUS.] [G. T. S.]

PAULUS THE PERSIAN [PAULUS (40)].

PAULUS (110) SILENTIARIUS, sometimes called "the Silentiary," from his position as an officer of Justinian's court. Agathias calls him *τὰ πρῶτα τελῶν ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἀμφὶ τὸν βασιλέα σιγῆς ἐπιστάταις*, and describes him as of high family and great wealth. It seems most likely from the superscription of his work on the Great Church, that he was son of Cyrus, and grandson of Florus. He wrote several epigrams preserved in the Anthologia Palatina, and some other works of minor importance; but his chief poem was that already mentioned, a poetical account of the buildings and dedication of the Great Church of Constantinople, which, as the evidence of a contemporary, must always be an important authority on the greatest effort of Byzantine church architecture. The poem, to which is prefixed a dedication in iambic verse, is written in Homeric hexameters. Its vividness is much praised by Agathias, but, from his necessary avoidance of technical terms, it is rather difficult to follow clearly his description of the building.

This work, together with the *ἔκφρασις τοῦ ἄμβωνος*, was edited by Graefe (Lips. 1822). It had previously beeu edited by Du Fresne, and by Bekker in the Corpus Scriptorum Byzantinorum. Some assistance to the better understanding of the poem in its relation to church architecture may be found in Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church* (Introduction). [H. A. W.]

PAULUS (111) SCHOLASTICUS. Two letters are addressed to him by Gregory the Great, in the first of which, written in 590, shortly after his accession, Gregory deprecates his congratulations; in the second, written thirteen years afterwards, Gregory expresses his joy at Paulus's reconciliation with LEO (38), bishop of Catania. From these letters it appears that Paulus lived in Sicily (*Epp.* i. 3; xiv. 1). [F. D.]

PAULUS (112), a leader in the Severian heresy, who according to a letter of Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, had that interview with the emperor Heraclius in Armenia, which paved the way for Monothelitism. The letter, which was addressed to pope Honorius, was read in Actio XII. of the Sixth Synod, A.D. 680, and may be seen in Mansi (xi. 530), Hardouin (iii. 1311), and other works on the Councils. Baronius gives it under the year 633 (num. xvii.). For the various dates assigned to the interview, the place of it, and the doubt if Paul was the person, see SERGIUS, and PERSON OF CHRIST, subdiv. MONOTHELITISM. [C. H.]

PAULUS (113) the Armenian, an eminent teacher in the sect of PAULICIANS, in the 7th century, about the time of Justinian II. Many traced the name of the sect to him, but this no doubt was of earlier date. He was the father of Gegnaesius and Theodore. (Phot. c. *Man.* i. 19; Pet. Sic. i. 28; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 340-3.) [M. B. C.]

PAULUS (114), surnamed AFIARTA, chamberlain of pope Stephen III., is described by Anastasius (*Hist. de Vit. Rom. Pont.* 285 sq.) as combining with Didier, king of Lombardy, against his master's friends [CHRISTOPHER (7)], killing or driving them into exile. His policy was reversed by pope Hadrian on his accession, A.D. 772 [HADRIANUS (8)]. [J. G.]

PAUSIANUS, bishop in Thessaly, one of three bishops whom pope Boniface I. declared, A.D. 422, separated from his communion [CYRIACUS (14)] (Bonifacius I. *Epp.* no. 13 ap. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 776; Jaffé, *R. P.* num. 146). He must be the bishop of Hypata, who, at the council of Ephesus in 431, took the side of John of Antioch, signed the contestatio to Cyril, joined the conciliabulum, and is mentioned in the circular letter of the council with some thirty more separatists under John (Hardouin, i. 1352, 1578 here corruptly called Subanus, 1623; Le Quien, ii. Tillem. xii. 403, xiv. 604). [J. G.]

PAUSICACUS, blind man healed under the invocation of St. Thecla (Basil. Seleuc. *Vit. S. Theclae*, lib. ii. no. 8, ap. Boll. *AA.SS.* Sept. 23, vi. 559; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 168). [J. G.]

PAWL HEN (PAULINUS, PAULENS, POLIN, POULENTUS), Welsh saint, was probably a north Briton, disciple of St. Illtyd, and according to Ricemarch (Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 122), of St. Germanus: seems to have lived in Man, and may have been called Hên or the Aged to distinguish him from St. Paul of Leon. He established a monastery and school at Tygwyn ar Dâf, Alba Domus, or Whitland, in Carmarthenshire, where St. David and St. Teilo were among his pupils. (See Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 122; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 13–15.) By later writers he is spoken of as a seeless bishop, but he was probably only abbat of Tygwyn (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 142 sq. Append. C). The tradition embodied in the *Life of S. David* (Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 137; Colgan, *A. SS.* 429, c. 23) is that he was present as a bishop at the synod o. Llandewi-Brefi, Cardiganshire, in A.D. 519 (Ussher) to oppose the Pelagian heresy, and was the special means of having St. David brought forward. Whatever be the date assigned for that synod, Pawl Hên must have flourished in the first half of the 6th century; his feast is Nov. 22. At Dolau Cothi in Caio, Carmarthenshire, an old inscribed stone is believed to be to his memory (Westwood, *Lap. Wall.* 79). [J. G.]

PAYSIO, an Egyptian solitary in the fifth century (Rosweyd, *V. P.*, v. 11, § 23). Tillemont (xv. 151) suggests that he may be the same as Paësis, the brother of Poemen. [C. H.]

PEADA, son of Penda, king of Mercia, by his wife Cyneswitha (Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 630, 637), and apparently the eldest of the family. Having been appointed by his father to govern the province of the Middle Angles of which Leicester was the centre, he became a neighbour of Oswy, king of Northumbria, whose daughter Alchfleda he asked in marriage. Oswy consented if Peada would become a Christian, and Peada, under the persuasion o. Alchfrith, Oswy's son, after being instructed in the faith was baptized by Finan, at the place described as *Ad murum.* He brought from Northumbria four missionary priests, Cedd, Adda, Betti, and Diuma, the last of whom was afterwards made a bishop. Penda tolerated the proceedings of his son, which began two years before his death; but continued his usual forays into Oswy's territories, and in 655 fell with his British allies in the battle of Winwaed. His power fell with him: Peada however was allowed by his father-in-law to act as king of the Southern Mercians, south of Trent; a different district apparently from that which he had governed under Penda. His reign was short. He was assassinated, as it was said, with the connivance of his wife, at the following Easter, A.D. 656 (Bede, *H.E.* iii. 21, 24). Peada is reckoned among the founders and benefactors of Medeshamstede, in conjunction with Oswy (*Chr. S.* A.D. 655, *M. H. B.* 312, 320). The authority for the early history of the abbey is very questionable, but it may rest on a true conjecture, for Bede ascribes the foundation to Abbot Sexwlf, whose work may very well have begun under Peada's auspices (*H. E.* iv. 6), although Wulfhere may have completed it. [S.]

PECTHELM, the first English bishop of Candida Casa, or Whitherne, in Galloway. The see must have been re-established (having been unoccupied from the time of Ninian) about the year A.D. 730. Beda ends his history two years later, and mentions Pecthelm as being then at Whitherne, where many had been added to the faith (*H. E.* v. 23). Richard of Hexham (ed. *Surtees Soc.* p. 35) mentions a tradition that Acca, bishop of Hexham, had been helpful in establishing the see of Whitherne, which is probable enough.

Florence places Pecthelm's death in A.D. 735 (i. 54). Among the letters of Boniface there is one addressed to bishop Pecthelm. He sends him a present of a cloak and a towel, and asks his advice on a matrimonial question. The letter is ascribed to the year 736 (i. 89, ed. Giles), but if Pecthelm, bishop of Whitherne, is the correspondent, it must be ante-dated a year or more. [J. R.]

PECTWINE (PEHTWINE, PECHTWIN), the third English bishop of Whitherne (Candida Casa) or Galloway. He was consecrated on July 17, 763, in the district called Aelfete (Elmete), no doubt by the archbishop of York (S. C. *sub anno*). We know nothing further of him, save the fact that he died on Sept. 19, 776 (S. C.). Symeon and Florence place his death a year later. [J. R.]

PECUSIUS, pupil and friend of St. Pachomius at Tabenna (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. 243; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iii. 358). [J. G.]

PEGA, ST. (PEGAN, PEGE, PEGIA), Jan. 8, an anchoritess, sister of St. Guthlac of Crowland, in whose Life by Felix (Boll. *Acta SS.* 11 Apr. ii. 38), the earliest notice of her occurs. Although she resided in his neighbourhood Guthlac, from motives of asceticism, declined ever seeing her, a piece of austerity that can be accounted for by a statement in a metrical life of that saint (W. de Gray Birch, *Saint Guthlac*, Wisbech, 1881, Introd. page xxvii.) that the Evil One in the shape of Pega once sought to deceive him. Guthlac, however, held her in true brotherly regard, directing that a secret of his spiritual life revealed by him just before his death in 714 should be imparted to her (*Vit. Guthl.* § 35), and requesting that she should wrap him in his winding sheet and place him in his coffin, which she did (§§ 35, 36). At the end of a year, A.D. 715, she went again to Crowland, and in a great assembly of ecclesiastics re-entombed him in the oratory of his church, and while there is reported to have cured a blind man from Wissa (Wisbech), by the application of some salt consecrated by the deceased saint (§ 40). The spurious *Historia Ingulphi* (Gale's *Scriptores*, i. 5) adds that having bestowed on abbat Kenulph St. Bartholomew's scourge, Guthlac's psalter, and other relics, Pega returned by water to her own cell, which was four leucae distant westward, and that after spending two years and three months in mourning there (which brings the period to the latter part of 717) she went on a pilgrimage to Rome, where she died.

There is nothing unlikely in such a journey, as Pega was probably not above forty years old, and the Roman pilgrimage had begun to be prevalent among all classes and both sexes in Britain. Abbat Ceolfrid had gone out the previous year. The period of her death is not stated; Orderic Vital (*H. E.* iv. 15, t. ii. p. 276 edit. Le Prevost, 1840) gives the day as Jan. 8, and adds that a church was afterwards raised over her remains, of which, however, nothing further is handed down. This author also states (cap. 16, p. 284) that the locality of her cell near Crowland was named from her Pegelanda, and that a monastery afterwards arose there. As Pegia she occurs once in Florence of Worcester (ann. 714, *M. H. B.* 540), who in recording Guthlac to have been her brother seems to attribute to her an almost equal fame. She has no place in the *Roman Martyrology* of Baronius. There is no known *Vita* of St. Pega; but Bolland (*Acta SS.* 8 Jan. i. 532) has collected nearly all the passages of ancient authors referring to her. The spot which Orderic names Pegelanda is without doubt the modern Peykirk or Peakirk in Northamptonshire, called in Camden's time Peagkirke, Pega's church. It lies on the western verge of the great Peterborough Fen, ten miles north of Peterborough and seven or eight (perhaps rather a long "four leucae") west from Crowland. It is skirted by the Welland, down which stream Pega's boat would have dropped to reach her brother's cell. The monastery which arose there survived the Danes, but disappeared before the Norman Conquest. For modern notices of Pega and Peakirk see *Monast. Anglic.* ii. 95, iii. 203; Tanner's *Notitia;* Camden's *Brit.* ed. Gough. ii. 168, 186; Bridge's *Northamptonshire*, ed. Whalley, ii. 574. The dedication of the church is to St. Pega. Lewis (*Topog. Dict.* 1849) states that some ancient remains exist at Peakirk bearing the name of *The Hermitage*. St. Pega may be accepted as a genuine English saint, and Peakirk as a satisfactory identification. [C. H.]

PEGASIUS (1), bishop of Troas about A.D. 350–360. His name has been found in a previously unknown letter of the emperor Julian, first published in *Hermes*, 1875, pp. 257–266. This letter gives a very interesting description of a visit paid by Julian to Troy before he became emperor. It describes the graves of Hector and Achilles, and the temple of Minerva as being still honoured by the inhabitants with sacrifices; while the bishop of the place Pegasius seems to have acted as custodian of the temple, and of the images which were in their places and in good order. He had evidently discerned Julian's tendency to Paganism. Julian, upon entering the temple, recognised traces of sacrifices, and asked if the people still sacrificed to the gods. The bishop defended the practice on the analogy of the honour paid by Christians to the martyrs. The bishop turned Pagan on the accession of Julian, but does not seem to have gained much by his apostasy, as Julian's letter was written to plead his cause on the special ground that such converts needed encouragement. This letter is of great interest in view of modern explorations of the site of Troy. (Cf. Boissier's art. on Julian in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, July, 1880, p. 106–108.) [G. T. S.]

PAGASIUS (2), an apostate who on visiting the martyr Basilius presbyter of Ancyra in his prison, in the reign of Julian, was severely reproved by him (Boll. *Acta SS.* 22 Mart. iii. 379; Tillem. vii. 377). [ELPIDIUS (36).] [C. H.]

PEGASIUS (3), sixth bishop of Perigueux, mentioned as a contemporary by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* ii. c. 13; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 210); this was before A.D. 595, and probably in 577 [GREGORIUS (32) TURONENSIS] from its place in the history of the Franks. [J. G.]

PEIRIO ap Caw, Welsh saint of the 6th century, patron of Rhospeirio in Llanelian, Anglesey. (Rees, *Welsh SS.* 230, 254; *Myv. Arch.* ii. 51.) [J. G.]

PELAGIA (1), June 9, virgin and martyr at Antioch about A.D. 306. She drowned herself to avoid defilement, according to St. Ambrose, *De Virgin.* lib. iii. cap. 7, and *Epist.* 37 ad Simplicianum. Chrysostom in his homilies (Migne, *P. G.* t. i. 579) on her feast, says she committed suicide by flinging herself from the roof of her house. Her mother's name is supposed by some to have been Domnina, who also drowned herself with her daughter; see the acts of both in Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* pp. 520 and 576. There was a church at C. P. dedicated to St. Pelagia, which Constantinus Copronymus destroyed. Ceillier confuses Pelagia, virgin and martyr of Antioch, with Pelagia the converted actress [PELAGIA (3)], but there was a century and a half between them. [G. T. S.]

PELAGIA (2), May 4, virgin and martyr at Tarsus. She was of singular beauty. Her acts tell a long story about Diocletian's desire to marry her after his own son had committed suicide, upon her conversion to Christianity. Upon her refusal she was put to death by burning in a brazen bull. Her story is told in *AA. SS.* Boll. Mai. i. 454–458, cf. 747. Her Greek acts have been critically reprinted, with learned notes, by H. Usener in his *Legenden der Heiligen Pelagia*, Bonn, 1879, p. 52. She must be carefully distinguished from the two Pelagia's of Antioch [PELAGIA (3)]. [G. T. S.]

PELAGIA (3), surnamed MARGARITA, MARINA and PECCATRIX, Oct. 8, an actress of Antioch about the middle of cent. v., celebrated for her repentance. Her history has been the subject of a long discussion in the *AA. SS.* Boll. Oct. iv. 248–268, where she is distinguished from two other Pelagias of Antioch, and Pelagia of Tarsus, martyr under Diocletian. The story of our Pelagia has been told by Jacobus, a deacon and eye-witness of her conversion. Nonnus, bishop of Edessa and successor of Ibas in that see [IBAS, Vol. III. p. 195] [NONNUS (4)], was once preaching at Antioch when present at a synod of eight bishops. Pelagia was then the favourite actress and dancer of Antioch, whose inhabitants had poured riches upon her and surnamed her Margarita from the number of pearls she wore. She came into the church during the sermon, to the astonishment and horror of the other bishops. Nonnus had been an ascetic of the severe order of Pachomius of Tabenna, and he dealt with her. He addressed Pelagia with such plainness and

sternness, touching her sins and the future judgments of God, that she at once repented, and with many tears desired baptism, which, after some delay, was granted to her, the chief deaconess of Antioch, Romana, acting as sponsor for her as well as assisting at her baptism according to custom. Her acts then tell of the assaults made upon her by the devil, and his attempts to win her back to sin. She finally left Antioch, and withdrew to a cell on the Mount of Olives, where she lived as a monk in male attire, and died some three years afterwards from her excessive austerities. Jacobus, the deacon, gives us an account of a visit he paid to her there. It is very interesting as offering a description of an anchorite's cell, such as can be seen to this day in many places in Ireland, as at St. Doulough's church near Dublin, at the abbey of Fore in the co. Westmeath, and in considerable numbers in the monastic island of Inismurry, off the coast of Sligo in Donegal Bay. She was living as an enclosed anchorite, in a cell without any door, and with a window through which alone the occupant communicated with the external world. Her whole history is full of interesting touches, describing the ancient ritual of baptism and other ecclesiastical usages. Hermann Usener published in 1879 a treatise concerning her *Legenden der Heiligen Pelagia*, in which he printed her Acts in Greek, discussed their historical difficulties, and maintained in a lengthened introduction that the whole story was only an adaptation to Christian uses of the legend of the Semitic Aphrodite, which took various shapes all along the Syrian coasts, and among the Mediterranean islands. He quotes (p. xxi.) an inscription *C. I. L.* iii. 3066, which expressly gives the name of Pelagia to Venus. His theory is very interesting, and is worked out with much learning. It is the same as that which Baring-Gould, in his *Myths of the Middle Ages*, has already applied to the history of St. George of England [GEORGIUS (43)]. It has a basis of truth. The church certainly largely adopted holy places and days from the Pagans, but she connected them with Christian persons or facts. She had plenty of martyrs and saints for this purpose, without being compelled to dress up a Pagan deity in Christian attire. The mere identity of names is nothing, otherwise we might resolve hundreds of well-authenticated Christian martyrs and saints into Pagan gods. Usener gives, in pp. 29 and 30, an exhaustive analysis of the Latin, Greek, and Syriac MSS. of Pelagia's Acts, with very full notes on the Greek text. T. Gildemeister published Pelagia's Syriac Acts in the Bonn Universitäts-Programm of 22nd March, 1879. Cf. Wright's *Cat. Syr.* MSS. in *Brit. Mus.* p. 1101, num. 948. [G. T. S.]

PELAGIANUS, bishop of Luperciara. (*Sentt. Epp.* 44, Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii.) The name of his see is not found in the geographies or in any inscription. Morcelli ingeniously guesses that, from its Roman name and the worship or dedication implied by it, it was probably in the Roman province of Africa where Roman observances most prevailed. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, p. 496, indicates perhaps, though not so strongly as Morcelli says, that the cultus of the Luperci was not found in Asia.

[E. W. B.]

PELAGIUS (1), bishop of Laodicea in Syria Prima. While very young he became betrothed, and fulfilled his engagement, but on his wedding day he persuaded his bride to embrace with himself a life of continence (Theod. *H. E.* iv. 13). On account of his piety and many virtues he was chosen unanimously to the bishopric of Laodicea, to which he was ordained by Acacius of Caesarea (Philostorg. *H. E.* v. 1). He was present at the synod of Antioch in 363, and signed the letter of the bishops to Jovian declaring their adherence to the Nicene faith (Labbe, ii. 828; Socr. *H. E.* iii. 25; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 4). He was banished by Valens for his orthodoxy in 367 to Arabia (Theod. *H. E.* iv. 13). On his recall he attended the orthodox synod of Tyana in 367 (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 12), as well as that of Antioch in 378, where he signed the tome published by the Roman synod under Damasus in 369 (Labbe, ii. 894). In 372 he signed the letter drawn up by Meletius at the request of Basil, to the western bishops requesting their aid in redressing the evils of the Eastern Church (Basil, *Ep.* 93 [69]). In 376 Basil wrote to him expressing his desire to see him once again (*ibid.* 254 [311]). At the Council of Constantinople in 381 he, like Diodorus of Tarsus, was named one of those orthodox Eastern bishops communion with whom was a test of orthodoxy, and to whom the administration of the Churches of the East was committed (Socr. *H. E.* v. 8; Soz. *H. E.* vii. 9; Theod. *H. E.* v. 8; Labbe, ii. 955; Facund. iv. 2; and Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 793). [E. V.]

PELAGIUS (2). The particulars of the early life and career of Pelagius, whose name is identified with the prominent subject of theological controversy of Latin Christendom in the 5th century, are very imperfectly known from contemporary history. He is said by Augustine, Prosper, Gennadius, Orosius, and Mercator to have been a Briton. Jerome speaks of him as coming of the Scottish race (*habet progeniem Scoticae gentis de Britannorum vicinia*, Pref. lib. 3 in Jerem.), which may imply that he was an Irishman, the Scoti being at that time settled in Ireland. The name Pelagius undoubtedly looks like a Grecised version of some earlier name; but the tradition that the original name of the heresiarch was Morgan (Marigena, Πελάγιος), and that he came from Bangor in North Wales, rests on late and untrustworthy authority. The date of his birth is uncertain. It was probably about A.D. 370. The earliest information obtainable about him is that he was a monk, though he does not appear to have been a member of any particular religious community. It is expressly recorded that he was not in holy orders. Both Orosius and pope Zosimus speak of him as a layman. It is a question whether he is to be identified with the monk Pelagius, whose defection from his own cause St. John Chrysostom so bitterly lamented in a letter written to Olympias in the year 405 during his exile in Armenia. On the supposition that St. Chrysostom was speaking of the most famous bearer of the name, this would be the earliest historical notice of Pelagius, and would imply that he had been resident some time in the East; and some probability might be given to this hypothesis by the marked influence of the Eastern type of

thought upon his subsequent theological opinions. But the ascertained dates of incidents in the career of Pelagius seem to forbid the identification. Pelagius came to Rome very early in the 5th century. If the authority of Mercator is to be accepted, that he imbibed his opinions from Rufinus the Syrian in the episcopate of Anastasius, we must fix the date of Pelagius's arrival in Rome not later than A.D. 401, and he did not leave that city till A.D. 409. His personal character at this period of his life is spoken of with the utmost respect by his contemporaries. His great opponent St. Augustine describes him as being generally held to be a good and holy man, and of no mean proficiency as a Christian (*De Pecc. Mer.* iii. 1). Paulinus, bishop of Nola, who was much attached to him, esteemed him as a special servant of God. The coarse and abusive language in which in later years Jerome charged Pelagius with gross self-indulgence and deformities produced by an unrestrained sensualism is utterly unworthy of credit, for it is inconsistent with all that is known of him, and must therefore be dismissed as a calumny of unscrupulous opponents in the heat of theological controversy. Pelagius, upon taking up his residence at Rome, was actuated by a strong moral purpose, enforcing the necessity of a strict Christian morality as against a laxity of life which would content itself with external religious observances. It is to this period, before he had gained notoriety by the propagation of his peculiar opinions on the great subjects of grace and free-will, that must be assigned the composition of three works which Pelagius wrote. These were partly of a speculative and partly of a practical tendency. His first published work was a treatise in three books on the Trinity. The second was a collection of passages from Scripture, all bearing on points of Christian practice, called by Gennadius, *Eulogiarum Liber*, by Augustine and Orosius, *Testimoniorum Liber*. It was arranged after the model of St. Cyprian's treatise *Testimonia* (Aug. *Contra duas Pelag. epp.* iv. 21). The third was an exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul. This seems to have been a series of short explanatory notes on the thirteen epistles of St. Paul, and extracts from them are occasionally given in St. Augustine (*De Gestis Pel.* 39). This book has had a curious literary history. It was attributed at one time to Gelasius; for many centuries it passed under the name of Jerome, the bitterest opponent of Pelagius. It has in all probability been largely altered and modified by later editors, in order to purge it from the expression of opinions of a heretical tendency. There can, however, be no doubt that the work which appears in all the printed editions of St. Jerome's works is substantially that of Pelagius, for it coincides with the quotations given by St. Augustine and Mercator as expressly derived from Pelagius.

At Rome Pelagius became acquainted with Caelestius, whose name was so intimately associated with his own in the subsequent controversy. Caelestius had originally been an advocate (*auditorialis Scholasticus*), but was converted by the influence of Pelagius to a stricter form of religious life, and very soon became an ardent disciple of his master, whose views as they became more advanced he openly maintained and enforced by his writings. Setting aside as improbable the injurious imputations with which the hostility of later opponents attempted to blast the character of Pelagius, it is evident that during his long residence at Rome he was animated with a sincere desire to become a moral reformer. He set before him a high standard of righteousness as demanded of sincere Christians, and advocated a severity of life which was unwelcome to the luxurious and corrupt practice of the contemporary church. But the consciousness of the necessity of a pure and self-denying morality as an element in religion, led him to lay exaggerated stress upon the native capacity of the free will of man, to form a wrong estimate of the actual moral condition of human nature, and to overlook or fatally undervalue the necessity of Divine aid in effecting the restoration of man to righteousness. The first symptoms of his antagonism to those theories of St. Augustine which were then developing themselves and obtaining general acceptance in the Western Church are exhibited in an anecdote which we learn from St. Augustine himself (*De Dono Persev.* c. 53). Pelagius was violently indignant on hearing a bishop quote with approbation the famous passage in the Confessions of St. Augustine, where he prays to God, Give what Thou dost command, and command what Thou wilt (*Da quod jubes et jube quod vis*). This language appeared to Pelagius to involve an intolerable disregard of the freedom of human action, and to make man a mere puppet in the hands of his Creator. It was about the same time apparently (A.D. 405), that Pelagius wrote a letter to Paulinus (Aug. *de grat. Christi*, 38), which evidently touched upon the disputed questions of nature and grace. This letter is not extant, but St. Augustine, who had read it, declared that it dwelt almost entirely upon the power and capacity of nature, only in the most cursory manner making reference to divine grace, and leaving it doubtful whether by grace Pelagius meant only the forgiveness of sins, and the teaching and example of Christ, or that influence of the Spirit of God, which corresponds to grace proper, and is an inward inspiration. Pelagius remained at Rome till about the year 409, when in consequence of the threatened invasion of that city by Alaric, he withdrew in company with Caelestius to Sicily, and after a short interval proceeded to Africa. He visited Hippo Regius, from which at the time its great bishop Augustine happened to be absent, and therefore the opportunity of meeting his future opponent in his own city was denied him. Pelagius seems to have remained quiet at Hippo, but shortly afterwards repaired to Carthage, where he saw Augustine once or twice. Augustine was at that time deeply involved in the Donatist controversy, but it was then apparently that he first learned, in casual conversation with some Christians, that Pelagius and his friends had begun to advocate and openly propagate certain views which startled him by their novelty. The obnoxious opinion was broached that infants were not baptized for the remission of sins, but for the sake of obtaining a higher sanctification through union with Christ. This novel doctrine appeared to Augustine to be a denial of the accepted teaching of the Church, as it virtually involved the denial of any guilt of original sin which needed forgiveness, even in the case of infants. As, however, Augustine was pre-

occupied at the time with his vindication of the church against the Donatist errors, and did not ascribe much weight to the personal influence of the chief upholders of the new heresy, he refrained from immediately writing in defence of the doctrine assailed. Pelagius, after a short interval, sailed for Palestine, leaving his friend Caelestius behind him at Carthage. In Palestine he was soon introduced to Jerome, at that time residing in his famous monastery at Bethlehem, surrounded by Eustochium and Paula, and others whom he had persuaded to adopt an ascetic life of seclusion from the world. Caelestius, left behind at Carthage, had continued openly to disseminate his peculiar views, and on proceeding to seek ordination as a presbyter, was accused of heresy before the bishop Aurelius. A council was summoned at Carthage in A.D. 412, at which, however, Augustine was not present, and the accusation was conducted by Paulinus the deacon and biographer of Ambrose of Milan. The charges brought against Caelestius were seven in number. It was alleged that he taught (1) That Adam was created liable to death, and would have died, whether he had sinned or not. (2) That the sin of Adam hurt himself only, and not the human race. (3) That infants at their birth are in the same state as Adam was before the fall (4) That neither by the death nor the fall of Adam does the whole race of man die, nor by the resurrection of Christ the whole race of man rise again. (5) That the Law introduces men into the kingdom of heaven, just in the same way as the Gospel does. (6) That even before the coming of Christ there were some men sinless, *i.e.* men as a matter of fact without sin. (7) That infants, even though they are not baptized, have eternal life.

Caelestius was heard in his own defence, and endeavoured to explain away some of his assertions. He declared that he fully admitted the necessity of baptism for infants, and their need of a share in the divine redemption. But his explanations were judged evasive, and his doctrines were condemned as unscriptural and contrary to the Catholic faith. A sentence of excommunication was passed upon himself and his followers. He proposed at first to appeal from the sentence of the council to the bishop of Rome, but abandoning the intention shortly afterwards sailed from Carthage to Ephesus. The prevalence which the opinions of Caelestius and his party had obtained, and the efforts which were made to diffuse them, led Augustine to denounce them both in private conversation, and in his public sermons. In three or four of his sermons delivered at this time (170, 174, 175), he devotes himself to the refutation of the innovating doctrines, though he still abstains from mentioning by name their chief upholders. His first written treatise on the controversy which was subsequently to engross so much of his literary efforts was called forth in reply to a letter addressed to him by his friend Marcellinus, who was troubled by daily assaults of Pelagian disputations. Marcellinus solicited the judgment of Augustine upon the doctrines that Adam would have died independently of his sin, and that his transgression proved injurious only to himself and did not in any way affect his descendants, and that the baptism of infants was not necessary for the remission of original sin, from which they were wholly exempt, but of actual sin, of which they were potentially capable. The book in which the questions proposed to him by Marcellinus were discussed Augustine calls indifferently a treatise on the Deserts and Remission of Sins or on Infant Baptism, which church rite necessarily formed a prominent subject in the controversy. The work originally consisted of two books. The first book established the positions, that death in man was the penalty of sin, and not a mere condition of his natural constitution; that the whole offspring of Adam was affected by his sin, and that the purpose of baptism of infants is the remission of that original sin, the guilt of which they bear from their birth. Almost the whole of this book seems to have been a reply to a Pelagian treatise of some anonymous writer (*De Pecc. Mer.* i. 64). In the second book Augustine argued that the first man might have lived without sin by the grace of God and his own free will; that as a matter of fact no living man is wholly free from sin, the reason of this being that no man wills all that he ought to do, owing to his ignorance of what is right, or his want of delight in doing it; that the only man absolutely without sin is Christ, the God-man and Mediator. Augustine added by way of appendix as a third book of this treatise a letter which he wrote to Marcellinus when a very few days after the compilation of the former books he became acquainted with some fresh arguments against original sin advanced in the exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul by Pelagius, who, however, put the arguments in the mouth of another, and did not avowedly express them as his own. Throughout the two first books of this treatise Augustine never mentions Pelagius or Caelestius by name, possibly hoping that they might yet be won back to the orthodox faith; in the third book, while arguing strongly against the views of the nature of original sin propounded by Pelagius, he speaks of Pelagius with marked respect. He goes so far as to call him a signally Christian man, a highly advanced Christian (vir ille tam egregie Christianus, *De Pecc. Mer.* iii. 6; non parvo provectu Christianus, *id.* iii. 1).

Marcellinus was somewhat disturbed by the assertion of Augustine that it was abstractedly possible for man to live without sin, though as a matter of fact no man actually exhibited this sinless perfection. To quiet the perplexity of his friend, Augustine immediately wrote a second small treatise in one book, *On the Spirit and the Letter*, so entitled because it diverged into a discussion of the famous passage of St. Paul in 2 Cor. iii. 6. It is a beautiful and profoundly spiritual description of the way in which the letter of the law, whilst it enlightens the soul in the knowledge of duty, is unable to impart the power for its fulfilment, and therefore only evokes the consciousness of sin, whilst the grace of the Spirit kindles in the soul a new life and strengthens the will to holiness of conduct.

Pelagianism still continued to propagate and assert itself, and found many upholders in Carthage. It claimed to support itself by the authority of the Eastern Churches, whose tendency had always been to lay stress on the power of the human will, and boldly retorting the accusation of innovation, it declared that the views of Augustine, and the dominant party in Africa

were a departure from the old orthodoxy. This new move roused the indignation of Augustine. In a sermon preached on June 27, A.D. 413, after reading the Gospel containing the account of the discourse of our Lord with Nicodemus, he proceeded to handle the subject of infant baptism, and addressed himself particularly to the refutation of some new phases of Pelagian opinion. From this sermon we learn that the Pelagians now taught that infants were baptized, not because they needed any remission of the guilt of original or actual sin, from which they were wholly free, but in order that they might enter into the kingdom of God, and thereby obtain salvation and eternal life. The critical passage of St. Paul in Rom. v. 12, which declared that "by one man sin entered into the world," they interpreted as meaning that Adam sinned by an act of free choice, and so caused all his descendants to sin by the imitation of his example. If, they scoffingly asked, men are born sinners from a sinful parent, why are not men born righteous from believing parents who have been justified by baptism? If Adam's sin hurt those who had not sinned, why, by parity of consequence, should not the death of Christ profit those who have not believed on Him? The preacher, towards the close of his sermon, read to the congregation from the epistle of their famous martyred bishop St. Cyprian, written A.D. 255, a passage in which the judgment of the church of his day was emphatically pronounced that baptism was administered to infants for the remission of sin, which they had contracted through their birth, and ended by making an earnest appeal to his opponents not to persevere in the maintenance of opinions which, being hostile to such a fundamental point of church doctrine and practice as infant baptism, must be disowned by the church as heretical. He entreated them, as friends, to see the error into which they were drifting, and not to provoke a formal sentence of condemnation. About the same time he received a letter from Pelagius himself, who was still in Palestine, to which he replied in friendly and affectionate terms. This letter is preserved in Augustine's own treatise *De Gestis Pelagii* (c. 52), where Augustine points out the unfair inferences in his own favour which Pelagius had endeavoured to found on it at the synod of Diospolis.

The condemnation of Pelagianism by the synod of Carthage deterred its more prominent upholders from the continued open assertion of their peculiar doctrines, and induced them to be content with their more quiet and secret circulation in church circles. Adherents increased to such an extent that Augustine professed himself in alarm as to where the evil might break out afresh (*Epist.* 157). The tidings of such a fresh outbreak came to him in the following year (A.D. 414) from Sicily, where one Hilary wrote to him informing him that some Christians at Syracuse were asserting that man can be without sin, and easily keep the commandments of God, if he will; that an unbaptized infant overtaken by death cannot possibly perish deservedly, as he is born without sin. These were evidently forms of Pelagian teaching. Other opinions mentioned by Hilary at the same time as held by these Syracusans exhibit a fresh development of Pelagian thought, if they really originated from the same source. These were that a rich man cannot enter the kingdom of God unless he sell all that he has, and that it cannot avail him to keep the commandments of God, if he does this whilst still retaining his riches and availing himself of their help. Such an assertion of the necessity of the monastic renunciation of private property as a condition of religious life was probably an exaggeration of the real teaching of the monks of the West, Pelagius and Caelestius. Augustine sent an elaborate reply to this letter of Hilary, in which he repeated many of the arguments which he had before employed in his already written treatises. About the same time it came to his knowledge that two young men of good birth and liberal education, Timasius and James, had been induced by the influence and exhortations of Pelagius to renounce the world and adopt the monastic life, and had adopted many of the peculiar opinions of their master. They had however been powerfully impressed with the arguments of Augustine on the nature of Christian grace, and forwarded to him a book of Pelagius, to which they requested Augustine to give a detailed answer. This he did in his treatise *De Naturâ et Gratiâ*. The book of Pelagius, if we may rely upon the fairness of the quotations made from it by Augustine, and there is no reason to distrust them, advocated in the interests of morality the adequacy of human nature for good action. It affirmed that it was possible to live without sin by the grace or help of God. But the grace thus recognised was the natural endowment of free will, itself the gift of God, though sometimes the conception of it was enlarged so as to include the knowledge of right conveyed by the Law. Sin was pronounced to be avoidable if men were to be truly accounted responsible moral agents, and sin being rather a negation than a positive entity could not vitiate human nature. When man has actually sinned he needs forgiveness. Nature was magnified, as if the admission of a subsequent corruption was derogatory to the goodness of the original creation. The instances of all the Old Testament worthies who are described as having lived righteously were appealed to as proofs of the possibility of living without sin. It is obvious that the continuance of controversy was leading Pelagius to a more formal and systematic development of his theory.

The same tendency to systematisation is seen in a document of definitions or arguments attributed to Caelestius, which was communicated to Augustine by two bishops, Eutropius and Paul, as having been circulated in the Sicilian Church. A series of sixteen, or as some condense them, fourteen questions is designed to point out the difficulties of the Augustinian theory, and to establish the contrary theory by one ever-recurring dilemma, that either man can live entirely free from sin, or the freedom of the human will and its consequent moral responsibility must be denied. Augustine replied to this document early in A.D. 415, in his treatise *De Perfectione Justitiae Hominis*, addressed to the two bishops who had called his attention to this dialectical vindication of Pelagianism.

The scene of the controversy now changed from Africa to Palestine, where Pelagius had been resident for some years. In the beginning

of A.D. 415, Paulus Orosius, a presbyter from Tarragona in Spain, came over to Africa in order to consult Augustine as to certain questions connected with Origenism and Priscillianism, which were being stirred in his native land. He had conceived an intense admiration for Augustine, and became one of his most devoted disciples. Augustine describes him as quick in understanding, fluent in speech, and fervent in zeal. After giving him such instruction as he required on the subjects in which he was seeking guidance, he sent him to Jerome, at Bethlehem, ostensibly for the purpose of obtaining further instruction, but in reality to watch the proceedings of Pelagius, and announce to the church in Palestine the steps which had been taken in the African church for the suppression of the rising heresy. Orosius reached Palestine in June, and spent a few weeks with Jerome, who was at this time occupied in writing his Dialogue against the Pelagians. He was invited to a synod at Jerusalem held on July 28, and was asked what he could tell the assembled presbyters as to Pelagius and Caelestius. He gave an account of the formal condemnation of Caelestius by the council of Carthage in A.D. 412, and mentioned that Augustine was writing a treatise in answer to a work of Pelagius, and read a copy of the letter on the controversy addressed by Augustine to Hilary. Thereupon the bishop John desired that Pelagius himself should be sent for, and have an opportunity of personally defending himself from any charges of unsound doctrine which might be alleged against him. Pelagius, on his introduction, was asked by the presbyters whether he had really taught the doctrines against which Augustine protested. He bluntly replied, And who is Augustine to me? This bold and contemptuous rejection of the name and authority of the great bishop whose influence was paramount in the West, owing to his signal services in the Donatist controversy, roused the indignation of the presbyters, but the presiding bishop was not deterred by their clamour. To the amazement of Orosius he admitted Pelagius, layman and alleged heretic as he was, to a seat among the presbyters, and then, asserting his own independence, exclaimed, I am Augustine here. He proceeded to hear what charges might be made against Pelagius himself. Orosius thereupon said that Pelagius, according to his own confession, had taught that man can be without sin, and can easily keep the commandments of God, if he will. Pelagius acknowledged that he could not deny that he had used such language. Orosius claimed that such doctrine should be at once denounced as untenable on the authority of the recent council at Carthage, and of the writings of Augustine and their own venerated neighbour Jerome, who in a letter to Ctesiphon had recently expressed his sentiments on this novel mode of thought. The bishop took no heed of this vehement appeal and attempt to pronounce sentence without giving the accused the opportunity of a full hearing. He himself quoted the scriptural instances of Abraham, who was bidden "to walk before God and be perfect," and of Zacharias and Elizabeth who were described as "walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the law blameless," as affording at all events a *primâ facie* justification for the statements of Pelagius. The difficulty of discussion was increased by the circumstance that several members of the assembly were ignorant of Latin, and the aid of an indifferent interpreter had to be employed. The tables were now turned upon the accuser, for the bishop argued, If Pelagius said that man could fulfil the commands of God without the aid of God, his doctrine would be wicked and worthy of condemnation, but as he maintained that man could be free from sin not without the aid of God, to deny this position would be to deny the efficacy of Divine grace. Orosius proceeded to anathematize the notion of such a denial of grace, and seeing that John was unwilling to admit a charge of heresy against Pelagius, appealed to another tribunal. Declaring the heresy to be of Latin origin, and its dangerous tendency to be most formidable in the Latin churches, where it had chiefly been promulgated, he demanded that the whole question should be referred to pope Innocent, as the chief bishop of Latin Christianity. To avoid further risks this compromise was accepted. The whole account of the proceedings of this synod at Jerusalem is derived from the *Apology* of Orosius, and must be received with some deductions, having regard to the fiery and intemperate invective which the impassioned Spaniard lavishes upon Pelagius and all his followers.

This effort to quell Pelagianism having proved unsuccessful, it was determined by the opposing party to attempt a fresh judicial investigation of the incriminated doctrines before a tribunal of higher authority. If we may believe Pelagius himself, this renewed effort was the result of the influence of Jerome and a small knot of ardent sympathizers who made Bethlehem their headquarters. Towards the end of the same year, A.D. 415, two deposed Western bishops, Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, laid a formal accusation against Pelagius before a synod, which met at Diospolis (the ancient Lydda) under the presidency of Eulogius, bishop of Caesarea and metropolitan. Fourteen bishops attended this synod, Eulogius, John, Ammonianus, Eutonius, two Porphyrys, Fidus, Zomnus, Zoboennus, Nymphidius, Chromatius, Jovinus, Eleutherius, and Clematius. When the time for hearing the accusation came on, the two accusers were absent owing to the illness of one of them, but a document (libellus) was handed in containing the principal charges. The propositions which it was alleged Pelagius had maintained were some of them of an ambiguous character, capable of being explained in either an orthodox or heretical sense, and some of them quotations from writings of Caelestius and other members of the party, for which Pelagius declined to be held personally responsible. It was objected to him that he had said that no one could be without sin, unless he had the knowledge of the law. On being asked whether he had used that language, he acknowledged that he had, but not in the sense which his opponents attached to it; he had intended by it to say that man is helped by the knowledge of the law to keep free from sin. The synod admitted that such teaching was not contrary to the mind of the church. It was charged again that he had affirmed that all men are governed by their own will. Pelagius explained that he had intended by this to assert the responsibility of man's free will, which God aids in its choice of good; the

man who sins is himself in fault as transgressing of his own free will. This too was pronounced to be in agreement with church teaching, for how could anyone condemn the recognition of free will or deny its existence, when the possibility of God's aid to it was acknowledged? It was alleged that Pelagius had declared that in the day of judgment the wicked and sinners would not be spared, but would be burned with everlasting fire, and it was inferred from this that he had intended thereby to imply that all sinners would meet eternal punishment, even those who had substantially belonged to Christ—it was probably implied that such teaching was a denial of the temporary purgatorial fire which was to purify the imperfectly righteous. Pelagius replied by quoting the words of the Saviour Himself, as given in St. Matth. xxv. 46, and declaring that whoever believed otherwise was an Origenist. This satisfied the synod. It was alleged that he wrote that evil did not even enter the thought of the good Christian. He defended himself by saying that what he had actually said was that the Christian ought to study not even to think evil. The synod naturally saw no objection to such language. It was alleged that he had disparaged the grace of the New Testament by saying that the kingdom of heaven is promised even in the Old Testament. It was supposed that by this he had proclaimed a doctrine that salvation could be obtained by the observance of the works of the law. He explained it as a vindication of the divine authority of the Old Testament dispensation, and its prophetic character. It was alleged that he had said that man can, if he will, be without sin, and that in writing a letter of commendation to a widow who had assumed the ascetic life, he used fulsome and adulatory language which glorified her unexampled piety as superlatively meritorious. He explained that though he might have admitted the abstract possibility of sinlessness in man, yet he had never maintained that there had existed any man who had remained sinless from infancy to old age, but that a man on his conversion might continue without sin by his own efforts and the grace of God, though still liable to temptation, and those who held an opposite opinion he begged leave to anathematise not as heretics but as fools. The bishops were satisfied with this acknowledgment that man by the help of God and by grace can be without sin. Other propositions alleged against him, such as those which were condemned by the synod of Carthage in A.D. 412, he declared were not his own, but made by Caelestius and others; yet he was willing freely to disavow them. It is hard to believe that in so doing Pelagius was not pronouncing condemnation on views which he had himself on other occasions maintained. Finally, Pelagius professed his belief in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and in all the teaching of the Holy Catholic Church, and the synod being satisfied of his agreement with sound doctrine, and his rejection of all that was contrary to the faith of the church, acknowledged him as a Catholic and in full communion with the church. It is evident that party feeling ran very high. Jerome was looked upon as having had a chief hand in the prosecution of Pelagius, and apparently by way of vengeance a violent and outrageous assault was made upon his monastery at Bethlehem, which was ascribed to some of the Pelagian party, with what justice it is not easy to ascertain. As Neander remarks, it is not likely that Pelagius should have had any share in the tumultuous proceedings, as in that case there is no doubt evidence of the outrage would have been laid before the Roman bishop Innocent in the subsequent proceedings. Jerome, regarding the issue of the synod of Diospolis as an utter disappointment, and suspecting the orthodoxy of many of its members, spoke of the assembly as a "miserable synod." Augustine in his treatise *De Gestis Pelagii*, written after he had received a full official record of the proceedings of the synod, argued that Pelagius had only escaped by a legal acquittal of little moral worth, inasmuch as it had been obtained by evasive explanations and condemnation of the very dogmas which he had before professed. It is impossible, however, to read such records as remain of the debates at this synod without perceiving that the Eastern church had not embraced in its entirety the doctrine of grace as formulated by Augustine in the West, and that provided free will and grace were recognised as joint factors in the production of human goodness, it was not anxious to define by precise distinctions the exact limits of each agency.

The controversy once more returned to the West. A synod of more than sixty-nine bishops assembled at Carthage towards the close of A.D. 416. Orosius produced before them the accusations which had been presented against Pelagius by Heros and Lazarus. They recognised in them the same heretical opinions which had been previously condemned at Carthage in A.D. 412, and determined to appeal to Innocent, the bishop of Rome, on the great questions at issue. Granting that the synods of Jerusalem and Diospolis might have been justified in the acquittal of Pelagius on the ground of his explanations and evasions and disclaimers of responsibility for some of the positions alleged, they called attention to the continued prevalence of doctrines which affirmed the sufficiency of nature for the avoidance of sin and fulfilment of the commandments of God (thus virtually superseding the need of Divine grace), and which denied the necessity of baptism in the case of infants, as the way of obtaining deliverance from guilt and eternal salvation. A synod held at Mileum in Numidia in the same year, attended by sixty-one bishops, wrote a letter to Innocent to the same effect, and with these two synodical letters was sent also a letter from Augustine and four brother bishops, Aurelius, Alypius, Evodius, and Possidius, in which they sought to minimise the effect of the acquittal of Pelagius in the East at Diospolis by saying that the result had only been obtained by the accused concealing his real sentiments and acknowledging the orthodox faith in ambiguous language, calculated to deceive the Eastern prelates, ignorant as they were of the full force of Latin words, and at the mercy of an interpreter. They demanded that Pelagius should be summoned to Rome and examined afresh, to see whether he acknowledged grace in the full scriptural sense. To enable the Roman bishop to judge dispassionately of the merits of the case they forwarded to him the book of Pelagius, on which

Timasius and James had sought the judgment of Augustine, and the book (*De Naturâ et Gratiâ*) which Augustine had written in answer to this request. They specially marked some passages in the work of Pelagius, from which they thought Innocent must inevitably draw the conclusion that Pelagius allowed no other grace than the nature with which God had originally endowed man. Innocent answered this threefold appeal in three letters written on Jan. 27, 417. He began each with a strong assertion of the supreme authority of his see, and many expressions of his satisfaction that the controversy had been referred to him for final decision. He expressed his doubt whether the record of the proceedings at Diospolis which had reached him was to be trusted as authentic. The book of Pelagius forwarded to him he pronounced unhesitatingly to be blasphemous and dangerous, and gave his judgment that Pelagius, Caelestius, and all abettors of their views ought to be excommunicated.

Innocent died on March 12, 417, and was succeeded by Zosimus, whose name seems to indicate his Eastern origin. Caelestius who on his expulsion from Africa had gone to Ephesus, where he obtained ordination as presbyter, left that city and proceeded to Constantinople, from which, as he began disseminating his peculiar opinions, he was driven by its bishop, Atticus. Without delay he repaired to Rome, to clear himself of the suspicions and charges which were urged against him. He laid before the new pope Zosimus a confession of his faith, which after going minutely into an elaborate exposition of the chief articles of the Catholic Faith proceeded to make reference to the controverted doctrines of grace. Treating them as really lying outside the limits of necessary articles of faith, he submitted himself to the judgment of the apostolic see, if in any way he had gone astray from scriptural truth. He professed his belief that infants ought to be baptized for the remission of sins in accordance with church practice, as the Lord had appointed that the kingdom of heaven could not be bestowed save upon the baptized. But in acknowledging that infants ought to be baptized for the remission of sins, he did not admit that they derived sin by propagation; sin is not born with man, but is his own act of choice. To impute evil to human nature antecedently to any exercise of the will he held to be injurious to the Creator, as making Him the author of evil. Zosimus held a synod in the Basilica of St. Clement. He asked Caelestius whether he condemned all the errors ascribed to him. Caelestius answered that he condemned all that Innocent of blessed memory, the predecessor of his judge, condemned, and was ready to condemn all that the Apostolic see deemed heretical. Zosimus declined to pronounce a definitive sentence; at the same time he deprived and excommunicated the bishops Heros and Lazarus, who had not appeared to substantiate the charges made against the Pelagians, and after an interval of two months, wrote to Aurelius and other African bishops, censuring them for the premature condemnation of Caelestius. He refused to decide upon the merits of the accusation until the accusers of Caelestius appeared face to face with him, whilst he informed the African bishops that he had admonished Caelestius and his followers to abstain from these nice and curious questions, which did not tend to edification. After the despatch of this letter Zosimus received a letter from Praylius, the new bishop of Jerusalem, speaking favourably of Pelagius, and this was accompanied by a letter from Pelagius himself, and a confession of faith, which he had drawn up for presentation to Innocent, but as they reached Rome after Innocent's death, they were delivered to his successor. This letter of Pelagius is lost, and known only by quotations of it made by Augustine. The confession of faith is extant. Like that of Caelestius, it recapitulates the great articles of the Christian faith. In it he declared that he recognised free will in such a way as that man always needs the aid of God, and charged with error both those who say with the Manichaeans that man cannot avoid sin, and those who assert with Jovinian that man cannot sin. He ended with professing his willingness to amend his statements if he had spoken incautiously, and to conform them to the judgment of the prelate "who held the faith and see of Peter." Zosimus had the letter and creed of Pelagius read in public assembly, and pronounced them to be thoroughly Catholic and free from all ambiguity. He even spoke of the Pelagians as men of unimpeachable faith (*absolutae fidei*) who had been wrongly defamed. He wrote a fresh letter to Aurelius and the African bishops, upbraiding them vehemently for their readiness to condemn men without giving them a proper opportunity of self-defence, strongly denouncing the personal character of Heros and Lazarus, as rendering them untrustworthy witnesses, and gratefully acknowledging that Pelagius and his followers had never really been estranged from Catholic truth. It is difficult to see how Zosimus arrived at a conclusion so strikingly different from that of his immediate predecessor. It may have been that the peculiar constitution of his mind did not fit him for the discussion of the deeper questions of theology, and may have led him rather to busy himself with the practical side of ecclesiastical administration. The points at issue had not occupied his attention, and so far as he entered into them, he may have been disposed to take the less rigid views of the Eastern church on original sin, grace, and free-will. It is obvious to conjecture that when he found Caelestius and Pelagius both acknowledge the necessity of grace, he did not trouble himself with any closer examination of what they understood by the term. His language implies that he thought the formal Augustinian theory an attempt to be wise above that which is written, and unprofitable in the interest of Christian morality. Augustine generally passes over in silence this action of Zosimus, speaking of it as an instance of gentle dealing with the accused, and rather implying that Zosimus, with an amiable simplicity, had allowed himself to be deceived by the specious and subtle admissions of the heretics.

The African bishops, though they had applied to Rome, were not willing to accept without remonstrance the judgment pronounced by the bishop in favour of opinions which long study had taught them to regard as inimical to the faith and destructive of all true spiritual life. Meeting together at Carthage, they drew up a

long letter to Zosimus, in which they defended themselves from the charges of hastiness and uncharitableness which he had brought against them, justified the condemnation of Pelagianism pronounced by Innocent, and entreated Zosimus to make a fresh enquiry into the doctrines of Caelestius. The subdeacon Marcellinus was the bearer of this letter. Zosimus replied in a letter, March 21, 418, extolling in extravagant terms the dignity of his own position as the supreme judge of religious appeals, but declaring that he had not taken any further steps, hinting also at the possibility of reconsidering the question. On May 1, 418, a full council of the African church, composed of 214, or as others enumerate them 224, bishops, was held in the basilica of Faustus at Carthage, under the presidency of Aurelius. This council was unwilling to wait for a theological determination of the see of Rome, but asserting its own independence, formulated nine canons in which the principal Pelagian dogmas were anathematised, some of them probably being a republication of canons passed at former minor councils.[a] Anathemas were pronounced on the doctrine that infants derive no original sin from Adam which needs expiation in baptism, and that there is some middle place of happiness in the kingdom of heaven for infants, who depart this life without baptism. In like manner a strong protest was made against the views that the grace of God by which we are justified through Jesus Christ avails only for the forgiveness of past sin, and not for aid against the commission of sin, or that grace is only the revelation of the will of God, and not an inspiring principle of righteousness, or that grace only enables us to do more easily what God commands. The two concluding canons point to a peculiar application of Pelagian doctrine, which was a curious anticipation of the teaching of some modern sectaries. They reject the idea that the petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Forgive us our sins," is inappropriate for Christian men in their own case, and can only be regarded as a prayer for others, and that it can only be used as a fictitious expression of humility, and not as a true confession of guilt.

Appeal was now made to the civil power. Possibly the intervention of Count Valerius, an intimate friend of Augustine, may have been employed in bringing to an end the controversy which was distracting the Western church. The emperors Honorius and Theodosius issued a decree banishing Pelagius and Caelestius from Rome, and pronouncing a sentence of confiscation and banishment upon all their followers. An imperial letter communicating this decree was forwarded to the African bishops. Zosimus, whether in vacillation or in alarm at the strong force of the dominant Catholic opinion which had now enlisted the state in its support, proceeded to investigate the subject afresh, and summoned Caelestius before him for fuller examination. Caelestius, seeing the inevitable result, withdrew from Rome. Zosimus thereupon issued a circular letter (epistola tractoria) confirming the decisions of the North African church.[b] He censured as contrary to the Catholic faith the tenets of Pelagius and Caelestius, particularly selecting for reprobation certain passages from Pelagius's Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, which since his former consideration of the case had been laid before him, and ordered all bishops in the churches acknowledging his authority to subscribe to the terms of his letter on pain of deprivation. This subscription was enforced through North Africa under the protection of the imperial edict by Aurelius, the bishop and president of the council at Carthage, and in Italy under the authority of the prefect. Eighteen bishops in Italy refused to subscribe, and were immediately deprived of their sees. The ablest and most celebrated of these was Julian, bishop of Eclanum in Apulia, who entered into controversy with Augustine with much learning and critical power, and a temper which his opponents might well have emulated. He complained, not without some degree of justice, that the anti-Pelagian party were attempting to suppress their opponents by the strong hand of imperial authority rather than to convince them by an appeal to reason. He charged the Roman bishop and clergy with a complete departure from their former convictions, and complaining that subscription to the letter of Zosimus was being enforced on individual bishops in isolation and not at a deliberate synod, demanded a further consideration of the points at issue in a fresh council, refusing to acknowledge the dogmatic authority of the North African church. A letter which was commonly supposed to be written by him was circulated in Rome, the professed object of which was to shew the mischievous consequences of the dominant anti-Pelagian doctrine, and another letter, written in the name of the eighteen deprived bishops of Italy to Rufus, bishop of Thessalonica, and remonstrating against their condemnation, was probably drawn up by Julian. The two letters came into the hands of Boniface, who at the end of the year succeeded Zosimus as bishop of Rome, and were communicated by him through Alypius to Augustine, who replied to them in his treatise *Contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum*, addressed to Boniface. He subsequently pursued the argument against Julian at much greater length, first in a treatise *contra Julianum* in six books, written in A.D. 421, and then in the closing years of his life in a work left unfinished, of which six books only were completed before his death. Julian throughout his writings sought to cast a prejudice upon the Augustinian form of Catholic doctrine by raising forcible objections to the more unguarded assertions by which it laid itself open to attack by its very exaggerations. He boldly challenged it as a revived form of Manichaeism, not without an implied hint that the early education of Augustine in that heretical form of belief might still be moulding his doctrine. It was objected that the Augustinian system denied the goodness of the original creation of God—represented marriage, although a divine institution, as necessarily evil and sinful —disparaged the righteousness of the Old Testament saints—denied free will and its

[a] These canons were ascribed by Baronius and others to the synod of Mileum, but the oldest copy preserved at Ghent, and Photius and pope Caelestine all agree in ascribing them to this council of Carthage, held in 418.

[b] A fragment of this circular letter is preserved in Augustine, *Epist.* 190.

consequent moral responsibility—and nullified belief in the forgiveness of all sins at baptism. Augustine showed that these were unfair deductions from his statements of doctrine, maintaining that the original goodness of man's nature is not incompatible with the recognition of its corruption after Adam's fall, that the Old Testament described the holy lives of the saints without asserting their sinlessness and freedom from temptation; that free will was so vitiated by the fall that it was powerless for righteousness, without the prevenient and co-operating grace of God, and that even after the forgiveness conveyed in baptism there remained the sinful element or concupiscence. In meeting another objection of Julian, that the anti-Pelagians brought these high points of theological doctrine before the uneducated masses, who were incompetent judges, instead of arguing them before men of rational culture, Augustine could confidently and successfully appeal to the popular consciousness of Christendom, as bearing witness to man's moral impotence and his need of redemption. The experience of the human heart was, after all, a better judge of such spiritual facts than the most subtle arguments of reason and conflicting interpretations of the meaning of the New Testament.

The tendency of Pelagianism to underrate the necessity of the divine redemption, and to disparage the dignity of the Person of the Redeemer by denying his sinless humanity, is manifested in the case of Leporius. He was a monk and presbyter of Southern Gaul who had embraced Pelagian views, but coming into Africa had been reclaimed from them by Augustine. In making his recantation he acknowledges that he had taught that Jesus Christ as a mere man was liable to sin and temptation, but by his own efforts and exertions without divine aid had attained to perfect holiness. Jesus had not come into the world to redeem mankind from sin, but to set them an example of holy living (Cassian, *de Incarn.* i. 234; Gennadius, *de Script. Eccles.* 59). Leporius's peculiar anthropology had thus coloured his theological conception of the God-Man. Annianus, a deacon of Celada, wrote at the same time in defence of Pelagian views, and at the suggestion of Orontius, one of the deposed bishops, translated the homilies of John Chrysostom on St. Matthew in the interest of a high morality as he alleged. He claimed Chrysostom as a powerful upholder of evangelical perfection, a firm asserter of the integrity of human nature against any Manichean notions of its essentially evil character, and of the free will which it was the glory of Christianity to recognise in opposition to any Pagan ideas of fate and necessity. For this reason he recommended for purposes of edification the writings of Chrysostom as giving co-ordinate prominence to grace and free will.

That Pelagianism was not wholly extinguished even in Italy by the forcible measures adopted against it both by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities is proved by a letter of pope Leo, written about A.D. 444, in which he desired the bishop of Aquileia not to receive into communion any in his province suspected of the heresy before they subscribed a formal renunciation of its errors. The letters of pope Gelasius also refer to occasional outbreaks of the heresy in Dalmatia and elsewhere towards the end of the 5th century.

Pelagianism came under the formal condemnation of the Eastern church in an incidental way. Several of the deposed Pelagian bishops repaired to Constantinople, where they found Caelestius. Atticus, the patriarch, had refused to receive them, but his successor Nestorius gave them a patient hearing. He wrote to Caelestius, the bishop of Rome, for information about the reasons of their condemnation and the nature of their peculiar doctrines, but received no answer. When Nestorius himself fell into disgrace owing to the assertion of his distinctive heresy touching the person of Christ, he was rather disposed to sympathise with Caelestius and his followers as the objects of persecution by a dominant party. It does not appear that the East had entered into any special discussion of the points raised by the Pelagian controversy; its leading rulers and writers were rather disposed to recognise generally the co-operation of grace and free will, without narrowly determining their limits. But the general council which met at Ephesus in A.D. 431, under the influence of Cyril, joined in the same condemnation the tenets of Nestorius and Caelestius, though it refrained from any specification of them. It pronounced sentence of deposition upon any metropolitan or any cleric who had held or should hereafter hold the views of Nestorius or Caelestius.

The personal history of Pelagius after the condemnation of his views by Zosimus is lost in obscurity. He is said to have died in some small town in Palestine, being upwards of seventy years of age. Caelestius in the same way disappears from history after the council of Ephesus; the time and place of his death are unknown. Julian is said to have died about A.D. 454 in an obscure town of Sicily, where he maintained himself by teaching a school. There is a story that in a time of famine he relieved the poor by parting with all that he had. There is a tradition that in the 9th century the inscription was still visible on his tomb, Here rests in peace Julian, a Catholic bishop.

A modified form of Pelagianism arose in the closing years of Augustine's life, to which later scholastic writers gave the name of semi-Pelagianism. The advocates of the system were spoken of at the time of its introduction as Massilienses, on account of their connexion with the church of Marseilles. Its originator was John Cassian, commonly called a Scythian, though he was probably a native of Gaul. He had been brought up in a monastery at Bethlehem, and after living some time with the monks of Egypt, went to Marseilles, where he founded two monasteries, one for men and one for women. He differed widely in opinion from Pelagius, for he acknowledged that the whole human race was involved in the sin of Adam, and could not be delivered but by the righteousness of the second Adam; that the wills of men are prevented by the grace of God, and that no man is sufficient of himself to begin or to complete any good work. But though he admitted that the first call to salvation sometimes comes to the unwilling, and is the direct result of preventing grace, yet he held that ordinarily grace depends on the working of man's own will. He constantly appeals to the cases of

Zacchaeus and the penitent thief as instances of men who received a call because they were first willing. He protested against ascribing nothing but what is evil and perverse to human nature. He rejected the idea of an absolute predestination, acknowledging, however, a predestination upon foreseen merits and perseverance. Grace is to work with man's own efforts; it is capable of being lost, and is to be retained not by a special gift of perseverance, but by man's own free will. The circulation and acceptance of these views were reported to Augustine by two lay friends, Prosper and Hilary, and by way of meeting them he composed two treatises, one on the Predestination of the Saints, the other on the gift of Perseverance. These treatises defended the doctrines of an arbitrary election and of a will determined wholly by grace, and failed to satisfy the objections felt by the church of Marseilles. The controversy was vigorously maintained on the Augustinian side by Prosper in the celebrated poem *De Ingratis*, full of much bitterness, and advocating the doctrine of irresistible grace. Augustine died in A.D. 430, but the Gallic theologians still felt the deepest objections to the predestinarian views which he had so distinctly enunciated, regarding them as in essence fatalistic and injurious to efforts after moral progress. The monastery at Lerins was one of the principal centres of opposition to ultra-Augustinian views. One of its members, Vincent, the author of the Commonitorium, was very probably the Vincent who drew up a series of sixteen objections to the current teaching, to which Hilary replied. God, he declared, did not predestine the wicked to sin, but to punishment; men are condemned for their own misdoings, and are reprobated because God foresaw that they would abuse their free will. Faustus, abbat of Lerins, and afterwards bishop of Riez, in Provence, in A.D. 475 prosecuted one of his presbyters, Lucidus, before a synod at Arles for advocating extreme predestinarian views, and at the request of the synod wrote a book maintaining vigorously the necessity of both grace and man's free will for the fulfilment of God's will. He charged the opposite doctrine with misleading worldly-minded Christians into Antinomianism. A body of Scythian monks at Constantinople in A.D. 520 were greatly disturbed by the opinions expressed by Faustus, and appealed to Hormisdas, bishop of Rome, for a formal condemnation of them, and subsequently to the African bishops who had been exiled into Sardinia after the irruption of the Vandals. One of these, Fulgentius, on his restoration, wrote in defence of the Augustinian system, endeavouring to clear it from misrepresentations as to its practical tendency. The controversy continued in Gaul and Western Europe generally It was brought to a conclusion in the time of Caesarius, bishop of Arles. That eminent and devout prelate was an ardent admirer of Augustine, and by some of his sermons had given offence to the sympathisers with semi-Pelagian opinions. A council was held at Valence in the province of Vienne, to which Caesarius, who was unable to attend, sent representatives, explaining his views on predestination. The acts of that council are not extant, but very shortly after Caesarius held a council in his own province of Arles, at Arausio (Orange), in July, A.D. 529, taking occasion of a large gathering there at the dedication of a new church by Liberius the Patrician, praetorian prefect. Caesarius brought before the council certain doctrinal articles received from the pope Felix IV., which were for the most part extracts from Augustine's writings or sentences of Prosper. These the council adopted and formulated, as the expression of Catholic truth on the doctrines of grace. It is impossible not to admire the gentle and Christian tone in which they were set forth, contrasting most favourably with the violent language of the earlier decisions which had ended in fulminating sentences of excommunication and banishment. The preface to the canons, which is probably due to Cæsarius, beginning with a simple statement that tidings had reached the council that there were some who held incautious views touching grace and free will not in accordance with the rule of Catholic faith, proceeds to say that it had been thought well to set forth a few heads of doctrine gathered from Holy Scripture and the ancient fathers, and transmitted by the Apostolic See, to instruct those who think otherwise than they ought, and it entreats every one who had before not held right views on these points not to delay to conform his thoughts to this exposition of Catholic truth. The canons are twenty-five in number. The first two, in opposition to Pelagian doctrine, declare that by the sin of Adam not only his body, but his soul, was affected for the worse, and that his sin injured not only himself, but all his descendants. The next six expound the functions of grace, affirming that grace is given to man to make him in the first instance call upon God for grace, that God does not wait for man's will, but prepares it for deliverance from sin, that the initial act of faith is not from man, but from God's grace, that grace makes men believe and will aright, that we cannot without grace either think or choose any good thing pertaining to salvation. The eighth, in opposition to Cassian, rejects the idea that some are brought to the grace of baptism by their own free will, to hold this would be a virtual denial of the universal weakening of the human will by the Fall. The fourteenth asserts that no one is delivered from misery but by the prevenient mercy of God. The eighteenth that reward is due to good works when they are done, but grace, which is unmerited, must precede to enable them to be done. The twenty-second that if man has any truth and righteousness within him, it is from the fountain of all good. It is remarkable that not one of the canons touches on the disputed question of predestination. The prelates appended to the canons an address in which, after saying that they content themselves with having vindicated the indispensable necessity of grace for all good action, they affirm their belief that *all* the baptized, by the aid and co-operation of Christ, can attain salvation, a position which the rigid Augustinian theory would hardly allow. They protest that they do not believe that any are predestined to evil, but if there are any who hold that opinion, which they doubt, they repudiate it with indignation. They assert that without any preceding merits God inspires men with faith and love, and leads them to baptism, and after baptism helps them by the same grace to fulfil his will.

The faith of the penitent thief and of Zacchaeus they declare to have been a gift of God's bounteous grace, and not an act of unaided nature. Pope Boniface II., who had succeeded Felix, confirmed the decrees of this Gallican council in a letter written to Caesarius. The moderation and good sense of the fathers of Orange, and their earnest desire to avoid the extravagance either of extreme predestinarianism, which would annihilate the human will, or an arrogant self-trust, which would claim to be independent of divine grace, had their reward. Their decrees met with general acquiescence, and both Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism ceased to be dominant forces in Western Christendom.

Semi-Pelagianism was substantially a revival in the West of the early Eastern anthropology, guided by a clearer insight into the moral problems involved, which was a result of the experience of the Pelagian controversy. It held man in his original state to have had certain physical, intellectual, and moral advantages which he no longer enjoys. In the beginning his body was not subject to death, he had extraordinary knowledge of external nature and apprehension of the moral law, and was sinless. The sin of the first man brought into the world physical death for man's body, and a moral corruption which was propagated to his posterity. Freedom of will to do good was not lost, but greatly impaired. Man in his present condition is morally diseased. The imputation of original sin is removed in baptism, and baptism is essential to salvation. Man needs the aid of divine grace for the performance of good works and the attainment of salvation. The free will of man works in co-operation with divine grace. The two influences are not to be severed. There is no such thing as an unconditional decree of God, but predestination to salvation or damnation depends upon the use which man makes of his freedom to good. Election is therefore conditional. The merit of man's salvation is, however, to be ascribed to God, because, without God's grace, man's efforts would be unavailing. Wiggers has forcibly observed that Augustinianism represented man as morally dead, semi-Pelagianism as morally sick, Pelagianism as morally sound.

The full theory of Augustinianism in all its strong asseverations of an unconditional election and a total corruption of human nature did not retain its hold on the theology of the Western church during the succeeding centuries, nor was it ever acknowledged in the Eastern church. Practical questions of organisation of ecclesiastical authority usurped undue importance, and diminished the attention bestowed on the deep points of theological doctrine. It is true that men like popes Leo I. and Gregory I., in the 5th and 6th centuries, and Bede in the 8th were Augustinian, but the general tendency of the West turned in another direction, while it sternly rejected Pelagianism proper.

The famous history of the monk Gottschalk, in the latter part of the 9th century, proves how distasteful the assertion of an unqualified predestinarianism had become, but as this lies beyond the assigned limits of this Dictionary it must not receive more than a passing reference.

Pelagianism never developed itself into a schism by proceeding to set up an organisation external to the Catholic church. It practised no distinctive rites, it accepted all the traditional ecclesiastical discipline. It freely retained for instance the practice of infant baptism, though it formed a different opinion on the moral and spiritual significance of the act. It was a mode of thought which strove to win for itself acceptance within the pale of the church, but was successfully cast out.

The impartial student of history, on his first survey of the controversy, is disposed to feel a certain amount of sympathy with the cause of Pelagianism. He feels indignant at the intolerance which appealed to the strong arm of the civil power to crush, by the physical forces of exile and confiscation, a theological doctrine, and too frequently refused a fair hearing of the accused in their own defence. And it is not unnatural that religious men of a strongly practical turn of mind should, in their admiration of the eager desire to foster a high standard of moral progress, and of the impatience of indolent self-excuses which apparently led Pelagius first to enunciate his views, look upon him as a misunderstood reformer. Thus John Wesley in one of his sermons expresses his belief, that the real heresy of Pelagius was neither more nor less than the holding that Christians may by the grace of God "go on to perfection," or in other words fulfil the law of Christ (*Works*, vi. 328, ed. 1829). But when we come to estimate Pelagianism as an entire system we perceive, that its triumph would have been in effect the revival of the old pagan mode of thought, and would have evacuated Christianity of all its spiritual and supernatural elements. It was unsound, both as a philosophy of human nature and as an interpretation of the teaching of Scripture. It represented death and disease as part of the original constitution of human nature, and in no way connected with any antecedent moral depravation, and regarded each human being as coming into the world furnished with moral faculties unfettered and unbiassed towards good or evil, the will being perfectly free to choose between good and evil. God had given to man the light of the Law, and subsequently the light of the Gospel that he might have the advantage of a revelation of moral truth, but obedience or disobedience to the law of righteousness was entirely the act of man's own free will. Goodness was a meritorious exercise of his capacities, wickedness was his own fatal choice, and justly rendered him liable to punishment. Each man began life free and innocent, and undetermined to good or evil; there was no original corruption of nature, no congenital moral weakness, no internal struggle of a higher and lower nature, no spiritual disease which needed a remedy. But to claim this dignity and perfection for human nature was to contradict the plainest verdict of human consciousness, which bears testimony to a frailty and corruption, and the perpetual acknowledgment of poets and moralists of the pagan world, who with one consent lament the moral impotence or imperfection of the will. Whatever was the account to be given of the origin of this connate tendency to sin, and of this internal struggle between reason and appetite, the fact of its universal existence was undeniable. The ideal free will might be one which was equally capable of doing anything

which was physically possible, the actual free will of which men find themselves in possession is weak and biassed to evil. As Prof. Mozley has said, "The Pelagian did not possess himself properly of the facts of human nature, and committing the same fault in morals that the mediaeval philosophers did in science, he argued upon an abstract idea, instead of examining what the faculty, as we experienced it, really is; and an absolute free will, which was a simple conception of the mind, displaced the incomprehensible actual will, the enigma of human nature, the mystery of fact."

Nor can the denial of original or birth sin be reconciled with the teaching of Scripture, except upon most forced methods of interpretation. It is true that in his uniform exposition of the important text, Romans v. 12, Augustine was led astray by the erroneous Latin version of ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον *in quo omnes peccaverunt*, and the Pelagians were more correct in rendering this *quia* or *propter quod* peccaverunt, but this very passage itself refuted the theory of the actual sinlessness of many men maintained by Pelagius; and the whole tenour of the argument of St. Paul, throughout the context of the chapter treating on the need of redemption, was to assert a transmitted moral corruption and its accompaniment of a physical penalty, death. The repeated assertions in Scripture of the universality of the redemptive act of Christ presupposed the universality of the sinful nature which the redemption was designed to restore. It was idle for Pelagius to claim Abel, Enoch, Melchizedek and others as instances of sinlessness, simply because Scripture regarded only their righteousness, and was silent as to any faults in their lives. Incidental notices of events in their careers could not be pressed as if they were exhaustive biographies. And in the case of virtuous heathen such as Fabricius, Cato, Scipio, and others to whom reference was often made in the controversy, it was not necessary with Augustine to deny the reality of heathen goodness, and to designate their virtues as only "splendid vices." It would have been wiser not to narrow the conception of divine grace, and to admit that the goodness in the heathen world was due to some measure of divine inspiration; at the same time, it was an exaggeration of an imagination uncontrolled by sober fact to attribute a sinless perfection to the heroes of paganism.

In ascertaining the precise views of Pelagius and his followers, it is necessary to be cautious, because we depend for our information principally upon the testimony of their opponents. We have, however, some few original writings of Pelagius, the Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, the letter to Demetrias, and the confession of faith forwarded to Pope Innocent. Augustine also, in his own controversial treatises, often cites verbatim whole passages from Pelagius and his follower Julian, before proceeding to their refutation.

We may arrange the chief points of distinctively Pelagian doctrine under certain heads.

1. *Original Sin.*—It is plain that the Pelagians denied altogether the existence of original sin in any such sense as an hereditary moral corruption. They refused to acknowledge a sin propagated by generation (*peccatum ex traduce*). Sin, they said, is not born with man, but is committed afterwards by man. It is not a fault of nature, but of free will. Julian expressly declared that God had made men without any fault at all, full of natural innocence, and capable of voluntary virtues. Pelagius, differing strongly from Augustine, denied the theory of traducianism or transmission of a soul by physical generation. He held each individual soul to be a direct creation of God at the birth of the body, and therefore pure and untainted. The infant before any exercise of his will has not corrupted the goodness of his simplicity. Moral corruption can only be produced by a long-continued habit of sinful acts. But this will be exhibited only in adults, and is brought on only by their own fault. Each man morally is at his birth in the same state of innocence as Adam was when first created. Sin can only be an imitation of Adam's transgression, not a congenital depravity of nature. Still less, in the view of the Pelagians, did original sin involve an imputation of the guilt of Adam to all his descendants. The Augustinian doctrine regarding Adam as the representative of the human race, the one head and centre in whom all men had unity and solidarity, accounted Adam's sin as entailing a double consequence to all his posterity, moral corruption and imputation of primeval sin (*vitium et reatus*). Pelagianism, on the contrary, declared that it was contrary to all principles of equity and moral rectitude that God should impute to a man the sin of another. Death it considered to be a natural necessity, and not a penalty of sin either in Adam or his descendants. Later forms of orthodox theology have so far accepted the Pelagian doctrine as to reject the theory of the imputation of Adam's sin to all his descendants, whilst fully admitting moral corruption as the hereditary taint of human nature.

2. *Infant Baptism.*—The Pelagians never called in question the validity and necessity of the baptism of infants, but they interpreted its significance in accordance with their view of the moral condition of the recipients. They could not regard baptism as administered for the remission of original sin in infants, seeing that on their theory infants had no original sin which needed remission. Making a distinction between salvation or eternal life and the kingdom of heaven, they declared the latter to be the distinctive salvation of Christians, and taught that baptism was the necessary introduction into this kingdom of heaven. Unbaptized infants, they held, might be partakers of salvation, for, as they had no guilt of birth sin, and were incapable of actual sin, it was impossible that they could be consigned to eternal damnation. Baptized infants received the sacred rite not for the forgiveness of their sins, but that they might attain spiritual sonship, and become partakers of the kingdom of heaven. The Pelagians thus agreed with the general mind of the Church in interpreting the saying of our Lord to Nicodemus (John iii. 5) as implying the absolute necessity of baptism for all, but sought to evade the repulsive dogma of the eternal damnation of the unbaptized by introducing the untenable distinction between the lower salvation and the higher entrance into the kingdom of heaven. Afterwards the Pela-

gians more explicitly admitted that baptism, even in the case of infants, had for its object remission of sins, but not of original sin, nor of sins actually committed, but of sins which might hereafter be committed by the baptized infants. Baptism was designed, in the case of infants, not to make the guilty righteous in the sight of God, but to make the good better. It was accompanied not by justification, but by sanctification. It was the instrument of regeneration and renovation, of spiritual adoption and participation of all the benefits which Christianity imparted. The contrast between the Pelagian and Augustinian doctrine, on the purpose of baptism, cannot be more strongly exhibited than in a passage of Julian (Aug. *Opus Imp.* v. 9): "We do not baptize for the purpose of freeing from the claim of the devil, but that those who are the work of God may become His children, as pledges of His love, that those who have come forth from God's tuition may be still further advanced by His mysteries, and that those who bear the work of nature may attain to the gifts of grace, and that their Lord, who has made them good by creation, may make them better by renovation and adoption."

3. *The effect of the sin of Adam.*—The earlier form of Pelagian doctrine on this head was that the sin of Adam did not in any way injuriously affect his descendants: it entailed no moral or physical evil. Each man at his birth started with the same capacity for goodness as his first ancestor. But pressed hard by their adversaries and the clear language of the New Testament on this point, the Pelagians subsequently admitted that Adam injured his descendants by the example of evil which he set, by imitation of which they became sinners. They could also allow that men are not now born exactly in the same state as Adam before his transgression, because Adam, as an adult, was endowed with reason and freedom, whilst his posterity are born without the use of reason, and the consequent immediate exercise of will. The death to which Adam became subject in consequence of his disobedience they understood as spiritual, not physical. He might perhaps have attained to immortality, had he remained obedient to the law under which he was placed.

4. *Free will in man.*—Consistently with his denial of any such moral corruption of nature as the theory of original sin implied, Pelagius asserted the full and unimpaired freedom of the will. He maintained that all men are governed by their own will. Man brings into the world with him the capacity of good and evil. We are created without virtue, and so also without vice. In his letter to Demetrias, Pelagius unhesitatingly disclaims any idea of moral inability or weakness in the attainment of goodness. "We contradict the Lord when we say, It is hard: it is difficult: we cannot: we are men: we are encompassed with mortal flesh. O unholy audacity. We charge God with a twofold ignorance, that He does not seem to know what He has made, nor what He has commanded: just as if, forgetting the human weakness of which He Himself is the author, He had imposed laws on man which He cannot endure." Elsewhere (*De lib. Arbitrio*, as quoted by Augustine, *De Gratia Christi*, c. 4) he distinguishes three things, to be able, to will, and to be, *posse*, *velle*, *esse*. To be able we place in nature: to will, in free will, to be, *i.e.* to do, in the effect. The first refers peculiarly to God who has bestowed this on His creature, the other two must be referred to men, because they flow from the fountain of free will. That we *can* do, say, or think any good thing is of Him who gave us the ability and aids it, but that we actually do, or speak, or think aright is of ourselves, because we can also turn all these to evil. It is obvious how entirely antagonistic this line of thought was to the Augustinian doctrine, which held one consequence of the fall of man to have been the loss of any real free will, and attributed to all men in their natural state an absolute incapacity for goodness.

5. *Grace.*—It is difficult to fix precisely the character of the Pelagian doctrine on the relation between free will and grace, on account of the ambiguity which is discernible in the Pelagian employment of the term grace. Augustine perpetually charges Pelagianism with limiting the notion of grace to some external benefit of creation or law or revelation, and denying its true sense as an inward operation of the Holy Spirit upon the heart of man. It is true that many of the passages cited from Pelagius put forward prominently this wider notion of grace. In the famous passage, already referred to, in which Pelagius distinguished the three stages of human action as power, will, and act, he ascribed power to nature, but immediately explains that this is a divine gift, as being bestowed by the Creator of man. Free will and all the faculties and affections of human nature are in this sense grace, being gifts of God. In other passages grace seems primarily to mean the law and the revelation of God. The knowledge of the law is necessary to righteousness, for God gives men precepts teaching them how they ought to live, and thus removes their moral ignorance, so that men may know what to do and what to avoid. This kind of grace is necessary to the attainment of perfect goodness. At other times the example of Christ in His holy life is spoken of as a gift of higher grace vouchsafed under the Gospel, rendering it superior to the earlier Mosaic Law. From another point of view the forgiveness of sins of those who have actually transgressed is called grace, and the word is also extended to baptism, which is the appointed symbol and channel of this forgiveness. The canons of the council of Carthage agree with the treatise of Augustine in understanding such wide employment of the term grace to imply a denial of the need of grace to assist man from falling into sin again when once forgiven, and of grace as an imparted disposition to love and a faculty to practise God's commands. But it may be fairly doubted whether the Pelagians intended wholly to deny grace in its stricter sense as an internal agency. Pelagius anathematized all who said that the grace of God was not necessary not only every hour and every moment, but also in each single action. Julian described the operations of grace as sanctifying, restraining, inciting, illuminating the human soul. This language implies more than creative grace, it speaks of a grace assisting the created nature, and this by influences addressed not only to the intellectual faculties by instruction and illumination, but to the will and affections by

incitement and restraint. So profound a student of the controversy as Professor Mozley has not hesitated to express his judgment that the charge against Pelagius that he meant by grace only the natural will and endowments of man considered as Divine gifts, or the outward means of instruction and edification provided for man in the Bible and the church is not altogether justified by the language of the Pelagians themselves. The error of the Pelagians was that attributing to man in his present state an absolute freedom of will, unmoved by any bias to evil, they denied the necessity of prevenient grace from God to set the will in action. They argued as if a wholly independent act of the will could accept or use proffered grace. The Augustinian theory made the action of grace entirely independent of the will, it was an irresistible power which forced the will. The Pelagian made it depend on antecedent acts of the will, an *adjutorium quo*, and not an *adjutorium sine quo non*. It thus denied grace in the sense of internal spiritual influence as the initial step in the work of conversion to righteousness. Its whole tendency was to disparage the office of grace, to view it as facilitating rather than as inspiring right operations of the will and the affections, to claim for man the merit of his own progress in righteousness, and by thus engendering a proud consciousness of self-acquired virtue to extinguish humility. Such a system, besides being untrue to the facts of human nature, is proved by all experience to be adverse to the formation of devout and energetic piety.

6. *Predestination.*—Pelagius and his followers did not discuss with much frequency or earnestness the question of Predestination. The full development of the Augustinian doctrine on this head, as exhibited in the treatises, *De Dono Perseverantiae* and *De Praedestinatione Sanctorum*, belonged to a period when Pelagius himself had vanished from the scene. It is clear, however, from passages in Pelagius's Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles that he was opposed to any view of an absolute predestination to salvation or damnation, recognising only a predestination founded upon foreknowledge. God, he believed, destined for salvation those who, as He knew, would believe in Him and obey His commandments, and for damnation in like manner those who would continue in sin. Thus he explains Romans ix. 15, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy," to mean, I will have mercy on him whom I have foreknown to be able to merit mercy, and on another verse of the same chapter he comments in very explicit language, "God's foreknowledge does not prejudge sinners should they be willing to be converted. The prophecy, 'Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated,' is not concerning those who are Jacob and Esau according to the flesh, but concerning those who were to be good or evil by works, and by the works themselves to have the hatred of God or to obtain His mercy."

Authorities.—Pelagius, *Epistola ad Demetriadem Virginem*, *Libellus Fidei ad Innocentium* [usually printed among Jerome's works]; St. Augustine, the anti-Pelagian treatises as contained in vol. x. of the Benedictine edition of his works, and his Epistles, *id.* vol. ii. (Classis 3); a convenient reprint of the anti-Pelagian treatises has been edited, with introduction by W. Bright, D.D., Oxford University Press, 1880; Julian, *Libellus Fidei*, ed. J. Garnier, Paris, 1673; Jerome, *Preface to Jeremiah*, *Epistola ad Ctesiphontem*, *Epistola ad Ctesiphontem;* Prosper, *De Ingratis*, *Contra Collatorem*, *Epistola ad Rufinum* (Benedictine ed. Paris, 1711); Marius Mercator, *Commonitorium adversus haereses Pelag. et Cael.*, ed. Garnier, Paris, 1673 (appended are seven elaborate dissertations on points connected with the history of Pelagianism, full of research, though one-sided); Paulus Orosius, *Liber Apologeticus*, ed. Zangemeister, Vienna, 1882; Vossius, G. J. *Historia Pelagiana*, Leyden, 1618; Noris, Henr. de, *Historia Pelagiana*, Padua, 1673; Wiggers, G. F. *Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus*, in two parts, 1821, 1833; the first part was translated by R. Emerson, Andover, U.S. 1840 (a most exhaustive work, with copious references to original authorities); Neander, *Church History*, vol. iv.; Guizot, *History of Civilisation in France*, lecture v.; Jacobi, J. L., *Die Lehre des Pelagius*, Leipzig, 1842; Mozley, J. B., *Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination*, c. iii., London (Murray), 1878; Wörter, *Der Pelagianismus*, Freiburg, 1874; Klasen, F. *Die innere Entwickelung des Pelagianismus*, Freiburg, 1882. [W. I.]

PELAGIUS (3), a presbyter to whom Chrysostom wrote a letter from Cucusus expressive of respectful regard. (Chrys. *Ep.* 215.) [E. V.]

PELAGIUS (4), a monk, celebrated for the severity of his ascetical discipline, whose defection Chrysostom laments in a letter to Olympias. (Chrys. *Ep.* 4.) [E. V.]

PELAGIUS (5), of Tarentum, mentioned by St. Augustine as not to be confounded with the heresiarch of the same name. (Aug. *Ep.* 186.) [H. W. P.]

PELAGIUS (6), bishop of Tarsus and metropolitan in the middle of the fifth century (Labbe, iv. 927). [E. V.]

PELAGIUS (7), deacon of the Roman church, who wrote to Fulgentius Ferrandus, whose epistle in 546 (*Ep.* 6, *Pat. Lat.* lxvii. 921) is in reply to an enquiry from him and the deacon Anatolius. [J. G.]

PELAGIUS (8) I., bishop of Rome after Vigilius, in the reign of Justinian I., A.D. 555 to A.D. 560.[a] A native, and deacon, of Rome, he had been appointed by pope Agapetus, when about to leave Constantinople (A.D. 536) as his apocrisiarius there. [See AGAPETUS.] After the death of Agapetus he seems to have been got hold of by the empress Theodora, and used as an instrument of her machinations for intruding Vigilius into the Roman see. For he was the emissary whom she sent to prevent, if possible, the return of Silverius, who after his election and ordination as successor to Agapetus, had been deposed and banished by Belisarius under her orders.

[a] If the inscription on his monument in the Vatican, as quoted by Baronius from Manlius, is to be trusted, he held the see for four years, ten months, and eighteen days, and was buried on the 4th of March. Accordingly his ordination would be in April, A.D. 555, and his death at the beginning of March, A.D. 560.

Under Vigilius he again appears as apocrisiarius of the Roman see at Constantinople; and he it was who, having been sent on some mission into Palestine, joined with the patriarch Mennas on his return in moving Justinian to issue his edict for the condemnation of Origenism. After this he returned to Rome, where he appears as one of the two deacons of Vigilius who applied to Ferrandus of Carthage for advice after the issue of the imperial edict "De tribus Capitulis" (c. A.D. 544). For notices of his action so far, see *Art.* on VIGILIUS. When Vigilius had been summoned by the emperor to Constantinople in the matter of the Three Chapters, Pelagius remained behind as the archdeacon and chief ecclesiastic of Rome; and this position he occupied (the pope meanwhile lingering in Sicily on the way to the imperial city) when the Gothic king Totila (A.D. 546) besieged and captured Rome. Procopius (*de Bell. Goth. L.* 3) speaks of him at this time as follows:—"There was then among the Roman ecclesiastics one Pelagius, a deacon, who having resided for a long time at Constantinople had won in a very high degree the friendship of the emperor. Thence he had repaired to Rome, shortly before the siege began, fortified with great store of money. During the siege he imparted of it liberally to those who were in need, so that, having been before accounted a good man among the Italians, he acquired (as was fit) an increased reputation for charity and benevolence." The Romans being reduced to great straits from famine, he consented at their request (as Procopius further informs us) to go in person to Totila to sue for a truce of a few days, on condition that, if no succour should meanwhile arrive from the emperor, the city should be surrendered. He was courteously received by the Gothic king, but accomplished nothing. In the December of the same year Totila entered Rome as a conqueror, and went to pay his devotions in the church of St. Peter. There Pelagius met him, with the gospels in his hands, and falling on his knees before him, said, "Prince, spare thy people." The conqueror answered with a significant smile, "Hast thou now come to supplicate me, Pelagius?" "Yes," he replied, "inasmuch as the Lord has made me thy servant. But now withhold thy hand from these who have passed into servitude to thee." Moved by these entreaties, Totila forbade forthwith any further slaughter of the Romans. He also employed Pelagius, together with a layman Theodorus, in an embassy to Constantinople for concluding peace with the emperor, binding them with an oath to do their best in his behalf, and to return without delay to Italy. They executed their commission, and brought back Justinian's reply, which was to the effect that Belisarius was in military command, and had authority to arrange matters (Procop. *de Bell. Goth. L.* 3.).

The pope Vigilius having proceeded from Sicily on his voyage to Constantinople in the early part of the year 547, it was not long before Pelagius joined him; and he appears to have supported him and acted with him in his changing attitudes of submission or resistance to the emperor's will [see VIGILIUS]. Having signed his *Judicatum*, he afterwards kept aloof with him from the Constantinopolitan council (called the 5th oecumenical), and subscribed also his *Constitutum* in which its action was condemned. For this he was, with others, exiled by the emperor, but recalled and received with favour on his joining Vigilius in his recantation; and with him he was allowed to return to Italy, A.D. 554, being said to have been even then nominated by Justinian as the pope's successor in case of his surviving him (Victor Tur. *Chron.*). He proceeded to Rome after the death of Vigilius at Syracuse, and was there consecrated pope, being supported by Narses, who at that time was in command of Rome, and who of course acted under the emperor's orders. The appointment was not welcome to the Romans themselves, and there was even difficulty in getting prelates to consecrate him. Two only in the end officiated, John of Perusium and Bonus of Ferentinum, assisted by Andreas, a presbyter of Ostia, in place of the bishop of that see, whose peculiar privilege it usually was to ordain the popes. Anastasius (*Lib. Pontif.*) attributes the feeling against Pelagius to his being supposed to have aided and abetted the persecutions undergone by Vigilius at Constantinople, and being even suspected of having caused his death; and he further states that, in order to satisfy the people, Narses and the new pope organised a procession with litanies to St. Peter's, where the latter, holding up the cross and the gospels, declared himself from the pulpit innocent of all ill-doing against his predecessor. It is quite possible that charges of having hastened the death of Vigilius had been brought against Pelagius by his opponents, which he found it thus necessary to reply to; but the real cause of his unpopularity could not well have been his previous persecution of the late pope, whom he had always acted with and supported; it rather was (as represented by Victor Turonensis) that he had acted too much with him, in consenting at last to condemn the Three Chapters, and that he came as the emperor's creature, pledged to support the decisions of the Constantinopolitan Council. A great part of the western church still, and for many years afterwards, was resolute in rejecting these decisions; and what is principally known of the action of Pelagius as pope is his unavailing attempt to heal the consequent schism. The bishops of Tuscany had written to request his concurrence in their rejection of the council, and (as appears from his answer to their application) had meanwhile ceased to pray for the bishop of Rome in the ecclesiastic office. He severely reproves them in reply, declares his entire acceptance of the first four general councils (by way of insisting that the condemnation of the Three Chapters by the recent fifth implied no disparagement of that of Chalcedon), and urges the guilt and danger of schism from the apostolic sees (*Ep.* vi.). It is observable that in this as in other letters he does not speak of the see of Rome in particular, but of apostolic sees generally, quoting St. Augustine as to the necessity of all churches being in communion with such sees. It may be that, acting as he now was with a view to please the emperor and retain his favour, and maintaining the decrees of a purely eastern council which in the end ignored the pope, he thought it prudent to avoid apparent disparagement of the eastern patriarchates through any peculiar exaltation of the Roman see, such as was usual in utterances from St. Peter's chair. And he might indeed have provoked inconvenient reprisals, had he pleaded prominently the authority of

his own see for compliance with what his predecessor, supported by the west generally, had once authoritatively denounced, and to which both he and Vigilius had so tardily and inconsistently given their adhesion. There remains also a letter of his, addressed to the church at large, in which he earnestly defends his own orthodoxy, declaring his unqualified adhesion to the four great Councils, and to all that the popes before Vigilius had written. He is careful especially to declare that he venerates as orthodox Theodoret and Ibas, who (be it remembered) had not been personally anathematized by the fifth council, though their writings had been. It is the letter of a man anxious to defend himself in a suspected and difficult position. Appeals and remonstrances proving of no avail, while large portions of Italy,—not only Tuscany, but also especially Liguria, Venetia, and Istria,—persisted in their repudiation of the fifth council, and even had renounced communion with Rome, Pelagius endeavoured to enlist the civil power in his aid. He wrote several letters to Narses, who seems to have shrunk from using violence, urging him to have no scruples in the matter. These letters are an unqualified defence of the principle of persecution. To punish evil done, or to prevent its being done, is (he says) not persecution, but love. "If, as some would persuade you, no one is to be thus brought from evil to good, all laws, human and divine, might be set at naught. That schism is an evil is undoubted; and that to separate from the apostolic sees, and erect altar against altar, is schism, is apparent also; and the rules of the fathers have specially enjoined that ecclesiastics resisting their superiors, or separating from them, or erecting rival altars, shall be deprived and excommunicated, and, if they persist in schism, be suppressed by the public authority." "So, sir," he concludes one of his letters, "as your mind is perchance timid, lest you should seem to persecute, I have thus briefly shewn you what is enjoined by the authority of the fathers; for there are thousands of other examples and constitutions in which it is evidently acknowledged that those who cause schisms in holy church ought to be suppressed by the civil powers, not only with exile, but also proscription of their goods and hard imprisonment." So, it seems, the generality were to be dealt with: the leading recusants, including (as is especially requested in one of the letters) the bishops of the great sees of Aquileia and Milan, he desires should be sent under a guard to Constantinople, to be at the mercy of "the most clement emperor." One of these, Paulinus of Aquileia, had convened a synod in which communion with Rome had been renounced, and Narses himself excommunicated. Pelagius expresses himself as shocked; but still thankful, inasmuch as this last act would be likely to make Narses do something. He sees the hand of Providence in the proceedings of those insensate and perverse men, who, imagining their sect to be the Catholic church, had gone to such a length as to exclude the exarch from the pollution of their communion, and so unwittingly driven him to take sides against them. Let not, says he, the presumption of those wicked men go on unpunished; they will go from less to more, unless you stop them. Further, as if still doubtful whether Narses would proceed as he desired him to do, he draws his attention to the crimes of one Eufrasius, a person associated with the recusants, who had been proved guilty, he says, of homicide, adultery, and incest. See, he continues, what a set those men belong to who have so proudly insulted you: remove such men from the province: use the opportunity given you by God for suppressing them. By way of further disparaging the two metropolitans of Aquileia and Milan, and removing any scruples that Narses might retain, he represents one of them at least, Paulinus, as no lawful bishop at all. It had been a custom of long standing for these two great metropolitans to ordain each other: but (says Pelagius) the ordination was always to take place in the church of the ordained, so that the ordainer might not seem to claim jurisdiction over the other, and might also be assured that the new bishop was acceptable to his flock. In violation of this rule Paulinus had gone to Milan for consecration, and was therefore but a pseudo-bishop, as well as a schismatic: and the other was also compromised, having acted uncanonically. It does not appear that Narses took any action such as the pope desired. Certainly the two metropolitans retained their sees, and the schism continued during the reigns of many succeeding popes. Gregory the Great (*acc.* 590) found it existing still, and had to deal with it.

It is to be observed that there is no sign during this conflict of Pelagius having insisted on assent to the decrees of the fifth council by the objectors themselves, although the council, and Vigilius too, had distinctly anathematized all who should refuse such assent. He only fought against separation from the Roman see because of its assent. To have attempted more he probably saw would be at that time hopeless. And this policy of dispensation was continued by his successors. At a later period, indeed, it appears from *Diurn. Rom. Pontif.*, *tit.* 6, that bishops, on their ordination, were required to declare in their profession of faith, "Eos autem quicunque ab eisdem sanctis patribus in memoratis quatuor synodis, vel Quinta sub piae memoriae Justiniano confecta, diversis vicibus damnati leguntur, ego meaque ecclesia, earundem venerandam patrum auctoritatem sequentes, insolubili damnatione percellimus." But this addition is considered by Garner to have been made not earlier than A.D. 685. (See Pagi *in* Baron. *ad an.* 556, IV.)

In Gaul also Pelagius was accused of heresy. Consequently the Frank king Childebert sent to him an ambassador, by name Rufinus, to demand from him a confession of his faith, requesting him either to declare his acceptance of the tome of pope Leo, or to express his belief in his own words. He readily did both, asserting his entire agreement with Leo, and with the four councils, and appending a long confession of faith, which was of course altogether orthodox. But he made no mention of the fifth council, or of the necessity of accepting its decrees. He further praised the king for his zeal in the true faith, and expressed the hope that no false reports about himself might give occasion for any schism in Gaul (*Ep.* xvi. *ad Childebertum*; *Ep.* xv. *ad Sapaudum*).[b]

[b] *Ep.* x., which purports to have been addressed to Childebert on this occasion, is evidently not all genuine. It appears to be a compilation from two distinct documents: the beginning and the end suit the occasion, and

He seems to have been anxious about the result; for in a letter written soon after to Sapaudus, bishop of Arles, he says, "We exhort you, that if the letter which we have directed to our most excellent son king Childebert... has been pleasing to the most glorious king himself, and to your charity, or to our brethren and fellow-bishops, we be informed of it by a reply from your charity" (*Ep.* xv. *ad Sapaudum*). He had already shewn anxiety to conciliate Sapaudus, fearing, we may suppose, the possible defection of the Gallican church from Rome. He had seized an early opportunity of sending him a short friendly letter (*Ep.* viii.), though, as he says in it, he had not yet received (as would have been fitting) a congratulatory address from him: but he could not refrain (he continues) from sending a fraternal greeting, hoping that they might live on terms of mutual love, and correspond frequently. He afterwards sent him the pall, and conferred on him the vicariate jurisdiction over the churches of Gaul which former popes had been accustomed to commit to the metropolitans of Arles. It appears that Childebert's ambassador had previously asked him to do this, but he had delayed till he should receive, according to ancient custom, a written request from the bishop himself. On at length receiving this, accompanied by a letter from the king, he complied at once, replying cordially to both letters (*Epp.* xi., xii., xiii.). If in other letters that have been referred to he prudently refrained from asserting the universal supremacy of St. Peter's see, he did not so refrain on this occasion; being now, we may suppose, well assured of the spiritual allegiance of the Gallic church. He speaks in his letter to Sapaudus of "the eternal solidity of that firm rock, on which Christ had founded His church from the rising to the setting of the sun, being maintained by the authority of his (*i.e.* Peter's) successors, acting in person, or through their vicars." And, as his predecessors had, by the grace of God, ruled the universal church of God, he commits to the bishop of Arles, after their example, and according to ancient custom, supreme and exclusive jurisdiction over Gaul, as vicar of the apostolic see. It cannot but strike readers of church history during the reign of Justinian I., and especially of the proceedings of the fifth council, how little the theory of universal spiritual dominion thus enunciated agreed with facts. Indeed Pelagius himself, while he wrote in this strain, was really throughout his popedom acting as the creature of the emperor, who had defied and overruled the authority of the Roman see.

There are a few other letters, or fragments of letters, attributed, with no suspicion of spuriousness, to Pelagius. In one to Childebert, written after complaint received from Sapaudus, he respectfully remonstrates with the king for having allowed the metropolitan, who represented the pope himself, to be summoned on the petition of one of the suffragans before the tribunal of another bishop, who is not named. Some have reference to the schism in the matter of the Three Chapters, condemning it, and warning against it. One, to a patrician Cethegus, has reference to a bishop elect of Syracuse, who had been sent from Sicily to be ordained at Rome. Pelagius had refused for a whole year, on the ground of the man having a wife and children: but as the Syracusans obstinately persisted in their choice, he had consented at last, having endeavoured only to guard against any evil consequences by taking security from the person ordained not to divert any of the goods of the church to the use of his wife, family or relations, or bequeath to his heirs any part of what he should derive from his see.

may have been taken from a letter by Pelagius to the Frank king: the rest of the epistle, which constitutes the bulk of it, seems from its contents to have been addressed by pope Vigilius to the emperor Justinian,—perhaps from Sicily after he had left Constantinople.

From the monuments of the Vatican, collected by Manlius, Baronius cites as follows: "Hic requiescit Pelagius Papa, qui sedit annos quatuor menses decem, dies decem et octo. Deposit. iv. non. Martii" (*i.e.* March 4). According to this, his death was in the year 560. It occurred, according to Anastasius, after his foundation of the church of the apostles SS. Philip and James, which was completed by his successor John III.; with respect to which church Baronius also gives from the Vatican monuments aforesaid, "Pelagius coepit, complevit Papa Joannes." In a letter from pope Hadrian to Charlemagne about images, there is also the following passage: "Multo amplius ejus sanctissimi successores, domnus Pelagius et domnus Joannes mirae magnitudinis ecclesiam Apostolorum a solo aedificantes historias diversas tam in musivo quam in variis coloribus cum sacris pingentes imaginibus et nunc usque hactenus a nobis venerantur." He was buried in St. Peter's. [J. B—y.]

PELAGIUS (9) II., bishop of Rome after Benedict I., under the emperors Tiberius, Constantine and Mauricius, from November A.D. 578 to February A.D. 590, during a little more than eleven years. He was a native of Rome, the son of Winigild, and supposed from his father's name to have been of Gothic extraction. At the time of Benedict's death the Lombards, who were already masters of a great part of Northern Italy, were besieging Rome. Consequently the new pope was consecrated without the sanction of the emperor (required since the reign of Justinian) having been previously obtained. It might be partly to excuse this informality, as well as to solicit aid against the Lombards, that the new pope, as soon as he was able after his accession, sent a deputation to the emperor Tiberius, who had become sole emperor on the death of Justin II. in the October of 578. On this occasion it doubtless was that Gregory, known afterwards as pope Gregory the Great, was first sent to Constantinople as apocrisiarius of the Roman see, having been, much against his own will, summoned from his beloved monastery of St. Andrew, and ordained deacon to qualify him for the office. But it has been a disputed point whether it was Pelagius II. or his predecessor Benedict who thus ordained him for the purpose. Paulus Diaconus, in his short life of St. Gregory, does not name the pope, saying only that the pontiff who then presided over the church drew him from his monastery and ordained him deacon, and that he not long afterwards sent him to Constantinople. But Joannes Diaconus, in his later life of St. Gregory (written with that by Paulus before him), names Benedict as the pope who ordained him, but Pelagius as having sent him to Constantinople, thus correct-

ing the loose account of the earlier biographer. It may be concluded that Benedict, having called him from his monastery, and ordained him with the intention of despatching him as apocrisiarius, had been prevented from doing so by the Lombard siege, and that Pelagius, the siege being raised, carried out the design. Gregory continued to represent Pelagius II. at the imperial city for many years, under Mauricius, who succeeded to the empire A.D. 582, as well as under Tiberius. But no record remains of instructions sent to him from Rome till A.D. 584, when Pelagius sent him a letter (dated 4 October in that year) by the hands of Sebastianus a bishop, and Honoratus a notary. Its main purport is to represent the lamentable condition of Italy, and the imminent danger of Rome, from the Lombard invasion, Longinus, the exarch at Ravenna, having been appealed to in vain. Gregory is directed to join Sebastianus in pressing on the emperor the urgent need of succour. He is also desired to send back forthwith to Rome Maximianus, the abbat of St. Andrew's monastery, who was at that time with him at Constantinople. Maximianus did accordingly return (Joan. diac. *Vit.* S. Greg. c. 33, cf. Greg. *Dialog.* iii. 36), and Gregory himself appears to have followed him soon afterwards, probably A.D. 585 (Joan. diac. *ib.*). Having returned to Rome, he was allowed to live as he desired in his monastery once more, but was still employed by Pelagius for literary work, as will appear below.

The policy of the emperor Mauricius at this time was to make friends with the Franks, and enlist their aid against the Lombards. He had made a treaty with the Frank king, Childebert II., engaging him to invade Italy, and drive out the Lombards, on condition of receiving a large pecuniary reward. The promised invasion took place, probably A.D. 585; but resulted in a treaty of peace between the Franks and Lombards (Greg. *Turon.* vi. 42; *Paul. diac. de gest. Longob.* iii. 17). How far, if at all, this policy of the emperor was due to any instigation from the pope does not appear; but it was certainly in accordance with his views and desires. For in an extant letter to Aunarius (or Aunacharius), bishop of Auxerre, dated 5 Oct. A.D. 580, we find him urging that prelate to use his known influence over the Frankish kings, so as to dissuade them from friendship or alliance with the Lombards, and incite them to come to the rescue of Rome and Italy. It was not, he says, without providential design that the neighbouring kingdom of the Franks was united in orthodoxy of faith with the Roman empire. Let them use the power and opportunity given them by joining the emperor in defence of Rome, the mother of their common faith, and so avoid the danger of being implicated in the judgment which would fall eventually on the sacrilegious invaders.

On the retirement of Childebert from Italy, it appears that Smaragdus, who had succeeded Paulinus as exarch of Ravenna, had also concluded a truce with the Lombards (*Epp.* Pelag. II. *Ep.* I. *ad episcopos Istriae*). Pelagius took advantage of it to open negotiations with the bishops of Istria, who still remained out of communion with Rome in the matter of the Three Chapters. For the earlier attempts of Pelagius I. to reconcile them, see the article on that pope. Paulinus, the metropolitan of Aquileia (whose forcible removal the first Pelagius had in vain urged on the exarch Narses), had meantime (A.D. 568) been compelled by the Lombard invasion to take refuge with his treasure in the island of Grado[a]. He had been succeeded by Elias, who is said to have held a synod there for confirming the transference of the see from Aquileia to Grado; at which synod Laurentius, a presbyter, is further said to have been present in behalf of pope Pelagius II., producing a letter from him which authorised the transference of the see. But the alleged acts of this council of Grado (given Labbe, vol. vi. p. 651), and especially the letter from the pope, are probably spurious [see art. on ELIAS (19)]. The letters to be now spoken of, written, as aforesaid, after the truce concluded with the Lombards, and which are open to no suspicion, are inconsistent with any previous intercourse between Pelagius II. and the bishops of Istria, who are addressed as still out of communion with him, and as being now for the first time approached by him with a view to reconciliation. In the first of these letters (sent by the hands of a bishop Redemptus and Quodvultdeus, abbat of St. Peter's monastery) he attributes his long silence to the hard necessities of the time, and rejoices in the temporary quiet procured through the labours of the exarch Smaragdus, which allowed him at last to follow the yearnings of his heart. He implores them to consider the evil of schism, and return to the unity of the church. Like the first Pelagius, he is at pains to vindicate his own faith, and to declare his entire acceptance of the four great councils and of the tome of pope Leo, by way of shewing that his acceptance of the fifth council, and his consequent condemnation of the Three Chapters, involved no departure from the ancient faith. Like his predecessor, too, he does not insist on condemnation of the Three Chapters by the Istrian bishops themselves. He only begs them to return to communion with Rome, notwithstanding its condemnation of the same: and this he does so far in a supplicatory rather than imperious tone. In his second letter he declares himself deeply grieved by the unsatisfactory purport of their reply to his first, and by the reception which his emissaries had met with. He follows his predecessor in quoting St. Augustine as to the necessity of all churches being united to apostolic sees, but further cites Cyprian *De Unitate ecclesiae* (with interpolations that give the passages a meaning very different from what they were originally intended to convey) in support of the peculiar authority of St. Peter's chair[b]. Finally he calls upon the Istrians to

[a] Hence called New Aquileia. It continued to be the seat of the old Aquileian patriarchate till A.D. 1450, when it was removed to Venice (Gibbon, c. xlv.).

[b] It does not of course follow that Pelagius consciously misquoted. St. Cyprian's text may have been already tampered with in the Roman copies of it. The quotations in the letter of Pelagius are as follows, the passage in brackets being absent from the oldest MSS. of Cyprian, and those in italics being omitted in the letter. "Exordium ab unitate proficiscitur [et primatus Petro datur ut una Christi ecclesia et cathedra monstretur: et pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur qui ab apostolis unanimi consensu pascatur] *ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur.* Hanc ecclesiae unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? *Qui ecclesiae renititur et resistit* [qui cathedram Petri super quem fundata est ecclesia deserit et resistit] in ecclesia se esse confidit?"

send deputies to Rome for conference with himself, or at any rate to Ravenna for conference with a representative whom he would send; and in connexion with this request he mentions (significantly, as will appear in the sequel) that he has written to the exarch Smaragdus on the subject. Another, called his third, letter to Elias and the Istrian bishops, is of the nature of a treatise on the subject of the Three Chapters, and was composed for him by Gregory, as Joannes Diaconus informs us: "Pelagius papa Eliae Aquilensi episcopo nolenti tria capitula Chalcedonensis synodi suscipere[c] epistolam satis utilem misit, quam Beatus Gregorius, cum esset adhuc diaconus, scripsit" (*de gest. Longob.* iii. 20). It was probably this composition that Gregory, when pope, sent to certain bishops,[d] who still demurred to the condemnation of the Three Chapters, speaking of it thus: "To remove all doubt from your minds, I have thought it useful to send you the book which my predecessor of sacred memory, pope Pelagius, wrote on the subject . . . If after reading this book you should persist in your present opinion, you will certainly shew yourselves to give heed not to reason but to obstinacy" (*Epp. S. Greg. lib. ii. Ep.* 51). Appeals and arguments proving of no avail, Pelagius seems to have followed the example of his predecessor in calling on the civil power to persecute, and to have succeeded better with Smaragdus than the first Pelagius had done with Narses. For Smaragdus is recorded to have gone in person to Grado, to have seized Severus who had succeeded Elias in the see, together with three other bishops, in the church, carried them to Ravenna, and forced them to communicate there with John the bishop of that see. They were allowed, however, after one year (Smaragdus being superseded by another exarch), to return to Grado, where neither people nor bishops would communicate with them till Severus had recanted in a synod of ten bishops his compliance at Ravenna (*Paul. diac. de gest. Long.* iii. 27, cf. *Epp.* S. Greg. l. 1, *Ep.* 16).

Towards the end of the pontificate of Pelagius (probably A.D. 588), a council was held at Constantinople in the matter of Gregory, patriarch of Antioch, who had been charged with crime, and had appealed to the emperor ("ad imperatorem et concilium." Evagrius). It was apparently a large and influential one, and not confined to ecclesiastics. Evagrius Scholasticus, who was present as the advocate of Gregory, describes it thus: "Cum omnes patriarchae, partim per se, partim per vicarios, quaestioni de Gregorio habitae interessent, et causa esset coram sacro senatu et multis sanctissimis primis episcopis primarum urbium cognita. . ." (Evagrius, *H. E.* vi. 7).

This council is memorable as having called forth the first protest from Rome, renewed afterwards more notably by Gregory the Great, against the assumption by the patriarch of Constantinople of the title "oecumenical." The title itself was not a new one; as an honorary or complimentary one it had been occasionally given to other patriarchs; and Justinian had repeatedly designated the patriarch of Constantinople "the most holy and most blessed archbishop of this royal city, and oecumenical patriarch" (*Cod.* i. 7; *Novell.* iii. v. vi. vii. xvi. xlii.). Nor do we know of any objection having been raised till the occasion of this council, at which it may have been ostentatiously assumed by the then patriarch, John the Faster, and sanctioned by the council, with reference to the case before it, in a way that seemed to recognise jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Constantinople over that of Antioch. Pope Gregory goes so far as to intimate that the assumption of the title had been John the Faster's main purpose in assembling the council, the appeal of Gregory of Antioch having afforded only a convenient opportunity: "Ex causa alia occasionem quaerens, synodum fecit, in qua se universalem appellare conatus est" (Greg. I. *Ep.* ad Eulogium et Anastasium, l. v. *Ep.* 43). At any rate Pelagius took fire. He regarded it as implying a claim to authority over the universal church; and he wrote accordingly to protest against it, declaring all the proceedings of the council (except with regard to the acquittal of Gregory of Antioch) null and void, and forbidding his apocrisiarius at Constantinople to communicate with the patriarch. His letter has not come down to us (*Ep.* viii. *inter Epp.* Pelag. II., which purports to have been written on the occasion, being undoubtedly spurious); but Gregory the Great, during his own contention with the same John the Faster on the same subject, speaks of it more than once, and of the action of Pelagius as above described (*Epp.* S. Greg. l. v. *Epp.* 18, 43; l. ix. *Ep.* 68).

In November A.D. 589 there was a remarkable and destructive inundation of the Tiber at Rome, followed by a plague described as "Pestis inguinaria," of which Pelagius II. was one of the earliest victims, being attacked by it in the middle of January A.D. 590 (Greg. Turon. l. x. c. 1). According to Anastasius he was buried on the 8th of February in St. Peter's. Gregory I. speaks in his dialogues of the peculiar destructiveness of this pestilence, and of arrows having been seen descending from heaven, and seeming to strike people (*Dial.* l. iv. c. 36). Anastasius records among the pious acts of Pelagius his having covered the shrine of St. Peter with silver-gilt plates, having made his own house a hospital for old men, and having built a new church over the body of the martyr St. Laurence, and adorned his sepulchre with silver plates. This last work of his is referred to by Gregory I. in speaking of the reverence due to the remains of saints. He says that Pelagius having desired to improve the surroundings of the martyr's place of burial, the persons employed, while digging, unexpectedly disclosed the body itself, and that all who had seen it, though none of them had presumed to touch it, died within ten days (*Epp.* Greg. I. l. iv. *Ep.* 30, *Ad Constantinam Augustam*).

In addition to the supposititious letter (above referred to) to John of Constantinople, there are three others, now acknowledged to be spurious, viz., to a bishop Benignus, to the bishops of Campania and Italy, and to those of Germany

[c] There is evidently a mistake in this description of the attitude of the Istrian bishops; but the testimony to Gregory's authorship of the letter sent to them by Pelagius remains.

[d] Usually supposed to be the bishops of Ireland. But the title of this epistle of Gregory is uncertain.

and Gaul, of which the main drift (as is usual in the forged letters of popes) is the authority of bishops, and especially of the Roman see. Five *Decreta*, attributed to this pope, are given by Ivo and Gratian. [J. B—y.]

PELAGIUS (10), bishop of Anagnia. His name appears among the signatures to the decrees of the Council of Rome in A.D. 595 (*Appendix ad S. Gregorii Epp.* 5). [F. D.]

PELAGIUS (11), bishop of Tours, was one of the Gallic bishops to whom Gregory the Great wrote, commending to them St. Augustine and his companions, in A.D. 596 (*Ep.* vi. 52). He was the immediate successor of GREGORIUS (32). [F. D.]

PELAGIUS (12) (PELAYO), first king of the independent Christian remnant, in the mountains of the Asturias. Sebastian of Salamanca (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 479) describes him as son "Fafilani ducis ex semine regio." The oldest MS. of the *Chron. Albeldense* (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 433), transcribed in A.D. 976, on the other hand makes him son of Veremund and grandson of RODERIC, with the evident intention, says Helfferich (*Entstehung und Geschichte des Westgothen Rechts*, 220, &c.), of connecting the new and old monarchies. Another MS. of uncertain date, from the monastery of San Millan, contains the following story, adopted by Lucas of Tuy and Roderic of Toledo, who wrote in the 13th century. WITTIZA at Tuy "struck the Dux Fafila, Pelayo's father," whom EGICA had sent thither "quadam occasione uxoris fuste in capite," so that he died, and when he became sole king, he expelled Pelayo, who afterwards rebelled against the Saracens with the Asturians, from Toledo on account of the quarrel with his father." The story may be one of the interpolations of Pelayo of Oviedo (A.D. 1101–1129), who collected and altered various historical documents (among them the *Chron. Alb.*) generally in the interests of the see of Oviedo. [FROILA I.] The passage, however, is apparently wanting in the first edition of the *Chron. Alb.* in 1663, which was printed from such an MS. (See Florez's notes.) In Ibn-Khaldoum's *History of the Beni-Alphonso* (Dozy, *Recherches*, i. 86), compiled in the 14th century, and containing fragments from the work of a Cordovan annalist of the 11th century, who must, in Dozy's opinion, have used Latin chronicles now lost, we have Pelayo, son of Fafila; while in the monk of Silo (c. A.D. 1100 in *Esp. Sag.* xvii.), Pelayo is simply "Roderici regis spatarius." Later writers of the 16th and 17th centuries, improving on Lucas of Tuy, make Fafila and Theodifred, Roderic's father, sons of Kindasvinth, and thus victims in common of the rival house of Egica, in order to deduce the descent of the kings of Castile from the Gothic kings through Pelayo, and so trace it back to the emperor Theodosius, Theoderic the Ostrogoth, &c. &c. Roderic, too, and Pelayo thus become first cousins, and on Roderic's death, Pelayo inherits on strict principles of hereditary descent.

The authentic facts of Pelayo's history are but few. The chosen chieftain of the unconquered remnant in the Asturias, he headed a rising c. A.D. 717 or 718. At one time his followers were reduced to thirty men and ten women, who took refuge in the cavern of Covadonga, where they supported themselves on the honey they found in the crevices of the rocks. Pelayo gradually grew stronger, till at last an army was sent against him under Alcama and the traitor OPPAS. The situation of the cave, situated in a narrow defile (see the description in Ford's *Handbook*, 241), was admirably adapted for defence against superior numbers; the Mohammedans were routed with great slaughter, Alcama was killed, and Oppas taken prisoner. Sebastian of Salamanca adds various legendary details; the arrows of the assailants were miraculously turned back upon themselves, 124,000 were killed and 63,000 more perished by the fall of a mountain in their flight. The effect of this victory was the evacuation of Gijon by the Berber governor Monnuza, who suffered heavy losses on his retreat.

Pelayo died in A.D. 737, after reigning between nineteen and twenty years, his capital being at Canicas (Cangas de Onis), and was buried with his wife GAUDIOSA, at St. Elalia of Velamio between that place and Covadonga. (*Chron. Alb.* Seb. of Sal.; Al-Makkari, translated by Gayangos, ii. 34; Dozy, *Hist. des Musulmans*, iii. 22.) [F. D.]

PELAYO. [PELAGIUS (12).] [F. D.]

PELEUS, an Egyptian bishop and martyr in Palestine with Nilus and Patermuthius, in the eighth year of the Diocletian persecution. They suffered by fire after labouring for a long time in the copper mines. (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13; *Mart. Palest.*, cap. xiii.) [G. T. S.]

PELUSIANUS, a friend of Antony the hermit, who, with another monk, Isaac, shared the sepulchre of Antony. (Jerome, *Vit. Hilarionis*, 30.) Jerome appears to have seen them himself (*ib.* 31). [W. H. F.]

PENDA, king of the Mercians. (PANTHA, Nennius, *M. H. B.* 75, 76.) Penda, according to the royal pedigrees preserved in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and by Florence of Worcester (*M. H. B.* 308, 630) was the son of Pybba or Wybba, the son of Creoda, the twelfth in descent from Woden. The British account preserved by Nennius makes him one of twelve sons of Pubba, and, omitting some of the intervening links, the eighth from Woden. We learn from Bede that there was before him at least one king of the Mercians, Cearl, the father of Quenburga, the first wife of king Edwin, but Cearl does not appear in the pedigrees, and is only conjecturally identified with Crida (Bede, *H.E.* ii. 14). Crida's death is noted in the Chronicle under the year 593, but the title of king is not given him there. By Henry of Huntingdon, however, he is made the first king of Mercia (*M. H. B.* 714). The title of king is not given by ancient authority to Pybba; and Cearl, if not identical with Crida, may have been his successor. But, however we attempt to pierce the obscurity, Penda seems distinctly to have been the first person who attempted to raise Mercia into a leading power. The tradition preserved by Nennius is that he was the first who separated the Mercians from the kingdom of the Northmen "Nordorum," and probably Crida and Pybba had both been dependent on the Northumbrian Ethelfrith,

after whose fall in 617 they would come under the rule or hegemony of Edwin.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle assigns to Penda a reign of thirty years, beginning from 626 (*M. H. B.* 308); the words of Bede (*H.E.* ii. 20) which give him a reign of twenty-two years from 633, might be interpreted to fix his accession as early as 611. The date usually accepted is the later one, and is certainly the point at which Penda enters into history. It is the year of Edwin's marriage with a Christian wife; Penda, the ruler of the territory that lay between Kent and Northumbria, must have made up his mind to reject Christianity; and as we do not know what had become of his kinswoman, Edwin's first wife, a family grudge may have affected his determination. From 626 to 655 Penda is the prop and mainstay of declining paganism and the ruthless destroyer of Christian kings.

We have no distinct data as to the extent of the Mercian territory when Penda became king; but it is certain that on the north, south and east he was pressed by hostile tribes of his own nationality, whilst on the west he had to deal with the remnant of the Britons who occasionally sought alliance with him against their still more powerful neighbours in Northumbria and Wessex. Long after this date the kingdom of the East Angles extended over Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire; Hwiccia, or at least the southern portion, was West Saxon; and Oxfordshire likewise, when Dorchester was the ecclesiastical metropolis of Wessex.

Penda's first struggle was with Wessex; in 628, according to the Chronicle, he had a battle at Cirencester with Cynegils and Cwichelm, who were still heathen, and who made a treaty with him after what was perhaps a drawn battle (*M. H. B.* 309). It was possibly a result of this treaty that Coinwalch, the son of Cynegils, married a sister of Penda (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 7), whom he afterwards repudiated. Five years after this, in conjunction with the British king Caedwalla, who was a Christian, Penda attacked Edwin in Northumbria, and defeated and slew him at Hatfield, Oct. 12, 633. In 635, however, Oswald threw off the Mercian yoke, and defeated Caedwalla at Denisesburn (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 1). Penda was at the time apparently engaged in a struggle with the East Angles, but he received as an exile Eadfrid, one of the sons of Edwin by his Mercian wife, who may have had reason to dread the jealousy of Oswald, and whom Penda subsequently murdered (Bede, *H.E.* ii. 20).

In 636 is dated the war with the East Anglian kings, Sigebert and Egric, both of whom perished in the same battle (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 18; Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 529). It is stated by Henry of Huntingdon that Earpwald, the predecessor of Sigebert, was slain by Penda, but this is not mentioned by Bede, and there was doubtless a danger that all such deeds should be laid to the account of the ruthless pagan.

The next recorded war took place in 642, when Oswald was the victim. Penda defeated and slew him at Maserfeld on the 5th of August. Oswy, who succeeded him in Bernicia, had, possibly under constraint from Penda, to allow Oswin (a kinsman of Edwin) to rule Deira for a few years.

In 645 Penda attacked Coinwalch in Wessex, offended at the divorce of his sister, and drove him into East Anglia, where he was baptized at the instance of king Anna. Penda, however, never relaxed in his hostility to Northumbria; Bede mentions two expeditions, one in the time of bishop Aidan, in which he besieged Bamborough, and another in the time of Finan (*H. E.* iii. 16, 17). These inroads seem to fall between 645 and 652.

Penda must now have been feeling the approach of old age: if he was fifty in 626 he must have been now over seventy; and although he was wise enough to see that Christianity was everywhere gaining ground, and that it was of little use attempting to repress it at home, he kept up vigorous hostilities with the Christian provinces outside his own kingdom. Anna, king of the East Angles, who was an influential propagator of the Gospel, fell before him in 654. The year before this, Peada, Penda's eldest son, whom he had made king or viceroy of the Middle Angles, had received Christianity and brought missionaries out of Northumbria into Mercia. Penda, Bede tells us, did not forbid the preaching of the word; but those who having become Christians did not bring forth the works of faith, he especially despised, saying that they were wretched and contemptible who did not condescend to obey the God in whom they believed. It is possible that, whilst he would tolerate missions and monks, he would not tolerate the existence of political Christianity, or of a league of Christian kings against him.

But his end was drawing near. In 655 Oswy, worn out with the inroads of his pertinacious foe, offered to buy him off with a large gift of treasure. Penda declared that he would be satisfied with nothing short of the extermination of the rival power. Oswy thereupon, having vowed his daughter to perpetual celibacy and given twelve estates for the foundation of monasteries, marched with a small army against him Alchfrith, one of his sons, was with him—Ecgfrith, another son, being a hostage in the hands of Penda's queen; and Oidilwald, the son of Oswald, being ranged on Penda's side; as was also the East Anglian king Ethelhere, whom Bede regards as responsible for the war. [Ethelhere.] The two armies met near the river Winwaed, at a place which it has tasked historians and antiquaries for a thousand years to identify; the campus Gai of the British writers; placed by some as far north as the Forth, by others as far south as Leeds. Oswy gained a complete victory; nearly thirty ealdormen and British princes fell on Penda's side; and the aged king perished with his army.

The consequence, almost immediate, of Penda's death was the acceptance of Christianity in all the English kingdoms, though not at an equally rapid rate.

Penda's wife is called by Bede, Cynuise, by Florence, Kineswitha. They had five sons and two daughters, all of them missionaries and five of them saints; Peada, Wulfhere, Ethelred, Merewald and Mercelm, Kineswitha and Kineburga. Legend adds a third daughter, Wilburga, the wife of Frithewald and mother of St. Osyth. [S.]

PENTADIA, a deaconess of the church of Constantinople, widow of the consul Timasius, "the master-general of the armies of Theodo-

sius" (Gibbon). On the banishment of her husband by the eunuch Eutropius to the African Oasis, where he subsequently perished (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 7), Pentadia had been also marked out for destruction by his base and cruel enemy. Hunted from one place of retreat to another, she at last took refuge in the church, where she was effectually protected by Chrysostom in defiance of the eunuch's abolition of the right of sanctuary, of which, by a nemesis of fate, he was not long after to avail himself to save his own worthless life. Pentadia, in gratitude, devoted her life to the service of the church which had afforded her asylum, and of the bishop by whom the rights of that asylum had been so effectually asserted. She became one of his deaconesses, and lived the life of a recluse, never leaving her house except to go to church. She was one of the faithful band of women with Olympias and Procula, who remained with Chrysostom to the very last, on the evening of his expulsion, and of whom he took so affecting a leave in the baptistery of the cathedral (Pallad. p. 90). She was subsequently apprehended on the charge of having been implicated in the conflagration of the church, and was dragged before the prefect Optatus, and by him committed to prison (Pallad. p. 28). Being brought before him a second time, Optatus sought to break down her firmness and intimidate her into a confession, by putting her fellow-accused of the male sex to exquisite tortures in her presence. But she remained constant in her denial of complicity in the fire, and without employing many words she stopped the mouths of her accusers, and convinced the bystanders that the accusation was false. She sent a detailed report of the circumstances, for which Chrysostom wrote her a long letter of warm thanks, at the same time praising highly her courageous wisdom (Chrys. *Ep.* 94). Subsequently when Heraclides, whom Chrysostom had appointed bishop of Ephesus in the place of the deposed Antoninus, was compelled in his turn to leave his see, Chrysostom wrote requesting Pentadia to render him all the support and consolation in her power (*Ep.* 14). Hearing that she was desirous of coming to visit him at Cucusus in the winter of 404, Chrysostom wrote entreating her to give up the notion, not only because her health was far too fragile to undertake such a journey at so inclement a season and Cucusus was exposed to the assaults of the Isaurians, but also because she could not be spared at Constantinople, where her presence supported and encouraged the faithful under their persecutions, and by leaving her post she would lose the spiritual gain she was acquiring by her beneficent actions (*Ep.* 104). Chrysostom wrote again complaining of her long silence, which surprised him the more, as several persons had come to Cucusus who could have conveyed her letters. He begged that she would send him a reply by the bearer of the letter (*Ep.* 185). [E. V.]

PEPIN. [Pippin.]

PEPUZIANI, another name for the Montanists (see Montanus, Vol. III. pp. 939, 945). Epiphanius may safely be disregarded, who, treating of the Montanists, in the 48th section of his work on heresies, treats of the Pepuziani, in the 49th, as a kindred but distinct sect; but his whole tone is that of one without any real information as to the special significance of the various names by which he had heard the Montanists designated. [G. S.]

PERATAE. [Euphrates (1).]

PERATICI, a heretical sect, anathematized in Actio x. of the sixth general council, A.D. 681 (Mansi, xi. 850), the same as the preceding. [G. T. S.]

PEREBIUS (Perrebius, Perrevius), bishop of Pharsalia, appealed to pope Boniface I. against his fellow bishops, and Rufus, bishop of Thessalonica, in A.D. 422, was asked by the pope to enquire into the matter (Bonifacius I. *Epp.* no. 13, ap. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 776). He was present at the Ephesine council A.D. 431, where in the *Acta* he is called Πεῤῥέβιον Φαρμάλου, but in the subscriptions Θεσσαλονικέων Σαλτῶν, Thessalonicensium Saltuum. Le Quien places him in the see of Pharsalia (Hard. i. 1354, 1423, 1528; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 118; Jaffé, *R. P* num. 146 al. 363). [J. G.]

PEREGRINUS (1), called Proteus, an apostate from Christianity and a Cynic philosopher of the second century, whose history has been satirically told by Lucian. Lucian's work has sometimes been thought a romance, but the reality of it is amply confirmed by Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Attic.* viii. 3, and xii. 11, who describes Proteus as "a grave and courageous man, whom he had seen at Athens living in a hut, outside the city, where he taught wisdom and laid down that men ought not to sin when they can escape notice, fortifying his teaching out of Sophocles and the Greek poets." Aulus Gellius died early in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and before the suicide of Peregrinus. The real existence of Peregrinus is also proved by Philostratus (*Vitae Sophist.* ii. 13), where the contempt cherished for him by Atticus Herodes is mentioned. He was abusing, we are told, Herodes as he passed after the usual fashion of Cynic philosophers of that time, when Herodes turned and calmly asked him why he acted so. Peregrinus thereupon redoubled his reproaches in his semi-barbarous tones, when the other passed on, remarking, "We are both fools; you for abusing me, I for listening to you." Other writers, Pagan and Christian alike, of the same age, mention him as Tatian in his *Orat. adv. Graec.* c. 25; Athenagoras *pro Christian.* c. 26, who tells us of his statue which was erected at Parium; Maximus Tyrius, *Diss.* iii.; Tertull. *ad Mart.* c. 4; and Eusebius in his *Chronicon* (ii. 178 sq. ed. Schöne), cf. also among moderns, I. Sörgel, *Lucian's Stellung zum Christenthum*, 1875, Schiller's *Geschichte der Kaiserzeit*, p. 685, and Bernays' tract *Lucian u. die Kyniker*, Berlin, 1879. The story of Peregrinus is therefore a real one, and as such is a very valuable illustration of the life of the second century. The work of Lucian tells it. He was born at Parium on the Hellespont, where he committed various crimes, including parricide. He escaped justice by transferring his property to the municipality and then passed over to Palestine, where he came in contact with Christianity. He became a convert, and according to Lucian's account, even a bishop or at least a presbyter.

Lucian probably viewed the Christians as merely a Jewish sect, as he uses the term Συναγωγεύς about him. Yet this fact alone is not conclusive, for Jewish influences and names were then so widespread that they were applied sometimes even to pagan officials, of which a second-century example was lately discovered at Salonica, where the title ἀρχισυνάγωγος is given to the president of a Collegium. Cf. *Comptes-Rendus de l'Acad. des Ins.* 1884, p. 259. Peregrinus was then imprisoned for the faith, and Lucian's words are a valuable and truthful description of the conduct of the Christians towards confessors generally. Crowds attended at the prison and ministered to Peregrinus, bribing the gaolers to obtain admission. The lately discovered "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" is also illustrated by this narrative. It takes elaborate precautions against wandering apostles and prophets, who desired only to make gain of the gospel. Such a false apostle was Peregrinus. His real character was, however, discovered, and he was excommunicated. He then became a Cynic philosopher, a sect which Lucian specially abhorred, and resided at Rome. He made use of the licence permitted them to abuse the emperor himself, but was speedily expelled by the Praefectus Urbis. He next passed into Greece, and there, to obtain a greater notoriety, burned himself alive at the Olympic games at the 236th Olympiad A.D. 165, following the example set by the Buddhist missionary who immolated himself at Athens in presence of the emperor Augustus. Cf. Strabo, xv. i. 73; Dion Cassius, liv. 9; and Lightfoot *On Colossians*, p. 394. Dr. Lightfoot has elaborately discussed the relations between the stories of Peregrinus and St. Ignatius in his new work (*SS. Ignatius and Polycarp*, t. i., pp. 129, 133, 331, 450, ii., pp. 206, 213, 306, 356; cf. Salmon's *Introd. to the N. T.*, pp. 522, 650). The article on Lucian in this Dictionary should also be consulted. Lucian's narrative about Peregrinus is there translated. [G. T. S.]

PEREGRINUS (2), first bishop of Auxerre, belongs to the second half of the third century. He was a Roman citizen, consecrated and sent to Gaul by Pope Sixtus II. A.D. 257, as one of a large number of missionaries who were bearing the Gospel into western Europe (Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 182 sq. ed. 1732). He is said to have been martyred at Baugi, in Auxerre, c. A.D. 304, and his usual feast is May 16, but his acts (Boll. *A. SS.* Mai. iii. 558–61), are not of historical value (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 261; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 42–3). [J. G.]

PEREGRINUS (3), a Donatist presbyter, who joined with the Seniors of Musti in denouncing the Maximianists, and requesting that they might be expelled from their churches (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 56, 62). Whether the same as the Donatist bishop of Sufes, A.D. 411, does not appear. (Coll. Carth. i. 142.) [H. W. P.]

PEREGRINUS (4), a deacon, mentioned by St. Augustine in 412 to Marcellinus, as having accompanied Boniface, bishop of Cataqua, in a journey to Hippo (*Ep.* 139), perhaps the same as the one mentioned *Ep.* 149. [H. W. P.]

PEREGRINUS (5), a bishop to whom, c. 415, a letter was addressed by Alypius and Augustine about Maximus, a physician, who had renounced Arian opinions, and to whom they had written previously on this subject. (Aug. *Ep.* 170, 171.) [H. W. P.]

PEREGRINUS (6), a count, baptized with Gabinianus at Easter 428 or 429, and spoken of very highly by St. Augustine (*Ep.* 227 al. 67; Tillem. xiii. 928). [C. H.]

PEREGRINUS (7), bishop of Misenum. [ENNODIUS; HORMISDAS.]

PEREGRINUS (8), disciple of St. Benedict, is Gregory the Great's authority for one of the miracles he relates of the saint (*Dial.* ii. 27). [F. D.]

PEREGRINUS (9), a bishop who wrote a preface to a short work containing a summary of Priscillian's doctrine in 93 canons first published by Card. Mai in *Spicileg. Rom.* t. ix. p. 1–10 (Ceillier, vi. 266). [G. T. S.]

PERENNIS, praetorian prefect and practical ruler of the Empire under Commodus. He condemned the Senator Apollonius to death as a Christian between 183 and 186. Perennis himself was executed on the demand of the guards. See PERENNIS in DICT. CLASSICAL BIOGRAPHY. (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 21.) Görres in *Jahrbücher für Protest. Theologie*, 1884, p. 399–410, discusses the action of Perennis in the light of latest criticism. [APOLLONIUS.] [G. T. S.]

PERGAMIUS (1), a wealthy man in Egypt, to whom was attributed the wish to steal away the body of Antony, thus causing the friends of Antony to conceal his sepulchre. (Jerome, *Vit. Hilarionis*, 31–32.) [W. H. F.]

PERGAMIUS (2), a layman of position, who soon after Basil had become a bishop, wrote sharply to him, reproaching him with having allowed his letter to remain unanswered. Basil replies in a good-humoured strain, and says he must lose all knowledge of himself before he forgets Pergamius (Basil, *Ep.* 56 [354]). [E. V.]

PERGAMIUS (3), count of the East, whose wife was healed by Peter of Galatia, a solitary near Antioch c. 385 (Theod. *Hist. Rel.* c. 9; Tillem. xiv. 254). [C. H.]

PERGAMIUS (4), a bishop, a friend of Chrysostom, in whom he placed entire confidence, by whom, when on his journey to Cucusus, he requested Olympias to send him news of herself and her circumstances (Chrys. *Epp.* 10, 11, 12). [E. V.]

PERGAMIUS (5), chorepiscopus, about A.D. 430, commended for his kindness by Firmus, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. (Patrol. Graec. lxxvii. 1514.) [G. W. D.]

PERGAMIUS (6), dux of Egypt, ordered along with the augustal prefect Apollonius in 482 by the emperor Zeno to expel John Talaia from the patriarchal see of Alexandria and enthrone Peter Mongus (Liberat. *Brev.* c. 18). Pergamius afterwards carried Zeno's henoticon to Egypt, and urged Peter to receive it, and admit the separatists to his favour (Evag. *H. E.* iii. 13). Tillemont, with great probability, identifies him with the Pergamius, brother of JOANNES (113)

SILENTIARIUS, described in the life of this saint as being high in the favour of the emperors Zeno and Anastasius, holding several offices under them, and zealously following in the steps of his pious brother (Boll. *Acta SS.* 13 Mai. iii. 231, § 3; Tillem. xvi. 330, 334, 634, 762). [C. H.]

PERGENTINUS, martyr with his brother LAURENTINUS (2).

PERIGENES (1), imaginary bishop of Argos, who, according to "Praedestinatus," c. 19, confuted the Sethites. [G. S.]

PERIGENES (2), bishop of Corinth, of which place he was a native, and where he was advanced by regular gradation to the priesthood. When the see of Patrae became vacant, he was made bishop by Rufus, bishop of Corinth, with the consent of all the provincial bishops, A.D. 419; but the people of Patrae would not receive him; their objection to him we do not learn, but he did not enter upon his see. When soon after the bishop of Corinth died, the Corinthians wished to choose Perigenes as their bishop, and petitioned pope Boniface for leave, as he exercised authority over the province of eastern Illyricum. After making some delay to allow of fuller information being received from his legate in that quarter, Rufus, bishop of Thessalonica, and also of fuller consideration of the question of episcopal translation (Socrates, *H. E.* vii. c. 36; Smith and Cheetham, *D. C. A.* i. 225), the papal consent was accorded, and Perigenes appointed bishop of Corinth c. A.D. 419, acknowledging the pope's supremacy, and that of Rufus his legate (Bonifacius I. *Epp.* no. 4; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xx. 760; Socrates, *ut supra;* Fleury, *H. E.* xxiv. 31; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 8). [BONIFACIUS I. Pope]. But on the death of Rufus, Perigenes hesitated to acknowledge allegiance to his successor at Thessalonica, though he was invested with the same legatine authority by pope Sixtus. To maintain his authority, Anastasius, the new bishop, convened a synod at Thessalonica, to which, as well as to Perigenes individually, the pope, A.D. 435, sent letters, urging him and the other Eastern bishops to yield obedience to Anastasius (Sixtus III. *Epp.* nos. 7, 8, 10; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* l. 610 sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 250). His response to the papal address and the date of his death are unknown (Gams, *Ser. Episc.* c. 4; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 159). He was present at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, on the orthodox side (*Conc. Eph.* Act. vi. and *Conc. Chalc.* Act. i. ed. Binius). [J. G.]

PERISTERIA, a pious lady, who had bequeathed large sums of money for distribution among the monasteries and charitable houses in Egypt. The deacon Ischyrion accused Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, first in a letter to St. Leo, and then at the third Actio of the council of Chalcedon, of wasting her bequest [DIOSCORUS (1); ISCHYRION (4)] (Fleury, *H. E.* xxviii. 13). The same Peristeria is supposed to be "the most noted matron of that age," who is referred to by St. Nilus in his letter to the monk Agathias "de virtute colenda et vitio fugiendo." (Nilus, *Opp.* 596, Suares, 1673; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 428; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 209.) [J. G.]

PERPETUA (1), martyr, Feb. 2 (Bas. *Men.*), March 7 (*Mart. u.s.*; *Vet. Rom.*) In Wright's *Syriac Martyrology*, she is commemorated with Saturninus and ten other confessors. Her full name was Vibia Perpetua. The name Vibia often occurs among African inscriptions, but not Vivia, as Ruinart spells it. The name Perpetua occurs once only among the African inscriptions, *C. I. L.* t. viii. p. 1018. The place of Perpetua's execution has been a subject of debate. Ruinart and Valesius maintain the claim of Carthage, where Victor Vit. tells us the martyrs were buried in the great basilica. Tuburbium has the authority of some MSS., whence they have been sometimes called Martyres Tuburbitanae; a name which more properly applies, according to Valesius, to three martyrs, Maxima, Donatilla, and Secunda, who suffered under Valerian, celebrated by Augustine in his 345th sermon, and by the ancient Carthaginian *Kalendar* in Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* on III. Kal. August. Perpetua was arrested with Saturninus and Secundulus, and with two slaves, FELICITAS and Revocatus. Saturus, who also suffered with her, escaped arrest for a time, but subsequently surrendered. All of them seem to have been catechumens merely.

I. *Abstract of the Acts.*—Perpetua was honourably born, twenty-two years of age, married, and had lately brought forth an infant son. She had a father, mother, and two brothers, one of whom was a catechumen. As soon as she was arrested, her father strove to induce her to recant, an attempt which he frequently renewed even before the tribunal. The martyrs were baptized after their arrest, possibly while kept in custody by those who had arrested them (quum adhuc cum persecutoribus essemus), and before they were transferred to the public prison (in carcerem) (cf. Le Blant, *Actes des Mart.* v. 9, p. 48). Upon their transfer thither they seem to have been consigned to the dungeons, as Perpetua tells us of their frightful heat and darkness. They were at once attended, according to the ancient discipline of the Carthaginian church, by the deacons Tertius and Pomponius (Cypr. *Ep.* 15 *ad Mart.*). They bribed the soldiers to allow the martyrs the privilege of exercise in the air for a few hours every day. Perpetua now saw her first vision, indicative of her future passion. She saw a ladder reaching to heaven guarded by a dragon. Saturus mounted first and then Perpetua followed. They came to a large garden, where was a shepherd clad in white, feeding sheep, while thousands in white robes stood around. The shepherd gave Perpetua a piece of cheese, which she received "junctis manibus" and consumed, the attendants saying "Amen," upon which Perpetua awoke and understood that death was nigh at hand. Their trial came on soon after. They were suddenly summoned to the Forum while at dinner, where they were placed on a raised platform (catasta). After confession of their faith, the procurator Hilarianus, who presided instead of Minucius Timinianus, the proconsul, who had died, condemned them to the beasts on Geta's natal day, probably the anniversary of his assumption of the title Caesar, as his true birthday was May 26. After her condemnation Perpetua saw another vision about her brother Dinocrates, who had died when seven years old. She saw that he was in

punishment, but after continuous prayer for him it was revealed to her that he was removed into a place of refreshment and peace. This vision has been the subject of some controversy. It is of course a clear proof that prayers for the dead were then used by that party in the church which claimed to adhere most closely to apostolic usages. Some supposing Dinocrates unbaptized, have claimed it as sanctioning the view that the unbaptized dead are helped by prayer, a view which Augustine combated in *De Orig. Animae*, lib. i. cap. 10, and lib. iii. cap. 9, where he maintains that Dinocrates was in punishment for sins committed after baptism. The day before her passion Perpetua saw another vision, wherein she triumphed over an Egyptian, representing the devil, and was rewarded with a golden branch. The portion of the Acts, ch. iii.–x. inclusive, purport to have been written by Perpetua; ch. xi.–xiii. were written by Saturus, and narrate his vision. He beheld that after they had suffered and had departed from the body they were borne by angels into the East. There other angels received them in a beautiful garden, where they met Saturninus and Artarius, who had been burned alive, and Quintus who had died in prison. They were then introduced, clad in white, into the Lord's presence, where the Trisagion was always sung, and round whose throne stood twenty-four elders. Before the door of this inner presence chamber they saw Optatus the bishop, and Aspasius the presbyter-doctor, sad and separated. These cast themselves at the martyrs' feet and entreated them to compose their quarrel. The martyrs embraced them, saying, "Art thou not our Father (Papa), and thou a presbyter, why cast yourselves at our feet?" The angels then sternly rebuked Optatus, and bade him correct his people because of their disorderly assemblies. The martyrs then recognised many of their brethren, and were regaled with perfumes surpassing description. The Acts then give a minute account of their passion which bears every mark of authenticity. They were publicly entertained the day before their passion, at the supper prepared for those condemned to the beasts, which they turned into an agape (Tertull. *Apologet.* c. 42). When the hour of execution arrived the tribune attempted to array the men as priests of Saturn, the women as priestesses of Ceres, but yielded to the indignant protest of Perpetua. She suffered by the sword, after she had been tossed by an infuriated cow. Like Blandina at Lyons, who suffered the same, she was unconscious of any pain (cf. Dodwell's *Dissert. in Irenaeum*, ii. §§ 43, 46; Routh's *Reliq.* i. 360). The conduct of the martyrs converted Pudens the governor (optio) of the prison, whom Ruinart would identify with a Pudens commemorated in the ancient Carthaginian Kalendar on April 29. The use of Optio for a prison official is fixed by August. *in Joh.* c. xi. trac. xlix. § 9; Le Blant, *AA. MM.* p. 49; and Du Cange, *s. v.*

II. *Date.*—The Acts fix the martyrdom on the natal day of the Caesar Geta. The term natal day, as we have already noticed, is used for the anniversary of the accession of an emperor. Now, according to Clinton's Fasti, Geta was made Caesar in the winter of A.D. 198, which would fairly agree with the time of year of the martyrdom. As to the precise year we are more uncertain; the succession of African proconsuls being as yet very imperfectly known. We know that they suffered in the year when Minucius Timinianus was proconsul and died in his period of office. One circumstance, however, would seem to fix the date to the year 202, or at farthest 203. There was as yet no general persecution of the Christians, such as soon after developed itself. The freedom enjoyed by the clergy and Christians in ministering to the martyrs is sufficient proof of this. Why, then, did they suffer? On January 1 of the year 202 Severus was at Antioch, where he appointed himself and Caracalla consuls for the ensuing year. During the month of January he proceeded by easy stages through Palestine to Egypt, upon which journey he exercised such severities upon the Jews as, according to Renan, have left their mark on the Talmud (*Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 775–76). He also published an edict forbidding any fresh conversions from Paganism to Judaeism or Christianity, while imposing no penalties on original Jews or Christians. Now all of our martyrs were fresh converts, and as such seem to have suffered under this edict. It is difficult to decide between the years 202 and 203. Against 202 there is this to be said—our martyrs suffered on March 7. They must have been arrested some time in February, perhaps early in the month, to allow time for imprisonment apparently in three different places, the delivery of Felicitas and the trial. Now if the edict was published in January, sufficient time could scarcely have elapsed for its reception at Carthage. If it was not published till the emperor's arrival at Alexandria, where he seems to have specially devoted himself to the worship of Serapis, it could not possibly have been known in Carthage in time to satisfy our dates. We are therefore inclined to fix upon the year 203 as the true date. Görres, in *Das Christenthum u. Kais. Sept. Sever. Jahrb. Prot. Theol.* 1878, p. 315, cf. p. 290, points out that Perpetua was illegally condemned to the beasts, and should, as honourably born, have been beheaded. But the Roman proconsuls were not very observant of strict law in persecuting the Christians (cf. Tertull. *ad Scap.* c. 4; Pauli, *Sent.* v. 29, 1; Ulpian, *Dig.* xlvii. 12, 2).

III. *Authorship of Acts.*—Some have maintained that Tertullian was the author of the Acts. The style is in many places very similar to Tertullian's. The documents themselves profess to have been in great part written by Perpetua and Saturus, and completed for publication by a third party. Who this third party was cannot now be ascertained. Tertullian certainly knew the Acts, as he refers to the vision of Perpetua in *De Animâ*, c. 55, where, however, he evidently writes from memory, and confuses the vision of paradise granted to Saturus with the vision of her conflict granted to Perpetua the day before her passion, not the day of her passion, as Tertullian states. A further question has been raised as to the opinions of the martyrs and of the compiler of the Acts, whether they were Montanist or Catholic. On the one hand it is urged that the preface utters Montanist sentiments, speaking of prophecies and visions as granted by the Spirit. On the other hand, it is equally clear that the martyrs had not separated from the Catholic communion, as they were

attended by the deacons, according to custom; while again Saturus sees the bishop Optatus and the presbyter Aspasius in Paradise, where the bishop is reproved not for rejecting the Paraclete, but for suffering his flock to walk in a disorderly manner. Yet it is quite evident that the spirit and tenets of Montanism had infected a large and enthusiastic section of the church, which hardly tolerated the more conservative and easy-going views and practices of the church authorities. From that section our Acts emanated. Cardinal Orsi, in the last century, wrote a long dissertation to prove the orthodoxy of the martyrs, which Basnage had impugned. Routh, on the other hand, lays down decidedly that the author was a Montanist (*Rel. Sac.* i. 455).

IV. *Original Language of Acts.*—All our manuscripts are in Latin; yet Aubé (*Les Chrét. dans l'Emp. Rom.* p. 615) thinks they may have been originally written in Greek. One MS. indeed represents Perpetua as speaking Greek to the bishop Optatus in Paradise. The Acts certainly contain a very large number of Greek words in Latin characters, whence we may at least conclude that the martyrs were bi-lingual, and that Greek was then very current at Carthage. [SCILLITAN MARTYRS.] The Acts contain some interesting illustrations of ancient church customs. The Good Shepherd appears as He does in the catacombs, feeding His sheep, Eucharistic words and actions are recorded. The shepherd gives a piece of cheese to Perpetua. She receives it "junctis manibus," while those around say "Amen" (c. iv.). The kiss of peace is given (c. x.). The Trisagion is sung, and in Greek (c. xii.). In the language of the visions we can clearly see the influence of the Apocalypse (cf. specially c. xii.). The Acts were discovered and published by Lucas Holstenius in the 17th century. Ruinart embodied them in his *Acta Sincera*. They will also be found in *Acta SS.* Boll. Mart. i. p. 630; Munter, *Primord. Eccles. Afric.* p. 226. They are translated in Clark's Ante-Nicene Series, Cyprian's works, t. ii. p. 276. Aubé, *l. c.* p. 521, has published another version from a Parisian MS.

On the chronology of the martyrdom, cf. Uhlhorn, *Fundamenta Chronolog.* Tertull. 1852, p. 5, sq.; Bonwetsch, *Die Schriften Tertullians*, 1878, p. 75; *Gesch. des Montanismus*, 1881, p. 184; Arkill on Perpetua, in new volume of Herzog's *Cyclopaedia.* [G. T. S.]

PERPETUA (2) JULIA. [JULIA (8).]

PERPETUUS, ST., sixth archbishop of Tours, between St. Eustochius and St. Volusianus, both of whom were his relatives, belonged to one of the great senatorial families of the Auvergne. He possessed considerable wealth (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* x. 31), was a student of sacred literature and a friend of the two poets Sidonius Apollinaris and Paulinus of Périgueux (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* vii. 9; Paulinus Petr. *De Vita S. Mart.* vi.; *Epist. ad Perpet.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 1064 seqq., 1071). He was consecrated in 460 or 461, and in the latter year presided over the council of Tours, convoked to make head against the spirit of worldliness and profligacy which had pervaded the Gallic clergy (Mansi, vii. 943 seqq.) The council of Vannes, held about 465, and over which apparently he also presided, had the same object in view (*ibid.* 951 seqq.) His principal work was the construction of the great church of St. Martin at Tours. The one built by Briccius had become too small for the fame and miracles of the saint. Of the new one which replaced it at 550 paces from the city, and to which the saint's body was translated with great ceremony (circ. Jul. 4, 473), owing to its being Gregory the historian's own church, we have full and interesting details and measurements. (See *Hist. Franc.* ii. 14; *De Mirac. S. Mart.* i. 6.) Euphronius, bishop of Autun, gave the marble for the saint's tomb (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 15), and inscriptions in verse were composed for it by Sidonius Apollinaris of Clermont and Paulinus of Périgueux. The former's has come down to us (*Epist.* iv. 18), but of the one contributed by the latter we only hear in his letter to Perpetuus (*Paulinus Petricord*, ibid., Migne, col. 1074). A good many other churches were built by Perpetuus, and notably one in honour of St. Peter and St. Paul, which he constructed to receive the roof of St. Martin's old church, as it was of elegant workmanship (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 14; x. 31). Besides church-building Perpetuus bestowed much care on the services of his church. Gregory recounts the fasts, vigils and regulations for divine service instituted by him for different seasons of the year, and still observed in Gregory's own time (*Hist. Franc.* x. 31; cf. *Hist. Litt.* ii. 626–627; Ceillier, x. 438, 441).

Perpetuus died in 490 or 491, after an episcopate of thirty years (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 26; x. 31), and, as he had asked in his will, was buried in the church he had built, at the feet of St. Martin (*Epitaphium* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 755, and elsewhere). The old hagiologies are at variance as to the day of commemoration of his death, Florus, Rabanus and others noticing it on Dec. 30, while Usuard and the *Roman Martyrology* place it on April 8 (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. i. 750, where the latter date is adopted as his day, but his *depositio* is fixed Dec. 30).

Perpetuus has left an interesting memorial in his will. It was first published, together with a metrical epitaph, by d'Achéry in 1661 in the fifth volume of the *Spicilegium*. It is also given by Boll. (*Acta SS.* Apr. i. 750–751), Ruinart (Greg. Tur. *appx.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1149, seqq.), Migne (*Patr. Lat.* lviii. 753 seqq.), *Gall. Christ.* (xiv. *instr.* 1–3), and Ceillier (x. 439–440). There seems to be no doubt of its genuineness. Perpetuus signed it in duplicate on Mar. i. 475. After giving their freedom to the slaves, both male and female, on an estate he had purchased, forgiving his debtors, bequeathing various legacies to churches, relations and friends, and providing from his own means a pension for two priests he had been compelled to degrade, he makes the poor the heirs of all the residue of his property (cf. *Hist. Litt.* ii. 624; Ceillier, 439–441). [S. A. B.]

PERSEUS, a bishop, "*Collega* noster," sent on business from Rome to Carthage with Felician. (Cyp. *Ep.* 59.) [E. W. B.]

PERSON OF CHRIST, CONTROVERSIES RESPECTING THE. A full discussion of the views held respecting the Person

of Christ within the period embraced in this Dictionary would range from the heresy of Simon at one end of the series to Adoptionism at the other, and the reader will find accordingly under such names as ARIUS, ARIANISM, ADOPTIONISTS, DOCETISM, SABELLIANISM, discussions of various portions of this great question. But the heresies which arose during our period touching the Person of Christ, may be classed under two great divisions. (1) Heresies which dealt with the Person of Christ in relation to the persons of the Holy Trinity; which, broadly speaking, embrace all heresies down to and including Arianism in its various shapes. (2) Heresies which deal with the Person of Christ, as considered in and by itself alone; embracing, therefore, all questions touching the relations between the human and divine natures and the mode of their union in His person. The first class, in fact, dealt mainly with the Godhead of Christ; the second dealt with His Incarnation. This second class begins with Apollinarianism, followed by Nestorianism, Monophysitism, Monothelitism, and ending with Adoptionism. Apollinarianism, Nestorianism, and Adoptionism have been already discussed. It only remains, therefore, to consider in this article the view of Christ's person taken by the Monophysite or Eutychian party, out of which was logically and necessarily evolved the Monothelite heresy; for if Christ had but one nature, and that the divine, He necessarily had but one will, and that the divine will. Under this article therefore will be treated the Monophysite and the Monothelite heresies.

MONOPHYSITES

is the general name of a number of sects agreeing in the heretical tenet, that only one nature subsisted in Christ after the hypostatic union. MONOPHYSITISM designates their doctrinal tendency (*μόνος, single, φύσις, nature*). The Monophysites (Μονοφυσῖται) received this name from their theological opponents, whom they in turn styled Diphysites or Dyophysites (Διφυσῖται—Δυοφυσῖται) and "Nestorians" or "semi-Nestorians;" by their own writers they are constantly spoken of as "the orthodox" and "the believers," or "the faithful." (See John of Ephesus, *Eccl. Hist. passim.*)

1. *Earlier traces of the doctrine of a single nature.*—The doctrine of the Divinity of Our Lord having been defined by the decrees of Nicaea, A.D. 325, the main problem of Christology next began to press for solution. The Nicene symbol had declared that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, was begotten of the Father, that is of His substance, and thus was God begotten of God, and consubstantial with the Father (*ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί*); and that for our salvation He came down, was incarnate, and made man (*σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα*). The church had thus decided that the Redeemer was both God and man; and the problem was to reconcile, in the concrete unity of His person, these two aspects or natures of the Godhead and the manhood; in other words, to define the relation between the divine and the human element in the historic personality of Jesus, and to determine how God and man coëxisted in the unity of one individual being. As Dorner has pointed out, the difficulty of the problem was rendered insuperable by the fact, that the two natures were more and more regarded as mutually antagonistic and exclusive. Under such a condition no real union—no union, that is, which was more than a mechanical juxtaposition, or which did not involve an entire or partial suppression or absorption of one or the other nature—was conceivable.

The idea of the union as a *mixture* of the two natures, was one for which high patristic authority might be alleged. Origen (d. 254) and St. Gregory Nyssen had described the union as a *κρᾶσις* or *σύγκρασις*, using these terms in their strict sense, and not in the free manner of SS. Irenaeus, Cyprian, Augustine. Origen speaks of "the quality of the mortal element in Christ changing into an ethereal and divine quality;" and of "His mortal body, and the human soul therein, changing into God, by participation in His divinity;" language which obviously implies a transformation of the human into the divine nature, in consequence of the union, the divine properties passing over into the human nature, and, as it were, deifying it. So also St. Gregory Nyssen taught that by the union with God, the flesh of Christ cast off all weakness and corruption, rising superior to the laws and restrictions of ordinary human bodies. Like a drop of vinegar poured into the ocean, it wholly lost its own nature, and took on the divine. Its *substance* remained unimpaired, but submerged and lost in the ocean of deity. Accordingly the divine and human elements in Christ might be distinguished only in thought.

Similar conceptions had been entertained by the Arians, were adopted by Apollinaris and his followers, and afterwards revived by the Julianist Monophysites. Like St. Gregory Nyssen, Apollinaris insisted upon the *oneness* of Christ. To distinguish God from man in Him was to set up two persons, two Sons (a favourite Monophysite contention). "The Jews," he wrote, "in crucifying the body, crucified God." The Scriptures make no distinction between the Word and His flesh; there is one nature, one hypostasis, one activity (*ἔστι μία φύσις μία ὑπόστασις μία ἐνέργεια*). Christ was neither all man, nor all God, but a blend (*μίξις*) of God and man. And as the worship of Christ is one, there are not divers substances (*ἄλλη καὶ ἄλλη οὐσία*) but one only, in virtue of the synthesis of God with a human body. That human body was not endowed with a rational soul (*ψυχὴ λογική*), for where complete man is, there is also sin; and Christ did not grow in goodness through a course of discipline. In Him, therefore, the divine reason or *logos* discharged the function of intelligence or spirit (*νοῦς—πνεῦμα*). "O new creation!" he exclaims; "O godlike mixture! God and Flesh constituted one nature!" (*θεὸς καὶ σὰρξ μίαν ἀπετέλεσαν φύσιν.*)

The doctrine of a mixture of the natures was condemned by the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. As the conflict with Arianism had issued in a recognition of the perfect divinity, so the conflict with Apollinarianism produced the declaration of the perfect humanity of Christ.

2. *Antagonism of Alexandria and Antioch.*—The period between the council of Constantinople and that of Chalcedon (381–451) was marked by a controversy in which the antagonistic tendencies represented by the schools of Alexandria and Antioch came into collision with

each other. The question was whether the incidents of human life which the Scriptures predicate of Jesus, His birth, bodily affections, and death, must be referred to the manhood only, or to both the natures. The Alexandrian theology clung to the mystical and transcendent aspect of the incarnation, whereby God became one with man. The great Athanasius had asserted an unmixed physical union of the Word with the flesh that became His own, and explained this ἕνωσις φυσική as a union in respect to nature (ἕνωσις κατὰ φύσιν). In accordance with this thesis, which was aimed at the Arians, the weightiest emphasis was laid upon the unity of the divine and human in Christ; an idea which was pushed to such extremes that all distinction of the two natures appeared to be obliterated. Just as Apollinaris had approved of such expressions as "God was born," "God was crucified," so the Alexandrian church in general delighted to style the Blessed Virgin, Mother of God (Θεοτόκος). On the other hand, the theologians of Antioch, following the lead of Diodorus of Tarsus (d. 394) and Theodore of Mopsuestia, insisted upon the unchanged permanence of the human nature in and after its union with the divine. They had always before their eyes the spectre of Apollinarianism; and they rejected with horror phrases which seemed to attribute birth and death to deity. They admitted that the manhood was adorable in so far as it was the instrument of the Logos; not, however, as in any degree participating in the divine properties, which the Alexandrian doctrine of an exchange of attributes (ἀντιμεθίστασις τῶν ὀνομάτων) assumed.

3. *Theodore of Mopsuestia.*—The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia was intimately connected with his peculiar theory of man. He believed that it was Christ's vocation to be that true and real image of God which Adam ought, but failed, to have become; and he asserted that so far as He was man, Christ was subject to moral development, ascribing to Him, in opposition to Apollinaris, a real human soul endowed with the faculty of self-determination or free-will, which, for our salvation, sustained a real conflict with evil. When Jesus was formed in the womb, the divine Logos, foreknowing what manner of man He would become, united with Him; and all His life long, Jesus resolved and acted in harmony with the indwelling deity. Further, God dwells in men not specially in respect of His nature or activity, for in those respects He is omnipresent; but in respect of His good pleasure in them (εὐδοκία; St. Matt. iii. 17), which varies in degree according to the various excellence of their characters. The divine pleasure in Christ was so great, that God dwelt in Him *as in the Son.* Theodore called the union of the two natures a *synaphea* (συνάφεια, *connexion*). Each was complete, and therefore each involved a person, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπρόσωπόν ἐστιν ὑπόστασιν εἰπεῖν; but in their union they constituted one person (πρόσωπον).

Against the Syrian attempts at circumscribing the ineffable mystery of the Incarnation by the forms of the human understanding, the Alexandrian spirit rose in implacable hostility. Its principal champion was the patriarch Cyril, whose long and bitter controversy with Nestorius, beginning in a strife about the term Θεοτόκος, ended in the condemnation of his adversary by the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. Nestorius, a Syrian monk who had been raised to the patriarchate of Constantinople, adhering to the theology of Antioch, disapproved of the popular title of the Virgin, as implying a confusion or mixture of the two natures in Christ: "The creature," he urged, "bare not the Creator; she bare a man, the instrument of deity. The Holy Spirit did not create God the Word, but fashioned of the Virgin a temple for God the Word to dwell in." Like his teachers, he held an indwelling (ἐνοίκησις) of the Godhead in Christ, and a conjunction (συνάφεια) of the two natures; but he seems to have carefully avoided that sundering of which his enemies accused him: "for the sake of the hidden, I adore the apparent; God is inseparable from the apparent, therefore I separate not the honour of that which is not separated: I separate the natures, but I unify the adoration."

The doctrine of the Antiochenes was a protest on behalf of the truth and reality of Christ's human nature. The grand objection to their theory lay in the fact, that it seemed to postulate a merely mechanical or local union of the two natures, and in its most developed form hardly got beyond a *relative union* (ἕνωσις σχετική), a union, that is, conditioned by the fitness of the elements for coëxistence and coöperation. The Alexandrians rightly apprehended that the union of God and man in Christ was something much beyond this; but they fell into the opposite extreme of asserting what Dorner has called a *magical union*, appearing to maintain a transmutation of the human into the divine. Neither of the two conflicting schools shewed much inclination to understand the position of its antagonists; a captious deduction of repudiated consequences was the favourite argumentative device; anathemas were met by counter-anathemas; and the final triumph which Cyril obtained, through court influence, was rather a personal victory over his powerful rival than a triumph of orthodoxy over heresy.

4. *Cyril of Alexandria.*—The expulsion of Nestorianism did not bring peace to the church. Isidore of Pelusium had forewarned Cyril against preparing the way for perpetual schisms, a warning which was amply justified by the after course of events. In his intemperate advocacy of the Alexandrian doctrine, Cyril had allowed himself to use language which at least lay open to the gravest misapprehension. This was especially the case in his twelve *Anathematismi* or articles of recantation, which he launched at Nestorius (A.D. 430), and of which Gibbon has said that they are "indelibly tinged with the colours of Apollinarian heresy." Cyril held fast by the ἕνωσις φυσική, and adopted the formula "One incarnate nature of God the Word" (μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη), which he cites as from Athanasius. After the union the two natures are no longer to be distinguished; in the abstract, indeed, two natures may be discerned, in the concrete only one, that of the incarnate Word. And the predicates proper to each are now transferrible; one may correctly say that the divine Word *suffered* in flesh, and in flesh was crucified. Mary was truly Theotokos. Cyril did not by any means deny the true humanity. On the contrary, he held that the Word took to Himself a perfect

human nature of the same substance as ours, which suffered no change by that ineffable union. In Christ there was God the Word + a true human soul and body. The union, however, was so close that not two natures but one resulted. Cyril explained this by the analogy of soul and body, which combine to constitute a single human nature, though they are in themselves absolutely different the one from the other. Thought can distinguish two natures in Christ, just as it can in a man; but in reality, they are so indissolubly united, that we ought not to say that two natures exist in Him, but only one. It was not that Cyril confounded the ideas of *nature* and *person*. He could distinguish them well enough for purposes of controversy. But he considered the Logos to be the personal element in Christ. The Logos at the incarnation appropriated flesh or humanity, as a mere selfless group of attributes. "He remained one, yet not lacking flesh nor without a body; but having a body as a *proprium*, inseparable in virtue of union" (ἴδιον ἔχων αὐτὸ καθ' ἕνωσιν ἀδιάσπαστον). The union did not modify the original divine attributes; it merely added another group of characters to the concept Logos, so that thenceforth Logos + Humanity made up one being. "The manhood became proper to the Word, and one Son is conceived of therewith" (ἡ ἀνθρωπότης γέγονεν ἰδία τοῦ λόγου, καὶ εἷς υἱὸς νοεῖται σὺν αὐτῇ). When hard pressed, however, Cyril could only defend his doctrine of the unconditional transfer of predicates, by such paradoxical sayings as that the Logos *suffered without suffering* (ἀπαθῶς ἔπαθε), or that Christ, while remaining omniscient, assumed also the attribute of limited knowledge *by way of an economy* (οἰκονομικῶς οἰκειοῦται καὶ τοῦτο μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων). No wonder that the unlettered monks, who were everywhere his passionate allies, mistook Cyril's meaning. The ineffable mystery which he rightly asserted for the incarnation, seemed to be preserved and enhanced by this kind of language; but it is certain that among the rank and file of his supporters, many, in their zeal against Nestorianism, fell into the opposite error of confounding the natures, and believed in an absorption or transmutation of the manhood by the Godhead.

5. *Eutychian development of Monophysitism.*—Cyril died in 444, and was succeeded by Dioscorus, who with less learning and argumentative power, was far more conspicuous for violence. The archimandrite Eutyches and the monks of Constantinople, who had done good service for Cyril against their patriarch Nestorius, were as zealous for his successor against the Syrian champion Theodoret of Cyrus, whom they supposed to divide the one and only Christ into two Sons of God. Already Dioscorus had accused his great opponent to Domnus the patriarch of Antioch, and had apprised the emperor that the whole church of eastern Asia was "Nestorian," when (A.D. 448) the charge of heresy fell like a thunderbolt upon his mainstay at Constantinople the abbat Eutyches. Eusebius of Doryleum pressed the charge of Apollinarian errors against this person, in the home synod of the patriarch Flavian. Before the synod Eutyches said, "I confess that our Lord originated out of two natures before the union; after the union I confess one nature"—the ordinary Monophysite view. In accordance with Alexandrian phrase, he called the body of Christ God's body; but, he added—and this it was which gave the greatest offence—that he did not think it could be consubstantial with our bodies (ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν). Condemned by the synod, Eutyches appealed from its sentence to a general council; and the emperor Theodosius, who was his friend and the fast ally of Dioscorus, ordered a council to meet at Ephesus (A.D. 449). Dioscorus was to preside, supported by Juvenal of Jerusalem and Thalassius of the Cappadocian Caesarea. Flavian and the other judges of Eutyches were not to vote, but to wait for the verdict of the council. The abbat Barsumas, a furious Monophysite, was to sit as representing the Syrian monks, who were all partisans of Alexandria. The verdict of such a council was certain beforehand. Bribery and intimidation secured the deposition of Flavian, Theodoret, Eusebius. The legates of pope Leo the Great could not get a hearing for his famous letter to Flavian, in which he drew the sharpest distinction between the two natures as subsisting in Christ after the union. Flavian, who was fatally maltreated by the brutal partisans of Dioscorus, appealed to another council to be held in Italy. Pope Leo, indignant at the lawless proceedings of what he not unjustly styled a "synod of brigands" (σύνοδος λῃστρική—latrocinium), wrote, and induced Valentinian III. to write, to Theodosius proposing an Italian council. Unwilling to yield, Theodosius was compelled to negotiate, if he would have his new patriarch Anatolius recognised by the Western church. Soon a change of court parties restored his sister the princess Pulcheria to power, who was rigidly Dyophysite in her opinions; and the cause of the murdered Flavian triumphed when she and her consort Marcian ascended the throne (A.D. 450). With the court, many bishops, whom fear or servility had connected with the Egyptian party, now changed sides. Amnesty was proclaimed for all, save Dioscorus and Juvenal. By command of Marcian, 630 bishops met, first at Nice, then at Chalcedon, which was yet nearer to the court. The emperor, who dreaded the alienation of the powerful and fanatical Monophysites, was hopeful that a compromise might be achieved, and the schism healed by the labours of this council. As soon as the bias of the imperial court became manifest, Dioscorus was deserted even by his former allies. At the outset a majority of the bishops went over from the Egyptian to the Oriental benches. All assented to a reversal of the decrees of Ephesus. Yet when the first draft of a creed prepared by Anatolius and a secret committee of bishops was submitted to the council it provoked dissensions. The draft is lost, but apparently it asserted that Christ consisted of or originated out of two natures (ἐκ δυοῖν φύσεων), an ambiguous phrase more agreeable to the Monophysites than to their opponents. The Roman legates, who had before interfered to prevent Dioscorus from taking his seat in the council, now insisted upon the acceptance of Leo's decisions, formulated in the letter to Flavian; and the emperor ordered a second committee to draw up another creed. Much noisy contention followed. At last the imperial commissioners declared, that it was the opinion of Dioscorus that Christ *consists of* (ἐκ), not *subsists in* (ἐν) two natures; whereas pope Leo had

defined that two natures are united without confusion, without change, without separation, in the one Christ. Which was right? The bishops, or a majority of them, shouted their accord with the pope, and his doctrine was incorporated with the definition of the council, which concludes thus (Mansi, vii. 108): "Following, therefore, the holy fathers, we all, with one voice, teach to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood, the same being truly God and truly man, of a reasonable soul and body, of the same substance with the Father as touching the Godhead, and of the same substance with us as touching the manhood, in all respects save sin like unto us; before the worlds begotten of the Father, as respects the Godhead, in the last days for us and for our salvation of Mary the Virgin, the Mother of God (**Θεοτόκου**) as respects the manhood, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only begotten, known of two natures (Latin text, *in duabus naturis*; see Evagr. ii. 4), without confusion, without change, without division, without severance (ἐκ δύο φύσεων ἀσυγχύτως ἀτρέπτως ἀδιαιρέτως ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον); the difference of the natures having been in nowise done away on account of the union, but rather the special character of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one person and one hypostasis; not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and only begotten God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ: even as from the first the prophets and Jesus Christ Himself taught us concerning Him, and as the creed of the fathers hath delivered unto us."

Dioscorus did not quail. He denied the authority of the council, and even excommunicated pope Leo. He was deposed. In the eighth session Theodoret was restored to his see, but not until he had yielded a reluctant assent to the anathema against Nestorius.

The council of Chalcedon sought to exclude from the church the one-sided exaggerations of both Antioch and Alexandria, the errors identified with the names of Nestorius and Eutyches. Against the former, "those who ventured to corrupt the mystery of the economy, and talked shameless folly about a mere man who was born of the holy Virgin Mary," it adopted the synodical letters of "the blessed Cyril" to Nestorius and his Oriental sympathisers; against the latter, "those who introduce a confusion and mixture, and senselessly feign that the nature of the flesh and of the Godhead is one, and monstrously assert that the divine nature of the only begotten was passible owing to the confusion," or who "insanely hold that the form of the servant taken from us was of a heavenly or some other (non-human) substance," the council stamped with its authority the letter of Leo to Flavian. The general Monophysite position was condemned in the words, "The synod anathematises those who suppose two natures of the Lord before the union, but one after it." And the council ruled that, on pain of deposition for the clergy, and excommunication for monks and laity, none should propose, or write, or teach, or even think a different creed. The painful and repulsive features of the struggle should not be allowed to confuse the judgment of the modern student as to the real merits of the controversy, and the importance of the points at issue between the contending parties. History compels us to distribute our blame impartially. Abundant evidence is supplied, by their own writers and champions, of the fierce intolerance of the Monophysite sectaries towards the Catholic body; apart from the general consideration, that the narrow exclusiveness of the sectarian spirit must always be essentially opposed to Christian forbearance and charity. Moreover, the degenerate manners of the times must not be forgotten. Incidents and behaviour characteristic of the age, however deplorable as exhibitions of an imperfect practical Christianity, cannot fairly be regarded as reflecting discredit upon the definition of Catholic dogma which emerges as the permanent outcome of those bewildering strifes and internecine conflicts. They, at all events, who believe in the perpetual guidance of the One Church by the Spirit of its Divine Founder will find no serious difficulty here. After all deductions upon whatever accounts, the truth remains that the definition of Chalcedon did inestimable service to the church, and to the cause of a sound Christology, by its authoritative declaration that the problem of the union of the two natures is not rightly solved by assuming either a dual personality or a metamorphosis of one nature into the other, i.e. either on Ebionitic or on Docetic principles. At the same time, as commonly happens, the solution of one problem was the suggestion of another; and henceforth theological speculation laboured with the difficulty of reconciling, in the unity of one person, the two natures which, as a result of the definition of the council, appeared to be mutually exclusive and incompatible with each other. During the following three centuries this antithesis rose into continually sharper and clearer contrast, until the rise of Adoptionism in the 8th century brought matters to a crisis.

6. *Progress of the struggle after the Council of Chalcedon.*—The council of Chalcedon broke up without having achieved its immediate ends. Opposing tendencies were not likely to be reconciled by the decrees of a synod which might be said to have oscillated between two creeds, and to have been swayed in its decisions by the imperial will. The partisans of Dioscorus spread their doctrines among the illiterate monks of Egypt and Palestine, who saw nothing but "Nestorianism" in the assertion of the two natures in Christ after the union. It was a common belief that Nestorius the arch-heretic had been invited to the synod of Chalcedon, but had providentially died on the way. The oecumenical council was regarded as a mere party synod; and the Monophysites—as they now began to be generally designated—stood aloof henceforth in sectarian isolation from the main body of the church. They constituted a numerous and powerful community not only in Egypt and the East, but also in Constantinople itself, as the lately recovered history of John of Ephesus abundantly proves. In Palestine the hot-headed monk Theodosius, abetted by the empress Eudoxia, excited his brethren of the cloisters, drove the time-serving Juvenal from his see, and usurped the patriarchate of Jerusalem, deposing and creating bishops with a high hand, until at last violence was suppressed by violence (A.D. 451–453).

At Alexandria terrible scenes had ensued upon the news of the deposition of Dioscorus. A number of imperial soldiers were burnt alive by the mob in the Serapeum. The outbreak was quelled by a stronger force, and the orthodox Proterius was maintained on the patriarchal throne, although the Monophysites held aloof under the presbyter Timotheus Aelurus (*weasel*), and the deacon Peter Mongus (*μογγός*, *hoarse*). On the death of Marcian (A.D. 457), they ventured to make a patriarch of Timotheus Aelurus, and Proterius was murdered in the cathedral church. The fanaticism of the Monophysites was not appeased until it had burnt all the episcopal chairs in the churches, on which the murdered patriarch ever sat, washed with sea-water the altars at which he had ministered, removed his name from the diptychs, and confiscated his goods. The new patriarch at once excommunicated all "Chalcedonians," and among them pope Leo. Meanwhile some clerical refugees from his violence accused Aelurus at the court; and the latter, not to be outdone, memorialised the new emperor, accusing the late synod of "Nestorian" heresy, and vindicating his own views by passages from the fathers. The emperor Leo I., well aware of the power of the Monophysites and of the expedience of a peaceful solution (Egypt being, as John of Ephesus remarks, the granary of the capital), at first thought of another general council. This pope Leo strongly deprecated; and being likewise unwilling to come, as the emperor requested, and conduct the negotiations with the Monophysites, he advised that the metropolitans of all parts of the empire, except Egypt, should be ordered to ascertain the opinion of their bishops respecting the validity of the election of Aelurus, and the orthodoxy of the decrees of Chalcedon. A great majority of some 1600 prelates answered that the council was orthodox, and the election of Aelurus null and void. The bishops of Pamphylia attempted to mediate between the opposed camps, by replying that the symbol of Nice was sufficient for all practical needs. The doctrine of the union of two natures in the one Christ was not delivered to catechumens as a lesson or creed, but reserved to the clergy for polemical purposes. The epistle of Leo to Flavian was not a creed, but an invective against heresy. They further avowed a preference for the phrase, one incarnate nature of the Word, on the ground of patristic authority (Mansi, vii. 573). They concluded by recommending an imitation of the forbearance of Christ towards those who were in error. The emperor, however, proceeded to order an inquiry concerning the murder of Proterius at Alexandria, and banished Aelurus first to Gangra, then to the Tauric Chersonese (A.D. 460). Another Timotheus, nicknamed Salophaciolus (ܨܠܘܦܩܝܘܠܐ) was appointed in his stead; a prelate whose orthodoxy was tempered by a conciliating spirit of Christian charity, which won the respect and affection even of the bitterest Monophysites.

Fresh disturbances broke out at Antioch. Peter the Fuller (ὁ γναφεύς), a monk who had been a fanatical supporter of Eutyches at Constantinople, succeeded, by help of the monks, in expelling the orthodox patriarch Martyrius; and having occupied his throne, convulsed the church by interpolating the liturgical Trisagion with a Monophysite formula. The ancient hymn of the Seraphim (Isa. vi. 3) had been modified in the reign of Theodosius II. into Ἅγιος ὁ θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς! Peter further altered it by introducing the phrase, ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς. Thus originated the Theopaschitic controversy, which was not settled till the reign of Justinian (A.D. 553, *vid. infr.*). Not long afterwards Peter was banished by an imperial decree (A.D. 470). When, however, Zeno, the son-in-law of Leo, had been driven from the throne by the usurper Basilicus (A.D. 476), who sought support by favouring the Monophysites, Peter the Fuller and Timotheus Aelurus were reinstated in their sees, and an Encyclical (τὸ Ἐγκύκλιον) was addressed by the new emperor "to Timotheus, the most pious and God-loving archbishop of Alexandria," ruling that the Nicene creed, and the canons of Constantinople and Ephesus should alone be valid. The decrees of Chalcedon and the letter of pope Leo were to be burnt, and all bishops were to subscribe the Encyclical (Evagr. iii. 4). As usual, the Greek bishops shewed themselves facile enough in the matter. But the orthodox monks of Constantinople were not inactive, and Acacius the patriarch was soon able to effect a successful rising in favour of the exiled emperor. The falling usurper vainly issued his Ἀντεγκύκλιον (Repeal of the Encyclical); Zeno triumphed, and with him the cause of Chalcedon (A.D. 477). The five hundred bishops who had accepted the Encyclical now signified their sorrow to Acacius, at the same time excusing themselves on the ground of constraint. Shortly afterwards, Timotheus Aelurus died, and the Monophysites chose Peter Mongus to succeed him. The restored emperor passed sentence of death upon Mongus, who only saved himself by flight. Timotheus Salophaciolus was forced again upon the unwilling Alexandrians. Confiscation and exile were held over all who should not submit to his communion within two months. For a time the patriarch's wise moderation, an attitude which he maintained in spite of Zeno's exhortations to suppress the heretics, secured the tranquillity of the church. But upon his death, the Monophysites again elected Mongus, while the orthodox minority raised John Talaia to the patriarchate. Talaia, confident in the friendship of Illus, a great courtier, omitted to pay the customary compliments to the patriarch Acacius; a slight which the latter did not forget. The subsequent rebellion of Illus was sufficient to discredit Talaia with the emperor, and Mongus, seizing his opportunity, hastened to the capital and urged the expediency of a compromise with the Monophysite majority of Alexandria. By the help of Acacius, Zeno was persuaded to publish (A.D. 482) his famous Edict of Union (ἑνωτικόν), which sought a basis of union in the suppression of disputed phrases, and the use of less definite expressions such as all could admit. The document is preserved in Evagrius (iii. 14). It rules that the symbol of Nice, Chalcedon and Ephesus is alone valid, and confirms Cyril's Twelve Anathematismi. It declares that Christ is one and not two, for to one belong the miracles and the sufferings; and it condemns not only Nestorius and Eutyches, but all who, *whether at Chalcedon or any other synod*, had contradicted the doctrine of this

edict. [HENOTICUM.] In the heated state of parties the only effect of this well-meant effort for peace was an aggravation of discord. The zealots on both sides separated from the moderates who accepted the compromise. Many of the Egyptians renounced their connexion with Mongus, and were henceforth known as *Acephali* (Ἀκέφαλοι, the headless party). John of Ephesus (v. 6) speaks of them as heretical. Many of them, he relates, found refuge in Pamphylia, where they were again converted by the zeal of the "orthodox" (i.e. the regular Monophysites). They regarded Aelurus as the last genuine patriarch; but, contrary to his teaching, they appear to have believed that the body of Jesus was superior to ordinary human bodies. On the other hand, acceptance of the Henoticum was a proof of Monophysite heresy in the eyes of inflexible partisans of the council of Chalcedon. Rome firmly opposed the compromise. Since the downfall of the Western Empire (A.D. 476) the popes had become independent of Constantinople; after vain remonstrances, therefore, Felix III. excommunicated Acacius, who, however, paid no heed to the sentence, but quietly removed the pope's name from the diptychs of his church (A.D. 484). The result was a schism between East and West, which lasted from A.D. 484 to 519. Meanwhile the Eastern church was still distracted by the questions which the Henoticon had failed to shelve or settle. In Constantinople the monks called *the Sleepless* (Ἀκοίμητοι) maintained communion with Rome, and the bitterness of party there and elsewhere often broke out into open quarrel. Anastasius (A.D. 491–518) succeeded to the empire and policy of Zeno. His desire was to maintain the public peace by holding the balance evenly between the rival parties, but he was foiled by the fanaticism of the times. Suspected from the first by Euphemius the patriarch of Constantinople, who had wrung from him a written pledge that he would not attack the authority of Chalcedon, Anastasius got rid of him on a charge of treason (A.D. 495). The new patriarch Macedonius signed the Henoticon, and attempted to reconcile the fierce monks of the capital, especially the Akoimetoi, to the compromise, but was himself prevailed upon to become a decided Chalcedonian. Meanwhile the Monophysites of Syria, headed by Xenaias (the famous Philoxenus) bishop of Mabbogh (Hierapolis), rose in revolt against Flavian the patriarch of Antioch, who had subscribed the Henoticon, but was unwilling to condemn the council of Chalcedon and the doctrine of the two natures. Swarms of furious monks crowded the streets of Antioch; the citizens and another band of monks drove them out with bloodshed. Both Xenaias and Severus, another eminent leader of the Monophysites, afterwards repaired to Constantinople, whither hordes of monks of both parties followed them. The emperor now favoured the Monophysite faction, by way of reprisals on Macedonius and the unquiet Chalcedonians. Riots broke out in the very churches, one body of monks chanting the Trisagion in its older form, another interrupting with the Monophysite addition. After peace had been restored the emperor managed to depose Macedonius (A.D. 511) and appoint in his stead Timotheus, who accepted the Henoticon, and even anathematised the council of Chalcedon. Next year another mad outbreak in Constantinople, again in connexion with the Trisagion, was only lulled when the aged Anastasius appeared in the circus as a suppliant, offering to abdicate his throne! In A.D. 513 Severus expelled Flavianus, and occupied his place as patriarch of Antioch. On the other hand, the orthodox majority in Jerusalem drove out Elias their patriarch, who belonged to the moderate party. The struggle pursued its wild and bloody course throughout the eastern provinces.

In A.D. 514 new troubles befel Anastasius. Vitalian, a rude savage, commanding the imperial troops in Thrace, declared himself the champion of Chalcedon; and after wasting the country up to the walls of the capital, compelled the emperor to promise the restoration of Macedonius and Flavianus to their sees, and the termination of the schism between East and West. Negotiations with pope Hormisdas were begun. The pope demanded of Anastasius (1) the recognition of the council of Chalcedon and Leo's letter to Flavian, and a general enforcement of the same upon the clergy; (2) the anathema upon Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, Aelurus, Peter Mongus, Acacius, Peter the Fuller; (3) the restoration of all deposed clergy who had supported Rome, their causes to be submitted to the pope, who should also have the trial of those who had persecuted the orthodox. Anastasius stood firmly by the memory of Acacius, and the negotiations were broken off, to be renewed by his successor, Justin I. (A.D. 518–527), a Dacian soldier, who had been captain of the guard. Though illiterate, Justin was known to be staunchly orthodox, and, moreover, allowed himself to be guided by the counsels of Vitalian and Justinian, both of whom were pledged to the cause of Chalcedon. The citizens of the capital were unanimous in their clamours for communion with Rome, for the recognition of Chalcedon, for the deposition of Severus of Antioch. Justin published edicts recalling the exiled bishops, deposing their Monophysite successors, and debarring heretics from public offices. The names of Acacius, Zeno, Anastasius, were stricken off the diptychs. Severus and the other Monophysite leaders fled to Alexandria, where the predominance of their party protected them against the violence of the court. The whole East, except Egypt, became orthodox, and the schism with Rome was at an end (A.D. 519).

7. *Disintegration of the Monophysites. Origin of the sects.*—The conflux of the Monophysite leaders to Alexandria was the occasion of new controversies within the party itself. Two main tendencies emerge, which may be generally described as a further evolution of Eutychianism, and an approximation to the standpoint of orthodoxy. On the one side the chief names are Dioscorus, Timotheus Aelurus, Julian of Halicarnassus; on the other, Severus of Antioch, and Philoxenus of Hierapolis. The former so rigidly insisted on the unity of Christ's incarnate nature as to involve a transmutation of human into divine; the latter made serious attempts to shew how distinctions might exist in the one compound nature.

(1) Dioscorus, the successor of Cyril, whose followers were called Dioscoritae (Διοσκορῖται), taught that God the Word became man without

sin and without change; and suffered *not according to nature, but according to grace.* He did not doubt the reality of the flesh of Christ or of His sufferings; but he asserted that the blood of Christ was, *in its own nature*, the blood of God, and hence its transcendent sacrificial worth. It is not corruptible (φθαρτόν), nor of the same substance with anything merely natural (μὴ γένοιτο ἑνὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν λέγειν ἡμᾶς ὁμοούσιον τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ).

Timotheus Aelurus in like manner appears to have believed that the incarnation involved no change in the divine nature, as must have been the case had it been mixed or compounded with a second nature, that is, humanity. "The one nature of Christ," he wrote, "is the Godhead alone, albeit the latter has been made flesh without change" (φύσις δὲ Χριστοῦ μία μόνη θεότης, εἰ καὶ σεσάρκωται ἀτρέπτως). The Word was incarnate not by any natural necessity, but only with a view to the salvation of man. The human nature which He assumed *was of the same kind and substance as ours;* but being merely God's instrument adopted for a special purpose, it did not constitute a human nature distinct from the divine. "His flesh is neither the essence (οὐσία) nor the nature (φύσις) of Christ; it is a dispensational condition (νόμος οἰκονομίας) rightly carried out for our salvation;" yet, "it is called connatural and consubstantial (ὁμοούσιος) with us, according to the principle of the dispensation (κατὰ τὸν τῆς οἰκονομίας λόγον), viz. generation from a woman." But, "if the man who was to be formed in the Virgin's womb had been a man according to nature and law—an ordinary natural man that is, subject to human conditions—he could not have been born of her without destroying her virginity;" an argument similar to that which was ascribed to Eutyches, who was accused of teaching that the divine Word passed through Mary like water through a pipe. On the other hand, Aelurus proved to certain Eutychians who wished for communion with him, that "the Word was consubstantial with us according to the flesh, and with the Father according to the Godhead." It is clear that both Dioscorus and Aelurus assigned such overwhelming preponderance to the divine aspect of Christ that practically the human element was from the outset absorbed or at least deified. The *homoousia* of His flesh with ours becomes, from their point of view, shadowy and unreal.

Dioscorus had declared that the blood of Christ was not earthly and corruptible like that of bulls and goats. JULIANUS, BISHOP OF HALICARNASSUS, took up and developed this idea, in his polemic for the absolute unity of Christ. "If we call the body of Christ corruptible (φθαρτόν), we make it essentially different from the Logos, and so admit two natures in Christ—the doctrine of Chalcedon." Accordingly the result of its union with the Logos was that this body forthwith partook of the divine incorruptibility; it acquired, as it were, a new and higher nature, which exalted it above even those innocent corporeal affections and weaknesses which are common to mankind (πάθη φυσικὰ καὶ ἀδιάβλητα), such as hunger, thirst, weariness, and the like. It was by no means denied that Christ took of the Virgin a body consubstantial with ours; but by its connexion with the Word, His body was immediately invested with a supernatural character; it became ἄφθαρτον, like the body of the Protoplast (Adam) before the Fall; and was the same before as the orthodox believe that it became after the resurrection. At the same time, the sufferings of Christ were real; only He endured them by choice (ἑκών), and not by natural necessity (ἀνάγκῃ φύσεως). He was not subject to the laws of our nature, yet He freely renounced the impassibility of His human nature, and submitted to suffering for our sake. Julianus was no Docetist. He lays his curse upon those who say that human flesh, as an abominable or polluted nature, is unworthy of union with God.

The followers of Julianus were injuriously called by their opponents APHTHARTODOCETISTS (Ἀφθαρτοδοκῆται) and Phantasiasts (Φαντασιασταί). The orthodox argument against them was this: if the body of Christ were incorruptible, it could not really have been consubstantial with ours; thus His sufferings and death were only in seeming (δοκήσει); and in seeming only He became man, and we are saved (John Damasc.). But, like their master, the Julianists expressly asserted that Christ ate and drank and suffered not in show or seeming (φαντασίᾳ, δοκήσει), but in reality; not, however, in consequence of natural necessity, but of His own voluntary choice, for our salvation. Further, they taught that His incorruptible body was consubstantial with ours. Against this, however, we must set the fact that, in opposition to the Severians (*vid. inf.*), they maintained that there was in Christ but one kind of life, viz. a divine life, one nature, viz. a divine, not a composite nature, *one essence* (οὐσία, *substantia*) *and quality* (ποιότης). They seem to have meant that although Christ's human nature was in origin earthly, and like our own, the mode of His actual existence was purely divine; free from all human weakness, He felt, willed, and thought divinely. It followed that His sufferings were divine, and accordingly one of them spoke of His tear for Lazarus as ἄφθαρτον τὸ δάκρυον καὶ θεῖον. They urged that if Christ were not entirely identical with the Word, and yet were adored as God, a fourth person would be added to the Trinity. This Julianist view of the human nature plainly lies open to the objections (1) that if the body of Christ lacked a human method of feeling, willing, and acting, it was not truly human; (2) as it had exchanged human for divine properties, a mixture of the natures had taken place.

Some of the Julianists hesitated to exclude absolutely the conception of φθορά in relation to Christ's body. They allowed that it remained *potentially corruptible* (δυνάμει φθαρτόν), while raised by the power of the Logos above actual "corruption." Others carried out their premisses to the extreme conclusion, that from the moment of union the humanity became increate. Even as a man, Christ had a right to the titles of God and Creator, and therefore was a proper object of worship. The abolition of the distinction of human from divine was thus complete. They were called ACTISTETES (ἄκτιστος, *increate*). They styled their opponents CTISTOLATRIANS (κτιστός, *created*, λατρεύω, *to worship*).

(2) The second and more important section of the Monophysites was constituted by the followers of Severus, patriarch of Antioch (from

A.D. 511, *vid. supr.*). The doctrine of Severus coincided in the main with that of the patriarch Cyril. Christ was of (ἐκ) two natures, neither of which was at all modified by the union: μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν καὶ μένουσι καὶ σκοποῦνται ὅπερ εἰσίν. μένει δὲ ἑκάτερον ὅπερ ἔστι τῇ φύσει. The two elements might still be discriminated in thought: "Two," he says, "are the natures that we mentally discern (νοοῦμεν) in the Christ, the one created, the other increate." And the human nature was consubstantial with ours: "The Word united hypostatically with Himself the body that was connatural and homogeneous and consubstantial with us" (ἑνώσαντα καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἑαυτῷ τὸ ἡμῖν ὁμοφυὲς καὶ ὁμογενὲς σῶμα καὶ ὁμοούσιον). Moreover, in his controversy with Julianus and his followers, Severus wholly repudiates the notion of a blending or confusion of the natures (σύγχυσις), as well as that of a suppression of the humanity. On the other hand, he not less distinctly denies a permanent dualism of natures and anathematises the council of Chalcedon: "The synod and pope Leo, having defined two natures in the case of Christ (ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ), and two activities of them, after the ineffable union, must righteously be laid under ban, as having divided the one Christ into two persons (πρόσωπα), for an impersonal nature is never active" (οὐ γὰρ ἐνεργεῖ ποτε φύσις οὐχ ὑφεστῶσα). Leo had asserted, in his letter to Flavian, that the divine nature worked the miracles, the human underwent the sufferings; each nature fulfilling its own distinct function. Severus replied that such a view was virtually the *relative union* (ἕνωσις σχετική) of Nestorianism. It seemed to him that a human nature, evincing its existence in a distinct activity (ἐνέργεια) of its own, involved a purely human substratum or subject (ὑφεστός, ὑπόστασις), side by side with and independent of the divine person of the Son. To avoid this result, Severus declared that all the actions and affections of Christ must be ascribed to the one incarnate nature of God the Word. The one nature was, indeed, compound (σύνθετος), but its two parts always acted together, so that both deity and humanity were concerned in all that Christ did and suffered. His doings and sufferings, therefore, were in no case wholly divine nor wholly human, but *theandric*, divine-human, or godmanlike; a term which Severus borrows from pseudo-Dionysius. "As the incarnate Word is undivided Himself, His activity also must be undivided (ἀμέριστος)." As an instance Severus was fond of adducing the walking on the sea (John vi. 15), an act performed through the flesh, yet transcending the laws of its nature (ὑπὲρ τοὺς τῆς φύσεως νόμους). Such cases proved to him that the laws of the human body might be temporarily suspended or counteracted by the will of the Logos; not that they were abolished from the moment of union, as the Julianists imagined. On the contrary, "His body bore its voluntary and sinless affections in accordance with the laws of its nature, by permission of God the Word," and "His death took place according to nature (φυσικῶς), with His own consent." Severus was careful to avoid Theopassianism: "So far as He was God, Emmanuel suffered not, save in seeming; so far as He was man, He suffered in truth." "He suffered in the flesh that He had made His own; and so the sufferings may be called properties (ἴδια) of the incarnate Word" (Cyril's doctrine of ἰδιοποίησις), "and it is correct to say that God suffered for us."

It will be seen that the Christology of Severus approaches very near to that of Chalcedon. He held that Christ was one, and that this personal unity embraced a divine and a human element, each of which "remained unimpaired and unaltered, yet subsisting in composition, not in independent monads" (ἐν συνθέσει ὑφεστώτων καὶ οὐκ ἐν μονάσιν ἰδιοσυστάτοις). But he preferred to designate these elements as essences or substances (οὐσίαι) rather than as natures (φύσεις), lest he should appear to posit two such "monads," that is, independent (personal) centres of action.

Philoxenus (Xenaias) agreed with Severus in teaching that the one nature of Christ was composite. God the Son became a man of the Virgin, without alteration of His divine attributes. The Word was not changed into flesh at the union, nor was there any mixture of the two elements, nor transformation of either into the other. The one nature of Christ was constituted out of two, just as any one man is constituted of the two natures of soul and body (an illustration of Cyril's, which Severus also employed). Philoxenus appears to have agreed with the Julianists that the sufferings of Christ were not natural, but strictly a matter of choice (Barhebraeus).

The first class of Monophysites theorised chiefly about the body of Christ and its exaltation by union with God the Word. Severus, in commenting on the words, "Not as I will but as Thou wilt" (Matt. xxvi. 39), alleged that they do not prove the existence of two diverse wills in Christ, nor that His will flagged, nor that a struggle took place in Him. On the contrary, the Logos freely permitted His flesh to suffer according to its nature. The question was thus suggested whether the other faculties of Christ's human soul, volition and knowledge, were to be considered as ordinarily limited by the laws of human nature, to which His feelings and affections were confessedly subject, with occasional exceptions, determined by the controlling will of the Logos; or whether in these respects the soul of the God-man shared always in the divine perfection of the Logos. To be consistent, Severus must have admitted the former alternative. Accordingly, after his death, the deacon Themistius came forward at Alexandria with the doctrine that the human soul of Christ resembled ours in this respect also, that its knowledge was limited. In proof of this, Themistius referred to the Lord's declaration that no man knoweth the hour, *not even the Son*, but the Father only; and to His question about the grave of Lazarus, "Where have ye laid him?" The doctrine gained but a small following among the Monophysites. Its advocates were called AGNOETES (Ἀγνοηταί) or THEMISTIANS, and were excommunicated by Theodosius, the Severian patriarch of Alexandria. Thenceforth they formed a distinct sect, which existed down to the 8th century.

8. *Continuation of the external history.*—The emperor Justinian (A.D. 527–565) aspired to legislate for the spiritual as well as the temporal domain. His crafty consort Theodora played upon his weakness in the interest of

Monophysitism, to which she was devotedly attached. Her zeal in the cause is well illustrated by a story which tells how she contrived to forestall the emperor by converting the Nubians to Monophysite Christianity (John Eph. *Eccl. Hist.* iv. 1 sqq.). Justinian never wholly abandoned the hope of reconciling the Monophysite sects to the main body of the church. A recurrence of the Theopaschitic dispute afforded the first occasion for decided intervention. The formula of Peter the Fuller (*vid. supr.*), which implied that God was crucified, had found a certain degree of acceptance in Constantinople, especially with the monks and populace. This was quite natural, seeing that the church had sealed with its approval the use of the term Theotokos, "Mother of God." If birth were thus predicated of God, it might seem only consistent to attribute to Him suffering also and death. In the time of Justin (A.D. 519) John Maxentius and a band of Scythian monks had demanded official recognition of the Trisagion in its amended form at Constantinople; and not succeeding there, had applied to pope Hormisdas, who, however, pronounced the new clause heretical. His successor, John II., thought otherwise; and the famous theologian Fulgentius Ferrandus expressly maintained the doctrine, that one of the Trinity might be said to have been born and crucified. The formula gained an increasing hold upon the popular mind, until (A.D. 533) Justinian sanctioned it by a special edict, doubtless in the hope of satisfying the Monophysites, whose representatives had accused their opponents of not confessing that "the Lord suffered in the flesh, or that He was one of the holy Trinity, nor that the miracles and sufferings alike belonged to the same person." Justinian's edict ruled "that one member of the holy and consubstantial Trinity was crucified" (crucifixum unum esse ex sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate). In A.D. 553, the fifth general council anathematised those who should reject the formula. The orthodox in Syria continued to use the Trisagion with the added clause, until its rejection by the Quinisext council, Can. 81, after which it was peculiar to the Monophysites and Monothelites. This concession was as fruitless as the various conferences which the emperor ordered between the bishops of the contending parties. Justinian was swayed now in this, now in that direction, according as he yielded to the influence of the representatives of Monophysitism or orthodoxy. He can hardly have been very decided in his adherence to the tenets of either, seeing that for thirty years he employed the earnest Monophysite John bishop of Ephesus as a trusted minister; sending him in A.D. 542 to convert the heathen of Asia Minor, and in 546 appointing him inquisitor of the secret heathen of the capital.

The Monophysite leaders rallied around Theodora; the sect organised itself everywhere; Anthimus, represented as orthodox, was raised by her influence to the patriarchate of Constantinople (A.D. 535); Severus resorted thither. Next year, pope Agapetus appeared at the Byzantine court as envoy of Theodoric the Ostrogoth. To him some of the monks and clergy accused Anthimus. Agapetus excommunicated the patriarch on his refusal to make an orthodox confession, and return to Trapezus, his original see. Justinian's eyes were opened, Anthimus was deposed, and Mennas made patriarch in his room. A home synod of the new patriarch at once condemned Monophysite doctrines, and Justinian sanctioned its decrees by a severe enactment, which banished their leaders from the capital and other chief cities, and warned them to abstain from public functions, and from making converts. The writings of Severus were doomed to the flames; those who transcribed them were to lose the right hand. In Alexandria itself Justinian appointed an orthodox patriarch, the abbat Paul. This persecution only availed to weaken the Greek empire in the East. The province of Great Armenia, which was almost entirely Monophysite, revolted to the Persians. Baffled thus far, but not discouraged, the empress now began a new intrigue. She secretly engaged to secure the popedom for the Roman deacon Vigilius, if he would pledge himself to subvert the authority of the council of Chalcedon, and declare in writing his sympathy with Anthimus and the Monophysite leaders. Silverius, who had succeeded Agapetus, proving less compliant than Vigilius, was banished, and Vigilius elevated (A.D. 538). He so far kept faith with Theodora as to address to Anthimus, and his friends Theodosius and Severus, an epistle which accorded with their peculiar sentiments: "me eam fidem quam tenetis," he wrote, "deo adjuvante et tenuisse et tenere significo." And in the confession appended to the letter: "non duas Christum confitemur naturas, se ex duabus naturis compositum unum filium, unum Christum, unum Dominum. Qui dicit quia hoc quidem miracula faciebat, hoc vero passionibus succumbebat (pope Leo's assertion) et non confitetur miracula et passiones unius ejusdemque quas sponte sua sustinuit carne nobis consubstantiali anathema sit!" and so on. But Vigilius was cunning enough to beg his correspondents not to publish the letter, but rather to pretend suspicion of him, in order to facilitate the fulfilment of his engagements to the party. This was not quite what the empress had expected. But she was not to be disheartened. At once she threw herself upon a new scheme, which might at least sow discord in the camp of the enemy. At this time Justinian was greatly under the influence of the abbats Domitian and Theodore Ascidas of Palestine, whose zeal for the council of Chalcedon he had rewarded with episcopal honours. Both were Origenists, and their influence at court enabled them to protect the monks of Palestine, who had adopted the same views, against the persecutions of the patriarch Peter of Jerusalem. Peter wrote to the emperor, complaining of the spread of Origenism. At the same time Pelagius, the pope's legate at Constantinople, and the patriarch Mennas urged the condemnation of Origen, probably because they were jealous of the power of Ascidas. The emperor was only too pleased to play the judge in such a cause. Forthwith he ordered Mennas to convene a synod and condemn the departed heretic (circ. A.D. 544). The fifteen anathemas against Origen appear to belong to this synod. All bishops and abbats were to subscribe them as a condition of consecration.

9. *Controversy of the Three Chapters.—Reaction against the School of Antioch.*—Ascidas and his friend Domitian outwitted their ad-

versaries by a prompt assent to the synod's decrees. But they could not feel safe until they had managed to occupy the heresy-hunting spirit of the emperor with some other object. Justinian was engaged upon a book intended to further his darling purpose of reconciling the Monophysites by answering their objections to the decrees of Chalcedon. Ascidas and Domitian assured him that he might dispense with the labours of authorship; the condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia, of Theodoret's writings against Cyril of Alexandria, and of the letter of Ibas bishop of Edessa to Maris of Ardashir, would remove all objection to the council from the Monophysite apprehension. These three writers, as chief representatives of the theology of Antioch, were hateful to the Monophysites; and the empress gladly abetted a plot, which would wound the patriarch Mennas and the orthodox party, by a serious though indirect blow at the authority of the council of Chalcedon, which had expressly pronounced the writings of Theodoret and Ibas to be orthodox. Justinian was persuaded, and published (A.D. 544) the famous edict of THE THREE CHAPTERS (περὶ τριῶν κεφαλαίων, *De tribus capitulis*), which anathematised the person and writings of Theodore, and the specified works of Theodoret and Ibas. The letter of Ibas was offensive to the Monophysites, because, while it by no means acquitted Nestorius of blame, especially for his opposition to the term Theotokos, it accused the patriarch Cyril, whom they regarded as infallible, of Apollinarian heresy. Justinian was careful to add to his edict an anathema upon all who should construe it to the prejudice of the council of Chalcedon.

The edict of the Three Chapters was sent to all bishops for subscription. The patriarch Mennas yielded an unwilling assent, to be withdrawn if the pope's decision were adverse. In like manner the patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem, Alexandria only succumbed to threats of deposition. Bribery also was freely employed, and the time-serving spirit of the Eastern prelates is painfully illustrated by their general submission to the imperial dictates. On the other hand, the African, Illyrian, and Dalmatian bishops were nobly true to their convictions. Pontianus wrote to the emperor that the condemned writings were unknown in Africa; but in any case he and his brethren could not acquiesce in laying the curse of the church upon the dead. Justinian now turned to pope Vigilius, who was as destitute of moral courage as of theological acumen. In his perplexity the pope appears to have requested the opinion of the famous Fulgentius Ferrandus, deacon of Carthage. Ferrandus, writing to the Roman deacons Pelagius and Anatolius, pronounced against the edict of the Three Chapters, mainly on the three grounds (1) that there could be no question of the authority of general councils; their decrees were inviolable; (2) that deceased brethren are beyond human judgment, and that stumbling-blocks should not on their account be thrown in the way of the living; (3) that no individual ought to compass for his own writing, by many subscriptions, an authority which the church concedes to Scripture alone. In A.D. 547 Justinian summoned the vacillating pope to Constantinople. There Vigilius was terrified into condemning the Three Chapters in a document called the *Judicatum*, reserving, however, in all things the authority of Chalcedon. A synod of Western bishops was now convoked (A.D. 548), which Justinian hoped to sway through the pope, who was himself naturally anxious to obtain their countenance. The African bishops proved obstinate, though Vigilius managed to get seventy signatures for his *Judicatum*. Thereupon Facundus, bishop of Hermiane, presented to the emperor his *Pro defensione III. Capitulorum*, a spirited work in which he condemned that arbitrary dogmatism which was the bane of the Greek church, and protested equally against state interference in matters of conscience, and the servility of the Eastern bishops.

Soon afterwards the synod of North Africa excommunicated the pope for his doings in the matter of the Three Chapters. Vigilius then begged the emperor to convene a general council, and, pending its decision, to allow him to withdraw the *Judicatum*. As the price of this concession, Justinian exacted a stringent oath, that Vigilius would abide by his condemnation of the Three Chapters. The same year (A.D. 551) the emperor issued a second edict, quoting and condemning Theodore of Mopsuestia, but declaring that no slight was thereby cast upon the credit of Chalcedon. Vigilius refused subscription, and excommunicated all who should subscribe. The barren strife had outlasted eight years, when the fifth oecumenical council met at Constantinople under the presidency of the patriarch Eutychius. The pope held aloof, but promised within twenty days to furnish the emperor with his final decision. This he did in his *Constitutum ad imperatorem*, which ruled (1) that though the extracts from Theodore of Mopsuestia were heretical, it was impossible to condemn a writer who had died in the communion of the church: (2) that to condemn the works of Theodoret and Ibas, which had received the sanction of Chalcedon, would be to impair the authority of that council. Thereupon the council then sitting broke off communion with the pope, and ratified all the emperor's recent decrees. Theodore and his writings and followers were anathematised, and the curse was extended to the obnoxious works of Theodoret and Ibas. The writers were spared because the council of Chalcedon had absolved them. The question of Origenism was not raised in a council in which the leading spirit was Theodore Ascidas. The unhappy Vigilius now finally submitted, formally condemned the Three Chapters, and assented to the decrees of the synod, as a condition of being permitted to return to Rome. He died on the way at Syracuse (A.D. 555). His successor Pelagius at once recognised the late council, owing to which some of the Western bishops cast off his communion, a schism which was only healed by Gregory the Great.

The weary quarrel was at an end, but Justinian was as far as ever from the attainment of his purpose, the reunion of the Monophysites with the general body of the church. The council of Chalcedon remained an insuperable barrier between the two camps. The emperor had evinced a leaning towards Monophysite conceptions by sanctioning their addition to the Trisagion (A.D. 533), as well as a similar formula of the fifth council. In the year of his death (A.D.

565) he issued a stringent edict in favour of Aphthartodocetism, and deposed Eutychius patriarch of Constantinople for his resistance to the measure. Further persecution was interrupted by the emperor's decease. His successor Justin II. (A.D. 565–578), who was likewise anxious for religious unity, issued an edict commanding the cessation of all further dispute (A.D. 565), and behaved mildly to the Monophysites until the sixth year of his reign, when he sanctioned the violent repressive measures of John Scholasticus, whose zeal against heresy appears to have been inspired by the ambition of reducing all the prelates of the East into dependence on the patriarchate of Constantinople. Churches were razed, bishops and clergy thrown into prison, monks and nuns forced into communion with their persecutors by the expedient of thrusting the consecrated bread between their teeth. The violence of the persecution is vividly set forth in the pages of the Monophysite historian John of Ephesus. The same writer shews very clearly the strength of the sect both at the capital and elsewhere. Not only were the empress Sophia and her household Monophysites, but many members of the senate and the upper classes also. The persecution lulled some time before the death of Scholasticus, but was renewed by the restored patriarch Eutychius (A.D. 577). The Caesar Tiberius had been vainly importuned by John Scholasticus to take part in it; but upon his elevation to the throne (A.D. 578), being falsely suspected of Arian views, he was driven in self-defence into publishing an edict for the suppression of heresy, under colour of which the Monophysites again suffered cruelly. Tiberius had a plan for restoring union, but his wife hated the schismatics. While the emperor's attention was absorbed by his foreign wars, the patriarch Eutychius was left to take his own course with the Monophysites. One of his measures was the exaction from all new bishops of an oath to discontinue the use of the obnoxious clause of the Trisagion, which led to much disturbance in Syria and Asia Minor. His successor, John the Faster (A.D. 582), refused to persecute.

From the time of Justinian and his immediate successors, the Monophysites have remained in formal schism from the orthodox Eastern church. They owe their ecclesiastical organisation in Syria to the unwearied labours of Jacob, called al-Baradai and Zanzalus, who for upwards of thirty years (A.D. 541–578) wandered from place to place, sometimes in the disguise of a beggar, ordaining clergy, reconciling the feuds, and reviving the courage of his fellow-believers. [JACOBUS BARADAEUS.] Theodosius, the exiled patriarch of Alexandria, who for thirty years lived at Constantinople under the patronage of the empress Theodora, and until his death (A.D. 567) exercised a paramount influence upon his party in Egypt and elsewhere, suggested the revival of the Monophysite patriarchate of Antioch in the person of Paul of Asia. This was done by Jacob and his bishops; and the titular patriarch of Antioch has ever since been the recognised head of the Monophysite church of Syria. Subordinate to him was a functionary called the Maphrian (ܡܦܪܝܢܐ), who had special charge of the district round Tekrit.

In Armenia the council of Chalcedon was anathematised by the synod of Tovin (Thiven, Twin, Tiben, Dovin), A.D. 536. The imperial persecutions drove the Monophysites into the arms of Persia. In A.D. 571 the Armenians revolted against Khosru Nushirwan, in consequence of the Magian attempts to compel them to renounce Christianity. But in A.D. 578 they were again reduced to submission. The Armenian church belongs to the Julianist species of Monophysitism. [ARMENIANS.]

In Egypt, their indigenous home, the Monophysites constituted the dominant church. The adherents of Chalcedon, although supported by the state, were too few to appear more than a sect of Melchites ("King's men," i.e. "Imperialists"). The Monophysites materially assisted the Muhammadan conquest of Egypt (A.D. 640), and were rewarded with possession of the churches and recognition as the legitimate Christian communion. The authority of their patriarch still extends over the Ethiopian church of Abyssinia. [COPTIC CHURCH.] The faith which has survived the vicissitudes of ages in Syria, Egypt, and Ethiopia is that of Severus. The Julianists had disappeared from the two former countries by the 9th century; they still had a patriarch in the latter, A.D. 798.

10. *Further development of the sects.—Conclusion.*—It was hardly possible for logic to acquiesce in the middle position of Severianism. Accordingly Stephen Niobes, a sophist of Alexandria, insisted on a thorough-going Monophysitism, teaching that the union abolished all distinction even of the essences (οὐσίαι) of the two natures. "Either we must maintain a perfect unity; or if we suppose a difference in Christ, we grant also a duality of natures, and so agree with the Chalcedonians." Niobes won over the two Syrian monks, Probus and John Barbûr, who had accompanied their patriarch Peter of Callinicus to Alexandria. The two converts actively disseminated his doctrine in that city, until the patriarch Damianus expelled them, when, returning to the East, they found great success in the cloisters, and induced the patriarch Peter to hold a synod at Guba to consider their tenets. The synod pronounced against Niobes and his followers, the NIOBITES; and in its name Peter wrote a treatise asserting Severianism as the orthodox faith, and ruling that the two natures remained distinct even after the union, yet without number and without separation. John and Probus now declared for Chalcedon; and after Peter's death (A.D. 591), they argued their new cause with such zeal as to bring over many monks and even some whole towns to Dyophysitism.

In the reign of Justin II. arose the so-called TRITHEITES. Their founder was Johannes Askunages (ܐܣܩܘܢ ܙܢܓܐ) ("Bottle-shoes"), an obscure philosopher, whom Justinian banished from Constantinople. Barhebraeus quotes him thus: "I confess one nature of Christ, the Incarnate Word; but in the Trinity I reckon the natures and substances and godheads according to the number of the persons." This doctrine was developed by the famous Aristotelian commentator Johannes Philoponus. He conceived the essence (οὐσία) of the deity as a species, and the divine persons (ὑποστάσεις) as

the individuals included under it. The doctrine of the Tritheites was a logical deduction from the common Monophysite belief, that every φύσις involves an ὑπόστασις; everything that really exists, exists as an individual. Further, the church having sanctioned the formula, "One of the persons of the Trinity was crucified," it was natural to conceive of the other two persons after the analogy of the person of Christ, which was an approach to the Tritheite standpoint.

The monk Athanasius, a grandson of Theodora, and Conon bishop of Tarsus, were the heads of the two sections into which the Tritheites afterwards divided on the question of the resurrection of the dead.

Philoponus had written a treatise to prove that "there is no resurrection for these bodies, but other bodies are created, which come to the resurrection in their stead." He appears to have held that both the *matter* and the *form* (ὕλη—εἶδος) of the body perish in the grave. Athanasius and the ATHANASIANS or PHILOPONISTS accepted this doctrine; Conon and the CONONITES anathematised it and its advocates. Justin ordered a discussion between Conon and Eugenius on the one side and the chiefs of the Severians on the other, before the patriarch, John Scholasticus. The Cononites were defeated, and their leader Conon subsequently underwent a long imprisonment in Palestine. On his release he spread his doctrine in the provinces of Syria, Cilicia, Isauria, and Cappadocia. Theodosius the Severian ex-patriarch of Alexandria wrote against the Cononites; Eutychius of Constantinople actively persecuted them; Damianus of Alexandria excommunicated them. They were unable to make permanent head against the opposition of the main body of the Monophysites themselves. Later, Damianus, who from A.D. 577 was the Severian patriarch of Alexandria, himself became known as an heresiarch in his own communion. He distinguished God *per se* (αὐτόθεος), or the substance (nature) of God, from the three persons of the Trinity, and so was taken to assert four gods. He and his followers were accordingly styled TETRATHEITES or TETRADITES. The latter were also known as DAMIANITES, from their founder, and ANGELITES, from the town of Angelium. Peter of Callinicus, whom Damianus had appointed patriarch of Antioch in the lifetime of the patriarch Paul (A.D. 581)—a step which led to a long and bitter schism between the Monophysites—wrote against the views of Damianus, which were perhaps of a Sabellian character. Assemani gives a passage in which Damianus quotes the following from St. Gregory Nazianzen: "In divine worship we speak of one substance and three Persons. The former expression denotes the nature of deity, the latter the properties of the three Persons."

Hence he infers ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܘܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܢܘܢ, *i.e.* "The Unbegottenhood, and the Begottenhood, and the Processiveness are the Persons." Thus Damianus identified each person of the Godhead with its characteristic property or differentia. Against this view, Peter urged that as each Person has several properties, Damian ought consistently to multiply the Persons. John of Ephesus describes him as an unlearned and foolish man, but says nothing of his heresy, which must therefore have been broached later than A.D. 585.

The conflict between the opposed tendencies of Monophysitism and Dyophysitism may be regarded as necessary to the working out of a sound Christology. Starting from the conception of a duality of natures, the adherents of Chalcedon endeavoured to demonstrate their unity in the sphere of the person; their opponents, while insisting upon the unity of Christ, were in great part led to the recognition of an essential difference within the sphere of the one incarnate nature. The two methods were complementary. Moreover, the process of doctrinal evolution could hardly have dispensed with the metaphysical training and acute logical discernment which the Aristotelian Monophysites brought to bear upon the questions in dispute. Severus, Xenaias, John Philoponus, were thinkers of no mean dialectical skill. Indeed, in their scientific enforcement of the Monophysite idea, they sometimes had the advantage of their orthodox antagonists. As between the Severians and the church, the argument rather concerned right use of terms than truth of conceptions. The wavering and uncertain connotation of such expressions as φύσις, ὑπόστασις, οὐσία, made it very difficult for disputants to come to an understanding. Still the general question was by no means a mere logomachy; for it involved the explanation of a wonderful fact, the objective reality of which was taken for granted by both sides, viz. the union of God and man in the person of Christ. The Monophysites argued that φύσις denotes what is common to all the members of a genus. But this common something (κοινόν τι) only exists as individual; apart from some member of the genus it cannot be said to exist at all. So, then, neither the divine nor the human φύσις can exist except as individualised. The Monophysites called the individualised φύσις an ὑπόστασις. If, then, with the Chalcedonians we assert two natures in Christ after the union, we thereby assert two hypostases in Him, like the Nestorians. They therefore concluded that the two natures combined to form one new and wholly unique nature, viz. ἡ Χριστότης, *the Christhood* or theanthropic nature, and this new φύσις, of course, only existed as individualised in the actual Christ. On the other hand, the Dyophysites rightly saw in a union within the sphere of the natures a lurking danger of transmutation or mixture. They dreaded the Docetic and Apollinarian element in the conception of their adversaries, and they taught that the human nature was not, indeed, ἀνυπόστατος; it inhered in the *divine* hypostasis. But this was really marring the perfection of the humanity, and assuming a mixture in the sphere of the person like that which Monophysites assumed in the sphere of the nature. In fact, the contending parties were not far apart, when they, from different points of view, agreed in depriving the human nature of a proper self, making it merely an attribute or cluster of attributes taken on by the Logos (the opinion of Cyril).

Sources.—The documents in Mansi, *Concilia*, vi.–ix.; Niceph. Callist. *Hist. Eccl.*; Evagr. *Hist. Eccl.*; *The book of Timotheus* (*Aelurus*) *against*

the Council of Chalcedon, MS. Br. Mus. Add. 12,156; John of Ephesus, *Third part of Eccl. Hist.*; the Syriac MSS. of Severus and Philoxenus (see Wright's *Catalogue*); Liberatus, *Breviarium* (*apud* Mansi, ix.); Zacharias Rhetor *ap.* Land. *Anecd. Syr.* iii.; Facund. Hermianens. *pro Defens. III. Capit.*, Gall. xi., and 665, sqq.; Fulgent. Ferrand. *Pro tribus Capit.* ibid.; Leontius Byzant. *de Sectis*, and *contra Eutych. et Nestor.* Galland, xii.; Procopius, Theophanes.

Works.—Walch, *Gesch. der Ketzer.* vi. vii. viii.; Baur, *Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung Gottes*, ii.; the Church Histories of Neander, Gieseler, Hase, Kurtz; Mai, *Nov. Coll.* VII. i.; Gieseler's *Commentatio qua Monophysitarum veterum variae de Christi persona opiniones etc. illustrantur*; Hagenbach, *Dogmengeschichte*; Dorner's *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, a work to which the writer is specially indebted; Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* ii.; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* ii.; Gibbon, ch. xlvii.; the articles in Herzog, Wetzer and Welte, Lichtenberger. [C. J. B.]

MONOTHELITISM.

(The adherents of this view are called by Johan. Dam. Μονοθελῆται, cf. Stephanus ed. Dindorf. *s.v.* Μονοθελῖται is a bad reading of Euthymius in Fab. *Bib. Graec.* viii. 333. Milman and others call this party Monothelitism.) This name designates not so much a sect without the church as a controversy which raged within its borders. It was simply a development of the Monophysite controversy. As the Oriental mind pondered upon the union of the divine and human natures in Christ, it perceived that it was logically necessary to hold that Christ had but one will, and that, a divine will, if the Monophysite conception were correct, and He had but one nature and that, a divine nature. This controversy had also its own issues, and they, very important and far-reaching. It paved the way for the schism between East and West, exaggerating and deepening the jealousy between Rome and Constantinople, which uniformly took opposite sides in this struggle; while, again, it led up to the Iconoclastic disputes, which occupied the whole of the 8th century as Monothelitism occupied the 7th. [ICONOCLASM.] Monothelitism originated in politics. Heraclius was engaged in his great struggle with Chosroes and the Persian Empire, which terminated in his triumph, A.D. 628, wherein he felt the manifold evils which resulted from the religious feuds which desolated the empire. To reconcile, therefore, the Eutychian or Monophysite party to the orthodox he held several conferences with leaders of the former party, trusting largely to his own theological powers to effect a reconciliation. The precise date of the birth of Monothelitism is surrounded with much obscurity. Thus Theophanes in his *Chronograph.* i. 506, asserts that the heresy originated in a conference at Hierapolis in Syria, between the emperor and Athanasius, sixth Jacobite patriarch of Antioch (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 1361). The emperor promised him the throne of the orthodox patriarchate if he would admit the authority of the Chalcedonian synod. He then admitted his belief in two natures, but skilfully invited the emperor to determine περὶ τῆς ἐνεργείας καὶ τῶν θελημάτων whether he should assert two or one. The emperor being puzzled consulted Sergius patriarch of Constantinople and Cyrus of Phasis [CYRUS (4)]. Both of them agreed to the doctrine of one will and one energy. On the other hand the libellus of Stephen bishop of Dora, read at the Lateran council, A.D. 649, asserts that it was Theodore of Pharan who started this heresy (Mansi, x. 891–902), while the patriarch Sergius presents us with another and more reliable version of the story. Writing to the pope Honorius to secure his co-operation as against Sophronius and the Dyothelites, he gives us his account of the origin of the controversy. During the Persian war, Heraclius being in Armenia, Paul, a follower of the heretic Severus, entered into controversy with the emperor, whose theological skill the patriarch praises. This conference was probably held at Theodosiopolis in Armenia, A.D. 622. The emperor there spoke of the one energy in Christ. Some time after, the emperor being at Phasis, he consulted Cyrus the bishop about the doctrine of one will and one energy. Cyrus being in doubt, the emperor commanded him to consult Sergius whether any of the fathers had ever used such an expression. Sergius replied by sending various passages which seemed to support this view, and specially some extracts from an alleged epistle sent by one of his predecessors Mennas to pope Vigilius. These varying accounts may all be true. Monothelitism was in the air, and the question may have been raised in various quarters about the same time. It is impossible, however, now to determine the exact sequence of events amid which it originated, or to settle exactly its chronology, though Hefele attempts to do so in his History of the Councils (sec. 292; cf. Pagi, *ad annum* 627 sqq.). We can only say for certain that prior to the year A.D. 629 the controversy was firmly established. We may now divide its history into four periods.

I. A.D. 623–638, when the question chiefly discussed was whether we are to assume only one energy in Christ with the Monophysites and Monothelites, or two energies with the orthodox. The effect of this view was, as Dorner remarks, the Monothelites held that the deity of Christ alone was active, the humanity being completely passive.

II. A.D. 638–648. This second stage was inaugurated by pope Honorius. He asserted that there were two natures in Christ, each working in its own way, each with its own ἐνέργεια, but only one will, which he assigns to the personality of Christ. During this period Monothelitism was dominant in the East, while, after Honorius, it was vigorously opposed in the West.

III. A.D. 649–680. During the greater portion of this period Monothelitism was dominant in the East, while the West continued its opposition. The emperors attempted to break down the opposition by treating it as rebellion. From the year 677, however, a change came, and Constantinus Pogonatus began to treat with the pope about the meeting of the sixth general council, which assembled in A.D. 680, and condemned Monothelitism.

IV. The revival of Monothelitism for a short period under the emperor Philip, A.D. 711.

i. During the earliest period, A.D. 623–638. Egypt was in the first instance the great centre of

interest. There the Monophysite party had rent the church asunder. The schism, in fact, was so deep that it threatened dire political danger to the empire in the conflict with the Saracens which was just then impending. (Cf. on this point *art.* on COPTIC CHURCH in t. I. pp. 666, 667.) Cyrus, therefore, the trusted friend and counsellor of Heraclius, was sent thither as patriarch in A.D. 630, when the emperor was reorganising the empire after his great struggle against the Persians. [CYRUS (4).] The object of his elevation was simply to effect the union of the Monophysite with the Catholic party. This is manifest from a letter in which Cyrus tells Sergius of the union which he had accomplished and which he entirely ascribes to the instructions and advice of the emperor and the patriarch himself (Mansi, t. ix. p. 562). The date of this union was June A.D. 633. At that time, however, two monks, Maximus, from the monastery of Chrysopolis near Constantinople, and Sophronius, from the monastery of St. Theodosius in Palestine, were tarrying in Egypt, whither they had fled some time previously through fear of the Persians. These men became afterwards the leading opponents of Monothelitism. Indeed, the most careful and logical expositions of the orthodox system will be found in the writings and disputations of St. Maximus [MAXIMUS]. Sophronius inaugurated the opposition. Maximus describes (*Opp.* t. ii. p. 75, and in Mansi, x. 690) his action at the synod of Alexandria, where the nine articles of union were adopted. Both of them were tarrying at the time in Egypt. As soon as they heard of the proposed union they resorted at once to Alexandria, where Sophronius rushed into the assembly, and with strong cries and tears, rolling himself on the pavement, besought them to reject the articles which had been read for their information by the patriarch's command, who evidently wished to secure the co-operation and assent of men so distinguished for orthodoxy. Sophronius repudiated them, however, as being equivalent to the heresy of Apollinaris. He specially objected to the seventh article, which laid down that "one and the same Christ had performed His divine and human actions by one theandric operation as St. Dionysius taught," referring to an expression of the Pseudo-Areopagite in *Ep. ad Caium* 3, 4 (cf. *Schol.* Maximi in app. *Opp.* Joh. Scot. Erigen. p. 58 sqq. Oxon. 1681). Failing in his opposition at Alexandria, Sophronius departed to Constantinople, where he endeavoured to bring over Sergius to his views, but in vain. Sergius, like Cyrus and the emperor, was far more anxious about the political union and strength of the empire than about exact orthodoxy. Sergius, however, for peace sake consented to cease all discussion upon the disputed points. Sophronius returned home to Palestine, where he was soon chosen patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 633 or 634. Sergius seems at once to have recognised in his election a threatening danger to the union which had been accomplished. He therefore, without waiting to receive formal notice of Sophronius's elevation, wrote a long epistle to pope Honorius detailing the history of the whole dispute, and appealing to him for assistance in maintaining peace. This letter is a most important document for the early history of the movement. It will be found in Mansi, xi. 530. We possess two letters of the pope to Sergius. The first is the immediate reply to the letter of Sergius mentioned above. In it he sanctions the course adopted by Sergius and Cyrus. In Mansi, xi. 579–582, we have a fragment of a further letter from Honorius to Sergius. Sophronius, upon his election, issued, as usual with bishops, a synodical epistle, γράμματα ἐνθρονιστικά, as it was technically called. In it he professed his own faith and made a fierce attack upon his opponents. This is one of the ablest and earliest expositions of the Dyothelite point of view. It will be found in Mansi, xi. 459–510. He specially insists, as in *l. c.* 486, that unless the distinction between the human and divine wills and modes of working be maintained, the incarnation will be resolved into a mere docetic phantasm. Furthermore, he recognised equally with Sergius the importance of securing the support of the great patriarch of the West. He therefore despatched envoys to Rome to state his case. In the second epistle of Honorius to Sergius (Mansi, xi. 579–582) the pope informs the latter of their arrival and of the counsel he had sent Sophronius, advising him to observe the rule of silence upon the whole question. Both these letters of the pope were ordered to be burnt by the sixth general council. The reply of Constantinople to the synodical epistle of Sophronius was the publication A.D. 638 of the Ecthesis [ECTHESIS], which, though nominally an imperial edict, was really the work of the patriarch alone, as Heraclius himself tells us in a letter written to pope John IV. in A.D. 641 (Mansi, xi. 9). A careful study of its contents demonstrates this, as it merely reiterates the views and expressions urged by Sergius in his letter to the pope. The Ecthesis was read in the third session of the Lateran council, A.D. 649, and will be found in Mansi, x. 991. It left the controversy in this position: it prohibited the use of the expressions one "energy" or two "energies," but was clearly favourable to the Monothelite view. The issue of the Ecthesis terminates the first stage of the controversy. ii. The second period extends from A.D. 638–648. We cannot within our limits trace the progress of the controversy from year to year as is done in works specially devoted to the subject, like Combefis, *Hist. Haeresis Monothelit.*, to which we must refer the reader anxious to make a fuller acquaintance with its details. Having discussed at some length the documents which opened the debate on either side, we can now merely indicate the principal events of its history. The leading figure of our second period is Maximus. The details of his personal history are given under his name. He was, as we have seen, the personal friend and devoted ally of Sophronius. He was a man of the highest character, who had surrendered the most splendid prospects for conscience' sake, and by the devotion of a long life, and finally by a martyr's death, proved the reality and depth of his convictions. His writings too, which are very extensive, show him to have been a man of deep and subtle thought. As the letter of Sophronius was the leading document on the Catholic side in the first period, the discussion of Maximus with Pyrrhus holds the same position in the second. By the year 642 most of the earlier leaders had passed from this earthly scene, as Honorius and Sergius in

638, Heraclius and Cyrus in 641. Into the place of the patriarch Sergius, Pyrrhus abbat of the monastery of Chrysopolis was chosen. It was to this monastery Maximus belonged, and over it was he now called to preside as successor of Pyrrhus.[a] This latter prelate was deposed in 641 and driven into Africa, whither he was followed by Maximus in 645, who had become so alarmed at the progress of heresy that he left his monastery to seek the help of the pope. Finding that Pyrrhus was spreading his views in Africa, he challenged him to a public discussion, which took place in July 645, in presence of the African bishops and of Gregory prefect of the province. This discussion is very valuable for its historical details as well as for its logical exposition of the orthodox view. Pyrrhus opened the discussion by asserting, that as there was but one person in Christ so there was but one will, will being attached to personality. If there were two wills in Him, then there must have been two persons. Maximus, on the other hand, maintains that will is an essential part of either nature, the human or the divine, and necessary to its perfection. As Christ then had two perfect natures, He must have had two wills and two modes of working. The discussion is a very lengthened one. It will be found in Mansi x. 710–760, and in the collected works of Maximus. It was successful for the time in the apparent conversion of Pyrrhus, who accompanied Maximus to Rome, and was reconciled to the papal see. His conversion was merely dictated by political motives. Gregory the prefect of Africa was plotting a revolt. The pope was throwing all his influence upon his side as an upholder of orthodoxy, and Pyrrhus hoped to regain his patriarchal throne through their means. Some time after, being disappointed in his hopes, he returned to his former Monothelitism. Maximus remained at Rome for several years, and took part in the Lateran synod of 649. Another leading champion of this period on the orthodox side was Stephen bishop of Dora, the friend of Sophronius and his delegate to the pope. He presented a treatise on the subject under debate to the Lateran synod, which is valuable for some of its historical details. It is contained in Mansi, x. 891. The second period terminated with the excommunication of Pyrrhus the ex-patriarch, and of Paul the actual patriarch, of Constantinople, in a synod held at Rome by pope Theodore A.D. 648, when the indignant pope signed the sentence of excommunication with the consecrated wine of the Eucharist. The emperor and the patriarch Paul, on the other hand, issued in the same year the Type, an imperial edict which, in a more moderate shape than the Ecthesis, re-imposed silence upon the controversialists under the severest penalties.

III. A.D. 649–680.

The third period at its opening saw Monothelitism dominant, at its termination saw it overthrown. The history of so complete a revolution is very interesting, proving the power of ideas when supported by faith and enthusiasm as against movements which rely, as did Monothelitism, upon the civil power alone; for Monothelitism, it must never be forgotten, from the day of its birth revelled in the full sunshine of imperial favour, while Dyothelitism had to struggle with every earthly force arrayed against it. Dyothelitism produced its martyrs, its Martin I., its Maximus, its Anastasii. Monothelitism was simply a statesman's device, which collapsed when deprived of civil support, because devoid of any innate life of its own. This third period opens with the meeting of the Lateran council at Rome in the year 649, convoked by pope Martin I., who was chosen pope in July of the same year in succession to Theodore. He had been, prior to his election, Apocrisiarius of the Roman see at the imperial court, where he had ample experience of the intolerance of the Monothelite party. Immediately upon his consecration he convoked a synod almost entirely composed of Italian bishops, which met on Oct. 5, and continued its sittings till Oct. 31. The transactions of this synod, as contained in Mansi, t. x., embody many documents valuable for the earlier history of Monothelitism, as the *Libellus* of Stephen of Dora, extracts from the writings of Theodore of Pharan, one of the earliest and ablest exponents of Monothelitism, copies of the *Ecthesis* and *Type*, letters of Sergius and Cyrus. This synod published a creed, which was identical with that of Chalcedon, with the addition of the following words bearing on the question at issue: "Credimus et duas ejusdem sicuti naturas unitas inconfuse, ita et duas naturales voluntates divinam et humanam, et duas naturales operationes, divinam et humanam, in approbatione perfecta et indiminuta, eundem veraciter esse perfectum Deum, et hominem perfectum, eundem atque unum Dominum nostrum et Deum J. Ch., utpote volentem et operantem divine et humane nostram salutem." This decision was further elaborated by the council in twenty canons, setting forth their own Christological conception and anathematising the opposite error. The acts of this synod were sent broadcast throughout Christendom, while a special letter was sent to the emperor, Constans II., calling upon him to reject his Monothelite advisers and to submit to the decision of the Roman council. The emperor, however, had no such intention. During the very sessions of the synod he sent the exarch of Ravenna, Olympius, to arrest pope Martin, to force the Roman church to accept the Type and observe silence upon the controverted points. When Olympius failed, he sent a more determined man, who arrested the pope in 653 and conducted him to Constantinople, where he was consigned to a miserable imprisonment. After various attempts to shake his determination, he was banished to the Crimea, where he died amid the glory of martyrdom, Sept. 16, 655. At the same time Maximus and his two disciples, the Anastasii, were arrested at Rome, where their intellectual influence on the Dyothelite side had been very great. They were also brought to Constantinople and tried, chiefly on political grounds. Maximus was accused of bringing about the capture of Egypt, Alexandria, and Africa by the Saracens, by inducing Peter prefect of Numidia to withhold his troops when ordered by Heraclius to advance to the aid of the invaded districts, on the plea that the emperor was a heretic. Space would fail to tell

[a] The question whether Maximus was successor of Pyrrhus, or whether Pyrrhus was ever abbat of Chrysopolis, is a disputed one. Cf. Pagi *ad ann.* 642, 1; Hefele, *l. c.* sec. 303.

of the debates, trials, tortures, and exiles of Maximus and his friends. Let it suffice to say that they too, after suffering mutilation of the tongue and right hand, were banished to the Lazian district, where Maximus died a martyr to his consistency on Aug. 13, 662. The energy displayed in this persecution availed to secure silence for a time. Vitalian and Adeodatus, popes from 657–676, even joined in communion with Constantinople, and had their names inscribed in its diptychs, a favour conceded to no Roman pope since Honorius. But a change was coming over the prospects of Monothelitism in the midst of its apparent prosperity. Constantinus Pogonatus, or the Bearded, reversed the imperial tradition, embraced the Catholic view of the controversy, and issued a summons for a general council, which accordingly met and established Dyothelitism as the creed of the universal church. [CONSTANTINUS V.] This sixth general council was, as Milman remarks, a triumph and a humiliation for the Roman see, since while it established the faith for which it had so long struggled, it at the same time condemned Honorius, a former pope, as an excommunicated heretic, a condemnation which pope Leo II. himself, when announcing the decisions of the council to the kings of the West, glories in and ratifies (cf. Milman's *Latin Christianity*, lib. iv. cap. 6).

The acts of this general council will be found in Mansi, t. xi. They are discussed at considerable length by Hefele in his History of the Councils.

IV. A.D. 711–713.

The fourth period of the controversy embraces only two years. The emperor Justinian II. was a cruel tyrant but a supporter of the Catholic side. He was deposed and murdered by his army, and Philippicus Bardanes chosen into his place. He had been reared in the Monothelite faith, which he at once proceeded to re-establish. He removed even before his entry into Constantinople the picture of the sixth general council, which had been attached to the wall of the imperial palace, between the fourth and sixth guardhouses (scholae). He restored to the diptychs the names of Honorius, Sergius, and the others excommunicated by the council, and finally, after deposing the Catholic patriarch, Cyrus, and substituting in his place John, a Monothelite, he summoned a synod, which, after the manner of Constantinople, obediently ratified the imperial wishes. The emperor then called upon pope Constantine to accept the change. The pope at once refused, and, backed by the Roman people, declared the emperor a heretic and removed his name from the diptychs and his portrait out of the churches. This reaction, however, lasted only two years, as Philip was deposed at the feast of Pentecost, A.D. 713, after which we hear no more of Monothelitism. The interest indeed attaching to the abstract question was henceforth swallowed up by the more practical and pressing Iconoclastic controversy, which very controversy was indeed, as we remarked at the beginning, another branch out of the root of Monophysitism. [ICONOCLASM.]

The Monothelite party is now represented by the Maronites of the Lebanon, who united themselves to the Roman communion, A.D. 1182. The term Maronite was generally used in the East to express the Monothelite party. Eutychius, Elmacin, and other Eastern authors refer the origin of Monothelitism to a certain Syrian monk, one Maro, who lived under the emperor Maurice, towards the end of the 6th century (Renaudot, *Patr. Alexand.* p. 149). The reputation of Maro is vindicated by Assemani, *Acta Mart. Oriental.* t. ii. p. 405–412; cf. *Bibliographie Universelle*, s.v.

The authorities about Monothelitism are of two kinds, (1) Ancient; (2) Modern.

(1) The ancient authorities have been mentioned to a large extent already. They are comprised in Mansi, t. x.–xii., and all other standard collections of the councils. The student who wishes to investigate further will find a complete list of all the ancient and modern writers, down to his own day, either for or against Monothelitism in Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, t. xi. p. 151–153, ed. Harles.

(2) Of the modern authorities we need only notice the monographs devoted to the subject, as of course all the great histories discuss the heresy at large. They are seven in number. Combefis, *Hist. haer. Monothel.* in *Auct. Nov.* t. ii. Paris, 1648; J. S. Assemani, *Biblioth. Juris Oriental.* t. iv.; Jac. Chmel, *Dissert. Hist. de Origine haeres. Monothel.*; Tamagnini, *Hist. Monothel.*; Walch, *Ketzerhistorie*, Bd. ix. s. 1–666; Hefele, *Concil. Geschichte*, Bd. iii. s. 110–332; Forbesii à Corsa, *Instruct. Histor.-Theolog.* lib. v. Dorner, in his *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, Div. ii. vol. i. p. 155 sqq. Clark's ed., has an able discussion of the whole question, as has also Neander, t. v. 242–272, Clark's ed. Neander and Dorner may be consulted specially for the bearing of the controversy on Christological doctrine. Cf. also Ceillier, tt. xi. and xii. *pass.*; Bower's *Hist. of the Popes, pass.*; and for the civil history of the controversy Le Beau, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, ed. Saint-Martin; and Finlay's *Greece*. The articles on the different names mentioned above will furnish much information. [G. T. S.]

PERTINAX, P. HELVIUS, made emperor by the conspirators after the murder of Commodus, January 1, A.D. 193, murdered by the mutinous praetorians on the following March 28. (Dion. lxxiii. 1–10; Herodian, ii. 1–5; Julius Capitolinus, *V. Pertinacis*; Tillemont, *Emp.* ii.; Gibbon, c. 4.) [F. D.]

PERVINCUS, deacon of TURRIBIUS of Astorga. (Leo, *Epp.* 15; Idatius, *Chron.*, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 678, li. 882.) [F. D.]

PETELMUS, addressed by archbishop Boniface. [PECTHELM.]

PETILIANUS, an eminent Donatist bishop, probably a native of Constantina or Cirta, chief town of Numidia, born of parents who were Catholics; but while he was still a catechumen he was carried off almost by force against his will by the Donatists, received by baptism into their community, and subsequently made, between 395 and 400, their bishop in Cirta. (Aug. *c. lit. Petil.* ii. 104, 238; *Serm. ad pleb. Caesar. de Emerito*, 8.) He had practised as a lawyer with great success, so as to obtain the name of the Paraclete, the identity of which name with that of the Holy Spirit, if we may believe St. Augustine, was flattering to his

vanity (*c. lit. Petil.* iii. 16, 19). He afterwards took a prominent part in the Conference, A.D. 411, as one of the seven managers on the Donatist side, but after this we hear no more of him. (Aug. *Retract.* ii. 34; *c. lit. Petil.* ii. 40, 95; iii. 57, 69; Optatus, Opp. *Mon. Vet. Don.* liii.) About A.D. 398 or 400, Augustine addressed to some of the leaders of the Donatist sect in Cirta a private letter inviting them in temperate language to discuss the questions at issue between them and the church, an invitation which was rejected by them with contempt. But when he was in the church of that place, together with Absentius (Alypius) and Fortunatus its Catholic bishop, a letter addressed by the Donatist bishop (Petilianus, but without a name) to his own clergy, was put into his hands, of which he found the purport to be at once to cut off communion with the Catholic church. This proposal seemed to him to be so monstrous as to make him doubt whether the letter could have proceeded from a man of his reputation, until he was assured that this was the case. (FORTUNATUS (10), Vol. II. p. 552.) But lest silence on his part should be misunderstood, he undertook at once to reply to its statements, though the letter was plainly imperfect, and ought to be presented in a complete state. The writer accuses the Catholics of making necessary a repetition of Baptism, because, he says, they pollute the souls of those whom they baptize. The validity of baptism in his view depends on the character of the giver, as the strength of a building depends on that of the foundation. He quotes Ecclus. xxxiv. 30, (25) applying to his own sect the words, "wise men" (Matth. xxiii. 34), interpreting the word "dead" (mortuo) to mean an ungodly person; he charges the Catholics with persecution, and also with "tradition," and makes an insinuation about Manicheism. Replying to these charges, Augustine shows that the validity of baptism depends, not on the conscience of the minister, but on the promise of Christ, and urges the difficulty created by the Donatist argument. If a person receives baptism from an ungodly minister without knowing his character, will he receive faith? On the principle laid down by the writer, plainly not: will it be guilt? If so, then Donatists ought to re-baptize all who fall into sin after baptism. But Scripture bids us not to trust in man, not even in a faithful steward, and St. Paul forbids any mention of his own name in connection with baptism. If by "dead" (Eccles. xxxiv. 30) he meant ungodly, what is to be said of Optatus (of Thamugada)? If by this word he meant "guilty," i.e. convicted, what can be said of Felicianus and Praetextatus, the advisers of Maximianus against Primian, who were condemned by the Donatist Council (of Bagaia)? Augustine also urges against the Donatist party their perverse inconsistency in cutting off from communion churches in other countries, entirely ignorant of the transactions in Africa, the use made by them of the military power of Gildo, and shows that even "tradition," which he condemns as strongly as his opponents can do, cannot affect the descendants of "traditors," of whom they receive one at least without scruple. If they who suffer persecution are more righteous than their persecutors, the Maximianists, whose church was overthrown by the soldiers of Optatus, and who, at the instance of Primianus, were excluded from their own churches by order of the pro-consul, must be more righteous than those who promoted these acts. Certainly they cannot justly complain of imperial edicts against those who separate from the Catholic Church. In separating themselves from the universal church, they show their blindness for the sake of a few tares in Africa, cutting themselves off from the "corn" of Christ. But the promise of God cannot be overthrown by a few failures. As to conduct, what can be said of the circumcellions and the excesses committed during Gildo's supremacy? Perhaps the writer of this letter will not acknowledge his authorship, for his party are much afraid of their words being retained, and perhaps he expects Augustine to refute what has been said about Manicheism, but it is difficult to see how its errors can be overthrown by those of Donatism. In conclusion, he calls on his opponents to meet the argument founded on the case of the Maximianists.

In his second book, Augustine, for the benefit of the less acute among his brethren (tardiores patres), takes one by one the charges of Petilian, whose letter had by that time been received in a complete state. The statements, 108 in number, including applications of Scripture passages, and an appeal to the Catholics, are answered by Augustine *seriatim*. Remarking in the first place on the form of salutation used by Petilianus, which agrees mainly with those adopted by St. Paul in his Epistles, he asks why he and his party do not communicate with the churches to whom St. Paul wrote? The arguments used by Petilian may be summed up under two principal heads as follows, but they are much intermixed with each other, and contain much coarse vituperation. 1. *The inefficacy of Baptism by ungodly persons.* The corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit, but the party who call themselves Catholics are corrupt, followers of Judas, false prophets, false priests, whose "oil" is to be avoided (Ps. cxl. 6; cxli. 5), children of "traditors," whose deeds resemble those of their predecessors, no true bishops. Can a man pronounce a legal decision who is not a magistrate, or will a magistrate's decision carry weight if his life be immoral; or can a man be truly called a priest who only repeats priestly words? If the Apostles were justified in re-baptizing disciples of St. John Baptist, what can be said against the baptizers of those who have received only a profane baptism? 2. *The iniquity of persecution.* Did the Apostles persecute? St. Paul certainly did so as a Jew, but regretted it deeply afterwards. The persecutor is a true child of the devil. God delights to draw people to himself, why do not the Catholic party, so called, leave people to choose for themselves? God did not wish schismatics to be killed, and the true pattern in this respect may be learnt from our Lord's conduct under persecution (Matth. xxvi. 51, 52). It is the Catholics who have broken unity, but truth and falsehood, life and death, cannot be united, nor true believers (Donatists) with Macarius (MACARIUS (21), Vol. III. p. 774). The Catholics break the Commandments, contradict the Beatitudes, make martyrs, are wolves among sheep. What business have

Christians with kings, of whom so many have been persecutors: why calling Donatists heretics, do the Catholics desire their communion; if they are innocent why persecute them, if guilty why seek union with them? Woe to those who lack unity, let people beware of partaking in the sins of others. In his reply Augustine shows, 1. *The true nature of Baptism.* Those who fall away after baptism must return, not by re-baptism, but by repentance. The notion of the Apostles as a body being polluted by the presence among them of Judas is distinctly contrary to our Lord's words (John xiii. 10). Petilian ought to be ashamed of speaking of baptism in the name of the Trinity as a falsehood or a counterfeit to any one, but if this were so, the counterfeit would be found in Optatus (of Thamugada) who regarded Gildo as God. The authority of a magistrate is derived from the emperor, and as to what he said about a man repeating priestly words, even Caiaphas was a true priest, but the Donatists profane the Sacraments on account of men's personal faults. If his doctrine about Baptism be true, why did St. Paul and other Apostles baptize persons already baptized by the Baptist, whose baptism was a preparatory ordinance, and distinct from Christian baptism, which is given in the name, not of Caecilian, or Petilian, or Augustine, but of Christ. If the Holy Spirit can only be given by the hands of pure men, how was it that 120 persons received it on the Day of Pentecost without any imposition of hands, and Cornelius, even before baptism itself. 2. *As to Persecution.* Augustine denies the charge, and retorts it upon his adversary, whose partizans, the Circumcellions and others, were guilty of persecution. As to Marculus, he doubts the facts of the case (MARCULUS, Vol. III. 824). But even if the charge were true in respect of former days, it does not inculpate men of the present day. Even the acts of Optatus, though he lived among the Donatist party, and his birthday was celebrated by them, and his patron Gildo held by them in reverence, do not condemn Petilian, and it was he who compelled Felicianus to return to the Donatist communion. Augustine mentions also the acts of Faustinus at Hippo, and Crispinus at Calama. (CRISPINUS (2), Vol. I. 713. FAUSTINUS (8), Vol. II. 464.) He points out the inconsistency of the party in their behaviour towards the Maximianists, and the manner in which Rogatus suffered during the ascendancy of Firmus. The way of life is narrow, but if the Donatist party claim to be the only true church, the claim of the Maximianists must be stronger still, because they are fewer in number. Petilian had asked *quae est ratio persequendi?* Augustine replies (1) by quoting Ps. c. 6 (ci. 5), by which quotation he implies, as he does elsewhere, that what his adversary regarded as persecution, he on his part regarded only as legal and justifiable prosecution, a confusion of terms which it is plain that no argument could ever reconcile; (2) by reminding Petilian that our Lord himself drove the buyers and sellers from the temple with a scourge. 3. In near connection with this question of persecution comes the one of *appeal to the civil power*, in which Augustine shows that the Donatists themselves not only appealed to Constantine, but took advantage of the patronage of Julian. The cases quoted by Petilian of persecuting emperors are irrelevant, for their severities were directed against the undivided church, some of them, as Nero, being heathens, one, viz. Valens, an Arian. So too are the cases of Macarius and Ursatius, who are said by Donatists to have suffered the just punishment of their crimes by violent deaths. Ursatius died in battle, and how Macarius died is not known. The church supported by Catholic princes was opposed by Optatus, and it therefore became necessary to bring forward the law about a fine of 10 lbs. of gold for irregular ordination (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5. 21, A.D. 392), a law of which Donatists take no notice, but accuse Catholics of cruelty in enforcing it, yet neither Crispinus nor Petilian have been losers in any pecuniary way. 4. *Language of Scripture and of the Church perverted.* Regarding his own party as pure, and his opponents as impure, Petilian applied without scruple to himself and his party all passages which extolled purity, and to the others all which condemned impurity. Among others great stress was laid by them on Ps. cxl. 6 (cxli. 5) on which the reading of the lxx. and Vulgate is plainly founded on a reading of the Hebrew, of which neither party were aware, but which gives a totally different meaning. Taking the sense, however, as it stands in those two versions, Augustine protests against the bigotry which would reject the prayers even of sinners, such as we all are, and reminds Petilian of the petition in the Lord's Prayer, which, asking forgiveness for ourselves, presumes the same on our own part towards others. Petilian laid stress on the meaning of the word "Catholic," which he said was "single" or "universal," *unicum vel totum*, and charged his opponents with breaking the unity of the church. In reply Augustine, confessing that his knowledge of Greek was not great, shows that his adversary's was still less, for "Catholic," καθ' ὅλον, cannot mean "single" but "universal," i.e. spread over the whole world. Petilian says, "Come to the Church." Augustine replies, Where is it? It cannot be in Africa only, or among the Montenses at Rome, or in Spain in the family of one woman (Lucilla). The efficacy of baptism rests not with Petilian or Peter, or Paul, or Donatus, but on the Trinity itself. In receiving persons baptised by Donatists, the Catholics seek to destroy, not their baptism but their error.

After this Petilian wrote a second letter, which, except some passages quoted by Augustine, has not been preserved, but which appears from his reply to have contained no new arguments but much of personal abuse, to which he made little reply, though he says that he is not conscious of the truth of the charges brought against him (Possidius, *Indiculus*, iii.). His reply forms the third letter to Petilian, and in it, besides refuting some personal charges, he repeats his former arguments, and one of them at much greater length, viz. his answer as to the dependency of the benefit of baptism on the moral condition and intention of the minister Dealing with some of the charges brought against him, while he expresses his sincere regret for his own way of life before baptism, he points out that his former sins were cleansed therein; and as to his subsequent life, those who

knew him can bear witness to what it has been since that time. Petilian calls him a Manichean, a charge which his conscience does not admit; and he appears to believe a vague statement, made by a woman, that he was a priest of the Manichean sect. He begs, however, that the Donatist party will judge fairly between himself and Petilian, whose witnesses they accept, though they refuse to believe his own. He may call himself Paracletus and Augustine Tertullus, and try to turn on him the charge of Manicheism; he accepts the angry words of (Megalius) his ordainer, but passes by the apology made afterwards by him before the council. He finds fault with monks and monasteries, knowing nothing of them, and passes by the cases of the Maximianists and of Optatus. He asserts falsely that Augustine was banished from Africa by Messianus the pro-consul; for at the time at which this is alleged to have been the case he was delivering lectures on rhetoric at Milan. In preparing his argument against that of Petilian, that the validity of baptism depends on the moral condition of the minister, he puts forward the very tenable supposition that this might not be pure, and if so, as shown in the first letter, what, on his theory, would be the result to a receiver ignorant of the fact? Petilian taxed them with introducing a mere vague supposition (fortasse), one of the same class as the one that the sky might fall. But there are many instances of men, Augustine says, some of them among Donatists, whom he mentions by name, who have done this, and, having performed the ceremony of baptism, have afterwards confessed their unbelief or wickedness of which at the time they were guilty, and have been degraded from their office, and yet the sky has not fallen. Church discipline ought to be maintained, but the whole church is not polluted by a few ungodly members. Some persons condemned by the church have been rebaptized by Donatists. Much that he had said in his former letter is wisely passed over by Petilian, but he asks Donatists to judge fairly between him and his opponent. It is plain that Augustine felt that there was some weight in the question raised by Petilian about the character of the minister of baptism, and for this reason he discussed it at some length, as he did also at still greater length, though not exactly from the same point of view, in his treatise *de Baptismo contra Donatistas*, in which, though not agreeing in the general doctrine laid down by Cyprian, he appears to admit a necessity for rebaptism in some extreme cases (*de Bapt.* i. 19, 29). But his argument against Petilian and his party from their own point of view is conclusive, and demonstrates the insufficiency of the ground taken by them in separating themselves from the church.

In close connection with these letters is the treatise of St. Augustine on the Unity of the Church, which he wrote at the time between the second and third of them, and which is intended to supply an answer to the question, "Where is the church?" The church was called by the men of former days "Catholic," because it is *καθ' ὅλον*, *i.e.* universal, and it is the Body of which Christ is the Head, so that they who are not in the church do not belong to his Body. Where is this to be found? Appeal must be made to Scripture (*libri Dominici*). Christ consists of Head and Body, and so they who do not believe in his Incarnation, &c., do not belong to his Body. The treatise then points out (1) the types and prophecies relating to the church, beginning with the ark, mentioning a curious misapplication of its description made by a Donatist preacher at Hippo (c. v. 10), the application of those prophecies to himself made by Christ; (2) the necessity for mixture in the church of evil with good even in Africa, as shown by the outrages of the Circumcellions, and the proceedings against the Maximianists, and the universal character of its structure, contrasted with the exclusiveness of Donatism.

In the enquiry at Carthage, in which Petilianus took a leading part, he was chiefly remarkable for ingenious quibbling and minute subtlety on technical details of proceeding: wrangling about the delay as to the day of commencing proceedings, the blame of which he tried to fix on the opposite party; insisting on personal signature by every bishop without exception, and insinuating fraud in this matter on the part of the others; attempting to throw on the catholics the position of appellants, so as to place himself and his own party in that of respondents only; objecting to production of legal documents as if the whole question were to be argued on scripture grounds only; refusing for himself and his party the liberty of sitting in the presence of the Commissioner, and thus obliging him to stand during the proceedings; using, in short, as Augustine said afterwards, every artifice in order to prevent real discussion; and on the third day losing his temper and insulting Augustine personally in a coarse and vulgar manner; showing throughout the faculties and disposition of a pettifogging advocate, adroit but narrow, dishonest himself and suspicious of dishonesty in others; spinning out the time in matters of detail, taking every advantage which the case afforded, fair or unfair, and postponing, though with much ostentatious protest to the contrary, the real matters in dispute. In the earlier part of the account his name, as that of every other speaker, is mentioned in its special place; but as the details of the latter portion are lost, and the account given by Augustine in his *Breviculus* omits the names, the share taken by Petilian in this latter portion is unknown (see Vol. I. 894, and *Coll. Carth.* edd. Dupin and Oberthür; Aug. *Retract.* ii. 18, 25, *Ep.* 141; Ribbek, *August. und Donat.* p. 341–348; 391–424; 524–609). [H. W. P.]

PETRAIN (PETRANIUS, PETRANUS), Irish bishop of the third order of saints, abbat of Lusk, and died A.D. 616. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 615; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* ii. 331–4.) [J. G.]

PETROCUS, ST., son of Clement, a Cornish prince (Rees's *Welsh Saints*, 266, *Life of S. Cadoc* in *Cambro-British Saints*, 310, Shearman's *Loca Patriciana*, 172), is said to have died June 4, 564 (William of Worcester 100, 101, 108, 115, 129; Haddan and Stubbs, i. 157, 701). Leland (*Itin.* viii. 514) refers to the old life of the saint, which was used by John of Tinmouth, and is given in the *Acta Sanctorum* for June 4, i. 400–402 (Hardy's *Cat. Mat.* i. 117). He lived in a hermitage near the river Heyle at

Bodmin, the old name of which was Petrockstow (Aelfric cited in Wuelcker's *Anglia*, iii. 107; see too Leofric's *Missal*, ed. Warren, 1883, p. lxii., 5, 272, 280), and there his relics were preserved in an ivory casket which still survives. His relics were so much esteemed that in 1177 they were stolen and carried off to the abbey of St. Mevennus in Brittany (Oliver's *Monasticon*, Exon. 16), and it needed a special interposition of Henry II. to enforce their restoration. A most curious memorial connected with his altar there is the Bodmin MS. of the Gospels, now in the British Museum, on the leaves of which are entered the manumissions of many Cornish serfs between 941 and 1026 (the list is printed in Kemble and Thorpe, and in Oliver's *Monasticon* Exon. 431, Haddan and Stubbs, i. 676 to 682; and with corrections by Whitley Stokes in Gaidoz' *Revue Celtique*, i. 332 to 345). Probably the Celtic bishopric of Cornwall was seated at Bodmin (William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum*, ii. § 95, p. 204), until the Danes destroyed the place in 981. (*Sax. Chron.*) It is to the Danish ravages that we owe the almost complete destruction of the documents connected with the Cornish church; only the memory of the old dedications of churches survives, representing the ruin of the early condition of the West. The bishopric seems to have been then removed to St. Germans (apparently once called Llan-aledh, Haddan and Stubbs, i. 697), and then united with that of Crediton, and finally the joint bishopric of the two counties settled at the strong fortress of Exeter in 1050. The monastery of Dinurrin from which bishop Kenstec sent his profession of faith and obedience to archbishop Ceolnoth not long before 870 (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 674), may have been either Dingerein or Gerrans, just east of Falmouth, which belonged to the see of Exeter, or Dynmure, one mile north of Bodmin, where there was an important British camp and bridge (William of Worcester, 109). His life says that Petrock studied in Ireland, that he visited Rome and the East, and that he returned to Cornwall accompanied by Credanus, Medanus, and Dechanus, who were all (according to Leland's *Descript. Brit.* 61) buried at Bodmin. They are said to have landed at the place afterwards called Petrockstow or Padstow, but previously Aldestowe, which was a dependency of the manor of Bodmin (it is not called Petrockstow till 1349). Many churches were dedicated to St. Petrock. In Cornwall we have Bodmin, Padstow, St. Petrock minor, Trevalga; in Devon, West Anstey, South Brent, Clannaborough, St. Petrock in Exeter (see Kerslake, *The Celt and the Teuton in Exeter*), Hollacombe (which belonged to St. Petrock's at Bodmin), Lidford, and Newton St. Petrock (see the *Journal of Institution of Cornwall*, ii. 199, 1867, and a *Life of St. Petrock* in iii. 1–9; *Bibliotheca Cornubiensis*, by Boase and Courtney, p. 477). [C. W. B.]

PETRONIA, a lady of Uzalis, mentioned by St. Augustine as having been cured of a disease of long standing, for which she had worn a charm, by means of the relics of St. Stephen. (Aug. *Civ. D.* xxii. 8, 21.) [H. W. P.]

PETRONILLA (1), saint and virgin. According to the legend related in the letter attributed to Marcellus, son of the prefect of the city, and incorporated in the apocryphal acts of SS. Nereus and Achilleus, she was the daughter of St. Peter, was struck with palsy by her father, and afterwards was restored to health by him. On account of her great beauty count Flaccus fell in love with her, and came with a number of soldiers to take her by force as his wife. She rebuked him for coming with an armed band, and desired him, if he wished to have her as his wife, to send matrons and virgins on the third day to conduct her to his house. He granted her request, and she passed the three days in prayer and fasting with her foster-sister Felicula, and on the third day after receiving the sacrament died, and the women brought by Flaccus to escort her home celebrated her funeral. She was buried on the estate of Flavia Domitilla, on the road to Ardea, a mile and a half from Rome. (*Acta SS.* May, iii. 10–11, vii. 420–422.)

Such is the legend: it remains to inquire from what sources it was derived. It seems to have originated (see Lightfoot, *S. Clement*, 259–262) from the combination of two elements: (i.) the Manichaean apocryphal story mentioned by St. Augustine (*c. Adimantum*, xvii. *Op.* viii. in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xlii. 161) that St. Peter by his prayers caused his daughter to be struck with palsy (the account in St. Augustine implies, without expressly stating it, that she was afterwards restored to health by her father); (ii.) the existence in the Christian cemetery of Flavia Domitilla of a sarcophagus inscribed with the words AURELIAE (or AUREAE) PETRONILLAE FILIAE DULCISSIMAE. Petronilla was assumed to be a diminutive of Petros; the inscription, it was imagined, had been engraved by the hand of the apostle himself, and in the early ages of the church the supposition that St. Peter had a daughter excited no repugnance. Later writers, for instance Baronius, felt this to be a difficulty, and accordingly explained *filia* in the sense of a spiritual daughter, in the same manner as St. Peter speaks of St. Mark as his son. But the legend is based entirely on the assumed derivation of Petronilla from Petros, whereas it is really derived from Petronius or Petro. Now the founder of the Flavian family, the grandfather both of the emperor Vespasian and his brother, T. Flavius Sabinus, the head of that branch of the Flavii to which the supposed converts to Christianity belonged, was T. Flavius Petro of Reate. Petronilla therefore was probably one of the Aurelian gens, several of whom are shown by the inscriptions discovered by De Rossi to have been buried in the same cemetery, and was by the mother's side a scion of the Flavian family, and was therefore related to Flavia Domitilla, the owner of the land under which the cemetery was formed, and was probably, like her, a Christian convert. So much may be affirmed with reasonable certainty, the rest of her history is unknown.

Probably on account of her supposed relationship to St. Peter she was held in high veneration. Though the subterranean basilica constructed by pope Siricius between A.D. 391 and 395 contained the tombs of the martyrs SS. Nereus and Achilleus, it was in her honour it was dedicated, and there her body remained in its sarcophagus till A.D. 757, when it was translated by pope Paul I. to the Vatican, and placed in what had

been the mausoleum of the Christian emperors, close to St. Peter's (*Liber Pontificalis* in *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 1139). This was done in fulfilment of a promise made by the pope's brother and predecessor Stephen II. to Pippin king of the Franks, on his visit to his court, as a token and pledge of the alliance between the Papacy and the Franks against the Lombards, which within fifty years was to lead to the re-establishment of the Western Empire. St. Peter being specially honoured by the Franks, and being their patron saint (*Epp.* Steph. II. iv. v. in *Cod. Carol.* in *Patr. Lat.* xcviii. 101, 102), Petronilla naturally shared in the veneration paid to her reputed father, and is in fact styled by Paul I. the *auxiliatrix* of Pippin (*Epp.* Pauli I. xiii. in *Cod. Carol.* in *Patr. Lat.* xcviii. 150). Stephen had himself converted the mausoleum into a chapel for the remains, but had died before the translation was accomplished.

There her body remained, the chapel being considered to belong in an especial manner to the kings of France. In A.D. 1471 a restoration was begun at the expense of Louis XI., in the course of which the ancient sarcophagus was discovered, and the inscription was fortunately copied by Sabinus, the antiquarian. After the chapel was demolished, early in the 16th century, in consequence of the rebuilding of St. Peter's, the sarcophagus and its contents lay for a long time neglected in the sacristy, till at last, in A.D. 1574, it was broken up and used for paving the new church, and the relics, transferred to a new receptacle, were in 1606 deposited at the altar where they still remain beneath the mosaic copy of Guercino's famous picture of the original interment of the saint. To the present day the French ambassador, after presenting his credentials to the pope, visits the chapel of St. Petronilla.

Within the last ten years, thanks to the indefatigable industry of Cav. de Rossi, the ancient basilica of St. Petronilla has been discovered and excavated, the original positions of her sarcophagus and the tombs of SS. Nereus and Achilleus have been determined, and a fresco, probably of the first half of the 4th century (*Bull.* 1875, 16), has been found, which represents St. Petronilla conducting one of her votaries to Paradise. In this picture she is designated as a martyr. The last discovery (*Athenæum*, March 4, 1882) in these catacombs is a chamber, the great antiquity of which is shown by its style of decoration, akin to the Pompeian. The inscription which had been over the door, written in characters of the Flavian era, is AMPLIATI, which at once suggests the thought, can this be the tomb either of the Ampliatus himself or of his family to whom St. Paul alludes? (*Rom.* xvi. 8). An interesting account of these discoveries, and a discussion of the legend of St. Petronilla and the history of her cultus is given in Cav. de Rossi's papers (*Bullettino di Archeologia Christiana*, 1865, 46; 1874, 1, 68, 122; 1875, 1–77; 1878, 125–146; 1879, 1–20, 139–160; 1880, 169), and the fourth volume of *Roma Sotterranea* is to be devoted to the subject. St. Petronilla is commemorated on May 31. [F. D.]

PETRONILLA (2), a Lucanian lady, had been induced by bishop Agnellus to enter a nunnery and to endow it with all her property. When she with the other nuns fled to Sicily before the Lombard invasion, Agnellus, the son of the said bishop, was said to have seduced her. Gregory in A.D. 593, directed the deacon Cyprianus to inquire into the charge, and if it was true to compel her to re-enter a nunnery and do penance (*Ep.* iv. 6). [F. D.]

PETRONIUS (1), a monk in the coenobium of Pachomius at Tabenna in the Thebais, of eminent virtue. When Pachomius died, May 9, 348, Petronius, who was then superior of the coenobium of Men or Tismen in the diocese of Panis, was chosen to succeed him, but he survived his election only thirteen days. The source of our information is the Greek *Acta* of Silvanus and Pachomius (Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii. 27 CD, 52 C, 42 CD, 44 DC; Tillem. vii. 176, 217, 218, 229, 230, 689, 692, viii. 130). [C. H.]

PETRONIUS (2), ST., bishop of Bologna, early embraced the monastic life. According to Gennadius (*de Script. Eccl.* 41, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 1082) the *Vitas Patrum* being Lives of the Egyptian monks, which monks regarded as the rule and mirror of their profession, were attributed to him. This work is not extant, unless Gennadius refers to the *Vitae Patrum* of Rufinus (*Patr. Lat.* xxi. 387), which, it has been suggested, were composed by Rufinus from materials furnished by Petronius. The book is indeed attributed to Rufinus by St. Jerome, (*ad Ctes.* in *Patr. Lat.* xxii. 1151), but is not included by Gennadius in the list of his works. It relates a journey to the most celebrated monasteries and hermitages in Egypt, but from what is known from other sources of the life of Rufinus, it appears that he could not have been in Egypt at the time the journey is represented to have been made. Tillemont (*M. E.* xii. 657) collects the evidence, of which one specimen will be sufficient. The writer (ch. i.) mentions that he was with St. John of Lycopolis, when news of the defeat of Eugenius by Theodosius arrived at Alexandria, i. e. late in A.D. 394; now St. Jerome states (*in Ruf.* iii. 18 in *Patr. Lat.* xxiii. 470) that Rufinus was never in Alexandria after Theophilus became bishop, i.e. after A.D. 385. One solution is that Rufinus wrote the book from the materials supplied by and under the character of some traveller, who probably was Petronius; another is that Petronius found the book in Greek and employed Rufinus to translate it. The writer was a deacon, and travelled with six companions from Jerusalem (ch. i.). He first narrates what he saw in the Thebaid and then in Nitria. The perils of the way prevented them going further than Lycopolis. At the end of the book he mentions the various dangers they encountered. Their boat was once almost upset in the Nile, they were wrecked on an island in Lake Mareotis, were pursued by robbers, were nearly lost in the inundation of the Nile, and finally in Nitria were nearly devoured by some crocodiles in a pool left by the inundation, which they had incautiously approached, thinking they were dead. Gennadius also mentions a treatise (*de Ordinatione Episcopi*) attributed to Petronius but written in too good a style to be his. He therefore supposes it was written by his father, Petronius, who was distinguished for his learning

and eloquence; as the author speaks of himself as praetorian prefect. It is uncertain which of the praetorian prefects of the names is meant. A Sextus Petronius Probus was praetorian prefect four times, first in A.D. 368 (*Cod. Theod.* x. tit. 24. 1), but it is generally supposed that the father of St. Petronius was either the Anicius Probus, son of the last mentioned, who may also have borne the name of Petronius, and who was consul in A.D. 406, or the Petronius who was vicar in Spain, A.D. 395–7 (*Cod. Theod.* iv. tit. 21. 1. tit. 6. 5), and prefect of the Gauls between A.D. 402 and 408 (*Cod. Just.* xi. 73). The whole question is discussed by Tillemont (*M. E.* xv. 30) and the Bollandists (*AA. SS.* Oct. ii. 424). Gennadius states that St. Petronius died during the joint reign of Theodosius and Valentinian, i. e. between A.D. 425 and A.D. 450. Eucherius of Lyons, writing about A.D. 432, mentions St. Petronius as a contemporary instance of one who had forsaken the highest worldly position (*Ad Val.* in *Patr. Lat.* l. 719), and Gennadius speaks of the holiness of his life. He is commemorated on Oct. 4, and is the patron saint of Bologna. [F. D.]

PETRONIUS (3), a presbyter of Gaul, messenger to Leo the Great. (Leonis *Epp.* lxvi. and lxvii.) [C. G.]

PETRONIUS (4), bishop, to whom in A.D. 525 Dionysius Exiguus addressed the first of his two letters on the Pasch, giving an account of the cycle which Dionysius was about to publish [DIONYSIUS (19)]. [J. G.]

PETRONIUS (5), the fifth abbat of St. Augustine's, Canterbury. According to the legendary history of the abbey, he was a Roman, elected to succeed Gratiosus, whose death is fixed to 638, and was blessed by archbishop Honorius in 640. No reason is alleged for the delay, but it is conjectured that Honorius may have been on a long tour. His death is dated 654, and the place of his burial was unknown. There is, however, an epitaph assigned to him in the Monasticon,

> "Abbas Petronius, bonitatis odore refertus
> Subjectos docuit, vitiorum sorde piavit."

The years assigned to him fall pretty nearly within the archiepiscopate of Honorius and the reign of Earcombert. But nothing is really known of him, and his existence depends for historical credibility on the possible authenticity of the ancient list of abbats. (Elmham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 175, 183; W. Thorn, ed. Twysden, c. 1769; *Mon. Angl.* i. 120. Somner's *Antiquities of Canterbury*, ed. Battely, pt. 2, p. 164.) [S.]

PETRUS APOSTOLUS, PREACHING OF (Κήρυγμα Πέτρου; praedicatio Petri et Pauli). Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 3) enumerates four spurious works bearing the name of the Apostle Peter, but not recognized by ecclesiastical writers. These are the Acts of Peter, the Gospel of Peter, the Preaching of Peter and the Revelation of Peter. To these Jerome, in his *Catalogue*, adds a fifth: the Judgment of Peter. Concerning the Acts of Peter, see ACTS APOCRYPHAL, CLEMENTINE LITERATURE, and LINUS; concerning the Gospel and the Revelation, see GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL, APOCALYPSES APOCRYPHAL; concerning the Judgment see TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES. In this article an account will be given of the Preaching of Peter, a work which must be as old as the middle of the second century. It is quoted several times by Clement of Alexandria, who uses it without scruple as a genuine record of Peter's teaching (*Strom.* i. 29, p. 427 Potter; ii. 15, p. 465; vi. 5, pp. 759–762; vi. 6, p. 764; vi. 7, p. 769; vi. 15, p. 804; *Eclog. Prophet.* 58, p. 1004). It had been previously employed by Heracleon, who is quoted by Origen (*In Johann.* xiii. 17) as citing the same passage as that quoted by Clement, p. 760. In this passage Origen leaves it to his readers to determine whether the 'Preaching' is to be regarded as genuine, spurious, or mixed; but elsewhere (*De Princ.* Praef. 8) he expresses a decidedly unfavourable opinion of the book.

Critics of the school of Baur assume it as an article of pious belief that the first Acts of Peter must have been Ebionite and anti-Pauline, relating a contest between the Apostle Peter and Simon Magus, under which disguise Paul is to be understood as represented. But there is no real proof that any work which professed to record Peter's preaching is more ancient than the work now under consideration; and this is distinctly neither Ebionite nor anti-Pauline. In the passage which is largely quoted by Clement (*Strom.* vi. 5), the Christians are described as a community distinct alike from Jews and Gentiles, and forming a third race (τρίτον γένος). All three worshipped the same God; but both Gentiles and Jews went astray in their manner of worshipping Him. We must not worship like the Gentiles, who took gold and silver and other substances which God had given for man's use, and made them objects of worship; they also worshipped creatures given for man's food, and even worshipped weasels and mice, cats,[a] dogs, and apes. But neither must we worship like the Jews; for they worship angels and archangels; they honour the sun and the moon, and until the moon appears will not keep their first sabbath nor their other feasts. But God has said in the Scriptures, "Behold I make a new covenant, not like the covenant which I made with your fathers on Mount Horeb." This new covenant is that of the Christians; those of the Jews and of the Gentiles are old.[b] This writer evidently is no Ebionite; but has completely separated himself from the Jews, who he declares, though they fancy they alone know God, really know nothing of Him.

The mission to the Gentiles is represented as part of Christ's appointed plan. He is said to have told His apostles after His Ascension to remain for twelve years labouring among the Jews; and after that to go out and preach the gospel through the whole world in order that those who should believe might be saved, and those who should not believe might at least not be able to say in their excuse that they had not heard. Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 18) quotes Apollonius as reporting a tradition, that our Lord had

[a] We may perhaps be tempted to suspect an Egyptian origin for this book of the Preaching.

[b] A use of the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to be indicated here.

directed the apostles not to leave Jerusalem for twelve years; but he does not connect that tradition with the Preaching of Peter.

It would appear that this work introduced Paul as Peter's fellow labourer. Clement (p. 761), when speaking of this work, goes on to say that "besides the preaching of Peter's (πρὸς τῷ Πέτρου κηρύγματι) the apostle Paul also testifies." Now critics are generally agreed that the words put into the mouth of Paul are taken from the same work, which seems to have consisted of two parts, a Preaching of Peter and a Preaching of Paul. Lactantius (*Inst. Div.* iv. 21), to all appearance speaking of the same work, describes it as containing the Preaching both of Peter and Paul, "quae Petrus et Paulus Romae praedicaverunt, et ea praedicatio in memoriam scripta permansit." Pseudo-Cyprian[c] also (*De Rebaptismate*, 17) has a quotation, presently to be mentioned from the "Praedicatio Pauli." It may be conjectured that after the two separate preachings of Peter and Paul there followed a conclusion relating the joint preaching of the two apostles at Rome. For one of the things alleged by Pseudo-Cyprian, in order to prove the untrustworthy character of the book, is that it represents Peter and Paul meeting in "the city," as if they had not known each other before. The words quoted by Clement as Paul's in the passage referred to, were probably taken from the joint preaching of the two apostles; for what Paul says seems to be a natural supplement to what Clement quotes as Peter's. Peter is represented (*Strom.* vi. 15) as appealing to the prophecies of Christ in the Jewish Scriptures; Paul bids them take also the Grecian books. He alleges the Sibyl as testifying to the unity of God, and also Hystaspes as prophesying of Christ. The substance of what he quotes has been given in the article HYSTASPES (Vol. III. p. 289). The fact that the names of the Sibyl and of Hystaspes are coupled in precisely the same manner by Justin Martyr, suggests a suspicion either that the author of the Preaching used Justin or that the Preaching is old enough to have been known by Justin. In favour of the latter supposition is the fact, that the Preaching seems to show an independent knowledge of Hystaspes. But that there is literary dependence, on the one side or the other, between the two books, is made highly probable, by the existence of two other coincidences.

One of the few statements made by Justin about our Lord, for which we do not find authority in our Gospels, is that at his baptism when he descended into the water a fire was kindled in Jordan (*Trypho* 88). It has often been remarked that Justin has shaped his sentence in such a way as to separate this statement from the things for which he alleges apostolic authority. Now Pseudo-Cyprian (*u. s.*) reports that this statement was to be found in the "Preaching of Paul," and is not in any Gospel.[d] He imagines that the book must have been forged by some heretics, against whom he had to contend, who contrived to give to those whom they persuaded to join them, a literal baptism "with fire." We may accept his testimony, that the book was appealed to by these heretics, without being persuaded that it was they who forged it. The "Preaching of Paul" appears to have included a recital of some of the events of our Lord's history. Pseudo-Cyprian tells us that it related that our Lord was constrained by his mother, almost against his will, to accept John's baptism, and that it represents him as then making confession of sin. We are led to think it likely that the author of the "Preaching" used the Hebrew gospel, which, according to St. Jerome (*Adv. Pelag.* iii. 2), related that our Lord was urged by his mother and his brethren to receive John's baptism, whereupon he answered, "What have I sinned that I should go and be baptised of him, unless indeed this that I have said be ignorance." There is another coincidence with the Hebrew gospel, the discussion of which is not quite free from difficulty. Origen (*De Princ.* Praef. 8) quotes the "Teaching of Peter" as making our Lord say, "I am not an incorporeal spirit." Now Jerome (*De Vir. Illust.* 16; *in Isai.* lib. 18 Prol.) reports that these words were found in the Hebrew gospel. And this report gains confirmation from the fact that Ignatius, who is likely enough to have used an Aramaic gospel (*Ad Smyrn.* 3), when apparently referring to the same incident as that recorded (Luke xxiv. 39), does so in the form, Ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν ἔφη αὐτοῖς Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. We should seem then justified in the inference, that the author of the Preaching used the Hebrew gospel; but the curious point is that Eusebius, whom we have every reason to suppose to have been acquainted both with one work and the other, quotes (*H. E.* iii. 36) the passage from Ignatius, and says that he does not know where Ignatius got those words. We know no other solution of the difficulty than that the memory of Eusebius did not always help him as well as might be desired.

It still remains to be mentioned that Clement three times reports that the Preaching gave to our Lord the titles νόμος and λόγος, and himself combines these epithets. (*Strom.* vii. p. 837.) Now a third coincidence between the Preaching and Justin Martyr is that Justin (*Trypho* 11) applies to our Lord the title νόμος αἰώνιος, interpreting the word νόμος in the prophecy of Isaiah (li. 4) νόμος παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται of our Lord personally. He understands in like manner the word διαθήκη in Jer. xxii. 31 Heb. and xxxviii. 22 LXX.: a prophecy which, we have already seen, was quoted in the Preaching. Comparison here is in favour of the originality of Justin; but it is remarkable that Clement Alex. (*Strom.* i. 29) using the words νόμος and διαθήκη in the same way quotes the Preaching as his authority and not Justin. A very curious coincidence, suggesting a possibility that the Preaching might have derived the idea from another source, is that Hermas also has ὁ νόμος οὗτος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐστι. Now there seems to be a plain use of the "First Commandment" of Hermas in the language in which Peter in the Preaching proclaims that there is one God

[c] With respect to the authorship of this tract, *see* URSINUS AFER.

[d] The Ebionite Gospel described by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx. 13) related that a great light shone round the place, but a "light" and "fire" are by no means to be confounded.

ἀχώρητος ὃς τὰ πάντα χωρεῖ. The use of the word Logos in the Preaching is only worthy of notice, if it is supposed that the author was earlier than Justin.

It is to be regretted that the remains of the Preaching of Peter are too scanty to allow of any such comparison being made with the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions as would enable us to speak positively as to the relations of the Preaching with the latter documents. It is to be observed, however, that the *Recognitions* (i. 12) and *Letter of Clement to James* 23 (20) recognized a previous account of Peter's Preaching as having been sent to James.

The fragments of the Preaching of Peter were collected by Grabe, *Spicilegium* (i. 62), by Credner, *Beiträge*, 349–364, and lately by Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. ext. Can. recept.* Fascic. iv. 51–65, 2nd edit., 1884. [G. S.]

PETRUS (1), aged bishop, accused of misappropriating the church's property. His cause was taken up by Cyril of Alexandria, c. A.D. 442, who wrote in his favour to Domnus, bishop of Antioch (Cyril, *Ep.* 78 al. 59). [J. G.]

Bishops arranged in order of sees or countries.

PETRUS (2), African bishop in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. iv. de Basilide, A.D. 254; *vid.* of Hippo Diarrhytus, Cyp. *Ep.* 67. [E. W. B.]

PETRUS (3), bishop of Aleria in Corsica, a correspondent of Gregory the Great. (Gregorii *Epist.* lib. vi. ind. xiv. 22; lib. viii. ind. i. 1, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 813, 903.) [F. D.]

PETRUS (4) I, ST., archbishop of Alexandria, succeeded Theonas, A.D. 300. By one account, which Burton accepts on the authority of Philip of Side (see *Lect. on Eccl. Hist.* ii. 433), he had been president of the catechetical school of Alexandria; but it is hardly likely that, as Burton assumes, he was the Peter who, fifty years earlier, had been a companion of Dionysius of Alexandria, in his dreary Libyan place of retreat amid the storm of the Decian persecution. After his accession he had three years of tranquil administration, which he so used as to acquire the high reputation indicated by Eusebius, who calls him a wonderful teacher of the faith, and "an admirable specimen of a bishop, alike in the excellence of his conduct and his familiarity with Scripture" (Euseb. viii. 13; ix. 6). Then came the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution; and three years later, in the early part of 306, Peter found it necessary to draw up conditions of reconciliation to the church, and of readmission to her privileges, for those who through weakness had in various degrees compromised their fidelity. The date is determined by the first words of this set of "canons" or regulations, "Since we are approaching the fourth Easter from the beginning of the persecution," *i. e.* reckoning from the Lent of 303. (This is overlooked in Mason's *Persecution of Diocletian*, p. 324, where these "canons" are assigned to 311.)

The substance of these remarkable provisions (which are given at length in Routh's *Relliquiae Sacrae*, iv. 23 ff.) is as follows. I. Those who did not give way until extreme tortures had overstrained their powers of endurance, and who had been for three years already "mourners," without being admitted to regular penance, might communicate after fasting forty days more with special strictness. (This may remind us of St. Cyprian's equitable judgment on persons who had fully intended to hold out, but had been overcome by intense and complicated torture, *de Lapsis*, 13. The mourners or weepers, as is well known, were "candidates for penance," who besought the faithful as they passed into the church to plead for their admission into the class of penitents; see Basil, *Epist.* 199. 22, and other references in *Notes on Canons of First Four Councils*, Oxford, 1882, p. 37.) II. Those who, as Peter phrases it, had endured only the "siege of imprisonment," not the "war of tortures," and therefore deserved less pity, yet gave themselves up to suffer some affliction for "the Name," although in prison they were much relieved by Christian alms, may be received after another year's penance. (This canon reminds us of the really dreadful "trial" of imprisonment in such dungeons as are referred to in Rev. ii. 10, and also in the letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, Euseb. v. 1, in Tertullian *de Resurr. Carnis*, 8, and in the Acts of St. Perpetua, and elsewhere in the authentic martyrologies; see too the description of the "lignum" and "barathrum" in Card. Newman's *Callista*, c. 32. Compare Abp. Trench on the *Epistles to the Seven Churches*, p. 99.) III. Those who endured nothing at all, but lapsed under sheer terror, must do penance for four years;—the parable of the barren fig-tree is quoted. (Here again, Peter illustrates the description given by his great predecessor Dionysius, of those Alexandrians whom the mere publication of Decius's edict had scared into apostasy, Euseb. vi. 41; see too Cyprian, *Epist.* 8; Euseb. *Mart. Pal.* 1; Ancyr. can. 6; Nic. 11.) The IVth (canon) is not, strictly speaking, a canon, but a lamentation over *lapsi* who had not repented (Neale, i. 98). Peter cites the cursing of the fig-tree, with Isa. lxvi. 24, lvii. 20. V. Those who, in order to evade the trial of their constancy, feigned epilepsy, or promised conformity in writing, or put forward pagans to throw incense on the altar in their stead, must do penance for six months more, although some of them had already been received to communion by some of the steadfast confessors. There is a fanciful reference to the fact that Christ, Himself a preacher of repentance and of that kingdom of heaven which is "within us" by our faith in Him, was conceived six months after the Baptist. On the right of confessors to plead with the Church for a shortening of the penance-time of the lapsed, and on the abuse of that right, see Cyprian, *Epist.* 22–27; *De Laps.* 12 (or 18); Bingham, xvi. 3, 4). VI. Some Christian masters compelled their Christian slaves to face the trial in their stead; such slaves, having lapsed under such circumstances, must "shew the works of repentance" for a year. VII. But these masters who, by thus imperilling their slaves, showed their disregard for apostolic exhortations (Eph. vi. 9; Col. iv. 1), must have their own repentance tested for three more years. VIII. Those who, having lapsed, returned to the conflict, and endured imprisonment and tortures, are to be "joyfully received to communion, alike in the prayers and the

reception of the Body and Blood, and oral exhortation." On such a return to the "agon," cp. Cypr. *Epist.* 19 (the reader of Euseb. v. 1 will remember how Biblias "fell and rose again," dying a martyr). IX. Those who voluntarily exposed themselves to the trial are to be received to communion, because they did so for Christ's sake, although they forgot the import of "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us," &c., and perhaps did not know that Christ Himself repeatedly withdrew from intended persecution, and even at last waited to be seized and given up; and that He bade His disciples flee from city to city (Matt. x. 23), that they might not enhance their enemies' guilt. Thus Stephen and James were arrested; so was Peter, who "was finally crucified in Rome;" so Paul, who was beheaded in the same city. (Here Peter states the Catholic, as opposed to the Montanistic principle of action, as it had been stated by the church of Smyrna in Euseb. iv. 15, and by Cyprian in *Epist.* 8.) It is indicated by a few words of that noble poem in which Milman brings us so wonderfully near to the mind and life of the Church of the Martyrs—

> "Hold we all prepared . . . .
> To give the last and awful testimony
> To Christ our Lord. Yet tempt not to our murder
> The yet unbloody hands of men."
> (*Martyr of Antioch*, p. 41.)

(On exceptional cases, see note in Cypr. *Epist. Lib. Fath.* p. 71.) Hence, clerics who thus denounced themselves to the authorities, then lapsed, and afterwards returned to the conflict, must cease to officiate, but may communicate; if they had *not* lapsed, their rashness might be excused. (This "canon" refutes Epiphanius's opinion, derived from Meletianising documents, that Peter was in favour of restoring lapsed clerics to their ministry, *Haer.* 68. 3.) XI. Persons who, in their zeal to encourage their fellow-Christians to persevere and win the prize of martyrdom, voluntarily avowed their own faith, were to be exempted from blame; compare Euseb. vi. 41, fin. Requests for prayer on behalf of those who gave way after imprisonment and torture ought to be granted: "no one could be the worse" for sympathising with those who were overcome by the devil, or by the entreaties of their kindred (compare *Passio S. Perpet.* 3, *S. Iren. Sirm.* 3; Euseb. viii. 9, on this form of trial). XII. Those who paid for indemnity are not to be censured; they showed their disregard for money; and Acts xvii. 9 is here quoted. (This indulgent ruling contrasts markedly with Tertullian's bitter denunciation of such a practice, *de Fuga in Persec.* 12.) XIII. Nor should those be blamed who fled, abandoning their homes,—as if they had left others to bear the brunt. Paul was constrained to leave Gaius and Aristarchus in the hands of the mob of Ephesus (Acts xix. 29, 30): Peter escaped from prison, and his guards died for it; the Innocents died in place of the Holy Child. Here follows a somewhat mystical application of Isa. viii. 4 to the case of the Magi, and the assertion that the infant John was sought for at the same time, and that his father Zacharias was caught, and then slain between the temple and the altar, a story which in a different form is scornfully set aside by Jerome, *in Matt.* c. 23. XIV. Imprisoned confessors in Libya and elsewhere had mentioned cases of persons who had been compelled by sheer force to handle the sacrifices. These, like others whom tortures rendered utterly insensible, were to be regarded as confessors, for their will was steadfast throughout; and they might be placed in the ministry. These "canons" were ratified by the Council in Trullo, c. 2, A.D. 692, and so became part of the law of the Eastern church. (Compare Euseb. *Mart. Pal.* 1; *Passio SS. Tarachi et Probi*, c. 8, in Ruinart, *Act. Sinc.* p. 467; C. Ancyr. c. 3.)

Very soon after these "canons" were drawn up, the persecution was intensified by the pagan fanaticism of Maximin Daza. Peter felt it his duty to follow the precedents he had cited in his 8th canon, and the example of his great predecessor Dionysius, by "seeking for safety in flight" (Burton, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 441). Phileas bishop of Thmuis, and three other bishops, were imprisoned at Alexandria; and then it was that, according to the Maffeian documents, Meletius, being himself at large, held ordinations in their dioceses without their sanction "or that of the archbishop," and without necessity (*Hist. Writings of St. Athanasius*, Oxford, 1881, Introd. p. xxxix.). The four prelates wrote a letter of remonstrance (see it in Routh, *Rell. Sac.* iv. 91); they reminded him of the rule which forbade one bishop to interfere in another's diocese, and pointed out that they had provided for their flocks by the appointment of "visitors," and that, even if their sees had been vacated by death, he ought to have applied to "the great bishop and father, Peter," for license to ordain outside his own bounds. To this letter, which is significant as to the solid position which the diocesan system had now acquired in Egypt, Meletius made no reply; as another document expresses it, "he did not go to visit either the imprisoned bishops or blessed Peter." They were subsequently martyred (the date of Phileas's death has been matter of some question, but may reasonably be placed in 306); and immediately afterwards the reckless bishop of Lycopolis repaired to Alexandria, fell in with Isidore and Arius, two malcontents who aimed at the priesthood, and at their instigation excommunicated the two visitors or vicars-general commissioned by Peter, and ordained two in their place, one in prison, the other in a mine. Peter, being informed of this lawless procedure, wrote to the faithful in Alexandria to this effect: "Since I have ascertained that Meletius, disregarding the letter of the martyred bishops, has entered my diocese, taken upon himself to excommunicate the presbyters who were acting under my authority . . . and shown his craving for pre-eminence by ordaining certain persons in prison; take care not to communicate with him until I meet him in company with wise men, and see what it is that he has in mind. Farewell." (Routh, *Rell. Sac.* iv. 94.)

Allusion has already been made to the Epiphanian account of the origin of Meletianism, which is inconsistent with Peter's real opinion as to lapsed clerics. It also supposes Peter and Meletius to have been fellow-prisoners when they disputed as to the case of the lapsed,—Meletius taking a sterner, and his primate a milder view; after which, Epiphanius was informed, Peter hung up his mantle curtain-wise

across the dungeon, and sent word to its other inmates, "Whoever thinks with me, let him come here; whoever thinks with Meletius, let him go to the other side," whereupon the majority sided with Meletius. Epiphanius, we cannot doubt, was misled by the graphic story of a Meletianising romancer, as Athanasius, in his darker picture of the offence of Meletius, must be supposed to reproduce the story which he had heard as a young cleric, and which may have grown out of the resentments of Peter's own clergy, and of others who knew that Meletius had somehow escaped persecution (see *Hist. Writings of St. Athanasius*, p. 40). By all accounts, however, the schism began under Peter (Athan. *Apol. c. Ari.* 11); and Sozomen enables us to connect a statement in the Maffeian documents with the subsequent alliance between the schismatics and the great heretical party, which was formed some nine years after Peter's death. The interview between Meletius and Arius appears to have been fruitful in trouble for the great archbishop who was a mere boy when it took place, but who in 356 compared the league between their followers to the reconciliation between Pilate and Herod Antipas (*ad Ep. Aegypt.* 22). Arius, we are told, "began to act with Meletius in his career of innovation, but abandoned him, and was ordained deacon by Peter, and again was ejected by him from the church, because, when Peter excommunicated the adherents of Meletius, and did not recognise their baptism, Arius inveighed against this proceeding, and could not bear to hold his peace" (Soz. i. 15). If this statement is correct, Peter must have held the rigorous Cyprianic view as to the nullity of all baptism when administered outside the communion of the church, and by acting on it in this case he was "likely to revive ancient dissensions" (Burton, *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 298). A much later story, to the effect that Arius gave expression to his characteristic heresy in Peter's lifetime, and that Peter told his disciples how in a dream he had heard Christ denounce Arius for having rent His garment, betrays its own legendary character. It may be read in the extracts from Severus, embodied by Renaudot in his "History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria" (p. 58), where it is given in full detail,—"Quis, Domine, vestem tuam ita discidit? *Arius*, inquit;" and "monuit me venturos postridie qui pro Ario intercederent, sed ne illis acquiescerem;" and again in the "Annals" of that same patriarch Eutychius who wrote six hundred years after Peter's death, and whose credulous untrustworthiness as to the early history of his see had been too often overlooked for the sake of a famous passage which seemed to tell against episcopacy. Renaudot claims the "common tradition of the church" for the vision of the rent garment; and thinks that it really referred to the Meletian schism, and that later transcribers of the story, being ignorant of that chapter in Arius's life, took for granted that the excommunication must have been incurred by his heresy, which accordingly they antedated. Neale also (*Hist. Alex.* i. 105) persuades himself that the tale has elements of truth.

Egypt was part of the dominions of Maximin; and that tyrant, besides presiding over martyrdoms in Palestine (A.D. 306, 307, 308), practised other enormities at Alexandria (Euseb. viii. 14; Burton, ii. 451). During Peter's retirement, his habits had become more strictly ascetic, while at the same time he continued to provide "in no hidden way" for the welfare of the church (Euseb. vii. 32). The phrase οὐκ ἀφανῶς is significant, as it points to the well-understood system of communication whereby a bishop of Alexandria, although himself in hiding, could, like Athanasius in the desert, make his hand felt throughout the churches which still owned him as their "father." Peter must have grieved over the sufferings of many of his flock who were condemned to penal servitude in the "Porphyry quarry" of Thebais: Eusebius mentions two sets of such prisoners, who also suffered various mutilations (*Mart. Pal.* 8), and among them was Paphnutius, one of his own suffragans, who afterwards, at Nicaea, exhibited to Constantine's reverent sympathy the socket whence his right eye had been scooped out (Soc. i. 11). Doubtless, also, Peter heard with pleasure of the practical charity which impelled some Egyptian Christians, in the December of 308, to undertake a journey "in order to minister to the necessities of the confessors in Cilicia" (Euseb. *Mart. Pal.* 10), and he may have rejoiced in the martyrdom of two Egyptian bishops, who were burned to death at Caesarea in 310 (*ib.* 13). Probably his own return to Alexandria, and the formal communication of the Meletians as above mentioned, took place after a toleration-edict, which mortal agony wrung from Galerius in the April of 311. This edict constrained Maximin to abate his persecuting energy; but he began again, ere long, to harass his Christian subjects, and to encourage zealous heathen municipalities to memorialise him "that no Christians might be allowed to dwell among them" (Euseb. ix. 2). Thus at the end of October, in 311 (*ib.*), "the Christians found themselves again in great peril" (Burton); and one of the first acts of Maximin's renewed persecution was to smite the shepherd of the flock at Alexandria. Peter was beheaded, says Eusebius (vii. 32), "in the ninth year of the persecution" (311), by virtue of a "sudden" imperial order, "without any reason assigned" (ix. 6). This simple statement, by one who knew much of Egyptian affairs at this period, is curiously contrasted with the exuberance of later imaginations, which ascribed the order to Diocletian, incensed—so ran the tale—with Peter for having received at Alexandria the Christian wife of an apostate official at Antioch; (Peter was said to have been miraculously led to recognise as valid the baptism which she had administered to her children during a storm at sea,—as Alexander, in a much earlier story, would not reiterate the baptism administered to his playfellows by the boy Athanasius). Severus (ap. Renaudot) had heard two accounts of Peter's death: by one, he was beheaded while he stretched forth his neck through a hole made in the prison wall, before his people could come to resist the soldiers; by another, he suffered at a place called Bucolia, near the tomb of St. Mark; the Christians, it was said, performed his funeral with great solemnity, the corpse being seated on the patriarchal throne during the celebration of the Eucharist. The "Acts of St. Peter's martyrdom," says Routh, are ignored by Ruinart, and are evidently spurious (*Rell. Sac.* iv. 82). The day of his death

was the 29th of Athyr, or Nov. 25th, on which day he is commemorated in the Ethiopic church. The Greeks honour him on the day preceding.

Besides fourteen canons, we have what is reckoned by Johnson and Routh as the "fifteenth," but is in fact a fragment of a work on the Paschal Festival. In it he says that it is usual to fast on Wednesday, because of the Jews, "taking counsel for the betrayal of the Lord;" and on Friday, "because He then suffered for our sake." "For," he adds, "we keep the Lord's day as a day of gladness, because on it He rose again; and on it, according to tradition, we do not even kneel." The custom of standing at prayer on Sunday was again enforced by the Nicene council (c. 20; Bright, *Notes on the Canons of the First Four Councils*, p. 73). We have also fragments from three other works of his. At the first session of the council of Ephesus (Mansi, iv. 1185), there were read three short extracts from his book on the "Divinity of Christ;" the second of these had already been quoted by Cyril in his *Apol. adv. Orient.* 1. Their purport is to state the fact of the Incarnation; and he excludes such a view of the *κένωσις* as would suppose the Word to have parted with the power or glory of His Godhead when He condescended to become man. And this passage, given by Routh in Greek, from a Bodleian MS., is taken by Leontius of Byzantium, in his first book "against Nestorians and Eutychians," from Peter's treatise "on our Saviour's sojourn among us." It anticipates both the Ephesine and the Chalcedonian theology by saying simply that Christ "was God by nature, and became Man by nature." (In the Latin version of Leontius, in Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* xii. 668, "Filium Dei" is wrongly put for "Filium hominis," in the quotation of Luke xxii. 48 adduced by Peter to show that the Son of God became Son of Man.) Again, of Peter's treatise against the Origenistic theory of the pre-existence of the soul, and of its "having been placed in the body because it had sinned," Leontius preserves a passage in which Peter contends that the body and soul of the first man were contemporaneous in origin, and were not brought together by combination, as if one had existed before the other, and had come from another place to join it (Mai, *Scr. Vet. Nov. Collectio*, vii. 85, from "Leontii et Johannis Rerum Sacrarum," *lib.* 2; Routh, *Rell. Sac.* iv. 48). Nearly the whole of this passage is quoted by Justinian, *ad Mennam*, Mansi, ix. 504 (among the documents of the Fifth General Council), and he also quotes a few more lines to the effect, that the theory in question is "derived from Greek philosophy, and is alien to the mind of pious Christians" (Routh, *ib.* 50). Routh gives another extract from the work called *Didascalia*, on the authority of Leontius and John,—a lamentation over past forgetfulness of God's observant scrutiny; "I consented to sin, saying to myself, 'God is pitiful and will bear with me,' and since I was not smitten forthwith I did not stop, but rather despised indulgence and exhausted God's longsuffering" (Routh, 82). He treats as doubtful an alleged extract from a work by Peter on "Blasphemy," to the effect that the writer, when vexed by an impious thought which came into his mind, consulted the brave confessor Paphnutius, already referred to, who told him that when he was imprisoned, and had suffered "fire and tortures for Christ's sake," the devil suggested blasphemous thoughts to his mind, which he shook off "with God's help," saying, "O evil one, . . . this blasphemy against God is thine, and shall recoil on thyself." The passage, says Routh, is the last of certain scholia, from various authors, written on the margin of the Sermons of Isaac the Syrian, and was copied for him from a "codex bibliothecae Coislinianae" (iv. 79). [W. B.]

PETRUS (5) II., archbishop of Alexandria, succeeded Athanasius in May 373. In order to promote the peaceful succession of an orthodox bishop, on the removal of the great primate, whom an Arian government had found it inexpedient to disturb, Athanasius had been requested to recommend one who could be elected by anticipation: and he named Peter, whom Gregory Nazianzen describes as honoured for his wisdom and grey hairs (*Orat.* 25. 12) "who had been a companion of his labours" (Theod. iv. 20), and, in Basil's phrase, his spiritual "nursling" (*Epist.* 133); and who, in conjunction with another presbyter, when they were passing through Italy to Egypt in 347, had accepted from the notorious Arian intriguers Valens and Ursacius a written attestation of their desire to be at peace with Athanasius, when his cause was for the time triumphant (Athan. *Hist. Ari.* 26). The clergy and magistrates assented to the nomination; the people in general applauded; the neighbouring bishops came together to attend the consecration, in which, according to a "fragment" of Alexandrian history, the dying archbishop took the principal part (cf. Theod. *l. c.*; and *Hist. Aceph.* ap. Athan.). Five days afterwards (May 2) Athanasius died, and Peter took possession of "the evangelical throne." But the Arians seized the opportunity for which they had been waiting, and employed, as in 340, the agency of a pagan prefect. Palladius, by means of bribes, assembled a "crowd of pagans and Jews," and beset that same church of Theonas within which Syrianus had all but seized Athanasius in 356. Peter was commanded to withdraw; he refused, the church doors were forced, and the brutal orgies described in Athanasius's "Encyclical" were repeated: a youth in female dress danced upon the altar; another sat naked on the throne, and delivered a mock sermon in praise of vice (compare Peter ap. Theod. iv. 22 with Greg. Naz. *Orat.* l. c.). At this point in the profanation Peter quitted the church; Socrates says that he was seized and imprisoned (iv. 21), but his own narrative points the other way. It proceeds to describe the intrusion of the Arian Lucius, who was now to play the part of Gregory in 340 and of George in 356. He had been ordained priest by George, had presided over the Arians of Alexandria after that usurper's death, had been vainly put forward by them as their bishop elect under Jovian ("qui se moqua de lui et d'eux," Tillemont, vi. 582), had re-entered Alexandria in 367, and been ignominiously thrust out, and now, having been consecrated by Arian hands abroad, was escorted into the city by Euzoïus the Arian bishop of Antioch (who many years before had been condemned with Arius by the Nicene council), and by Magnus, high treasurer under Valens. Peter tells us that the pagans esteemed Lucius

as the favourite of Serapis, because he denied the Divinity of the Son: and dwells on the brave confessorship (1) of nineteen priests and deacons whom Magnus, after vain attempts to make them Arianize, transported to the pagan city of Heliopolis in Phoenicia, sending also into penal servitude twenty-three monks and others who expressed their sympathy; (2) of seven Egyptian bishops who were exiled to Diocaesarea, a city inhabited by Jews, while some other prelates were "handed over to the curia," their official immunity from onerous curial obligations being annulled in requital of their steadfastness in the faith. Damasus of Rome, hearing of this new persecution, sent a deacon with a letter of communion and also of consolation for Peter: the messenger was arrested, treated as a criminal, savagely beaten, and sent to the mines of Phenne. Peter adds that children were tortured, and intimates that some persons were actually put to death, or died of cruel usage, and that, after the old usage in pagan persecutions, their remains were denied burial. The narrative illustrates at once the theology, the ritual, and the electoral customs of the Egyptian church. Peter puts into the mouth of the nineteen confessors an argument, quite Athanasian in tone, from the eternity of the Divine Fatherhood (cf. Athan. *de Decr. Nic.* 12): like Athanasius he there insists that God could never have existed without His "Wisdom" (cf. *Orat. c. Ari.* i. 14): like him he disowns a materialistic conception of the γέννησις (cf. *de Decr. Nic.* 11, *Orat. c. Ari.* i. 21): like him he quotes the Arian formula ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ("once the Son was not," cf. *Orat. c. Ari.* i. 5, &c.): and like him, also, he represents the Homoousion as summarising the purport of many texts (cf. *de Decr. Nic.* 20).

Evidently Peter had not wasted his opportunities as the trusted companion of his great predecessor. In one passage he refers to the invocation of the Holy Spirit at the eucharistic consecration; in another he intimates that monks used to precede a newly arrived bishop, chanting the Psalms. When describing the uncanonical intrusion of Lucius, he refers to the three elements of a proper episcopal election, as fixed by "the institutions of the Church"—(1) the joint action of the assembled bishops of the province, (2) the vote (ψήφῳ) of "genuine" clergy, (3) the request of the people (αἰτήσει, the Latin "suffragium," as Cyprian uses it, *Epist.* 55. 7, speaking of the same threefold process, "de clericorum testimonio, de plebis ... *suffragio*, et de sacerdotum ... collegio;" and for the "requests" of the people, sometimes urgently enforced, see Athan. *Apol. c. Ari.* 6. Basil speaks of such requests as embodied in ψηφίσματα, *Ep.* 99). After the fashion of his age he plays with the name of Lucius as one who "took pains to imitate" a wolf (λύκου); as Gregory calls him "a shepherd of wolves" (*Orat.* 25. 11). It appears that Peter remained for some time in concealment, during which time, following the example of Athanasius, he wrote his encyclical (Tillemont, vi. 582): he afterwards made his way to Rome, where he was received by Damasus, as Julius welcomed Athanasius in 340. He remained at Rome five years, gave information as to Egyptian monasticism (Jerome, *Ep.* 127. 5), and was present, as bishop of Alexandria, at a council held by Damasus, probably in 377, for the condemnation of the Apollinarians. Timotheus, whom Apollinaris had sent to Rome, and Vitalis, bishop of the sect in Antioch, were included in the sentence pronounced against their master (comp. Soz. vi. 25 with Theod. v. 10); and Facundus of Hermiane, in his "Defence of the Three Articles," quotes part of a letter addressed by Peter to the exiled Egyptian confessors at Diocaesarea. "I ask your advice," he writes, "under the trouble that has befallen me: what ought I to do, when Timotheus gives himself out for a bishop, that in this character he may with more boldness injure others and infringe the laws of the fathers? For he chose to anathematize me, with the bishops Basil of Caesarea, Paulinus, Epiphanius, and Diodorus, and to communicate with Vitalis alone" (*Pro Defens. Trium Capit.* iv. 2). Here we see that Peter naturally treats Paulinus, not Meletius, as the true bishop of Antioch, this being the Alexandrian view. His relations with Basil were very kindly; their common love and reverence for Athanasius had drawn them into a correspondence (Basil, *Epist.*133, written in 373); and a letter of Basil's in 377 associates this act of intimacy with one or two points of interest in the general church-history of the time (*Epist.* 266). It appears that the Egyptian "confessors" had hastily received into their communion the gravely suspected disciples of Marcellus of Ancyra. This had troubled Basil. Peter had heard of it, but not from Basil; and had remonstrated with his exiled subordinates. Moreover Basil's enemy Dorotheus, visiting Rome in order to enlist Western sympathies in favour of Meletius as against Paulinus, met Peter in company with Damasus. The old bishop of Alexandria fired up at the name of Meletius, and in a fit of irritation said, "He is no better than an Arian." Dorotheus, angered in his turn, said something which offended Peter's dignity; and Peter wrote to Basil, complaining of this, and of his silence in regard to the exiles' conduct. Basil answers in effect: "As to the first point, I did not care to trouble you, and I trust it will come right by our winning over the Marcellians; as to the second, I am sorry that Dorotheus annoyed you, but you who have suffered under Arians ought to feel for Meletius as a fellow-sufferer, and I can assure you that he is quite orthodox."

Peter's exile came to an end in the spring of the next year. The troubles in which Valens had involved himself in regard to the Goths encouraged the prelates whom he had banished to act for themselves. Fortified by a letter of commendation from Damasus, Peter returned to Alexandria: the people forthwith expelled Lucius, who went off to Constantinople: but, as Tillemont remarks, Valens had other business on hand than to dream of restoring *ce misérable* (vi. 610), and Peter was thenceforth undisturbed in his see. Jerome taxes him with being too easy in receiving heretics into communion (*Chronic.*); and in one celebrated affair of another kind, his facility brought him no small discredit. Early in 379 he had not only approved of the mission of Gregory of Nazianzus to act as a Catholic bishop in Constantinople, but had formally authorised it, had "honoured" Gregory "with the symbols of establishment" (*Carm. de Vita sua*, 861), and thereby apparently claimed

some supremacy over Constantinople (Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 206). Yet ere long he allowed himself to become the tool of the ambitious Maximus, who pretended to have been a confessor for orthodoxy, and thus perhaps reached Peter's weak side. He aimed at "securing the see of Constantinople; and Peter, contradicting himself in writing," as Gregory words it (*de Vita sua*, 1015), commissioned some Egyptian prelates to go to Constantinople and consecrate Maximus. The scheme failed disgracefully: Maximus had to leave Constantinople, and after attempting in vain to propitiate Theodosius, went back to Alexandria and tried to intimidate Peter, "putting the old man into a difficulty" (Greg. *de Vita sua*, 1018), but was expelled by secular force. Peter reconciled himself to Gregory, who panegyrized him as "a Peter in virtue not less than in name, who was very near heaven, but remained in the flesh so far as to render his final assistance to the truth, &c." (*Orat.* 34. 3). Peter in fact died soon afterwards, February 14, 380. It was in ignorance of this event that Theodosius, a fortnight afterwards, named him with Damasus as a standard of Catholic belief in the famous edict of Thessalonica (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. 1. 2: see Gibbon, iii. 363). He was succeeded by his brother Timotheus. [W. B.]

PETRUS (6), surnamed MONGUS (Stammerer), Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, had been ordained deacon by Dioscorus, and is said to have been his agent in some acts of tyranny, and to have taken part in the outrages against Flavian at the Latrocinium (Mansi, vi. 1017). When the latter was deposed and Proterius consecrated in his place, Peter went into schism with Timotheus Aelurus, refused to return to his duties at the new archbishop's bidding, and was in consequence deposed (Liberatus, *Breviarium*, c. 15; comp. P. Felix in Mansi, vii. 1065; *Brev. Hist. Eutychian. ib.* vii. 1062). But when the emperor Marcian's death deprived Proterius of a protector, Timotheus was irregularly consecrated, and Proterius was slain by a Monophysite mob. Timotheus then took possession of the see, and made Peter Mongus his archdeacon; but after three years he was deposed and expelled, and Peter fled at the same time (Midsummer, A.D. 457). Timotheus Salofaciolus, who adhered to the Chalcedonian doctrine, was consecrated, and sat undisturbed until A.D. 476, when the brief reign of Basiliscus brought Timotheus Aelurus back to Alexandria. He died, however, in the next year. The orthodox patriarch Salofaciolus had taken refuge in a monastery near Canopus, and in his absence the Monophysites determined to place Peter in the see. According to Acacius of Constantinople, in his letter to pope Simplicius, "Peter, child of the night as he was, finding darkness convenient for the perpetration of a robbery,—while the corpse of him who had subverted the rules of the fathers (Aelurus) still lay unburied,—surreptitiously, at midnight, took possession of the see in the presence of only one bishop" (Mansi, vii. 983). The next pope, Felix, appears to have received different accounts. According to Evagrius (iii. 20) Egyptian bishops informed him that Peter had been "ordained by two bishops only, who shared his unbelief," and so Felix describes him as having been appointed by heretics (*Epist.* in Mansi, vii. 1039) and "by profane persons" (*ib.* vii. 1108) and "at the hands of condemned heretics" (*ib.* vii. 1104); but again he says that Peter with difficulty procured the instrumentality of one bishop for his usurpation (*ib.* vii. 1066), and in a later writing claims Acacius's testimony for the fact that "no Catholics" had made Peter bishop, "for they had all thought with, and held communion with, Timotheus" (Salofaciolus), "but it was the act of one man, an accomplice in Peter's insanity" (Mansi, vii. 1075). So the Breviculus, "Peter was ordained for the Alexandrians by a single heretic" (*ib.* vii. 1063). On the other hand, Liberatus not only says "the heretics ordained for themselves Peter as bishop," which might mean only that they procured his ordination, but speaks of "those who caused Peter to be enthroned," which, taken literally, would imply the presence of several bishops at the ceremony (*Breviar.* c. 16). The text of Evagrius, "the *bishops* of Alexandria, by their own authority, elect Peter," is amended by Valesius, in his note, to "those of Alexandria . . . elect Peter as their *bishop*," on the double ground that suffragans could not be called οἱ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐπίσκοποι, and that Peter was ordained by only one bishop; in the next note he variously describes bishops as having "elected" and as having "ordained" Peter. The emperor Zeno, indignant at the boldness of the Monophysite party (Neale, *Hist. Alex.* ii. 17), "imposed on Peter," according to Evagrius, "the penalty of death;" but if so, he must have quickly commuted it for a lesser penalty, for Liberatus says that Anthemius, the Augustal prefect, in obedience to an imperial order, ejected Peter from the bishopric as an "adulterer," a term also applied to him by Acacius (Liberatus, c. 17), Calandion patriarch of Antioch (Evagr. iii. 16), and Simplicius (Liberatus, c. 18), on the ground that he had violated the rights of Timotheus, then legitimately "espoused" to his church, (cf. Chalc. can. 25). The decree also required his expulsion from Alexandria (Mansi, vii. 983–985). Le Quien (*Or. Christ.* ii. 416) and Neale think that Salofaciolus had interceded for Peter's life; but Liberatus, whom Le Quien quotes, only says that this very gentle prelate, who was "charged with being too lenient towards heretics," wrote to Zeno requesting "that Peter should be sent farther off into exile, because he lay concealed in Alexandria, and plotted against the church" (*Brev.* c. 16). Pope Simplicius wrote in the same sense to Zeno and to Acacius, complaining that Peter was still harboured in hiding-places within certain houses belonging to men like-minded with himself (Mansi, vii. 984, 5). Accordingly, Peter was driven out of Egypt; John, surnamed Talaia, steward of the great church, was chosen patriarch, but neglected to announce his accession to Acacius, and thus gave an opportunity to Mongus's agents to represent to the bishop of Constantinople that John was "not a fit man for the bishopric," in that he had Monophysite leanings, and had accepted the see in violation of an oath, whereas Peter was beloved by the people, and would restore internal unity to the Alexandrian church. Acacius, piqued by John's omission, lent an ear to these representations, and prevailed on Zeno to expel John, and to

restore Peter on condition that he should support an attempt to promote doctrinal unity without enforcing the authority of the council of Chalcedon, and should send letters of communion to the other patriarchs, including Simplicius, who, however, showed a firm front, acknowledging that while John Talaia was under accusation he could not be recognised as bishop of Alexandria, but entirely refusing to recognise in that capacity one who had been all along a comrade and a teacher of those who were fighting against the truth. If Peter were now a convert to that truth, let him by all means be received as such; but it was out of the question that he should be placed in high ecclesiastical office at the request of the very persons who had been associated with him in "separation from Catholic fellowship" (Mansi, vii. 992–4). This protest had no effect on the authorities at Constantinople; Zeno gave orders that Talaia should be expelled from Alexandria, and that Peter Mongus should be "enthroned" after he had accepted a document known in church history by a name it ill deserved, the *Henoticon*, or instrument of unity (A.D. 482). It was addressed to the bishops, clergy, monks, and laymen of the Alexandrian patriarchate, it recognised the Creed of "the 318" at Nicaea as "confirmed by the 150" at Constantinople, the decisions of the council of Ephesus, together with the twelve articles of Cyril; it employed language as to Christ's consubstantiality with man which Cyril had adopted in his "reunion with the Easterns;" it also rejected the opposite theories of a "division" and a "confusion" in the person of Christ, and included Eutyches as well as Nestorius in its anathema. Instead of renewing the explicit censure directed by Basiliscus in a previous circular against the council of Chalcedon, Zeno employed an ambiguous phrase, "We anathematize every one who thinks or ever has thought differently, either at Chalcedon or at any other synod," words which might be explained as pointed at those who were admitted to communion at Chalcedon after disclaiming Nestorianism, while, as their adversaries alleged, they were still Nestorians at heart. At the same time all recognition of that council was omitted (Evagr. iii. 14; Liberatus, c. 18, and note thereon, Galland. *Bibl. Patr.* xii. 149). Peter accepted this formulary, and was thereupon enthroned, amid a great concourse, at Alexandria. His instructions were to unite all parties, including the "Proterian" adherents of Timotheus Salofaciolus, on the basis of the Henoticon. This, for the time, he effected at a public festival, when as patriarch he preached to the people, and caused the Henoticon to be read (Evagr. iii. 13; Liberatus, c. 18). In letters to Acacius and Simplicius, he professed to accept the council of Chalcedon (Liberatus); and by playing the part of a time-server (*κόθορνος*, Evagr. iii. 17) he disgusted the thorough-going Monophysite John bishop of Zagylis in Libya, the abbat Ammon, who had brought the order for his restoration, and various abbats and monks of Lower Egypt, who raised a tumult in the Caesarean basilica (Liberatus, c. 18). Peter could not afford to quarrel with them, and probably thought himself secure enough to show his hand. (See Valesius on Evagr. iii.16.) He accordingly anathematized the council of Chalcedon, and the Tome of pope Leo, substituted the names of Dioscorus and the Monophysite Timotheus for those of Proterius and Timotheus Salofaciolus on his diptychs, and gratified his own vindictiveness by taking up the body of Salofaciolus from its place among the buried patriarchs, and "casting it outside the city" (Liberatus; compare Felix ap. Mansi, vii. 1076). This caused a great excitement; the earnest Catholics in their turn renounced Peter's communion; and tidings of this turn of events disturbed the mind of Acacius, who had already been urged by Simplicius either to obtain from Peter a simple adhesion to the council of Chalcedon, or to withdraw from communion with him. Simplicius's death (March 2, 483) relieved him from the necessity of replying; but he saw what mischief might come of a violent policy, and sent to Alexandria for an authentic account. Peter then surpassed himself in a letter, which Evagrius has preserved. Repeatedly acknowledging the "holy council of Chalcedon," he asserted that the story of his having rejected it was an invention of slanderous monks, meaning evidently some who were "Proterians." As for the disinterment story, he calmly contented himself with remarking that such an act would be displeasing "both to God and to the laws." Acacius was glad to accept these explanations; he could not afford to break with Mongus; but he had now to deal with the clear head and resolute will of Felix II. or III., the successor of Simplicius, who listened readily to the complaints of the exiled Talaia and of other Egyptian bishops (Evagr. iii. 20) against Peter, and against Acacius as in league with Peter, and sent two bishops, Vitalis and Misenus, to Constantinople in order to denounce Peter, and summon Acacius to defend himself before a council at Rome. The legates were partly coaxed and partly frightened into communicating with the resident agents of Peter at Constantinople; and they brought back to Rome letters in which Zeno and Acacius assured Felix that Peter was an orthodox and meritorious prelate (Evagr. iii. 20; Mansi, vii. 1055, 1065, 1081). Their weakness was punished by deposition; and Felix, with his synod, proceeded not only to anathematize Peter as an "Eutychian" usurper, but even to excommunicate the bishop of Constantinople as his patron (July 28, 484). He then wrote again to Zeno, desiring him to "choose between the communion of Peter the apostle and that of Peter the Alexandrian" (Mansi, vii. 1066), and taking much the same tone as in a later document, when, by way of meeting the objection, "the Alexandrian people would not allow Peter to be taken from them," he asked, "What if the Alexandrian people were to demand the restoration of idolatry?" (*ib.* vii. 1078). Tutus, his new messenger, absolutely caused a zealous monk to fasten the pope's letter of excommunication on the pallium of the patriarch of Constantinople, while he was entering his cathedral for the liturgy (Liberat. c. 17). Nothing daunted, Acacius for his part broke off communion with Rome, and upheld Peter to the last, although he must have felt that his conduct was highly embarrassing, for Peter again anathematized the proceedings of Chalcedon and the tome of Leo, and those who would not accept the writings of Dioscorus and Timotheus (Evagr.

iii. 22). He expelled certain orthodox bishops, and took from one, named John, the abbacy or hegumenate of Diolchos, which he transferred to his formidable friend Ammon (Liberatus). These proceedings being reported to Zeno, he sent Cosmas to rebuke Peter and to restore peace. Cosmas could only succeed in reinstating the ejected monks. Another attempt at establishing unity, by means of Arsenius as governor of Egypt, was not more successful; conferences took place at Constantinople, and discussions took place in Zeno's presence, with no result, because he would not commit himself to the council of Chalcedon (Evagr. l. c.). It appears that Peter again modified his tone, and wrote to Acacius, as if acknowledging that synod. This double-dealing, on becoming known in Egypt, provoked some of the Monophysite clerics, monks, and laymen to disown him and to meet for worship apart, omitting his name in their diptychs (Liberatus, 18), and these uncompromising dissentients became known as "Acephali" (Leontius *de Sectis*, v. 2), although they obtained as their bishop one Esaias from Palestine (Liberat.). Renaudot quotes from Severus, the Monophysite bishop and "historian," a sample of Monophysite stories relating to this new schism. Acacius, he says, wrote to Peter Mongus, asking him to receive him into communion, as being, in fact, strongly hostile to the council of Chalcedon and to the "blasphemous" tome of Leo. Peter, in reply, asked if this were indeed so, and Acacius sent him a satisfactory profession of faith. Peter therefore acknowledged Acacius; but two bishops, James of Sa, and Menna of Moniel Tama, came to Alexandria and asked why he had done so. "In order to gain him over to orthodoxy" (Monophysitism); and he showed them Acacius's letter. "But being inflated with pride, they would not accept his excuses, and schismatically separated themselves from the communion of the apostolic throne of St. Mark." Their followers kept up two schismatical bishoprics until a Jacobite patriarch, about 808, brought them back into his communion. The tale, says Renaudot, has just this amount of fact in it, that "very many Monophysites" (Leontius says "*some*," *de Sectis*, v. 2) did secede from Peter's communion; but it was "in consequence of his acceptance of the Henoticon, et dissimulatam concilii Chalcedonensis damnationem." When Fravitas, or Flavitas, succeeded Acacius in A.D. 489, he opened a correspondence both with Felix (Liberat. 18) and with Peter (Evagr. iii. 23); but after four months he died, and was succeeded by Euphemius, who, on discovering Peter's real position in regard to the council of Chalcedon, indignantly broke off all relations with him (Evagr. iii. 23). A new strife between Constantinople and Alexandria was imminent, when Peter Mongus, respected by none, died at the end of October in 490 (Le Quien, ii. 422), leaving behind him numerous works (Neale, ii. 24).

[W. B.]

PETRUS (7), bishop of the Jacobites of Alexandria. He was chosen after Theodosius (who died in 568) and in opposition to Theodorus, who had been secretly consecrated by Longinus just before himself. The year of these proceedings was 575, a considerable time after the death of Theodosius, and not immediately after it as is assumed in *L'Art de Vérifier* (iii. 476). The *History* of John of Ephesus, discovered not long ago, settles the date. Peter was a simple and ignorant old man, a deacon only, who had been a companion of Theodosius in his exile at Constantinople. In consequence of a false report believed by the party of Peter, that one of the secret consecrators of Theodorus was Paul patriarch of Antioch, the official head of the whole Jacobite sect, Peter was induced to issue a sentence declaring Paul deposed, and the result of that intemperate act was to divide the whole Jacobite world into two bitter factions, the Syrian half of it chiefly siding with Paul, and the Egyptian with Peter. Jacob Baradaeus, after whom the Jacobites were named, and who had great authority among them, strongly disapproved of Peter's conduct, and visited Alexandria with the hope of restoring harmony, but while there he was gained over by Peter's party, and went so far as to join in the condemnation of Paul, A.D. 578. Peter died before his rival Theodore, but in what year is not known. His successor was Damianus (John of Eph. *H. E.* tr. by Dr. R. Payne Smith, pp. 266, 277, 328).

[C. H.]

PETRUS (8), Melchite patriarch of Alexandria when that city was taken by the Arabs, A.D. 640–654. He was opposed by Benjamin, the Monophysite patriarch. Peter was a Monothelite, and in consequence was anathematized by pope Martin in the Lateran council, and in a letter written by that pope to Joannes of Philadelphia, his vicar in the East. In that letter (Mansi, x. 811) Martin calls Peter the pretended bishop of Alexandria. After the capture of Alexandria, Peter fled to Constantinople, leaving the Monophysites henceforth triumphant in Egypt. From this time there was a vicar of the see of Alexandria kept at Constantinople, to represent that see in all official documents. Cf. the signatures to the Acts of the 6th General Council A.D. 680 (Mansi, xi. 334, 687). The Arabs always favoured and protected the Monophysite patriarch and party as being hostile to the Melchites or adherents of Constantinople [MELCHITES]. (Le Quien, ii. 450; Neale, ii. 71.)

[G. T. S.]

PETRUS (9), bishop of Altinum, sent to Rome in A.D. 500, according to Baronius, but in A.D. 503, according to Pagi, by Theodoric, as visitor to arbitrate between the parties of SYMMACHUS and LAURENTIUS, and to inquire into the charges by Ennodius against the former. (*Lib. pro Syn.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 198) is accused of neglecting Theoderic's orders to visit St. Peter's immediately on his arrival in Rome, and of having been won over by the adherents of Laurentius. Symmachus afterwards assembled a Synod of 115 bishops, by whom Petrus was condemned, as having violated the rights of the Holy See (Anastasius, *Vita Symmachi* in *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 451).

[F. D.]

PETRUS (10), (surnamed FULLO, The FULLER), intruding patriarch of Antioch, 471–488, a Monophysite, took his surname Πέτρος ὁ Γναφεὺς or Κναφεὺς, "Petrus Fullo," from the trade he at one time exercised as a Fuller of cloth, though whether before he became a monk or

after he had embraced a religious life is uncertain. The accounts of his earlier life are somewhat various, but they admit of being harmonised. According to Acacius of Constantinople, in the *Breviarium* of Liberatus, c. 18 (Labbe, vi. 449), Petrus had been the hegumenos or abbat of a monastery at Constantinople, and having been compelled to abdicate his post on account of certain unspecified charges "hoc propter crimina derelicto," he made his escape to Antioch (Labbe, v. 1082). Theodorus Lector (*H. E.* i. c. 20, pp. 554, 555), followed by Theophanes and Cedrenus, describe him as having been a presbyter of the Church of St. Bassa at Chalcedon. On the other hand, he is described as a monk at the monastery of the Acoimetae at Constantinople by the Cyprian monk Alexander in the *Laudatio Barnabae* (c. iii. § 32), found in the *Acta Sanctorum* (Jun. vol. ii. p. 447), and in the *Synodica Vetus* (Labbe, iv. 1009; Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* vol. xii. p. 396). Tillemont shows considerable skill in harmonising these various statements (*Empereurs*, tom. vi. p. 404). He regards Petrus as having been originally a member of the convent of the Acoimetae, which he places in Bithynia on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, and having been expelled thence for dissolute life and heretical doctrine, passing over to Constantinople, where he attached himself as a parasite to persons of distinction, by whom he was introduced to Zeno, the future emperor, the son-in-law of Leo, whose favours he was skilful enough to secure, obtaining through his means the chief place in the church of St. Bassa, at Chalcedon. Here his true character having speedily become known, he consulted safety by flight, and attached himself to Zeno, who was then setting out for Antioch, as commander of the East. Having arrived at Antioch, A.D. 463, his unbridled ambition soared to the patriarchal throne, which was then filled by Martyrius, and having gained the ear of the rabble, he adroitly availed himself of the powerful Apollinarian element among the citizens, and the considerable number who favoured Eutychian doctrines, to excite suspicions against Martyrius as a concealed Nestorian, and thus succeeded in causing his tumultuous expulsion and his own election to the freshly vacated throne. This took place in 469 or 470 (Theod. Lect. p. 554; Labbe, iv. 1009, 1082). When established as patriarch Peter at once declared himself openly against the Council of Chalcedon, and added to the Trisagion the words "who wast crucified for us," ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς, which he imposed as a test word upon all within his patriarchate, anathematizing those who declined to accept it. According to the *Synodicon* he summoned a council at Antioch to give synodical authority to this novel clause (Labbe, iv. 1009). The deposed prelate Martyrius went to Constantinople and laid his complaint before the emperor Leo, by whom, through the influence of the patriarch Gennadius he was courteously received, and a council of bishops having reported in his favour, his restoration was decreed (Theod. Lect. p. 554; Liberat. c. 18, p. 122). But notwithstanding the imperial authority Peter's personal influence, supported by the favour of Zeno, was so great in Antioch that Martyrius's position was rendered intolerable, and wearied out by the violence and contumely to which he was subjected, he soon abdicated his see and quitted Antioch, leaving his throne to be again occupied by the unscrupulous and heretical intruder. The indignation of Leo was naturally excited by this audacious disregard of his commands, of which he was apprised by Gennadius, and he despatched an imperial decree for the deposition of Peter and his banishment to the Oasis (Labbe, iv. 1082). According to Theodorus Lector, he evaded the execution of this sentence by flight, and Julian was unanimously elected bishop in his room, A.D. 471, holding the see until Peter's third restoration by Basiliscus in 475 (Theophan. p. 99; Theod. Lect. p. 533). During the interval Peter, who found his way to Constantinople, remained there in retirement in the monastery of the Acoimetae, his residence in the imperial city being connived at on his having given a pledge that he would not create any further disturbance (Labbe, iv. 1009, 1082; Theophan. p. 104). During the short reign of the usurper Basiliscus (Oct. 475–June 477) the fortunes of Peter revived. Under the influence of his wife Basiliscus declared for the Monophysites, recalled Timothy Aelurus, patriarch of Alexandria, from exile, and by his persuasion issued an encyclical letter to the bishops calling on them to anathematize the decrees of Chalcedon (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 4). Peter gladly complied with the emperor's mandate, and was rewarded by his restoration for the third time to the see of Antioch, A.D. 476 (*ibid.* 5). Julianus was deposed, and did not long survive his deposition and disgrace [JULIANUS (29)]. Peter, on his restoration, enforced the addition to the Trisagion, and behaved with great violence to the orthodox party, crushing all opposition by an appeal to the mob, whom he had secured by his unworthy arts, and who confirmed the patriarch's anathemas by plunder and bloodshed. Peter, once established on the patriarchal throne, was not slow to stretch its privileges to the widest extent. He ordained bishops and metropolitans for Syria, among whom was John Codonatus [JOANNES (35)], a deposed presbyter of Constantinople, who had accompanied him on his return to Antioch, whom he appointed bishop of Apamea, metropolis of Syria Secunda. The people of Apamea refused to accept him, and he had to return to Antioch (Labbe, iv. 1042, 1082; Theod. Lect. p. 555; Theophan. p. 110; Liberat. *Brev.* c. 18). The fall of Basiliscus, A.D. 477, naturally involved the ruin of all those who had supported him, and had been promoted by him. Peter was one of the first to fall. His former associate John, the rejected of Apamea, leapt into his place. This however he occupied for only three months, having been deposed and condemned by a synod convened at Antioch (Theophan. *Chronog.* p. 107; Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 1042, 1151). He was succeeded by Stephen, who was speedily followed by another of the same name, on whose murder Calandria was appointed bishop, A.D. 482 [CALANDIO]. John Codonatus, who had been a second time elected to the patriarchate by the Oriental bishops, assembled at Antioch (Vict. Tunun. *sub ann.* 488) was again deposed, satisfaction being made to him by his election to the see of Tyre by Acacius, who found it convenient to forget his previous condemnation of John, and his appeal to pope Simplicius against him. Meanwhile Acacius the patriarch at Constantinople convened a synod A.D. 478, at which Peter and

John were again condemned. Acacius laid the whole story of their persecution and violence before pope Simplicius, and obtained the confirmation of his sentence of condemnation (Labbe, iv. 1082, 1125, 1223; Liber. *Brev.* c. 18). An order was given by Zeno for the banishment of Peter to Pityus. On his way thither he managed to elude the vigilance of his guards, and took refuge in a church dedicated to St. Theodore, whence he seems to have returned to Antioch, where he secretly conducted the machinations of his party against the orthodox prelates (Labbe, iv. 1033; Theophan. p. 107; Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 8). The order of succession in the events of this troubled time is confused, and cannot be recovered with any certainty. There is however no doubt that Calandio was deposed and banished in 485, ostensibly on political grounds, as the favourer of the rebellion of Illus and Leontius, but really through the theological animosity of Acacius [CALANDIO], and that for the last time Peter was replaced on his unstable throne by Zeno on his signing the Henoticon (HENOTICON, p. 895 b.) This last restoration may be placed in A.D. 485 (Theophan. p. 115; Theod. Lect. p. 569; Labbe, iv. 1207; Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 16). Peter at once resumed his career of violence, expelling from their sees orthodox bishops who refused to sign the Henoticon, and performing uncanonical ordinations, especially that of the notorious Xenaias (Philoxenus) to the see of Hierapolis (Theophan. p. 115). He was condemned and anathematized by a synod of forty-two Western bishops held at Rome A.D. 485, and separated from Christian communion (Labbe, iv. 1123–1127). This Western anathema however in no way affected his position at Antioch, of which he retained the patriarchate till his death, which took place three years afterwards, A.D. 488, or according to Theophanes in 490 or 491. One of his latest acts was the revival of the claim of the see of Antioch to the obedience of the island of Cyprus as part of the patriarchate. This question after long debate had been formally settled at the council of Ephesus in 431, and the church of Cyprus had been declared autocephalous. Peter, strong in his recovered favour with the emperor, and relying on his liberal bribes, urged his pretensions with much vehemence, and might have gained his point but for the opportune alleged discovery of the body of St. Barnabas in a grave near Salamis, with the Gospel of St. Matthew written by his own hand on his breast. Anthemius the metropolitan of Salamis, accompanied with his suffragans, conveyed the sacred volume to Constantinople, and laid the whole case before Acacius and Zeno. Peter's claims were annihilated by so indubitable a proof of the apostolic origin of the church of Cyprus, which thus preserved its ancient independence (Vict. Tunun.; Theod. Lect. p. 558). Peter is accredited with several changes in the ritual of the church of Antioch. With the exception of the removal of the words "Christ our King," appended by Calandio to avoid the Theopaschite heresy, to Petrus's own addition to the Trisagion, "who wast crucified for us," these alterations appear generally unexceptionable if not commendable. According to Theodorus Lector he introduced the public benediction of the chrism; the benediction of the baptismal fonts on the evening of the Epiphany instead of as previously at midnight; and the recitation of the Nicene creed at every celebration of Holy Communion instead of once a year only. He is also said to have caused the name of the Blessed Virgin to be mentioned in all prayers (Theod. Lect. pp. 563, 566; Theophan. p. 115). There is extant a large collection of letters purporting to be addressed to Peter by various Eastern and Western prelates (Labbe, iv. 1052–1072, 1098–1122). Their genuineness is more than doubtful. The question has been fully discussed by Valesius (M. de Valois) in his notes on Evagrius (pp. 177, 178), and his decision against their authenticity, which is followed by Tillemont (*Mém. Eccl.* xvi. 375) and other modern critics is generally accepted. (Tillemont, *les Empereurs*, tom. vi. pp. 404–407; *Mém. Eccles.* tom. xvi. *passim*; Theod. Lect. pp. 554, ff.; Theophan. *Chronograph.* pp. 104, 107; Liberat. *Breviar.* c. 18; Evagr. *H. E.* lib. iii. 4, 16; Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, vol. ii. append. p. 553.) [E. V.]

PETRUS (11), 4th Jacobite bishop of Antioch (Le Quien, *Or. C.* ii. 1359), surnamed Callinicus, succeeded on the deposition of Paulus, A.D. 578. He visited Alexandria and fell into controversy with the bishop Damianus upon the doctrine of the Trinity. He died A.D. 591. (Greg Bar. *Chron.* i. 250 sq. in Assem. *Or. C.* i. 486, ii. 69 sq., 332.) [J. G.]

PETRUS (12), bishop of Apamea, the metropolis of Syria Secunda, under Anastasius, c. 510, a Monophysite, a warm partisan of Severus the intruding patriarch of Antioch, the leader of the Acephali, and charged with participating in the violent and sanguinary transactions by which the Monophysite creed was sought to be forced on the reluctant Syrian church. Our principal knowledge of Petrus is derived from the various acts of accusation (libelli) against him, presented by the clergy and monks of his diocese to the civil and religious authorities of the district, and the synod and councils of the time. With all the deductions to be made for party rancour, the account is sufficiently scandalous. Peter was accused of having taken forcible possession of his see, in violation of all ecclesiastical order, though he had not received canonical ordination either as a monk or as a presbyter (Labbe, v. 120). What is reported of him as a bishop recalls the charges against Paul of Samosata. He is stated to have had a lofty throne erected, on which he sat ostentatiously, and to have swaggered pompously through the forum with a band of attendants, rudely pushing aside the crowd to make way for him (*ibid.* 124). Definite charges were also made of rapacity, venality, gluttony, a dissolute life, gross irreverence, and violent and abusive language. The first formal complaint against Peter was that made before Count Eutychianus, governor of the province, by the clergy of Apamea, substantiated by their affidavits (Labbe, v. 219, 243). In these he is charged with declaring himself the enemy of the Chalcedonian decrees, and erasing from the diptychs the names of orthodox bishops and fathers of the church, and substituting those of Dioscorus, and Timothy Aelurus and other heresiarchs. Evidence is given of insulting language and overbearing conduct toward his clergy, acts of violence and

grossness, as well as of intercourse with females of loose character, especially a figurante (πτεροβόλος) named Stephana, and a certain actress, Mary of Emesa, whom he is accused of having introduced into the baptistery at the most solemn times, and of having conversed with them alone there for hours together. A second "libellus" was presented by the abbat and monks of the province to their bishops (*ibid.* 244–250), reflecting on Peter's ignorance—for which he deserved to be sent back to an elementary school (p. 245. 13)—and licentious life, and detailing various murderous attacks made on the monasteries of the province and the orthodox inmates, whom he is stated to have replaced with women of infamous character. In conjunction with Severus he was accused with having hired a band of Jewish banditti, who attacked, from an ambuscade, a body of 350 orthodox pilgrims, slew them all, and left their corpses unburied by the roadside (*ibid.* 119). Clergy were violently dragged from the altar by his emissaries, and ruthlessly butchered if they refused to anathematize the Chalcedonian faith. On the accession of Justin, A.D. 518, the Monophysite Timothy having been succeeded by the orthodox John in the patriarchal chair of Constantinople a few months previously, the bishops of Syria Secunda were emboldened to lay their complaints against Peter, as well as those against Severus, before the council assembled at the imperial city, July 518, inviting the emperor's authority to deliver them from so intolerable a tyranny (*ibid.* 215). Their prayer was granted; and Peter was deposed and sentenced to exile as a Manichee—by which opprobrious name the Monophysites were popularly designated—at the same time with Philoxenus (Xenaias) of Hierapolis (Theophan. p. 142). Nothing seems to be known of Peter between the time of his banishment and his reappearance at Constantinople, in company with his friend and master Severus, on the temporary revival of the fortunes of the Monophysites, through the influence of the Empress Theodora. The interval may not improbably have been passed with Severus at Alexandria. He accompanied Severus, or at any rate, speedily followed him, on his obtaining the emperor's permission to return to Constantinople, where he took a leading part in his schismatical proceedings, "setting up altar against altar and font against font, even in private houses" (*ibid.* 11). In 535, Anthimus of Trapezus, a secret Monophysite, succeeded the orthodox Epiphanius as patriarch of Constantinople, and the triumph of the Acephali seemed secured. The next year, however, pope Agapetus, on his embassy from Theodahad, succeeded in opening the eyes of Justinian to the deception that had been practised on him. Anthimus was deposed, and on the recommendation of Agapetus, Mennas was appointed to the vacant chair. The new patriarch lost no time in summoning a council to pronounce the condemnation of Monophysitism and its chief leaders, A.D. 536. Various acts of accusation against Peter, in conjunction with his first master Severus, were laid before the synod, together with petitions from the monks and clergy of the province, addressed to Justinian and the new patriarch for their condemnation as avowed heretics (Labbe, v. 100, 106). The sentence of excommunication passed upon them as obstinate depravers of the faith by Anthimus's predecessor Epiphanius, was read (*ibid.* 251). This was confirmed by Mennas and the synod, who cut off from communion Peter and Severus, as men who had "voluntarily chosen the sin unto death," and had "shown no signs of repentance and a better mind" (*ibid.* 253). This sentence received confirmation from Justinian. Peter was forbidden to reside in Constantinople, or its vicinity, or any of the more important cities, and commanded to live in complete retirement, and abstain from association with others, lest he should poison them with his heresy (*ibid.* 267). Nothing more is known of him. Letters, addressed to him by Severus exist, among the Syriac MSS of the British Museum (Wright, *Catal.* p. 559, no. 5, no. 20). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 913; Labbe, *Concil.* vol. v.; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclés.* livre 31, 40, 44; livre 32, 52, 54, 57.) [E. V.]

PETRUS (13), bishop of Arcavica or Ercavica, subscribes the canons of the third council of Toledo in A.D. 589. He had then been some years bishop, and signs before thirty-one bishops. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 254.) Two letters were addressed to him by abbat EUTROPIUS (13), afterwards bishop of Valencia, q.v. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 9; Isidorus, *de Vir. Ill.* 45, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxiii. 1106.) He subscribes second among the suffragans the canons of the synod of Toledo in A.D. 597. (*Esp. Sag.* vii. 70; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte in Spanien*, ii. 2. 15, 25.) [F. D.]

PETRUS (14), bishop of Barca, in Africa, addressed by Gregory the Great, in January A.D. 593. (*Epp.* iii. 16.) [F. D.]

PETRUS (15), Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople, succeeded PYRRHUS before the middle of A.D. 655. On his accession he sent, according to custom, a synodical letter to Rome. Its language was exceedingly obscure, and avoided the question of the Single or Double Will and Operation. The clergy and laity refused to allow Pope EUGENIUS to receive it. (*Lib. Pont.*, *Vita Eugenii.*) With the view of reconciling the Monothelites and the orthodox party, he put forward the novel theory of the existence of Three Wills and Operations, namely, of the One that the Monothelites, and of the Two that the orthodox acknowledged, and thus induced the Pope's apocrisiarii at Constantinople to communicate with him. (*Rel. Motionis*, 7; Anastasius, *Ep.*, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xci. 121, 133, 135; Agatho, *Epp.* 1, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 1203, 1205.) [EUGENIUS (1).] His letter to Pope Vitalian on the subject was partly read at the thirteenth session of the council of Constantinople (Mansi, xi. 571), but was condemned, on the ground that the passages cited in it from the fathers in support of his views were falsified, and the reading was discontinued. Petrus presided at the synod which condemned MAXIMUS (23) and his companions to mutilation and exile in A.D. 662. (*Acta Maximi*, in *Patr. Gr.* xci. 170; Mansi, xii. 358.) Petrus died in A.D. 666. (*AA. SS.* Aug. i. 81*; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 231.) [F. D.]

PETRUS (16), bishop of Corinth, in succession to Erasistratus who was a member of the Latrocinium in 449. In 450 he joined (Labb. iv. 675) Abundius and the three other legates of pope Leo [LEO (5), p. 658 *b*]. In 451 he declared for Flavian and subscribed the condemnation of Dioscorus at Chalcedon (Labb. iv. 177, 449), and in 457 he was one of the fifty-eight metropolitans (iv. 891) addressed by the circular of the emperor Leo. (Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 161: Tillem. xv. 651, 688, 799). [C. H.]

PETRUS, of Cuenca; *vid.* of Arcavica.

PETRUS (17), bishop of Damascus at the time that Severus was inducted into Flavian's seat at Antioch in the year A.D. 512. He was orthodox, and when Severus was endeavouring to compel the bishops of his province to accept his synodical letters anathematizing all who held the two natures in Christ, he left his see and fled to Palestine, together with Julian of Bostra (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 33; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* tom. ii. col. 834). [E. V.]

PETRUS (18), bishop of Damascus in the middle of the 8th century, a contemporary of John of Damascus. It was in obedience to his directions that John drew up his Λίβελλος περὶ ὀρθοῦ φρονήματος, a profession of orthodox faith to be recited by Elias the Maronite bishop of Jadruba, on his reception into the church by Petrus. These facts are preserved in the title of the work given by Leo Allatius. Another work, written by John at the suggestion of his bishop, is the *Disputatio contra Jacobitas*, address to the Jacobite (Eutychian) bishop of Daraea, with the view of his conversion to the orthodox faith. Theophanes informs us that Peter had his tongue cut out by the orders of Waivalid, and was banished to Arabia Felix, where he continued to celebrate the Eucharist, with a distinct voice, until he sealed his faith by martyrdom (Theophan. p. 349). He is commemorated by the Greeks on the 24th of February (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* tom. ii. c. 836). [E. V.]

PETRUS (19), bishop in the East. [DOMITIANUS (15).]

PETRUS (20), bishop of Edessa, succeeded Cyrus on his death, June 5, A.D. 498. During his episcopate Mesopotamia was ravaged by Cabades (Kawad), king of Persia, in his endeavour to wrest the province from Anastasius. Of the horrors of this terrible time of war, pestilence, and famine, in which Edessa had a full share, being more than once besieged by Cabades, we have a moving account from a contemporary witness in the Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite. Peter signalized the entrance on his episcopate by several ritual reforms. He was the first to institute the Feast of Palm Sunday in the church of Edessa, as well as the benediction of water on the eve of the Epiphany, and the consecration of chrism on Maundy Thursday, and he regulated the observance of the other festivals (Jos. Stylit. c. 32). An earthquake having occurred at Edessa A.D. 500, he instituted public processional litanies of the whole population (*ib.* 36). The same year, the city and province suffering grievously from famine, Peter visited Constantinople to petition Anastasius personally for a remission of taxes. In this he was only partially successful (*ib.* 39). The famine returning A.D. 505, Peter, not disheartened, made a second application to the emperor, who received him with frowns and rebuked him for leaving his distressed flock at such a time. However, feeling the justice of his request, he remitted the taxes for the whole of the province, sending the order by another party, without informing Peter (*ib.* 78). He died on Easter Eve, A.D. 510. (Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* tom. i. pp. 268 ff. 279; 406 ff.). [E. V.]

PETRUS (21), one of three Egyptian bishops who accompanied Athanasius in 335 to Constantinople and into the presence of Constantine (Ath. *Ap. c. Ar.* 87; Tillem. viii. 62, 666). [C. H.]

PETRUS (22), an Egyptian bishop who assisted in the ordination of Timotheus Salofaciolus to the see of Alexandria (Leo. Mag. *Ep.* 173; Tillem. xv. 823). [C. H.]

PETRUS (23), bishop of Gangra, the metro polis of Paphlagonia. His predecessor Callinicus, after having been ordained at Constantinople by Proclus, died almost immediately after his return to Gangra. On Peter's election in 449, Eusebius, bishop of Ancyra, metropolitan of Galatia, was urged by the people of Gangra to ordain him. He declined to ordain out of his own province, and recommended his being ordained, as his predecessors had been, at Constantinople. They assented, and Peter was ordained by Proclus. These facts came out in the discussion as to the prerogatives of the see of Constantinople, in the last session of the council of Chalcedon (Labbe, iv. 815), Peter himself admitted that he had followed precedent, and had felt no scruple in being ordained at Constantinople (*ib.* 814). Peter had previously been present at the "Latrocinium" in 449 (*ib.* 117), and was concerned in the condemnation of Flavian (*ib.* 310). His name appears also at the council of Rome under Symmachus in 503 (*ib.* 1370). [E. V.]

PETRUS, of Gaza; *vid.* of Majuma.

PETRUS (24), possibly the same as number 2; suffrag. 72, Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii.; called in later MSS. "martyr"—bishop of Hippo Diarrhytus or Zaritus, in the proconsular province which under Tiberius was a "Libera Colonia." *hod.* Binsert (Aug. *De Bapt. c. Don.* lib. vii. c. 36, § 70). [E. W. B.]

PETRUS (25), earliest known bishop of Hippos, on the south-west of the sea of Galilee, present at the council of Seleucia in 359 (Hard. i. 725; Wiltsch. i. 224). In the council of Antioch, 363, he occurs as Πέτρος Σίππων (Soc. iii. 25), where as Valesius believes the reading should be Ἵππων. The Latin version (Hard. i. 742) has Petrus Hipponius. (Le Quien, iii. 709; Tillem. viii. 764.) [C. H.]

PETRUS (26), bishop of Hydruntum (Otranto). Gregory the Great, early in A.D. 596, commits to him the care of the three vacant sees of Brundusium, Lippiae, and Gallipoli, directs him to visit them and to cause the clergy and laity of each to choose a fit person not a layman as bishop. (*Epp.* vi. 21, 62.) [F. D.]

PETRUS (27), a bishop in Istria, together with another named Providentius, were in schism on the Three Chapters' question. They had expressed to the notary Castorius their wish to go to Rome to discuss the matter with Gregory the Great, if it was promised that they should receive no illtreatment. Gregory therefore, in August A.D. 595, wrote to send them the desired assurance, and to exhort them to come (*Epp.* v. 51). [F. D.]

PETRUS, of Iturbica; *vid.* of Arcavica.

PETRUS (28), patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 524–544 (Clinton, *F. R.*; Niceph. *Chron.* p. 410) was born at Eleutheropolis, and succeeded John II. (omitted by Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 37) in A.D. 524. He manifested the same reverence for the celebrated ascetic St. Sabas, as his predecessors had done, and frequently visited him in his desert home. When his sister Hesychia was dangerously ill, and had been given over by the physicians, Peter sent for St. Sabas, who signed her three times with the cross, on which she began to recover (Cyrill. Scythop. *Vit. S. Sab.* no. 68). On the death of the abbat Theodosius, Jan. 11, A.D. 529, Peter, with other bishops of the province, hastened to the monastery to be present at the funeral of the holy man. During his episcopate took place the sanguinary insurrection of the Samaritans against the Christians, goaded to madness by the persecution of Justinian, offering only the alternative of baptism or rebellion (Gibbon, ch. 48). Many of the Christians lost their all and were reduced to beggary. Peter therefore begged St. Sabas to repair to Constantinople and lay before the emperor Justinian a petition for the remission of the taxes. His mission was successful, and he was received with much joy on his return by Peter and his flock (*ibid.* no. 70–76). Visiting him a short time afterwards in his cell, Peter found the holy man worn out with fatigue and hunger and almost at the last gasp. He tenderly placed the aged ascetic in a litter, and had him carried to his episcopal residence, where he attended upon him personally, until his strength being a little restored, he was, at his own request, conveyed back again to his cell to die, and was buried by Peter with great pomp, A.D. 532 (*ibid.* 78). On the deposition of Anthimus, the Monophysite patriarch of Constantinople, by the single authority of pope Agapetus, then present on state business at the imperial city, and the appointment of Mennas as his successor, early in A.D. 536, Agapetus issued a synodical letter dated Mar. 13 of that year announcing these facts, and with true occidental pride calling on the Eastern church to rejoice that for the first time a patriarch of New Rome had been consecrated by the hands of the bishop of Old Rome, and, together with the errors of Anthimus, stating and denouncing those of Severus, Peter, and Zoaras. On the receipt of this document Peter summoned a synod at Jerusalem and subscribed the condemnation, Sept. 19, 536, Agapetus having died on the 21st of the preceding April (Labbe, v. 47, 275, 283). [ANTHIMUS; AGAPETUS; MENNAS.] The rapid spread of Origenistic opinions in some of the monasteries of Palestine under the influence of Nonnus, as vehemently opposed by the members of other monastic bodies, gave rise to serious troubles which Peter was unable to allay. The monasteries were mutually denouncing one another, and expelling tainted members from their society. There were frequent quarrels, and affrays sometimes ending in bloodshed. The Origenists were supported by a powerful court party, headed by the abbats Domitian and Theodore Ascidas, who had managed to curry favour with the imperial pedant Justinian, and obtain bishopricks, the one of Ancyra, the other of the Cappadocian Caesarea (Evagr. *H. E.* iv. 38). The dignity and authority of Peter, a decided enemy of Origenistic doctrines, being seriously weakened, he found himself compelled to make concessions which compromised his position. His predecessor in the patriarchal chair, Ephraim, had issued a synodical letter condemnatory of Origen, and the Origenistic party clamoured to have his name removed from the diptychs. Peter was convinced that Justinian had been hoodwinked by the powerful abbats, and was ignorant of the real character of these doctrines. To open his eyes to their danger he conceived the following device. He instructed two of his own abbats, Gelasius and Sophronius, to bring before him a formal complaint, setting forth the heresies of Origen in detail. This document he forwarded to Justinian, with a letter describing the disturbances created by the Origenistic monks, and beseeching him to take measures to quell them. The emperor, flattered by this appeal at once to his ability as a theologian and his authority as a ruler, the petition being supported by a Roman deputation, headed by Pelagius, then at Constantinople on ecclesiastical business, granted the request, and issued a decree condemning the heresies of Origen, and ordering that no one should hereafter be created bishop or abbat without first condemning him and other specified heretics. The emperor's edict was confirmed by a home synod, σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα, convened by Mennas, and it was sent for signature to Peter and the other patriarchs. These proceedings took place in the year 541 (*Vit. S. Sab.* no. 84; Liberat. *Breviar.* c. 23; Labbe, v. 635; *Vit. S. Euthym.* p. 365). The object however was thwarted by the chiefs of the party subscribing the edict aimed at them, thus sacrificing truth to self-interest. Theodore maintained his position at court, and threatened Peter that he would cause him to be deposed if he continued to refuse to receive back the Origenistic monks who had been expelled (*Vit. S. Sab.* no. 85). To divert the emperor's attention from the Origenistic controversy, an attack was craftily organised by Theodore Ascidas and his fellows against certain writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia Theodoret and Ibas of Edessa, supposed to savour of Nestorianism. They had little difficulty in persuading the emperor, backed as they were by the powerful influence of the empress Theodora, an avowed favourite of Monophysitism, to issue an edict condemnatory of these writings, for which the three points on which it specially dwells, obtained the name of "edictum de tribus capitulis," περὶ τριῶν κεφαλαίων, or "the three chapters" by which the whole controversy became subsequently known. As this edict was published on the sole authority of the emperor, without any synodical authority, great stress

was laid on its acceptance by the bishops. The acquiescence of the four Eastern patriarchs was the most important point. If they agreed to it the other bishops would follow. This, however, was not gained without extreme difficulty. No one of them was disposed to sign a document which seemed to disparage the conclusions of the council of Chalcedon. Mennas was the first to yield [MENNAS]. Peter's signature was obtained after a longer struggle. On the first publication of the edict, he solemnly declared in the presence of a vast crowd of turbulent monks clamouring against its impiety, that whoever signed it would violate the decrees of Chalcedon. But the threats of deposition with which Justinian enforced compliance with his wishes weighed with him against his conscientious convictions, and in common with the other equally reluctant patriarchs he signed the document (Facundus, lib. iv. c. 4). He did not long survive this disgrace, and died, A.D. 544, after a twenty years' episcopate. (Vict. Tunnen. ap. Clinton, *F. R.* ii. 557; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclés.* livre 33; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 264 ff.; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* vol. ii. 189 sq.) [E. V.]

PETRUS (29), bishop of Laodicea about the 7th century, but not given by Le Quien or Gams. He wrote *Commentarium in quatuor Evangelia*, of which Migne (*Pat. Graec.* lxxxvi. 3321 sq., from Mai, *Bibl. Nov.* t. vi. 543) has given a few extracts, but Mai has found the whole commentary at the Vatican. His *Expositio in orationem dominicam* (Migne, 3329 sq. from *Bibl. Patr.* xii. 222) is better known (Binius, *Vet. Patr.* 777–80; Ceillier, *Aut. Sac.* xi. 787–8). [J. G.]

PETRUS (30), of Iberia, ordained bishop of Majuma, in Palaestina Prima, by Theodosius, who had seized on the see of Jerusalem in 452 (Evagr. *H. E.* ii. 5). He was one of the two consecrating prelates who laid hands on Timothy Aelurus (Labbe, iv. 893, 899; Evagr. *H. E.* ii. 8). [E. V.]

PETRUS (31), bishop of Majuma, a contemporary of John of Damascus, who pronounced his eulogy on his death. Peter was on very intimate terms with the leading Arabians, and in his last sickness, feeling himself near his end, made a last effort for the conversion of his friends, which led to his own martyrdom. In his zeal for their souls, deaf to their friendly warnings, he denounced the creed of Islam with such uncompromising vigour, and pronounced such violent anathemas on Mahomet and all who followed his teaching, that it was impossible to overlook his impiety, and he died by the sword of the executioner. He is commemorated by the Greek church on Feb. 21 (Theophan. *Chronogr.* pp. 349, 350). [E. V.]

PETRUS (32), twenty-fifth bishop of Metz, succeeded Villicus, and ruled ten years, c. A.D. 568–78. Bouquet (Rec. *Hist. des Gaul.* iv. 79) gives a letter to him from Gogus, who is supposed to have been the mayor of the palace of king Sigebert. His feast is 27 Sept. (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 689; Boll. *AA. SS.* Sept. vii. 351, and Oct. xii. 671; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 333). [J. G.]

PETRUS (33), metropolitan bishop of Myra, one of the fifty-eight to whom the emperor Leo sent the circular letter (Labbe, iv. 937, 940) Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem, mentions him (Phot. *Cod.* 231) with the epithet ὁσιώτατος. (Tillem. xv. 799.) [C. H.]

PETRUS (34), claimed to be bishop of a Numidian see, and went to Rome to assert his rights before Gregory the Great, who in A.D. 596 remitted the investigation of the case to the Numidian bishop Columbus (*Epp.* vi. 37). [F. D.]

PETRUS (35), first bishop of Parembolae in Palestine (τῶν παρεμβολῶν τῶν Σαρακηνῶν ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ, i.e. of the military stations of the Saracens in Palestine). According to the biography of St. Euthymius by Cyrillus Scythopolitanus, Peter was originally a Greek in the service of the Persians, with the very un-Greek-like name of Aspebetus, under Izdegird. A persecution of the Christians having been set on foot by the Magian party, Aspebetus was commissioned to occupy the passes to prevent the escape of the fugitives. Out of compassion for the innocent victims of religious intolerance Aspebetus executed his duty remissly, and even assisted the Christians in their flight. This being reported to Izdegird, Aspebetus, in fear for his life, deserted to the Romans with his son Terebo, his relatives and all his property. Anatolius, then prefect of the East, gladly welcomed him, stationed him in Arabia, and put him in command over all the tributary Saracen tribes in those parts. His son, Terebo, still a boy, had suffered from paralysis before his father's flight, and had lost the entire use of one side. After reaching Arabia, the boy was warned in a dream to apply to Euthymius for cure. As narrated in another article [EUTHYMIUS (4)] the application was successful. The boy recovered the use of his side, and the grateful father, with his brother-in-law Maris and all his Saracen followers became believers in Christ and received baptism, Aspebetus taking the name of Peter (Cyrill. Scythop. *Vit. S. Euthym.* c. 18–24; Coteler. *Eccl. Graec. Monum.* ii. pp. 216–222). The new disciple devoted himself to a religious life; and as the number of converts from the Arabians had become so large as to require a bishop of their own, he was recommended by Euthymius to Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, by whom, in defiance of the canonical rights of the old metropolitan chair of Caesarea, the new see was created, and Aspebetus (or Peter) appointed its first bishop (*ibid.* c. 39; Cotel. p. 231). The exact date is uncertain, but Tillemont gives reasons for placing it before 428 (Tillemont. *Mém. Ecclés.* xv. 196). He attended the council of Ephesus in 431. On his way thither he visited Euthymius, who counselled him to follow the guidance of Cyril of Alexandria and Acacius of Melitene in all things at the synod (*ibid.* c. 55, p. 236). At Ephesus he was one of the four bishops deputed to notify the time of the synod to Nestorius, and to invite him to appear and clear himself of the charges against him (Labbe, iii. 454). He was also one of the three sent to apprise John of Antioch on his arrival, of the decisions of the synod (*ibid.* 639). His name appears among those subscribing the de-

position of Nestorius, and the decrees of the council (*ibid.* 541, 692). On his homeward journey he again visited Euthymius, and informed him of all that had taken place at the council (*Vit. Euthym.* c. 55, p. 246). Peter's death must be placed before 451, in which year his second successor John attended the council of Chalcedon, his immediate successor Auxolaus, a Eutychian, having had a very brief episcopate (*ibid.* c. 72, p. 260). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 767; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xiv. 378, 392, 432, 451, xv. 196, 203.) He had successors of the same name in 473 and 536. (Le Quien, iii. 767, 770.) [E. V.]

PETRUS (36) I., bishop of Pavia, was cousin of king LUITPRAND and his father Ansprand, and after the civil war that followed the death of Cunipert was banished to Spoleto by the victorious Aripert II. (c. A.D. 702), and after ten years' exile was recalled by his kinsmen after the defeat and death of Aripert (c. A.D. 712). During his exile, St. Sabinus was said to have appeared to him and predicted his appointment to the see of Pavia, where he built a basilica dedicated to the saint. Paulus Diaconus (*Hist. Lang.* vi. 58) praises him for his chastity and other virtues. According to his epitaph, he was fifty-four at his death, and assuming he was twenty when he was banished, his birth would be c. 680, and his death c. 734. He is said to have been bishop thirteen years, which would place his elevation c. 721. He is commemorated May 7th (*AA. SS.* Mai. ii. 194). [F. D.]

PETRUS (37) II., bishop of Pavia, mentioned in the letter of Pope Hadrian to EGILA, as being a *missus* of Charles. The letter was written between A.D. 781–785 (Jaffé, *Bibl. Rer. Germ.* iv. 244). Cappelletti (xii. 407) is therefore mistaken in placing his episcopate between A.D. 795–800. [F. D.]

PETRUS (38) I., bishop of Ravenna, succeeded Ursus, c. 396, and is said to have died about the beginning of the reign of Valentinian III., c. 425. The order in Agnellus of the bishops of Ravenna in the 5th century is Petrus I., Neon, Exuperantius, Joannes I. (Angeloptes), Petrus II. (Chrysologus), Aurelianus. Now Petrus II. was consecrated between A.D. 432 and 440. Neon was alive in Oct. 458, and from 477 the order is known to have been Joannes, 494 PETRUS III., 519 or 20 Aurelianus. The true order is, therefore, probably:

Petrus I., c. 396–425.	Exuperantius, c. 460–477.
Joannes I., c. 425–432 or 440.	Joannes II., c. 477–494.
Petrus II., 432 or 440–450.	Petrus III., c. 494–519 or 520.
Neon, c. 450–460.	Aurelianus, 520

and the confusion arose from Agnellus identifying Joannes I. and Petrus II., with Joannes II. and Petrus III., whom he omits altogether, attributing their actions to their namesakes. It is possible that Agnellus getting Neon out of the right order, but knowing his predecessor was a Petrus, invented Petrus I., of whom nothing is known *aliunde*. (Agnellus, *Lib. Pont.* in *Mon. Ger. Hist., Script. Rer. Lang.* 289-91.) [F. D.]

PETRUS II, bishop of Ravenna [CHRYSOLOGUS.]

PETRUS (39) III., archbishop of Ravenna, became bishop after June 5, A.D. 494, the date of the death of his predecessor Joannes (*Corpus Insc. Lat.* xi. 304). He was bishop at least as late as the consulship of Eutharic in A.D. 519, when he was unable to check an attack on the Jews at Ravenna (*An. Vales.* 81), but must have died soon afterwards, as his successor Aurelianus died in May A.D. 521. (Agnellus 53, note in *Scrip. Rer. Lang.* 315.) He took a prominent part in the councils held at Rome between A.D. 500 and 504, to decide the disputes arising from the double election of SYMMACHUS and LAURENTIUS. Like his colleague Laurentius of Milan, though he avoided any intercourse with Symmachus while the case was pending, he did not omit his name when celebrating mass (Ennodius, *Lib. Apol.* in *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 197). He subscribes the acts of the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th Synods convened by Symmachus (Mansi, viii. 252, 268, 299, 314). The exact dates of these Synods are disputed. [LAURENTIUS (10).] He is probably the bishop of that name to whom Avitus writes for information about the disputes between the churches of Rome and Constantinople in A.D. 517 (Avit. *Epp.* 37, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 253), and may be the one charged by one Thomas with wrongfully detaining his share of his deceased father's property (Cassiodorus, *Var.* iii. 37, in *Patr. Lat.* lxix. 597). The chronology of the bishops of Ravenna in the 5th century is exceedingly perplexed, as Agnellus not only omits this Peter altogether, confounding him with an earlier Peter who probably died in A.D. 425, with St. Peter Chrysologus, and Peter IV. consecrated in A.D. 569 or 570, but makes two Johns into one. [F. D.]

PETRUS (40), bishop of Rhesina or Theodosiopolis, a Monophysite, one of the six bishops who in the year A.D. 533 held a conference with the orthodox party at Constantinople. He was expelled by Justin. Bar Hebraeus mentions his death about the same time as that of Severus of Antioch (Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* tom. ii. pp. 89, 327; Asseman. *de Monophysitis;* Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* tom. ii. col. 981). [E. V.]

PETRUS (41), bishop of Sebaste, the youngest brother of Basil the Great and Gregory Nyssen. He was the last of the ten children of Basil the elder and Emmelia. His father died almost immediately after his birth, which must be placed before A.D. 349 (Greg. Nyss. *de Vit. S. Macr.* ii. 185). His sister Macrina, more than twenty years older than himself, adopted her infant brother as her own special charge. She took him from his wet-nurse, and kept him constantly by her side, proving herself, in Gregory Nyssen's words, "not only his sister, but his father, mother, tutor, and warder" (παιδαγωγός) (*ib.* 186). She was his sole teacher, and a very strict one, leaving the boy little or no time for vain amusements. The religious mind of that age had only one ideal of perfection, the ascetic life. For this Macrina trained her young brother, and with joy she saw her care rewarded. When Macrina and her mother retired to their religious retreat on the banks of the Iris, Peter accompanied them, where, according to his brother, he proved all in all to them, working with them towards the angelical life.

Peter shared in the high physical and mental endowments of the family. His acquirements were very varied, and he had a natural gift for handicrafts, in which, without any direct instruction, he excelled as much as in intellectual pursuits (*ib.* 186). He contributed by his manual labour to the support of his mother and sister and their establishment, as well as of the large crowds who in time of scarcity were drawn thither by their reputation for charity. For some years his brother Basil was his near neighbour on the other side of the Iris, where he had established a monastery for male ascetics, in the presidency of which he was succeeded by Peter, when in A.D. 365 he was finally recalled to Caesarea by the bishop Eusebius. He was ordained presbyter by Basil, c. A.D. 370 (Greg. Nyss. ii. 187). He seems to have been employed by his brother on delicate missions requiring tact and discernment. A letter of Basil's to Eustathius of Sebaste, c. A.D. 371 (*Ep.* 119 [307]), as well as that to the bishops of Pontus, whom he was desirous to bring back to his communion (*Ep.* 203 [77]), were carried by one of the name of Peter, whom he styles his brother; but it is not certain whether the relationship was natural or spiritual. In A.D. 375 Basil revisited his old monastery, and stayed "in his brother's little house" (*οἰκιδίον*) for repose, in the midst of his arduous episcopal life (*Ep.* 216 [272]; 210 [64]). As recorded in another place [MACRINA (2), the younger], he was present with his sister Macrina at his mother's deathbed, A.D. 373, and was offered by her as her tenth to God (Greg. Nyss. ii. 186). Peter continued to reside in his monastery till after the death of his brother Basil and of his sister Macrina in A.D. 379. Gregory Nyssen records that, on reaching his dying sister's house, he found that Peter had started four days before by another road to meet him. He consequently missed being present at her death and funeral. The following year, A.D. 380, he was ordained bishop, probably of Sebaste, in Lesser Armenia, which had been vacated by the death or deposition of Eustathius. That Peter was bishop of Sebaste is accepted without question by Tillemont, who remarks (*Mém. Ecclés.* ix. 574) that "by a remarkable providence the brother of St. Basil was placed on the throne of his most dangerous enemy." Nicephorus, however, a somewhat untrustworthy authority, is the first writer who names his see (*H. E.* xi. 19). Theodoret (*H. E.* v. 8) and Suidas (*sub voc.* Βασίλειος, i. 539) simply style him a bishop, without naming his diocese. He took part in the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381 (Theod. *u. s.*). Olympias, the deaconess, the friend of Chrysostom, entrusted large funds to him for distribution to the poor (Pallad. p. 166). His death is placed by Tillemont between A.D. 391 and 394. His brother Gregory survived him, and took part in the first commemoration of his death at Sebaste (Greg. Nyss. *ad Flav.* iii. 645). He is commemorated in the Roman calendar on the 9th of January. The genius of Peter seems to have been rather practical than literary. Rufinus, instituting a comparison between the three brothers, says that the two younger combined equalled Basil; Gregory in word and doctrine, and Peter in the works of faith (Rufin. ii. 9). Theodoret remarks that, though Peter had not received such a training in classical literature as his brothers, τῆς θύραθεν παιδείας οὐ μετειληχὼς σὺν ἐκείνοις, he was equally conspicuous with them in the splendour of his life (*H. E.* iv. 30). But though undistinguished in theological literature himself, we are indebted to him for several of his brother Gregory's most important works, which were undertaken at his instigation. It was at his request that, as we learn from the proems, the two treatises supplementary to his brother Basil's "*Hexaemeron*," the "*Explicatio Apologetica*," and the "*De hominis opificio*" were undertaken (Greg. Nyss. *Opp.* i. 1, 44). The latter treatise was sent to Peter as an Easter gift. Gregory's great doctrinal work against Eunomius was also due to his brother's entreaties that he would employ his theological knowledge for the refutation of that heretic, and at the same time to disprove the charges brought by him against their brother Basil (*ib.* ii. 265, 266). Gregory's original intention was to limit his refutation to the first of Eunomius's two books. But Peter wrote a letter to him, the only literary production of his that is preserved to us (*ib.* 268), entreating him with the zeal of a Phinehas to strike through both the heretical books with the same spiritual sword, which he knew so well how to wield. The language and style of this letter show that Peter was in no way the intellectual inferior of the more celebrated members of his family (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* ix. 572–580). [E. V.]

PETRUS (42), bishop of Terracina, reproved by Gregory the Great for his conduct to the Jews. He died in A.D. 592. (Gregorii *Epist.* lib. i. ind. ix. 35; lib. iii. ind. xi. 13, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 489, 614.) [F. D.]

PETRUS, of Theodosiopolis; *vid.* of Rhesina.

PETRUS (43), bishop of Tricala, was charged with the care of the see of Agrigentum during its vacancy by Gregory the Great, who directed that he should receive the bishop's fourth of its revenues in A.D. 594. In 601 Gregory the Great directed that he should be paid forty solidi out of the revenues of the monastery of Lucusia (*Epp.* v. 12, xi. 49). [F. D.]

Presbyters.

PETRUS (44), a priest of Cabarbaricha, one of the originators of the Archontic heresy, c. 360 (Epiph. *Haer.* 20 vel 40, cap. 1; Tillem. ii. 296, 322, ix. 653, x. 490, 491). [ARCHONTICI.] [C. H.]

PETRUS (45), archpresbyter of Alexandria, expelled by the patriarch THEOPHILUS. [ISIDORUS (28).] [E. V.]

PETRUS (46), a priest of Ptolemais in the Libyan Pentapolis, addressed by his bishop Synesius (*Ep.* 13; Tillem. xii. 549, 688). [C. H.]

PETRUS (47), a Spanish priest, at whose house Vincentius Victor saw a work by St. Augustine on the origin and derivation of the soul, a subject in which he took much interest, and which is mentioned in more than one of his letters, but especially in one to St. Jerome, A.D. 415 (*Ep.* 166, see also 143, 159, 162).

Vincentius took upon himself to reply to this work, and asserted that it was at the suggestion of Peter that he had done so. To this Augustine replied in the work *de anima et ejus origine*, in four books, of which the second is addressed to Peter, and in which he speaks of the book of Vincentius as verbose and superficial, warns him against accepting all its statements, and exhorts him to persuade him to correct them. The work of Augustine was probably written in 419 or 420. (Aug. *Retract.* ii. 45, 56; *De anima*, &c. ii. 1; Cellier, vol. ix. p. 466.) [RENATUS, VINCENTIUS.] [H. W. P.]

PETRUS (48), priest of Alexandria and primicerius of the notaries, promoter of the suit against Nestorius at the council of Ephesus A.D. 431 (Labbe, iii. 451, 530, 613, 624, 671, 673); Tillem. xiv. 379, 396, 399, 429, 430, 442. [J. G.]

PETRUS (49), a priest at Rome who, in the time of pope Coelestine I., founded the church of St. Sabina in the Aventine, according to an ancient inscription on the church cited in Baronius (Baron. *Ann.* 432, xxxvii.; Tillem. ii. 251, xiv. 157). [C. H.]

PETRUS (50), one of the priests and archimandrites of Constantinople addressed with MAGNUS (5). [C. H.]

PETRUS (51). A presbyter well skilled in medicine, a friend of Theodoret. (Theod. *Epp.* 114, 115.) [E. V.]

PETRUS (52), priest, sent by Flavian from the council at Constantinople, A.D. 448, to enquire in the city about Eutyches having sent to the monasteries there a treatise for signature regarding the faith [FAUSTUS (28)]. He and the deacon Patricius were sent at the third session, and reported at the fifth that the tome had been delivered, but was not signed (*Conc. Chalc.* act. i. ap. Binium, *Conc.* ii. pt. i. 81, 85). [J. G.]

PETRUS (53), a priest of Edessa of the 5th century. From Gennadius (*De Script. Eccl.* cap. lxxiv. in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 1102) we learn that he wrote treatises on various subjects, and composed psalms in Syrian metre in imitation of St. Ephraem (Trithemius, *de Script. Eccl.* c. 167; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 442; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* tom. ii. col. 926). [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (54), archdeacon, author of sixty-nine questions with answers explaining difficulties in the prophet Daniel. The work was first published by order of Charlemagne, and is given in *Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 1347. Some have thought that this Peter is the same as the questioner in Gregory's *Dialogues*, but there is no clear evidence to connect the two. [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (55), a deacon of Langres, elder brother of Gregory of Tours the historian, who relates his miraculous cure through the intercession of St. Julian, and his eventual murder in 577 (*Mirac. S. Jul.* ii. 24, *Hist. Franc.* v. 5). [S. A. B.]

PETRUS (56), deacon and one of the Scythian monks addressed by Fulgentius of Ruspo [FULGENTIUS (3)]. [C. H.]

PETRUS (57), a deacon, or according to some MSS. an archdeacon. He was an intimate friend of Gregory the Great, and had been his companion in studying the Scriptures. From the first book of the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great (*Pat. Lat.* lxxvii. 149), we learn that it was Petrus who induced his friend to write the book, and the dialogue is represented as being carried on all through with him. [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (58), subdeacon of Rome. From the first letter of the first book of the epistles of Gregory the Great we learn that he was appointed Gregory's vicar in Sicily. Many letters are found in the first, second, and third books of epistles giving him instructions on various matters. In the thirty-second letter of the second book Gregory recalls him to Rome with many expressions of affection. The letters of the third book point to his having been employed in Campania in the same capacity as in Sicily (cf. *Epp.* 1, 5, 19). We find passages of reproof and exhortation to more vigorous work, as well as of commendation, in several letters (cf. lib. i. 56, ii. 32). [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (59), deacon of Naples, was a candidate for the bishopric on the death of FORTUNATUS (21) in A.D. 600. Gregory the Great had heard that he was a moneylender, and directed that the fact should be inquired into, declaring that he was ineligible, if it was true. Paschasius was ultimately chosen (*Epp.* x. 62). He was perhaps the same as the deacon of the same name, who had taken the side of PAULUS, bishop of Nepi, during a previous vacancy (*Epp.* ii. 15). [F. D.]

PETRUS (60), reader in Alexandria, ringleader of the mob in murdering HYPATIA (1) A.D. 415 (Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* vii. c. 15; Fleury, *E. H.* xxiii. 25). [J. G.]

PETRUS (61), an acolyte of the Roman church, who had fled from his post to the church of Jerusalem. Gregory the Great (lib. viii. ep. 6) writes instructions to Amos, bishop of Jerusalem, concerning him. [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (62), cleric of Naples, had been accused of immorality. The bishop, without trying the case, had suspended him from accompanying him. Petrus appealed to Gregory the Great, who blamed the bishop's action, and directed him and the subdeacon Anthemius to hold a strict inquiry (*Epp.* x. 40, 41). [F. D.]

PETRUS (63), a Galatian anchorite, who lived near Antioch with an Egyptian of the same name (Theod. *H. E.* iv. 28). [G. T. S.]

Monks.

PETRUS (64), a solitary commemorated by Theodoret in his *Religiosa Historia*. He was by birth a Galatian, embraced a monastic life when seven years old, and lived to the age of ninety-nine. After visiting the holy places at Jerusalem and Palestine, he fixed his habitation at Antioch, making his home in an empty tomb. Here he supported life on bread and water, keeping a strict fast every other day. He had for his companion and attendant a man named Daniel, whom he had delivered from an evil spirit.

Theodoret relates that his mother, when a beautiful young woman of twenty-three, being unable to obtain any relief from a malady in her eye from any oculist, was induced by one of her female servants to apply to Peter. Going to him dressed richly in accordance with her station, and resplendent with gold ornaments and gems, the solitary upbraided her for presuming to attempt to improve on the handiwork of her Maker, and by his earnest words having cured her of the malady of vanity and the love of dress, he signed her eye with the cross, and she was speedily healed. Other members of her household were cured by him in a similar manner. When, seven years after the cure of her eye, she became the mother of Theodoret, and was given over by the physicians, Peter having been summoned, prayed over her with her attendants, and she speedily revived. As he grew older she was accustomed to bring her child once every week to receive the old man's blessing. Peter would take the little boy on his knees and feed him with raisins and bread. But, great as was his love for him, he very discreetly refused to allow him to become a sharer of his cell and a helper of Daniel in his attendance upon him. Peter made the young Theodoret a present of half his linen girdle, which was believed to have the miraculous property of relieving pain and curing sickness. For this purpose the amulet was frequently lent, and at last, being kept by one of its borrowers, the family was deprived of the precious gift. (Theod. *Hist. Rel.* c. ix.; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xv. 209–213.) [E. V.]

PETRUS (65), the head of a monastery near Antioch early in the fifth century. He was a brother of Alexander, the founder of the Acoemetae at Constantinople, in whose *Vita* (cap. vi. § 37 in Boll. *Acta SS.* 15 Jan. ii. 308, new ed.) is related a visit he paid to Peter's monastery (Tillem. xii. 492, 494). [C. H.]

PETRUS (66), monk addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. ep. 15). [J. G.]

PETRUS (67), an orthodox archimandrite of Constantinople, addressed by Leo the Great (see under EMMANUEL, Manuel). (Leonis *Epp.* li. lxxi.) [C. G.]

PETRUS (68), abbat in the African province called Tripolitana, and author of a commentary or catena on the Pauline Epistles selected out of the writings of S. Augustine. Cassiodorus (*Inst.* c. 8) commends it to the monks (cf. Migne, *P. L.* t. lxx., col. 1120). [G. T. S.]

PETRUS (69), an African abbat who refused at the council of Carthage, in 525, to recognise the jurisdiction of Liberatus, primate of the Byzacene province, pleading a decision of a council of Arles held in 455, which recognised the spiritual independence of monasteries. This is one of the earliest instances of the claim for freedom from episcopal supervision afterwards successfully made by the monastic orders (Mansi, *Concil.* t. viii. 648–656; Hefele's *Councils*, 238). [G. T. S.]

PETRUS (70), abbat of SS. Andrew and Lucy at the date of Gregory the Great's Dialogues, had his tomb constructed by that of a monk named Merulus who had died 14 years before, from which he declared a wonderful fragrance issued (*Dial.* iv. 47). [F. D.]

PETRUS (71), monk of Iberia, who, according to Gregory the Great, was restored to life after beholding the torments and flames of hell (*Dial.* iv. 36). [F. D.]

PETRUS (72), the first abbat of the monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul, commonly called St. Augustine's, Canterbury. He was probably one of the monks who accompanied Augustine on his first journey, and therefore may be supposed to have been a monk of the monastery of St. Andrew at Rome. He is first mentioned by Bede (*H. E.* i. 25) as joined with Laurentius in the mission which Augustine after his consecration sent to Rome to announce that the Gospel had been accepted by the English, and that he had been made bishop, as well as to put before the pope the questions which drew forth the famous "Responsiones Sancti Gregorii." He must have returned some time before the death of Augustine, and been either appointed by him and Ethelbert, or designated as the future head of the monastery, which at his request Ethelbert was building outside the walls of Canterbury. The building was not finished when Augustine died, but Laurentius, his successor, consecrated the new church, and Peter became the first abbat. The Canterbury tradition, as presented by Elmham, was that Peter stayed three years at Rome, and that he survived the archbishop one year, seven months, and three weeks. Nothing certain however can be stated about him beyond what we learn from Bede, namely, that he was sent as envoy to Gaul and was lost at sea off Ambleteuse, a few miles north of Boulogne. His body was cast ashore and buried by the natives in an obscure place, but a heavenly light, appearing over the grave, revealed the anctity of the abbat's body; and on inquiry made for the purpose of identifying him, his remains were translated to Boulogne. The Count Fumertius is said by modern authority to have directed the removal, and to have deposited the body in the church of St. Mary, where it may still rest under the guardianship of the canons of Boulogne (Gotselinus, ut infra). An epitaph is given by Elmham. The Canterbury monks kept the obit of Peter on the 30th of December, on which day he is commemorated in the Benedictine martyrology. In the English martyrology and by Ferrarius the 6th of January is assigned to him, possibly as the day of the translation (Smith's note on Bede *H. E.* i. 33). The year of his death is uncertain. If the Canterbury computation be accepted, and on such a point it is not necessary to regard it as baseless, Peter must have perished in the winter of 606, or of 607 at the latest. Abbat John, his successor, was believed to be in office in 610, when the bull of Boniface IV. to Ethelbert was concocted (*Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 67); but nothing definite can be inferred from this.

Eadmer, the Canterbury hagiographer, wrote a life of Abbat Peter, which is still in MS., but which was no doubt in the hands of Thorn and Elmham, who have really put nothing on record that is not found in Bede, except the computa-

tion above referred to. There is a notice of him in Mabillon's *Acta SS. O.S.B.* saec. i. p. 1. page 1. and the Bollandist acts, January, tom. i. pp. 335, 336. Peter's name appears in the charter of Ethelbert to the monastery and in the Privilege of St. Augustine, both documents unfortunately and hopelessly spurious (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 4, 5; *Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 57, 59).

See Gotselinus *de Translatione Sti. Augustini*, ap. Mab. *Acta SS. O.S.B.* tom. ix. p. 760; Elmham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 92–126; Thorn cc. 1761, 1766; Hardy, *Catalogue of Materials*, &c., i. 206, 207; *Monasticon Angl.* i. 120. [S.]

PETRUS (73), a confessor in Egypt in the Decian persecution [PAULUS (100)]. (Euseb. vi. 40, vii. 11; Tillem. iv. 247, 248.) [R. J. K.]

PETRUS (74), May 15. Martyr at Lampsacus, in the Decian persecution with Paul, Andrew, and Dionysia. They suffered under a proconsul Optimus. Their acts have all the marks of authenticity, and are often quoted by Le Blant to illustrate his argument in *Les Actes des Martyrs*, Paris, 1882, e.g. cf. pp. 159, 166. (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 147; Ceill. ii. 118.) [G. T. S.]

PETRUS (75), a eunuch in the household of Diocletian, and one of the earliest victims of the persecution (Euseb. viii. 6; Tillem. v. 280, 281, 655). Tillemont reckons the date as Mar. 12, 303. [C. H.]

PETRUS (76), an ascetic, surnamed Abselamus, Jan. 11, martyr at Caesarea, A.D. 309. He suffered with Asclepius, a Marcionite bishop on the third day before the Ides of January. He belonged to the neighbourhood of Samaria. (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* cap. x.; Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 344.) By some he has been confused with PETRUS BALSAMUS, cf. Ruinart, *l.c.* p. 556. [G. T. S.]

PETRUS (77) BALSAMUS, Jan. 3, is by some identified with Petrus Abselamus. Like him Balsamus belonged to the neighbourhood of Samaria. He suffered in Palestine by crucifixion, probably about A.D. 311, under the president Severus. His Acts were translated out of Greek into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius. They have all the marks of antiquity, and are often quoted by Le Blant in his *Actes des Martyrs* to illustrate ancient legal customs. (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 556.) [G. T. S.]

PETRUS (78), a notary addressed by Gregory the Great (lib. ii. *Ep.* 1, v. 9, in *Pat. Lat.* lxxvii. 539, 751). [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (79), vir illustris, to whom pope Martin addressed his tenth epistle (*Pat. Lat.* lxxxvii. 174). [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (80), vir illustris to whom St. Maximus of Chrysopolis addressed two letters (*Patrol. Graec.* xci. 509, 534). [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (81), an advocate to whom Theodoret wrote, thanking him for the assistance he had rendered to the inhabitants of Cyrrhus (Theod. *Ep.* 46). [E. V.]

PETRUS (82), secretary to the emperor Majorian, and addressed in a highly laudatory ode by Sidonius Apollinaris, about A.D. 458 (Sidon. Apoll. *Carm.* no. 3; ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 638; Tillemont, *Hist. Emp.* vi. 131, 132; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 396). [J. G.]

PETRUS (83), notary of the Roman church. Pope Leo II. sent him into Spain to get the signatures of the Spanish bishops to the decrees of the 6th council. (*Letter of Leo II.* in Mansi, xi. 1058.) Benedict II. addressed a letter to him, urging him to execute his commission at once. (Mansi, xi. 1085.) [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (84), a layman who lived about the end of the 3rd century. Peter being on his way to Jerusalem, and fearing Eastern heretics, begged Fulgentius of Ruspa to give him a rule of faith. This was given to him in a treatise consisting of forty articles, *De fide, seu de regula verae fidei.* (*Pat. Lat.* lxv. 671.) [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (85), one of the coloni on the church estate of Vitelae, made defensor by Gregory the Great, who forbade that his sons should quit that estate, on which they were *adscripti glebae*, or marry any one who did not belong to it (*Epp.* xii. 25). [F. D.]

PETRUS (86), a youth, on whose behalf and in that of his brother Phocas, Gregory Nazianzen addressed a poem to their father Vitalian in 375, supplicating kinder treatment for them (Greg. Naz. lib. ii. sec. 2, carm. 3, cf. vers. 79 in *Pat. Gr.* xxxvii. 1480, 1486; Tillem. ix. 380). [C. H.]

PETRUS (87), major-domo of Gregory the Great's monastery, died four years before he wrote his *Dialogues*, in which he relates (iv. 36) how a soldier in a vision saw Petrus in the world of the departed, suffering torments, because when ordered to inflict punishment he did so not from obedience, but from the cruelty of his disposition. [F. D.]

PETRUS (88), mentioned in a letter of Gregory the Great to JANUARIUS (25) (*Epp.* iv. 9.) [F. D.]

PETRUS (89), a Sicilian noble or official of high rank, to whom Gregory the Great commended ROMANUS on his appointment in A.D. 599 (*Epp.* ix. 2). [F. D.]

PETRUS (90), vir clarissimus, vicedominus or manager of the property of the great lady RUSTICIANA, complained to Gregory the Great that men belonging to the church of Syracuse had forcibly entered upon her estate in Sicily, and that he could get no redress from the bishop (*Epp.* xi. 43). [F. D.]

PETRUS (91), conductor on property of the Roman Church in Sicily. (*Epp.* i. 44, xiv. 5.) A conductor was a middleman between the owner and the actual occupier. [F. D.]

PETRUS (92), son of LUCILLUS (3), had appropriated much of the property of the church of Malta. Gregory the Great ordered that he should be compelled to restore it (*Epp.* x. 1). [F. D.]

PETRUS (93), a converted Jew of Cagliari, was baptized on Easter-eve A.D. 598, and the next day took possession of the synagogue there against the bishop's prohibition, and erected a cross and an image of the Virgin in it. Gregory the Great ordered the cross and image to be reverently removed, and the synagogue to be restored to the Jews (*Epp*. ix. 6). [F. D.]

PETWIN. [PECTWINE.]

PEUCETIUS (Πευκέτιος: Valesius takes the name to be the Greek form of PICENTIUS), chief favourite of the emperor Maximin Daza, and through his favour three times consul, was put to death on the change of Government following the death of his master (Euseb. *H. E.* ix. 11). [G. S.]

PHACIDAS, bishop of Edessa, ruled ten years and abdicated in A.D. 409 (Assemanus, *Bibl. Orient*. i. 400, 424; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 958). [J. G.]

PHAEDIMUS, bishop of Amasea in Pontus. According to the singular and not very probable story told by Gregory Nyssen, it had been revealed to Phaedimus, who had the gift of prophecy, on the return of the young Theodore, better known as Gregory Thaumaturgus, to his native city, that he was destined to be its bishop. He, therefore, sought an opportunity of laying his hands upon him and ordaining him surreptitiously. Having been baffled in this, he is said to have resorted to the strange expedient of ordaining him by prayer alone, without imposition of hands, when he was three days journey away, an ordination which Gregory is stated to have considered binding. (Greg. Nyss. *Vita Greg. Thaumat.* in *Pat. Gr.* xlvi. 909; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* iv. 326.) [E. V.]

PHAGANUS, *Mon. Angl.* i. 1. [FAGANUS.]

PHANTASIASTAE. [JULIANUS (47) Vol. III., p. 474ᵃ.]

PHARETRIUS, bishop of the Cappadocian Caesarea at the time of the deposition and banishment of Chrysostom, A.D. 404. He was evidently a timid man of no force of character or steady principle, anxious to side with the stronger party, and secure his personal safety. His behaviour to Chrysostom was ungenerous in the extreme when, on his way to his place of exile, his exhausted strength required him to make a few days' halt at Caesarea. [CHRYSOSTOM, Vol. I. p. 530]. Chrysostom, writing afterwards to his lay friend Paeanius, acknowledges that Pharetrius's conduct towards him was such as admitted of no excuse. At the same time, lest there should be a breach between the clergy of Caesarea, who had manifested the warmest affection for him, and their bishop, he begs Paeanius to inform Pharetrius that he has heard of his having expressed sorrow for what had occurred. (*Ep.* 204.) [E. V.]

PHARHÂD, otherwise Aphraates, Jacob, and Sapiens Persa. The author thus variously denominated has been generally confounded with Jacob of Nisibis, to whom his works have been attributed [JACOBUS (4)]. It was only in our own time that the distinction between them has been discovered. The discovery is due to the late Canon Cureton, who found the homilies of Aphraates among the Nitrian MSS. of the British Museum, and intended their publication to be the crowning labour of his life. Death overtook him before he carried out his intention, which, however, Mr. W. Wright fulfilled in 1869 by publishing the Syriac original, promising to add an English translation, which, however, has not yet appeared. Since the publication of this work, Aphraates has attracted much attention among scholars, because he must be regarded as the oldest father and writer of the Syrian church. The time of his birth is not exactly known, but it must have been towards the conclusion of the 3rd century, as we find him a writer in high repute about the year 335. He seems to have been born on the borders of Persia, if not within that empire, as he dates several of his homilies by the years of the reign of Sapor II., as well as by the era of the Greeks commonly used in Syria. The details of his life are almost unknown. From his writings we can deduce that he was a monk, and probably a bishop of the monastery of St. Matthew, near Mosul, which continued from the earliest times down to 1820 to be the seat of the metropolitans of Nineveh (Asseman. *De Syris Monophys. Dissert.* Romae, 1730, p. 100; Rich, *Residence in Koordistan*, t. ii. p. 74). Some have thought that he was a disciple of Ephraem Syrus, which, however, is not possible, as Ephraem must have been by many years his junior, not having been born till after the year 306. Pharhâd flourished, according to the date furnished by himself in dissertation *de Acino*, till the year 345 at least. He seems to have been present at the council of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, held A.D. 344, where he was selected to draw up the encyclical letter of the council. Concerning the remainder of his life we know nothing, as he must be clearly distinguished from an Aphraates mentioned as one of the ancient martyrs in Wright's *Syriac Martyrology*, where the words "ancient martyrs" indicate those who suffered prior to the time of Simeon Bar-Sabba'e, ninth bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, who himself suffered while our Aphraates (Pharhâd) was composing his later homilies. Another Aphraates is mentioned by Theodoret (*H. E.* iv. 22) and in the *Hist. Relig.* where his life and famous interview with the Arian emperor Valens, A.D. 373–377, are described at some length.

The writings of Aphraates are important from several points of view. (*a*) From the point of view of Biblical criticism. Wright regards his quotations of Holy Scripture as so important that he collects them in a separate index. He thinks Aphraates quotes the Peshito, but usually from memory. Others again have maintained that our author used Tatian's Diatessaron alone for his gospel quotations, and never used the Canonical Gospels. (Hilgenfeld's *Zeitsch. für wissensch. Theolog.* 1882–83, p. 115; Zahn's *Forschungen zur Gesch. des Neutestam. Kanons*, Th. i. p. 84.)

(*b*) From a historical point of view. His Dissertatio vi. *de Monachis*, throws light on the organisation and abuses of monasticism in his time. The monks of Mar Mattai in Eastern Syria lived, as Rich describes them sixty years

ago, in separate cells or houses of their own. The anchorite not the coenobite life was the usual type of monasticism in his time, else Pharhâd would not have been obliged to rebuke the monks for wishing nuns to live with them in the same cells, "justum, decens atque decorum est unum quemque etiamsi afflictione prematur, solitarium manere." If they wish for female society, he very wisely advises them to get married. St. Cyprian, a century earlier, had to rebuke the same abuse (*Epist.* iv.). Again they witness to the religious state of eastern Syria in the middle of the 4th century. The controversy with the Jews is still the all-important one. Thus while Hom. i.–x. deal with topics like charity, prayer, and fasting, Hom. xi.–xxii. are almost wholly taken up with the Jewish controversy. The Jews had in the 3rd century established flourishing schools at Edessa, Nisibis, and other cities in that neighbourhood, where they cultivated the Christian controversy with great diligence. Aphraates himself engaged in personal controversy, as he tells us in Hom. xxi. *de Persecutione* that it was an argument with a Jew which led to its composition. Among heretical sects he mentions the activity of Valentinians, Manichaeans, and Marcionites, but never once alludes to Arius or Arianism. Upon two points his opinions were remarkable. He maintains that the world would come to an end 500 years after the incarnation, and that the human soul sleeps between death and the resurrection. His Christological statements, too, sometimes are ambiguous or deficient from the standpoint of Nicene orthodoxy.

The literary history of his works has been a curious and a chequered one. He was very celebrated in his own time and country. His works were highly valued in succeeding centuries, and frequently republished. Thus one of the British Museum MSS. of his work is the fourth earliest-dated MS. in existence, bearing the date equivalent to December A.D. 474. George, bishop of the Arabs [GEORGIUS (25)] in the 8th century, discusses the doctrines of Pharhâd in a letter to a presbyter, Joshua. This letter is translated in Couper's Syriac *Miscellanies*, p. 61. The Homilies of Pharhâd were translated into Armenian about the 5th century, probably by the disciples of Mesrobes [MESROBES]. Through this version alone his works were known to the West till the discovery of the Nitrian MSS. For a copious list of references about him the reader should consult Wright's preface, or an exhaustive memoir by Jacobus Forget, *De Vita et Scriptis Aphraatis*, Lovanii, 1882. The homilies of Aphraates are disposed, according to a common custom of that age and country, after the order of the Syriac alphabet. [G. T. S.]

PHARNERSES (P'HARHNERSCH, PHARNESEC), Catholicus of Armenia, about the middle of the 4th century. Saint Martin in his *Mém. sur l'Arménie*, i. 437, fixes this date A.D. 336–340. This seems too early, according to the narrative of Moses Choren. (*Hist.* iii. 16.) He tells us that Pharnerses was chosen as head of the Armenian church on account of the failure of the family of Gregory the Illuminator [ARMENIANS, t. i. p. 164]. [G. T. S.]

PHEBADIUS. [FOEGADIUS.]

PHELIM, bishop of Armagh. [FEDLIMIDH (3).]

PHERBUTHA, otherwise Tarbula, April 22, sister of St. Simeon, bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, who suffered under Sapor, April 21, A.D. 343. She was put to death, together with her sister, on suspicion of having poisoned the queen, and at the instigation of the Jews. (Sozomen. *H. E.* ii. 12; Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 632.) [G. T. S.]

PHIBIONITES, given by Epiphanius (*Haer* 25, p. 77) as the name of a Gnostic sect. Nothing is known as to their special tenets or as to the derivation of the name. [G. S.]

PHILAGRIUS (1), prefect of Egypt A.D. 335–340. St. Athanasius brings all kinds of charges against him in his *Epistola Encyclica*, his *Apologia contra Arianos*, and in his *Historia Arianorum*, all contained in Migne, *P. G.* t. xxv. He accuses him of apostasy from Christianity and of immorality. His charges must be regarded with some suspicion, as Philagrius supported the Arian party in Alexandria, and assisted in the installation of their bishop Gregory in 340. Gregory and Philagrius were both of them from Cappadocia. [GREGORIUS (8).] [G. T. S.]

PHILAGRIUS (2), an intimate friend and fellow student of Caesarius, the brother of Gregory Nazianzen, who regarded him with much affection, and wrote to him frequently, especially after his return from Constantinople in 342, when he and Gregory were fellow sufferers from gout and rheumatism, which to their mutual regret prevented their meeting as often as they desired. Philagrius remonstrated with Gregory on his leaving Constantinople and resigning the bishopric, for which Gregory defends himself on the ground that it was not really his see, that being Nazianzus, but only one which he had held temporarily and most reluctantly. (*Epp.* 64–67, 70.) [E. V.]

PHILAGRIUS (3), a solitary near Jerusalem, of whom an uncommon act of honesty is recorded (Coteler. *Mon. Gr. Ecc.* i. 796; Rosweyd, *Vit. Pat.* v. 6, § 15; Tillem. x. 468). [C. H.]

PHILAGRIUS (4), a person addressed by Sidonius Apollinaris (lib. vii. ep. 14; Tillem. xvi. 230). [C. H.]

PHILAGRIUS (5), a blind man, into whose complaints Gregory the Great in A.D. 599 directed the bishop of Milan to inquire and to see that justice was done. (*Epp.* ix. 126.) [F. D.]

PHILASTER (PHILASTRIUS), bishop of Brixia (Brescia), in the latter part of the 4th century. Augustine uses both forms of his name, but preferably Philastrius; the form Philaster is used in the acts of the council of Aquileia. His successor in the see, Gaudentius, used every year to preach a panegyrical sermon on the anniversary of his death (July 18). One of these sermons, preached on the fourteenth anniversary, has come down to us, and from its vague laudatory statements we have to extract the scanty information we possess concerning the life and

work of Philastrius. We learn from it that he was not a native of Brescia, but had, like Abraham, left his country and his father's house. From what country he came we are not told. Spain or Africa has been conjectured. Schröckh considers that his Greek-sounding name is probably derived from the later Latin "filiaster" a step-son (see Ducange, *s. v.*). He is commended for his zeal not only in the conversion of Jews and heathen, but also in the confutation of heresies, especially of Arianism; and he is said to have even incurred stripes by the vehemence of his opposition to that sect, which was dominant at the time. He is said to have travelled much. At Milan he withstood the bishop Auxentius, the Arian predecessor of St. Ambrose; and at Rome also he was highly successful in his defence of orthodoxy. Finally he settled down at Brescia, where he is said to have been a model of all pastoral virtues. We may judge of the impression he produced by the care taken by his successor to perpetuate his memory; and his cult was revived with great splendour in the 9th century, Rampertus, who was then bishop, having made a great translation of his relics, which, we are told, was attended with many miracles. Rampertus counts him as seventh bishop of Brescia, and he is still regarded as one of the patron saints of that city.

The only data we have for fixing the date of Philaster's episcopate, or the duration of his life, are that he took part as bishop of Brescia in a council held at Aquileia in 381 (see the proceedings of that council in the works of Ambrose, ii. 802, or p. 935, Migne); and that he must have died before A.D. 397, the year of the death of Ambrose, since that bishop interested himself in the appointment of his successor. The year 387 has been frequently named as the date of Philaster's death, but there is really no evidence that he did not live longer. St. Augustine mentions that he had seen Philaster at Milan in company with St. Ambrose; and this was probably some time during the period A.D. 384–387, during which Augustine was at Milan. It is likely that Philaster had been commended to the church of Brescia by Ambrose, who would have known of Philaster's opposition to Auxentius. The notices of Philaster to be found in ecclesiastical writers are collected in the Bollandist life. (*AA. SS.* July 18, vol. iv. p. 299.)

Philaster is now chiefly interesting as the author of a work on heresies, portions of which, having been copied by St. Augustine, became stock materials for haeresiologists. Augustine having been asked by Quodvultdeus to write a treatise on heresies refers him in reply (*Ep.* 222) to the works of Epiphanius and Philastrius, the former of whom had enumerated twenty heresies before our Lord's coming and sixty since the Ascension, the latter twenty-eight heresies before and 128 after. Concerning this difference of enumeration, Augustine refuses to believe that Epiphanius, whom he accounts far the more learned of the two, could have been ignorant of any heresies known to Philaster; and he explains the difference as arising from the fact, that the word heresy is not one of sharply defined application, and that accordingly the one counted opinions as heresies which were not so reckoned by the other. To a certain extent this explanation may be accepted; for Philaster in his excessive eagerness to swell his list of heresies, has included many items which must be struck out unless we count every erroneous opinion as a heresy. In fact when he has completed his list of heretical sects called after the names of their founders, he adds a long list of anonymous heresies, apparently setting down all the theological opinions with which he disagreed, and branding those who held them as heretics. Thus, to give a few examples, those are set down as heretics (c. 108) who imagined, as many excellent fathers did, that the giants of Gen. vi. 2 were the offspring of angels, those (c. 112) who thought that any uncertainty attached to the calculation of the number of the years since the creation of the world, those (c. 94) who denied the plurality of heavens or (c. 115) who asserted an infinity of worlds, those (c. 133) who imagine that there are fixed stars, being ignorant that the stars are brought every evening out of God's secret treasure houses, and as soon as they have fulfilled their daily task are conducted back thither again by the angel who directs their course. It is to be feared he regards those as heretics (c. 113), who call the days of the week by their heathen names, instead of the scriptural names first day, second day, &c.; and some of his transcribers have rebelled on being asked to write down those as heretics who believe (c. 154) that the ravens brought flesh as well as bread to Elijah, who surely would never have used animal food. On the other hand, it is not true that all the heresies enumerated by Philaster, but unnoticed by Epiphanius, are such that omission can be accounted for by a difference of opinion as to what is heresy. When Augustine, at length yielding to his correspondent's request, wrote a short treatise on heresies, he first gives an abstract of the sixty post-Christian heresies discussed by Epiphanius, and then adds a list of twenty-three more taken from Philastrius, remarking that this author gives others also, but that he himself does not regard them as heresies.

The question of the relation between Philaster and Epiphanius has of late years become important, in consequence of the theory of Lipsius which is now generally accepted, and which has been explained in the article HIPPOLYTUS, Vol. III. 94, viz., that both writers drew from a common source, namely, the earlier treatise of Hippolytus against heresies. In order to establish this theory it is necessary to exclude the supposition of a direct use of Epiphanius by Philaster, which might seem the more obvious way of accounting for coincidences between the two writers.

From what has been said above as to the duration of Philaster's life, it is seen to be chronologically possible for him to have read the treatise of Epiphanius which appeared in 376 or 377. At what period of his life his own work was written we cannot tell. The notes of time in it are confusing. In c. 112 he counts bad chronology as a heresy; but if so, his own orthodoxy is questionable: for he places his own date (c. 106) over 400 years after Christ, and (c. 112) about 430. Possibly his transcribers are in fault, but the blunder is as likely to have been his own. In c. 83 he speaks of the Donatists, "qui Parmeniani nunc appellantur a Parmenione quodam qui eorum nuper successit

erroribus et falsitati." Parmenianus became Donatist bishop of Carthage about A.D. 368, and died in 391; and the "nuper" would lead us to think that Philaster wrote early in this episcopate. But the form Parmenio, if it be not a transcriber's error, seems to show that Philaster knew little of African affairs. The mention of Praxeas and Hermogenes as African heretics (c. 54) is accounted for by Lipsius through Philaster's having got their names from Tertullian. Philaster's anonymous heresy (c. 84) seems plainly to have been identified by Augustine (*Haer.* 70) with Priscillianism, the breaking out of which is dated in Prosper's Chronicle A.D. 379. But Philaster's silence as to the name Priscillian seems to indicate an earlier date.

But whether or not it were chronologically possible for Philaster to have used the work of Epiphanius, the complete independence of his treatment shows that actually he did not use it. Eager as he was to swell his list of heresies, he makes no mention of Archontici, Severiani, Encratitae, Pepuziani, Adamiani, Bardesianistae, and others, with whom Epiphanius would have made him acquainted; and in the discussion of all heresies later than Hippolytus, which are common to Epiphanius and Philaster, the two writers neither agree in their matter nor in the order of arrangement. Hence Lipsius inferred that the agreements in the two writers as to earlier heresies is to be explained by the use by both of a common source. This also accounts for a striking common feature, namely, the enumeration by both of pre-Christian heresies. Hegesippus (see Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22) had spoken of seven Jewish sects (τῶν ἑπτὰ αἱρέσεων), and had given their names. And it would seem from the opening of the tract of Pseudo-Tertullian that Hippolytus began his treatise by declining to treat of Jewish heresies. His two successors then might easily have been tempted to improve on their original by including in their plan pre-Christian heresies.

Concerning the New Testament Canon, Philaster states (c. 88) that it had been ordained by the apostles and their successors that nothing should be read in the Catholic Church but the law, the prophets, and the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, 13 Epistles of St. Paul, and the seven other epistles which are joined to the Acts of the Apostles. The omission from this list of the Apocalypse and the Epistle to the Hebrews seems intended only to exclude them from public church reading. In c. 60 he treats as heretical the denial that the Apocalypse is St. John's, and in c. 69 the denial that the Epistle to the Hebrews is St. Paul's. He accounts for difficulties raised as to the reception of the latter as arising from its speaking of our Lord as "made" (c. iii. 2), and from the apparent countenance given to Novatianism in cc. vi. 4, x. 26. Consequently the public reading of this epistle is not universal: "[leguntur] tredecim epistolae ipsius, et ad Hebraeos interdum."

The first printed edition of Philaster appeared at Basle in 1539; the most noteworthy of subsequent editions are one by Fabricius in 1721 containing an improved text and a valuable commentary; and one by Galeardus in 1738, giving from a Corbey MS. now in St. Petersburg, chapters on six heresies, which had been omitted in previous editions, but which are required to make up the total number of heresies to the 156 mentioned by St. Augustine. This complete text has been reprinted by Oehler in his *Corpus Haeresiologum*, vol. i. [G. S.]

PHILEAS, Feb. 4. Bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, and martyr A.D. 306. He was a very learned man. He suffered under Calcianus, as told in his acts in Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 548; cf. Le Blant, *Les Actes des Martyrs*, p. 55, 113, where their authenticity is defended. (Combefis. *Lecti Triumphi*, p. 185.) Eusebius (*H. E.* viii. 10) quotes a description of the sufferings of the martyrs from an Epistle addressed by Phileas to his own church. This Epistle may relate to the severe measures of Armenius, governor of Egypt, described in the Coptic Acts of St. Coluthus, published by Georgius. [MARMENIA.] We conclude from Eusebius's words, *l.c.* cap. ix., "the judge himself entreated them that they should have compassion on their children and wives," that Phileas was a married man. [PHILOROMUS.] He is probably the Phileas mentioned again by Eusebius (viii. 13). [G. T. S.]

PHILEMON (1), March 8. A flute player who was converted by the patience of the martyr Apollonius. He suffered torture with him at the city of Antinoüs. Their constancy converted the magistrate Arianus who tortured them. All three were thence transferred to Alexandria, where the prefect ordered them to be drowned, probably about A.D. 303. (Rufin. *de Vitis Patr.* cap. 19; Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 539; Ceill. iii. 49; Le Blant, *Actes des MM.* p. 48, 157.) [G. T. S.]

PHILEMON (2), extolled by St. Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 183), and another addressed by St. Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 190). [G. W. D.]

PHILEMON (3), one of two presbyters of Rome who, probably in a vacancy of the see, corresponded with Dionysius bishop of Alexandria, on the question of re-baptism (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* vii. 5, 7). [G. W. D.]

PHILETUS, the tenth bishop of Antioch, A.D. 218–229 (Clinton), the successor of Asclepiades, succeeded by Zebinus (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 21; Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* ii. 548). [E. V.]

PHILIBERTUS (PHILBERTUS, FILIBERTUS), **ST.**, founder and first abbat of Gemeticum (Jumièges) in the diocese of Rouen and Herense (Hermoutier, now Noirmoutier) in Poitou, and founder or assistant-founder of the priory of Quinciacum (St. Benoît-de-Quincy), near Poitiers and the nunneries of Pauliacum and Villare (Montivilliers), lived in the 7th century (circ. A.D. 616–684). We have a biography of him, as to which the critics are divided. Dom, Rivet, and others believe it to have been written by a monk of Jumièges within twenty-five years of Philibertus's death, who, though not an eyewitness, derived his information from one who was, with the style retouched by another author of about the same date. The version we have is this improved one, with, however, the original *prologus* (*Hist. Litt.* iv. 43–44). Others think the biography the work of Ermentarius, or Hermentarius, a monk of Hermoutier in the 9th century, who undoubtedly wrote an account of

the miracles performed by the saint's relics (Ceillier, xii. 552–553). It was published by Mabillon (*Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* ii. 818–825, Paris, 1669), and is also to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. iv. 75–80.

According to its story, Philibertus was born in the district of Elusa (near Eauze in Gascony) and was brought up at Vicus Julius (Aire), where his father Filibaudus was bishop. Sent in boyhood to king Dagobert's court, he came under the notice of St. Ouen. At the age of twenty he elected to become a monk, and received the tonsure from Agilus, abbat of Rebais, a monastery built by Ouen, and on Agilus's death was chosen to fill his place. To acquaint himself with the best monastic institutions, he visited many foundations through France, Italy and Burgundy, under different rules, and on his return, having resolved to build a monastery of his own, begged from Clovis II. and his pious queen Baldechildis (Balthildis) a spot called Gemeticum in the district of Rouen, and there founded the well-known monastery of that name (A.D. 655). Later on he built the nunnery of Pauliacum at about 10 miles distance, and made Austroberta first abbess. His example caused monasteries to spring up in Neustria, while his own flock was constantly swelled by fresh accessions of priests and men of rank. A quarrel with Ebroin, by whom he was first imprisoned and then driven into exile extended his influence into Poitou. The letters he brought from St. Ouen induced Ansoaldus, bishop of Poitiers, to permit the foundation of a monastery in the isle of Herium. Here he remained till the death of Ebroin (A.D. 681) opened Neustria again to him, when he returned to Jumièges. The gift of a township in the Caux district, now enabled him to found another nunnery, Villare (Montivilliers). He soon, however, returned to Ansoaldus at Poitiers and then visited Quinciacum, near Poitou, where he helped to found a priory, Saint-Benoît-de-Quincy (cf. *Gall. Christ.* ii. 1289 for this foundation). The rest of his life he spent at Herium, setting Aicadrus over Jumièges, and another disciple over Quincy. The day of his death and commemoration is given as Aug. 20, on which he is marked by Usuard and other ancient hagiologists (see Boll. *ibid.* p. 67). The year is conjectured to be 684.

From allusions to him in the biographies of contemporary saints we learn that he made large gifts to Rebais, where he served his novitiate (*Vita S. Agili*, Mab. *ibid.* p. 324), that he was a friend and guest of St. Wandrigisilus at Fontanelle (*Vita S. Wand.* Mab. *ibid.* p. 542), and that his influence with queen Balthildis obtained considerable endowments for Jumièges (*Vita S. Balth.* Mab. *ibid.* p. 780), while the biographer of his successor Aicadrus calls him "omnium sanctorum in Neustria famosissimus" (*Vita S. Aicadri*, Mab. *ibid.* p. 957), and in an inscription by Alcuin for an altar he is coupled with St. Agatha, and characterized as "plurima construxit qui loca sancta deo" (Carm. lxxvi., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* ci. 747).

For the history of the saint's relics, which is almost as eventful as his life, see the narrative of Hermentarius (Boll. *ibid.* 81–95; cf. Ceillier, xii. 552, 3), and the supplementary account of Falco, who lived in the 11th century (p. 73, cf. Ceillier, xiii. 464). They finally rested at Tournus. [S. A. B.]

PHILIMATIA (FILIMATIA), a Gallic lady of rank, whose epitaph was written by Sidonius Apollinaris. He eulogizes her as wife, mistress, mother, and daughter (*Epist.* ii. 8). [S. A. B.]

PHILIMATIUS, a friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, who writes to advise him to accept the post of assessor of the prefect of Gaul which had been offered him (*Epist.* i. 3). Another letter written to Eriphius, contains an account of the festival of St. Justus at Lyons, a most interesting picture of the social life of the 5th century in Gaul. Philimatius, though advanced in age, bears a part in the youthful sports, which follow the service, and is gently quizzed by Sidonius (*Epist.* v. 17). [S. A. B.]

PHILIPPICUS (PHILEPICUS, originally called BARDANES), emperor of Constantinople from Dec. 711 to June 713. He was a Monothelite, and therefore deposed the orthodox patriarch Cyrus, and put the heretic John in his stead. He imprisoned Cyrus in the monastery of Chora, which he had founded. [CYRUS (5)]; [JOANNES (128)]. He abolished and burned the official copy of the acts of the sixth General Council, and reinstated in the diptychs the anathematized names of Sergius and Honorius. His political history will be found in the DICT. OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOG. (Theophanes, pp. 311, 316–321; Ceill. xii. 23.) [G. T. S.]

PHILIPPUS (1), of Tralles, Asiarch at the time of the martyrdom of POLYCARP; see p. 429. In the place referred to it is stated that the historic reality of this Philip has been confirmed by an inscription found at Olympia. It may here be added that Lightfoot (*Ignatius*, i. 613) has printed two new inscriptions relating to this Philip, and also by means of his full name, Caius Julius Philippus, given in the first mentioned inscription, has identified him with the subject of three other previously known inscriptions. Philip is thus proved to have been a well-known man of great wealth and munificence. Lightfoot (*u. s.*) shows that the date of his tenure of office indicated by these inscriptions is quite reconcileable with the date otherwise determined, of the martyrdom of Polycarp; and without any necessity to have recourse to the perfectly admissible supposition, that Philip held the office of Asiarch more than once. Concerning the office, see Lightfoot, ii. 990, where among other things it is shown that the holder was 'high-priest of the province of Asia,' and that his tenure of office was probably four years. [G. S.]

PHILIPPUS (2), the ninth bishop of Jerusalem, of the purely Jewish succession. According to Eutychius and the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, his predecessor Tobias held office for three years from A.D. 121, and his successor Seneca began his episcopate in A.D. 125, so that Philip's episcopate was limited to four years (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 5; *Chron. Armen. Euseb.*). [E. V.]

PHILIPPUS (3), interlocutor with Bardesanes (Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* vi. 10; Tillem. ii. 455). [BARDAISAN, p. 257 *a*.] [C. H.]

PHILIPPUS (4), bishop of Gortyna, in Crete, at the beginning of the last quarter of the second century, and author of an able confutation of the heresy of Marcion, a work now only known to us by the favourable report of Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 21, 23, 25). He was mentioned as bishop in the letter addressed by DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH to the church of Gortyna (see that article). [G. S.]

PHILIPPUS (5), THE ARABIAN, emperor, a native of Bostra in Trachonitis, was a man of low birth. His father was said to have been a famous robber chief (Victor, *Epitome*). Having been made pretorian prefect he supplanted the younger Gordian in the affections of the soldiers, and caused him to be deposed and put to death in March A.D. 244. [GORDIANUS (1).] After making peace with Sapor the Persian king, he proceeded to Rome. To strengthen his authority he made his brother Priscus and his relation Severianus respectively commander of the troops in Syria and in Macedonia and Moesia. He attacked the Carpi, a barbarous tribe, who had committed ravages on the Danube, and defeated them, but granted them a peace on easy terms. In A.D. 248, the games to celebrate the thousandth anniversary of the foundation of Rome were celebrated with great splendour. In the summer of the following year Philip was defeated by Decius near Verona and slain, and his young son Philip, whom he had associated with himself in the empire, was also put to death. [DECIUS.] The authorities for the reign of this emperor are of the most meagre and conflicting character. The only thing that makes it important is the report that he was the first Christian emperor. Almost the only foundation for this is the narrative which Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 34) gives without vouching for its truth, namely, that Philip being a Christian wished at Easter to join in the prayers with the congregation, but that on account of the many crimes he had committed the bishop of the place refused to allow him before he had confessed and taken his place among the penitents, and that he willingly obeyed. Here neither the place nor the name of the bishop is mentioned. The latter is supplied by Leontius, bishop of Antioch about A.D. 348 (quoted in *Chron. Pasch.* 270, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xcii. 668), who states it was St. Babylas, of Antioch. He also gives a very inaccurate account of Philip's crime—that he had been praetorian prefect under Gordian, who at his death had left him guardian of his son, and that Philip had murdered the latter and seized on the empire. Philostorgius (*H. E.* vii. 8, in *Patr. Gr.* lxv. 545) tells a similar story, but according to him the emperor was Numerian or Decius, who were certainly heathens. Similarly in St. Chrysostom (*Liber in S. Babylam*, 5, in *Patr. Gr.* l. 560), the emperor is the one that put St. Babylas to death, and is therefore Decius. We are also told that Origen wrote to Philip and the empress (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 36), but the letters are not preserved, nor do we know what they contained. St. Jerome also (*Chronicon* and *de Viris Ill.* 54) calls Philip the first of all Christian emperors, in which he is followed by Orosius; and Dionysius of Alexandria (Eus. *H. E.* vii. 10) speaks of emperors before Valerian who were reputed to be Christians, but does not mention their names. Against this doubtful testimony must be set the following facts. (i.) Constantine is called by Eusebius (*V. Cons.* i. 3) the first Christian emperor. (ii.) No event, with the exception of his alleged penitence at Antioch, is recorded of Philip that implies he was a Christian. (iii.) He celebrated the millennial games with heathen rites. (iv.) He deified his predecessor and was himself deified after death. (v.) No heathen writer mentions that he was a Christian. (vi.) A year before Decius issued his edict against the Christians, and therefore while Philip was still reigning, a violent persecution had broken out at Alexandria (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 41), which would not have been allowed to go on had the emperor really been a Christian. It seems therefore safest to conclude with Clinton, who sums up the whole of the evidence (*Fasti Rom.* ii. 51), that Philip was not a Christian. It may be asked is there any foundation for the story of Philip and St. Babylas? An indirect confirmation is given by the date, as Philip may very possibly have been at Antioch at Easter, A.D. 244, on his return to Rome after Gordian's death. The form which the conversion of Constantine assumes in the narrative of Zosimus (ii. 29), the bitter enemy of Christianity, shows in what a distorted aspect the Christian doctrine of remission of sins might appear to the eyes of a pagan. It is possible that Philip, feeling remorse for the way he had treated Gordian, and believing that Babylas was able to purify him from his guilt, really did make some application to him, and that this is the kernel round which the story has grown up; but it seems impossible to say with any certainty what parts of it, if any, are genuine and what are fictitious. It should be mentioned to Philip's credit that he was the first emperor who tried to check the grosser forms of vice at Rome (Lampridius, *V. Heliogabali*, 31; *V. Severi*, 23), though his efforts were unsuccessful (Victor *de Caesaribus*, c. 28). (Zosimus, i. 18–22; *Vita Gordiani Tertii*, c. 28–33; Tillemont, *M. E.* iii. 262; Gibbon, c. 7, 10, 16.) [F. D.]

PHILIPPUS (6), Oct. 22. Bishop of Heraclea in Thrace and martyr in the Diocletian persecution about A.D. 304 with Severus, a presbyter, and Hermes a deacon. His acts present one of the most vivid and minute pictures we possess of that persecution, and are often quoted as such by Le Blant in his *Actes des Martyrs*, e.g. pp. 12, 41, 52, 54, &c., where many incidental marks of authenticity are pointed out. The various steps adopted in this persecution can be clearly traced in this narrative, the arrest of the clergy, the seizure and destruction of the sacred writings and vessels, and finally the torture and death of the martyrs. Philip was arrested and examined by a president Bassus, who then committed him to the free custody of one Pancratus (c. vii.). Bassus was soon succeeded by a certain Justinus, who was much more stern towards the Christians than his predecessor, whose wife was a Christian. After some time Justinus brought them to Adrianople, and there burned Philip and Hermes on the same day. (Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 442.) [G. T. S.]

PHILIPPUS (7), FLAVIUS, pretorian prefect of the East, an Arian, and hostile to Athanasius (*Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* 51) in the reign of Constantius, described by Socrates as wielding

immense power and styled δεύτερος μετα βασιλέα, second to the emperor alone. He was addressed as pretorian prefect in a law of June 9, 340, was consul in 348, and in 350 acted in the campaign against Magnentius (Clinton, *F. R.* i. 402, 412, 420). In 342 (Tillem. vii. 256) he received instructions at Constantinople from the emperor at Antioch for the expulsion of the orthodox patriarch (Soc. ii. 16; Soz. iii. 9). [PAULUS (18).] Athanasius (*Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 51) speaks of him as an enemy to him after the death of Constans. In less than a year from the death of Paulus, which may be placed on Nov. 6, 350 (Tillem. vii. 359), in 351, therefore, Philippus was deposed from his dignities, exposed to public insults, and died miserably (Athan. *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* 7). Tillemont (vii. 698, 699) discusses the chronology, in which he differs from Valesius (in his notes to Soc. and Soz.) and Baronius. [C. H.]

PHILIPPUS (8), superior of a coenobium at Jerusalem in 362, who sent some of the supposed relics of St. John the Baptist to St. Athanasius at Alexandria. (Rufin. *H. E.* ii. 28; Tillem. vii. 361, viii. 213.) [C. H.]

PHILIPPUS (9), of Side, an ecclesiastical historian who flourished at the commencement of the fifth century. He was a native of the maritime town of Side in Pamphylia, the birthplace of Troilus the celebrated sophist, whose kinsman he was proud of reckoning himself. Cave states (*Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 39) that Philip while still a young man presided over the ecclesiastical school at Alexandria in which he had been taught, and subsequently removed to his native place Side, but there appears to be no sufficient ground for this statement. The transference to Side seems to have been effected by Philip's teacher, Rhodon the successor of Didymus, led thereto probably by his pupil's influence. The removal was fatal to the prosperity of the school, of which (Schröckh, *Christlich. Geschicht.* vii. p. 8) we hear no more. We find Philippus afterwards at Constantinople, where he enjoyed the intimacy of Chrysostom, by whom he was admitted to the diaconate. Tillemont says of him that he was rather the imitator of Chrysostom's eloquence than of his virtues, and that the imitation was a very poor one. Philippus entertained a very high opinion of his own learning and of his claims to ecclesiastical advancement. On the death of Atticus, A.D. 425, by whom he had been ordained presbyter, Philippus was a candidate for the vacant see, and found a number of influential supporters (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 27). The preference of Sisinnius caused him extreme mortification, which he had the weakness to publish to the world in his "Christian History," into which he introduced a violent tirade reflecting on the character both of the elected and the electors, more particularly the lay supporters of Sisinnius. The bitterness of his invectives and the rashness of the charges alleged are noticed by Socrates, who regarded them as undeserving of the slightest mention in his history (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 26). Not discouraged by his failures Philippus was again put forward as a candidate, both after the death of Sisinnius, A.D. 428, and on the deposition of Nestorius in A.D. 431. On both occasions he had a considerable and energetic party in his favour (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 29, 35). On neither occasion, it is needless to say, was he successful in obtaining the position for which he was eminently unfitted, and he died a simple presbyter. The chief work written by Philippus was entitled, "a Christian History," Χριστιανικὴ Ἱστορία. It was a vast and elaborate work divided into thirty-six books, each containing between twenty and thirty chapters, making full a thousand in all. It began with the creation, and was carried down to his own times. With the exception of one or two fragments the whole is lost. The description of it given by Socrates (*H. E.* vii. 27) and Photius (*Cod.* 35) shows that its loss is not to be regretted on literary grounds; and though if it had come down to us we should have known much more of the times in which he lived, his credit for veracity is so small that in him we should have had a very untrustworthy guide. His history is described as a very diffuse, ill-managed collection of heterogeneous materials, gathered from all sources and piled together rather for the display of his multifarious reading and his universal knowledge than for the purpose of instruction. Socrates describes it as a medley of theorems in geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and music, together with descriptions of islands and mountains and trees and other matters of little moment. The chronological order of events being constantly disregarded, the result was a very loose work valueless alike to the learned and the unlearned; the latter being incapable of appreciating the ornate and pompous style, while the former were disgusted with his wearisome tautology. Photius's estimate of the book is equally low—"diffuse; neither witty nor elegant; written more for display than usefulness; wearisome and unpleasing; full of undigested learning, with very little bearing on history at all, still less on Christian history" (Phot. *Cod.* 35). A rather important fragment relating to the school of Alexandria and the succession of the teachers, has been printed by Dodwell at the close of his dissertations on Irenaeus, Oxon. 1689. Of this Neander writes: "The known untrustworthiness of this author; the discrepancy between his statements and other more authentic reports; and the suspicious condition in which the fragment has come down to us, render his details unworthy of confidence" (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 460, Clark's transl.). Another considerable fragment is reported to exist in the Imperial Library at Vienna, entitled *de Christi Nativitate, et de Magis*, giving the acts of a disputation held in Persia concerning Christianity between certain Persians and Christians, at which Philip was himself present. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xii. 431; *Hist. des Empereurs*, vi. 130; Cave, *Hist. Lat.* i. 395; Photius, *Cod.* 35; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* vi. 112, lib. v. c. 4 § 28.) [E. V.]

PHILIPPUS (10), one of Chrysostom's adherents who died in exile in Pontus before 408. (Pallad. p. 196.) [E. V.]

PHILIPPUS (11), an ascetic, presbyter of the schools of the clergy at Constantinople, deprived of his employment for his adherence to

Chrysostom, from whom he received a consolatory letter (Chrys. *Ep.* 213). He retired to Campania, where he was reported to be sick when Palladius wrote in 408. (Pallad. p. 196.) [E. V.]

PHILIPPUS (12), a priest, present as legate of pope Zosimus with Faustinus and Asellus at the council of Carthage, held on May 25th, A.D. 419, the canons of which he subscribes. (Mansi, iv. 433.) [F. D.]

PHILIPPUS (13), prefect of Eastern Illyricum, to whom an edict was directed in 421 ordering that if any question arose about ecclesiastical affairs it was to be referred to the patriarch of Constantinople, as enjoying all the rights and privileges of Old Rome (*Cod. Theod.* t. vi. lib. xvi. tit. ii. lex 45, ed. Gothofred; lib. xvi. tit. viii. l. 21, *de Judaeis*), is also addressed to him. It orders him to protect the Jews from violence. [G. T. S.]

PHILIPPUS (14), a priest, present as legate of pope Celestine with the bishops Arcadius and Projectus at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431 (Mansi, iv. 1281). They were not in time for the first session on June 22nd, at which Nestorius was deposed, but were present at the second on July 10th, and ratified the proceedings of the first. He was afterwards one of the deputation sent by the council to the emperor (Mansi, iv. 1458). The Nestorians afterwards circulated a letter forged in the name of Philippus, asserting that pope Sixtus was displeased at the deposition of Nestorius (Mansi, v. 326). This Philippus is probably the same person as num. (12). [F. D.]

PHILIPPUS (15). priest, who according to Gennadius (*Vir. Ill.* 62) was a disciple of Jerome, and died in the reigns of Marcian and Avitus, *i.e.* A.D. 455–6, having written a commentary on Job and some familiar letters. The interlinear commentary on Job printed with Jerome's works (*Pat. Lat.* xxiii. 1401 and the *Admonitio* prefixed) is believed by some to be that of Philippus; but there is another, which used to be attributed to Bede, in the early folio editions of whose works it may be seen (Basil. 1563, t. iv. p. 602; Colon. 1612, t. iv. p. 447), and this is cited as Philippus's by Bede himself in cap. iv. *De Rat. Unciarum*, of his *De Rat. Temporum* (*Opp.* ed. Giles, t. vi. p. 148). See more in Fabric. *Bibl. Lat.* ed. Mansi, v. 295; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 434; Ceill. vii. 564, x. 472; Bede, *Opp.* ed. Giles, t. ix. *Praef.* p. x.; Tillem. xii. 351, 661. [C. H.]

PHILIPPUS (16), bishop, to whom with four other bishops of Epirus, Gregory the Great in A.D. 595 signified his approval of the election of Andreas as bishop of Nicopolis and metropolitan (*Epp.* vi. 8). [F. D.]

PHILIPPUS (17), priest apparently in Palestine, to whom Gregory the Great wrote in May A.D. 603, acknowledging his letter, which announced the death of the priest Andreas, sending him 50 solidi, and asking for his prayers (*Epp.* xiii. 29). [F. D.]

PHILIPPUS (18), comes excubitorum, or commander of the imperial body-guard. Gregory the Great wrote to him early in A.D. 591, explaining why he had accepted the pontificate (*Epp.* i. 32). [F. D.]

PHILIPPUS (19), a monk of the monastery of St. Vitus in Rome, set up in opposition to the usurping pope Constantine after the death of Paulus, A.D. 768. For an account of the temporary intrusion of Constantine into the see by his brother Toto, duke of Nepi, see CONSTANTINUS II., p. 658. The Primicerius Christophorus and his son Sergius, who had gone to the Lombard king Desiderius to solicit aid against the usurper, had returned to Rome, and had succeeded in entering the city, July 29, accompanied by a presbyter called Waldipert, apparently a Lombard, and other Lombards, who had joined them. Duke Toto, with his brother Passivus, being in Rome at the time, had attacked the invaders; but the former had been slain, and the latter had fled to his remaining brother, the usurping pope, in the Lateran, and both had been seized and placed under guard. During the confusion that ensued Waldipert, with a party of Romans, but without the knowledge of Christophorus and Sergius, entered the monastery of St. Vitus, and brought out thence a presbyter called Philip, whom they elected and proclaimed as pope. Why this man was selected we are not told: he may have been a Lombard, known to Waldipert, who hoped thus to elevate one of his own nation to the papal chair. The poor man's greatness was, however, of very short duration. He was conducted with the usual forms to the Lateran, gave the accustomed blessing to the people from the pontifical chair, and afterwards entertained at table some of the notables of Rome. But shortly (probably on the following day), Christophorus, having become aware of what had been done, arrived in great wrath, and swore before the people that he would not depart from Rome till Philip was expelled from the Lateran. He was accordingly forthwith expelled, and, in great trepidation, "descending by a ladder that led to a bath," returned to his monastery. After this no more is heard of him. Having been, apparently, only a passive tool, he seems to have escaped the vengeance that afterwards fell on others, including Waldipert, who is said to have taken refuge in the Pantheon, to have been condemned to have his eyes and tongue pulled out, and to have died in consequence. The whole account, as above given, is from Anastasius. (*Lib. Pontif.* in vit. Stephan. III.) [J. B—Y.]

PHILO (1) (Φίλων), better known as PHILO JUDAEUS (Hieron., *de viris illustr.* c. 11).[a] In Jewish writings—where, very significantly, his works are not mentioned from the time of Josephus to Azaryah de Rossi (1511–1578), who treats of him in his celebrated work *Meor Enayim*[b]—he is called Yedidyah ha-Alakh-

[a] There was an older Jewish Philo, and yet others of that name, notably the deacon Philo, from Cilicia, and also a bishop, mentioned by Polybius in his life of Epiphanius (c. 49), probably the same as the Φίλων Καρπάθιος whom Suidas mentions as the author of a commentary on Canticles. This Philo was made bishop of Carpasia in the island of Cyprus in A.D. 401.

[b] Part II. (Imré Bhinah) Sect. I. (Per. III.–VI.), and also Sects. III. and IV. The notice of Philo in the work known as *Shalsheleth ha-Kabbalah* is without any value.

sanderi. But we do not imagine that Philo really had this as his second or Jewish name; still less, that the name Philo was intended as the Greek equivalent for Yedidyah, since the use of foreign (Greek) names was so common, especially among extra-Palestinian Jews, that it was an admitted legal principle: "The names of Israelites outside Palestine are like those of the Gentiles" (Jer. Gitt. 43*b*, lines 4 and 5 from top). The vindication of a survey of the life, and of the writings and system, of Philo in a work on *Christian Biography and Doctrines*, lies not only in the copious references and the important place assigned to him by Eusebius, by St. Jerome, and other church-writers, but in the relation between the works of Philo and the Apostolic writings; in the bearing of his teaching on the church in the time of her planting; and, lastly, in the influence which he exercised on a certain direction of Christian thought.

I. *Predecessors of Philo: Historical Development of Hellenism.*

As the interest attaching to Philo greatly depends on his connection with Hellenism, of which he was the last and fullest exponent, it seems desirable to preface this account of him by a sketch of the theological direction of which he was the most distinguished representative. We have called it a direction rather than a system, because it was not so much the outcome of independent thinking as the issue of a current of thought. There was nothing strictly systematic about it, unless it were in the application of its principle, which was that of Judaeo-Hellenic eclecticism. Its underlying idea was to combine two apparently incompatible directions: the faith of the synagogue and the thinking of Greece. To the Hellenists both were very real. Neither one nor the other could be surrendered. It can scarcely be said that in the issue the substance and spirit were derived from Judaism, the form from Greece. Rather does it often seem as if the substance had been Greek and only the form Hebrew. Yet not in its fundamental theologumena, which were of the Old Testament. In truth, the educated Jews of the West found themselves Hebrews by birth, upbringing, religious profession, and even conviction—at least in its negative aspect, with reference to heathenism. On the other hand, they had by association and education become Grecian in the modes and results of their thinking. The welding of these two was Hellenism or Alexandrianism.

If it be true that every special theological view forms part of, and influences, all others, and again that a theological direction cannot be fully understood apart from the whole current of contemporary thinking: this holds specially good of Hellenism. The Jewish world had issued from the Babylonish exile in two directions—not only geographically, but, partly in consequence of it, mentally also and theologically. One branch of the old Hebrew stock returned to Palestine. They were in every sense the minority: in numbers, in wealth, influence, and culture. On the other hand, they represented the intense religious element in Israel. Yet they could neither reproduce the old, nor restore it, even if they had clearly apprehended its character. The old development had come to a close with the deportation to Babylon. The exiles had been torn from their old associations; their former religious worship had been rendered impossible; and they had to find for themselves not only new forms but a new direction, suited to the new conditions. They had gone into exile Hebrews; they returned Jews. But the very earnestness of religious purpose, which alone could prompt their return to Palestine in the then condition of the land and people, might prove misleading. Close adherence to the law might lead to one-sided elaboration of its letter; separation from the heathen to narrow-minded exclusiveness; and belief in the divine calling, instruction, and mission of Israel to what afterwards became the worst characteristics of Pharisaism. And this direction once entered upon, all the surrounding circumstances would favour its progress. Even the physical condition of Judaea, shut off from the busy world by walls of limestone-rock or by dreary wilderness, would discourage free intercourse, be unfavourable to agriculture or commerce, and turn mind and imagination inwards. When it was attempted to force on Israel heathen manners, and to modify, if not suppress, their God-given religion, it would only rouse to more fierce resistance. If Israel was despised, down-trodden, and hardly bestead of the Gentiles, all the more intense would grow the consciousness of spiritual and even moral superiority, of a divine dignity that could never be brought into comparison with aught in the heathen world, and of a future, transcendent not only in spiritual but even in outward glory. Pride, not to say boast, of nationality was only one consequence. The other and far wider reaching was intense occupation with all that was Jewish, and the development of Judaism in every possible direction. The system of Rabbinic traditionalism which was its outcome was a kind of theological hypochondria in which every conceivable danger had been anticipated and sought to be avoided, and in which every symptom was watched and provided for. And the man who was learned had to know the true medicine, especially the Rabbi. For the real priesthood of this religion were the Rabbis. Naturally the unlearned, the "country people," were despised and hated. The ignorant could not be thoroughly Jewish, and their direction would eventually approximate to heathenism. The saying recorded in the New Testament: "This people who knoweth not the law are cursed" (St. John vii. 49), has its exact counterpart in that which, significantly, is ascribed to the great Hillel,[a] the father of Jewish traditionalism: "The unlettered cannot fear God, nor yet the ignorant [the *am ha-arets*] be pious" (Ab. ii. 5). For, in truth, if they had been pious, they would not have been ignorant of that which to the Pharisee contained everything worth knowing. When the near kinsman of a great Rabbi enquired of him whether having mastered all Jewish lore he might not turn to that of the Gentile world, the teacher, referring to Ps. i. 2, bade him enquire what hour was not of the day nor night, that he might devote

[a] Even in theological controversy it seems almost incredible boldness on the part of Jewish writers to ignore this saying of Hillel.

it to study that was not of the law. For to Judaism the exclusion of everything non-Jewish was a condition of its existence. To have admitted the foreign element would have been to begin a contest in which, as all experience, past and present, has shown, traditionalism must have been fatally worsted. In all sober earnest and conscientious sincerity, the last word of Palestinian Judaism to the Gentile world must be: *Non possumus!*

If this holds true of Palestinian Judaism and of the Eastern branch of the "dispersion," another stream of the Jewish "diaspora" flowed in a quite different direction. It were impossible to trace the beginnings of the Jewish settlements in the West. Commercial intercourse, local circumstances, political necessities, and the love of wandering or the search after wealth, may all have contributed to increase their number. In that direction was the centre of power; thither flowed the wealth and learning of the world, and thence pulsated its life-blood. Already a century and a half before our era the Western diaspora could be described as "covering every country and every sea" (*Orac. Sibyll.* III. 271). It was only natural that these Jewish strangers should cling with every heart-fibre to the religion of their fathers, brooding with fond memory upon the glories of the past, or dreaming of those of the future that stood out in such bright contrast to their present. Jerusalem was not only the home of their fathers and the capital of their people, but also their religious centre. There was the only place of lawful sacrifice; thence issued the law; and thither turned their thoughts, even their attitude, in prayer. Some time or other to visit it in religious pilgrimage must have been a pious hope to which few could have been strangers, even as all shared in the sacred duty of contributing to its temple, in the services of which all had a part, since its sacrifices were offered not only for the worshippers present but for all Israel, however widely dispersed. Yet there were influences at work which widely separated the Western Jews from the home and centre of their faith in Palestine. To begin with, the language which they heard and spoke was different. Few of them could have any real knowledge of Hebrew, and it is probable that the services of the synagogue and the reading of the Scriptures were in Greek, even as we know this to have been the prescribed language for the more private and personal offices. Nor could foreign culture be shut out. In Palestine what first met, and continually compassed them, was Jewish; in the Western dispersion it was Greek. In these circumstances the Palestinian *non possumus* was itself and absolutely impossible.

When once this point was reached, perhaps unconsciously, its logical sequences could not be avoided or evaded. The cultured Jew could not withdraw himself from the influence of Greek thought. The better he knew, the more he liked it. Its very novelty and strangeness had attractions. There could not be doubt that much in it was true, divine. But then he was a Jew, and the law which Moses had brought had come directly from God; Israel had been called of God; their whole history, especially in its beginnings, had been under the direct guidance of God, and hence eternal in its lessons. The synagogue had stood on one side from the heathen world, and condemned it. That might apply to the outside appearance of it, as represented by the populace. But it was not true as regarded its inner meaning and deeper Divine truths. One Divine revelation could not contradict the other. Penetrate beneath the letter of Scripture, understand the import of its allegoric teaching which adapted Divine truth to the capacities of men—to their intellectual standpoint, and it would be seen that the revelation to Israel and the truths of Greek philosophy accorded. They had come from the same Divine source; only, all fulness was in revelation, strictly so called, and merely partial or broken rays in Greek philosophy. The synagogue might look only at the letter of the Scriptures, and at the outside of the Greek world, and shrink back with its *non possumus.* The Greek world might similarly look at the outside of the Scriptures and the surface of the Jewish world, and contemptuously turn aside with a *non volumus.* But there was higher and deeper truth than either found on the surface. He was the true Israelite who penetrated beyond the letter to the spirit. And the further he penetrated, the richer the ore that was laid bare to him, and the more did he perceive that it was the true precious metal, which was also the riches of philosophic thinking.

And yet the Hellenist would deem himself only the better Jew for this discovery. For if to cleave to the letter alone would have been purblindness, still to relinquish the letter which itself was true, and which opened up much deeper truths, would have been madness and sin. Thus, although in quite another manner, and in a far different spirit from St. Paul's, Hellenism would show that although the Jew had every way the vantage, yet He was the God, not of the Jew only, but also of the Gentile. Hellenism was noble in its aim, however faulty in its method. It sought to conciliate the two developments which for long centuries had proceeded independently, separately, as it might seem, hostilely. Standing between the *non possumus* of Palestine and the *non volumus* of the Greek world, it stretched a hand to each, and would fain have brought them together. That could not be, and so Hellenism failed of the success it sought, although certainly not of all success. St. Paul achieved what Alexandrianism aimed at. He began, not by combining the two, but by acknowledging the Divine in each, and he traced it, through the common poverty, the common need, and the common aspirations of both, up to the common provision of the God and Father of us all.

It will have been noticed that the method by which Hellenism reached its results was that of allegorical interpretation. We can scarcely call this Greek, since it is more or less common to all ancient religions. It was certainly applied to Homer before the time of Philo. The Stoics, who would fain have combined adhesion to the popular faith with their own philosophic results, were fond of this 'θεραπεία of myths.' Indeed, it was of absolute necessity if they were to be retained, while its application would elevate the myths into mysteries, and show that beneath the coarse but fragile surface of the seeming

there was absolute and sublime meaning of truth. The only drawback was that the method itself was not true. It was an afterthought, and the truths which were inferred had been carried into, before they were carried out of, the myths. But Jewish Hellenism had no myths to interpret, and in this also lay its superiority to the heathen world. But in place of these myths it had the letter, true indeed, but shallow and poor, if only literally understood. Taken by itself it might have been almost as great a difficulty to the Grecian Jew as were the popular myths to the philosophers. But here also the allegorical method brought light and meaning by importing into the letter of an event or command certain preconceived thoughts. The Palestinians had also a method which must be called allegorical; only it began at the other end from that of the Alexandrians. It is a common thing in Jewish writings to find a verse of Scripture cited and then allegorically applied to certain persons or events in Jewish history. On the other hand, Alexandrianism found an event or person, and allegorically carried into it a philosophical truth, or what it regarded as such.[d] And more than this, it otherwise also imitated the heathen mode of allegorism. For in its hands the patriarchs and heroes of Jewish history became a veritable philosophic Olympus and their history an ethical mythology.

From what has been said it will be inferred that, after all, resort to the allegorical method was prompted by apologetic motives. It is indeed mostly so. In the hands of these philosophers allegory was the ἀντιφάρμακον τῆς ἀσεβείας (the antidote of impiety), by showing the ὑπόνοια—the hidden thought and deeper sense—of the myths. In the hands of the Hellenist Jews it would not only vindicate the letter of Scripture against attacks, or it might be doubts, but also reveal a ὑπόνοια which was in accordance with those philosophical truths to which no doubt could attach: nay, it would present them much more fully, purely, and truly. Thus Jew and Greek were to be elevated in Hellenism into a higher unity. We shall presently see how closely the Hellenistic rules of allegory followed those of the Greeks. But where the underlying idea was such as we have described it, and its method of application so similar, it appears natural to infer that the object must have been not only to meet a felt want in the Jewish, but if possible to reach also the Gentile, world. We here recall that, although the Greek translation of the Old Testament may have been necessary for the Greek-speaking Jews, yet it was begun under the patronage, and, as some think, at the instance, of the Ptolemies, the Greek rulers of Egypt. But we have even stronger evidence of the desire to approach the Greek world. Those extensive falsifications by Jewish hands of historical notices and of poetry as from ancient Greek writers and classic poets, which Eusebius and others have quoted in all good faith (*Praepar. Evangel.* ix.; *Clemens Alex. Strom.* i.; *Praep. Ev.* xiii.; *Clem. Strom.* v.; *Pseudo-Justin, Cohort. ad Gr.* and *de Monarchia*)[e]; the almost incredible Jewish forgery of Sibylline books; and the supposed Gentile but probably Jewish works to which Josephus refers (*Ag. Ap.* i. 23, comp. 22); even so un-Palestinian a production as a "drama" on the Exodus by an Alexandrian Jew, Ezekiel (Eus. *u. s.* ix. 28, 29), whatever we may think of its poetry and versification: these and other writings of similar kind must have been intended far more for Gentile than for Jewish eyes. Nor probably would the reference to heathen philosophers have been so frequent or emphatic if the object had not been to attract Greek readers.

We have designated this direction as Hellenism from its tendency, but also as Alexandrianism from the city which was its head-quarters, and, indeed, the capital of the Western "dispersion." Antioch may have had as numerous a Jewish population, if we include its floating portion. But it did not represent Western Judaism, being rather an intermediate link with Palestine, nor could its Jewish inhabitants compare with those of Alexandria in wealth, culture, or influence. This is not the place to describe the magnificence of a city which at the time was the commercial centre of the world and the home of literature and science. Suffice it, that, besides its mercantile importance, it had special attractions to the Jews. Its founder, Alexander the Great,[f] had accorded them equally exceptional privileges with the Macedonians. These were confirmed and even enlarged by the Ptolemies, the successors of Alexander, and afterwards by Julius Caesar. Originally one quarter had been assigned to them; afterwards two quarters are named as specially Jewish, although not in the sense of the Jews being confined to them. The vast trade of Alexandria was chiefly in their hands, and there were synagogues in all parts of the city. But their chief glory was that great central synagogue, built in the shape of a basilica, and furnished with seventy chairs of state for the eldership, of the magnificence of all which even the Palestinians were never weary of boasting. It was a strange relationship that between the Rabbis of Palestine and the Jews of Egypt, with their schismatic and yet non-schismatic temple at Leontopolis—of independence and yet dependence and homage on the part of the Alexandrians; of disavowal and yet acknowledgment and even incorporation on the part of the Palestinian authorities. Palestinian Rabbis taught and exerted authority in Alexandria, and Alexandrians resided in Jerusalem, and were even represented among their Rabbis. But, without laying stress on the fact, that these strangers were gathered in a special synagogue (Acts vi. 9), it is surely significant that even in the early apostolic church the deep-rooted suspicions and misunderstandings between 'Grecians' and 'Hebrews' could make themselves felt (Acts vi. 1). Evidence to the same

[d] When St. Paul used allegory (as in 1 Cor. ix. 9; Gal. iv. 21, etc.), it appears to me that he applied it in the Palestinian, rather than the Alexandrian manner. On the other hand, it is impossible to read the Epistle to the Hebrews without feeling that its writer had been trained in Alexandrian modes of thinking, although we cannot fail to recognise the immeasurable difference as regards the substance of what was conveyed in Alexandrian form.

[e] On this whole subject see Delitzsch, *Gesch. d. Jüd. Poesie*; Freudenthal, *Hellenist. Stud.* 1, 2; Schürer, *Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes.*

[f] In Ber. R. 23, the words: "They call their lands after their own names" (Ps. xlix. 11), is applied to the naming of Alexandria after Alexander the Great.

effect comes to us from such notices as that the work done in the temple by Alexandrian artificers proved unsatisfactory (Yoma, 38*a*; Er. 10*b*), and that the self-sufficiency of the Alexandrians had become so proverbial that it was said of a Rabbi on a certain occasion that he was a true Alexandrian.

This self-assertion may probably be accounted for by the circumstances of the Jewish community in Alexandria. If the Jews in other of the Grecian cities were under semi-independent *Archontes* or rulers of their own, those of Alexandria were under the government of their *Ethnarch*, whose authority was, however, transferred by Augustus to the whole "eldership" (Philo *in Flacc.* ed. Mangey, ii. 527). "Another,[g] presumably Roman office, though for obvious reasons often filled by Jews, was that of the *Alabarch*, or rather *Arabarch*, who probably collected the revenue derived from the Arab population. Among others, Alexander, the brother of Philo, held that post. The firm of Alexander was probably as rich as the great Jewish banking and shipping house of Saramalla in Antioch. Its chief was entrusted with the management of the affairs of Antonia, the much respected sister-in-law of the emperor Tiberius. It was a small thing for such a man to lend King Agrippa, when his fortunes were very low, a sum of about 7000*l*., with which to resort to Italy. Two of the sons of Alexander married daughters of King Agrippa, while a third, at the price of apostasy, rose successively to the posts of Procurator of Palestine and finally of Governor of Egypt. The temple at Jerusalem bore evidence of the wealth and munificence of this Jewish millionaire. The gold and silver with which the nine massive gates were covered, which led into the temple, were the gift of the great Alexandrian banker."

The prosperity and culture of the Jewish community at Alexandria, the peculiarly eclectic spirit characteristic of that city, and the singular opportunities which it afforded for acquiring knowledge and coming into contact with then modern thought, will explain how the direction known as Hellenism originated and developed there. It has already been stated that Philo was only its last and fullest representative. It would perhaps be too much to assert that many distinct traces of it are to be found in the LXX. version of the Old Testament. The number of really or presumably distinctive Hellenistic expressions has been reduced to two (Gen. i. 2, and Is. xlv. 18), and even these are open to some doubt. It is quite true that there is a marked endeavour to remove in the rendering of the Old Testament all anthropomorphisms and anthropopathies,[h] but neither is this quite consistently carried out,[i] nor yet is it peculiar to the Alexandrian translators. It is equally noticeable in the Targum Onkelos, in the Talmud,[k] the Midrash, perhaps even in the last revision which the Hebrew text itself may have undergone.[l] And it has been argued,[m] with great show of reason, that it needed not the Philonic nor any other system to suggest the desirableness of avoiding anthropomorphisms; that this had been taught by older thinkers; and indeed would appear natural and necessary to educated Greeks at that period. On the other hand, this Greek "time-spirit," manifesting itself in the translation of the LXX., is itself evidence of the tendency which issued in Hellenism.[n] Nor should we here overlook the introduction of certain words and expressions in the LXX. (as in Job vii. 18, Ps. li. 12), which recall the terminology of the philosophical schools.

We advance another step in Hellenism with the work of Aristobulus, a Jewish peripatetic philosopher, of which Eusebius (*Praepar. Evang.* vii. 14; viii. 10; xiii. 12) and Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. 342; v. 595; vi. 632) have preserved fragments.[o] The book was a commentary on the Pentateuch addressed to King Ptolemy Philometor about 160–150 B.C. Its object was peculiar. As Hermippus (about 200 B.C.) had traced some of the doctrines of Pythagoras to Jewish sources (*Jos. ag. Ap.* i. 22), so Aristobulus sought to explain the accordance of the best teaching of the Greek philosophers with the law of Moses by their having derived their knowledge from the Jewish lawgiver. Accordingly there must have been, long before the version of the LXX., another translation of the law into Greek from which the most ancient and celebrated of the Greek poets and philosophers (Plato and also Pythagoras) had drawn. As previously stated, these quotations (from Orpheus, Linus, Homer, and Hesiod) are impudent forgeries, the bold assertion of which it is not easy to understand, although it is not certain whether Aristobulus himself or some other Jewish apologist was the author of these frauds. Apart from this, there cannot be question that Aristobulus not only derived from Platonic, Peripatetic, and Stoic philosophy the views which he expressed in his commentation on the Pentateuch,[p] but also that as a Jew he remained, or thought he remained, within the boundary lines of his creed. Quite irrespective then of the question whether on some of the leading points in Philo's system he approximated that thinker, his use of Greek philosophy, his combination of it with, and derivation from, the teaching of the Old Testament, and his subordination of Greek wisdom to the Law, mark

---

[g] The quotation is from *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*.

[h] Comp. Frankel, *Palaest. Exegese, passim*; Siegfried, *Philo von Alex.* pp. 17, 18.

[i] Thus the Theophanies are taken literally. Comp. the admissions of Dähne, *Gesch. Darstell. d. Jüd. Alexr. Religionsphil.* ii. pp. 38, 39.

[k] Thus in connection with the history of Elijah the principle is almost indignantly enunciated—although perhaps not without an anti-Christian object—that never did God come down from heaven nor man go up to it. (Sukk. 5*a*.)

[l] Compare here especially Geiger, *Urschr. u. Uebersetz. d. Bibel*. But his conclusions must be received with great caution.

[m] Zeller, *Philosophie d. Griech.* (3rd. ed.), vol. iii. p. 254.

[n] On the distinction between Hellenism and Rabbinism in that respect, comp. *Life and Times of Jesus*, i. pp. 28, 29.

[o] All notices about him are collected in L. C. Valckenaer's learned *Diatribe de Aristobulo Alexandrino Judaeo*, reprinted in Gaisford's (Oxford) ed. of Eusebius' *Prepar. Evang.* t. iv. pp. 339–451. For the genuineness of these fragments, against the objections of Jewish writers and of Kuenen, see Zeller, *u. s.* pp. 257–259, notes.

[p] Comp. Zeller, *u. s.* pp. 262–264. See also *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, p. 36.

a distinct advance in the development of Hellenism.[q]

In truth it is only what might be expected that Hellenism, as finally represented by Philo, should have passed through a process of development, although its fundamental principles would from the first find expression. For the philosophic ideas which it was intended to incorporate into, or rather to find in, the Old Testament had been expressed long before Philo. To say therefore that the statements of Aristobulus do not go beyond what may be traced to the influence of Platonic, Peripatetic, and Stoic philosophy, does not settle anything as regards his relation to Philo. For the essence of the system consisted in the peculiar theological use made of Greek philosophy; and differences could only obtain in the varied, or else in the more extensive, application of this fundamental principle. And Aristobulus already knew, and employed the allegorical method in the explanation of the Old Testament. On these points, however, we are under the disadvantage of possessing only a very scanty knowledge of Philo's predecessors. His own writings do not give the impression of originality. Besides, he repeatedly refers to the allegorical interpretations of others, as well as to canons of allegorism apparently generally recognised. He also enumerates differing allegorical interpretations of the same subjects.[r] All this affords evidence of the existence of a school of Hellenist interpretation. Its leading characteristics appear in the epistle of Pseudo-Aristeas,[s] in which he professes to inform his friend Philokrates of the circumstances connected with the LXX. translation of the Old Testament. It is not necessary to discuss the details of this legendary story. For our present purpose it suffices to note that this Aristeas, who passes himself off as a Greek, was really a Jew. His "Hellenism" is very advanced. Witness here his reference to the relation of "the part-Gods" to the supreme God, his identification of Zeus with the God of the Jews, and his identification of wisdom with piety. Nay, Aristeas ventures to put Alexandrianism even into the mouth of the Jewish high-priest Eleazar, not only as regards God and the Law, but in an allegorical interpretation of such special enactments as those concerning unclean animals which might have been regarded by the Greeks as superstitious if only literally interpreted.

This is not the place further to discuss the question of the presence of Alexandrian elements in other works of that period.[t] They appear very fully, and closely approximating to the teaching of Philo, in the apocryphal "Wisdom of Solomon," and in what has been misnamed the fourth book of the Maccabees. In the former work we specially mark what is said about Wisdom (vii. 22—viii. 5; ix. 4, 9), when this property of the Almighty is so distinguished from Him as to be almost separated and hypostatised, while that which the Old Testament ascribes to God is there attributed to Wisdom (comp. also specially ch. x.). Similarly, we find there the same *dualism* as in Philo, as regards creation and man, as well as the same Stoic enumeration of the four cardinal virtues (viii. 7). But the so-called "Wisdom of Solomon" probably dates from about the time of Augustus, while it seems likely that what is known as the fourth book of the Maccabees—a stoic treatise on the supremacy of pious reason over the emotions—dates even later, possibly from about the time of Philo himself. We therefore proceed, so far as it is possible, to sketch it:

II. *The Life of Philo.*

Our scanty information is here chiefly derived from notices in his own writings (such as *Legat. ad Cai.* i. 22, 28; *de Leg. Allegor.* ii. iii. *passim*, for example, ii. 21, iii. 53; *de Spec. Legg.* ii. 1; *de Provid.* ed. Aucher, ii. § 107), from Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 8, 1; xix. 5, 1; xx. 5, 2), and from more or less authentic statements by later writers (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 4 sq.; *Praepar. Evang.* viii. 13 sq.; Jerome, *de viris illustribus*, c. 11; Photius, *Biblioth. Cod.* ciii. civ. cv.; Suidas, *s. v.* Φίλων). The scion of a distinguished and wealthy family, which had probably for generations taken a leading part in the commerce of Alexandria, and, at any rate, in its Jewish affairs, Philo was born in that city. So far as we can judge, he was a constant resident there, with only the exception of occasional journeys or of retirement for ascetic purposes (see the latter for example *de Leg. Allegor.* iii. 21). According to St. Jerome, Philo was of priestly descent. His own writings afford no evidence of it.[u] But of the worldly position of his family there cannot be doubt. Reference has already been made to the circumstance, that Philo's brother[x] occupied the high post of Alabarch. In his youth the latter had been in Rome and gained the friendship of Claudius. Afterwards he managed the affairs of Antonia, the mother of Claudius and the sister-in-law of Tiberius. We again recall that at a critical period in the life of Agrippa he was able to supply the Jewish king with the means needful

[q] See the Extracts from Aristobulus in Eusebius, *Praepar. Evang.* viii. 10, and xiii. 12.

[r] The proof-passages for this and the preceding statement in Zeller, pp. 265, 266.

[s] Most conveniently referred to as printed in Havercamp's ed. of Josephus, vol. ii. (after the *Variae Lectiones*), pp. 103–132.

[t] Doubtfully in the oldest portions of the Sibylline Books and in 2 and 3 Macc.—more clearly perhaps in Ecclus.

[u] I can scarcely see indication of it in the dignity which Philo attaches to the Levites (Ewald, *Gesch.* vi. pp. 258, 259), although I venture to think that, especially in Temple-times, some distinction would attach to such descent even—nay, in some respects, especially—outside Palestine. The statement (*De Provid.* § 107) that he had been sent by his countrymen as their representative to the temple: *ad orationem hostiasque offerendas* does not convey to me, as to Hausrath (*Neutest. Zeitg.* ii. 1. p. 148), that he had offered them himself. Nor does it seem to me (as to Ewald) that this is materially affected by the recension in Eusebius (*apud Richter*, vi. p. 200): εὐξόμενός τε καὶ θύσων. There are many and weighty reasons against understanding this of the priestly functions.

[x] This is expressly stated by Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 8, 1), and the fact that a nephew of Philo is also mentioned as bearing the name Alexander (in the *De Rat. animal.*, edited by Aucher, § 1, 72) does not prove that the Alabarch was the nephew, and not the brother, of Philo (so Ewald and Zeller). The suggestion of Bishop Pearson, that this Alexander was he of the high priest's kindred mentioned in Acts iv. 6, scarcely deserves serious discussion.

for prosecuting his cause; and that his sons afterwards intermarried with the family of that monarch. So close was his connection with the imperial house, that he gave to his son the name Tiberius Alexander. But it was not only worldly greatness which distinguished the family of Philo. Josephus, who records that by the munificence of the Alabarch the nine massive gates which opened into the temple were covered with silver and gold (*War*, v. 5, 3), also speaks of his religiousness (*Ant.* xx. 5, 2). Of this, however, he offers no further proof than that, unlike his son Alexander, he remained faithful to the Jewish faith. But such outward profession and even munificence to the temple would in no way be incompatible with great laxity of religious belief. That he specially occupied himself with religious philosophy appears even from the treatise "On Providence" which Philo addressed to him,[y] and which must be regarded as embodying their discussions and the views urged upon him by Philo. On the other hand we learn from another tractate of Philo (*De Rat. animal.*),[z] that in the view of the Alabarch, supported by the results of his observations and investigations, animals possessed the same kind of reason as man. Widely divergent as such notions were, not only from Judaism, but from all that Philo himself cherished and laboured to set forth, they afford instructive insight into the ferment of ideas on religious subjects in the higher ranks of Jewish society in Alexandria, into the causes which contributed to the formation of Hellenism, and into the process through which Philo must have passed in the development and construction of his own system.

Assuredly Philo himself was far removed from materialism. Again and again, and most earnestly, does he impress on us[a] that pleasure must be considered the enemy of all true wisdom and piety, and that the body is the principle of evil and of death.[b] All that we know of his outer and inner life accords with these views.[c] Of his training and culture, as indicating the sources of his system, we shall have occasion to speak in the sequel. Meantime suffice it that his acquaintance with so much of Greek poetic and philosophic literature, and his thorough appreciation of it, indicate to what pursuits his youth, if not his life, must have been devoted. At the same time he displays equally the fullest knowledge of the sacred writings of his people, mainly, indeed in their Greek rendering, yet implying at least some acquaintance with the Hebrew and Chaldee originals. Of his ardent, even enthusiastic, faith in the Jewish religion, it is scarcely necessary to speak. Indeed, if the teaching of the Old Testament was what Philo considered it: the basis and the crown of all that was wise, true, and lofty, in that Greek literature, of which he was so enamoured —it must have held charmed alike mind and heart of such an one as our philosopher. Again, his writings give also evidence of close and keen observation of nature, and of considerable attention to natural science. But a man whose mind was so constituted and so cultivated, and who was so copious an author, could not have lived in self-indulgence or the pursuit of pleasure. Indeed, occasionally we have a glimpse into his inner life.[d] Having, as he tells us, implanted in him from earliest youth a desire for learning, he describes his mental development, making in his own fashion allegorical application to it of the history of Sarah and Hagar in their relation to Abraham—although in very different use of it, both there and in other passages (*de congr. quaer. erud. gratia*, § 14, and again[e] *de mutat. nom.* § 44), from that of St. Paul (Gal. iv. 22–31). Philo has it that before we reach that stage when we become the fathers of children by wisdom, which is virtue (Sarah), she seeks to benefit us by others. Thus Sarah gave to Abraham Hagar, that is, encyclical knowledge, yet ever retaining her own rule and place as the legitimate wife and mistress. So had it been in his own experience. Some were so attracted by the handmaidens as to forget the mistress, but he, when he came to woo and wed philosophy, had brought to her the offspring of those handmaidens, to whom, when "very young," he had successively joined himself—language and literature, geometry, and the science of music. In glowing terms he describes (*De spec. Legg. ad* vi. viique *Dec.* c. § 1) with what intense delight his whole being was filled during his study of the divine oracles and doctrines, "never entertaining any low or grovelling thoughts, nor wallowing in desire after glory or wealth, or the pleasures of the body," but dwelling far aloft in fellowship with the great Kosmos, and removed from all earthly paltriness and evil. Yet Philo always remained firmly attached to his Jewish faith, and that in the face of scoffers, such as the one over whose self-destruction he exults as fit punishment (*De mutat. nom.* end of § 8). If therefore Philo took part in the amusements of Alexandria, as seems only natural from his standpoint, which was not that of Christianity, it was with inward regrets, and still striving after the higher ideal. Oft in the midst of a crowd he brought his mind into solitude; or while attending banquets and feasts he put upon himself the bridle and discipline of reason, or else retired from them into solitude and the wilderness, though, alas, too often there to become conscious of the power of indwelling corruption (*De Leg. Allegor.* iii. §§ 21, 53).

In truth what Ewald has said of the writings of Philo may also be applied to his life. It exhibits the best that could be reflected from a soul that had not been touched by Christianity. That such a man should have been not only the fit ex-

[y] Preserved (although Book I. not in its original condition) in a translation into Armenian, and edited in Latin by Aucher (*Venet.* 1822). Our quotations are from the reprint in Richter's ed. of the works of Philo (*Lips.* 1829–1830, viii. small vols.).

[z] Also only preserved in Armenian translation and in the Latin of Aucher (a reference to it in Hieron. *u. s.* ii.).

[a] So, for example, often and at great length in *de Legg. Alleg.*

[b] So also in *de Legg. Alleg.* See for example, iii. 22.

[c] We are the more desirous of establishing this as Hausrath (*u. s.* p. 149), repeating the language of Delaunay (*Philon d'Alexandrie*, p. 16), charges Philo with luxurious self-indulgence and unreality in his professions to the contrary.

[d] *De spec. Leg.* ad vi. viique *Decalogi cap.* § 1.

[e] There Sarah represents virtue, whose offspring is, so to speak, true and direct: virtue from an innate good disposition, while Hagar is intermediate instruction, when knowledge comes from teaching.

ponent of the highest development of Hellenism, but also been chosen the representative and spokesman of his people, is only what might be expected. In point of fact, he appears in that capacity in the few incidents of his life of which we are historically certain. From the circumstance that at the time of his embassy to Caius Caligula (A.D. 40) he describes himself as aged (*Legat. ad Caium*, §§ 1, 28), we infer that Philo was born between the years 30 and 20 before Christ. Probably he died not very long after his return from Rome, and during the reign of Claudius (A.D. 41–54). He was thus an older contemporary of St. Paul. When we consider his age, and his relation to Hellenism, and, on the other hand, the outward circumstances of the rising Church, we can scarcely wonder that he had apparently not been brought into contact with the work and writings of St. Paul. Still less do we marvel that he should have been apparently unacquainted with the announcement of the Baptist and with what, to such as he, would have seemed its yet more strange realisation in Jesus of Nazareth. One like Philo must have been brought into close personal contact with the Christ in order to have been influenced by Him. Probably he had never heard of that Teacher of Nazareth, Who had brought the deeper and fuller reality of his own strange dreams and feeling after the truth. No historical value attaches to the report mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 17) that Philo had held familiar intercourse with St. Peter in Rome, any more than to his identification of the *Therapeutae* (on whom, see below) with the ascetics of the early Christian communities planted by St. Mark in Egypt (Eus. *u. s.* 16), nor to the supposed reverence of Philo for those "Apostolic men of his day, sprung probably from the Hebrews," who had continued to observe the old customs. To this legend, more confidently repeated by Jerome, Photius (*Biblioth. Cod.* cv.) adds the report, that Philo had been baptised but afterwards seceded from the church διά τινα λύπην καὶ ὀργήν.

Of Philo's domestic life it is not easy to speak with confidence. It has been asserted that he was married, and that his wife had said, in an assembly of noble women, when asked why she alone of them wore not golden ornaments, that a husband's virtue was sufficient ornament for his wife (*ex Antonio*, ed. Richter, vi. 236, *Ser.* cxxiii.). But the story seems to rest on a misreading of Philon for Phokion (Zeller, *u. s.* p. 340, note). Nor yet can any inference, either as to his single estate or his married unhappiness, be drawn from the very unfavourable account which he gives of women and of the effects of marriage on a man, by which he became changed from a freeman into a slave (in the fragment of the *Apologia pro Jud.* quoted by Mangey and Richter as from Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* viii. 8; in Gaisford's ed. viii. 11, vol. ii. pp. 300, 301). For, there Philo is concerned to vindicate abstinence from marriage as enjoined by the Essenes. And just as we know from his own writings that he mixed in society and even took part in its pleasures, so may he have been married, although in theory he may have regarded the other state as every way preferable. At the same time the absence of any reference to wife or children, or even to domestic life, seems significant. But what we are chiefly concerned with, is, to defend Philo from the charge of untruthfulness as regards the asceticism which he professed. In further evidence of his views and mode of living, we here appeal to a very striking passage in which he denounces all frivolity, and warns against indulgence in anything that was not absolutely necessary to life (*de Somn.* ii. §§ vii.–x.). After a very unfavourable description of Joseph as representing the possession of the vain things of this world, he proceeds to denounce the prevailing luxury in food, cookery, dress, houses, furniture, drink, in short in every department of life. Instead of this he bids us practise the utmost frugality in all things. And he concludes by calling upon the soul to cut off a right hand[f]—to hate what it had loved, and not like Adam to prefer the two (trees) of the creature to the great Unit, the Creator, but to go forth beyond the smoke and tempest, to flee from the whirlpool of life, and as the proverb had it: not to touch it even with the tip of the finger[g]—rather to gird itself up for the sacred ministrations which are "the speculations of wisdom."

It was the custom of the extra-Palestinian Jews to send their contributions and gifts to the temple. Otherwise also they were wont to depute representatives to offer the prayers and sacrifices of their communities. It was only natural that a man every way so distinguished among his coreligionists as Philo should have been chosen for this honourable duty by the Alexandrian, if not generally the Egyptian, Jews. With great modesty he only incidentally refers to it in another connection (*de Provid.* ii. § 107, and the corresponding passage in Eusebius, *Praepar. evang.*), although in a manner showing how closely he had observed everything around. At a later period, he was called, much against his will, to take part in the public affairs, communal or general, of his native city. Most regretfully does he speak of having been drawn from his beloved studies and from solitude, and cast into the sea of politics, with all the cares and troubles which this involved. In the midst of these hateful occupations his comfort was to be able often to rise superior to that in which he was engaged, to indulge in his chosen pursuits, or else to escape from men and public affairs into loved retirement (*de Leg. spec.* ad vi. vii. Dec. c. § 1). We know what forced Philo into a current so contrary to that of his former life. He speaks of a μισόκαλος φθόνος, an ill will and malice that hated all good. The political circumstances of his time and people furnish only too plain a commentary to this, although, with his usual charity, Philo avoids (as so often) personal mention of those whom he had to stigmatise, and with his wonted modesty keeps himself and his activity as much as might be in the background. But

[f] The saying must not be confounded with the words of our Lord (St. Matth. v. 30), although the form is similar. Not only is the object of Philo quite different, but his immediate reference is to Deut. xxv. 12.

[g] Here also the reader will mark similarity of form with expressions in the Apostolic epistles, which only render the more striking the absolute contrariety as regards the object of the Apostles' teaching. The whole subject of the relation between Philo and the Apostolic e istles is too large for discussion here, and must be reserved for special treatment on another occasion.

the sky which for well nigh four centuries had been so bright over the Jewish community of Alexandria (*Legat. ad Cai.* 44) was rapidly becoming overcast, and there were gathering signs of a terrible storm that would soon burst. Whether envy of the wealth and immunities of those prosperous Jews inflamed that national hatred which mostly seems to lurk in the hearts of Gentiles against Israel, or the latter partly provoked it by their overbearing deportment, there was ill-feeling and bad blood in the Egyptian and Roman population of Alexandria, as regarded the synagogue and all its members. And when we remember that the populace and even the better classes were almost absolutely swayed by that intense hater and persecutor of the Jews, Apion —a man for whose lying, ignorance, charlatanry, conceit, boastfulness, and unscrupulosity it is difficult to find adequate terms—it will be understood what the result would be. The mischief broke out so early as the latter part of the reign of Tiberius. Philo informs us that the Roman governor—not the Flaccus of whom we shall presently speak [h]—desirous of forcing the Jews into apostasy, began by insisting on their breaking the sacred labour-rest of the Sabbath. The reasoning which he employed is sufficiently indicative of his temper and bearing. Arguing that, if calamities such as would destroy their own and their families' lives and property, were to threaten them, they would bestir themselves to active exertion on the Sabbath, he urged that he himself, who ordered them to work, was, in virtue of the power he wielded, all the evils which he had enumerated: whirlwind, war, deluge, thunderbolt, famine, pestilence, and earthquake (*de Somn.* ii. § 18). Little, or rather anything, might be expected from one whom Philo designates as not a man, but as an evil of some extraordinary kind, a calamity brought from far over the sea, or come from some other planet. Happily this unnamed governor was obliged to desist. But far more grievous evil befell the unhappy Jews under the reign of Caligula. His mad desire to be worshipped as a God, which led to such manifestation of feeling and such mischief, offered to the Alexandrians, who in their frivolity would have worshipped any god, the welcome opportunity of carrying out their designs against the hated Jews. The last incentive was given by the sudden and unexpected arrival of Agrippa, whom Caius had elevated to royalty over the tetrarchy of Philip, and who, by command of the emperor, had taken the more expeditious journey by one of the great liners to Alexandria, rather than risk the more dangerous and uncomfortable sail directly to Syria. The appearance among them of a Jewish king, attended by a body-guard, excited to absolute fury the ill- and well-dressed mob of Alexandria, which, as Philo has it, added to the naturally jealous and envious disposition of the Egyptians "an ancient" and "innate" hatred of the Jews (*in Flacc.* § 5). The Roman governor, Avilius Flaccus, had been previously gained against them. His jealous fears were now stimulated to the utmost. Unchecked and even secretly favoured, the Alexandrians enjoyed a hey-day of Antisemitism. From private and personal insults to Agrippa, they proceeded to speeches in the public schools, and to doggrel lampoons and gibes of the popular kind. Finally a great demonstration was made in the Gymnasium. Thither they dragged a harmless lunatic, arrayed him with a crown of flattened papyrus leaf, in a door-mat for a mantle, and with a papyrus-rod for sceptre, while the youth of Alexandria stood around him as mock bodyguard, and the multitude hailed him Mari, which was the Syriac mode of addressing kings. What followed (*in Flacc.* § 6–11) reads terribly like Antisemitic movements in all ages, to our own enlightened days. The first rush of the mob was to the synagogues to place in them statues of the emperor—for, were not the Jews dangerous despisers of the religion and customs of the empire, and, indeed, hostile aliens in its midst? Next the wretched sufferers were driven together, and shut up in one narrow quarter of the city, while the mob plundered their houses at will. When hunger drove the poor outcasts beyond the boundaries to which they had been confined, they were set upon and put to torture and death amid terrible sufferings, their lifeless bodies being dragged to pieces through the streets. But this was not all. A show of right must be given to these proceedings. The rule of the Jewish community in Alexandria had been committed by Augustus to a council of elders. Thirty-eight of the most aged and venerated among them were now arrested by order of Flaccus, and driven, bound with thongs or in chains, to the theatre, where they were stripped and scourged in a manner only done to the lowest populace, and never to Jews. Some of them died under the lash; the others had a brief life of suffering left them. Other horrors followed: scourging, hanging up, and torturing on the wheel—all as part of public theatrical entertainments, to be followed by the execution of the victims on the fatal cross or otherwise. The excuse for this was that the Jews had concealed arms for attack on the people and authorities. But the most rigid search brought nothing to light, though it gave occasion for every insult and indignity. It may, however, have been (for the only account we possess is the indignant, rather than historically precise, narrative of Philo) that the sufferings of the elders and others had been in punishment of their resistance to the worship of Caius; and that Flaccus, professing to act all along in his Roman magisterial capacity, had made further show of enforcing peace between the two parties in Alexandria by searching for arms in the houses of the Jews, having previously taken away those of the Gentile population.[1]

Even before the arrival of Agrippa in Alexandria, the Jews had prepared a memorial to the emperor, which Flaccus, who still deceived them, had promised to forward with his own recommendation. Needless to say, it was never despatched. Agrippa, indeed, sent it to Rome with a letter of his own, but nothing came of it. But the days of Flaccus' governorship

[h] Comp. *Ewald*, u. s. p. 265, note 1.

[1] This is the view of Ewald. But against it is the circumstance, that Philo ascribes the search for Jewish weapons to foreign influence; that he speaks of a desire to incite the army against the Jews as the motive of Flaccus; that he describes the search as wholly unexpected; and, lastly, that he attributes the disarming of the Egyptian population to quite other causes than the tumults against the Jews.

were numbered. While the Jews were observing their Feast of Tabernacles, and crying to the God Who had brought them through the perils of the wilderness, their persecutor was recalled to Rome, condemned to banishment, and soon afterwards killed. There was now no longer any hindrance to carrying their petitions and complaints before the emperor—unpromising as this must have appeared. A deputation of three was appointed to go to Rome. Philo was chosen their leader and spokesman. Nor could anyone have been found in every respect equally fitted for the task. The Alexandrian counter-deputation was headed by Apion.[k] The Jewish deputies travelled in the storms of winter. They were not allowed to see the emperor in Rome, but had to follow him to one of his country-houses. Philo has left an account of the humiliating audience granted to the Jews (*De Legat. ad Cai.* §§ 44 to end of the tractate). They found Caius surrounded by all their bitterest enemies, and indignant not only at the Alexandrian but also at the Palestinian Jews, who refused to receive his statue. No regular hearing was given them, but the emperor hurried from room to room, asking questions about the rights to which the Jews appealed, only to interrupt their answers by continuing his inspection of the villa, expressing anger, or else scoffing, as at their abstinence from swine's flesh. Alternately held in terror for their lives and in horror at the blasphemies to which they had to listen, Caius finally dismissed them with the remark, that these people were not so wicked as unfortunate and foolish in not believing in his divinity. Josephus records that Philo had gone from the imperial presence with these words of comfort to his friends, to be of good courage, since Caius' words indeed showed anger at them, but that in reality they had set God against himself. In the following year Claudius ascended the throne of the Caesars. At tidings of this the Jewish population of Alexandria took up arms to recover their immunities. Claudius interposed on their behalf. Not only was the Alabarch (the brother of Philo) set free from prison, but the emperor issued a decree which restored the liberties and privileges of the Jews. This decree deserves careful perusal. It seems to establish these three points, to which we have previously called attention : that the envy of their Gentile neighbours was provoked by the privileges and immunities which the Jews legally possessed; that attacks upon them were first directed against their religious practices, especially their Sabbath-observance; and that the Jews were too apt to provoke hostility by the contempt which they showed towards others. (Jos. *Ant.* xix. 5, 2.)

Philo must have lived for some years after his return from Rome (probably from ten to fifteen years). He wrote several tractates referring to this embassy, of which one if not more have been lost. Possibly other of his works may date from the same period. It has been conjectured[l] that in extreme old age, following his loving bent for solitude and asceticism, he had retired to die among those Therapeutes, to whom Philo introduces us in his tractate *De Vita Contemplativa.* If he wrote this treatise about that time, it would dispose of some of the objections that have been urged against its genuineness, as well as against the existence of the Therapeutes. But this opens up literary questions to which we must refer in connection with an account of:

III. *The Writings of Philo: Criticism of the Text.*

As on other subjects, on which information is not complete, much and very diverse has been written on the tractates of Philo and their order. Only such brief sketch of the subject can here be presented as seems necessary for the information of the reader. The writings of Philo are referred to by Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 8, 1), and lists of them are given by Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 18), to which may be added those of Jerome, Photius, and Suidas. Of the works mentioned by Eusebius, some exist only in a fragmentary form, while others are wholly lost. It must be left undiscussed whether, as Ewald supposes, the larger works of Philo had at an early period been cut up into different tractates, such as we now possess them. External evidence to that effect there is little. The following is a brief account of the principal editions of Philo's works.[m] The earliest is that of Turnebus, Paris, 1552 (containing only thirty-nine treatises). To this were afterwards added the treatises published by David Hoeschelius, Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1587. Then comes the Geneva edition of 1613, which added the tractate *De Mundo* to the others, and a Latin translation of all. Next we have what is generally known as the *Paris edition*, 1640, which the Frankfort edition of 1691 closely follows (it contains also Hoeschel's edition of the *De Septenario* and *De Providentia Fragmenta*). Lastly, we have what may be regarded as still the best edition, that by *Thomas Mangey*, 2 vol. London, 1742. The learned editor added to the other works of Philo, from the Vatican codex, in which alone it exists, the tractate *De Posteritate Caini.* To these Cardinal (Angelo) Maï further added (Mediolani, 1818) the two tractates *De Festo Cophini* and *De Parentibus colendis*, and afterwards other fragments. Finally, there were added to all the others certain treatises existing in an Armenian version, found in a MS. at Louberg in 1791 by Dr. Zohrab, and published in a Latin translation at Venice (the MS. having been sent to the Armenian monastery of St. Lazarus at Venice) by J. B Aucher, vol. i. (1822) *de Providentia, libri ii.* and *de Animalibus; Quaest. in Gen. libri iv.; Quaest. in Ex. libri ii.; Sermo de Sampsone; de Iona; de Tribus Angelis Abraamo apparentibus*, vol. ii. (1826). To the critical *Apparatus* of Mangey something has been added in the incomplete edition of A. F. Pfeiffer (5 vols. Erlangen, 1785–92). Finally, we must mention the im-

[k] We owe our knowledge of this to Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 8, 1). Philo does not name Apion, which Ewald attributes to forbearance on the ground that Apion was alive when Philo wrote—a display of delicacy towards a literary opponent which sounds strange in our days.

[l] By Delaunay (*u. s.* pp. 33, 34), who is, however, not always trustworthy in his facts.

[m] Compare Fürst, *Bibliotheca Jud.* vol. iii. 1863 (pp. 87–93), who gives the literature to that date—although the notices are not always accurate; Delaunay. *Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1867; Schürer, *Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes.*

portant contribution made to this literature by J. B. Card. Pitra (*Analecta Sacra T.* ii. 1884) containing:—1, fragments from the *Codex Coislinianus* (of the eleventh century), viz., from *de Mund. Opif.* 3; from *Leg. Alleg.* 6; *Quaest. in Gen.* 2; *in Ex.* 4; *de Gener. Ab.* 1; *de Gig.* 1; *de Ebr.* 1; *de Mut. nom.* 2; *de Relig.* 1; *in Flacc.* 1; *ex cap. metr.* 1. 2. Fragments from Vatican MSS. Among them we note one (v.) to which the learned editor adds in a note the question whether it may not contain a reference to the Therapeutes. 3. An enumeration of the principal Vatican Codices, together with an *excursus.* 4. An account of the succession of the Philonic tractates according to these MSS. 5. Remarks on the ancient Latin versions of Philo, 6, and, most interesting to us, Latin versions of the greater part of *de Vita Contempl.* He also notes that the *Cod. Zohrab* contains an Armenian version of this tractate—and in general that this codex is *dignissimus nova recensione.*

The edition of C. E. Richter (Lips. 1828–30, viii. small vols.) simply reproduces the old text. But it is most serviceable, not only as containing all the works of Philo (from Mangey, Maï, and Aucher) but as being the most handy, and giving in the margin continuous reference to the corresponding pages in the Paris edition and in that of Mangey, as well as to those in the volumes of Maï and of Aucher.[n] It would occupy too much space to enumerate the various translations of Philo. Suffice it that Fürst (*Bibl. Jud.* iii. *s. v. Philon*) gives the titles of not less than thirty-three versions, either of all the works of the Alexandrian, or of one or more of them (thirteen into Latin, four into Hebrew, three into German, three into French, six into Italian, three into English, and one into Spanish). Since then other versions have appeared, such as Delaunay's French rendering of the *in Flaccum* and *ad Caium*, and the translation of all the works of Philo into English (1854–55) by C. D. Yonge (4 vols. But of the Tractates edited by Aucher, only the three first books of the *Quaest. in Gen.* are given). The translation is careful and faithful, but too often not intelligible,[o] partly from the confusion of sentences, and partly from the absence of any explanation of Philo's philosophical terminology. Still, great credit is due to the learned translator.

It has already been stated that, as regards the critical *Apparatus*, little progress has been made by Pfeiffer beyond the text of Mangey. Yet for many reasons an accurate collation of the MSS. is not only most desirable in the present state of the text, but even absolutely requisite for critical purposes. All the more therefore is it to be regretted that the collation actually made by Tischendorf for a proposed edition of Philo's works by *Chr. Aenoth. Orthob. Grossmann*, has—with the exception of a few specimens—been lost to the learned world on the death of that writer. Tischendorf had collated for that purpose not only all the MSS. at Paris but also those in the libraries of Italy, with the result of making many emendations on, and additions to the text of Mangey. The loss of the *Apparatus* collected for Grossmann led Tischendorf in 1856 during a journey to Italy to take in hand once more the best existing codices of Philo: the *Vatican* and the *Codex Laurentianus* in Florence. The latter (of which Tischendorf [*Philonea*, 1868] gives a photographed specimen page) is a beautiful MS. dating from the beginning of the 13th century. In the small work just quoted Tischendorf shows by many instances that Maï, who copied from this codex the *De Festo coph.* (which really forms part of the *De Septenario*) and the *De Parentibus col.*, both of which are really integral parts of the first tractate *De specialibus Legibus*, had been guilty of serious inaccuracies and mistakes. Tischendorf further notes that Hoeschel had, in his edition of the *De Septenario*, made use of the Munich codex 117, and of a transcript of it. This codex dates from the fifteenth or sixteenth century, and is much more clearly written than the *Laurentianus*, but critically inferior in value to it. We have already stated that Mangey was the first to edit from the *Codex Vaticanus* the *De Posteritate Caini.*[p] The edition having been made from a copy of the original MS., not only reproduced the obvious errors in the codex, but added others due to the transcriber, partly owing to his carelessness, partly to the difficulties of the MS. Some of these have been corrected by Mangey, others by Tischendorf. The work which he published (*Philonea*, 1865) contains the first and only critical edition of the first treatise *De specialibus Legibus* (on the third, fourth, and fifth commandments), to which he joined what really forms part of that treatise (though always given under separate headings, as): the *De Septenario*, the *De Festo Coph.*, and the *De Parentibus colendis.* It would be out of place here to mark in detail the critical value of his emendations and notes. But we notice specially (1) that the chapters in Tischendorf's text do not correspond to the paragraphs in Richter's edition. The latter frequently divides the text wrongly, and so introduces confusion. This as well as the omissions from the text render it difficult to understand the meaning and argument. The headings of the chapters are taken by Tischendorf from the margin of the *Cod. Laurent.* We notice (2) these headings to the various chapters; (3) that in the heading to what in Richter's edition (vol. v. p. 20) forms § 2 of *De Septenario*, the inscription taken from the *Cod. Laurent.* differs from that of Hoeschelius in leaving out the disturbing addition which we have italicised "Concerning the Festivals, *that they are ten in number.*" (4) After § 16 in

[n] The two editions *italicised* are those generally quoted. In the Richter the *Paris* edition of 1640, which that of Frankfort, 1691, follows, is marked by the initial letter *P.*; the edition of Mangey by the initial letter *M.* The tractates edited by Aucher are commonly quoted A I, A II.

[o] It is an ungrateful task to point out defects in an undertaking so difficult and laborious. But not only is the arrangement of the tractates bewildering, but the student of Philo would be often misled if he were to use the translation without consulting the Greek original.

[p] The tractate is not mentioned by Eusebius, nor by Jerome, Photius, nor Suidas. But Tischendorf conjectures that it may have been comprehended under some other tractate, such as the *Allegoriae*, of the sacred laws. He also shows that it was not known to Jerome, since otherwise he would have made use of it in his interpretation of Hebrew names, in which he follows Philo and Origen.

Richter's edition (p. 38; ed. M. ii. p. 291) follow a chapter (xix.) hitherto unedited (consisting of only five lines); two others (xx. and xxi.) equally unedited; another (xxii.) of which very little, and that inaccurately, had been edited (ed. Richter, § 17; ed. M. ii. 292); then three chapters (xxiii. xxiv. xxv.) partially edited before (Richter, §§ 18, 19; M. ii. 292, 293); in chap. xxvi. (ed. Richter § 20) three large pieces are added which do not occur in previous editions; chap. xxvii. is almost wholly new (the fragment, preserved in Richter, § 20); in chap. xxviii. there are again many *lacunae* in other editions (R. § 21); and the same holds true to even a larger extent in regard to chap. xxx. After some omissions from chap. xxxi. follows as chap. xxxii. what Maï and others have published as *De Festo cophini*, and with chap. xxxiii. the *De Parentibus colendis*, in which we only note that what in Maï and the later editions consists of three paragraphs (9–11) forms here a special chapter (xxxiv.) with the title "On False Swearers."

The preceding very brief critical analysis of the chief results of Tischendorf's labours must suffice without adding a similar account of his text of the *de Posteritate Caini*, or of the three small pieces which he publishes (two from the Vatican codices, 379 and 746, the third from a codex of the 10th century in the library of the patriarch of Alexandria). To the results of Tischendorf's critical labours require now to be added those of Pitra, which, besides their intrinsic value, will be very helpful for the guidance of future critical investigators. For, it will be observed that as yet we possess the critical text of only two of all the works of Philo.[q] How much still remains to be done, may be gathered from the circumstance that, according to Tischendorf, there are forty MSS. of Philo (Pitra enumerates 14 Greek and 10 Latin Vatican Codices), and that, besides these a fresh version of the Armenian codex is urgently required. This must be the first task; the next, and scarcely less important one would be to arrange the tractates, now scattered and torn up, into the works to which they belong (as has been indicated with regard to the *de Specialibus Legibus*) and, if possible, to classify them, alike in their logical sequence and perhaps in the order of their real succession. The last task would be to ascertain whether any, and which, of the tractates ascribed to Philo are spurious, and generally to eliminate all interpolations.

IV. *Tractates invalidated: the De Vita Contemplativa and the Therapeutes.*

As regards the question of genuineness or interpolation we ought to keep in mind the caution of Ewald (*u. s.* p. 339, note—perhaps not always remembered by that profound critic himself), that there are now-a-days people who would like to ascribe whatever does not suit them to Christian authorship [interpolation]. In the 17th century a Socinian ascribed all the works of Philo to a Christian falsifier of the second century. He was abundantly refuted by our own countryman, Peter Allix (*Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church against the Unitarians*, London, 1699, reprinted by the Clarendon Press, 1821). In our time (1841) the same theory was revived, with the modification of several Christian falsifiers, by a Jewish writer, Kirschbaum, to whom Grossmann replied with more than needful detail (*de Phil. oper. cont. serie*, Lips. 1841–42). The two orations, "in Sampson," and "de Jona," translated from the Armenian by Aucher (ed. Richter, vii. pp. 350–376) have been generally, and rightly, regarded as spurious, although (as Ewald rightly remarks, *u. s.* pp. 304, 305, note) they present no clear mark of Christian authorship. The *de mundo*—probably compiled from Philonic writings—and the *de incorruptibilitate mundi* (ed. Richter, vi. pp. 1–37), are also generally rejected.[r] The objections against the genuineness of the *Quod omnis probus liber* (ed. Richter, v. pp. 269–302), and still more those against the *de Legatione ad Caium* (ed. R. vi. pp. 77–147) have been proved groundless. Zeller (*u. s.* p. 340, note) rejects the first of the two books *de Providentia* (ed. R. viii. pp. 8–44). But the most serious attacks have of late been directed against the *De Vita contemplativa* (ed. R. v. pp. 302–323). These, especially as formulated in the ingenious, learned, and exhaustive treatise of P. C. Lucius (*Die Therapeuten*, Strassburg, 1879), involve not only the genuineness of that tractate, but, what is historically more important, the existence of the Therapeutes of whom it gives an account, and who have hitherto been commonly regarded as a kind of Egyptian counterpart of the Essenes. The question is of such importance, and so novel among ourselves, as to demand some special consideration.

The great preliminary difficulty of the theory of Lucius appears when its outcome is finally set forth. It is maintained (p. 154) that the tractate in question is the fabrication of a Christian at the end of the third, or in the first years of the fourth, century after Christ; and that it was intended as an apology for the ascetics of that time and especially of Egypt. Their practices were to be vindicated by the testimony of Philo—an equally *grata persona* with Jews and heathen philosophers—to the effect, that there had been an ancient Jewish sect, the Therapeutes, whose practice was similar to that of the Christian ascetics. And if the theory could otherwise be established, there would be *à priori* presumption in its favour from the circumstance that Eusebius, who is the first to refer alike to this tractate of Philo and to the Therapeutes, brings them into such marked connection with the ascetics of Egypt and the supposed disciples of St. Mark. But, as Lucius himself admits, the silence of writers previous to Eusebius cannot be regarded as proof of the non-existence of the Therapeutes, while, on the other hand, if they had really existed—or at any rate, if the *De Vita contemplativa* was a Philonic tractate—it would only be natural for such a writer as Eusebius

[q] It should however be added that the elegant French translation of the *De Vita Contempl.*, by Delaunay (*Moines et Sibylles*, Paris, 1874, pp. 89–122), is based on a critical revision of the text.

[r] See especially the full discussion by Bernays (*Gesammelte Abh.* i. 282–290). Frankel, whose strictures must however be taken with caution (as in the case of his unwarranted attack on the *Quod omnis probus liber*), has shown some strong reasons against the *de Incorrupt. Mundi*, which he regards as an enlarged redaction of the equally spurious tractate *de Mundo* (*Palaest. u. Alexandr. Schriftforsch.* in the *Programm d. Jüd. Theol. Seminars*, 1854, pp. 32, 33, note).

to bring them into such connection with the Christian ascetics. Nor is the argument of Lucius advanced by the fabulousness of the notice in Eusebius about a supposed intercourse between St. Peter and Philo, and the imaginary praise of the disciples of St. Mark by the latter. All this only proves that Eusebius really believed that the Therapeutes were "a sect." And, in general, such legends are of too frequent occurrence to derive from them any specific historic inference. On the other hand, there are serious, and to our mind fatal, preliminary objections to the theory of Lucius. For, as he himself admits (especially p. 163), there is no evidence of Christian ascetics at that time living together in communities, still less of such communities consisting promiscuously of males and females[s] (such as the *Therapeutai* and *Therapeutrides* of Philo); while even the ingenuity of Lucius cannot find a parallel among Christian ascetics for what Philo describes as the "greatest feast" of the Therapeutes, that of the fiftieth day (*De V. Cont.* 8, 9). Accordingly Lucius is obliged to represent this as a fabrication—so far as regards the day—based on the sacredness which Philo ascribes to the number 50, and intended to disguise under a Philonic garb a description of the Christian ascetic Sabbath and Sunday observances.[t] But surely the invention of a fiftieth day feast, for which there is not any *analogon* among Christian ascetics, was not necessary; while the charge of fabrication as regards so important a part of Therapeutic practice would throw doubt upon all parallelism between the Therapeutes and the Christian ascetics. Till these preliminary difficulties are cleared away, no solid argument can be built on the fact that there were at that time male and female Christian ascetics, and that many of their practices closely resembled those which the Philonic tractate attributes to the Therapeutes. For, on the one hand some of the most important Christian rites have no *analogon* in the description of the Therapoutes, while, on the other hand, Asceticism—whether Jewish, Christian, or even pagan—would necessarily always develop in the same direction. For a detailed discussion of this aspect of the question we must refer to the Article "Mönchthum," by Weingarten (in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. x. pp. 761–764). The reasons there urged against the identification of the Therapeutes with the Ascetics of the third century do not seem set aside by the considerations advanced in the subsequentArticle "Therapeuten" (*u. s.* xv. pp. 548–550). For it does not appear admissible to argue that we may gain from the *de V. Cont.* fresh knowledge of the practices of the early Ascetics, since such knowledge would be based on the assumption of the very fact which it was required to prove. Weingarten himself denies the Philonic authorship of the *de V. Cont.* and ascribes it (with Renan and others) to Jewish Hellenistic circles, not long after Philo. But, surely, if the "figment" of the Therapeutes cannot be traced to the Ascetics of the third century, still less is there any trace of a Jewish Hellenist community (apart from the "Therapeutes") which could have served as the historical basis for the spurious tractate. We submit that, as a first necessity of the argument, some adequate motive for the "invention" of the Therapeutes must be historically found. But if neither Christian nor Jewish counterpart can be found for the "Therapeutes," it seems extremely difficult to believe that only a short time after the death of Philo a "sect" should have been "invented" which had never any existence, and a treatise, specially written to describe its imaginary practices, ascribed to Philo, when all readers must have known that he could not have so solemnly vouched for that which was a pure fiction. And we further venture to add, that the main strength of the argument against the *de V. contempl.* turns on the question of the Therapeutes.

We have hitherto treated the *Therapeutes* as a "sect." We hasten to correct that statement by designating them more accurately as a school or party. Even a superficial examination will show such manifest and important differences between them and the Essenes of Palestine[u] as to make it clear that they could not have been an Egyptian branch of that community. In truth, the Therapeutes were not at all a sect in the twofold sense of either holding doctrines fundamentally diverging from those of the Alexandrian Jewish community, or separating themselves (as the Essenes) from the practices observed by them. They were neither heretics nor yet seceders from the synagogue, but rather an inner, esoteric, circle in it, where the principles which underlay Alexandrian Judaism found their outward expression.[x] In this view four points seem of importance.

1. Philo gives the designation of Therapeutes not merely to "a sect," but frequently employs the term in the more ordinary sense of "servants of God." Thus in the *De Sacrific. Ab. et Caini*, § 4 (ed. Richter, i. 235), in *De Vita Moys.* iii. § 14 (ed. R. iv. p. 213), and in *De Praem. et poen.* § 18 (ed. R. v. p. 241). Or else he connects the two terms "suppliant" and "servant" (ἱκέτης καὶ θεραπευτής) as in *Quod det. potiori insid.* § 44 (ed. R. i. p. 310); in *De Migr. Abr.* § 22 (ed. R. ii. p. 319); in *De Congr. erud. grat.* § 19 (ed. R. iii. p. 92); or in *De Vict. offer.* § 10 (ed. R. iv. p. 351). Most important in this connection, is the meaning which, as we gather, Philo attached to this θεραπεία, as not any real service of God but a contemplative and ascetic life (see especially *Quod det. potiori insid.* § 16, ed. R. i. pp. 282, 283; and § 44, *u. s.* p. 310).

[s] Of Hierakas and the Hierakites we need not here speak, since—even supposing the account of Epiphanius (*Haeres.* 67) to be quite trustworthy—Lucius himself disclaims the manifestly impossible identification of the Hierakites with the Therapeutes, or the inference that the *De V. cont.* was intended as an apology for that party (Lucius, *u. s.* pp. 144, 145). On this point see also the article "Mönchthum," in Herzog's *Real-Encykl.* 2nd ed. vol. x., pp. 760, 761.

[t] Lucius, p. 179.

[u] It is scarcely necessary to say that the *De Vita cont.* does not identify the two. It starts with a laudatory reference to the mode of life adopted by the Essenes, and proceeds to a still more laudatory and full description of those who eagerly follow the contemplative life (τῶν θεωρίαν ἀσπασαμένων).

[x] It seems scarcely requisite to refute the suggestion of an organic connection between the Therapeutes and Neo-Pythagoreanism; still less, that Philo had invented this fictitious community for the purpose of setting forth an imaginary model of ascetic and contemplative life (Zöckler, in Herzog's *Real-Encykl.* xi. 638).

This description of the true Therapeute quite accords with what is afterwards carried out in detail in the Tractate which gives an account of the so-called sect of the Therapeutes. In fact, even Philo's hesitation as to whence exactly to derive this name—or rather how to account for it (*De Vita cont.* § 1, ed. R. v. pp. 304, 305), seems to point in the direction of our general conclusion. There appears no reason to think of a special "sect," but rather of an esoteric circle of *illuminati*. Again, one of the most instructive passages is that in *Quod omnis prob. lib.* § 12 (ed. R. v. p. 285), in which after having shown that there were "wise men," in his sense of the term, in every nation, Philo points for that wisdom in Palestine to the Essenes, whom he designates the "Therapeutes of God" (*θεραπευταὶ θεοῦ*). These two things then seem clear. In the higher sense there were Therapeutes in every nation—although no mention is made of Therapeutic communities—and this is specially Philonic; while, on the other hand, to Jews the Essene practice would represent that rule of life which, so far as possible, they should follow. And this also accords with the otherwise strange conjunction of the Essenes with the "Therapeutes" in the introduction of the tractate on the Contemplative Life. It accounts for more than this, and explains how those "Contemplatives" should have, some occasionally, most of them constantly, withdrawn to a convenient place near busy Alexandria—a kind of "retreat," which, if it had been the monastery of "a sect" of strict ascetics, would scarcely have been located there. The "Therapeutes" were as little "a sect" as the original "Methodists;" they were Alexandrian Methodists (if the expression be lawful), or like the inhabitants of the Würtemberg settlement of Kornthal.

2. This leads us to the second point of importance, which can be treated more briefly. Philo speaks of the Therapeutes as existing not only chiefly in Egypt, where the neighbourhood of Alexandria was their chosen retreat, but in Greece, nay everywhere, in all countries (*De Vita Cont.* § 3). We again emphasise that there is no mention of any other community of them, or common centre, than that near Alexandria. It is strange that when Lucius argues that this betrays the Christian forger and his apologetic aim, since such wide extension could not have been predicated of any Jewish "sect," but might be attributed to the Christian ascetics—it should not have occurred to him that such a forger would have scarcely put into the mouth of Philo what the slightest consideration would show he could never have asserted in regard to a Jewish sect. But if he did not mean a sect, but the Therapeutes were in his mind "Contemplatives," such as he found in all nations—while the specially Egyptian and Alexandrian Therapeutes were "Contemplative" Hellenistic Jews, fashioning their rule of life so far as possible after that of the Essenes, then all becomes plain. From this point of view this otherwise strange assertion of the universality of the Therapeutes becomes an argument in favour of the Philonic authorship of the tractate *De Vita contemplativa*. In it Philo describes, after a general reference to universal Therapeutism, the special practices of the Alexandrian Jewish Therapeutes—perhaps with some exaggeration and idealism, perhaps even in language which may have been afterwards "redacted" or "interpolated." [y]

3. Another point which requires to be kept in view is this, that there are in the writings of Philo not unfrequent indications of his retirement to solitude and separation. In our previous remarks sufficient evidence has been furnished of the fundamental accord between the views of Philo in regard to the body, to pleasures and business, as well as the need—or rather the truth—of asceticism in the contemplative life of true wisdom, and the principles which underlay the rule of life followed by the Therapeutes of the *De Vita contemplativa*—indeed, we might say generally, by the "Therapeutes of God" of Philonic conception. But indeed this is not questioned by Lucius. To this, however, the further evidence here requires to be added that Philo himself resorted to such solitude. To select only a few instances—we quote here, first, his own express statement (*De Legg. Alleg.* ii. § 21, ed. R. i. p. 113) to the effect, that he often left the men who were his kindred and friends, and his country, and went into the wilderness that he might mentally perceive the things which were worthy to be beheld (*ἵνα τι τῶν θέας ἀξίων κατανοήσω*). Again, in the *De Abrahamo* (§ 4, ed. R. iv. pp. 8, 9) he similarly describes the good man as going forth from the town to spend his time in contemplation in some solitary place (*ἐν μοναγρίῳ ποιεῖται τὰς διατριβάς*)—where he is taking for companions the most virtuous of all mankind, "whose bodies indeed time has dissolved, but whose virtues the records which are left keep alive." We would suggest that, when retirement and separation were the ideal of every good man, many like-minded must have resorted to it, and in that case the idea of association would naturally occur. And although no definite argument may be founded upon it, we here recall the remarkable passage in *de mut. nom.* § 4, about that *θίασος*—that rare *γένος*—who had voluntarily deprived themselves of external things, had become weak, pale, emaciated, dissolved into a species of souls, in short, *ἀσώματοι διανοίᾳ*: just what we would have imagined the Therapeutes of Philo. Similar are the references in the *De Praemiis et Poenis*, § 3 (ed. R. v. p. 222), and the pathetic allusion to his own past contemplative life, as well as the mention of his occasional escape from public affairs and from men, in the introductory paragraph of the *De Specialibus Legibus*, ad vi. viique Decal. cap. (ed. R. v. pp. 63, 64). Indeed we are frequently arrested by references to a class of persons who involuntarily recall the Therapeutes (as in *de mut. nom.* § 4). Similarly, there are striking verbal correspondences. If in *de Abr.* § 4, the good man is said to retire to the *μονάγριον*, in *de V. cont.* § 2, the *μονάγριον* is the chosen abode of the Therapeutes. If in *de Abr.* § 4, we are told that this love of retirement was not prompted by *μισανθρωπία*, in *de V. cont.* precisely the same is said of the Therapeutes.

[y] If we have not referred to the reply of Delaunay (*Moines et Sibylles*, pp. 1–51) in defence of the *De Vita cont.* it is that the objections to which he replies are of the past, and, indeed, never were of any real importance. It is interesting that Frankel (*u. s.* p. 33, note) implicitly accepts the genuineness of our tractate.

4. The arguments hitherto advanced were intended to show that the "Therapeutes" of the *de Vita Cont.* are not represented as "a sect" but were an esoteric circle of "Contemplatives," chiefly among the Hellenists of Egypt, who formed a special "retreat" in the neighbourhood of Alexandria to which Philo was in the habit of retiring. In regard to this it seems even instructive that Philo designates them as a γένος (*de V. Cont.* § 2), and not as a αἵρεσις (which word is used in § 3). For, we remember that Philo attaches a special meaning to γένος in distinction from λαός—the latter term applying to the many, the former to the select and elect among them (*de Sacr. Ab. et C.* § 2). And this is the more noteworthy, as occurring in a connection which describes the contemplative state. It is further emphasised in § 4 of the same tractate, where such persons are specially designated as "Therapeutes of God." And the strength of the argument is increased by verbal comparisons. We refer here once more to the passages previously indicated (*de Legg. Allegor.* ii. § 21; *de Abr.* § 4; *de mut. nom.* § 4; *de Praem. et Poen.* § 3; *de Spec. Leg.* ed. R. v. pp. 63, 64). And we call particular attention to the wording in *de Legg. Alleg.* § 21, and to that in *de Abr.* beginning of § 4, as compared with the close of § 2 in *de V. Cont.* There seems here such correspondence as to confirm the Philonic character of our tractate—yet with such differences also as to render it impossible to regard the expressions in *de V. Cont.* as copied from the other tractates. It still remains briefly to advert to three important objections urged against the *de V. Cont.* First, the absence of any reference to the "Therapeutes" in the *Quod omnis prob. lib.* §§ 12, 13, where one would have expected their mention, is supposed to disprove their existence at the time. We answer: not, on the view of the Therapeutes taken in this Article. On the contrary, it seems to us that Philo at the close of § 11, in strict accordance with the *de V. Cont.* first, attests the existence of "Therapeutes" among Greeks and barbarians, and then proceeds, in §§ 12, 13, to describe the other Therapeutes—those in Palestine and Syria, the Essenes, or the "Therapeutes of God." There was no occasion for special reference to the Hellenist Therapeutes—the more so, that, as the beginning of § 12 shews, the argument was more properly addressed to the Gentiles, and the introduction of the Jewish Therapeutes was rather apologetic. A similar answer must be given to the second objection: concerning the narrowness that characterises *de V. Cont.*, and which cannot descry wisdom or virtue except among the "Therapeutes." Naturally so; but then the Therapeutes were *not* a Jewish sect, but "the wise" of all lands, although specially of the Jews. It is, indeed, true that the *de V. Cont.* speaks very harshly of heathen practices and even philosophic views. Yet, surely, there are admissions on the other side also (§ 3). And we venture to say that there is not anything about heathenism in the *de V. Cont.* which is not asserted much more strongly in *de Decal.* §§ 12, 13, 14. These paragraphs must be read before a conclusive argument can be based on the anti-Greek sentiments in the invalidated tractate. We might quote other and very strong passages to the same effect, but we content ourselves by pointing to the denunciations in *de Monarch.* i. § 1 (πλάνον ἀνήνυτον, and at the close: ἀσεβείᾳ τῇ μεγίστῃ), and especially as regards Egypt in *de Jos.* § 42. Nor would even inconsistencies in his views about heathendom startle us—first, because such inconsistencies frequently occur in his writings, and notably as regards the state of the heathen (comp., for example, the praise in *Quod Omnis Prob. Lib.* § 11 with the denunciation of Persian immorality in *de Spec. Leg. ad* vi. vii. D. C. § 3, and in general the sweeping blame in *de Leg. Spec. u. s.* § 7); secondly, because of the period when *de V. Cont.* was written, since, as Ewald has finely remarked, the tone of Philo becomes much more anti-heathen after the embassy to Caius. Lastly, it is urged against the *de V. Cont.* that Philo, so far from recommending ascetic withdrawal from life, repeatedly insists on the duty of taking part in its affairs. To this it is sufficient answer that Philo only advises such participation in worldly affairs for the present necessity, but at the same time constantly urges that the "contemplative" was the higher and better life, to which he himself had recourse whenever possible, and for which at all times he ardently longed.

In the space at our disposal we have only been able to refer to such arguments as seemed of greatest weight. It is proverbially difficult to prove a negative—that the *de Vita Contemplativa* is not spurious—although the *onus probandi* properly devolves on opponents. But it is submitted, as the outcome of our enquiries, that as yet sufficient ground has not been shown against the *de V. Cont.*, and that the existence and character of the Therapeutes, as we have viewed them, are confirmed by what we derive from other parts of the Philonic writings. But that centuries after this circle of Hellenistic *illuminati* had ceased, and quite gone out of all remembrance, Eusebius, finding their mention in a Philonic tractate, should have regarded them as "a sect," and utilised them in defence of Christian asceticism, is only what might have been expected.

V. *Arrangement of the Tractates of Philo.*

Comparatively little can be said about the arrangement of the tractates of Philo in the present state of the text. Until this has been rectified the materials for a "reasoned" arrangement can scarcely be said to exist. With characteristic genius Ewald has attempted it (*Gesch. d. V. Isr.* 3tte Ausg. vol. vi. pp. 294–304). But although not only the general direction but even many of the details of his arrangement must commend themselves to every thoughtful student, it is all too reasonable (if the expression may be used)—too much *à priori* and artificial, implying such a plan of conception and such steady continuance of execution as few writers of many tractates are conscious of. And so it impresses us rather as the survey of a later philosophic critic than as the absolute sequence of plan and work on the part of Philo, although great help in the understanding of his writings may be gained from it.[a] Putting aside

[a] Ewald supposes that Philo had composed three great works. The first of these was entitled Questions on the Laws and their Solutions. Of this only fragments (on

then, for the present, any "reasoned" arrangement, it may be most convenient to select from the various schemes proposed [a] that which offers greatest facility to the student by grouping the tractates according to certain common outward marks.[b] Here then we have—

A. *Works on the Pentateuch.*

Philo himself arranges these (*De Praem. et poen.* § 1, ed. R. v. p. 219) into three classes: the cosmogonic, the historical or historico-allegorical, and the legislative, comprising in the latter the two sections of general laws and special and particular ordinances, together with kindred subjects. It is an unimportant deviation from this when in Book II. of the *De Vita Moysis* (§ 8, ed. R. iv. 194) he marks the cosmological as a subdivision of the historical and genealogical section, thus leaving only two classes.

1. *Cosmogonic Literature.*—(1.) *De Mundi Opificio*, an allegoric and philosophic presentation of the history of the creation. [On this tractate, the work of J. G. Müller, *d. Jud. Philo Buch von d. Weltschöpf.* Berlin, 1841, should be consulted.[c] After a general Introduction in which the criticism of the text, although only from the then standpoint,[d] is discussed, Müller gives the text of the tractate which is followed by a very full commentary.]

2. *Historical Treatises* [mostly commentations on Genesis, although with frequent references to other parts of Scripture]. They are also called allegorical or genealogical, and comprise the following: (2, 3, 4), *Sacr. Legum Allegoriae*, three books (I. Gen. ii. 1–16; II. Gen. ii. 17—iii. 7; III. Gen. iii. 8–19), a most important work—apparently incomplete in our present text. It is closely connected with, *De Mundi Opif.* (as appears even from the words on the title: μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον); (5) *De Cherubim et de Cain* (Gen. iii. 24; iv. 1); (6) *De Sacrificio Abelis et Caini* (Gen. iv. 2, 3); (7) *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat* (Gen. iv. 8–15). These form vol. i. in ed. R. and extend in ed. M. to i. p. 225. (8) *De Posteritate Caini sibi visi sapientis* (Gen. iv. 16–26); (9) *De Gigantibus* (Gen. vi. 1–4); (10) *Quod Deus sit immutabilis* (Gen. vi. 4–12); then four tractates on the history of Noah: (11) *De Agricultura Noe* (Gen. ix. 20); (12) *De Plantatione Noe* (Gen. ix. 20, specially stated to be a second part of the treatise); (13) *De Ebrietate* [*temulentia*] (specially marked as preceded by another tractate now lost, on Gen. ix. 21–23); (14) *Resipuit Noe, seu de Sobrietate* (Gen. ix. 24); then (15) *De Confusione Linguarum* (Gen. xi. 1–9); next five treatises on events in the life of Abraham: (16) *De Migratione Abr.* (Gen. xii. 1–6); (17) [here begins ed. R. iii. ed. M. i. p. 473] *Quis Rerum Div. Heres sit* (Gen. xv.); (18) *De Congressu quaerendae eruditionis gratia* (Gen. xvi. 1–6); (19) *De Profugis* (Gen. xvi. 6–14); (20) *De Mutatione Nominum* (Gen. xvii. 1–22); then (21, 22) two tractates on dreams: *Quod a Deo mittantur Somnia.* From Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 18) we learn that there were five books on Dreams. Those preserved seem to be Books II. and III. Our Lib. i. *De Somn.* treats of the dream of Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 12, and following, xxxi. 11–13); lib. ii. of those of Joseph and Pharaoh (Gen. xxxvii. xl. xli.). Then comes (23) (with which vol. iv. ed. R. and ed. M. vol. ii. begins:) a Life of Abraham: the conception and treatment sufficiently appearing from the title, *Vita Sapientis per doctrinam perfecti, sive de Legibus non scriptis, hoc est de Abrahamo.* This, as appears from the introduction to *De Josepho*, had been followed by similar lives of Isaac and of Jacob—tractates now lost. Then follow (24) *Vita viri*

Gen. and Ex., and a fragment on Lev., as well as other fragments), have been preserved in the four books of *Quaest. in Gen.* and the two *in Ex.* of the Latin transl. from the Armenian by Aucher (ed. R. vols. vi. and vii.), and in Mai, *Script. Vet. n. collect.* t. vii. 1. The work had extended over the whole Pentateuch. [We regard these tractates rather as the material and preparation for his allegorico-exegetical writings.] Then had followed a second work on "The Allegories of the Sacred Law," which, as it grew in his hands, was divided into separate tractates. As regarded his main object Philo had only got as far as Gen. xx. (this is apparent from the contents of *de Somniis*, which, however, is also classed with the second great work of Philo. Eusebius speaks of five books *de Somniis*, of which only two have been preserved.) The work formed a kind of Homilies addressed to the circle of "initiated" Jews. On account of its length and for other reasons, these tractates were subdivided and abbreviated. Ewald considers that this work comprises all in Richter's ed. from vol. i. p. 60 (ed. M. i. p. 43) to the end of vol. iii. (that of M. i.), as well as the little tractate *de Deo* (ed. R. viii. pp. 409–414; A. ii. pp. 613–619). The third large work of Philo was chiefly intended for heathen readers and bore the title: On the Life of Moses and on his Laws. This work consisted of a "Life of Moses,"—originally intended to comprise four, but compressed into two books; then of treatises on three kinds of *Oracles of God*, viz. (1) *de Mundi Opificio* (ed. R. i. pp. 4–56); (2) on the unwritten laws, as embodied and presented in the lives of the seven patriarchs: Enos, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph. Of this only the tractates on Abraham and on Joseph have been preserved (ed. Richter, iv. pp. 4–113); (3) An explanation of the laws, with various supplemental tractates, comprising all in ed. Richter, iv. p. 246—v. p. 217 (ed. M. ii. pp. 180–407). To them must be added as a twofold supplement the *de Praemiis et poenis* and the *de Execrat.* (ed. R. v. pp. 219–257). The other tractates of Philo Ewald regards as detached and occasional. We cannot enter into further details; only remarking that, besides those which in their present form are in some sense fragmentary, at least 21 tractates of Philo seem wholly lost.

[a] Perhaps the most untenable arrangement is that into *theoretical* writings [*Haggadana*] and *practical* [*Halachana*] to which Grossmann adds as a third division: a *genus mixtum*.

[b] I have here followed generally the arrangement of Zöckler in Herzog's *Real.-Encykl.* xi. pp. 638, 639.

[c] Müller's synopsis arranges the tractate into an Introduction (§ 1, 2); then follow Part I. on Gen. i. or the *Hexaemeron* (§ 3–29), with interpretation of the number 7 according to Gen. ii. 1–3 (§ 30–43), and an epilogue (§ 44, 45) according to Gen. ii. 4–6. Part II. (§ 46–60) treats of the creation of the *visible* man and of the fall (Gen. ii. 7; iii. 24). Conclusion and retrospect (§ 61).

[d] Müller gives preference to the Munich Codex of the 14th century, which he styles A, and would have us decide in most cases for the readings common to the *ed. princeps* of Turnebus (Paris, 1552, and, with some additions, 1553) and the Codex A (Munich) which he regards as representing the oldest and most authentic text. Where these two differ, he would give the preference to that reading which is supported by other MSS. Lastly, he prefers Turnebus to the MSS. of Mangey.

Civilis, sive de Josepho, and (25, 26, 27) three books *De Vita Moysis, hoc est de Theologia et Prophetia*.

3. Writings on the *Mosaic Legislation* (very unreasonably arranged both in the Paris ed. and in those of Mangey and of Richter), viz. (28) *de Decalogo*; (29) *de Circumcisione*—the arrangement is Philo's (comp. the introduction to each of these tractates—but it may have opened the work *de specialibus legibus*, which, according to Eusebius was arranged into four Books). Next we have (30, 31) two books *De Monarchia* (on the First Commandment); (33, 34, 35, 36) four tractates connected with the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Commandments, and bearing the general title *De Specialibus Legibus*, viz. on the Third Commandment, *De Jurejurando et Religione* (commonly quoted as *De Spec. Leg.*); on the Fourth Commandment, *De Septenario*, with the supplemental *De Festo Cophini* (basket of first-fruits); and on the Fifth Commandment, *De Parentibus colendis*; (37) a treatise *De Specialibus Legibus* on the Sixth and Seventh Commandments (Philo inverts that order, and treats also of cognate subjects); (38) another treatise *De Specialibus Legibus* on the Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Commandments. With the latter he most skilfully connects the laws about forbidden meats.[e] Then (39) *De Judice*, (40) *De Justitia*, and (41) *De Creatione Principum* follow in the regular order of things. These are (according to Philo's own statement) succeeded by a treatise *De Tribus Virtutibus*, now divided into three tractates: (42) *De Fortitudine*, (43) *De Caritate*, and (44) *De Poenitentia*. Somewhat loosely joined to the Philonic treatises which we possess, but evidently inwardly connected, is the group of three tractates referring to Lev. i.–vii.: (45) *De Praemiis Sacerdotum et Honoribus*, (46) *De Victimis* (*de Animal. idon. Sacrif.*), and (47) *De Victimas Offerentibus*. With these should probably be connected: (48) the brief tractate *De Mercede Meretricis* (on Deut. xxiii. 18). It is not easy to find an exact place for the short tractate (49) *De Execrationibus* (on Deut. xxviii. 33). Possibly it may fit to (53) *De Praemiis et Poenis*. This tractate is (in its introduction) described as following on the *Cosmological*, the *Historical*, and the *Legislative* writings, and is a retrospect in which the rewards and punishments are traced from the time of Enos and Noah.

B. *Philosophical Writings.*

(51) *Quod omnis probus liber sit* (an apologetic tractate) addressed to Theodotus, and which states that it followed and was the counterpart of another tractate which dealt with the converse proposition to that now discussed.[f] Part of this tractate Ewald finds in the treatise (52) *De Nobilitate*. Then follow (53) *De Vita Contemplativa* (although this might be regarded as partly historical); (54, 55, 56, 57) four books *Quaestionum et Solutionum earum quae in Genesi sunt* (exegetico-allegorical and philosophical); (58, 59) two books [sermons] *Quaest. Solutionumque eorum quae sunt in Exodo*; (60, 61) two books. *De Providentia*; (62) *De Ratione quam habent etiam bruta Animalia* [*de Deo? De Mundo? De Incorruptibilitate Mundi??*]

C. *Political Writings.*

At present these comprise: (63) *In Flaccum* and (64) *De Virtutibus et Legatione ad Caium*. According to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 5) this work had consisted of five books. Of these the first, second, and fifth are lost. If we suppose the present work *Ad Caium* to have formed Book IV. then the fifth book (which is otherwise also announced as a continuation of the *Ad Caium*) may possibly have formed together with Book IV., an independent work: "On the Virtues" (Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 6). Ewald supposes that in early life Philo had written an apologetic work, entitled *Hypothetika*, or "On the Jews," of which he regards the quotations in Eusebius (*Praepar. Evang.* viii. 5, 11—7, 20) as fragments (comp. ed. R. vi. pp. 176 sqq.).

If, in conclusion, it be asked from which of the tractates of Philo insight may most readily be gained into his system, we would name in the first place: *De Mundi Opificio*, *De Abrahamo* (for allegorical interpretation), *De Josepho* (for practical philosophy), and *De Vita Moysis*. To these should however be added, as scarcely less important, the tractates *De Legum Allegor.*, *De Somniis*, and *De Decalogo*.

VI. *Standpoint of Philo: his Allegorical Method.*

What has hitherto been stated regarding Philo and his system cannot be properly understood, nor yet his special views appreciated, without some account of his own mental development and of the method by which he traced, or placed, his own ideas in the sacred Scriptures. The fundamental view of Philo was that true theology was conditioned by a comprehensive philosophical knowledge, by means of which the new Platonico-Pythagorean philosophy was to be combined with the old Jewish faith of Revelation. The method which he employed for this purpose was, as we know, the allegorical.[g] We also recall that, while Jewish and Grecian teaching were equally to be considered as true, the latter must be subordinated to the former as containing only partial truth. But as regards this incompatible alliance, the common Greek saying that either Plato philonised, or Philo platonised, really embodies the condemnation of the whole system.

This co-ordination of Greek philosophy with the Old Testament, appears from the very outset. Moses is described as having reached the very summit of philosophy, but yet as having learnt from the [Divine] oracles the most numerous and important principles of nature (*de Mundi Opif.* § 2). It is in the same spirit that Philo severely blames those who, having higher enlightenment, neglected the outward observance of the Mosaic laws, such as of the Sabbath, or of circumcision. This, chiefly, as

[e] Commonly the part on the Tenth Commandment, together with what is connected with it on forbidden meats, is made a separate tractate: *De Concupiscentia* (ed. R. v. pp. 133–146).

[f] This tractate is also mentioned by Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 18.)

[g] Zeller, *u. s.* pp. 340, 341. As we here generally follow Zeller and Siegfried (Philo von Alexandria) special acknowledgments have not been repeated. For the same reason only the principal proof-references will be given, and these as sparingly as possible. For others we must refer readers to the above two works.

it appears to us, on account of its detrimental influence on others, but also because the observance of the outward might tend to the good of that which was within, just as care for the body was needful for the health of the soul (*de Migr. Abr.* § 16). In accordance with this reverence for the letter were the views which Philo entertained about inspiration—although, as in Rabbinic Judaism, Moses was exalted above the other Biblical writers (*Vita M.* iii. § 23). But they had all been impersonal, passive instruments of inspiration, and the same also held true of the Greek version of the Old Testament, in which the translators had been Divinely "prompted" (*Vita M.* ii. § 5–7). Hence the severest punishments had descended on scoffers of even minute statements (*de Mutat. Nom.* § 8). Accordingly Philo rests all his teaching upon the Old Testament, although the special meaning which he finds in certain words and particles of the sacred text may often be due rather to the exigencies of his system than to his idea of inspiration.[h]

But by the side of this we have the other, or Grecian, side in Philo. He was so conversant with Greek literature—historical, poetic and philosophical—that it had entered into his mental being, and become part of it[i]. If he appeals to the seven sages of Hellas, to the Magi among the Persians, and the Gymnosophists among the Indians (*Quod omnis prob. lib.* § 11), he is specially enthusiastic as regards his own philosophic teachers. Empedocles, Parmenides, and Xenophanes are little short of divine (*de Provid.* ii. § 42); they, with Zeno, Cleanthes, and others, are a holy assembly (*u. s.* § 48); the Pythagoreans are described as most sacred (*ἱερώτατος θίασος*), and philosophy as of equal weight with a divine oracle (*Q. o. p. l.* § 1), while Plato is "the great," and Hellas, the only true "mother of men."[k] In accordance with Jewish and Rabbinical views, Theology was indeed considered the centre and climax of all, but then philosophy formed part of, and led up to, it. Therefore although Moses was incomparably the superior among philosophers, yet in a sense he was only *primus inter pares*. To the objection that the heathen myths were full of absurdity, profanity, and immorality (*de Prov.* ii. § 34–39), Philo replies that even if their writers were in these respects blameworthy, it would be as absurd to speak ill of them as of our fair world for the nuisances which it contains. But, in truth, our estimate of these myths was not correct. Each of them was an allegory, and had a deep spiritual meaning (which Philo presently sets forth in detail), which those "theologians:" Empedocles, Parmenides, Xenophanes, had taught in plain language (*u. s.* § 40–42). This, although Philo speaks in terms of strong reprobation of the heathen—even Greek—notions about the gods, just as he does of atheistic and materialistic views (*de Decal.* § 12, 13, and especially § 14). All these he denounces as not only ignorance (*ἄγνοια*), but endless error (*πλάνος ἀνήνυτος*), and the greatest impiety (*ἀσέβεια ἡ μεγίστη*), which should even be visited with punishment at the hands of the magistrates, since such men loved darkness rather than the brightest light (*de Monarch.* §§ 1, 7). And yet withal Philo seems not only to trace some of the myths (such as those about Herakles) to a background of historical fact, but even in platonic fashion to regard the planets as divine (*θείαις γὰρ φύσεσιν ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης*, Philo apud Eus. *Praep. Ev.* viii. 14, 50).[l]

The solution of the various difficulties which must have suggested themselves to a Jew in his acknowledgment and reception of heathen philosophic truths lay, as previously stated, in the view that the heathen philosophers had ultimately drawn from Jewish biblical sources, or at least that they had come to the same conclusions, which, however, had been anticipated by Moses. The latter—in regard to the leading principle of the philosophy of Heraklitus as to the existence of opposites in nature, which was found already in Genesis (*Quis rer. div. s. her.* § 43[m]). Zeno had actually derived certain of his ethical views from the history of Jacob and Esau (Gen. xxviii.), and in general the laws of Moses had influenced all nations, barbarians as well as Greeks (*de V. Moys.* ii. § 4). But it would certainly have been impossible to prove what was the fundamental idea of his system: the identity of the truths of philosophy with those of Revelation, and the priority and superiority of the latter, if the Scriptures had been interpreted only in their literal sense. It was necessary to regard the latter as an allegory, and to ascertain their higher meaning, at least to the initiated. In truth, it would have been derogatory to Scripture to have understood it only in a literal sense. It was not only that the law, as in Ex. xxii. 26, would in its bare letter seem poor and even open to objections (*de Somn.* i. § 17), —but occasionally the letter would give no meaning. Not that it was to be discarded: but it was only the body, while the allegorical meaning was the soul. If in Numb. xxiii. 19,

---

[h] The latter is the view of Zeller.

[i] Grossmann (*Quaestiones Philoneae*, p. 5, nota 5) enumerates 65 as "Graeci scriptores a Philone laudati." Comp. also Siegfried, pp. 137–139. Siegfried traces *Neo-Pythagoreanism* in the fundamental dualism of the system of Philo: in his views of God, of the Divine Reason pervading all, and the Divine powers in the *Kosmos*: *Stoicism*; in his views of the Logos a mixture of *Platonic, Stoic*, and *Neo-pythagorean* teaching; in his views of matter *Platonism* and *Stoicism*; of creation, specially *Platonism*; in his symbolism of numbers *Pythagoreanism*. In Psychology he traces the influence of *Stoic* elements (in the division of the soul according to eight powers); of *Platonic* elements (in the trichotomy of reason, courage, and desire); of *Aristotelianism* (as regards the nourishing, sentient, and reasonable soul); of *Neo-pythagoreanism* (as regards the body as the source of all evil), and, finally, again of *Platonic* teaching in regarding the essence of the soul as an efflux of the Divine. In Ethics Philo is chiefly under the influence of Stoicism.

[k] See the extravagant language about Hellas at the close of § 109, *de Provid.* ii.

[l] His condemnation of speaking ill of the heathen deities is, however, based on the need of general respect for the appellation of God (*De V. Moys.* iii. § 26), while his attribution of the fate of the three despoilers of the temple of Delphi, not to accident (*casu*) but to the judgment of God (*De Provid.* ii. § 28) may be set down to his general views.

[m] *Socrates sive a Moyse edoctus sive ex rebus ipsis motus* (*Quaest.* in Gen. ii. § 6); Heraclitus . . . *a theologo nostro mutuatus*, although *additis immensis iisque laboriosis argumentis* (*u. s.* iii. § 5), in another passage (*u. s.* iv. § 152) even: *Heraclitus a Moyse furtim dempta lege.*

we read that "God is not a man," and in Deut. i. 31, that He was as a man, the former expressed the absolute truth in regard to His teaching, while the latter referred to what was needful for the instruction of the many[n] (*Quod Deus immut.* § 11). In another place, commenting on the same two passages, Philo speaks of the full truth which is opened to the wise, and of the accommodation granted to the foolish, in which he includes all anthropomorphisms and all representations of God's anger, or of the instruments which He used against the wicked (*de Somn.* i. § 40). It follows indeed from his views on inspiration that all the narratives of Scripture were to be absolutely received, and all its laws to be literally observed. But this occasionally necessitated rationalistic suggestions on the part of Philo, such as that Moses had seen a fair form in the bush, and that its flames became articulate speech. But there was deeper truth also of which the letter was the allegory. Thus the manifestation and communication of God in fiery flame meant that the oracles of God are to be accurately understood and tested as gold by the fire, and that as fire both gives light and burns up, so those who obeyed God's commands had the light and would live for ever in it, while the disobedient were set on flame and burnt up by their appetites (*De Decal.* § 11). On the other hand, Philo also not infrequently indulges in tasteless and tedious effusions, such as in the stilted speech which he puts into the mouth of Jacob when he hears of the loss of Joseph (*De Jos.* § 5), or in the lecture which Joseph is made to deliver to Potiphar's wife, which, we should imagine, would have extinguished the most ardent passion (*u. s.* § 9), or in the address which Moses gives to the Midianite shepherds, and which, to our mind unaccountably, led them to discover from his looks and words that he was a prophet, and hence to retire before the daughters of Jethro (*De V. Mos.* i. 10). The historical tractates of Philo contain many such prosaic stories, speeches, and moralisings. Along with these Philo also introduces not a few embellishments and additions to the Biblical history, found also in Rabbinic tradition.[o] Although he was undoubtedly acquainted with Hebrew,[p] yet he probably derived these not from Rabbinic teaching, but indirectly, from what was floating about among the Jews, and universally received, as dating perhaps no one knew whence, nor from how long ago.

It were impossible here to give a detailed account of the application which Philo made of his method for eliciting the allegorical meaning of Scripture—often ingeniously and attractively, still more frequently in a manner and with results most extravagant.[q] Yet he did not proceed in a quite arbitrary manner, but kept in view some of the Stoic rules of allegory, and probably also many of the Jewish Haggadic canons. Still we cannot persuade ourselves that he always allegorised on definite rules.[r] So to speak, his only system was his system. He allegorised when he could—when the text suggested its possibility; and he allegorised when he must, when the text would otherwise have seemed to him incongruous. This necessity of his system accounts for the *three* rules, in accordance with which (as Siegfried supposes) Philo in certain instances wholly discarded the literal for the allegorical meaning of a passage, viz. when the former seemed to involve what was unworthy of God (in Philo's view); or else when the text presented insurmountable difficulties; or, lastly, when Scripture itself seemed to point to an allegory.[s] On the other hand, Philo also allegorised whenever he could by dint of ingenuity find some deeper meaning for what was written, especially when that deeper meaning could be substituted for what to a Grecian mind might seem trivial and superficial, or difficult in the letter of the text; and also when by such allegory he could foist upon Scripture his own philosophical views; or when it suggested some symbolism that had been used by his Greek or his Jewish teachers. To one or other of these the twenty-three rules can be reduced, by which (according to Siegfried) Philo was wont to trace the allegorical under the literal meaning of a passage. Even the number of these rules would render it difficult to believe that he had always consciously kept them in view. And when he speaks of "canons" (*de Somn.* i. § 15), and of "laws of allegory" (*de Abr.* § 15) this does not necessarily imply (as Siegfried suggests) a reference to certain definite rules, but rather that there were rules and laws in accordance with which allegorical interpretation was necessary.

At the same time it may be well, for the better understanding of Philo's writings, to group his allegorisms according to certain points of view. What here first impresses us is that Philo so often occupies ground similar to that taken in Jewish Rabbinic interpretations. It is so, when he finds indication of a special meaning in every word and sentence which, strictly speaking, might seem superfluous. Thus such a duplication as "Abraham, Abraham," conveyed a meaning of its own. So did an apparently superfluous expression, such as "Dying thou shalt die" (Gen. ii. 17), or the reiteration of what had been stated before, as when (in Gen. xvi. 3) Sarah is once more styled Abraham's wife, which was intended to show that, despite his union with Hagar, Sarah was still his real wife. But whereas Rabbinic interpreters would have made exegetical use of all this, or else applied it in a moral sense, Philo found in such cases indication, not of an exegetical or moral meaning, but of a quite different kind of teaching of which the letter was an allegory. Thus in the case of Sarah and Hagar the lesson was (as previously explained) about the relation of encyclical knowledge to true wisdom (*De Congr. quaer. erud. gr.* § 14). More arbitrary, but still

[n] This also accords with Jewish views. See *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*.

[o] For a fuller account of Philo's Jewish training and of the correspondence between his interpretations and the Haggadah (of which a summary is given in the *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, *l. l.*) we refer to Siegfried, pp. 142–157).

[p] This is denied by Mangey, though on very insufficient grounds.

[q] A number of instances are collected by Zeller, *u. s.* pp. 348–350.

[r] This is the view of Siegfried.

[s] Siegfried has illustrated the application of each of these three canons by a selection of apt and striking examples.

Jewish, is it, when different expressions that occur in connection with the same person are supposed to indicate a special meaning, as when Laban is once called the Syrian, and at other times Rebecca's brother[t]; or when an allegorical meaning is elicited, by an arbitrary change in the punctuation of a sentence, or in the relation to each other of words in the same sentence. Decidedly Jewish is also the attachment of a specific meaning to the choice of one word rather than another among synonyms (such as when in Gen. ii. 8, we have ἔπλασε. which referred to "the earthly man," while the expression ἐποίησε, in Gen. i. 27, referred to the "heavenly" man (*Leg. Alleg.* i. 12, 16). This canon gave large scope for allegorising, and Philo made frequent and very ingenious use of it. Still more ingenious were the allegorical interpretations based on a play of words, such as also occur in Rabbinic writings. Thus Philo explains (in *De Sacrif. Ab. et Caini*, § 34) the direction in Ex. xiii. 13, to exchange the firstborn of an ass for a young sheep by a twofold word-play: ὄνος, ass, and πόνος [*onus*] labour; and again, πρόβατον, sheep, and προβαίνειν, to advance forward—the latter word-play being expressly referred to by Philo, the former clearly implied in the collocation of the words. And the meaning of the allegory was: exchange all labour for improvement. But the meaning of the alternative—that, if the firstling of an ass was not exchanged, it was to be ransomed—was: if you are not able to exchange labour for improvement [if your nature does not advance by your labour], then give up your labour. We are still on Jewish ground when we find an allegorical meaning sought in adverbs and prepositions, or even in parts of a word. Thus, very instructively, Philo infers from the particle "after" in Gen. i. 27 ("God made man *after* the image," not "the image"), that the "heavenly" man was only a copy of the image of God, or of the Logos—the "heavenly" man serving in turn as model for the "earthly" (the mind in us), which was therefore only a third image of its Maker (*Quis rer. div. her.* § 48). Perhaps this, as indeed some of the previous principles of interpretation, can scarcely be called allegorical.[u] It is otherwise when, for example, Philo allegorically derives from the particle εὐ in εὐλογήσω ("I will bless them," Gen. xii. 2) this meaning, that God gives to the wise man the Logos who is worthy of praise, the particle εὐ always referring to virtue[x] (*De Migr. Abr.* § 13). Again, wide and varying allegorical application could be made of this other principle, that a word or an expression might be taken in one or all the meanings of which it was capable, nay, that for this purpose it might even be slightly altered (as in the accents or in the breathing). Yet this was also one of the most common modes of Haggadic interpretations—although (we repeat it) not for allegoric teaching. Thus Philo finds in the simple question, ποῦ εἶ; ("Where art thou?" Gen. iii. 9). no less than four different meanings (*De Leg. Alleg.* iii. 17). First, by altering the accent to πού, it would mean: Thou art somewhere—that which is created is in space and place, but God is not in any place, as Adam seemed to imagine that God was walking in the garden and surrounded by it. Secondly, it would be a call to the soul to consider how, instead of wisdom and good, it had chosen ignorance and vice. Thirdly, viewed as a question, the answer might be in the negative: "Nowhere," indicating that the soul of the wicked had no place of rest to go to, hence he is also said to be ἄτοπος. Or fourthly, the answer might be positive and hortative: "Hear, where I am"—where those are who see not nor hear God, who are destitute of wisdom and virtue, and who tremble. Again, very Rabbinic are the attempts to trace a deeper meaning in the choice of a peculiar expression, or in the use of a number, or of a tense. Illustrations of each of these may prove instructive. As regards the first, Philo[y] imagines that the use of the expression "one day," instead of "the first day," in Gen. i. 5, had this meaning, that it described, not the visible creation, but the "intelligible" and incorporeal kosmos, whose nature was "monadic" (*De Mundi Op.* § 9). In regard to the strange use of the plural in the account of the creation of man (Gen. i. 26), Philo "conjectures" that God had assistants in it on account of the "mixed nature" of good and evil in man, the good alone being traceable to Him, while the evil must be imputed to His other assistants. Conversely, the singular number in Abraham's address to the three angels (Gen. xviii. 3) showed that it was only a threefold appearance of one substance. But the allegory of the whole narrative is remarkable. It was really the vision of God by the soul. This vision was at one time of one, at another of three. In the middle was the Father of all, called in Holy Scripture ὁ ὤν. On either hand were the two most ancient and most near potencies: at His right hand the "Creative Potency" (ποιητικὴ δύναμις), at His left the "Royal" or Governing "Potency" (βασιλικὴ δύναμις)—the former θεός, the latter κύριος. Now the highest vision was that of the soul quite purified, when, discarding all numbers, even that of "two," which was nearest to the unit, it rose straight up to the Absolute, which was free from all mixture or combination, ὁ ὤν. Next to it was the vision of God through the "Creative Potency" (when man knew God through His works in creation); while the third was that through the "Governing Potency" (His Rule)—when man knew God in His providential government. Thus, after all, it was only the threefold appearance of One—hence the use of the singular number in Gen. xviii. 3 (*De Abr.* §§ 24, 25). To all this we may

t This is certainly conveyed in *De Prof.* 8, 9.

u I have nevertheless ranked them among the allegorical canons, because I have here followed Siegfried, from whose store of illustrations I have selected those given in the text, after having verified and examined them in detail. But the caution, given in the text, will show that all is not to be set down to "allegorising," and that our remarks about the "system" on which Philo proceeded are justified.

x It may be worth while giving, by way of illustration, from the section previous to that just quoted, the following ingenious allegory: If in Deut. xxiii. 1, 2, a eunuch and the son of a harlot are excluded from the congregation, this really referred to the exclusion, on the one hand, of an atheist, on the other of a polytheist.

y Like the Revised Version—and with little better reason.

add that yet another indication of allegorical meaning was found in the use or the absence of the article. For ὁ θεός was God Himself, θεός was the Logos (*de Somn.* i. § 39).

Nor is this all. In Rabbinic interpretation, if an inference had been drawn as to a special meaning in one passage, that meaning might henceforth be applied in all cases. We notice the same rule in Philo. Again, the position of a word relatively to what preceded or followed yielded allegoric teaching. Further, it was, in Philo's view, culpable negligence to overlook the significance of an omission. Thus the omission of the word "son" at the birth of Cain, although the first in the generation of men (Gen. iv. 1), while it occurred at that of Seth (iv. 25), showed that Cain was a disposition of the soul. Similarly, if Er was called wicked (Gen. xxxviii. 7) without any reason being assigned for it, it meant corporeity, while, when Noah was declared righteous without assignment of reason, it pointed to the significance of his name—that the righteous had rest. Nor can we wonder if the converse rule also was applied, and a special meaning seen in strange designations or names. Thus, if "Bethuel," "the daughter of God," was the father of Rebecca, its allegory was that Wisdom ever virgin had indeed a feminine name but a masculine nature, and hence could beget Rebecca—perfect virtue (*de Prof.* § 9).

We get beyond Jewish modes of interpretation when we come to the symbolism of numbers which has at all times engaged thinkers, and of which Philo makes most ingenious use. As regards the symbolism of names, Philo occupied Biblical ground, since the significance of names is frequently indicated in the Old Testament. It need scarcely be said that this was carried much farther in the Haggadah. Philo here sometimes follows the lead of Scripture, sometimes that of Jewish tradition, and at other times that of his philosophic teachers. But the importance of his use of that symbolism lay in the application which he made of it. In the view of Philo "those who bear a name become allegorical representatives of definite characters, and in that capacity affect the whole history." And this, although the same name was at times interpreted and applied by him in a manner quite different, and even opposite.[a] Sometimes Philo also gives a twofold Hebrew, or else a Hebrew and a Greek, etymology of a name, which again leads to manifold allegorical interpretations. We have left to the last Philo's symbolism in regard to objects, because it admits of too extensive application to be otherwise than generally described. All four-footed animals, birds, and creeping beasts mentioned in the Bible, were allegories of conditions of the soul, of faculties, dispositions, or passions; the useful plants were allegories of virtues, the noxious of the affections of the unwise—and so on through the mineral kingdom; through heaven, earth, and stars; through fountains and rivers, fields and dwellings; through metals, substances, arms, clothes, ornaments, furniture, the body and its parts, the sexes, and our outward condition.[a] Thus all Scripture, and every event, and every person and object mentioned in it, became an allegory. This must suffice, chiefly by way of illustration, with only this added caution that, when we speak of accord with Rabbinic modes of commentation, it is not implied that either Philo or the Rabbis derived their views from each other. Such dependence may indeed have existed, either generally (in floating traditions) or specifically. But it is at least conceivable that the source of both streams had been independent of each other, since allegorical and Haggadic interpretation naturally flow in the same direction, as the experience of all ages and schools has shown.

[a] For further particulars and for illustrations, we refer to *Siegfried*, *u. s.*

VII. *The System of Philo.*

What has just been explained in regard to the method of Philo will be useful in such study of his system as can here be attempted. So far as possible his views shall be presented in his own words.

A. THEOLOGY.—It has perhaps not been sufficiently noticed how earnest and how intensely Jewish Philo is in his Theism. The assertion of the Being of God, as against Atheism and Polytheism (that against Pantheism is perhaps rather a sequence of his system), is repeated in almost every tractate. It is supported by well nigh every argument which has since been brought forward in its favour, and set forth with an enthusiasm of personal conviction that shows how vital this point was to Philo, and often with an eloquence that carries us away. And, indeed, without it Philo would not have had any standing within Judaism. But beyond this, his views about God form the foundation of his practical theology. They also lead up to his conception of that contemplative life which Philo regarded as the highest object—as alike true wisdom, true life, and true holiness.

We have to keep this always in mind, since from the first Philo also introduces another principle, apparently antagonistic to that just referred to, and yet quite as fundamental to his system. For Philo would remove God far away from all contact with everything that exists (placing Him almost in contrast with it), until the Divine Being stands out in unapproachable light, and this alone can be predicated of Him that He is ὁ ὤν. There are two poles around which the system of Philo moves, alike in its speculative and in its practical aspect: the infinite separateness of God and the evil of matter. And yet, although the one is the outcome of Platonism, while the other touches Stoic elements, the two are really so connected that we might regard the Philonic view of God as the source and *matrix* of his whole system. And this view of God might seem to him not Platonic only. The Old Testament also had taught the infinite elevation of God, and the Judaism of

[a] We cannot deny ourselves quoting this beautiful allegory of Philo's (which has in so many ways been appropriated without acknowledgement): *σκιὰν δὲ καὶ ὑπόγραμμον τῆς αὖθις ἐπομένης ἀναβιώσεως τὸν ὕπνον* [*somnum futurae olim resurrectionis umbram et similitudinem*—ex vers. Mangey], Phil. *Fragm.* ed. R. vi. p. 229. In a somewhat different form, we have this in Ber. R. 17, where sleep and death, dream and prophecy, the Sabbath and the future life are grouped together.

Philo's time had declared His Name Jahveh to be ineffable. Besides, the whole tendency of the pre-Philonic development had (as will have been noticed) been in the same direction. We recall here the persistent and consistent efforts to remove all anthropomorphisms from the conception, and from the Biblical representations, of God. That such infinite distance of God was compatible with closest nearness to man, even to the extent of personal condescension to the humblest, and the dwelling in and with such: this constituted the highest teaching of the Old Testament, the sublimated essence of its spirituality, quite plainly indicated indeed in the Pentateuch, but brought out with increasing clearness by the Prophets and in the Psalms. Yet the apprehension of this element required spiritual sympathy, spiritual responsiveness—we had almost said, spiritual kinship. But Hellenism possessed not that kinship. Nay, in a sense, its intellectual apprehension of God and, though the expression seems to involve contradiction, such intellectual spirituality as that of Philo, were really contrary to it. It was necessary to have been "born of God," to open one's heart to its influence, in order to be in sympathy with it (comp. St. Matth. xi. 25). And so in this, as in all other respects, the New Testament has brought perfectness. St. John also (i. 18), as well as St. Paul (1 Tim. vi. 16) taught the unapproachableness of God, but their teaching led up to the Gospel-message by which the seeming contrast was for ever removed. And in the New Testament also, we must take leave to say, there is a vein of Asceticism, as regards the evil of the flesh and of the material; but that evil is not absolute, only relative and conditional, and its Asceticism aims after the subjection and transformation of the material, not its utter rejection.

1. *God.*—It has been said, and with truth, that the views of Philo in regard to the Deity are mainly of a negative character. But this was one of the necessities of his system. To his mind there might, as before indicated, seem such fundamental agreement between those negative descriptions of God in the Old Testament—with its ineffable Jehovah—and his philosophic teachers, as would make the latter only the more dear to him, and prove the kinship of their philosophy with his ancestral faith. But, assuredly, greater heresy could not have been spoken in Philonic ears, nor yet views more contrary to his system expressed, than when St. Paul preached his Gospel of Him[b] Who was manifested in the flesh (1 Tim. iii. 16), and St. John of the Son of God manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil (1 John iii. 8). For the fundamental principle of Philo's theology was that as God was neither in time nor space, so no qualities of any kind could be attributed to Him (He was ἄποιος). Hence no Name could be given Him (ἄρρητος), nor was He within the comprehension of man (ἀκατάληπτος). Instructive statements in this direction have been quoted in some of our previous remarks. Many further passages might be adduced. We select only one as interesting in other respects also (*De mutat. Nom.* §§ 2–4). Philo begins by warning us that the τὸ ὄν, which is equivalent to the ὁ ὤν, cannot be comprehended by man. Nor is it to be wondered (εἰ τὸ ὂν ἀνθρώποις ἀκατάληπτον), since even the mind in us is not knowable. It follows that no proper name can be given to Him who is "the Being in truth" (τῷ ὄντι πρὸς ἀλήθειαν). The "I am that I am," meant that His nature was "to be, not to be spoken forth" (εἶναι πέφυκα, οὐ λέγεσθαι). But the appellation Lord had been conceded to man: "Lord the God of three natures [in us—by]: instruction, goodness of nature, and practice" (askesis), of which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were respectively the symbols. If we read that the Lord appeared to Abraham, it was not He who is the great cause of all that became manifest, but one of His Potencies, "the Royal Potency," which bore the name Lord—not τὸ ὄν, but κύριος. And the expression "I am thy God," was not used properly, but in a figurative manner, as God was not in relation to anything, and this alike before and after the creation of the universe. Again—matter was that which was defective, even evil, and hence there was absolute contrast between it and God. We have already seen what special meaning we must attach to the expression, that God made man "after" His image. Similarly, we recall how all such affections on the part of God, as anger and the like, were to be regarded as an accommodation to a lower standpoint, as well as what lessons in reference to God were to be learned from the words to Adam: "Where art thou?" Remote from all matter which was finite, composite, not really being, God was the great *Monad*, the unmingled and unmixed One. It would be difficult to determine whether it was this contrast with all that was created, or the principle that God could not be compared to anyone, and that attributes could not be ascribed to Him, that had led Philo to describe God as quite above all the notions which we can connect with either virtue, knowledge, the good, or the beautiful (*De Mundi Opif.* § 2). Probably his philosophy would lead him to that conclusion, while his Jewish belief would arrive through the positive conception of the infinite superiority of God at the negative description of Him to which we have referred. In the view of Philo God was the archetype of the beautiful, the alone perfect and blessed, the world-reason, He Who is everywhere, beholds, and comprehends everything, yet is not comprehended by any. Above all, He is absolutely and eternally working, from Whom all springs and is set in motion, the constantly productive cause of all. Here then we have Stoic elements by the side of Platonism. But the transcendental perfectness of God was to be learned from those effects or manifestations of which He was the transcendental yet ever active cause. In this constant Divine causation[c] two properties stood out as fundamental: power and goodness. More especially was it the property of goodness.[d] This was also the highest and original impelling principle of Divine manifestation. And since God was θεός, Philo gives this name also to the property of goodness. It was the quality of good-

[b] The reading ὅς for θεός does not alter the significance in this respect of "the mystery."

[c] It need scarcely be pointed out that there was here a contradiction in the system of Philo between God as absolutely outside the world, and God as innermost in it, the constantly active, creative cause of all—the δραστήριον αἴτιον (*de mundi op.* § 2).

[d] The Rabbis also speak of this property of goodness.

ness to which alike the creation and the government of the world were to be traced. Yet only of that which is good in it, not of that which is evil. We have previously seen that God created only the souls of the good (*de mutat. nom.* § 4). So also in regard to His government. Only the good came from Him—not the evil, nor yet punishments, which His compassion, that outweighed His justice, sought to mitigate.

2. *The "Potencies,"* δυνάμεις. The apparent contradiction between the entire separation of God from the world and the fact that He was the ever active cause of all was resolved by the doctrine of the Divine "Potencies," as intermediary beings. Here Philo could fall back, on the one hand, upon Plato's archetypal ideas as the models of all the real, and, on the other hand, upon the Stoic principle of efficient or productive causes—the world-pervading reason of God, the potencies which, proceeding from Him, gave life and form and continuance to all. These two, then, Philo combined. When God would create the world, He recognised that there must be an ideal archetype of every work, and He formed the supersensuous world of ideas. But these ideas were not only models; they were also the productive causes, the potencies, which brought order into the material that existed, and to each thing its properties. The archetypal world then is also those invisible Potencies (δυνάμεις), which surround the Deity as His train, and by which He works in the world that which, owing to His separation from it, He could not otherwise have wrought.* The Potencies are the viceregents of God, His legates, and intermediaries to things finite. Here we come upon another of the difficulties of the system. On the one hand, these "Potencies" were ministering spirits—what the Greeks called "demons," and Moses "angels"—and as such to be invoked. On the other hand, they were "ideas," Potencies of which the higher always included the lower, and they existed only in the Divine thinking (*De Mundi Opif.* § 4). Besides, it was God Himself who in His Potencies was present in things. If, therefore, these "Potencies" are undoubtedly presented by Philo as "hypostases," yet they have not any true personal subsistence. Here his philosophy and theology are hopelessly at issue. In Philo's system the δυνάμεις must be in God, on account of his views about the world, and yet they must be different from God, on account of his views about the Deity.

The same unclearness prevails in regard to the origination of these Potencies. They can scarcely be called emanations from God, except by way of "a figurative description of a process, of which Philo himself had not formed a clear conception."

3. *The Logos.*—The number of the "Potencies" may be described as indefinite—since each Divine operation might be attributed to a separate one, or else several subsummated under one Potency. Among them, as previously stated, two: "goodness" and "power," stood out separately and supremely. We have already spoken of these as "the creative" and the "governing" Potencies, and seen that God is represented as standing between them. But the *Logos*, who is the manifestation of God, must be viewed as alike the combination and the source of these Potencies. We mark here once more the same inconsistency as before in regard to a hypostasis, which yet has not any personal subsistence. In truth the reasoning of Philo is wanting in logical precision. His definitions are only illustrations—perhaps for that very reason attractive to some minds, but unsubstantial and unsatisfactory. They tell us not what a thing is, but what it is like. Even in this respect there is a radical difference between the Logos of the fourth Gospel and the Logos of Philo. We feel assured that, as might be expected from the circumstances of time and place, there is frequent and marked reference to the system represented by Philo in the writings of St. Paul, but especially in those of St. John. For this must have been the prevailing mental direction among the educated and enlightened—the impressionable, in the Greek-speaking Diaspora. The Apostles must have been brought into constant contact with it. All the more striking therefore is it that St. John also sets forth as primal the doctrine of the *Logos*. But the Apostle deals with it not, like Philo, in illustrations, but—if not in definitions, which were impossible—in definite propositions, which clearly mark, not only the Personality of the Logos, but His relation to God, to the world, and to man.

On the other hand, the Logos of Philo is full of difficulties, contradictions, and perplexities. It is He in whom the intelligible world had its place (*De Mundi Opif.* § 8). Indeed that intelligible world (νοητὸς κόσμος) is no other than "the Logos of God already making the world." Again, "It is evident that the archetypal seal which we say is the intelligible world, is itself the archetypal model, the idea of the ideas, the Logos of God" (*u. s.* § 6). Further, the Logos, who sums up all the Divine Potencies, is also the intermediary between God and the world. In one of the strangest passages Philo, commenting on Ex. xiv. 19, tells us that the Father gave to the Archangel and most ancient Logos to stand on the confines of the two and to separate between God and creation. He is at the same time their bond and their separation. He is also both a suppliant with God on behalf of men and the ambassador who brings to them the commands of the Ruler — in which gift He rejoices. He is neither uncreated as God, nor created as man, but in the midst between these two extremes—a security to the Creator that man would not lapse into absolute revolt and disorder, and to the creature that God would not forsake His own work (*Quis rer. Div. her.* § 42). Thus He is, on the one hand, the representative of God to the world, the interpreter (ἑρμηνεύς) of His will and the executor of it, while, on the other hand, He is the suppliant for men (the ἱκέτης and παράκλητος), even their High Priest. Here we might seem to have reached not only a personality, but even a Divine personality, although one subordinate, a kind of second God. But we soon discover that what is meant does not represent anything real, but is only once more figurative or illustrative of this, that the connection between God and the world is not, and cannot be, direct, but must be indirect and

* We are here chiefly following the analysis of Zeller.

mediate. Thus, so to speak, *the Logos of Philo is a medium of disjunction, the Logos of the New Testament one of conjunction; in Philo it is because God is so far, in the New Testament because He is so near;* in Philo the Logos is an unreal, in the New Testament a real and essential Personality. Hence, if Philo calls Him the first-born Logos, and even "the Name of God," it is as the oldest of His "angels," the great archangel of many names—a Son only in the sense in which we all may be such (*de Confus. Ling.* § 28). This appears still more clearly when the Logos is called the eldest son in contradistinction to the world as the younger son (*ὁ μὲν γὰρ κόσμος οὗτος νεώτερος υἱὸς θεοῦ*,[f] *Quod Deus sit immut.* § 6). We now know what value to attach to it when Philo, designating the Logos as the shadow of God, tells us that He had used Him as the instrument in making the world. He himself explains it by adding that this shadow, and as it were model, is the archetype of all other things (*De Leg. Alleg.* iii. § 31). In point of fact the Logos is identical with the Wisdom of God, viewed as a quality. This is expressly stated (*Leg. Allegor.* i. § 19). The Logos is therefore not a Personality, but the relation in which God stands to the world—or rather it is both and yet not either: though certainly not a Person in the New Testament sense, or in regard to which we could speak of either co-ordination or subordination to God. Indeed we can scarcely think of the Logos irrespective of creation, of which he is alike the archetype, the model, and the pervading spirit. After all then the Logos, like the patriarchs, is only an allegory.[g]

B. COSMOLOGY.—Little requires to be here added to our former remarks. In estimating the views of Philo on this subject we must keep in mind the dualism which is fundamental to his system. Only what was good in the world was due to God—life and perfectness; all evil—imperfectness and death—must be traced to another source. That source was matter. Very instructive here is a passage in which the doctrines of Stoicism are put in the mouth of Moses. That greatest philosopher, we are told, had learnt that there were two principles: an active and a passive one (*δραστήριον αἴτιον* and *παθητικόν*). The former was the infinite Reason—as previously stated—unadulterated and unmixed, superior to virtue, to knowledge, to the good, or the beautiful. The passive principle was matter, inanimate and incapable of any motion of its own (*ἄψυχον καὶ ἀκίνητον ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ*). But set in motion, fashioned, and endowed with life by the *νοῦς*, it became the *Kosmos* (*De Mundi Opif.* § 2). The source of the *δύναμις* by which the world was made, was—as we remember—the goodness of God. God would impart of the good of His nature to matter [here specially designated "the substance," *οὐσία*] which had nothing good, but was capable of becoming everything. In itself it was without property (*ἄποιος*), without life, without arrangement, full of disorder and confusion. But it was transformed by the active impartition of the Divine. Yet this, not equally to all things, but to each in the varying measure of its capacity of receptiveness (*de Mundi Op.* §§ 5, 6).

Without pausing to distinguish what in these views is of Platonic, and what of Stoic origin,[h] we mark that in such a system the idea of *Creation* had no place. The world was not created but formed[i] (by the instrumentality of the Logos) by the separation (the Logos as *τομεύς*) and then conjunction (the Logos as *δεσμός*) of what formerly had been chaotically mixed up. Only the forms of what exists, not the matter, came of God. Yet the world had a beginning: but it would not pass away. Of time—which could not be older than the world—we must not speak in connection with creation, and the Mosaic account indicated the order of rank, not of time. As the world had been formed, so was it sustained by the constant activity of God. It was therefore a kind of continued creation. From creation we derived one evidence of the Being of God [the physico-theological argument]. Our world was in this respect like the gates into a city, like the first round of the ladder up to heaven. For a work so artistically, beautifully, and wisely arranged could not have originated of itself. Yet other evidence came from the mutability of all things, which therefore could not have originated of themselves but by the Immutable One, who alone could sustain them. Before passing from this, we must notice that here also there was contradiction. For the principle of Philo *ex nihilo nihil fit* was in contrariety to this other, according to which matter was really the *μὴ ὄν*.[k] Yet the physico-theological evidence for God, was, although the readiest, not the highest. That which should chiefly be aimed after was direct apprehension and contemplation of God by the soul. Nor should we here omit at least to mention the evidential connection between the earthly and the heavenly which Philo found in that symbolism of numbers, derived from Pythagoreanism, of which he made such frequent and strange application.[l] Of Philo's views on physical questions it is not necessary to speak. They were those of the philosophies of his age. Like them Philo regarded the stars as living beings, endowed with reason, and wholly virtuous without capability of evil (*De Mundi Opif.* § 24). Accordingly he

---

[f] In a remarkable passage (*de ebriet.* § 8) Philo speaks of the Creator as the Father, Knowledge being the mother, and their offspring the world, designating the latter as "the only" and "beloved" "Son" (*τὸν μόνον καὶ ἀγαπητὸν αἰσθητὸν υἱόν*).

[g] We cannot here attempt to institute a comparison between the *Logos* of Philo and the *Memra* of the Targumim. For this we must take leave to refer the reader to the analysis in *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.*

[h] See here Zeller, pp. 386–388.

[i] And yet there is contradiction to this also when we read (*De Somn.* I. § 13, end) that God, Who begat all things, not only brought them to visibleness, but also made that which formerly had not been (*ἀλλὰ καὶ ἃ πρότερον οὐκ ἦν ἐποίησεν*), being not only the Former but also Himself the Creator (*οὐ δημιουργὸς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ κτίστης αὐτὸς ὤν*). The objections of Zeller to the inference, that Philo here taught actual creation, do not seem to me conclusive.

[k] But Dähne (i. pp. 171, 172) ingeniously suggests that in the following we should substitute *οὐκ ὂν* for *μὴ ὄν*: *ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος οὐδὲν γίνεται, οὐδ' εἰς τὸ μὴ ὂν φθείρεται* (*De Incorrupt. Mundi,* § 2). But this must be taken with the reservation as to the genuineness of the tractate.

[l] For a summary see Zeller, pp. 391, 392.

designates them the "visible Gods" of whom the heavens are "the most holy abode" (*u. s.* § 7).

C. ANTHROPOLOGY.—As all the parts of the universe were full of living creatures, so was the air. It was the abode of incorporeal souls. Among them those that were nearest the earth and lovers of the body descended upon earth and were joined to mortal bodies (*De Somn.* i. § 22). The body like a river draws the soul into a whirlpool from which only few are saved by that spiritual philosophy, that teaches them to obtain the inheritance of the imperishable life in the presence of God (*De Gigant.* § 3). But the other souls, whose dwelling was higher up, were never entangled by love of the earthly, and always served the Father of the world (*De Somn. u. s.*). These souls that hovered in the air the philosophers called demons, but Scripture angels, because they reported (διαγγέλλουσι) the behests of the Father to the children and the necessities of the children to the Father (*De Somn. u. s.; De Gig.* § 24).[m] The evil angels were simply evil souls. By its origin, and irrespective of those sensuous parts which cling to it through its union with the body, the soul was connected with God. It was one of those "Potencies" or emanations which in their original condition were called angels (demons) and formed parts of that of which the Logos was the whole. But here also we must properly understand Philo. In the original formation of man, he tells us, God had used no other model (παράδειγμα) than His Logos (*De Mundi Opif.* § 48). But all the succeeding generations of men were always inferior, being farther removed from God, the original former of the first man. So there was constant degeneration (*u. s.* § 49). Adam had been the first citizen of this world. As every city, so the world had a constitution which was the right reason of nature, or more exactly the established order (θεσμός), the Law of God. But of this city and polity there must have been citizens before man. These could only have been the reasonable Divine natures (λογικαὶ θεῖαι φύσεις), some of them incorporeal and "intelligible," others not destitute of bodies such as the stars (*u. s.* § 50). With this constitution and with these beings the first man had been in complete harmony. Every man then was in respect of his reason kindred with the Divine Reason, Logos, being an impression, or fragment, of that happy nature. As regarded his body man represented every element and every thing in nature (*u. s.* § 51). In another place Philo describes "reason" (νοῦς) as an image of the Divine and invisible Being, a coin stamped and impressed with the seal of God, of which the eternal Logos was the χαρακτήρ (*De Plant. Noë* § 5; comp. also the passage in *Quis rer. div. her.* § 48, previously quoted).[n] The rational soul then was not formed immediately after God, but after the Logos. This "reason" (νοῦς), "the soul of the soul," had come to man from without, from God (*De Mundi Op.* § 21). In the system of Philo "reason" was equivalent to that "spirit" (πνεῦμα), which had been inspired from above, and was of Divine substance (*Quis rer. div. her.* § 38). But we had within us really a twofold nature: "animal and man." Each of these had its cognate faculty: the "zootic" (irrational), by which we lived, and the "reasoning," which made us rational beings. Irrational beings (animals) shared with us the "animal" faculty, but not the purely rational part, which was of God, who was the source of the most ancient Logos. The seat of the animal soul was in the blood. But the rational soul or "spirit" which had emanated from the supreme fountain, was the τύπος and χαρακτήρ of the Divine δύναμις. Moses had called it "the likeness of God," to shew that God was the archetype of the "rational" nature, and man the imitation and the copy. As stated, all this referred not to the animal part of the soul but to "reason," which was the "spirit" breathed into man, and of His own Divine Nature (ἰδίου θειότητος) (*Quod deter. pot. insid.* §§ 22–24).[o] While the "spirit" was thus the direct outcome of the Divine, the animal soul was (since its first creation) due to generation, to the σπέρμα, which passed from the lowest stage (ἕξις, such as the bones) by motion to that of φύσις (plant-nature, as the hair and nails), and into animal nature—the moist parts of the *sperma* forming the limbs and other portions of the body, and the airy parts of it the animal soul, with its two chief powers: nutrition and sensation (*De Opif. M.* § 22; *de Leg. all.*, ii. 7). The peculiar properties of the spirit were intellect and freedom of the will (*Quod Deus sit immutab.* § 10). And yet for all this spiritual nature, we are told in another place, that the soul was an efflux of that aether of which the heaven and the stars were formed.[p] Before time began the souls had been without body in undisturbed contemplation of God (*De Gigant.* § 7). To this Gen. i. 27 referred, which described the creation of "the heavenly man" (ἄνθρωπος οὐράνιος). He was the archetype ("after the likeness of God")—not an individual, but a species, and hence neither male nor female (ἄνθρωπος γενικός). But when joined to the body the heavenly became the "earthly" (γήϊνος) [*de leg. all.* i. 12; ii. 4]. Standing between the mortal and immortal, man was himself a little world—a microcosm—the noblest of all creatures. Yet far beneath purely spiritual essences, and indeed (as we have seen) not created by God alone, but with the assistance of demiurges. Only when the soul was freed from the body would those who had liberated themselves

[m] In *De Somn.* all this is connected with Jacob's vision of the ladder; in *De Gigant.* with the marriage of the sons of God with the daughters of men.

[n] All these explanations turn on the κατ' εἰκόνα of man's creation in Gen. i. 27.

[o] Zeller refers to the difficult question of the relation of this Divine Pneuma to the "Potencies," especially to the Logos. He holds that, as God only acted upon the world through His Potencies which were summed up in the Logos—and never directly—the Pneuma could not have been a second principle by the side of the Logos, but must be regarded as either one of the Potencies in the Logos, or else as only another aspect of the Logos, although not one peculiar to Him. Zeller decides in favour of the latter view, and thinks that Philo understood by Pneuma spiritual substance generally, as extending from God to rational beings through the medium of the Divine Potencies.

[p] *Quis rer. div. her.* § 57. Zeller shows that we have here an attempt to combine the Stoic view about the substance of the soul with the Aristotelian about aether.

from its sway, return to the enjoyment of the higher life—the νοῦς alone, not the lower parts of the soul, having share in it. But for those that were bound by the love of the earthly, a kind of migration of souls was in store (*De Somn.* i. § 22). In connection with the recent controversy about *the views entertained at the time of Christ as to punishment and its duration* we mark[q] that in Philo's view those who had been wholly subject to the violent and incurable disease of earthly wickedness would have to bear their misery, "being to all time shamefully cast out into the place of the wicked" (μέχρι τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος ἀθάνατα σκορακισθέντα εἰς ἀσεβῶν χῶρον, *De Cherub.* § 1), there to endure unmitigated and everlasting misery. And even the wicked of Jewish descent are consigned to "Tartarus and deep darkness" (τάρταρον καὶ βαθὺ σκότος, *de execr.* § 6).

The main point in the Psychology of Philo lies in his distinction between reason and sensuousness, between the reasonable and the non-reasonable, the immortal and the mortal part of the soul. With this, however, the Stoic views about "presentation" [by means of sensation (φαντασία) and "impulse" (ὁρμή)] are connected—the former being sensuousness affecting reason, the latter reason affecting sensuousness. And yet both were attributes of the animal soul! In another passage Philo speaks of three attributes of it: perception, presentation, and impulse (αἴσθησις, φαντασία, ὁρμή), giving the Stoic definitions of them (*Quod D. sit immut.* § 9). In yet another place we read (in connection with the symbolism of the number seven—that of the stars) of seven attributes of the soul: the five senses, the vocal organ, and the generative power (*de M. Opif.* § 40). Again, Philo speaks of the "male" and the "female" soul, of which the one devoted itself exclusively to God, the other to things created (*De Leg. Spec.* ed. Rich. v. p. 103, § 32). Lastly, we mark, on the one hand, the Platonic distinction of "reason" (λόγος), "courage," and "desire" (*u. s.* p. 135, towards the end)—and, on the other, the Aristotelian of the nourishing, sentient and rational soul.[r] If from all this unclearness we turn to what constantly emerges in the system of Philo, we come back upon the fundamental distinction and separation of sensation and reason. But sensation is that in the soul which is most kindred to the body. It has its deep root in the body, as the vessel of the soul (τῆς ὅλης ψυχῆς ἀγγείῳ, *De Congr. erud. gr.* § 5). The body was "Egypt," and this same allegorical designation indicated all the evil which came to us from the body.[s] Life in the body was real death, and death real life (*De Leg. Alleg.* i. at the close). The body was the prison-house. To come forth from it and from all sensuousness, was the condition of true life, and would be that of the better life hereafter. And this was the higher meaning of it when Abraham was led forth (Gen. xv. 5), and when Isaac and Moses went forth (Gen. xxiv. 62; Ex. ix. 29; *De Leg. Alleg.* iii. §§ 13, 14). We have previously referred to the remarkable passage (*De Gigant.* § 3), in which Philo speaks of the descent of the soul into the body as into a river, whose whirlpool carries away the many, while only few swim on the top, and afterwards return to their original habitation. These were they who, giving themselves to wisdom, died to the bodily life. And (*u. s.* §§ 7–9) those "angels" who had allied themselves to the daughters of man were the wicked who pursued various pleasures. Accordingly the spirit of God would "not remain among men for ever, because they are flesh." But all this was chiefly due to our inseparable connection with the flesh (§ 7), which was the great hindrance to the growth of wisdom. True, participation in earthly things was necessary in our present condition. And here applied the warning of Lev. xviii. 6. So far from voluntarily approaching the pleasures of the body, we must ever seek entirely to alienate ourselves from them, looking upon such things as riches, glory and bodily strength as being really the greatest evil (μέγιστον κακόν).[t]

From what has been said, it will be inferred that Philo strongly maintains the universal sinfulness of man. It is deeply interesting, that he always introduces it in connection with the need of sacrifices. If the entrance of the soul into the body was due to love of the sensuous, the connection between soul and body must lead to constant sin. Sin was congenital to every man, however good he might be. It was involved in his being born (*De Vita M.* iii. § 17). Commenting on Gen. xvii. 1, Philo shows that it was impossible to get rid of every stain of sin, or wholly to eradicate its evil; on which account we ought not to look for any perfectly good man in this life (*De mutat. nom.* § 6). But all this is not to be taken quite absolutely. While Philo declares that no man from his birth to his end lived without fault (whence, except for His mercy, God might pronounce universal condemnation), yet he also guards himself by qualifying this declaration of universal sinfulness by this addition: "Of himself" (μηθενὸς ἀνθρώπων τὸν ἀπὸ γενέσεως μέχρι τελευτῆς βίον ἄπταιστον, ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ δραμόντος, *Quod D. immut.* § 16). Similarly, although he would attribute absolute sinlessness only to God, yet he adds that it might possibly be also ascribed to a God-like man (τάχα δὲ καὶ θείου ἀνδρός, *de Poenit.* § 1). Whether this is to be regarded as a concession to current Jewish views, or must be traced to his exaltation of the Biblical heroes, it certainly modifies the statements of Philo as to the absolute prevalence of sin. And yet more important limitation does the doctrine of original sin receive. Commenting on Gen. xv. 16, Philo discusses the four ages of man, and ascribes to the child during its first seven years—before passion has developed in youth[u]—a pure nature

[q] For our present purpose it matters not what Philo may have derived from Plato (Zeller, p. 397, note 6).

[r] Comp. Zeller, p. 398.

[s] Zeller aptly notes that with Philo σάρξ is only a realistic expression for "body." The distinction between the Pauline and the Philonic use of this term must be evident. St. Paul distinctly and repeatedly marks that it is not the material *per se* which is evil.

[t] All this, and more, is fully set forth in *De Cherub.* §§ 13–19. Beginning with a highly mystical allegorisation of marriage—of that of Sarah, of Leah, of Rebekah (who is perseverance), and of Zipporah (winged and sublime virtue)—Philo makes an enthusiastic appeal for self-denial and the pursuit of wisdom.

[u] But this is partly developed with the development of the body, the passions having lain hidden.

which he likens to a smooth tablet that had not yet received any indelible characters, whether of good or of evil (*Quis rer. d. h.* § 59). And the same view is even more strongly expressed when Philo declares that the soul of the infant has neither share of good nor of evil (ἀμέτοχος οὖσα ἑκατέρου, ἀγαθοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ, *de Leg. All.* ii. § 15).

D. ETHICS.—It will naturally be expected that in Ethics Philo should mainly follow Stoic teaching. Throughout he emphasises it that only one thing was to be desired and followed: the good, pure virtue (τὸ μόνον εἶναι τὸ καλὸν ἀγαθόν, *de post C.* § 39, end). We have seen that, according to Philo, all that was earthly was to be regarded as a necessary evil, of which man was to make use as little and as simply as was absolutely requisite for his life, while at the same time he was to aim after the entire uprooting of all earthly desires and affections.[x] In all these respects one of the most instructive passages is that in *De Leg. Alleg.* ii. §§ 17–19, where Adam serves as allegory of the mind, Eve of sensation, and the serpent of pleasure, and all that has been previously said of the influence of the one on the other, and of the need of renouncing pleasure is evolved from the history of the fall. But this is not all. Like the Stoics, Philo speaks of the four great virtues: prudence, temperance, courage, and justice. These were the four rivers—all branches of that generic virtue, which springs from Eden, the wisdom of God, which is the Logos of God, according to whom generic virtue was created (*De Leg. Alleg.* i. § 19). Similarly we have an allegorical explanation of the four kings against five (Gen. xiv. 1–9) being the four affections: pleasure, desire, fear, grief, and again the five senses (*De Abr.* xli.). It would occupy too much space to follow the parallelism with Stoic teaching to its details.[y] It is more important to notice where Philo breaks off from Stoicism. To the question, how man was to get free from the power of the sensuous, Philo could not reply by directing him to himself. As a Jew he must have directed him for this to God. It was God who alone could plant or build up virtue in the soul (*De Leg. Alleg.* i. § 15). Nay, Philo goes beyond this into absolute Predestinarianism when he ascribes not only all good in man to Divine grace, but indicates that there had been an election for good even before any actual deed (*De Leg. Alleg.* iii. §§ 28, 27, 24), that God went forward to meet some souls (*u. s.* § 76), and that to some He gave the grace of perseverance (*u. s.* i. § 28). But from all this it followed that the main object of man must be to place himself in right relationship to God—not to follow his own ideas or views, but to aim after the contemplation of God. This, and this alone, was true wisdom. And with this final conclusion Philo returned from Greek philosophy to his Jewish faith.

Everything was to be regarded as subservient and secondary to this contemplation of God. Hence, although Philo insists with all earnestness on the duty of not leaving to the wicked the management of all political and worldly affairs which would lead to ruin, and on the duty of not withdrawing from all into solitude (*De Prof.* § 4), yet this was only for the present necessity, and as a kind of preparation for the higher life. We remember Philo's bitter complaints at being drawn into the whirlpool of public affairs. Joseph, as the type of a man engaged in state affairs, appears in an unfavourable light by the side of higher characters.[z] The same superiority belonged to Divine wisdom, as compared with all other knowledge. Philo treats of this in quite a series of paragraphs (*De Congr. quaer. erud. gr.* § 4, onwards). Not only are the encyclical sciences — grammar, music, mathematics, rhetoric, and dialectics (§ 4), and even astronomy, to which Philo assigns the second place (§ 10)—merely intermediate, subordinate, suited to the child-period, though they may lead up to the higher, but we remember the various allegorisms on this subject. Even philosophy is denounced as too often sophistry (§ 13). All such pursuits were as concubines compared with the true wife. We recall here what has been previously stated about the allegorical meaning of Hagar and Sarah, and about Philo's own experience in bringing, as it were, all the offspring from such connections to the true mistress of his soul (§ 14). And in another discussion (*De ebriet.* §§ 40–49) Philo seeks to show the groundlessness and the danger of imagining that we can attain any true knowledge by such studies. The human mind was not competent of itself to attain it in that direction; 1st, because of the darkness which here compassed many objects (§ 41); 2ndly, because of the endless variations which occurred in things within our ken (§ 42); 3rdly, because of the varying judgments of men, nay, even of our own minds, on the same subject (§ 43); 4thly, because of our liability to mistake and the partialness of our knowledge (§ 44, 45); 5thly, because of the merely subjective character of our sensations (sight, taste, &c., § 46), of our knowledge (§ 47), and even of what was considered right or wrong (§ 48); lastly, because of the absolute differences among philosophers on metaphysics, ethics, and all else (§ 48).

So then it was to God that mind and soul must turn. There only would we find true wisdom and true perfectness. But how was this to be attained? We have already seen that Philo sets before us the three patriarchs as symbols of the three types of wisdom and virtue: Abraham, of that which has been acquired by instruction; Isaac, of that which comes by natural disposition, and is innate; and Jacob, of that through practice and discipline, *askesis*. Nor can we be in any doubt which of these Philo regarded as the highest. Lowest stood *askesis*. It implied a constant struggle against the hostile element, in which a man ever required to pause, take breath, and recoup his strength. Higher than this was the virtue which came by instruction. Here there was no arrestment, but

[x] For details see Zeller, p. 403. Noteworthy passages also in *De Somn.* i. § 20, and the opening paragraphs of Book ii.

[y] See here Zeller, whose order and lead we have generally followed.

[z] So very often. See among others the comparison with Isaac "the leader of the good and noble company," "the self-taught," whose goodness was not acquired, but of his own nature (*De Somn.* ii. § 2.)

continual advance. Yet both were only partial and progressive—mediate also, whereas that virtue which was innate was direct, immediate, and absolute (*De mut. nom.* §§ 10–14). This was the immediate gift of God. True wisdom also, in its highest and only real stage, was the direct and immediate contemplation of God—not in His manifestations, but beyond all that is finite: in Himself. We are here approaching the final difference, as it seems to us, between the system of Philo and the fundamental principles of New Testament theology. In the system of Philo forgiveness, reconciliation, and mediatorship are ultimately not required; they would, indeed, be wholly out of place. Nor yet is faith required for approach to God. Philosophy might tell us to recognise God by His works. But this were only to perceive God in His shadow. Better far to pass beyond all created objects, to know the Great Uncreated Himself, the Logos, and the Kosmos. This had been the difference between Moses and Bezaleel (*De Leg. Alleg.* iii. §§ 32–33). In another place (*u. s.* § 62) Philo, using as illustration the difference between the health that comes to us from God, and that which is the result of medical skill, understands the latter of such good things as come to the soul through the "angels" (the individual "Powers") and the Logos—who is, as it were, the physician. But there are those who pass beyond the Logos to see God face to face, and are nourished directly by Him, and not by the Logos.[a] Nay, more than this—in a passage previously referred to (*De Conf. ling.* § 28) we are encouraged to advance to be adorned like "the firstborn Logos,"[b] the oldest of His "Angels," the great "Archangel" of "many names." Here then the Logos is no longer required—indeed, is left aside. Here also "the soul is shone upon by God as if at noonday," "it is wholly and entirely filled with the 'intelligible'" light, and wholly surrounded by its brilliancy; it has hastened on beyond the perception of God's highest attributes to that pure and unmixed unity, even to "the sight of the living God" (*De Abr.* §§ 24, 25). Led on by love as the guide of wisdom, the soul proceeds onwards beyond all that is seen, and heard, and known, to the purely "intelligible," to the original "models" and "ideas" of what, even when perceived by the senses, is so beautiful. Then it is "seized with a sort of sober intoxication," a kind of corybantian mania, and yields to enthusiasm, by which it is conducted onwards to the highest summit of the "intelligibles" (τῶν νοητῶν) till it seems to be reaching the great King Himself. And while it is eagerly longing to behold Him, pure and unmingled rays of Divine light are poured forth like a torrent so as to bewilder by their brilliancy the eyes of the understanding (*De mundi opif.* § 23). This was the ecstatic state in which our consciousness was merged and lost in the Divine. This was the real essence of "the trance," such as that of Abraham (Gen. xv.); nay, of all prophetic inspiration—and all the Biblical heroes were prophets. For the prophet spake nothing of his own. In him the brightness of the Divine light had extinguished all human light (*Quis rer. d. her.* §§ 52, 53). Nor was this prophetic inspiration confined to Biblical persons, nor yet to direct communications from God. Philo himself claims to have been frequently filled with Divine inspiration, in consequence of which he had learned to understand, and could interpret, what otherwise would have been unknown to him. Thus, for instance, had he learned that in the one living and true God there were these two "Potencies" of goodness and government (*De Cher.* § 9). And here lay the connecting point between direct Divine communication and our dreams, on which Philo so largely dwells in his classification of dreams (for example, in the opening paragraph of the second book *de Somniis*). But—and herein, surely, lies another fundamental difference from New Testament teaching—all this was only for the initiated, to whom Philo makes, as we have previously shown, his special appeal as against the common multitude (*De Cher.* § 14).

E. The Messiah and the Last Things.[c]

On these all-important subjects we shall naturally expect only the most shadowy statements on the part of Philo. Indeed, belief in a Messiah may be regarded as foreign to the system of Philo, and only introduced from his Jewish theology. Even so, it affords strong evidence of Jewish Messianic expectancy at that period. At the outset we mark three points on which Philo fundamentally diverged from the faith of the synagogue, and still more from the teaching of the New Testament. First: considering his views as to the body, Philo could not look for any resurrection of the dead. Nor yet did he believe in a final judgment, nor in the destruction of the world. Secondly, the highest ideal of Judaism, in the view of Philo, was Moses, whose return in the body he could not have expected. Thirdly, it were impossible to conceive anything more opposed to his system than the idea, that the Logos should ever become incarnate and appear in the flesh. And yet, for all this, it cannot be seriously called in question that Philo expressed anticipation both of a personal Messiah and of a Messianic reign and kingdom. The two passages to which we here refer are in *De Execrat.* §§ 8, 9, and in *De Praem. et Poen.* § 15 to the end, but chiefly § 19. In the first of these passages (at the close of the *De Execrat.* beginning with the end of § 8), Philo tells us that after the general repentance and reformation of Israel, a great change would come over their fortunes. Even those held in captivity would in one day, as at a given signal, be restored to freedom—their masters being ashamed to keep those in bondage who were so much better than themselves. Then they all would rise

[a] Very similar is the exposition of Jacob's ladder (Gen. xxxiii. 12) on which the "angels" descended, while to the perfect man applied Lev. xxvi. 12 (*De Somn.* i. § 23). Similarly also in *De Migr. Abr.* § 31, where we have a beautiful picture of the difference between the teachings of philosophy, falsely so-called, as well as the mistakes of pride, and the pure contemplation of God.

[b] Bishop Lightfoot (*Comment. on Coloss.* p. 146, col. *b*) notes the Philonic use of πρωτόγονος instead of the Apostolic πρωτότοκος.

[c] Comp. here, besides the works of Gfrörer, Dähne, and Schürer, especially J. G. Müller, *d. Mess. Erwart. d. Juden Philo*, and *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i.

up "with one impulse," and come from all the countries and islands whither they had been scattered "to one place pointed out to them" [similarly in *Bemidb. R.* 11]. On their march they would be guided "by an appearance more divine than is compatible with the nature of man" (ξεναγούμενοι πρός τινος θειοτέρας, ἢ κατὰ φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνης ὄψεως, *u. s.* § 9)—invisible to all others, but apparent to those that are saved. Besides, they would have three "Paracletes" to reconcile them to the Father: the goodness of Him on Whom they would call, the merits and intercession of "the Fathers," and their own moral change. [It will be noticed that in all this Philo is substantially in accordance with ordinary Jewish views, nor can this more Divine than human apparition be identified with his Logos.]

Here then we have a previous state of banishment and misery, a miraculous deliverance, and a return to Palestine under the invisible, yet visible, guidance of this human-Divine appearance. On the return of Israel to their land would follow the period of Messianic bliss. The ruined cities would be rebuilt; the desert inhabited; the happiness of former times would be far exceeded, and wealth inconceivable would flow in upon each individual and on the community. All this, to the utter confounding of their enemies, who had reviled them, ignorant that the former sorrows, due to Israel's unfaithfulness, had been intended as a warning to all men. But alike the religious reformation and the happiness of Israel would be never ending. And the passage appropriately concludes with what, to us at least, seems a reference to Is. vi. 13.[d]

Even more detailed than this is the sketch of the Messianic kingdom in the series of paragraphs in *De Praem. et Poenis.* Once more we have an allusion to what is evidently a favourite Messianic idea of Philo: the miraculous gathering together in one place, chosen by God, of all Israel, scattered to the ends of the world (§ 19, close). The sketch begins by a curious reference to the two classes of enemies which threaten men: wild beasts, and men inflamed by the selfishness of their passions. Philo connects the two kinds of warfare thus caused, and looks upon the removal of the one as dependent on that of the other. He expects that, when the passions of our minds shall be tamed, a similar change will pass over the wild beasts. They will first imitate the domestic animals, and then gradually learn to be the friends and companions of man. This somewhat realistically sketched picture represents "the future time," when what is "good shall shine upon the world" (§ 15). The peace in nature would react on man, who would be ashamed in this to lag behind the beasts. But if exceptionally there should be war on the part of those who boast in their insolence, they would be repelled by a force far more powerful, so that a hundred would flee before five (Lev. xxvi. 8). Some again would flee where no man pursued, so that their backs would be an easy target, and the whole army to a man be destroyed. For, adds Philo, freely quoting from the text of Numb. xxiv. 7, "A man shall come forth, heading an army and warring, who shall subdue great and populous nations, God sending the suitable assistance to the pious." This, he explains, would consist of courage of soul and strength of body. Moreover, quoting Ex. xxiii. 28—those who were unworthy of a regular defeat would be opposed by swarms of wasps, and so be shamefully destroyed. The victory thus achieved would be permanent. It would lead to irresistible dominion, to the benefit of all who were its subjects, whether willingly [on the part of the Jews], or from fear or shame [the Gentiles]. And temporal consequences also would follow, quite similar to those expected by the Rabbis in Messianic days: absence of disease, wealth, abundance without need of toil, a constant succession of harvests of the richest and best kind, boundless fertility of the soil, numerous offspring, with entire absence of barrenness, and the like. As we compare all this with the Rabbinic descriptions and with those of the *Pseudepigrapha,*[e] we feel that, as regards the outward details of Messianic expectancy, Philo occupies the same ground as his Jewish contemporaries.

F. Philo's views on the Canon of Scripture.[f]

1. At the risk of repeating what in part has been stated in another connection, we shall first place side by side the passages in which Philo expresses his views on *Prophetic Inspiration.* They are *four* in number. In the first (*de Monarch.* close of Book I.), he tells how the "prophet inspired" (προφήτης θεοφόρητος) to preach and prophesy was "possessed and inspired" (ἐνθουσιῶν) so that he did not comprehend what he uttered, but that all his words proceeded as if from another prompting him—the prophets being the "interpreters of God," Who made use of their voices as instruments to set forth what He pleased. Thus the prophet was actually possessed of God—he was passive, unconscious, and inspiration not only affected his mind but commanded his lips and his speech. Quite similar to this is the description in *de Leg. spec.* § 8 (ed. R. v. p. 122), where we are also told that, unknown to the prophet, his reasoning powers had left the citadel of his soul which the Divine spirit had entered, Who was making his voice to sound forth the prophecies he was delivering. In a third passage, after speaking of Abraham as inspired (ἐνθουσιῶντος καὶ θεοφορήτου), Philo uses almost the same ex-

[d] Müller holds that the Messianic description in this passage and in *de Praem. et Poen.* was based upon Dan. vii. 13, 14.

[e] Comp. En. xlvi. 1, &c.; xlviii. 2; lxii. 7; Orac Book of Sibyll. iii. 236, &c.; 4 Esd. xii. 2.

[f] The list of Scripture-passages bearing on this subject, given by Mangey, is misleading. The question as to the Old Testament Canon according to Philo—or rather, from what parts of the Old Testament Philo has quoted—has been fully and exhaustively treated by Cl. Frees Hornemann (*Observ. ad illustr. doctr. de Can. V. T. ex Philone*). The results of his investigations were transferred, in condensed form, by Eichhorn into his *Einl. in d. A. Test.* (vol. i. pp. 122-135). To remove from these lists all errors, and to supply omissions, it has been thought best to submit the matter to a fresh investigation, so as to adduce (with the exception of the Pentateuch) all the passages which Philo quotes from the Old Testament, and to indicate the Tractates in which he quotes them. For the sake of convenience the quotations are arranged in the order of the books in our A. V.

pressions about the prophet as being inwardly prompted, and struck and moved like an instrument to sound what God spake[g] (*Quis rer. div. her.* § 52). Lastly, although in more brief manner, substantially the same description of prophets is given in a fourth passage (*de Praem. et Poen.* § 9).

2. *The Canon.*—Although Philo described all the prophets as "God's interpreters" (ἑρμηνεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ,—Plato speaks similarly of the poets), and designated their writings in terms which mark this in the strongest manner,[h] yet a special distinction attached to Moses. This, in accordance with general Jewish opinion. And yet there is here also an exceedingly curious modification, if not contradiction, on the part of Philo. In *de Vita Moys.* iii. §§ 23, 24, Philo makes a threefold distinction even in the Mosaic books. In the first class he placed the sacred oracles "delivered in the person of God by His interpreter, the Divine prophet." A second class consisted of those "in the form of question and answer," while yet a third class comprised those "delivered by Moses in his character of Divinely prompted lawgiver, possessed by Divine inspiration." The first class of oracles was too exalted to be adequately praised; the second had a sort of human admixture: the prophet asking information and receiving instruction; while in the third Moses spoke as Lawgiver, God having given him a share of prescient power. This classification of inspiration seems to modify in an important manner the general views of Philo on the subject. It is further very remarkable that Philo ascribes the first and highest class of prophetic inspiration (ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ) not only to Moses but also to Jeremiah, whose special disciple he declares himself to have become (*de Cherub.* § 14, comp. with *de V. Moys.* iii. § 23).

The quotations by Philo from all the *five books of the Law* are so frequent that it is impossible here to enumerate them. The *book of Joshua* is quoted (Josh. i. 5), as inspired in *de confus. ling.* § 32, with which we must compare what is said concerning Joshua in *de carit.* § 2. The *book of Judges* (viii. 9) is quoted in *de conf. ling.* § 26, although without *direct* statement of its Divine inspiration, yet in a connection and manner which imply it. It is well known that the two books of Samuel and the two books of the Kings were anciently classed together as the *four books of Kings.* That Philo so classed them appears from this, that in *Quod Deus sit immut.*, § 2, 1 Sam. i. 11[i], is quoted as from the first book of Kings, while (*u. s.* § 29), when citing 1 Kings xvii. 10, he refers to it as from the books of Kings (ἐν ταῖς βασιλείαις). If therefore in *de ebriet.* § 36, Philo quotes 1 Sam. i. 11, as "holy scripture," while in paraphrastically citing the same verse, or else 1 Sam. i. 28, he speaks of Hannah and Samuel as prophets (*de Somn.* close of Book I.), the inference seems warranted that Philo ascribed *inspiration equally to the two books of Samuel and the two books of Kings.* We have already adduced two if not three passages in which Philo quotes 1 Sam. i. 11, possibly i. 28 also, and certainly 1 Kings xvii. 10. We now add the following: 1 Sam. i. 14, 15, are quoted in *de ebriet.* § 36; 1 Sam. ii. 5, is quoted twice: in *Quod Deus sit immut.*, § 3, and in *de mutat. nom.* § 25; 1 Sam. ix. 9, is quoted in *Quod D. immut.* § 29, in *Quis rer. Div. her.* § 15, and in *de Migr. Abr.* § 8; 1 Sam. x. 22, in *de Migr. Abr.* § 36; and 1 Kings xvii. 10 and 18 are quoted in *Quod D. immut.* § 29.

The *book of Ruth* is not referred to by Philo, but it is only fair to suggest that it was included in the book of Judges.

The *books of Chronicles* are quoted by Philo, viz. 1 Chron. vii. 14, in *de congr. erud. gr.* § 8. Possibly Philo may also have had 1 Chron. ix. 17–19, in mind in *de praem. et poen.* § 13. *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* were anciently joined together. That Philo regarded the *book of Ezra* as forming part of another work,[k] appears from the manner in which he quotes Ezra viii. 2, in *de confus. ling.* § 28. And Neh. x. 38, may have been in Philo's mind in *de mut. nom.* § 1.

The *book of Esther* is *not* quoted by Philo. *Job* xiv. 4, is quoted in *de mutat. nom.* § 6. *All the five books of Psalms* are quoted, and repeatedly with express declaration of their inspiration. Thus Ps. xxii. 1 (A. V. xxiii. 1) is quoted no less than three times: in *de agricult.* § 12 twice, and once in *de mut. nom.* § 20; Ps. xxvi. 1 (A. V. xxvii. 1), in *de Somn.* i. 13; Ps. xxx. 19 (xxxi. 19) in *de conf. ling.* § 11; Ps. xxxvi. 4 (A. V. xxxvii. 4) is quoted twice: in *de plant. Noë* § 9, and in *de Somn.* ii. § 37a; Ps. xli. 4 (A. V. xlii. 3) in *de migr. Abr.* § 28 [possibly Ps. xliii. (xliv.) in *de conf. ling.* § 12]; Ps. xlv. 5 (A. V. xlvi. 4) in *de Somn.* ii. § 37b; Ps. lxi. 12 (A. V. lxii. 11) in *Q. Deus immut.* § 18; Ps. lxiv. 10 (A. V. lxv. 9) in *de Somn.* ii. § 37b; Ps. lxxiv. 9 (A. V. lxxv. 8) in *Q. Deus immut.* § 17; Ps. lxxvii. 49 (A. V. lxxviii.) in *de Gigant.* § 4; Ps. lxxix. 6 (A. V. lxxx. 5) in *de Migr. Abr.* § 28; Ps. lxxix. 7 (lxxx. 6) in *de conf. ling.* § 13; Ps. lxxxiii. 11 (A. V. lxxxiv. 10) in *quis rer. Div. her.* § 58; Ps. xciii. 9 (A. V. xciv.) in *de plant. N.* § 7; Ps. c. 1 (A. V. ci.) in *Q. Deus immut.* § 16; and Ps. cxiii. 25 [17] (cxiv. 17) in *de Prof.* § 11.

From the *book of Proverbs*, which Philo ascribes to Solomon (*de congr. er. gr.* § 31), he quotes Prov. iii. 4, in *de ebriet.* § 20; Prov. iii. 11, in *de congr. er. gr.* § 31; Prov. iv. 3, &c., in *de ebriet.* § 20; and Prov. viii. 22, 23, in *de ebriet.* § 8.

From the *book of Ecclesiastes* there is *not* any quotation, but the reasoning attributed to Abraham on the death of Sarah (in *de Abr.* § 44), reminds us generally of Ecclesiastes, and in one part specially of Eccles. xii. 7. The *Song of Solomon* is not quoted by Philo.

Is. v. 7 is quoted as prophetic inspired utterance in *de Somn.* ii. § 26; Is. xlviii. 22, in *de mut. nom.* § 31; and Is. liv. 1, in *de execrat.* § 7. From *Jeremiah* we have three (or rather four) quotations, viz. Jer. ii. 13, is quoted in *de prof.* § 36; Jer. iii. 4, is quoted, with the previously given description of the prophet's highest inspiration, in *de Cher.* § 14; and Jer. xv. 10, in

---

[g] In the same passage we also find the curious statement, that every good man is a prophet.

[h] For the various designations given by Philo to the prophets (including Moses), and to their writings, see Hornemann, *u. s.*

[i] This, I think, and not v. 28, as is generally supposed.

[k] This probably included the books of Chronicles.

de conf. ling. § 12, and again with a variant in § 13. The *book of Lamentations* is *not* quoted, but it seems to have been included with the prophecies of Jeremiah. The only reference in Philo to the *book of Ezekiel* is of a peculiar kind. In *de monarch.* § 9, he explains the law as to the marriage of the high priest, as laid down in Lev. xxi. 13, 14. But in the following paragraph (§ 10) he adds certain details about ordinary priests not found in the Levitical Law, and which must be derived from Ezek. xliv. 22, although the passage is not expressly quoted in so many words. [And does not this concession to ordinary priests in the Priest-code of Ezekiel prove that it is of *later* date than the Law in Leviticus?]

Daniel is *not* quoted by Philo. But we have seen that the picture which Philo presents of the Messiah and of Messianic times is probably based on Dan. vii. 13, 14.

The twelve Minor Prophets are commonly treated as one work. Attestation of some of them would therefore imply the reception of all in the Canon. But Philo expressly quotes from two of the minor prophets, and that with distinct attestation of their Divine inspiration, viz.: Hos. xiv. 8, 9 in *de plant. N.* § 33, and again in *de mut. nom.* § 24, and, lastly, Zechar. vi. 12 in *de confus. ling.* § 14.[1]

From this analysis it will be seen that the only books of which it may with certainty be affirmed that they are not referred to by Philo are *Esther* and the *Song of Solomon*. The reference to *Ecclesiastes* is very doubtful, much more so than that to *Daniel*.

3. The reader who will take the trouble of comparing the quotations of Philo from the Old Testament, above given, and still more those from the Pentateuch, with the text of the LXX., will be equally struck by the agreement, and by the number and character of the divergences, between them. The latter (to which alone we here refer) are the more remarkable when we remember that Philo regarded the LXX. version as inspired. These divergences between the quotations of Philo and our present text of the LXX. seem to establish that sometimes that text differed from ours; at other times Philo seems to quote from memory; or he quotes paraphrastically; or he emendates the LXX. from the Hebrew; or he quotes freely; or he combines two or more of these peculiarities of quotation. But the general impression left on the mind is the *marked accordance* in these respects between the *mode of quotation by Philo and that of the New Testament writers*. In another place[m] we have shown that this free mode of Targumic quotation was in general use among the Hebrew-speaking Jews at the time of Christ. It is now clearly established by an examination of Philo that the same was the case with the Greek-writing Alexandrian Jews. The peculiar mode of Old Testament quotation by the New Testament writers is therefore, so far from being an objection, entirely in accordance with the established practice of that time.

While the quotations previously given will enable the student to institute the comparison and verify the conclusions just referred to, he has also the means of extending it over the Pentateuch. In his *Exercitatio in Versionem LXX. Interpr. ex Philone*, Hornemann has instituted a detailed comparison between the quotations of Philo and the text of the LXX., as previous to the labours of Tischendorf and Lagarde. This task has been resumed, with far better critical means, and extended over all the Old Testament quotations of Philo, by Siegfried in three articles in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* Jahrg. 1873. As the outcome of these investigations Siegfried groups the quotations of Philo under the following heads; 1. Quotations which are paraphrases. These comprise a very large proportion of them. 2. Quotations in which citation from the LXX. is combined with explanatory additions of Philo. 3. Quotations in which a verse is adduced in one passage according to the LXX., in another differing from it. 4. Quotations in which the reading of Philo occurs also in some of our MSS. 5. Quotations in which the LXX. is emendated from the Hebrew. 6. Quotations containing other variants—mostly of small importance. 7. Quotations which seem to indicate a Hebrew text differing from our Massoretic. 8. Variations from the LXX. of a linguistic character, to avoid Hebraisms or harsh constructions. 9. A few quotations in which several verses are strung together. This was also a frequent Rabbinic practice.[n] 10. Some remarkable quotations, in which Philo bases a special interpretation on an expression not found in our present text of the LXX. On this important point comp. also Gfrörer, *Philo*, vol. i. p. 51, and Dähne, *Jud. Alex. Rel. Phil.* ii. pp. 3, 4 (notes). But Siegfried is mistaken in including among these passages 1 Sam. i. 28 (*Q. Deus immut.* § 2), since the quotation there is *not* from 1 Sam. i. 28, but from verse 11, where the δοτόν, on which the argument turns, *does* occur in the LXX. 11. Deviations from the LXX. due to corruptions in the text of Philo. 12. Siegfried notices certain corrections in the text of Philo, to bring it into accordance with that of the LXX.

4. *The Apocrypha.*—Philo does not quote from any of the Apocrypha. This is the more remarkable since he so often quotes from heathen authors. There are indeed expressions which have been regarded as analogous, or at least similar, to some in the Apocrypha—chiefly in the Wisdom of Solomon, next to it, in Ecclus., a few in Tobit, one in Judith, a few in 1 Macc. and in 2 Macc., and one in 3 Macc. and in 1 Esdr.[o] But these supposed or real resemblances are not in any sense quotations, at most imitations, easily explained in the circumstances.

VIII. *Literature.*

The exigencies of space prevent the discussion of some other questions arising from the writings of Philo which, indeed, could not be adequately treated in a general Article. We therefore only indicate the sources of further information on

[1] The references in *Quaest. in Gen.* § 100, are probably to Numb. xiv. 9, and Ps. lxxxi. 15 (*Vulg.*). But we possess the Tractate only in Latin translation.

[m] *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.*

[n] Comp. *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.*

[o] The full list is given in Hornemann, *Observ. ad illustr. doctr. de Can.* vol. i. pp. 390.

these subjects. For a detailed exposition of the *Allegorical Exegesis* by which Philo connected his views with the Old Testament, we refer to the well-known work of Siegfried, which is mainly devoted to this point. To the same work we must also refer in regard to the *Jewish training of Philo* and the *agreement between his interpretations and those of the Rabbinic Midrash.* A very interesting branch of the same subject is the *correspondence between Philo and the Halakhah*, or Jewish traditional law. This has been carefully and learnedly indicated in a tractate (of 139 pages) by Dr. Bernhard Ritter. That scholar makes exhaustive examination of the, often incidental, notices in the writings of Philo on subjects connected with Jewish law: criminal jurisprudence, the law of marriage, of inheritance, constitutional law, and sacerdotal ordinances. By a comparison of these notices with the ordinances of the Mosaic law, and the later determinations of Rabbinism in the Halakhah, Dr. Ritter arrives at the conclusion, that the writings of Philo show a not inconsiderable acquaintance with the Halakhah of Palestine, side by side with great deviations from it. This is the more interesting as alike the one and the other indicates how the law of Moses was viewed, applied, and extended in practice by the Jews of Egypt. And both the agreement and the divergences with the Rabbinic usage of Palestine are the more important since, from the position of Philo, whose brother was Alabarch, his statements may be regarded as representing not only the common practice, but also the decisions of the Sanhedrin of Alexandria. It results that, although certain legal determinations of the Halakhah were known in Egypt long before Philo (as by Demetrios and Pseudo-Aristeas), and had taken root in popular life, yet their number was much smaller, and the general stand-point much more free, independent, and wide, than in Palestine.

A subject of still greater interest is *the relation, textual* (as to forms and modes of expression) *and doctrinal, between Philo and the New Testament writers.* On the doctrinal aspect some observations—although necessarily very brief—have been offered in this article. The relation between the views of Philo on "faith," and the teaching of the Old Testament on the one hand, and, on the other, that of the Gospels and Epistles is very ably discussed in the important monograph by A. Schlatter: *der Glaube im N. T.* (pp. 83–105 and 545–552). The general subject is more or less fully referred to in such works as the commentaries of Lücke on St. John, and others. The special treatise by Loesner is referred to in the subjoined account of the *Literature* of the subject. But with all acknowledgement of the learning and ability hitherto brought to bear on the subject, a fuller examination of this important point is still required. We may add, that another very important subject of enquiry is that into *the relation between Philo and the Alexandrian Fathers* (comp. here Dr. Bigg, "*The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*"). Yet another point of interest would arise from an examination of *the relation*—we cannot say connection—*between Philo and a certain direction of teaching in the later synagogue*, notably "The Guide of the Perplexed" [*Moreh Nebhukhim*] by Maimonides. The object of that treatise is to show the identity of Aristotelianism with the Old Testament and the Talmud. The method adopted may in some sense be described as the allegorical; indeed, sometimes the same Biblical facts are chosen for allegorising as by Philo. The views of God, of the Kosmos, of inspiration, and of many other topics are almost identical with, or closely related to those of Philo, while occasionally we are involuntarily reminded of the great Alexandrian, even by turns of expression. The subject is of literary interest, the more so, as no direct connection between the two can be traced.[p]

The literature on Philo is so large as to render it impossible here to enumerate it in detail. The curious reader is referred to Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* iii. pp. 87–94. The earlier literature of the subject is also given in most of the works which will be cited. In the enumeration about to be made, only such works will be named as have been used or referred to in connection with the present article. Unfortunately we cannot quote any previous English writer who has treated in detail of the system of Philo, with the exception of the account by Professor Jowett in his work on *The Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. i. pp. 448–514. This absence of previous English literature on the subject has rendered it necessary sometimes to introduce a new terminology, such as in rendering δυνάμεις by "Potencies,"—since other terms, such as "Powers," "Forces," or "Energies," were open to serious objection. The text used has been that of Richter (8 vols. Lips. 1828, 1829) together with the Frankfort ed. of 1691. The edition of Pfeiffer (Erlangen, 1785) is practically useless, not only from its incompleteness, but as not marking the text in paragraphs, nor yet giving any marginal reference either to the Paris edition or that of Mangey. Too much acknowledgment cannot be made of Tischendorf's *Philonea* (Lips. 1868), nor yet regret expressed for the loss of his other emendations of the text. Besides the books to which brief allusion has been made the following Articles or works on Philo may here find a place: the Articles in the *Encyclopaedias* of Schenkel (by Fritzsche) and of Herzog (in the 1st ed. by J. G. Müller, in the 2nd by Zöckler), and in Hamburger's *Real-Encykl.* (Abth. ii.); Gfrörer, *Philo u. d. Alex. Theos.* 2 vols. 1831; Dähne, *Gesch. Darstell. d. jüd. alexr. Relig. Philos.* 2 vols. 1834; Delaunay, *Philon d'Alexandrie*, 1870; Delaunay, *Moines et Sibylles*, 1874; Hausrath, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* vol. ii. pt. 1, 1875; Schürer, *Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes* (2nd ed. of pt. ii. of the *Neutest. Zeitgesch.*), 1885; Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.* (3rd ed.), vol. vi. 1868;[q] Grossmann, *Quaestiones Philoneae*, 1829; Lücke, *Comment. ü. d. Evang. d. Joh.* vol. i.; Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria*, 1875; Siegfried, *d. hebr. Wörterkl. d. Philo*, 1868; Zeller, *d. Philos. d. Griechen* (3rd ed.), vol. iii. pt. ii. 1881; J. G. Müller, *Des Juden Philo B. v.*

[p] The "Dissertation" of S. Weisse (*Philo von Alex. u. Moses Maimonides*, Halle, 1884), though superficial, deserves to be read as calling attention to the subject.

[q] The accounts in the works of P. Beer, Jost, and Grätz, as well as others, have been perused, but require not special reference. Works on the pre-Philonic period would occupy too much space.

d. Weltsch. 1841; Bucher, *d. Lehre vom Logos*, 1856; Heinze, *d. Lehre vom Logos*, 1872; Harnoch, *Philonis Jud. Logoi*, 1879; B. Ritter, *Philo u. d. Halacha*, 1879; J. G. Müller, *d. Mess. Erwart. d. J. Philo*, 1870; P. E. Lucius, *die Therapeuten*, 1879, with which should be read the articles *Mönchthum*, by Weingarten, and *Therapeuten*, by Harnack—both in the 2nd ed. of Herzog's *Real-Encykl.*; lastly, C. F. Loesneri, *Observ. in N. T. e Philone*, 1777 and C. F. Hornemann, *Exercit. Crit.* (Gött. 1773), as well as his *Observ.* (Hauniae, 1775), with which comp. the Art. by Siegfried in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* for 1873. To these we venture to add the present writer's account of Philo in the *History of the Jewish Nation*, pp. 417–456, and that in *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i. and App. —both, in some sense, preparatory and supplementary to the present Article. [A. E.]

PHILO (2), deacon. Among the proofs of the genuineness of the Ignatian letters is the fact, that we obtain a thoroughly consistent story on piecing together scattered notices about obscure persons. Thus two deacons are mentioned; Philo from Cilicia and Rheius Agathopus from Syria (*Philadelph.* ii., *Smyrn.* 10, 13). On carefully examining these notices, we find that these deacons had not started with Ignatius on his journey, but had afterwards followed on his track: that they took the same route as he had done: that at Philadelphia, a place where Ignatius himself had encountered some heretical opposition, there had been some who treated them with contumely; that they had been too late to overtake the saint at Smyrna, but had been kindly entertained by the church there. Finally, they are found in company with the martyr at Troas, and from them doubtless he received the joyful news of the peace which the church of Syria had obtained since his departure. The clearness with which the whole story comes out from oblique inferences is evidence that we have here true history to deal with. (Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, i. 334, ii. 279.)

It was no doubt the mention in the genuine epistles of this Philo from Cilicia that suggested to Pseudo-Ignatius to forge a letter in the name of the martyr to the church of Tarsus, and to specify that city as the place where Philo served as deacon. [G. S.]

PHILO (3), a bishop (see unknown) said by Jerome (*Vit. Hilarionis*, 30) to have been banished by Constantius to Babylon, and visited by the hermit Hilarion. [W. H. F.]

PHILO (4), bishop of Carpasia in Cyprus (erroneously called by Suidas Καρπάθιος), who according to the religious romance which passes under the title of the *Life of St. Epiphanius*, having been a rhetorician entered holy orders, and while still a deacon was ordained to the episcopate by Epiphanius, in obedience to a divine revelation, ἀπὸ ἀποκαλύψεως (Polyb. *Vit. S. Epiphan.* c. 49, p. 860). When Epiphanius visited Rome in A.D. 382 he left Philo in charge of Constantia, with authority to administer ordination if necessary (*ibid.*; Epiphan. *Epist. ad. Joann. Hierus.*). He is probably the same with Φίλων Καλπάσιος, commemorated in the Greek Menaea on Jan. 24. Philo was the author of a commentary on the Book of Canticles (Suidas *sub voc.*), dedicated to Eustathius a presbyter, and Eusebius a deacon, attributed in the old Latin translation to Epiphanius, and published under his name by Petr. Fr. Fogginius, 1750. It was first published in Greek, with a Latin version by M. A. Giacomelli, archbishop of Chalcedon, Rome, 1772. The largely interpolated Latin version of Stephanus Salutatus had been previously published at Paris by Rob. Stephens in 1537, and had been transferred to the *Bibl. Vet. Patrum*, cf. Le Bigne, 1609, tom. i.; the *Bibl. Magna Patrum*, 1618, tom. iv., and the *Bibl. Max.* 1677, tom. v. The commentary has been printed by Galland, 1769, tom. ix. pp. 713 ff.; and by Migne, tom. xl. pp. 10–154. Cave thinks Philo may probably have been the author of an Ecclesiastical History referred to by Anastasius Sinaita. He is quoted by Cosmas Indicopleustes, lib. x. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* x. 520; Ceillier, *Aut. Eccl.* viii. 480; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 374; Fabric. *Biblioth. Graec.* iv. 751, x. 479; Allatius, *de Philonibus*, Mai *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. vi.) [E. V.]

PHILO (5), bishop, who singly consecrated Siderius, bishop of Palaebisca, and is blamed by Synesius (*Epist.* 67) for it as an act of irregularity (Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 627–8; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iv. 220). [J. G.]

PHILO (6), bishop and head of a monastery, addressed by St. Nilus the Ascetic (*Epp.* ii. no. 160) on the training of novices in the religious life (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 218). [J. G.]

PHILOCALUS, a subdeacon of Hippo, holding the first place in his order, of good family, born on the estate of Orontius, for whom St. Augustine sent a letter by Philocalus to recommend him to his favour. (*Ep.* 222, 223.) [H. W. P.]

PHILOGONIUS, bishop of Antioch, 22nd in succession, followed Vitalis, c. A.D. 319. He affords the example of a layman, the husband of a wife and the father of at least one daughter, being raised at once, like Ambrose at Milan, to the episcopate of his city. He had been by profession an advocate (δικόλογος ἐκ μέσης ἀγόρας ἁρπασθεὶς), and had gained universal esteem by his powerful advocacy of the poor and oppressed in the law courts, "making the wronged stronger than the wronger." The few facts known of his history are gathered from a homily delivered at Antioch by Chrysostom on his *Natalitia*, the day of his death to this world and his birth to the heavenly world, Dec. 20th (Chrysos. *Orat.* 71, tom. v. p. 507, ed. Savile). Chrysostom comments upon the great difficulties, δυσκολίαι, Philogonius had to encounter at the commencement of his episcopate, from the persecution which had so recently ceased, and says that his highest eulogy is the pure and flourishing condition in which he left the church. The earliest ecclesiastical building in Antioch, "the mother of all the churches in the city," traditionally ascribed to apostolic times, the rebuilding of which had been begun by Vitalis, was finished by him (Theod. *H. E.* i. 3). He was denounced by Arius as one of his most determined adversaries (Theod. i. 5). He was succeeded by Paulinus, the Arianizing bishop of Tyre, c. A.D. 323. He is commemorated by the Latin church on Dec.

20, and on the same day in the Greek Menol. He is called Philonicus by Eutychius (p. 431), who assigns him five years of office (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. vi. p. 194; Neale, *Patr. of Ant.* p. 84). [E. V.]

PHILOPONUS. [JOANNES (564).]

PHILOROMUS, Feb. 4, a high treasury official in Egypt and martyr in the Diocletian persecution, A.D. 306 (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 9). His acts are given Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 548; cf. Le Blant, *Les Actes des Martyrs*, p. 55. [G. T. S.]

PHILOSTORGIUS, a Cappadocian, born about A.D. 368, and author of a church history extending over the period between the year 300 and the year 425. The greater part of his work has perished, but some fragments of it have been preserved by Photius. They were published under the care of Godefridius, at Geneva, in 1642, and again under that of Valesius, with a Latin translation and notes, at Paris in 1673. An English translation by Walford appeared at London in 1855. It is much to be regretted that so little of the history of Philostorgius has come down to us, for, injudicious and prejudiced as it may have been, it would at least have possessed the merit of being a contemporary record, and could not fail to have thrown light upon the feelings, if not always the facts, of his time. Photius regarded both the author and his book with worse than contempt. The style of the book he allows to be sometimes elegant, though more frequently marked by stiffness, coldness, and obscurity. The contents he treats as unworthy of reliance, often beginning his extracts by denouncing the author as an "enemy of God," an "impious wretch," an "impudent liar." Even Gibbon, naturally inclined as he was to accept the statements of a heretic in preference to those of an orthodox theologian, and who does not fail to notice, when speaking of Ulphilas the apostle of the Goths, that "the heresy of Philostorgius appears to have given him superior means of information" (*History*, chap. xxxvii.), is compelled to allow that "the credibility of Philostorgius is lessened, in the eyes of the orthodox, by his Arianism; and, in those of rational critics, by his passion, his prejudice, and his ignorance." (*History*, chap. xxi.) At other times Gibbon thinks that he appears to have obtained "some curious and authentic intelligence" (chap. xxv.), and yet that he was marked in making use of it by "cautious malice" (chap. xxiii.). These opinions, in the main so unfavourable, are shared by Tillemont (*Histoire*, vol. iv. p. 281), and, though with some just expressions as to what might have been the value of his history had it been preserved to us, by Jortin (*Eccles. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 122) and Schröckh (vol. i. p. 148). All the existing evidence indeed leads to the belief, that the history of Philostorgius was less a fair statement of what he had seen and known than a panegyric upon the heretics of his time. These circumstances, combined with the fact that so little of his history survives, render it unnecessary to dwell upon him at greater length. It may be worth while only to notice, that his history seems to have been written upon a plan illustrative of one of the curious conceits of his age. It consisted of twelve books, each book beginning with a letter of his name, so that the initial letters of all the books, taken together, formed an acrostic. (Comp. Fabricius, vol. vi. p. 115.) [W. M.]

PHILOSTRATUS. Of the various writers of this name one alone is important in relation to Christian history; the author of the celebrated life of Apollonius of Tyana. The following are the facts which may be said to be known, either absolutely or with a near approach to certainty, respecting this writer. He was born at Lemnos (*Vita Apollonii*, vi. 27), not later than the year A.D. 182; he studied at Athens under Proclus the rhetorician (*Vitae Sophistarum*, ii. 21), and at the same time occasionally heard the lectures of Hippodromus, the more magnanimous rival of Proclus (*V. S.* ii. 27). After this he attended the lectures of Antipater, at a time when that rhetorician was also instructing the two sons of the emperor Severus, Caracalla, and Geta (*V. S.* ii. 24). At what date or in what place this happened, we are not told; but it may be presumed to have been between the year A.D. 193 (the date of the accession of Severus), and A.D. 198 when Caracalla and Geta accompanied their father in his expedition against the Parthians. After this (and possibly before also), Philostratus was a great traveller (see especially the last sentence in his life of Apollonius); but, to judge by the epithet, "Philostratus the *Athenian*," attached to him by Hierocles and Eusebius, the greater part of his time must have been spent at Athens; and, as he tells us (*V. Ap.* 1, 3), that he belonged to the court of the empress Julia, wife of Severus, it is clear that he spent some years at any rate at Rome. The account given by Suidas agrees with this. It was at the instance of the empress Julia that he composed the life of Apollonius, though the language he uses respecting her in the passage last cited implies that she was no longer alive when the work was completed (he uses the past tense in speaking of her; and, moreover, the work would certainly have been dedicated to her had she been alive). Hence the completion of this work must be set down as posterior to A.D. 217, the year of Julia's death; but it had no doubt occupied Philostratus several years before that time. It may be observed that Philostratus accompanied Caracalla, then emperor, to Gaul, probably in the year 213 A.D. (*V. S.* ii. 32). The only other place, which is definitely mentioned as having been visited by Philostratus, is Antioch in Syria, where he had a conversation with Gordian, afterwards consul (see the dedication, to Gordian, of his lives of the Sophists). The 'Lives of the Sophists,' composed, it would seem, about A.D. 237 (see the Dictionary of *Greek and Roman Biography*), is the most valuable, though not the most celebrated, of all the works of its author. It gives a lively picture of men who were indeed not of exalted worth, and who floated on the surface of society without trying to penetrate to its depths, but whose character was not without amiable and benevolent traits. It must be said also, that it enables us to understand how it was that so little effort was made by the heathen world for the removal of the evils that

afflicted it; since intellectual men found so easy a resource for their faculties, and so sure a scope for their ambition, in the composition of rhetorical exercises.

Hardly anything is known of the personal life of Philostratus after the reign of Caracalla; he is said by Suidas to have lived into the reign of Philip (A.D. 244–249). Of the remaining works of Philostratus, the *Heroicus*, *Imagines*, and *Epistolae*, an account will be found in the DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY. For a full account of his most celebrated work, see the article in this dictionary on APOLLONIUS OF TYANA.

As a writer, Philostratus is quick to seize points of interest, delicately fanciful, and not without a praiseworthy industry; as a man, he is rather too much of the butterfly - courtier species.

The best edition of Philostratus is that by C. L. Kayser, Zurich, 1844. [J. R. M.]

PHILOTHEUS. [HIPPARCHUS.]

PHILOXENUS (1), bishop of Doliche in Euphratensis; sister's son, and suffragan, to PHILOXENUS (4), and a follower in his Monophysite tenets. He was one of six Severian bishops who, by command of Justinian, met six orthodox bishops in a conference at Constantinople in 533 (INNOCENTIUS (17)); the others being John of Tella, Nonnus of Ceresina, Peter of Theodosiopolis [Ras'ain], Sergius of Cyrus, and THOMAS OF GERMANICA (see *infra*). Hence it is probable that he had been previously ejected from his see, as three at least (John, Peter, and Thomas) of the others had been. But while the names of these three, with that of Sergius, are appended to the "Defence of the Orthodox bishops before Justinian" (extant in a Nitrian MS. (Wright, p. 937)), which no doubt belongs to the occasion of this conference, that of Philoxenus is wanting. We infer therefore that this was the time when he made the recantation of which we are informed by Innocent in his contemporary narrative. Gregory Barhebraeus makes his defection "to the sect of the Dyophysites" occur after his uncle's death, but before the consecration of Jacob Baradaeus (circ. 541); when he "subscribed the Synod and lived at Cyprus." (*Chron. Eccl.* i. 45.) There is no evidence that he was ever reinstated in his see. His signature (with those of his uncle and others) to the *Prosphonesis* of Severus *to the Orthodox monks of the East* (Wright, p. 970), and the *Letter* addressed to him by Severus, "*On the Episcopal Office*," belong of course to the earlier period of his life. [J. Gw.]

PHILOXENUS (2), presbyter, legate of pope Julius in 341 [ELPIDIUS (23)], and, with Archidamus, legate of Julius to the synod of Sardica in 343 (Athan. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 50). [C. H.]

PHILOXENUS (3), agent of pope Leo I., who wrote by him (*Ep.* 162 al. 132) to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458 (Tillem. xv. 812). [C. H.]

PHILOXENUS (4) (XENAIAS), a conspicuous leader of the Monophysite section of the church at the beginning of the sixth century. He shares with Severus of Antioch, the true scientific head of the previously headless party of the Acephali, the reputation of having originated the Jacobite form of Monophysitism, which long held the supremacy in Egypt and which is still adopted by the Copts. We have the misfortune of deriving our knowledge of Philoxenus almost exclusively from his theological opponents, against whom he was engaged in a determined and not very scrupulous warfare. According to them Philoxenus was little better than a religious adventurer of low birth and discreditable antecedents, who, endowed with considerable intellectual gifts, by mean arts and the most unblushing audacity worked his way to a place of dignity in the church, where he abused his power for the most unremitting persecution of his theological opponents. Much of what is stated to his discredit admits of reasonable doubt. Some stories we may absolutely reject as the exaggerations of polemical bitterness. We do know Philoxenus as an acute dialectician, a subtle theologian, and a zealous and uncompromising champion of the unity of the nature of Christ against what he regarded as the heresy of the two natures, and as one to whose desire to have a faithful rendering of the New Testament the church is indebted for what is known as the "Philoxenian Syriac Version." The original form of his name is uncertain. Xenaias represents the Syriac ܐܟܣܢ̈ܐ which (see Payne-Smith's *Thesaurus*) is an adaptation of the Greek ξένος, and therefore seems to present the latter half of the name Philoxenus in a Syriac guise. According to the received tale, however, Xenaias was his earlier name, which was Graecised into Philoxenus on his becoming bishop of Hierapolis. He was born at Tahal in Persia. He may have been of low even of servile origin, but that he was an unbaptized slave who had run away from his owner, as stated by Theodorus Lector (p. 569) and Theophanes (*Chronogr.* p. 115), and repeated by all subsequent writers, may safely be rejected as an orthodox calumny. The slander is refuted, according to Asseman, by his own words to Zeno in his letter *De Incarnatione Dei Verbi*, and in his tract *De Trinitate et Incarnatione*, which assert the fact of his baptism. Before he left his native country, he and his brother Adacus were zealous opponents of the two natures in Christ, and of all Nestorianising tenets (Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* i. 352; ii. pp. 10 ff.) The opprobrious epithet of "Manichee," which was applied to him (Theoph. p. 128; Labbe, vii. 368) as to the emperor Anastasius and other favourers of Monophysitism, has nothing to support it in what we know of Philoxenus' teaching. We soon find Philoxenus in Syria, where, having accepted the Henoticon and the twelve chapters of Cyril, he showed himself the active opponent of all Nestorianisers and the zealous propagator of Monophysite views in the country villages round about Antioch. As a heterodox teacher Calandio, the patriarch of Antioch, expelled him from his diocese. He was recalled by Peter the Fuller, by whom he was ordained bishop of Hierapolis (Mabug) in place of the more orthodox Cyrus, c. 485. The story runs that some Persian bishops visiting Hierapolis after his ordination recognised him as a runaway slave, and reporting that fact as well as that he had

never received baptism, Peter made light of it, saying that his ordination would stand instead of the Christian sacrament of initiation (Theod. Lect. *u. s.*; quoted in the Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea, Labbe, vii. 868). This tale may be safely discarded. During Peter's turbulent rule Philoxenus proved himself an active supporter of that violent and unscrupulous man in his measures for the suppression of the Nestorianising section of the church and the establishment of Eutychian or Monophysite doctrines in his patriarchate and generally in the East (PETER THE FULLER). The accession in 498 of the vacillating Flavian to the throne of Antioch, and his change of front when from having been an opponent of the decrees of Chalcedon he declared himself their advocate, was the signal for Philoxenus' adopting a more active line of conduct (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 31). The untiring animosity with which Philoxenus pursued Flavian, endeavouring to force him to accept the Henoticon, on his refusal denouncing him as a concealed Nestorian, demanding of him that he should not only repudiate Nestorius himself, but all who were regarded as sympathising with him, Diodorus, Theodorus, Theodoret, and many others, his denouncing him once and again to the emperor Anastasius, and the long series of measures by which he at last accomplished his deprivation and expulsion, are fully detailed in another place (FLAVIANUS OF ANTIOCH ii. No. 16, Vol. II. p. 533). In pursuance of his object Philoxenus made more than one visit to Constantinople. The first time was in obedience to the summons of Anastasius, A.D. 507. His arrival caused a great disturbance both among the clergy and laity and the monastic bodies. Macedonius the patriarch refused to communicate with or even to speak to so confessed a heretic. To consult the peace of the city, the emperor was compelled to remove him secretly (Theophan. p. 128; Victor Tunnun. sub ann. 499). Unable in any other way to secure the deposition of Flavian and the sharer of his faith and his fortunes, Elias of Jerusalem, Philoxenus obtained from Anastasius an order for the convening of a synod ostensibly for the more exact definition of the points of faith at issue, but really for the removal of the two obnoxious prelates. This synod met at Sidon early in 512. About eighty bishops assembled under the joint presidency of Philoxenus and Soterichus of the Cappadocian Caesarea. The synod is announced by Marcellinus in his Chronicle as "an infamous and ridiculous gathering of perfidious bishops banded against the orthodox." Parties ran so high, and the public peace was so much endangered, that the synod was broken up by the emperor's command without pronouncing any sentence on the two bishops (Labbe, iv. 1413; Theophan. p. 131; *Vit. S. Sab.* ap. Coteler, *Mon. Eccl. Graec.* iii. 297, ff.). The subsequent proceedings, when rival bodies of monks poured down from the mountain ranges into the streets of Antioch, those of Syria Prima, being it is said bribed, or at least roused, by Philoxenus, each eager to do battle for the representatives of their form of faith, and respectively joined by different parties among the citizens, converted the city into a scene of uproar and bloodshed (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 32), have been described elsewhere (*D. C. B.*, u. s.). It is only necessary to state that Philoxenus was left practically master of the field. Flavian was speedily expelled and banished, and the Monophysite Severus, the friend and associate of Philoxenus, was put in his place towards the close of the same year, 512 (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 33). The triumph of Philoxenus however was but short. In 518 Anastasius was succeeded by the more orthodox Justin, who immediately on his accession declaring himself an adherent of Chalcedon, restored to their sees the expelled orthodox bishops and deposed and banished the heterodox. Philoxenus is said to have been banished to Philippopolis in Thrace (Assemann. *Bibl. Orient.* ii. 19; Theophan. p. 141; *Chron. Edess.* 87), and thence to have been removed to Gangra in Paphlagonia, where (Barheb. ii. 56) he died of suffocation by smoke (*ibid.*). He is honoured by the Jacobites, and commemorated in their liturgy as a doctor and confessor.

As has been already stated we owe to Philoxenus the Syriac translation of the New Testament, known by his name as the "Philoxenian Version," subsequently revised by Thomas of Harkel, in which form alone we possess it. This was executed in 508 at his desire by his chorepiscopus Polycarp (Moses Agnellus, *ap.* Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* ii. 83; *ib.* i. 408). The version is characterized by extreme literality; "the Syriac idiom is constantly bent to suit the Greek, and everything is in some manner expressed in the Greek phrase and order." (Westcott, *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii. p. 1635 b.)

Philoxenus and Severus were the authors of the dominant form of Monophysite doctrines which, while maintaining the unity of the natures of Christ, endeavoured to preserve a distinction between the divine and the human. This doctrine is laid down in eight propositions at variance with the tenets of the early Christians, whom he stigmatised as Phantasiasts. Christ was the Son of Man, i.e. son of the yet unfallen man, and the Logos took the body and soul of man as they were before Adam's fall. The very personality of God the Word descended from heaven and became man in the womb of the Virgin, personally without conversion. Thus He became a man who could be seen, felt, handled, and yet as God He continued to possess the spiritual, invisible, impalpable character essential to Deity. Neither the deity nor the humanity was absorbed one by the other, nor converted one into the other. Nor again by a combination of the two natures was a third evolved as by chemical transformation. He taught one nature constituted out of two, not simple but twofold, *μία φύσις σύνθετος*, or *μία φύσις διττή*. The one Person of the Incarnate Word was not a duality but a unity. The same Son who was one before the Incarnation, was equally one when united to the body. In all that was said, done, suffered by Christ, there was only one and the same God the Word, who became man, and took on Himself the condition of want and suffering, not naturally but voluntarily, for the accomplishment of man's redemption. It thence followed that God the Word suffered and died, and not merely a body distinct from or obedient to Him, or in which He dwelt, but with which He was not one. His view as to the personal work of Christ is briefly summed up in the Theopaschite formula, "unus

e Trinitate descendit de caelo, incarnatus est, crucifixus, mortuus, resurrexit, ascendit in caelum." He held that "potuit non mori," not that "non potuit mori." It naturally followed that he affirmed a single will in Christ. In the Eucharist he held that the living body of the living God was received, not anything belonging to a corruptible man like ourselves. Philoxenus was decidedly opposed to all pictorial representations of Christ, as well as of all spiritual beings. No true honour, he said, was done to Christ by making pictures of Him, since His only acceptable worship was that in spirit and in truth. To depict the Holy Spirit as a dove was puerile, for it is said economically that He was seen in the likeness, not in the body of a dove. It was contrary to reason to represent angels, purely spiritual beings, by human bodies. We are told that Philoxenus acted up to his declared opinions and blotted out pictures of angels where he found them, and removed out of sight those of Christ (Joann. Diaconus, *de Eccl. Hist.* ap. Labbe, vii. 369).

Philoxenus was a very copious author. He is described by Assemani as one of the best and most elegant writers in the Syrian tongue (*Bibl. Orient.* i 475; ii. 20). Assemani gives the following catalogue of his works:—(1) *Commentaries on H. Sc.* Those on Matthew, Luke, and John exist in part in the MSS. of the British Museum. (2) The Philoxenian Version of the Gospels. (3) The *Anaphora* (Renaudot, ii. 310; Wright, *Catalogue*, 261, 12; 262, 5). (4) Prayer Book. (5) Order of Baptism. (6) *De Trinitate et Incarnatione Tractatus tres*, addressed to certain Syrian monks. (7) *De uno ex Trinitate Incarnato et Passo*, divided into ten discourses (Wright, 675; Assem. ii. 27–30). (8) *Epistola ad Abraamam et Orestem Presbyteros de Stephano Bar-Sudaili* (a monk of Edessa who had adopted Origenistic views, doing away with baptism, teaching a kind of Antinomianism, and a pantheistic identification of all things with God and their absorption into God). (9) *Professio Fidei*, in ten sections, expressly declaring the one nature and the one will of Christ (Wright, 856, b. d). (10) *Epistola ad Zenonem Imperatorem de Incarnatione Dei Verbi*, rejecting and anathematising the tenets both of Nestorius and Eutyches. (11) *Epistolae ad Monachos Gangalenses duae* (Soz. *H. E.* iii. 14). (12) *Epistola ad Monachos Amidenses* (Wright, 861, 78). (13) *Epistolae ad Monachos Teledenses duae* (Wright, 751, 3 g.). (14) *Epistola ad Monachos Senunenses*, written during his exile at Philippopolis. (15) *Disputatio cum Nestoriano quodam in Ephes. i.* 17. (16) *Tractatus in Nestorianum et Eutychen.* (17) *De Fide.* (18) *In Habibam Epistola.* (19) *Epistola ad Arzunitas.* (20) *Ad Monachum Novitianum.* (21) *Ad Patricianum Edessae.* (22) *De Castitate.* (23) *De Interdicto et Excommunicatione.* To these may be added thirteen homilies on Christian life and character (Wright, 764); twelve chapters against the holders of the Two Wills (*ibid.* 730, 749); ten chapters against those who divided Christ (*ibid.* 730). (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 31, 32; Theod. Lect. fragm. p. 569; Theophan. *Chronogr.* pp. 115, 128, 129, 131, 141; Labbe, iv. 1153; vii. 88, 368; Victor Tunnunen. *sub ann.* 499; Cyril. Scyth. *Vit. S. Sabae*; Niceph. *H. E.* xvi. 27; Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* i. 268, 352, 408, 479; ii. 10–46, 68; Bar-Hebraeus ed. Abbeloos, i. 184; ii. 56; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xvi. 677–681, 701–706; Neander, *Eccles. Hist.* iv. 255, Clark's transl.; Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 94; Schröckh, *Kirch. Geschich.* xviii. 526–538; Petav. *de Theol. Dogm.* lib. i. c. 18; Walch, *Ketz. Historie*, vi. p. 955 ff.; vii. 10 ff.; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Div. ii. vol. i. pp. 133–135, Clark's transl.) [E. V.]

PHILUMENE (1), Marcionite prophetess [APELLES, Vol. I. p. 127].

PHILUMENE (2), a widow befriended by St. Gregory Nazianzen in 382. [OLYMPIUS (7)]. [C. H.]

PHILUMENUS (1), Carthaginian subdeacon, who with the subdeacon Fortunatus and Favorinus the acolyte in the Decian persecution lapsed (or retired) and returned to his duty before the persecution was over. (Cyp. *Ep.* 34.) Cyprian reserves the case for the council of A.D. 251, prohibiting them meanwhile from the monthly clerical dividend. (*Ep.* 34.) [E. W. B.]

PHILUMENUS (2), bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, mentioned by Epiphanius as one of the three bishops who followed Acellus in rapid succession. On the death of Acacius in 366, Cyril of Jerusalem, in apparent violation of the canons of Nicaea, appointed Philumenus, who was deposed, and another Cyril appointed, in his turn removed by his namesake who appointed his sister's son Gelasius. (Epiphan. *Haer.* lxxiii. No. 37, p. 885; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 561; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* vi. 579. CYRILLUS, Vol. I. p. 762 a; GELASIUS, Vol. II. p. 621. a.) [E. V.]

PHLEGON, Greek writer in the second century, native of Tralles in Lydia. (For what is known concerning him and his writings, see *Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog.* iii. 337.) Though there is no appearance of his having been a Christian, we yet learn from Origen (*Cont. Cels.* ii. cc. 14, 33) that in his work Ὀλυμπιονικῶν καὶ Χρονικῶν συναγωγή (which we have now only in fragments, as put together by Müller, *Frag. Hist. Graec.* iii. 602 sq. Paris, 1849), he mentioned Christ's knowledge of the future (though falling into some confusion regarding Christ and St. Peter) the fulfilment of His prophecies, and an eclipse in the reign of Tiberius Caesar when Christ was crucified (Müller, *Frag.* iii. 606, 607, with bibliographical account of the passages; Meursius, *Hist. Mir. Auct. Graec.* iii. 169–170, Lugd. 1622; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* ii. 184, 218). [J. G.]

PHOCAS (1), of Sinope, a celebrated martyr, of whom very little is actually known, and whose real date is uncertain. Combefis places his martyrdom in the last years of Trajan, but Tillemont regards a later persecution, either that of Decius or that of Diocletian, more probable. Our sole knowledge of Phocas is derived from an oration in his honour by Asterius of Amasea. He states that Phocas was an honest and industrious gardener at Sinope, a convert to Christianity, and exceedingly hospitable to strangers. Having been denounced as a Christian, he was sentenced to death, and a party of soldiers was despatched to Sinope to carry the sentence into execution. In ignorance

of their errand Phocas hospitably entertained them, and on discovering their mission forbore to escape, as he might easily have done, and on their asking him if he could tell them where they could find Phocas, made himself known to them, and was at once decapitated. His trunk was buried in a grave he had dug for himself, over which a church was subsequently built. His relics were so fruitful in miracles that he obtained the name of Thaumaturgus. His body was transferred to Constantinople with great magnificence, in the time of Chrysostom, who delivered a homily on the occasion, from which, however, we learn nothing concerning the martyr (Chrys. *Hom.* 71, tom. i. p. 775). A monastery was subsequently built on the spot, in which his relics were deposited, the abbats of which are often mentioned in early times (Du Cange, *Constant. Christ.* lib. iv. p. 133). Gregory Nazianzen mentions Phocas as a celebrated disciple of Christ (*Carm.* 52, tom. ii. p. 122). That he was bishop of Sinope is a late invention. Some of his relics were said to be translated to the Apostles' Church at Vienne. He was the favourite saint of the Greek sailors, who were in the habit of making him a sharer at their meals, the portion set apart for him daily being purchased by some one, and the money put aside and distributed to the poor on their arrival at port. He is commemorated by the modern Greeks on two days, Jul. 22 and Sept. 22. The former day may be that of his translation. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* v. 581.)

Another martyr of the same name is mentioned by Gregory of Tours (*de Glor. Mart.* c. 99, p. 222), who is said to have been martyred in Syria. His relics were sovereign against the bites of serpents. He is unknown to the Greeks. He is confused by the Bollandists with Phocas of Sinope. (Bolland. ii. 366.) [E. V.]

PHOCAS (2), brother of PETRUS (86).

PHOCAS (3), emperor from November 602 to October 610. For a full account of his disastrous and sanguinary reign see *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*. For his relations with Gregory the Great, see Vol. II. p. 787. For the concession by Phocas of the primacy to Rome, and his grant of the Pantheon for a church, see BONIFACIUS III. and IV. In the last month of his reign, the Jews attacked the Christians at Antioch, and barbarously murdered the patriarch ANASTASIUS (2). The only column in the Forum that remains standing is that erected in A.D. 608, in honour of Phocas, by the exarch SMARAGDUS. (*Corpus Inscript.* vi. 1. 251.) [F. D.]

PHOCAS (4), of Edessa, as his title Bar-Sergius indicates, was the son of a certain Sergius, by profession a physician. He wrote an introduction to the Syriac translation of the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, and illustrated them with explanatory comments, the whole being accomplished, he tells us, in the space of a year without receiving help from any one. He is referred by Assemani to the sixth or seventh century; but Professor Wright remarks, that his mention of Athanasius II. and of Jacob of Edessa proves that he did not live before the eighth century (Asseman. *Bibl. Or.* i. 468; *Cod. Syr.* iii. fol. 300; Wright, *Catalogue*, 494, 495, dcxx.). [E. V.]

PHOCYLIDES. [SIBYLLINE ORACLES.]

PHOEBADIUS. [FOEGADIUS.]

PHOENIX, a young man of noble birth, probably a native of Antioch, left at an early age by the death of his father master of large possessions, who retired to the mountains to lead a monastic life. Growing weary of this when the novelty was worn off, he listened too readily to the evil counsels of some relatives, and returned to his native city, where he exhibited great splendour of retinue. Under the influence of some solitaries who followed him up, careless of the contumely with which they were at first treated by him, he repented of his backsliding and returned to a religious life. (Chrysost. *ad Theod. Laps.* i. 17.) [E. V.]

PHOTINUS (1), a Galatian by birth, educated by Marcellus of Ancyra, and afterwards deacon and presbyter of his church, perhaps too, through his diplomacy, during the time when Marcellus, expelled from his own see, A.D. 336, was wandering about from one western city to another, between Rome and Constantinople for so many years [art. MARCELLUS], transferred to the see of Sirmium. Less diplomatic than his master, though it would appear more engaging in the pulpit, he made no secret of the erroneous doctrines he had imbibed from him, and succeeded in obtaining a hearing for them. The Eusebians, tracing them to their fountain-head, placed master and pupil in the same category, and said one was just as great a heretic as the other. But the master had once been orthodox, and had stood by St. Athanasius in opposing the Arians at Nicaea—a fact to which he was ever afterwards appealing, with no small benefit to himself. The pupil had no such past to recall, but had been familiarised with error before he could think for himself. Yet so long as his master was upheld by St. Athanasius and by Rome, he was left in peace by the orthodox. Hefele well knows that he was never condemned at Rome, though he would gladly let others believe that he was. Anyhow the Eusebians at Antioch, in their lengthiest formula, three years after the Encoenia, were the first to attack him, classing him with his preceptor, to add point to their indignation against Julius of Rome for continuing to uphold Marcellus. He was next attacked at Milan, then the imperial capital, by the same party soon after at Sardica (DICT. CHRIST. ANT., *Councils of Milan*, and then *Councils of Sirmium*), and two years later another and a larger synod decreed his deposition. Moderns are not agreed where this synod met; some maintaining it was at Rome, others at Milan, while St. Hilary, beyond any reasonable doubt, fixes it at Sirmium (*Fragm.* ii. n. 21, comp. Larroque, *Diss.* i., *de Phot.* p. 76, et seq.), being the first of the councils held at that place, A.D. 349, though Larroque places it a year later. The Benedictine editor of St. Hilary declares against Rome, and avows his preference for Milan (*ib.* n. 19, note b). But St. Athanasius, on whose words he relies, being as he shows in his note, not in Italy then, but at Alexandria, simply confounds Milan, where there was a council just as he was preparing to leave those parts, with Sirmium, of which he knows nothing previous to its creed of

A.D. 351. And as for Valens and Ursacius, their very letter to Julius implies their *libellus* had been presented at Milan some time, which might well be two years—before; but they deferred taking further action, as the prospects of St. Athanasius, if not clouding over once more were not advancing just then. Even the Benedictine editor of St. Athanasius admits there were learned men in his day who maintained it was at this council of Milan, A.D. 347, that they were first heard (*Apol. c. Arian.* § 58, note). However, Constantius being absent when sentence was first passed on Photinus in his own city, the popularity which he had gained there stood him in good stead, in spite of his avowed opinions, which Socrates tells us he would never disclaim. He remained in possession accordingly till A.D. 351, when a second council having assembled there by order of the emperor, then present in person, Photinus was taken in hand by Basilius, the successor of his master at Ancyra, and having been signally refuted by him in a formal dispute, committed to writing on the spot, according to St. Epiphanius, by eight notaries who were present, was put out of his see forthwith. Hefele thinks he may have regained it under Julian for a short time; but was again turned out under Valentinian, to return no more, and Hefele places his death A.D. 366 (*Councils*, ii. 199). St. Epiphanius professes to have written his account of the errors maintained by Photinus from the shorthand notes of the disputation between Basil and him, taken down at the time, and which he summarises in a very few words (*Haer.* 71, § 2), but it is quite clear he could have known nothing of Photinus personally. For he places his heresy before that of Marcellus in order of time, makes him a native of Sirmium, and never drops a hint of his connexion with Marcellus. St. Hilary tells us, on the contrary, that St. Athanasius began to distrust Marcellus, as soon as ever his complicity with the opinions avowed by Photinus became patent (*Frag.* ii. 21). Of the twenty-seven anathemas (in the *Dict. of Christ. Ant.* this number, which had been written in figures, is misprinted twenty-*five*) appended to the creed of the council in which he was finally deposed, Nos. 4–22 are considered by Gieseler, and No. 27 in addition by Hefele, to have been directed against him; but these were framed by his enemies. Socrates, besides telling us that he could never be persuaded to retract his opinions, states that he composed a work against all heresies, measuring them all entirely by what he held himself (*E. H.* ii. 30). It is a pity Socrates should not have supplied us, therefore, with his opinions in his own words. Instead of which he tells us vaguely that Photinus, following the footsteps of his master, affirmed the Son of God to be mere man. According to the Eusebians he said that Christ Himself, and the Son of God, the Mediator, and the Image, had not existed before all ages, but only from the time when He became the Son of God and Christ; namely, when he took our flesh from the Virgin about 400 years since. Philastrius and Lucifer both credit him with the errors of Pau of Samosata; Sulpicius Severus, with the errors of Sabellius. St. Epiphanius and St. Augustine take the same view of him, and, lastly, St. Jerome calls him an Ebionite. All these different views of him may be seen in Larroque (*Diss.* p. 104–9). Theodoret speaks of the sects founded both by his master and by him as then extinct (*Haer. Fab.* iii. 1). A collection of authorities, on the chronological difficulties in connexion with his history may be seen in a note to Hefele's *Councils* (Oxenham's *Tr.* ii. 188-9). [E. S. Ff.]

PHOTINUS (2), a Cappadocian deacon, who when visiting the monastery of Paphnutius in Scetis, c. 401, while Cassian was there too, delivered a learned discourse against the anthropomorphic doctrine, which Serapion, one of the monks, was maintaining, and supported the letter just then issued by Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria. Serapion was convinced. (Cassian, *Collat.* x. cap. 3 in *Pat. Lat.* xlix. 823; Tillem. xi. 463.) [C. H.]

PHOTINUS (3), Macedonian bishop, recognised by pope Innocent I., c. 414; but with much hesitation, as he had been condemned by preceding popes. [INNOCENT (12).] (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xx. 535, c. 7; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* vii. 515.) [J. G.]

PHOTINUS (4), a Manichean teacher who held a disputation in A.D. 527 with Paul the Persian under the president Theodore. The disputation has been published by Card. Mai in *Biblioth. Nov. Pat.* iv. 79, cf. Migne, *Pat. Graec.* t. lxxxvii. It is divided into three sections, each one of which represents the debate of one day. (1) Concerning the creation of souls. (2) Concerning the two principles upheld by the Manicheans. (3) Concerning the holy scriptures. Under the third head the Manichean asks, in connection with the Sabbath, When did the Old Dispensation cease? To which the Christian replies, at the baptism of Christ. [G. T. S.]

PHOTIUS (1), a sophist at Constantinople, an intimate friend of St. Gregory Nazianzen, who in 382 or 383 addressed him in his *Ep.* 168 al. 91 (cf. Tillem. ix. 544). [C. H.]

PHOTIUS (2), priest at Constantinople, and friend of Nestorius, was employed by the latter in the year 429, to reply to St. Cyril of Alexandria's letter to the Egyptian monks, warning them against Nestorius's teaching (Mansi, iv. 1003; Cyril, *Epp.* 8); in the preceding year he had concurred with Anastasius, another Nestorian priest [ANASTASIUS, bishop of Tenedos], in sending two priests, Anthony and James, to Philadelphia in Lydia for the promotion of Nestorianism, as complained of by Charisius at the Ephesine council in 431 (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. xlviii. 727, Praef. ii. Opp. Marii Mercatoris) [CHARISIUS (1)]. When Nestorius was banished by imperial decree A.D. 432, Photius was included in the sentence and sent to Petra, but it is not known what became of him. His letter to the monks against St. Cyril is lost. [J. G.]

PHOTIUS (3), bishop of Tyre, and metropolitan, was elected on the deposition of Irenaeus, Sept. 9, 448. He is unfavourably known for cowardly tergiversation, in the case of Ibas of Edessa. Under the powerful influence of Uranius of Himera, he and his fellow judges first acquitted Ibas of the charges against him made at the investigation commenced at Tyre and

transferred to Berytus, and the next year at the "Robber Synod" of Ephesus, zealously joined in his condemnation (Martin, *Le Brigandage d'Éphèse*, pp. 118–120, 181) (IBAS). At the same synod he brought forward an act of accusation against Acylinus, bishop of Byblos, whom he charged with Nestorianism and refusing to appear before himself and Domnus, the real ground of offence being manifestly that he had been appointed by Irenaeus, and was a personal friend of his. Without hearing any further testimony, on Photius's statement alone, Acylinus was at once deposed. Photius at the same time undertook to clear Phoenicia of all clergy tainted with Nestorianism (Martin, *u. s.* p. 183; *Actes du Brigandage*, pp. 86–89). With easy versatility Photius took his place among the orthodox prelates at Chalcedon, regularly voted on the right side, and signed the decisions of the council (Labbe, iv. 79, 328, 373, &c.). Here also he gave his vote for the restoration of Theodoret to his bishopric (*ibid.* 623), presented a résumé of the proceedings at Berytus favourable to Ibas (*ibid.* 635), and signed the 28th canon conferring on Constantinople the same primacy, πρεσβεῖα, as that enjoyed by Rome (*ibid.* p. 803). At the same time, after presenting a petition to Marcian (Labbe, iv. 541), he obtained a settlement of the controversy between himself and Eustathius of Berytus as to metropolitical jurisdiction, in favour of the ancient rights of the see of Tyre, together with a reversal of Eustathius's act of deposition of the bishops ordained by Photius, within the district claimed by the former (EUSTATHIUS OF BERYTUS (22), Vol. II. p. 389) (Labbe, iv. 542–546; *Canon. Chalc.* 29). The date of Photius's death is uncertain. He was no longer bishop of Tyre in 457, when Dorotheus replied to the encyclical of the Emperor Leo (Labbe, iv. 921) (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 443; Ceillier, *Aut. Eccles.* xiv. 271, &c.; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* vol. xv. (index); Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* x. 678; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 808). [E. V.]

PHRONESIS, a mythological personage in the system of Basilides, as represented by Irenaeus (I. xxiv. 3). See BASILIDES, Vol. I. p. 278. [G. S.]

PHTHARTOLATRAE (φθαρτολάτραι), or Corrupticolae, the adherents of Severus the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 519. They were so called because they held that "the body of Christ was corruptible." [SEVERUS.] [MONOPHYSITISM.] (Hefele, *Councils*, t. iii. p. 459, Clark's trans.) [G. T. S.]

PHYSCO (Φύσκων, Φούσκων), one of four brothers, the rest being Salamanes, Malchio, Crispio, highly trained ascetics, disciples of Hilarion, residing in seclusion at Bethlehem, and all except Malchio living in the reign of Valens. (Soz. vi. 32; viii. 15; Tillem. vii. 573.) [C. H.]

PIALA, ST., said to have been the sister of St. Fingar or Gwinear (Vol. II. 517, Haddan and Stubbs, i. 36), and to have come with him from Ireland to Cornwall, where they were martyred about 450. The legend by the so-called Anselm is spurious (Whitaker, *Cathedral of Cornwall*, i. 290), but the names of the saints survive in the names of parishes near the Hayle estuary, Gwinear and Phillack (Whitaker, ii. 15, 21, 202). The latter, however, has been identified by some with St. Felicitas, and the name of the latter saint does occur in a Breton litany of the 10th century (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 82), but Celtic names were naturally identified later on with the better known names of the Roman calendar. The day of the African martyr, St. Felicitas, was 7th March, and William of Worcester 107, quotes from a calendar at Bodmin, "Sanctus Wenedocus, et Felicitatis Virginis, 7 die Marcii." [C. W. B.]

PIAMMON, called Ammon by Palladius, a presbyter and monk of Diolcos in Egypt in the 4th century, who had visions of recording angels standing at the altar, and indicating to him which of the brethren had sinned and which were repentant. (Ruf. *Hist. Mon.* 32; Pall. *Hist. Laus.* 72; Soz. *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 29.) Piammon was visited by Cassian and Germanus about the year A.D. 390, and Cassian's eighteenth conference (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xlix. 1089) was held with him. The subject of it is *De tribus antiquis* GENERIBUS *monachorum, et quarto nuper exorto.* The three ancient kinds were (cap. 4) the coenobites, the anchorets, and the sarabaitae, the first two of whom he cordially commends, while of the third he speaks slightingly. [SARABAITAE, in *D. C. A.*] The fourth and most recent kind, which he describes, without naming them (cap. 8), he severely censures, calling them anchorets or coenobites in profession, but in practice lukewarm, self-indulgent, and unsubmissive. [W. H. F. and C. H.]

PIAMON, virgin in Egypt, mentioned by Palladius (*Laus. Hist.* c. 37). [J. G.]

PIATON, ST. (PIAT), Oct. 1, presbyter and martyr in Gaul, whither he came with SS. Denys, Quentin, and others. See also a hymn of Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, where his body was said to rest (*Pat. Lat.* cxli. 340). [R. J. K.]

PIERIUS (1) (HIERIUS), commemorated on Nov. 4. An eminent presbyter of Alexandria, famous for his voluntary poverty, his philosophical knowledge, and his public expositions of Holy Scripture. He ruled the catechetical school of Alexandria under the bishop Theonas, A.D. 265, and afterwards lived at Rome. He wrote several treatises that were extant in St. Jerome's time. Some of them were known as late as the time of Photius. Among them was a homily upon Hosea, which he recited on Easter eve, wherein he notes that the people continued in church on Easter eve till after midnight. Photius mentions another work on St. Luke's Gospel as part of a volume by him, divided into twelve books. From his eloquence he was called the younger Origen. Photius declares that he was orthodox about the Father and the Son, though using the words substance and nature to signify person. But his manner of speaking about the Holy Ghost was unorthodox, because he said that his glory was less than that of the Father and the Son. In the time of Epiphanius there was a church at Alexandria dedicated in his honour. Some have therefore thought that he suffered martyrdom in the Diocletian persecution. (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*; *Mart.* Adon., Usuard.;

Euseb. vii. 32; Hieron. *Vir. Illust.* c. 76; Id. ep. 70 al. 84, § 4, p. 429; Id. *Praefat. in Osee*; Photius, *Cod.* 119; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* vi. 35; Du Pin, *H. E.* cent. iii.; Ceillier, ii. 462; Till. *Mém.* iv. 582.) [G. T. S.]

PILATUS, ACTS OF [GOSPELS, APOCRYPHAL], Vol. II. p. 708.

PIMENIUS, bishop of Amalfi. Gregory the Great, in a letter (lib. vi. ind. xiv. 23 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 813) to his subdeacon Anthemius, blames him for non-residence. [F. D.]

PINIANUS (1), addressed, but without a title, by the emperor Valentinian II. in a letter dated Feb. 23 in 385, on the election of Siricius to the see of Rome. The letter is printed from a Vatican manuscript by Baronius (*Ann.* 385, v.), who assumes that Pinianus was prefect of Rome and the husband of Melania the younger. Tillemont shows the difficulty of both these assumptions. On June 4, 386, Salustius is addressed as prefect. Pinianus is first known to have been prefect by a law addressed to him in July, 386, and on Sept. 8, 387, he was addressed in another as prefect. (*Cod. Theod.* vi. 378, ed. Gothofr.; Clinton, *F. R.* i. 513, 516) Tillemont thinks that in 385 he may have been deputy, or acting prefect only. (Tillem. x. 358, 744, 788, 823.) [C. H.]

PINIANUS (2), the husband of Melania the younger. His parentage is unknown, but he was probably not of inferior rank to his wife. (Natus ex consulibus; Surius, Jan. 31. See also Paulinus, Poem xx. 217.) He was but seventeen years old, she but thirteen, when they were married. Palladius speaks of him as son of Severus, who was a prefect (*Vit. Patr.* 119). They had no children; and when the elder Melania arrived in Italy in 397, some four years after their marriage, they agreed to a vow of continence but refused to separate. They entertained Palladius of Helenopolis when he came to Rome on Chrysostom's affairs. (*Hist. Laus.* 121.) They left Rome in 408, when the siege by Alaric was impending, and passed through Sicily where Rufinus joined them, and thence to Africa. Melania the elder having left them, and having died at Bethlehem, and Publicola also having died, they inherited her vast estates. They were intent on doing good, and are said to have liberated 8000 slaves. (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 119.) Pinianus is described by Palladius as living, when he wrote, in Campania and Sicily alternately, having in his train slaves, virgins, and 15 eunuchs. He had also 30 monks with him: he exercised himself much in reading the Scriptures, in gardening, and in hospitality, his wife Melania and his mother-in-law Albina being with him. After the sack of Rome they passed over into Africa, and settled at Tagaste with the bishop Alypius, and desired to make the acquaintance of Augustine. He immediately wrote to welcome them (*Ep.* 124); but, since he was unable to come to them, they went with Alypius to Hippo. There the strange scene, so instructive as to the church life of the period, occurred, which is recounted by Augustine (*Ep.* 126). The clergy and people of Hippo, knowing their wealth, determined that they should, by the ordination of Pinianus, become attached to their church and city. A tumult was raised in the church, and, though Augustine refused to ordain a man against his will, he was unable, or was not firm enough, to resist the violence of the people, who extracted from Pinianus a promise that he would not leave Hippo, and would not be ordained in any other church. The next day, however, considering that he was in danger of further violence, he, with Melania and her mother Albina, who had been with them thenceforth, returned to Tagaste. Thence some rather acrimonious correspondence ensued between them, especially Albina, and Augustine. (*Ep.* 125–8.) Alypius considered that a promise extorted by violence was not valid, Augustine demanded that it should be fulfilled; and the controversy lasted until, by the rapacity of the rebel Count Heraclian, Pinianus was robbed of his property, and the people of Hippo no longer cared to enforce the promise. Being now free, though poor, Pinianus, with his wife and mother-in-law, went to Egypt and saw the monasteries of the Thebaid. They then passed on into Palestine and settled at Bethlehem. Whether impressed by the monasticism of the Thebaid, or yielding to the despair which marks the epoch of the sack of Rome, they now were willing to do what their ascetic grandmother had been unable to force upon them during her lifetime, and to live apart. On the appearance of the Pelagian controversy, their letters to Augustine induced him to write his book on grace and original sin. This was in 417. They are said by Surius to have visited Cyril at Alexandria in the same year. We only hear of Pinianus after this time in a letter of Jerome in 419, in which his salutations, and those of Albina and Melania are addressed to Augustine and Alypius. (Jerome, *Ep.* cxliii. 2, ed. Vall. [MELANIA (2.) In the last paragraph of which article, after the words "in the year 437," insert "to visit her uncle Volusius"] Aug. *de Grat. Christi*, ii. and xxxii.; Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* 121, Surius, p. 380, Dec. 31.) [W. H. F.]

PINTA, Arian bishop, addressed in a letter *pro fide Catholica*, which is ascribed to Fulgentius of Ruspe (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxv. 707 sq.); but though it is upon the Arian heresy, and argues and quotes Scripture texts against it, it gives no clue to the identification of Pinta, and probably is not the work of Fulgentius [FULGENTIUS (3)] (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 494–5; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 69). [J. G.]

PINYTUS, bishop of Cnossus, in Crete (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 21, 23). See DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH, Vol. I. p. 850. [G. S.]

PIONIUS (1), martyr, suffered at Smyrna, in the Decian persecution, March 12, A.D. 250. It is stated in the article POLYCARP (see p. 428) that it was probably this Pionius who revived the *cultus* of Polycarp in Smyrna, by recovering an ancient MS. martyrdom of that saint, and fixing the day of commemoration in accordance with it. The Acts of Pionius relate that it was on the day so fixed (Saturday, Feb. 23), while he was engaged in this commemoration,[a] he was arrested in company with Asclepiades and Sabina,

[a] The words "facta oratione sollemni cum sanctum panem et aquam degustavissent," seem to indicate a communion on elements previously reserved.

the latter of whom had been a slave, and had been rescued by the Christians from cruel treatment inflicted on her by her mistress on account of her faith. Pionius had been warned in a dream of the coming arrest, and had put chains beforehand on the necks of himself and his companions in order that their captors might see that it was not in their power to inflict on them anything for which they were not prepared. Wearing these voluntary chains, they were taken to the forum, which was thronged with dense crowds of people, amongst them a great number of Jewish women, availing themselves of the leisure which their Sabbath afforded them. The Acts then contain a report of a long speech made by Pionius to the assembled multitude, of which we only extract one point for mention, namely, that in warning of judgment to come he tells how he himself in his travels had seen at the Dead Sea a spectacle of the effects of the avenging wrath of God.

Many of his hearers, moved with admiration and pity, entreated him not to throw away a life on many grounds so worthy of preservation, but obey the emperor and sacrifice. At last cried one, Are you so obstinate that you cannot be persuaded? Nay, returned Pionius, would that I could persuade you to become Christians. Heaven forbid, was the reply, that you should persuade us to cause ourselves to be burned alive. It is much worse to burn after death, returned the martyr. At this altercation they saw Sabina laughing, and turned on her with threats of a punishment, to a modest woman more terrible than death. That shall be as God wills, she calmly replied.

When at length they arrived at the prison, they found in confinement there already another Catholic presbyter, named Lemnus, and a Montanist woman named Macedonia. The divisions of the Christian community were at this time well known to their persecutors, for we find in the examinations of the martyrs that those who owned themselves Christians were always further interrogated to what church or sect they belonged. The Acts give a long report of exhortations delivered by Pionius to his fellow-prisoners, and then relate how a message was brought to the prison that the Christian bishop Eudaemon had already sacrificed, and that the prisoners must be brought to join him at the temple, in order to follow his example. Pionius protested that they had been committed to prison to wait the return of the proconsul to Smyrna, and that they ought not to be removed before his arrival. And in spite of blows and kicks, he made such obstinate physical resistance to being brought to the temple that the six attendants employed to carry him thither were obliged to get additional help before they could effect their purpose. The constancy of Pionius remaining unsubdued, he was brought before the proconsul on his return to Smyrna, repeated his refusal to sacrifice, persisted in it notwithstanding tortures used to shake his resolution, and ultimately was condemned "to the avenging flames, in order that he might strike terror into men and give satisfaction to the offended gods." Pionius walked with a firm and rapid step to the place of execution, undressed himself without waiting to be ordered, and, looking at his naked body, blessed God that he had been able to preserve it in chastity till then. Then he let himself be nailed to the stake, rejected the offer made him that the nails should be taken out if he would even yet sacrifice, and when the flames were lit, closing his eyes, prayed silently, his friends hearing no more than the "Amen," and "Lord receive my spirit." With Pionius suffered a Marcionite presbyter, Metrodorus, the stakes of both being turned to the east, Pionius on the right, Metrodorus on the left. We are told nothing of the fate of Asclepiades and Sabina. The Acts which we have here summarised are important on account of their undoubted antiquity. We only know them by a Latin translation, of which two types are extant; one published by Surius and reprinted by the Bollandists (Feb. 1), the other by Ruinart (*Acta Sincera*, p. 137). Of these the former seems more faithfully to represent the original, the latter not only being abridged in places, but exhibiting two designed alterations; viz. the suppression of the apostasy of the bishop Eudaemon, as also of the fact that the martyr Metrodorus was a Marcionite. But the common original was certainly read by Eusebius, who (*H. E.* iv. 15) gives a description of the acts of Pionius which agrees with those extant in too many particulars to allow us to suppose that different acts are intended. Eusebius, however, represents Pionius as suffering at the same time with Polycarp, while, as already stated, the extant Acts place him a century later, a date attested by the *Paschal Chronicle*, which makes Pionius suffer in the Decian persecution, and confirmed by internal evidence. We must therefore explain the statement of Eusebius as an error of haste, arising from the fact that he found the martyrdom of Pionius in the same volume which contained that of Polycarp, and possibly also that the chronological note found in our present MSS. was absent from the copy which he used. On the life of Polycarp ascribed to Pionius, see POLYCARP. [G. S.]

PIONIUS (2), a young man reproved by Nilus for luxuriousness (lib. iii. ep. 31). [C. H.]

PIOR (Πίωρ), a priest and solitary of the Cells in Nitria. He embraced the desert life in early youth, and on leaving his father's home (c. 305), he vowed to God that he would never again see any of his relations. Fifty years afterwards his aged widowed sister having heard that he was living, sent to implore a visit from him, and he on being bidden by his superiors, so far complied that he went to her house, stood at the door, and when she came out, spoke to her with his eyes shut, and then returned home (Soz. vi. 29). He would never take food except while walking, saying that he regarded feeding as quite a minor matter, nor would he expose himself to the temptation of indulging appetite (Soc. iv. 23). Other anecdotes are related of him. (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* cc. 11, 87, 88; Rosweyd, *Vit. P.* iii. 31, 136, v. libell. ix. 9; Cassiod. *Trip. Hist.* viii. 1; Cotel. i. 643; Tillem. viii. 447, 569, x. 63.) [C. H.]

PIPPINUS (1) I., the founder of the Carolingian dynasty, called in later times Pippin of Landen, from the Belgian castle of that name where he is said to have been buried and possibly

resided (see Richter, *Annalen*, pp. 154–5, n., and the authorities there cited). Little is known of his origin beyond the fact, that his father was a Frank named Carloman, who had been made duke or count by a king of Austrasia; but there is reason to believe that the cradle of the race was situated in the country lying between the Maas and Mosel, Rhine, Roer, and Amblève (see *Annal. Mett.* 687, Pertz, *Scriptor.* i. 316; Bonnell, *Anfänge des Karol. Hauses*, pp. 71–85). Pippin first appears in history in the year 613, as one of the Austrasian nobles who supported the Neustrian Clotaire II. against the young Sigebert II., out of hatred for Brunechilde (Fredegarius, *Chronicon*, xl.). Fauriel believes that with Arnulfus, bishop of Metz, the other ancestor of the Carolingians, he put himself at the head of the conspiracy which overthrew the queen. (*Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 410 seqq.; but see Bonnell, p. 94.) He is not heard of again till 622, when Clotaire installed his son Dagobert I. as king over the eastern part of Austrasia. Pippin became his mayor of the palace, and in conjunction with Arnulfus brought those regions to a height of prosperity which is said to have made them the envy of their neighbours (Fredegar. xlvii., lviii.; *Vita Arnulfi*, Bouquet, *Recueil*, iii. 508; *Gesta*, xli.; and see Pertz, *Geschichte der Merov. Hausmeier*, 36, 136). In 626 the death of his father left Dagobert sole king of the Franks. He soon moved the seat of government to Paris, and Pippin, though apparently retained with many other Austrasian chiefs in nominal attendance, was supplanted in his favour by the Neustrian nobles who flocked to the court. The king himself is said to have become thoroughly corrupted, and from being zealous in the cause of justice and well-doing, gave himself up to lust and rapine. (Fredegar. lx.) His death, in 638, set Pippin free to return to Austrasia, where the infant Sigebert III. was reigning. His old ally, Arnulfus, had retired into a monastery, but the friendship of Cunibert, archbishop of Cologne, procured him the countenance of the church, which his family found so useful. Now begins the period of the rois fainéants, and it is possible that Pippin might have anticipated the high destiny that awaited his descendants, had not death in the following year cut short his career (Fauriel, iii. 457, s.) Fredegarius bears striking testimony to the grief this event caused to the Austrasians, "ex eo quod ab ipsis pro justitiae cultu et bonitate ejusdem dilectus fuisset" (*Chronicon* lxxxv.; see, too, Aimoin iv. 20, and cf. Bonnell 106 f.) Pippin was a zealous friend to Christianity, which perhaps owed its footing in Belgium to the favour he showed it (cf. Warnkönig et Gérard, *Hist. des Carol.* I. 103). St. Eligius of Noyon, and St. Amandus of Elnone, Maestricht and Ghent, found protection and encouragement under his administration. Tradition, indeed, ascribes to him the foundation of the first monastery in those regions, Calvusmons, or Calfsberg, but this is doubtful (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. xii. 854 seqq.) The church showed its gratitude by numbering him among the Beati, his day being Feb. 21, and many of his relatives among the saints (Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 250–261). It is said that he was buried at Landen, but his remains were removed at a later time to Nivelle. (For his cult, which was local, see Boll. *ibid.* p. 259, and Warnkönig et Gérard, i. 102.) He left a son, Grimoald, afterwards mayor of the palace in Austrasia, and two daughters, Begga, who married Ansegisilus, or Ansegisus, son of Arnulfus, and became the mother of Pippin II., and St. Gertrude.

Guizot published a translation of his life, or panegyric, which though not earlier than the 9th century, may be founded on prior records. (*Mémoires*, ii. 379). [S. A. B.]

PIPPINUS (2) II., mayor of the palace in France (A.D. 688–714), often called Pippin of Heristal, but with little ground (cf. Richter, *Annalen*, 154–5, n.), was the grandson of Pippin I., and Arnulfus, bishop of Metz, his father being Ansegisilus, or Ansegisus, the son of the latter and his mother Begga, the former's daughter. He first appears prominently in history about the year 678. Four years earlier Dagobert II. had been sought out in his Irish monastery-prison, and raised to the throne in Austrasia by Wulfoald, the mayor of the palace. His stupidity and evil nature probably assisted the rise of Pippin, who, with his ally, Martin, was able to figure as the champion of the old German freedom in face of the royal tyranny, and the protector of the clergy, against the lawless exactions and robberies of the king (see Fauriel, *Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 474 ff., cf. also the speech attributed to Pippin in his subsequent victorious campaign, *Annal. Mettenses*, Pertz, *Scriptor.* i. 318); and by 677 the two were strong enough to convene a council of bishops of their own party, who condemned Dagobert on pretence of the violation of the monastic vows which had been imposed upon him in exile (Fauriel, *ibid.*). In the following year he was assassinated, and Pippin and Martin were left recognised, though untitled, chiefs of the Austrasian Franks (*ibid.*). But a more formidable obstacle than any yet encountered now confronted them. Ebroin, escaped from his imprisonment in Luxeuil, had carried everything before him in Neustria, and was now threatening Austrasia. The murder of Dagobert was probably his work (cf. *Vita Wilfridi*, Bouquet, iii. 601 seqq.), and he was now by force of arms setting up a puppet successor in Theodoric III., with himself for mayor of the palace. By 680 Pippin and Martin, at the head of an army composed partly of Austrasians and partly of refugees from the tyranny of Ebroin in Neustria and Burgundy, believed themselves strong enough to attack. The result, however, was disastrous, their army being defeated and dispersed near Laon. Pippin escaped by flight, but Martin was treacherously murdered a little later. (*Gesta*, 46). It seemed now as though the whole of France was to lie under the tyranny of Ebroin, when in 681 he was murdered. His successor, Warratto, reconciled himself with Pippin, who was apparently induced to acknowledge Theodoric's rule in Austrasia (see Richter, *Annalen* 175), and even assisted Warratto against a rebellious son named Gislemar (683). See *Gesta*, 47; Fred. 98. In 686 Warratto died, leaving his son-in-law, Bertharius, a weak and foolish man, and Pippin, who had now recovered from his defeat, face to face as candidates for the mayoralty. The overthrow of Bertharius at the battle of Tertry, or Testri, near St. Quentin, and his subsequent murder, made Pippin undisputed

mayor of the palace for the whole of the Frankish kingdom, with Theodoric as his nominal sovereign (688). See *Gesta*, 48; *Fred. Cont.* 99. This office he held till his death, and he seems to have thoroughly established its hereditary character, during his own lifetime appointing his son Grimoald to Neustria (A.D. 695), and when Grimoald died (A.D. 714), substituting his grandson Theudoald, an infant guardian for an infant king. In 691 Theodoric III. died, and was succeeded by his infant son Clovis III., who in turn died, and was followed by another roi fainéant, Childebert III., in 695. He reigned till 711, and left a son, Dagobert III. (711–715).

Pippin's policy was vigorous both within and without the kingdom. According to the Annals of Metz, he chastised the iniquities which during many years had grown up by the cupidity and injustice of the nobles, and caused the whole land to flourish in the service of Christ and the enjoyment of profound peace (ad ann. 691, Pertz, *Scriptor.* i. 320). Few details survive, but we know that abroad he carried on successful wars with the Frisians of West Friesland (*Annal. Mettens.* A.D. 692, 697, Pertz, *Scriptor.* i. 320, 321; *Fredegar. Contin.* cii.), and with the Alamanni in several campaigns. (*Annal. Mett.* A.D. 709, 710, 712, Pertz, *ibid.* 321–2.) Though eclipsed by his greater descendants, it was he who laid the foundations of his family's greatness. Once master of Austrasia and Neustria, he devoted himself to the policy of bringing within the circle of Frankish dominion the neighbouring nations, which under their own dukes enjoyed a virtual, if not nominal, independence—a policy which was crowned with such glorious results under his three successors (cf. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, iii. 7, 8). Like all his family too, he saw how powerful an ally the church might become, and fostered those foreign missionaries whose labours among the German nations seconded his arms. The English Willebrord he warmly encouraged in his mission to the Frisians (Beda, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 10), and his term of power witnessed the conversion of Bavaria by St. Rupert, who founded the bishopric of Salzburg, the mission of St. Kilian in East Frankland, crowned in 696 by his martyrdom near Würzburg (CILIAN), and the efforts among the Bructeri of St. Suibertus of England, who died in 713. For the charters and *privilegia* bestowed on religious foundations in his time, see Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvi.–lxxxviii. Pippin died in 714, leaving three grandsons, two of them sons of Drogo, and Theudoald, the above-mentioned son of Grimoald, and a son by a mistress Alpaida, the famous Charles Martel. Two sons, Drogo, duke of Champagne, and Grimoald, whom he had made mayor of the palace in Neustria in 695, died in his lifetime, the latter by violence.

[S. A. B.]

PIPPINUS (3) III. (called Pepin le Bref, or le Petit, titles unknown to his contemporaries, and said to be founded on a story related by a monk of St. Gall more than a century later, see Monach. Sangall. *Gesta Kar.* ii. 15, Pertz, *Scriptor.* ii. 758), mayor of the palace for Neustria and Burgundy from 741 to 747, for the whole of France from 747 to 751, and king of the Franks from 751 to 768, would stand forth as one of the greatest men of the middle ages, were he not overshadowed by the still greater figures of his father and son (Martin, *Hist.* liv. xii.). Before his death on the 21st of Oct. 741, Charles Martel divided the realm, over which he held sway, nominally as mayor of the palace, but really with absolute power, into two portions. To Carloman, his eldest son, he allotted Austrasia, Alamannia, and Thuringia; and to Pippin Neustria, Burgundy, and Provence. For Gripho, or Grippo, another son by a Bavarian captive Sonihilde, he carved out at the mother's persuasion a small territory from the middle of these two portions, to the indignation, as is said, of the Franks, who inhabited it (*Annal. Mett.* 741, Pertz, *Scriptor.* i. 327), and to the disgust of Carloman and Pippin, whose first action was to levy war upon their half brother. Quickly captured he was thrown into prison by Carloman, where he remained till Pippin, six years later, touched by his sorrows, set him free. Thenceforth he was in a chronic state of rebellion till he came to a violent end in 751 [GRIPHO].

Foreign Relations and Wars.—The relaxing by death of the strong grasp of Charles Martel was the signal for disturbances and outbreaks on all hands. At this time the relations of the surrounding countries to what may be called the Frankish territories proper of Austrasia, Neustria, and Burgundy were very diverse. Within the limits of ancient Gaul, Provence, on the south-east, was agitated with its recent rebellion, and reconquest by Charles, while in the tract lying along the Gulf of Lyons, then known as Septimania, the Arabs, though weakened by fierce dissensions among themselves, were still dominant over the Gothic population, and kept a firm grasp upon the old Roman stronghold of Narbonne. Westwards again, Aquitaine, which reached now from the Pyrenees with their wild Basque population (Wascones) to the Loire, under princes of its own (not Merovingian, as is generally said, see Rabanis, *Les Mérovingiens d'Aquitaine*) held a position of nominal dependence upon the Franks, but enjoyed substantial autonomy. Lastly, in the north-west were the Bretons, who, for more than a hundred years, had been self-governed and independent of their neighbours. Turning to the German nations on the east, we find that the strength of the Frieslanders had been broken by Charles in the two successful campaigns of 733 and 734, and they were for the time at peace. The Thuringians were now practically a part of Austrasia. The Suabians, or, as they had now come to be called, the Alamanni, were dependent on the Franks; but dukes of their own administered their internal affairs. Bavaria, like Aquitaine, under its own dukes, was nominally subject to Charles' suzerainty; but the bonds were weak. And lastly the Saxons, often conquered but never subdued, were a standing menace to Frankish supremacy and Christianity.

The accession of the two young princes was the opportunity of their turbulent neighbours. The dukes of Bavaria on the east and Aquitaine on the west refused the oath of fealty to Carloman and Pippin respectively, and declared themselves independent. Provence rose in rebellion again, the Alamanni also revolted, and the Saxons once more flew to arms. It would be unprofitable, even did space permit, to follow in

detail the almost annual campaigns which the two brothers first, and, after Carloman's retirement in 747, Pippin alone, were called upon to make in one or more of the districts above enumerated. In brief it may be said that it was not till the latter half of his reign that Pippin was free to turn his attention to the conquest and consolidation of France itself. The earlier years were chiefly occupied in repressing an attempt of the German nations to reconquer their old independence. This movement was headed by Odilo, the capable and high-spirited Duke of Bavaria, a most formidable opponent. His politic and far-reaching design of a great anti-Frankish confederacy extending to Aquitaine on the west, and his Slave neighbours on the east (cf. *Annal. Mett.* 743, Pertz, i. 328) may be traced even through the unfriendly narratives of the French chroniclers. Into the Carolingian family itself he introduced dissension by marrying Chiltrudis, the sister of Carloman and Pippin, against their will. (*Fredegar. Cont.* cxi.) But the greatest triumph of his diplomacy was the gaining for his plans the countenance of the pope, the official ally, as it were, of the Franks. Possibly Zacharias mistrusted the destinies of the two young princes, and believed he saw in Odilo the future chief of Western Europe and his champion against Lombard oppression. However, the tact and firmness of Pippin, who succeeded in discrediting the Papal Legate in the face of the Frankish army (see *Annal. Mett.* 743, Pertz, i. 328), and the ready tergiversation of the pope directly events showed him his mistake averted this danger. The failure of Odilo's designs may probably be ascribed to the inferiority of the undisciplined levies of his loosely welded coalition, in face of the comparatively civilized Franks, as much as to the superior policy of Pippin and his brother. In the year 748 he died, and the infancy of his son Tassilo and the final defeat and subjection of the allied Alamanni the same year averted all immediate danger on that side. (For the details of the Alamannic campaigns, see Stälin, *Wirtembergische Geschichte*, pp. 182–4.) By 752 Pippin, now king and sole ruler, was able to turn his attention to France. In this year, assisted by the treachery of their Gothic subjects, he drove the Arabs from all Septimania, except the fortress of Narbonne, the fall of which, after a seven years' siege, in 759, closed the chapter of Mohammedan domination north of the Pyrenees. The following year (753) he was free to invade Brittany, and for the time conquered it, occupying Vannes and imposing a tribute. (*Annal. Mett.* 753, Pertz, i. 131.) After that his work was interrupted by his two Italian campaigns of 754 and 755 against the Lombards, to be mentioned hereafter. But it was the conquest of Aquitaine that formed the great task of Pippin's reign. From 760 onwards till his death, every year but one witnessed the invasion and wasting of this unhappy country. It was not a war of pitched battles, neither the Gallo-Roman Aquitanians, nor even the hardier Basques, being a match in the field for the Franks, whose armies were now strong in cavalry, and even furnished with implements of siege (cf. *Fredegar. Cont.* cxxvi.). Sieges and plundering expeditions on one side, and guerrilla reprisals on the other, were its chief features, till at length the wretched inhabitants, wearied and ruined, bought peace for their shattered towns and desolated lands at the price of the betrayal and murder of their indomitable duke Waifarius and submission to Frankish rule (A.D. 768). For this war, see Fauriel, *Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* tom. iii.

Relations with the Church.—But the chief interest of Pippin's reign lies in his relations with the Church and Papacy. Charles Martel's term of power, though it had saved Christianity from the heathendom of Germany and Mohammedanism of Spain, was fraught with disaster to the church of France. The condition into which she had sunk at the time of his death may best be described in the memorable words of Boniface's letter to Zacharias, written in 742: "Franci enim, ut seniores dicunt, plus quam per tempus octaginta annorum synodum non fecerunt nec archiepiscopum habuerunt, nec ecclesiae canonica jura alicubi fundabant vel renovabant. Modo autem maxima ex parte per civitates episcopales sedes traditae sunt laicis, cupidis ad possidendum, vel adulteratis clericis, scortatoribus et publicanis, seculariter ad perfruendum. . . . Si invenero inter illos, diaconos quos nominant, qui a pueritia sua semper in stupris semper et adulteriis et in omnibus semper spurcitiis vitam ducentes . . .; et modo in diaconatu, concubinas quatuor vel quinque vel plures noctu in lecto habentes, euangelium tamen legere et diaconos se nominare nec erubescunt nec metuunt" (*Epist.* 42, Jaffé, *Bibl. Rer. Germ.* iii. 112–3). This terrible state of things was in part the result of the general corruption of Gallo-Roman society, which speedily infected the Franks, and had for many years been infecting the church in its midst, as is evident even in the pages of Gregory of Tours. But it was perhaps still more the result of the acts and neglects of Charles Martel. Without going the length of Michelet, who believed him a heathen (*Hist.* chap. ii.), we may say that he regarded the church merely as an instrument for the furtherance of his political designs. Thus he encouraged Boniface and his band of missionaries among the German nations, because their efforts tended, by creating a Christian and pro-Frankish party, to pave the way for his armies. On the other hand, the church of France he looked upon as a treasury for the payment and reward of his soldiers. Not only did he give to them the lands and revenues of churches and monasteries, but he banished the bishops and abbats who opposed him, and either left their seats vacant, appropriating the revenues, or in many cases instituted friends and followers of his own, turbulent and licentious laymen, who held them as mere posts of profit (see Hugo Flavin. *Chron.* lib. i., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cliv. 143–6; Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 12; Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, iii. 12 ff.). It was apparent that no reform of this state of things could be hoped for from within. It came in effect partly from Rome, partly, and in the first instance, from the side of Germany. As has been pointed out (e. g., by Michelet, *ibid.*), the Celtic and French churches held a different position in regard to the bishops of Rome from the younger institutions of England and Germany. While the former claimed to be sisters and almost equals of Rome, the latter were the creation of Rome's emissaries, and content with the position of daughters and subjects. The foremost champion of Rome's

supremacy was the great English missionary Boniface, who, for many years, had been labouring among the German nations on the eastern border, and one of whose chief hindrances had been the presence of unworthy members of the French and Celtic clergy. [BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINENSIS; ALDEBERTUS; CLEMENS (4); GEWILIEB; MILO.] The effect of the accession of the two young princes, Carloman and Pippin, was to extend Boniface's influence, and with it the power and influence of the popes, westward over France. Carloman, who inherited Austrasia and the German suzerainty, was at heart a monk himself, and became a pliant and eager instrument in his hands. How far Pippin shared his brother's beliefs, or how far he was swayed by policy and self-interest, is more doubtful. But of his disposition to aid in the reformation of the French church there can be no question. The first year of the two brothers' power is marked by the foundation of the three bishoprics of Würzburg, Buraburg, and Eichstädt (Bonifacius, *Epist.* 42, Jaffé, iii. 112), and the following by the first combined assembly of bishops and nobles in Austrasia, with reference to which Carloman had declared that "se de ecclesiastica religione quae, jam longo tempore, i.e., non minus quam per sexaginta vel septuaginta annos calcata et dissipata fuit aliquid corrigere et emendare velle (Bonifacius, *Epist.* 42; Jaffé, iii. 112). This council made evident at once the changes which had come over the temper of the rulers, for, with the provisions for church discipline, was passed one pledging Carloman and his nobles to the unconditional restitution of the property taken from the church. (See Jaffé, *ibid.* 47, p. 127, fraudatas pecunias ecclesiarum ecclesiis restituimus et reddidimus.) The following year was probably the date of the synod of Estinnes, near Laubes, another Austrasian Council (Richter, *Annalen*, p. 205). There it had to be admitted that, owing to wars and threats of war, the complete restitution intended was impossible, and a certain amount of church property must be retained for the army, but careful provision was made to lighten as far as possible the burden of the tax, to make the lay occupation temporary only, and prevent it from in any case effecting the utter destitution of the religious foundations (see the *Capitularies* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcvi. 1504, and for the whole question of the *precaria*, or as they soon came to be called, *beneficia*, carved out of church property, see Waitz, iii. 14 ff., 34 ff.; Warnkönig et Gérard, *Hist. des Carolingiens*, i. 209 ss.; Fauriel, iii. 224–5). The year 744 witnessed the founding of the famous monastery of Fulda, for long the central shrine of German Christianity, and the summoning by Pippin of the Council of Soissons, which did for ecclesiastical reform in western France what Carloman had already done in the East, and the next is distinguished by the first general council of France held under the presidency of St. Boniface, and, a new thing in French history, at the command of the pope (cf. Richter, *Annalen*, p. 210).

In 747 Carloman retired from the world into an Italian monastery, leaving Pippin sole governor of the Frank dominions. But though absolute ruler in fact, Pippin was still in name a mere mayor of the palace. He had found himself compelled, two years after his father's death, either in deference to Neustrian superstition, or owing to Neustrian intrigues, to seat another phantom king, Childeric III., upon the vacant Merovingian throne. This descendant of a line whose excesses had reduced it to impotence was a mere puppet. Once a year he was brought forth from the deep seclusion of his palace-prison to be shown to the people, and beyond that his existence served for little but to furnish a date for the years and a title for state documents (See *Ann. Lauris. Min.* 750 [753]; Einhardi *Vita K. Magn.* i.; Erchanberti *Breviarium*, 753, Pertz, *Scriptor.* i. 116, ii. 443–4, 328). A two years' cessation from foreign warfare (A.D. 749–750) gave Pippin opportunity to plan successfully a stroke which Grimoald more than a century before had lost his life in attempting. In the year 751, with the consent of the Franks in their annual assembly, the bishop of Würzburg and the abbat of St. Denys, representatives of Austrasia and Neustria respectively, were sent to pope Zacharias at Rome to ask "de regibus in Franciâ qui illis temporibus non habentes regalem potestatem, si bene fuisset, an non. Et Zacharias papa mandavit Pippino, ut melius esset illum regem vocari qui potestatem haberet, quam illum qui sine regali potestate manebat; ut non conturbaretur ordo, per auctoritatem apostolicam jussit Pippinum regem fieri" (*Annal. Lauriss.* 749, Pertz, i. 136). Accordingly Childeric was tonsured and relegated to a monastery, while Pippin was raised to the throne at an assembly of the Franks at Soissons, and with his queen, Bertrada, anointed, according to the later accounts by St. Boniface. This is the bald statement of the chroniclers, but it may be regarded as certain that it does not contain the whole matter. The pope undoubtedly was to receive consideration for this ready assent, which might so easily have been withheld, and it is not difficult to conjecture the main features of the transaction. The Lombards, who more than a century before had settled in Italy, had now for many years been pressing on the provinces north of Rome, and threatening the city itself. The Eastern Empire, to which the sovereignty of Italy nominally belonged, could afford no succour, occupied as it was with fierce Iconoclastic controversies and the aggression of Islam. In all the world there was now only one people which had the power and was likely to have the will to help, viz. the ancient champions of orthodoxy in the West, now ruled by the descendant and kinsman of so many saints and prelates. Already in 741, when Luitprand, the Lombard king, was at the gates, Gregory III. had made affecting appeals to Charles Martel, and had even offered to renounce allegiance to the Empire, and confer the title of patrician and consul of Rome upon the Frank mayor. But the deaths of Charles and Gregory within a few weeks of each other brought the negotiations to an abrupt close. [CHARLES MARTEL; GREGORIUS III.] But the chronic danger was still there, while the failure of the Bavarian confederacy had made it even more evident that the only hope of relief lay in the Franks. Without then going the length of Fauriel, who sees an actual bargain struck between the pope and the mayor of the palace (*Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* iii. 227, seqq.), we may well believe that the mutual

advantages to be derived from harmonious action were present to the minds of both.

The whole subject has been seized upon by subsequent writers, and twisted to political ends. At a very early date it seems to have been felt that an apology was needed for the dethronement of Childeric. Accordingly some asserted that he was raving mad (*e.g.* Ademar, &c., cited in Waitz, iii. 68–9 n.), others have sought its justification in a fictitious genealogy, tacking the Carolingian family to the Merovingian race on the female side (Pertz, ii. 308, 305). Others again have striven to prove, in the face of all the chronicles, that the pope never authorized the transfer of the crown (*e.g.* Guillon, *Pepin le Bref et le Pape Zacharie*, Paris, 1817), while others turned his advice into a command (Waitz, p. 70 n.), and some, for instance Gregory VII., have gladly seen in the transaction the exercise of a power inherent in the papal office to make and unmake kings. The part played in the transaction by Boniface, now archbishop of Mainz, has also been variously represented, Rettberg and others even holding that he was opposed to and endeavoured to prevent it (*Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 380 ff.; BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINENSIS).

But the return made by the pope went further than the mere sanction of the transfer. Pippin was *anointed* king. This anointing of the king, a ceremony unknown to the Franks, gave to the new monarchy that august and sacred character in men's eyes which the fable of a divine descent had conferred upon the older kings of German race (Waitz, iii. 61), and constituting him, as it were, an actual member of the clergy, was the source of the later theories on the subject of the sacredness and inviolability of his person and the indelible character of royalty (Martin, *Hist.* liv. xi.).

The question of the exact date of Pippin's elevation has been much discussed, but it probably took place in Oct. or Nov. of the year 751 (Richter, *Annalen*, p. 216). The following authorities may usefully be consulted on the whole subject of the change of dynasty, Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, iii. 46 ff.; Hahn, *Jahrbücher*, 121 ff.; 223 ff.; Warnkönig et Gérard, *Hist. des Carolingiens*, i. 251 ff.; Mascou, xvi. 34.

It was not however till 753 that the pope claimed from Pippin the fulfilment of his part. In that year Astolfus, Luitprand's son and successor, invaded the Roman provinces, and bore hard upon the city itself. Stephen II., who had succeeded Zacharias, impatient of dragging negotiations, took the desperate resolution of crossing the Alps in person, to implore the Frankish succour. Clothed in sackcloth and with ashes on his head, he threw himself at the feet of Pippin and his nobles, and would not be raised till his petition was granted (*Chronicon Moissiac.* Pertz, i. 293). His prayers were successful in spite of the opposition of Carloman, who was sent from his Italian monastery by Lombard influence to oppose the design (Einhardi *Annal.* 753, Pertz, i. 139; Anastasius, *Stephanus II.* 245, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 1094). The pope spent the winter of 753–4 at St. Denys, and the following July solemnly anointed Pippin, his queen and two sons, and created the father and sons patricians of Rome. He also blessed the Franks, and forbade them, on pain of excommunication, ever to elect a king issue of the loins of another than Pippin (*Clausula* in fine Greg. Tur. *de Glor. Conf.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 911). In the autumn of this same year 754 Pippin passed into Italy with an army. The Lombards were defeated, and Astolfus compelled to sign a treaty respecting the rights of the Roman church, but the Franks had hardly crossed the Alps on their return when he broke his engagements and flew to arms again. Thereupon Pippin, this time summoned by the famous letter purporting to be written by St. Peter himself (*Epist.* v., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 1004), entered Italy a second time, carried everything before him, and effectually broke the Lombard power. One of the terms imposed was the cession to Pippin of the towns and lands of the Exarchate and Romagna. These towns and lands, despite the representations and gifts of ambassadors from the Eastern emperor, to whom they nominally belonged, Pippin gave to the pope, declaring with an oath that he had entered on the contest for the favour of no man, but for the love of St. Peter and the pardon of his sins (Anastasius, *Stephanus* II. 251, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 1098). The formal act of donation has not survived, but is alluded to in documents of the time (Warnkönig et Gérard, *Hist. des Carol.* i. 262; Gibbon, cap. xlix.). Fulradus, Pippin's envoy, laid the keys of 22 cities at the shrine of the apostle. (For their names see Anastasius, *ibid.* ii. 254, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 1099; and Martin, *Hist.* liv. xii.) These constituted the famous temporal dominions of the papacy. Few events in history have excited more vehement controversy than this gift (see Warnkönig et Gérard, p. 262 seqq.; for the Lombard campaign see Abel, *Untergang des Langobardenreiches*, 25 ff.).

The change of dynasty and subsequent Italian campaigns naturally drew more closely the bonds connecting Pippin with the pope and clergy, and the former event was closely followed by the ratification and partial execution of the decrees as to restitution of church property (see Waitz, iii. 64 note and authorities cited), while the close of the war was marked by the immediate holding of a great council at the palace of Vernon-sur-Seine, where the re-establishment of discipline and reorganization of dioceses in France was seriously taken in hand (Pertz, *Leg.* i. 24). The work was continued by the councils of the following years, at one of which, Compiègne in 757, two papal legates were present (Pertz, *ibid.* p. 27). Henceforth it may be said that the great national assemblies of the Franks, the Fields of March, or Fields of May, as they now came to be (*Annal. Petav.* Pertz, *Script.* i. 11), were little else than councils presided over by the kings, at which bishops and nobles devised social and religious ordinances for clergy and laity alike, and at which the former rapidly obtained predominance, owing to their superior learning and organization. (See the *Capitularies* of Pippin in Pertz, *Leg.* i. 20–32, ii. 13; Bouquet, *Recueil*, v.; Mansi, tom. xii. and Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcvi. 1501 seqq.; cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 79, 121; Fauriel, *ibid.* p. 226, Warnkönig et Gérard, i. 266 sqq.)

The religious foundations shared in the prosperity of the time, so far as was compatible with the necessity which lay upon Pippin to provide

for his warriors in part from their lands, and Pippin was able, owing to his close connection with the papacy, to make them partial amends by the importation of famous relics from Italy which were a source of profit and renown to the French recipients (cf. *Annal. Petav.* 765, Pertz, i. 11). He himself set the example of reverence, and the spectacle might be seen of a king of France side by side with priests shouldering the coffin of a saint (*Translatio S. Austremonii*, Bouquet, v. 433; see too *Translatio S. Germani Pratensis*, *ibid.* p. 428), or again presiding over an assembly, that of Salmuntiacum, or Samoucy, in 767, where Greeks disputed with Romans on the subjects of the Trinity and the worship of images (Einhardi *Annales*, an. 767, Pertz, i. 145; Ado, *Chronicon*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxxiii. 125). The surviving charters and grants in favour of churches and religious bodies may be found in Pertz, *Germ. Diplom.* i. 103–110 (during the mayordom); Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcvi.; and Bouquet, *Recueil*, iii.–v. See too Sickel, *Acta Reg. et Imper. Kar.* ii. 1–11.

A few months after the death of his determined foe, Waifarius, Pippin fell ill, and soon recognising his illness to be mortal, he summoned his nobles and bishops to Saint-Denys where he lay, and divided his kingdom. His brother Carloman had died in 754, in a sort of honourable imprisonment at Vienne, and the claims of his young sons were ignored by Pippin, and they themselves tonsured and immured in a monastery. (See *Gesta Abb. Fontanell.* xv. Pertz, *Scriptor.* ii. 290.) Pippin had two sons, Charles the Great, called Charlemagne, and Carloman. Between these two, with the dualistic tendency which marks the Carolingians, (see Einhardi *Vita K. Magn.* cap. 3), but which events, fortunately for the dynasty, always overruled, he divided his kingdom, with the assent of the temporal and spiritual dignities assembled. On September 24, 768, he died, and was buried by his sons in the monastery as he had directed. [S. A. B.]

PIPPINUS (4), king of Italy, son of Charles the Great by Hildegardis, was born, probably in the year 776 (see Baron. *Annal.* Pagi 776, ii.; 783, iv). He was first called Carlomannus, but at the desire of pope Adrian who baptized and received him from the font at Rome in 781, his name was changed to Pippinus. He must be distinguished from another son of Charles called Pippin, and surnamed Gibbosus, or the Hunchback, who rebelled against his father in 792 and was secluded in a monastery till his death in 811. The pope when he baptized him also anointed Pippin king of Italy, which portion of his realm Charles had destined for him after his own death, in the meantime installing him there as under-king. In 806 the gift was confirmed by solemn disposition, approved by the pope, and there were further included in his dominion Bavaria and a part of Alamannia (Pertz, *Leg.* i. 140–3). When only 11 years of age he was placed at the head of an army and assigned a part in the operations which finally crushed the rebellious Tassilo (787). But beyond two campaigns against the Avars or Huns (A.D. 791 and 796), one against the Wenedi or Sclavi (A.D. 797), and an expedition against piratical Moors who were devastating Corsica (806), his wars, which were frequent, were confined to his own realm of Italy, where he vigorously prosecuted the family policy of bringing Western Europe under the Frankish empire. There were still two powers in Italy which refused submission to French domination. In the south the duchy of Beneventum, originally a dependency of the Lombards, continued its resistance after the parent stock had submitted, and in the north the islanders of Venetia, assisted in lukewarm fashion by Constantinople, stubbornly defended their independence against the Frankish claims. Into the Beneventan country Pippin made four campaigns between the years 791 and 806, devastating it with fire and sword, while in the latter years of his reign, the Venetians came near to losing their independence by his prowess. (As to the discrepancy between the French and Italian sources in the expedition of 810, see Baronius, *Annal.* 810, Pagi, iv.)

In 810 Pippin died in the lifetime of his father, leaving a son, Bernardus, who afterwards rebelled against Louis the Pious, and five daughters. The little that is known of his disposition is favourable. He is said to have provided for the instruction in Christianity of the conquered Huns and Slaves by Arno, bishop of Salzburg (Baron. *Annal.* 796, Pagi, xviii.), and to have administered Italy under the guidance of Adelhardus, the abbat of Corbie (Paschasius Radbertus, *Vita S. Adelardi*, cap. v.; Gerardus, *Vita S. Adelardi*, cap. iii., Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. i. 99, 113). Some Lombard laws were promulgated in his name (Pertz, *Leg.* i. 42–4, iv. 514–22). The chief authorities for his life are the *Annales* in Pertz, *Germania*, *Script.* I., especially those of Einhard and the *Laurissenses*, the *Vita Kar. Magn.* in tom. II., and the Italian records in Muratori. [S. A. B.]

PIRANUS, ST. This name is identical with that of St. Kieran or Ciaran of Ireland, for *p* in Britain is the equivalent of the Irish *k*, as we see in the two forms of the word meaning *head*, pen and ceann. The lives of these Irish saints were compiled in the 12th century by the Benedictine and other monks established by the English in Ireland, "majori diligentia quam judicio," and the dates of the early saints are hopelessly confused. This St. Kieran is said to have built the monastery of Saighir, which gave the name of Seirkieran to the parish where it lay, in the barony of Ballybritt, King's County (vol. i. p. 544), where his famous bell was kept, and he is also said to have been the first bishop of Ossory. He is said to have migrated to Cornwall, and to have been buried near the Severn sea, fifteen miles from Petrockstowe (Padstow), and twenty-five from Mousehole, about 540, but no such visit to Cornwall is recorded in the Irish lives (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 157, 164). Those lives, however, seldom notice any such migrations, though the Celtic saints were very migratory. Three parishes in Cornwall are dedicated to St. Piran, Perranzabulo (Lampiran in Domesday), where a curious early oratory has been laid bare by the sand drifting away from it, and which corresponds in situation to the description given above, Perranuthno near St. Michael's Mount, and Perranarworthal, near Falmouth harbour, besides chapels in other parishes, such as Tintagel. Probably St. Kerian in Exeter has pre-

served the Irish form of the name. (*Acta Sanctorum*, 5th March, i. 389-399, 901; Capgrave 267, from John of Tinmouth, "B. Piranus, qui a quibusdam Kerannus vocatur, in Cornubia, ubi quiescit, Piranus appellatur"; Leland even says that his mother Wingella was buried in Cornwall.) St. Piran's day, March 5, is still a fair-day at Perranzabulo and Perranuthno, and at the parish of St. Keverne in the Lizard district, which also possibly retains the Irish name. (Whitaker's *Cathedral of Cornwall*, ii. 5, 9, 210; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 271, "Saeran"; Giraldus Cambrensis, *Itin. Camb.* i. c. 6, mentions a chapel at Cardiff.) [KIERAN.] [C. W. B.]

PIRMINIUS, ST., abbat and bishop, or chorepiscopus, famous as a founder and reformer of monasteries, and as a missionary preacher in central Europe during the middle of the 8th century. His birthplace is unknown, and but little information can be gathered as to his life. He is stated to have left his own country, and to have preached first in Gaul and then in Germany, where he recalled to the faith many who had lapsed into heathenism. He appears to have remained for three years as abbat of Augia (Hermannus Contractus, sub anno 724 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. cxliii, 143), and to have been consecrated bishop, about A.D. 724, in Meltis (Melci, Meldi or Metti, unknown). He died, in 758, at Hornbach, in one of the many religious houses he had founded. His feast is Nov. 3 (Herzog, *Real-Enc.* xi. 680).

Mabillon (*Analecta*, tom. 4. 575; see also Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxix. 1029 sqq.) gives from an ancient MS. a short treatise entitled *Libellus Pirminii de singulis libris canonicis scarapsus*. *Scarapsus* is explained by Fabricius (*Bibl. Lat. Med. et Inf.*, lib. xv. s.v.) as = *collectus*. Heurtley (*Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 71) suggests that it is a misreading for *scriptus*. The treatise begins with the creation, and traces the working of the divine plan to the foundation of the church. It throws much light upon contemporary church life; and, in particular, it furnishes an important link in the history of the Apostles' Creed, containing the earliest known version which corresponds entirely with our present formula. The creed is twice given in the *Scarapsus*, once with each article assigned to its supposed apostolic author, and once as it was used at baptisms. (D'Achery and Mabillon, *Acta Sanct. ordinis S. Benedicti*, tom. iii. 2. p. 136; Pagii *Critica in Baronii annales*, sub anno 759. § ix. sqq.; Herzog, *Real-Enc.* xi. 680-2; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 630.) [H. C. S.]

PIRÔOU, martyr, with Athom his brother, in the Diocletian persecution. His acts are given in Hyvernat's *Les Actes des Martyrs de l'Egypte*, Rome, 1886, pp. 135 and 173. They were sons of a pious Christian priest, named John. Their acts give a lively picture of the Diocletian persecution in the villages of Egypt. [G. T. S.]

PISOURA, an Egyptian bishop, who suffered, with three other bishops, in the Diocletian persecution, under the governor Culcianus. His acts have been published by Hyvernat, in his *Les Actes des Martyrs de l'Egypte tirés des MSS. Coptes de la Biblioth. Vaticane*, pp. 114-134, Rome, 1886. His acts contain several passages found also with some interesting variations in the Coptic *Martyrdom of St. Ignatius*, Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, t. ii. 865. [G. T. S.]

PISTIS SOPHIA. A Gnostic book, known under this name, is one of the few remains of the old Gnostic literature which have come down to us. It has been preserved in a Coptic MS. of the British Museum, which Dr. Askew brought to London. The manuscript, a quarto of 346 pages, is written in the Thebaic dialect. Woide was the first to call attention to it (in Cramer's *Beiträge zur Beförderung theologischer Kenntnisse*, iii. (1778), p. 82 sqq.). From this MS. Bishop Münter published the Pseudo-Salomonic Odes (*Odae Gnosticae Salomoni tributae thebaice et latine*, Hafniae, 1812). Many years after this, Ed. Dulaurier gave a detailed account of the book, with two specimens of the text in a French translation (*Journal Asiatique*, 1847, Juin, pp. 534-548). A complete edition of the Coptic text with a Latin translation was soon after prepared by M. G. Schwartze, and edited by Petermann (*Pistis Sophia Opus Gnosticum Valentino adjudicatum e Codice Manuscripto Coptico Londinensi: descripsit et latine vertit M. G. Schwartze, edidit F. H. Petermann*, Berolini, 1851: the Latin version alone, Berolini, 1853).

The name Pistis Sophia, Πίστις Σοφία *not* Πιστὴ Σοφία, as Dulaurier and Renan propose to correct it) is nowhere given as the title of the whole work. It has no general title, and begins without any inscription, but is divided into four sections or books, of which the second, third, and fourth, bear separate titles. The second is inscribed *secundus* τόμος πίστεως σοφίας (p. 126, ed. Schwartze), the third and fourth Μέρος τεύχων σωτῆρος (pp. 252 and 357). The two first of these sections or books treat, for the most part, of the Pistis Sophia (pp. 43-181). The fourth book, which is, alas, defective, has probably got by accident into the place where we now read it in the manuscript. It presents a simpler and older form of Gnostic doctrine, and was the work perhaps of a different author. It describes Jesus as, immediately after His resurrection, making Himself known as the Redeemer to His disciples, and instructing them in the mysteries. The three first books relate, on the other hand, how Jesus gives the disciples a course of instruction for eleven years subsequent to His resurrection, and then ascends to heaven, whence, after completing His redeeming work, He returns to them once more and gives them the last and highest teachings concerning the supersensuous world, the middle kingdom, the under-world, and about the fates of the Pistis Sophia, and of individual human souls.

In the fourth book, Jesus is described as standing, after His resurrection, at an altar on the shore of the ocean, surrounded by disciples, men and women, clothed in white linen raiment. At His command, retire to His left hand, towards the west, the Aeons, the σφαῖρα, the Archontes, with their δυνάμεις, and the whole world. Jesus and His disciples then take their place *in medio* τόπῳ ἀερινῷ, on the way of the midst (*via medii*) underneath the σφαῖρα. He proceeds to instruct them concerning the significance and operation of the Archontes of the way of the midst, their binding by Jeû, and the tortures to which sinful souls are exposed from the five evil Archontes in the regions of the air, and also concerning the deliverance of the souls out of their power by the planetary spirits. At the prayer of the disciples that He would save them from those

torments, Jesus takes them to a mountain in Galilee, while the Archontes return to their former place. Jesus bids them bring fire and branches of trees, and then, amid mystic prayers, offers the Eucharist (the μυστήριον ἀληθείας βαπτίσματος) for their atonement. Here follows in the text a lacuna of several pages. But it is evident that meanwhile Jesus has betaken himself with His disciples into the lower world, and there depicts to them the various fates of souls after death, their torments in Orcus, their παλιγγενεσίαι, and also the conditions under which souls which have found the mysteries and done their penance, will be raised into the θησαυρὸς luminis.

The first three books make frequent reference to what is related in the fourth, and complete its descriptions. For eleven years after His resurrection Jesus has instructed His disciples concerning the lower mysteries only up to the 24th mystery. Then, on the 15th of Tobe (Tybi), the day of the full moon, a sudden glorious light invests Him, by which He is withdrawn from the view of His disciples and carried up into heaven. The next day He returns to them again, in order now finally to initiate them into all mysteries, from the highest to the lowest, and so impart to them the perfect Gnosis. This initiation, namely, could not be vouchsafed till the whole work of Jesus had been accomplished, the shining vesture left behind in the 24th mystery been restored to Him, and His return accomplished to the heavenly locality from whence he had come forth. This introduction is followed by a detailed description of the mysteries, in four clearly distinguishable sections, which do not coincide with the four books as denoted by their titles or inscriptions.

The first section (pp. 4–43) describes the ascent of Christ through the different regions of the spirit-world, from the earth through the way of the midst, and through the various provinces of the Κερασμός, up to the 13th Aeon, in order to accomplish the διακονία entrusted to Him by the first mystery, and subject all the Archontes to His dominion.

The second section (pp. 43–181) depicts the fates of the Πίστις Σοφία, that is, the penitent and believing Sophia whom Jesus meets, during His ascent, and beneath the 13th Aeon. Seized with longing for the *Thesaurus lucis*, which lies beyond the 13th Aeon, Pistis Sophia has separated herself from her consort (σύζυγος), in the 13th Aeon, and thereby incurred the hatred of Αὐθάδης, one of the Archontes of the 13th Aeon, and of the twelve Archontes under him. Deceived by a false light, generated by Authades, Sophia is enticed and drawn into the deeps of chaos, where she is deprived of her own robe of light by a number of προβολαί. In seven penitential prayers (μετάνοιαι) she makes her humble and believing supplication to the upper light, and prays for deliverance.

After the seventh penitential prayer, Jesus comes, of His own good will, to her help, and leads her out of the midst of her oppressors. But inasmuch as the command to deliver her from chaos has not yet issued from the first mystery, she is again tormented by her tormentors. After her ninth penitential prayer, Jesus raises her by means of a power of light sent to her, which surrounds her head with a crown of beams, up into a higher region of chaos, where she is purified from the material (hylic) elements which still adhere to her. After the twelfth prayer she is requickened by a fresh power of light, sent to her from the first mystery. But, yet again, once more she is overcome in conflict with her enemies, and is hurled down into the depths of chaos. After this, she is brought out of chaos by the angels Gabriel and Michael, is again invested with the powers of light, of which she has been deprived, and brought by Christ to a place underneath the 13th Aeon, whence she sends up thankful hymns to the upper regions. In this place she remains till the ascension of Jesus. Then, finally, after she has withstood the last assaults of her enemies, Jesus leads her to her former dwelling-place in the 13th Aeon, and brings her back to her σύζυγος, while she, in new triumphant hymns proclaims the mercy which has been vouchsafed her.

The third section (pp. 181–246) contains a lengthened description of the orders and degrees of spirits in the upper world, from the lowest to the highest χάρημα; each degree appearing in its turn as mere darkness in comparison with that above it.

The fourth section (pp. 247–356) finally gives detailed instruction to the disciples concerning the necessity and conditions of μετάνοια for individual human souls, concerning the sin-destroying power of the various mysteries, and the different fates to which penitent and impenitent souls will be respectively subjected.

The form of relation is that of dialogue. The disciples, male and female, put questions to Jesus, which He answers one by one, or exhibit the degree which each has attained in Gnosis by allegorical interpretations of scriptural texts and narration. Mary Magdalene is the readiest of all with questions and interpretations. She and John "the Virgin" (Παρθένος) are noted (231) as the chief disciples of Christ, that is, as those furnished with the greatest measure of Gnosis. But while Mary Magdalen is distinguished by her special thirst for knowledge, she is also admonished in the fourth book (p. 383) to let other disciples speak as well as herself. So, also, Peter, Andrew, James, Philip, Thomas, Matthew (in the fourth book also Bartholomew and Simon the Canaanite), come forward, and of the women, Salome and the mother of Jesus (κατὰ κόσμον). Philip, Thomas, and Matthew commit to writing the instructions which the disciples receive from Jesus (pp. 32, 69 sqq.).

We are indebted to K. R. Köstlin for the first thorough investigation of this work, and a detailed account of the whole system in *Baur und Zeller's Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1854 (pp. 1–104; 137–196). In what follows we have made use of Köstlin's account, in which there is but little to supply or correct; in treating of the doctrines of the fourth book, however, we shall have to separate them more definitely from those of the three first books.

The description of the kingdom of light in the fourth book reminds one of the simpler representations of the older Gnosis. At its head stands the *Pater paternitatis omnis* (called also *Pater* θησαυροῦ *luminis ;* ἀπέραντον *lumen, Sanctus Sanctorum omnium*); under him is the mystery of the Seven Voices (μυστήριον *Septem*

φωνῶν), *i. e.* probably a Heptad of the highest Aeons, from whom proceed in their turn forty-nine δυνάμεις, with their ψῆφοι. The dwelling-place of the *Pater paternitatis* is the *τόπος luminis luminum* (*θησαυρὸς luminis, τόπος ἀληθείας*). In this place appear also to exist the fifteen great δυνάμεις of the Pater θησαυρού. These are also called *Remissores peccatorum* (or μυστήρια), because they are the mediators of the powers of redemption.

Much more completely organised is the kingdom of light, according to the description of the first three books. At its head stands the *Ineffabilis*, called also the *Internus interni* and *Deus ἀληθείας*, the fulness of whose Being is unfolded in His immanent *μέλη Ineffabilis* (or *verba Ineffabilis*) on the one hand, and on the other, in the *μυστήρια*, which have issued from Him. At the head of these Mysteries, as highest principle of revelation and organ of creation, stands the *μυστήριον Ineffabilis* or *mysterium primum*, called also *Verbum unicum Ineffabilis*, from whence all other emanations proceed. This is, at the same time, the supreme intelligence which, issuing from the Ineffabilis, is like the Ineffabilis Himself, both *introspiciens* and *prospiciens* that is endowed with absolute knowledge, both of its own essence and of all other existence. This first mysterium is further the supreme principle of all forgiveness of sin. From it again proceeds the *primum* (*unicum*) *mysterium primi mysterii*, and from these two proceed further three, five, and twelve other mysteries. The upper world, the kingdom of light, finds its completion in the twenty-fourth or last mystery, which again itself produces twelve subordinate mysteries and emanations; beneath this is the *magnum lumen χαραγμῆς luminis*, which again divides itself into five *χαραγμαὶ luminis*, the *primum praeceptum* (*statutum*), which is divided into seven mysteries, the *magnum lumen luminum*, the five great Helpers (*παραστάται, προηγούμενοι*), which serve to conduct the energies of light into the lower regions, and finally the *τόπος κληρονομιῶν luminis*, the destined habitation of redeemed souls. The whole Light-Region is divided into three *χωρήματα μυστηρίων*, which follow one upon the other. The uppermost *χώρημα* is that of the Ineffabilis, the second that of the primum mysterium, the third (the *χώρημα partis externae*, called also *secundum χώρημα primi mysterii*) comprises all the other mysteries down to the twenty-fourth. All three *χωρήματα* are again inhabited by an infinite multitude of spirits, *τόποι* (or *τάξεις*), *ἀπάτορες, τριπνεύματοι*. These *τριπνεύματοι* again are of three grades, *ὑπερτριπνεύματοι, προτριπνεύματοι*, and *τριπνεύματοι*, with their *χωρήματα, τάξεις*, and *μυστήρια*. Again, each of these *τριπνεύματοι* has his *προαχώρητοι*, and further five trees of light and twenty-four mysteries. Besides these are named 124,000 *ὑμνευταί, ἀμήνυτοι* [*ἀμύναντοι?*], *ἀσήμαντοι, ἀνεννόητοι, ἀσάλευτοι, ἀκίνητοι*, with *τάξεις* corresponding.

With regard to the region which comes next beneath the realm of light, we learn but little from the fourth book. It is divided into three provinces, the right, the left, and that of the middle between them. What we are told of the rulers of these three dominions agrees so closely with the statements of the three earlier books that we may here conveniently combine both descriptions. There is, however, one essential difference between the latter and the former of these descriptions. According to *that*, the *θησαυρὸς* luminis is no longer identical, as in *this*, with the upper realm of light, but is placed below the three *χωρήματα* of the upper world, and stands at the head of the *κερασμός* or region of mixed light. The *θησαυρὸς* luminis, or *terra lucis* (*τόπος προβολῶν*) is then, according to this representation, the place from whence the light, which has its source in the upper world, is brought down into the lower world, and whereby it is again transmitted upwards from the one world to the other. In this *θησαυρὸς* luminis are found twelve gathering-points of lights (*τάξεις τάξεων*), the seven *φωναί* or *ἀμήν* (which, according to the fourth book, are the seven highest spirits of the world of light after the *Pater paternitatis*), and five trees of light. Beside the seven *φωναί* and the five trees of light are found, moreover, in this region three *ἀμήν*, the gemini *σωτῆρες*, and nine *φύλακες*, who are charged with the office of guarding the light. From the above-named gathering-points of light proceed further twelve *σωτῆρες*, each of whom again is set over twelve *τάξεις*. The mixture of *ὕλη* with the *θησαυρός*, or treasury of light, or the already existing combination of purer and impurer elements therein, has produced the material out of which the lower regions of the *κερασμός* were formed.

Beneath the light-treasury begins now also, according to the first three books, the division between the regions of right and left. The right, with its rulers, takes the first place next the treasury; but, whereas the fourth book names here, in addition to the two great lights, Jeû and Zorokothora Melchizedek, only one other, the Good One, the great Sabaoth, the three first books enumerate six great rulers of this region, Jeû the *ἐπίσκοπος luminis*, called also *primus homo* and *πρεσβευτὴς primi statuti*, the *φύλαξ καταπετάσματος*, then the two *προηγούμενοι*, and, as fifth and sixth, Melchizedek and the great Sabaoth, Father of the soul of Jesus. The office of these rulers is that of forming and developing all lower spheres of existence by bringing down the light out of its treasury, and then conducting it back thither again, and so accomplishing the salvation of such souls as are capable of reception into the higher world.

Next, after the region of the right, comes that of the middle (the *τόπος μέσων*), the spirits of which are specially entrusted with the guardianship of human souls. Among them the fourth book names (besides the Zarazaz or Μασκελλι, which probably belongs here,) the great Iao the Good, and the little Sabaoth the Good, to which the first book adds the little Iao. In this place of the midst the light-maiden (*παρθένος* lucis) has her seat, and is the judge of souls, who either discloses for them the gates of the light-realm, or sends them back into earthly existence.

Under her are placed (according to the text of the later description) seven other light-maidens with their fifteen helpers (*παραστάται*). In the *τόπος* Παρθένου sun and moon also have their seats (the *δίσκος solis* and the *δίσκος lunae*), and thence transmit their light, obscured indeed by many veils (*καταπετάσματα*), into the lower realms of creation. The *δίσκος*

solis is described in the fourth book as a great dragon carrying his tail in his mouth, and drawn by four great powers in the form of four white horses. The *βάσις* of the moon has the form of a ship drawn by two white cattle and steered from the stern by a boy; a male and a female dragon forming the rudder.

Beneath the place of the mid-region is that of the left, the place of righteousness, the lowest portion of the *κερασμός*, towards which the penitent souls are tending. It is here that the conflict between the light and the material principle takes its beginning. Here dwell likewise, according to the fourth book, the *ἀόρατος deus* and his *magna δύναμις* the Barbelo, from whence is derived the blood or corporeity of Jesus, and also the three *dii τριδύναμοι*, of which the two uppermost are called Ἰψανταχουνχαῖνχουχοοχ and Χαινχοοοχ (Βαινχοοοχ); all these spirits belong to the 13th Aeon reckoned from below. Underneath this Aeon are the twelve Aeons, of which six are ruled by Sabaoth Adamas, and six by Jabraoth. These produce, by the exercise of the *μυστήριον συνουσίας*, ever fresh ministering spirits, in order to extend the circuit of their power. These efforts are, however, opposed by Jeû, the Father of the Father of Jesus. Jabraoth, with his *ἄρχοντες*, undergoes conversion, and becomes a believer in the mysteries of light, in reward for which he is brought to a higher place, into an *ἀέρα purum*, and before the sunlight, *ad μέσον* and *intra τόπους ἀοράτου Dei.* Sabaoth Adamas, on the other hand, because he will not abstain from the *μυστήριον συνουσίας*, is confined along with his Archontes in the *σφαῖρα*, or the *εἱρμαρμένη σφαίρας*, the visible star-heaven in which the twelve spirits of the zodiac have their seat. Over the *σφαῖρα* Jeû sets five great Archontes, formed out of the light-powers of the right. These are the five planetary spirits—Kronos, Ares, Hermes, Aphrodite, Zeus. Under it he sets 360 other Aeons. The present fixed order of the star-courses is, therefore, originally a punishment inflicted on the Archontes for the misuse of their liberty. Three hundred and sixty Archontes then of the Adamas, having refused to believe in the mystery of light, are assigned a dwelling-place in a still lower region, that of the air (*τόπος ἀερινός*), beneath the *σφαῖρα*, or on the way of the mid-region, *in via medii*. Over these are likewise set five Archontes—Παραπλήξ, Ἀριούθ (Aethiopica), Ἑκάτη, Παρεδρὼν Τυφῶν, and Ἰαχθανάβας. Their occupation is to snatch away souls, to entice them to sin, and after death to torment them.

Here, again, the description in the three first books is somewhat different, and carried out into further details. In these also the 13th Aeon stands uppermost in the place of the left region, or that of righteousness. This Aeon is an image of the upper world, and like it contains innumerable spirits. The uppermost one is the *magnus ἀόρατος*, or *magnus προπάτωρ*, with his great *δύναμις* the Barbelo; then follow the three *τριδύναμοι*, the third of which indicates by his very name Αὐθάδης, the intrusion at this stage of finite narrowmindedness, the desire to exist for itself alone, which is characteristic of finite existence. From the great *προπάτωρ* and the two upper *τριδύναμοι* proceed twenty-four other *προβολαὶ ἀόρατοι*, which appear to be thought of as syzygies, or Pairs of Aeons. The last and lowest of these is the female Aeon (only occasionally mentioned in the fourth book), Πίστις Σοφία, whose audacious longing after the *θησαυρὸς lucis* has brought about her separation from her masculine Σύζυγος, and her Fall out of the World of Light. Below the thirteenth stand the twelve other Aeons (which again are inhabited by innumerable spirits), with their ambitious rule-loving Archontes, among whom is specially named the *Adamas magnus tyrannus*, known to us from the fourth book, and again below them the Archontes of the *εἱμαρμένη* (the second *σφαῖρα*) and the *σφαῖρα* (the *prima σφαῖρα, i. e.* the first, reckoning from below); further and finally beneath these are the Archontes of the way of the midst, with whom the *μοῖρα* has her seat, and through whom (according to the fourth book) punishments are executed on such souls as are condemned to a second earthly life.

In order to bring back the rebellious Archontes to a lasting obedience, Melchizedek comes down to them from the place of the right, deprives them of light-power, and all finer elements, the breath of their mouth, the tears of their eyes, and the exhalations of their bodies, and restores to the *θησαυρὸς luminis* all the purer elements of light contained in these. Out of the coarser remnant these Archontes next proceed to form the souls of men and animals, and, urged on by their innate love of rule, find themselves compelled to continue in this occupation till they are completely emptied of even the less pure elements of light. In this creative work concur also the *παραλήμπτορες solis et lunae*, who, collecting the scattered elements of pure light on the one hand, and, on the other, the still relatively finer sediments of these, form out of them on their own account, also the souls of men and animals.

Underneath the Way of the Midst is the World or *κόσμος*, which consists of (1) the *στερέωμα*, or firmament, with the innumerable spirits; (2) the earth, or *κόσμος hominum*; and (3) the under world. This last is divided into three places of punishment, (*a*) Orcus, (*b*) Chaos, or *Orcus Chai*, and (*c*) the Outer Darkness (*caligo externa*), into which are cast the souls incapable of redemption. Over Orcus rules the *ἄρχων ἐριναῖος*, Ariel; over Chaos, the lion-headed Ialdabaoth, along with whom are mentioned (in the fourth book) Persephone, and (as it seems) also Adonis. *Caligo externa*, the place of weeping and gnashing of teeth, is (in the third book) described as a great dragon which encircles the earth and carries its tail in its mouth, while the sunlight is obscured by the smoke and mist which issue from its darkness. In this dragon are twelve chambers of punishment (*ταμιεῖα κολάσεως*), in which are housed all sorts of brute-shaped Archontes. The upper approaches to these receptacles are under the guardianship of the good angels, whereas, souls thrust down into the outer darkness are made to enter them by means of the opening and closing dragon's tail. In Orcus, souls are tormented with flames of fire; in Chaos, with added darkness and smoke; in Caligo externa, with further additions of ice, hail, snow, and cruel cold.

The origination of human souls is particularly described in the third book. They are of different kind, according to the matter, more or less pure,

out of which they are formed. In this formation each of the five rulers or planetary spirits contributes his part; after which a Lethe-potion is offered them, *e σπέρματι κακίας*, and full of stimulant to evil lusts. This forms itself into their evil enemy, a spiritual substance surrounding the soul (*ἀντίμιμον πνεύματος*). By the provident care of the sun and moon spirit, every soul has a spark of light intermingled with it (thence *μίγμα*). The soul is then brought down from above by the Archontes of the Way of the Midst, and by them associated with its *μοῖρα*, or Genius of Death, whereupon follows its investiture with the *σῶμα ὑλικὸν ἀρχόντων*. As soon as the various psychical elements of the future human being, which exist apart in man and wife, have been united in conception, the 365 ministers of the Archontes proceed to fashion in the *μήτρα*, the future body consisting of 365 parts, impressing on it the *σφραγῖδες* of the days which will prove most significant in the formation of the man and the length of life assigned to him. These *σφραγῖδες* they then make known to the *ἄρχοντες ἐριναῖοι*, and a child is born, which, apart from the indwelling spark of light, is a mere creature and formation of the Archontes, and stands wholly under their power. All future life-fortunes befall the man thus formed with absolute necessity, and in consequence of the *μοῖρα* by which he is accompanied. Even the sin into which the soul falls under the influence of the *ἀντίμιμον πνεῦμα*, is an inevitable fate, a consequence *per ἀνάγκην εἱμαρμένης*; but every single act of sin is put on record in order to be punished. After the man's death his indwelling spark of light goes back to the Light-Maiden, while his soul is laid hold of by the *παραλήμπτορες* of the *ἄρχοντες ἐριναῖοι*, and after being led about for three days in all the *τόποι κόσμου*, is finally brought into the Orcus Chai. If not then condemned to eternal torment, the soul is, on the expiration of her term of penance, brought up out of chaos and placed before the *ἄρχοντες viae medii*. She is there questioned concerning the mysteries of the *μοῖρα*, and if ignorant of them, is again condemned to yet more terrible punishments. When these have been endured, the soul is brought before the light-maiden, and again by her, on account of past sins, brought back into the *σφαῖρα ἀρχόντων*, and from thence into a second earthly life. Endued once more with her old light-power, she is again born in the same way as before; and these *μεταβολαί* or *μεταγγισμοί* repeat themselves till the soul has completed the number of *κύκλοι* assigned her in accordance with the extent of her guilt. Should she now have passed through all this cycle of trials without having found the mysteries of light, or if, having received the highest mysteries, she has made no repentance, she will then be cast for ever into the outer darkness. Yet can many souls be delivered out of this outer darkness if they know the mystery of one of the twelve chambers of punishment in the dragon. In such cases they will be led upwards by the watch-keeping angels of Jeû, and being no longer capable of returning in new bodies to this world, will receive baptism from the seven light maidens, be set free from all punishments, and be translated into the lowermost *τάξις* of the treasury of light.

The necessity of sinning is not, however, universal. The apostles, for instance, were exempt from it, their souls having been formed out of pure elements of light. The possibility, moreover, of a soul keeping herself free from sin is elsewhere occasionally assumed. A soul initiated into the higher mysteries, and yet sinning, will be more severely punished than one which has only received the lower mysteries. These lower mysteries, on the other hand, lose through persistence in sin their power of atonement, till at length only the highest mystery of all is able to absolve from sin. In this way the work before us seeks to combine a strictly ethical position with that Gnostic esteem for pure knowledge without which no one can attain to the upper world of light. It represents the mysteries whose knowledge is required for any entrance into the treasury of light, as, on the one hand, a free gift vouchsafed to man, and, on the other, an object of striving and spiritual warfare. The absolving power attributed to them may be compared with the similar operation attributed to the sacraments of the church.

The fourth book describes, with special fulness, the fates of souls after death, the punishments which await them for their sins, as well as the circumstances of their regeneration and the condition under which they may obtain forgiveness. The five Archontes of the *via medii*, and their subordinate *ἀρχιδαιμόνια*, are first the tempters of the souls to sin, and afterwards the most terrible tormentors. The demons of the Παραπλήξ, an Archon, with woman's hair flowing down to her feet, lead souls astray to wrath, evil-speaking, and slandering; the demons of Ἀριούθ Aethiopica, who is also a female Archon, lead on, in like manner, to murder and bloodshed; and those of the three-headed Hecate to false-swearing, lying, and deceit; those of Paredron Typhon to uncleanness and adultery; and, finally, those of Iachthanabas, to unrighteous judgment and oppression of the upright and the poor. Souls that have been carried off by these demons are tormented by them, according to the nature of their transgressions, for one hundred years, or longer, and only after a corresponding favourable conjunction of the planets can they be rescued from their tormentors by the five Archontes of the Aeons (*i. e.* the planetary dynasts themselves), assisted by the higher spirits of the right and of the midst. Such souls, as on account of sin have to undergo regeneration, are, after death, first tormented in orcus by Ariel, then in chaos by Ialdabaoth, then again by the Archontes of the way of the midst, and so, finally, are led before the light-maiden, who pronounces her judgment upon them. They are then brought back into the *σφαῖρα*, and after being purified by the *λειτουργοὶ σφαίρας* through the instrumentality of fire, smoke, and water, they receive from Jaluham the *παραλήμπτης* of Sabaoth-Adamas, the drink of forgetfulness, and are then invested with a new body, the nature of which will be such as to put hindrance in the way of repetition of former sins.

Those, on the other hand, who have been guilty of greater sins, such as murder, blasphemy, sins against nature, or have performed the impure mysteries of the Cainites (a Gnostic sect), are not again invested with new bodies, but cast into the outer darkness where, along with the

dragon, they will be destroyed at the last judgment. Good souls, on the other hand, who, without having committed grievous sins, have failed to find the mysteries of light, will (according to the consentient representations of the third and fourth books), so soon as the favourable conjunction of the planets has taken place, be, after death, led about during three days in all *τόποι* of the universe, and likewise in chaos, and made acquainted with all the forms of punishment there; the punitive spirits of those regions will have but little power over them, and being rescued from these and safely conducted past the Archontes of the way of the midst, they will then be led before the light-maiden, and by her be signed with a *σφραγὶς praestans*. They will then remain with the little Sabaoth till the favourable time has come for their renewed descent to earth. Each soul being then supplied with a wisdom and watchfulness inspiring potion, and a *σῶμα δίκαιον*, will set herself to seek the mysteries o. the upper world, the Gnosis of which will render her worthy of a share in the kingdom of light. But, not these only, sinning souls also, who after they have found the mysteries of light, leave off sinning, may yet attain to the treasury of light. Such souls, when the favourable conjunction of the planets has come, will be once more sent back as righteous souls into the world. From all this it would seem that the fates of men after death will indeed depend on their moral conduct on the one hand, but also, on the other hand, on the conjunctions of the stars and the influence they exercise on the mysteries of light. Souls born under unfavourable constellations become bad, and will be unable to find the mysteries.

The redemption of human souls is, according to this, accomplished chiefly by initiation into the sin absolving mysteries. Into this Jesus first initiates His own disciples, and then commissions them to impart the knowledge of the same to others. In this impartation of absolving mysteries consist, according to the fourth book, the work of Jesus upon earth. For which end He brings down water and fire from the *τόπος luminis luminum*, wine and blood from the *τόπος* of the Barbelo. His Father sends Him the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove; fire, water, and wine, serve for the cleansing of all the sins of the whole world; while the blood serves Him as a token *propter σῶμα generis humani, i.e.* (probably) of His own corporeity. The word of Jesus, I have come to send fire upon the earth, points to the purification of the sins of the whole world by fire; in like manner, the saying to the woman of Samaria about the water of life (John iv. 10, 14), the issuing of water and blood from the pierced side of Jesus, and the consecration of the eucharistic cup as the blood of the covenant; all three refer to the forgiveness of sins accomplished by these mysteries of light. Of special energy and power for this end is the mystery of the eucharist, consisting of oblations and special prayers. Jesus Himself celebrates it, in the first instance, for the cleansing of His disciples, and bids them henceforth repeat it for the like cleansing of all future believers. The particular description here given of this celebration, the offering of water, wine, and bread, with solemn mystic forms of prayer, is of special importance as characteristic of the ritual and worship of the Gnostic party, among whom this work originated.

Beside the mystery of the eucharist, which is also designated as that of the true baptism, we find mentioned a *βάπτισμα fumi*, a *βάπτισμα πνεύματος sancti luminis*, an *unctio πνευματική*, and as the highest mystery, that of the seven *φωναί*, and their forty-nine *δυνάμεις* and *ψῆφοι*. These mysteries disclose to the souls of men the entrance to the kingdom of light, and the thus initiated have only to leave the *σῶμα ὕλης*, and then restrained no longer by any hostile or subordinate power, they mount up freely through all those regions to the treasury of light.

The Christology and Soteriology of the three first books is also much more developed and detailed than that of the fourth book. Jesus is in them represented as the universal Redeemer, whose historical manifestation and redeeming work on earth accomplishes at the same time a cosmical redemption. The prophets, patriarchs, and other righteous ones of the Old Testament, must wait in patience till Jesus have brought His disciples into the kingdom of light. Three only, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are at once, at the time of our Lord's ascension, received with Him into that kingdom; the rest have to return once more into earthly existence, and there receive the mysteries of light.

Jesus, who proceeds from the first mystery, i. e. from His Father, bears Himself the name of *primum mysterium*. The end of His mission to the earth is the revelation of the upper (higher) mysteries. As, on the one hand, even before His earthly manifestation, He had begun to work through the instruction of Enoch, as given in paradise; so, on the other hand, He makes the perfect communication of Gnosis and the accomplishment of His redeeming work coincident with the ascension.

The deliverance of the Pistis Sophia is a prelude and foretype of the redemption of humanity. In her, indeed, is typically represented the original descent and implanting in the lower world of the spark of divine light. But Pistis Sophia herself obtains her full deliverance only at the ascension.

The process of the work of redemption is as follows:—The *Σωτήρ* rises from His seat in the 24th mystery, leaves there His *ἔνδυμα lucis* behind, and descends unrecognised by the Archons (who take Him for the angel Gabriel) into the lower regions. From the *θησαυρὸς lucis* He carries with Him twelve powers of light, out of which the souls of the apostles are formed in the *σφαῖρα*; from the little Jao, in the place of the midst, He takes another power of light, with which He combines the soul of Elias, and out of this the soul of John, the forerunner, is formed. Thereupon He announces, and once more in the form of Gabriel, to Mary, that she is to become the mother of the *Σωτήρ*, and brings down to her a *ψυχή* and a *σῶμα*. The former is a *vis luminis*, from the great Sabaoth, in the place of the right; the latter is a robe of light from the Barbelo in the 13th Aeon, which, though a *ὕλη* needing some measure of purification, is yet no earthly or material corporeity. From these two constituents Jesus is formed. With Him in His very childhood a *πνεῦμα* is associated, called the *simile*

Jesu or *frater Jesu*, which keeps Him free from all hylic influences, and impels Him to receive the baptism of John. The Σωτήρ Himself descends at the baptism, in the form of a dove, upon Jesus.

The work of redemption upon earth, or the imparting of the mysteries of the upper world, is now proceeded with, partly in the way of instruction given concerning the τόποι ἀληθείας in general, partly in that of revelations concerning the remission of sins as mediated by various sacred actions and formulae. During His life on earth Jesus imparts the mysteries to His disciples, in the first instance, in parabolic and symbolical language, i. e. in the numerous parables and discourses of our canonical gospels, the deeper significance of which is not disclosed to them until after His ascension. His death is described as an actual crucifixion. After the resurrection He remains yet eleven years longer with His disciples, and then being reclothed with His heavenly ἔνδυμα *lucis*, on which are inscribed the secret names of all celestial and supercelestial beings. He mounts upwards through all the middle regions to the higher world of light. On His way He overcomes the opposing world-rulers of the 12th Aeon, and the Αὐθάδης, the ruler of the 13th Aeon, depriving them of their power of light, and compelling them to yield up again the souls which they have devoured, so that the ἀριθμὸς ψυχῶν τελείων may be completed. After this He brings the Πίστις Σοφία with Him into the upper realm of light. From thence, adorned with a triple crown of beams, He descends again to earth in the glory of world-redeemer, and initiates His disciples into all mysteries, *ab internis usque ad externa et ab externis usque ad interna*.

The personal apprehension of the work of redemption by individual souls is then proceeded with, through the mediation of the mysteries of light. After these, men must seek day and night, and render themselves worthy to receive them, by renouncing the world and the ὕλη, and all their cares, and sins, and occupations. These mysteries are again, in their turn, numerous and manifold. The "mystery of baptism" imparts, by water and fire, the cleansing from sin and the soul's deliverance from the ἀντίμιμον πνεῦμα, the μοῖρα and the σῶμα. But in order fully to accomplish this deliverance, further mysteries are also required from the *primum* χώρημα *a parte externa* (the lowest region of the realm of light upwards to the highest mystery, that of the *Ineffabilis*. These mysteries are imparted to penitent souls in a regular series, one after the other, because (as has been already observed) the lower mysteries lose their power after fresh relapses into sin, till at last the *Mysterium Ineffabilis* alone is of any help. The higher the mysteries that have been received, the severer is the punishment for relapses into sin. He who, after receiving the *mysterium Ineffabilis*, falls again into sin and departs impenitent out of this life, will be cast into the outer darkness. But even out of the *Caligo externa* deliverance is possible, through the mediation of others, who pronounce the *mysterium Ineffabilis*. A soul thus delivered is brought before the light-maiden, and she sends it back once more to earth, clothed in a righteous body (σῶμα δίκαιον). And even when it is no longer possible for a soul to return to earth in a new body, yet the possibility of deliverance (as was shown above) is not fully excluded.

The same series of mysteries, rising step by step up to the highest, serves also for the initiation of the δίκαιοι and ἀγαθοί. Those who have died penitent need not, after receiving the mysteries, to submit again to a fresh metempsychosis. Souls perfectly pure, who have been partakers of the highest mysteries, ascend upwards robed in glorious light, and without encountering any hindrance, through all the intermediate realms up to the place of the inheritance. Others who have received only the lower mysteries, and have not lived perfectly free from sin, are required to produce at every stage their ἀπολογία (ἀπόφασις, σύμβολα), are taken up, step by step, by παραλήμπτορες from the realms of light, examined by the Light-Maiden, and finally transmitted by Melchizedek into the *ultima* τάξις *luminis*. Of human souls, however, in comparison with all other spiritual existence, the saying is especially true—"the last shall be first"—for though once the mere dregs and last deposit of the light of the middle regions, they will, after passing through conflicts and sufferings, be raised above all the world-rulers (Archontes) and introduced into the realm of light.

After the reception into that realm of the pre-determined number of perfect souls (ἀριθμὸς αἰῶνος τελείων), the end of the world (συντέλεια αἰῶνος) will come. No sooner has that number been fulfilled than the gates of light will be finally closed, and no one more suffered to enter therein. Then will follow the *solutio mundi*, the dissolution by fire of the material universe, the κερασμός likewise will be dissolved, and all the powers of evil, yea, the outer darkness itself, and all its inhabitants, will be annihilated. The last act of all is the *evectio universi*. Jesus takes His station in the place of the inheritance, surrounded by fully purified souls. He then conducts the souls, which still abide in the lowest regions of the treasury of light, to the fitting place appointed for them, the curtains are then updrawn which have hitherto separated the θησαυρὸς *lucis*, the place of the right and the place of the midst from the realm of light, and all souls inhabiting those regions, mount up into the place of the inheritance. The same salvation will be vouchsafed to the penitent Archontes of the 13th Aeon, and those of the other twelve Aeons. But even after the whole has been perfected different ranks and orders will still be found in the realm of light. Above all stand the souls of the apostles, and of the just made perfect, who have received the first mystery of the *Ineffabilis*. To these belongs the saying—"they shall be one with Jesus"—*homines illi sunt ego et ego sum illi* (p. 230). Beneath these are placed the other souls of men in various ranks, according to the mysteries of which they have been made partakers. Among the Aeons, also, finally admitted into the realm of light, a corresponding order of ranks will be found, according to the places occupied by them in the times before their perfecting. Each one finally reaches the place pre-ordained for him (τόπος τάξεως) from the beginning, and enjoys henceforth that measure of knowledge which has been procured for him by the corresponding mysteries.

The four books of the work before us afford a clear insight into the changes and reconstructions to which the Gnostic systems were subjected. The fourth book, as we have already observed in our introductory statement, presents a yet simpler form of Gnostic doctrine, and variously connected with the older systems, such as those of Saturninus, the Ophites, Basilides, etc. The subsequent developments consist, like those of the Valentinian School, in the introduction of ever fresh series of spiritual beings, and of names of Aeons, as well as in the endeavour to push back to even greater and greater distances from this earthly world, the highest ranks and powers of the world of light. The system of the Pistis Sophia resembles, moreover, that of Valentinus in its (not so much dualistic as rather) monistic-pantheistic character. The ὕλη, or material substance, stands, not as in the older Syrian Gnosis, over against the world of light as a primeval realm of darkness, but is, in fact, a symbol of that finite narrowness and imperfection which increases in the same measure as the spirits which have emanated from the world of light, depart further and further from their original source, and its pure and perfect lustre. In this system, moreover, the antithesis of pneumatic, psychic and hylic souls, which the Valentinian system still retained, is given up; as, in all souls alike, the germ of spiritual life is found, so are they all likewise (those of the apostles alone excepted) burdened with a ὕλη, abandoned to an evil impulse by the ἀντίμιμον πνεύματος and the μοῖρα, and subjected by the κακία τρυφῶν to the εἱμαρμένη and the dominion of the Archontes. But as they all lie under a necessity of sinning, so there exists for all the possibility of deliverance by repentance and purity of life. The impartation of the mysteries of light, like that of the sacraments of the church, has for its first object the deliverance of souls from evil spirits, and the empowering them to exercise true repentance and a genuine morality of conduct. Even for souls abandoned to the outer darkness there still exists a possibility of salvation. Those only who have defiled themselves with specially grievous sins (the so-called mortal sins of the church's system) are finally shut up in the outer darkness, and so become obnoxious to ultimate annihilation. The degrees and differences which will continue to exist in the realm of light and the state of perfection are not independent of the differences in men's moral conduct. But especially the doctrine of the transmigration of souls shows how earnestly this Gnostic system endeavoured to disclose for all sinners fresh possibilities of repentance and an entrance into the kingdom of light.

This notwithstanding the Pistis Sophia is also cognisant of numerous degrees and differences of spiritual perfection which are not based on the free ethical position of individual souls, but on original differences of nature. The very elements out of which souls are originally formed are of very different (now finer, now coarser,) kinds. More especially the conjunctions of the planets, under which souls are born on earth, exercise a decisive influence on their subsequent ethical character. Under certain conjunctions good and righteous, under others, again, sinful souls are born; and so it is expressly said that at the final redemption every soul will reach the place which, from the beginning, was assigned her.

It is a peculiar and profoundly significant idea in the work before us that human souls although originally inferior to and immeasurably weaker than the Aeons and Archontes to whom they owe their existence, are yet destined in the end, when the universe reaches the goal of its perfection, to take their final place above them. Thereby also expression is given to the ethical principle which lies at the basis of the whole system, namely, that spiritual purification and gradual deliverance from hylic elements is essentially dependent on a moral process, and this forms a distinguishing peculiarity of human souls in comparison with all other spiritual beings. And so it is that the very creation of human souls ultimately subserves the purpose of depriving the apostate world-rulers of that power of light which they have abused. For even as their selfish endeavour to extend their power and dominion by the continual procreation of fresh series of ministrant spirits has a limit assigned to it by a higher will, so on the other hand must these Archontes, by an involuntary concurrence in the creation of human souls, themselves contribute to the undermining of their own sovereignty. No sooner has this purpose been accomplished by the completion of the number of predestined souls and their entrance into the kingdom of light, than the *Consummatio* and the *Solutio Universi* follow.

With the endeavour moreover to derive from different beings and regions of the spiritual world the distinctions and differences observable in this and its manifold kinds and ranks of creatures is closely connected the vast multiplicity of spiritual essences and mysteries, which this system provides for in excess even of that of Valentinus. As every degree in the spiritual world has its own approximate mysteries, so does the place assigned to individual souls at the end of the world depend on the degree of initiation attained to here. But although such an influence on the ultimate fate of human beings is assigned in this system to ethical conduct, the endeavour is no less obvious to refer the manifold differences in the good and the evil to an ultimate metaphysical basis, and the influence exercised by a multiplicity of higher powers on the origination and subsequent fate of human souls. While therefore the ethical features of this system and its denial of qualitative differences between pneumatici, psychici and hylici, constitutes on the one hand an approximation to the ethical standpoint of Catholic theology, so on the other hand is the reference of all spiritual differences to original differences of natural elements a genuine characteristic feature of Gnosticism. At the same time one must not overlook the close approximation of the doctrine of the mysteries contained in this work to that of the sacraments in the church. Both are media of supernatural help and grace; and so great as is the importance attached to the possession of Gnosis and initiation into its mysteries, the absolving and cleansing power of these is made to rest not on the Gnosis with which they are connected, but on the sacred mystic actions themselves. It is in accordance with these conceptions that a greater significance is attributed to the work of redemption as an historical phaenomenon, and more

especially to the death of Jesus and His blood-shedding, as that of the covenant (αἷμα διαθήκης) than is the case with other Gnostic systems.

In all these points the system of the book Pistis-Sophia exhibits an approach to the conceptions current in the Catholic church. And great as in other respects may seem the gulf which separates these endless genealogies of Aeons and spirits, divine essences and mythological figures, from the simple faith of Catholic Christendom, it must yet be remembered that in the Christian circles also of that time angelological speculations and astrological dreamings found especial favour. In this respect also the difference between Catholic and Gnostic opinions must be regarded as rather a quantitative than a qualitative one. But the clearest indication of the Gnostic character of this work is found in its Mythus of the fall and penitence of Pistis-Sophia. Attempts have been made to draw from this Mythus a proof that the work itself was a product of the Valentinian school; nay, some (as Woide and Dulaurier) have even thought that Tertullian expressly refers to it when he mentions (*Adv. Valent.* c. 2) the "Sophia" of Valentinus. This last assumption is perfectly arbitrary. But as to the Mythus itself we find it as much at home in the Ophite and Bardesanian systems as in that of Valentinus. We meet indeed, in the most various forms, this mythic history of the Sophia as symbol of the human soul which, having forgotten her heavenly origin, sinks ever deeper into the corrupting pleasures and pains of this earthly existence till reminded by help sent from above of her celestial home, and after enduring all manner of pains and distresses she is at length brought back to the place from whence she has fallen.

The points of connection between the system of the Pistis-Sophia and the Ophitic system are much more numerous than those between it and the Valentinian. This is clearly proved by Köstlin (*in loc. cit.* p. 185 sqq.): "First," he observes, "many single instances may be alleged; such as the significance possessed by the serpent (in this system also) as both a good and evil genius, the fall of the Sophia into the ὕλη, her penitence and her redemption by Christ, the names Ialdabaoth, Iao, Sabaoth, Adonis (the Adonaius of the Ophites), the animal forms assumed by evil spirits, the view that *not* a single world-ruler (the Demiurg) but several Archontes spake to the prophets, the notion that Christ by assuming another form in His descent through their realms remained unknown to these Archontes (cf. Iren. I. 30, 12), the importance attached in both systems (*ibidem*) to the perfect purity of the body of Jesus, as organ for the σωτήρ, the long abiding of Jesus upon earth after the resurrection, the high significance of sacramental acts (e.g. of the σφραγίς in baptism, *Orig. c. Cels.* vi. 27), and yet more of the ἀπολογίαι which the soul has to make before the Archontes on her upward passage through their respective realms (*ibid.* and c. 31), the doctrine of the immediate elevation of redeemed souls after death to the heavenly world, and also the essentially anthropomorphic conceptions of the supreme being (His σῶμα and μέλη) notwithstanding the assertion of His infinitude and "Unspeakableness"—(cf. Iren. I., 30, i. *primum lumen—beatum et incorruptibile et indeterminatum, esse autem hoc Patrem omnium et vocari primum hominem*). Again, and this is specially to be observed, the fundamental conception of the whole system that the development of the universe is nothing else but the return of the light-power from the realm of the ἄρχοντες to the heavenly world, their *evacuation* against their will and knowledge accomplished by the deprivation of the *humectatio luminis* or of its *virtus* (*ibid.* 6 sqq. 12 sqq.) is essentially Ophitic. In both systems the light-power is arbitrarily misused by the world-rulers for the production of *angeli, potestates*, and *dominationes*. In both the creation of man is the means of depriving them of this power. In both Christ draws by degrees to Himself the light-power confined in the earthly sphere, and the complete restoration of these elements of light to the upper world is the final close of the whole development. One other main point of doctrine in our system, that namely of the distinction made between souls which issue from the *primum lumen* and those whose origin is merely from the ὕλη (as for instance from the *habitus* of the Archontes) is found again in that doctrine of the Ophites which distinguishes between *animae sanctae* ('*ex substantia luminis*') and '*animas ex substantia Ialdabaothi*' or '*ex insufflatione*' (*ibid.* 14)."

So far Köstlin. It must be granted that several of the features here alleged as common to the Pistis-Sophia and the Ophitic system are not so exclusively, and on the other hand, that the doctrines concerning the Aeons in the two systems have but few points of contact. The Gnostic sects were however continually changing in these respects, and the so-called Ophitic parties were so various and divided that we should have no right to judge or measure them by the descriptions of Irenaeus. To the same group also belong the Gnostic sects mentioned by Irenaeus (I. 29) and Epiphanius (*Haer.* 26) who among other names bore also that of Barbelites (Epiph. 26, 3). Among these we meet again the mythological figure of the Barbelo so often mentioned in the book Pistis-Sophia. The light-maiden of the Pistis-Sophia recurs in one frequently mentioned among these Gnostics (Epiph. 26, 1; cf. Iren. I. 30, 9) (though in a different mythological connection) as the Virgin (Norea, i.e. נַעֲרָה *puella* or Barthenôs, i.e. παρθένος) who, against the will of the Archontes, reveals to men the higher powers and the Barbelo in particular, and announces the necessity of gathering and bringing back the sparks of light which the Archon and the θεοί, ἄγγελοι and δαίμονες in alliance with him have made their prey. Epiphanius mentions 26, 8) as books made use of by these Gnostics the small and great ἐρωτήσεις Μαρίας, and (26, 13) an *Evangelium Philippi*. Renan has recently (Marc Aurèle, p. 120 sqq.) endeavoured to identify these ἐρωτήσεις Μαρίας with the book Pistis Sophia. This is however quite impossible; for what Epiphanius tells us of the contents of those questions of Mary has nothing in common with our work, but rather agrees with the licentious practices (which are here so severely condemned) of another Gnostic sect, the so-called Cainites. These Cainites however, it must be observed, themselves belonged to the

large group of Ophitic parties, and Mary Magdalene does actually play a distinguished part in the Pistis Sophia among the female disciples of Jesus, and is remarkable among all, both male and female, for her thirst for knowledge and her unwearied activity in asking questions. If then it seems impossible to identify those ἐρωτήσεις Μαρίας with our Pistis Sophia, we are nevertheless confirmed in the conclusion that this book really belonged to the Ophitic Gnosis. It agrees further with the notice in Epiphanius of the use made by his Gnostics of an *Evangelium Philippi*, that our Pistis Sophia (p. 39–62 sqq.) also mentions Philip along with Thomas and Matthew as having been entrusted with the office of committing to writing the instructions given to His disciples by the risen Jesus. That moreover which Epiphanius tells us of the contents of his *Evangelium Philippi* agrees right well with the whole tone and range of thought in the Pistis Sophia. The following fragment of the *Evangelium Philippi* has had, quite improperly, an impure sense interpreted into it by Epiphanius: "The Lord has revealed to me what the soul must say when she mounts to heaven, and what she will have to answer to each of the higher powers. I have, he says, known myself and have gathered up myself from all quarters, and have sown to the Archon no children, but have torn up his roots, and gathered together the scattered members, and I know thee who thou art. For I, saith he, derive my origin from those above." The book Pistis Sophia exhibits moreover, along with great and striking differences, some remarkable points of contact with the views of the Barbeliotes of whom Irenaeus speaks. Köstlin (*loc. cit.* p. 187) has already compared with good reason the description given of the fall of the Sophia in Iren. I. 29, 4, with that in our book. More especially does what is there related of the sufferings of the Sophia from *Ignorantia* (i.e. the Demiurge) and Αὐθάδεια, remind us of the persecutions which, according to the Pistis-Sophia, she has to endure from the Αὐθάδης. The continual progress and changes of use in regard to names, figures, and symbols among the Gnostic sects need not puzzle us any more than the circumstance, that these names are continually occurring in different connections and significations.

From all this we may regard ourselves as justified in assigning (with Petermann and Köstlin) the book Pistis Sophia to one of the large group of Ophite sects, though nevertheless the system it contains is not identical with any one of the other Ophite systems known to us. From most of these it clearly differs in not having like them a dualistic but, like the systems of the Naassenes and Peratae known to us from the so-called Philosophumena, a pantheistic and monistic character. Its home moreover is not in Syria, like the systems described by Irenaeus and Epiphanius, but in Egypt. While of the many non-Greek names which occur in the fourth book a large part certainly are of Aramaic or Syriac origin, others are as clearly from Egyptian sources. Egyptian also is the mode of computing time (*mensis* Tobe, p. 4, i.e. Tybi), and so also the symbols of the sun-dragon and the moon-ship. The book, notwithstanding its Egyptian character, must have been originally written in Greek. The Coptic (Thebaic) text is a translation. This is proved by the numerous Greek words which it contains.

In comparison with the other Ophite systems known to us, that of our book is later and more developed. This remark applies not to the first three books only, but also to the fourth book. Köstlin is quite right in pronouncing it incredible that the far more richly developed world of Aeons and spirits described in this work should have subsequently shrunk up to the few mythological forms with which the earlier Ophites contented themselves, and that it was only by more recent speculations that the infernal potentate Ialdabaoth was exalted to the position of Demiurge and God of the Jews.

As indications of a comparatively later origin of the system may be further mentioned the numerous points of contact between it and Manichaeism (as already observed by Köstlin, loc. cit. p. 190 sqq.); to these belong the conceptions of a light-maiden, a world of light, trees of light, and light saviours (σωτῆρες θησαυροῦ *luminis*), of sun and moon as good spirits which take part in the enlargement of the sphere of light, and the liberation of the light-spark from the ὕλη, and more especially the conception of the moon as a ship of light, and further the formation of the σῶμα *Christi* after a prototypical light-form, the doctrine of the members (μέλη), of the *Ineffabilis* and the like. One must at the same time agree with Köstlin that no actual dependence of the Pistis Sophia on Manichaean views and teaching can be assumed. The one is a dualistic, the other a pantheistic system; if one is in any way dependent on the other, it is Manicheanism to which we must assign that position. The grand figure of the light-maiden finds its meaning and motive only in the connection in which we find it in the Pistis Sophia. Her activity is here very striking and significant, whereas in the Manichaean system she holds only a very subordinate and obscure position. It is indeed possible that a literary connection may exist between the book Pistis Sophia and the four books περὶ μυστηρίων of Terebinthos mentioned in the Acts of the Disputation between Archelaos and Manes. This Terebinthos is said to have been initiated in Egyptian wisdom, and his writing to have been one of the sources of the Manichaean doctrine; and though we may not at present be able to find other support for the conjecture, it may be assumed as probable that the book Pistis Sophia was written before the rise of the Manichaean system, and therefore before A.D. 270. Moreover, as the system contained in it is evidently more recent than the other Ophitic systems known to us, we shall have, with Köstlin, to assign its composition to the first half of the third century.

But if on the one hand the book points to Manichaeism, it exhibits on the other a remarkable approximation in a Gnostic work to the views and conceptions of the Catholic church. It has been remarked already that the Gnostic antitheses of psychici and pneumatici are here sensibly modified. The tone of moral earnestness which pervades the system is common to it with that of some other Gnostic parties, such as the Basilidians and the Marcionites; but a yet further approach to Catholic sentiment is found

in its assumption that salvation is obtained in the twofold way of right moral conduct and the use of cleansing and atoning mysteries. The condemnation of the immoralities practised in some Ophitic sects is as severe in the book of Pistis Sophia (p. 386 sq.) as it could possibly be among Catholics. It also takes a more friendly position in regard to the Old Testament and its religion than did the olden Ophites. If on the one hand it is said that the ἄρχοντες αἰώνων imparted the μυστήρια αἰώνων to the prophets of the Old Testament (p. 354), so again on the other hand it was through David, Solomon, Isaiah, and other prophets, as unconscious agents, that the *vis luminis* is said to have prophesied of the future redemption. Accordingly we find Davidic and pseudo-Salomonic psalms cited in the penitential prayers of the Sophia, and allegorically interpreted by the disciples male and female. The reception of the Old Testament prophets, patriarchs, and other righteous persons into the kingdom of light is expressly foretold; and to Israel's forefathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, special distinctions are vouchsafed in the redemption wrought by Christ.

Besides the passages quoted from the Psalms and prophets of the Old Testament, we find in this writing numerous citations from all four canonical gospels, without reckoning the not less frequent allusions to evangelical utterances, and one citation from the Epistle to the Romans (p. 294). The interpretation of citations made from the Gospels, like that of those from the Psalms, is allegorical after the manner otherwise known to us of the Gnostic schools. To the teaching of Jesus in the four Gospels the instructions vouchsafed to His disciples in our book are supposed to stand in the relation of a higher grade, developing and completing, but by no means superseding what has gone before. It is also worthy of remark that this higher teaching is not given to otherwise unknown disciples of Jesus, but to the Apostles themselves. Along with the older Apostles St. Paul is once mentioned and designated by Mary Magdalene as "our brother" (p. 294). Beside male disciples certain females also appear, as Mary Magdalene, Mary the Mother of Jesus *secundum* σῶμα ὕλης, Martha and Salome. The instructions which Jesus imparted to them are for the most part elicited by questions which they put to Him, Mary Magdalene distinguishing herself as the chief questioner. The first three books are those which put special honour on the Apostles by relating that they alone in place of the ψυχὴ ἀρχόντων carry in themselves the treasure of light, being thus from the first sinless and righteous (p. 149), and that therefore in the perfecting of all things they will take the highest place among the blessed (p. 231, 244).

Beside the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments various apocryphal writings are made use of, all probably being of Gnostic origin. Among these may specially be noticed the Pseudo-Salomonic odes published separately by Münter; which also, like the citations from canonical Scripture, are allegorically interpreted. To these must be added the book Jeû, which Jesus is supposed to have dictated to Enoch in paradise (p. 245 sq. 354). It is cited as an authority for the knowledge of the mysteries of the three κληροὶ *luminis*, and appears to have been the main source of the fully developed Gnostic doctrine of the three first books. We find also some allusions to an apocryphal gospel of the childhood (p. 120), and, perhaps to the gospel of Philip (p. 230).

A complete interpretation of the book Pistis Sophia is only then to be hoped for when the complete text shall have been recovered. Further light as to its meaning may be looked for from the publication of the hitherto unprinted Gnostic writings which have been preserved in Coptic MSS. and are now to be found in the British Museum, as well as in the libraries of Oxford and Leyden.

Compare — besides the treatise of Köstlin already referred to — the following works:— Woide, in Cramer's *Beiträge*, l. c.; Dulaurier, *Journal Asiatique*, l. c.; Münter, l. c.; Matter, *Geschichte des Gnosticismus*, German translation by Dörner, ii. 69 sqq. 163 sqq.; Baur, *das Christenthum und die Christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (2 Aufl. p. 226 sqq.): Lipsius, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopaedie, Artikel Gnosticismus* (separately published, Leipsic, 1860, p. 95 sq. 157 sqq.); Renan, *Marc Aurèle*, p. 120 sqq., *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, Paris, 1872, p. 333 sq.; Jacobi, in Herzog's *Theol.-Realencyclopaedie*, 2 Aufl. Artikel *Gnosis*. [R. A. L.]

PISTUS (1), Arian priest of the Mareotis, and intruding bishop at Alexandria, is first met with as a follower of Arius, and condemned with him in a council at Alexandria, A.D. 321 (Alexand. *Epist. Synod.* in *Pat. Gr.* xviii.; Gelasius Cyz. *Opp.* l. viii. ed. Cotel.). Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, continued to warn his clergy against him as an Arian and excommunicate; at Nicaea, A.D. 325, he sided with Arius, and was condemned. In 335, he was admitted to communion at the council held at Jerusalem under the influence of the Eusebians. When St. Athanasius was banished to Trèves in A.D. 336, or before his return in the end of 338, Pistus seems to have been consecrated bishop by the Eusebian bishop Secundus; he was at least so brought forward in opposition to Athanasius's restoration, and an attempt was made to carry pope Julius in his favour. At Alexandria Pistus had himself to yield to the intrusion of Gregorius the Cappadocian about A.D. 340, and then disappears from history. [ATHANASIUS, p. 187–8.] (Athan. *Ap. Cont. Ar.* §§ 19, 24, *Ep. Encyc.* § 6; Hefele, *conc. Gesch.* i. 488, sq.; Tillemont, *H. E.* vi. 221, sq.) [J. G.]

PISTUS (2), Egyptian bishop, who attended the council of Tyre (A.D. 335) and signed the decrees of Sardica (A.D. 343) on the Athanasian side (Athanas. *Ap. c. Ar.* §§ 50, 79; Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 335, 347; Binius, *Conc.* i. pt. i. 378; Hefele, *Conc. Gesch.* i. 468 sq.) Pistus, of Greece, an orthodox bishop, is mentioned by Athanasius in *Ep. ad Episc.* § 8. [J. G.]

PISTUS (3), presbyter of the Mareotis, on the Athanasian side, was one of the signataries on behalf of Athanasius (Athanasius, *Ap. c. Ar.* § 73; Binius, *Conc.* i. pt. i. 379). [J. G.]

PISTUS (4), deacon in Alexandria, assented with Colluthus and others to the condemnation of Arius, A.D. 321 (Athan. *Opp.* 282, Paris, 1581; Binius, *Conc.* i. pt. i. 444). [J. G.]

PISTUS (5), a solitary of Egypt early in the 5th century, of whom some anecdotes occur in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (Cotel. *Eccl. Gr. Mon.* i. 641; Tillem. xii. 462). [C. H.]

PITHIANI (Πιθιανοί), heretics in the list of Sophronius anathematised in the sixth synod (Mansi, xi. 850 D; Hard. iii. 291 A). Hardouin's margin and Latin version give Σηθιανοί and Sethiani as the true name [SETHITES]. [C. H.]

PITHO, mentioned by Theodoret as a disciple of Marcion. (*Haer. Fab.* i. 25.) [G. S.]

PITHYRION, a monk who lived in a cave near the Thebaid in the 4th century. He was a disciple of Antony, and was said to know the special vices which particular evil spirits infused into the minds of men. (Ruf. *Hist. Mon.* 13; Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* 74; Sozom. iii. 14.) [W. H. F.]

PITIRUM (Πιτηρούμ, PITERIUS, PYOTERIUS), a solitary in the country of Porphyrites in upper Egypt, directed, it is said, by an angel to visit the female monastery of Tabenna, where he would find a poor woman whose patience in a hard lot would make him think humbly of his own virtues. The visit and its good effects are related in full (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 42; Rosweyd, *Vit. Pat.* v. libell. xviii. 19; Cassiod. *Trip. Hist.* viii. 1). [C. H.]

PIUS I., bishop of Rome after Hyginus in the middle part of the 2nd century, during the reign of Antoninus Pius. The dates of the bishops of this early period cannot be fixed with certainty, the traditions about them being contradictory. The Liberian Catalogue (354) gives twenty years four months and twenty-one days as the duration of his episcopate, but is inconsistent in giving the consuls of the years 146 and 161 as those of its commencement and its close. The Felician Catalogue (530) gives the same consuls for its commencement without naming those of its close, but assigns it a duration of eighteen years four months and three days. Both name Antoninus Pius (A.D. 138–A.D. 161) as the contemporary emperor. Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 11) does the same, but says that Pius died in the fifteenth year of his episcopate. His chronicle also gives the same duration. Lipsius (*Chronol. der röm. Bischöf.*), after full discussion of the chronology of the period, accepts this duration, assigning from 139 to 154 as the earliest, and from 141 to 156 as the latest tenable dates. The absence of distinct early records of the early Roman bishops is further shown by the fact, that both the Liberian and Felician Catalogues place Anicetus between Hyginus and Pius. So also Optatus (ii. 48) and Augustin (*Ep.* 53, *ordo novus*). But that the real order of succession was Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, may be considered certain from the authority of Hegesippus (quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 22), who was at Rome himself in the time of Anicetus, and, when there, made out a succession of the Roman bishops. His own words, as given by Eusebius, are, "When I was in Rome I made a list (διαδοχὴν) of bishops to Anicetus; and Anicetus was succeeded by Soter, after whom was Eleutherus." Irenaeus, who visited Rome in the time of Eleutherus, gives us the same order of succession (*adv. Haeres.* iii. 3; cf. Euseb. iv. 11 and v. 24; also Epiphanius, *adv. Haer.* xxvii. c. 6).

The episcopate of Pius is important for the introduction of Gnostic heresy into Rome at the time rather than for any recorded action of his own. The heresiarchs Valentinus and Cerdo had come thither in the time of his predecessor Hyginus, and continued to teach there under Pius (Iren. i. 27; iii. 4; cf. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 11). Marcion of Pontus, who took up the teaching of Cerdo and developed from it his own peculiar system, arrived there after the death of Hyginus (Epiphan *Haer.* xlii. c. 1; cf. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 11). The account given by Epiphanius of his arrival in Rome is that, having been excommunicated by his own father, who was a Catholic bishop, for seducing a virgin, he fled from his own city (supposed to have been Sinope) to Rome; that he applied to the elders there for admission to communion; that they replied that, being united in the same faith, they could not receive him without the consent of the bishop his father; and that he thereupon began to be a teacher of heresy.

Pius, according to the MURATORIAN FRAGMENT (*circa* 170) and the *Liberian Catalogue*, was brother to Hermas, the writer of "the Shepherd." The first of these authorities alleges that the work was written in the time of Pius by Hermas, a brother of that bishop—"Pastorem vero nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Herma conscripsit, sedente in cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo fratre ejus." In the second it is said of Pius, "Under his episcopate his brother Ermes wrote a book, in which is commanded and contained what the angel taught him when he came to him in the habit of a shepherd." Also, an early Latin poem against Marcion (attributed to Tertullian) contains the lines,

> Post hunc deinde Pius, Hermas cui germane frater,
> Angelicus Pastor, qui tradita verba locutus.

In this last quotation the confusion between Hermas himself and the angel who appeared to him in the habit of a shepherd does not invalidate its testimony to the tradition of the relationship between Hermas and Pius. The only ground for doubting the truth of this important early testimony (that of the Muratorian Fragment being especially weighty) is the fact, that in the work itself the writer is instructed to send two copies of the revelations made to him, one to Clement for transmission to foreign churches, the other to Grapte for admonishing the widows and orphans. The name of Clement naturally suggests Clemens Romanus, accounted (see art. on CLEMENS ROMANUS) the third, or, according to some, the second, bishop of Rome after the apostles. Whatever his exact date, it is evident that, if he were the Clement to whom the revelations of "the Shepherd" were to be transmitted, the work could not have been written, as the Muratorian Fragment asserts, in the time of Pius; though it is possible that a brother of Pius might have been contemporary with Clemens Romanus, and thus that the relationship between Hermas and Pius might be a fact, though the date assigned to the former were erroneous. But the identification of the Clement referred to in "the Shepherd" with

Clemens Romanus is after all a conjecture only; a very tempting one, it is true: for to whom were the supposed revelations so likely to be given for transmission to foreign churches as to the head of the Roman church at the time of writing? But tempting conjectures are often delusive. And, even if we deemed it inevitable to regard Clemens Romanus as the Clement intended by the writer of "the Shepherd," we must remember at the same time that he is but giving an account of what had been told him in a vision, whereas the author of the Muratorian Fragment is speaking historically of what had occurred very recently in his own times (*nuperrime temporibus nostris*). Lipsius (*Chronol. der röm. Bischof.*) considers the alleged relationship of Hermas to Pius to be well established. Westcott also (*Canon of the New Test.* pt. i. ch. 2) accepts it, and adduces internal evidence in the work of Hermas itself of the later against the earlier date. But see art. on HERMAS in this Dictionary, where the other view is taken. It is hardly necessary to add, that the identification of the Hermas who wrote "the Shepherd" with his namesake in the Epistle to the Romans (*Rom.* xvi. 14) rests only on a conjecture of Origen (*Comm. in Rom.* x. 41).

Those who maintain the view of the presbyterian constitution of the early Roman church, and of the earliest so-called bishops having been in fact only leading presbyters, to whom a distinct episcopal office was afterwards assigned by way of tracing the succession, would assign the development of the later episcopal system to the age of Pius. Thus Lipsius (*Chronol.*) speaks of him as the first bishop in the stricter sense (*Bischof im engeren Sinn*). He supposes both Hyginus and Pius to have presided over the college of presbyters, though only as *primi inter pares*, and the need of a recognized head of the church to resist Gnostic teachers to have led to the latter obtaining a position of authority which, after his time, became permanent. The advocates of this view adduce passages from "the Shepherd of Hermas," in which messages are sent "τοῖς προηγουμένοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῖς πρωτοκαθεδρίταις," in rebuke of strifes for precedence among the Christians at Rome (*Vis.* iii. 9; *Mandat.* ix.; *Simil.* viii. 7). These strifes are supposed to denote the beginning of struggles for episcopal power in the supposed later sense. But there is no evidence in the passages themselves of the strifes referred to having had anything to do with such struggles. (See art. on HERMAS, p. 918.)

More cogent is the argument from the fact that, in the account given by Epiphanius of Marcion's arrival in Rome, he is represented as having applied for communion to the presbyters, without mention of the bishop. Those to whom he applied, and who gave judgment in his case, are called "the seniors (πρεσβῦται) who, having been taught by the disciples of the apostles, still survived" (*adv. Haeres.* xlii. 1); also "the presbyters (πρεσβύτεροι) of that time" (*ib.* c. 2); also ἐπιεικεῖς καὶ πανάγιοι πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διδάσκαλοι τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας. But these expressions do not in themselves disprove the existence of a presiding bishop, acting in and through his synod, who would himself be included in the designation πρεσβύτεροι. For it was certainly not till some time after the apostolic period that the names ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος were used distinctively to denote two orders of clergy. Even Irenaeus, though enumerating the bishops of Rome from the first as distinct from the general presbytery, still speaks of them as presbyters; using in one place (iii. 2, 2) the phrase "successiones presbyterorum," though in another (iii. 3, 1 and 2) "successiones episcoporum." Cf. iv. 26, 2, 3, 5; v. 20, 2; and *Ep. ad Victorem* (*ap.* Euseb. v. 24); where the bishops before Soter are called πρεσβύτεροι οἱ προστάντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Tertullian also (*Apologet.* c. 39) calls bishops and presbyters together *seniores*. If, however, the omission by Epiphanius of any mention of a head of the Roman presbytery at the time of Marcion's visit seem still to require accounting for, a reason may be found in the probable supposition of a vacancy in the see. For all that is said about the time is, that it was after the death of Hyginus, with no mention of Pius having succeeded him. In such circumstances the college of presbyters would naturally entertain the case.

This is not the place for a discussion of the apostolic origin of episcopacy, at Rome or elsewhere. But it may suitably be remarked in passing that, certainly very soon after the period before us, both Pius and his predecessors from the first were spoken of as having been bishops (however designated) in a distinctive sense, and that Anicetus, the successor of Pius, appears historically as such on the occasion of Polycarp's visit to Rome (Iren. *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24).[a]

Four letters and several decrees are assigned to Pius, of which the first two letters (to all the faithful and to the Italians) and the decrees are universally rejected as spurious. The two remaining letters, addressed to Justus bishop of Vienne, are accepted as genuine by Baronius, Binius, and Bona, but have no real claims to authenticity. [See PASTOR.] In the letter to all the faithful, Easter is ordered to be kept universally on a Sunday according to the Roman use, and the angel who appeared as a shepherd to Hermas is said to have so commanded. The same statement appears in the Felician Catalogue in addition to what has been quoted above from the Liberian Catalogue about the book of Hermas. In the book itself there is no foundation for the statement.

The Felician Catalogue also states that Pius was an Italian, and that his father's name was Rufinus; also that he was buried beside the body of St. Peter. He is commemorated in the Roman martyrology on the 11th of July as a martyr "in persecutione Marci Aurelii Antonini." But the silence on this head of both the Liberian and Felician Catalogues, of Irenaeus and all early authorities, invalidates his claim to the martyr's crown. [J. B—Y.]

PLACIDIA (1), empress. [GALLA (5).]

PLACIDIA (2), daughter of Valentinian III. and Eudoxia, and wife of the emperor Olybrius Anicius, whom she married in 464. She had previously been taken captive by Genseric in

[a] See also the letter, quoted by Eusebius, from Dionysius of Corinth to the Romans in the time of Soter, the successor of Anicetus. [SOTER.]

455. She had one daughter called Juliana Anicia. After the death of her husband in A.D. 472, she is said to have devoted herself to study, and to have visited Jerusalem where she lived for a long time. She then returned to Italy, and died at Verona. (Cf. Ducange, *Familiae Byzantinae*, p. 74; Clinton's *Fasti*, p. 674–676; Gibbon, cap. xxxvi.; Olybrius in *Dict. G. & R. Biog.*) [GENSERIC; EUDOXIA (3).] [G. T. S.]

PLACIDIANUS, a young man descended probably from Furius Placidianus, consul, A.D. 273. Placidianus died under Constantine the Great. His epitaph in the style of Commodian has been recovered from the excavations in the church of St. Agapetus in Palestrina. It is important for its description of the funeral offices, the funeral attended by the bishop and clergy, and its commendation of his soul to St. Agapetus for introduction into Paradise. The basilica is called in it the "Atria Sancti Martyris." The Placidiani probably built the church of St. Agapetus near Praeneste. (De Rossi, *Bullet. Arch. Crist.* 1883, p. 112.) [G. T. S.]

PLACIDUS (1), a friend and admirer of the literary works of Sidonius Apollinaris. See the letter written to him at Grenoble (*Epist.* iii. 14). [S. A. B.]

PLACIDUS (2), mentioned with Euticius, and thirty others as martyred in Sicily, on Oct. 5th, in the Hieronymian Martyrology (PLACITUS) and those of Ado and Usuard. Placidus, son of the patrician Tertullus, was brought as a boy to St. Benedict, at Sublaqueum, where the alleged miracle of his rescue from the lake took place. (Gregorii *Dial.* ii. 3, 7, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxvi. 140, 146.) According to *Acta*, purporting to be written by his companion, Gordianus, he was sent by Benedict to Sicily, founded a monastery at Messina, and suffered there with his brothers, Eutychius and Victorinus, his sister, Flavia, and thirty-three companions. These Acta were, however, not written at the earliest till the time of pope John VIII., A.D. 872, and are full of blunders, e.g. by a monstrous anachronism they attribute the martyrdom to Saracen invaders from Spain. It is probable that the writer started by identifying Placidus the Benedictine with the Placidus or Placitus of the Martyrology, a person of much earlier date, and dressed up a story with incidents from the actual Mahometan invasions of Sicily in the ninth century. Whether any substratum of facts, except those stated by Gregory, underlies the narrative, it seems impossible to decide. (*Acta SS.* Oct. iii. 65; Mabillon, *Ann. Ben.* ii. 3; iii. 2, 25; iv. 14.) [F. D.]

PLACILLUS of Antioch. [FLACILLUS.]

PLATO (1), July 22. Martyr at Ancyra, under a certain Agrippinus. He is only known by a letter of St. Nilus, disciple of Chrysostom; read at the second council of Nice. (*Mart. Rom.*; Ceillier, viii. 224; Ruinart, Pref. xxii.) [G. T. S.]

PLATO (2), 20th bishop of Poitiers (A.D. 592–9), was archdeacon at Tours before his elevation to the episcopate, and suffered with his bishop, Gregory the historian, from the persecution of count Leudastes, even to the extent of being imprisoned and threatened with torture and death (*Hist. Franc.* v. 50). Gregory was present at his installation at Poitiers, as appears from the congratulatory ode composed by Venantius for the occasion (*Misc.* x. 18, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxviii. 342). Nothing is known of his episcopate beyond an anecdote, related by Gregory, of his having saved the church buildings at Poitiers from imminent conflagration by holding up a reliquary containing some dust from the tomb of St. Martin at Tours (*De Mirac. S. Martini.* iv. 32). [S. A. B.]

PLATO (3), (*Πλάτων ὁ τοῦ Σακκουδίωνος ἡγούμενος*), abbat of Saccudion and of Symboleon, and a recluse in Constantinople. He has no *Acta* beyond the *oratio funebris* of Theodorus Studita, translated into Latin by Sirletus, in Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. 4, t. i. 364 sq. with commentary, *ib.* 362–4; Surius, *Vit. SS.* xii. 269, ed. 1618. *Vid.* also Theoph. *Chronog.* A. C. 788, 798, 801, and Theod. Stud. *Epp.* lib. i. epp. 1, 2, 3, 57. About A.D. 735 Plato was born of rich and noble parents in Constantinople, named Sergius and Euphemia. Left an orphan at an early age, he was educated by his uncle, the emperor's treasurer, whom in course of time he assisted in his work. Thus he amassed great wealth, and had every prospect of advancement, but his heart longed for the religious life, and his chief resort was to the churches and monasteries. At last he set free his slaves, sold all his goods, distributed his money among his sisters and the poor, and went to Mount Olympus, in Bithynia, where he became a monk under Theoctistus in the monastery of Symboleon, c. A.D. 758. He became the abbat's assistant, and in A.D. 770 his successor, where he was assiduous in his duties, and specially in making copious extracts from the writings of the fathers. When he afterwards visited Constantinople, he refused the offer of a monastery and of the bishopric of Nicomedia, and returned to his monastery. But when his relatives founded the monastery of Saccudion near Constantinople, he was induced to be its first abbat, A.D. 782, and as such attended the second council of Nice, where we find the signature attesting the Creed, *Πλάτων ἡγούμενος καὶ ἀρχιμανδρίτης Σακκουδεῶν* (Binius, *Conc.* iii. pt. i. p. 598, and sect. post, p. 55). Some time after he fell ill, and, resigning the abbacy in favour of Theodorus his nephew, became a recluse from A.D. 794 to 807. Yet this was probably the most anxious and painful part of his life. When the emperor [CONSTANTINUS VII. PORPHYROGENITUS] divorced his queen Marina and married Theodota, Plato united with his nephew Theodorus in separating from the communion of the patriarch Tarasius and excommunicating the emperor, thereby incurring imprisonment and exile (Baronius, *Annal.* A.D. 795, 42, 45). But his example supported the opposition of the monks, and seemed to excite the pity and favour of the empress Irene, by whom at Constantine's deposition A.D. 797, he was released; he went to Studium and became a monk under Theodorus. When Tarasius died

in 806, the emperor Nicephorus I. consulted, among others, Plato and Theodorus regarding the selection of a successor, but their recommendation was not taken, and the emperor appointed Nicephorus; for refusing all inducements and arguments to approve of the appointment, the two were cast into prison. The emperor then convened a largely attended council, and the aged and decrepit Plato was borne to it on men's shoulders. The marriage of Constantine was declared valid by dispensation, and the two monks were excommunicated and deposed along with all that disallowed the dispensing power. They were banished to separate prisons in the islands near Constantinople, until Michael I. became emperor and the exiles were recalled A.D. 811. In the remaining years of his life he was bed-ridden, but had the pleasure of receiving visits from Nicephorus and others who wished to efface all trace of former wrongs. He died on March 19, A.D. 813, and was buried at Studium on April 4, which is the day of his feast; on that occasion Theodorus pronounced the *oratio funebris* above alluded to (Baronius, A.D. 812, 5 sq.) Two sermons were afterwards delivered by Theodorus (*Bibl. Pat. et Auct. Eul.* ii. 1316, 1347, Nos. 33, 69, Paris 1610) in his memory (Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 775, 795, 808, 809).

[J. G.]

PLENIUS (Πλήνιος, Πλήνης), an Egyptian bishop banished by the Arians in 356 (Athan. *Ap. de Fug.* § 7; *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 72; Tillem. viii. 697). [C. H.]

PLINIUS SECUNDUS. [TRAJANUS.]

PLINTHAS (Πλινθᾶς, PLINTA in Marcellinus), commander of the army in the reign of Theodosius II., and consul in 419. In his time the Arians were torn by dissensions, and he, who belonged to the Psathyrian division of that body, was the means of restoring unity among them. (Soc. v. 23; Soz. vii. 17.) This he did in 419 if it was, as Socrates says it was, in the year of his consulship (κατὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν); but Sozomen says that Plinthas was at the time a consular (ἀνὴρ ὑπατικός). The length of the internal Arian schism (for which these authors are the authority) was thirty-five years, according to both of them; but the Latin version of Socrates gives twenty-five years, as does Cassiodorus (*Hist. Trip.* lib. ix. c. 40), and this shorter period is adopted by Valesius. Valesius deals with another difficulty presented by a passage in the *Chronicon* of Marcellinus Comes, who under the year 418 states that an insurgent count Plinthas was put down in Palestine that year. The chronology is discussed by Tillemont (vi. 632, 803) and by Clinton (*F. R.* i. 596). The latter makes the Arian schism to have begun in 385 and ended in 419. Plinthas is met with again in 431 endeavouring to put Saturninus in possession of the see of Marcianopolis in Moesia, in opposition to Dorotheus (*Synod. adv. Trag. Iren.* c. 46 in Mansi, v. 823; Tillem. xiv. 297, 498). [C. H.]

PLOTINUS, an account of the philosophy of this remarkable man has been given in the article NEOPLATONISM. It will be sufficient here to give those particulars which are known of his life and personal character; in respect of which the biography by Porphyry is almost our sole authority. The very brief notices of him by Eunapius and Suidas add nothing deserving credence to the account by Porphyry, except the assertion that he was born at Lycopolis in Egypt (Sivouth). This may be true, notwithstanding that Porphyry tells us that Plotinus would never disclose his native land, or his race, or the names of his parents. Neither, says Porphyry, would he ever suffer himself to be painted; but a portrait of him was procured by stealth; his friend Amelius bringing the famous painter Carterius to hear his lectures, by whom his features were afterwards delineated from memory. This reluctance of his to have the likeness of his bodily form perpetuated is not surprising in a man who (we are told) blushed to think he had a body. So far did his contempt for his bodily organs go, that he refused to take any remedy for a colic from which he suffered, regarding it as unworthy of an aged man to use means of this kind.

But to revert to the beginning of his life. When he was eight years of age, and already under instruction, he used to suck his nurse's breast (this he himself related to Porphyry); till one day, ashamed by her reproof, he desisted from the practice. At the age of twenty-eight, he devoted himself to philosophy; but could find no satisfaction in any of the recognised teachers, till one day a friend took him to hear Ammonius Saccas; after hearing whose exposition of principles, he cried out, τοῦτον ἐζήτουν, "this is the man I was seeking," and continued without any cessation to attend his school. At the age of thirty-nine, impelled by the desire to learn the philosophy of the Persians and Indians, he accompanied the emperor Gordian in his military expedition against Persia. But Gordian was slain in Mesopotamia, and Plotinus had difficulty in making his way safely back to Antioch. The next year he went to Rome, Philip being then emperor; and he now began to teach. He had some time before made an agreement with two others of the disciples of Ammonius, Herennius and Origen (not the Christian), that they should keep the doctrines of their master secret. But Herennius, and afterwards Origen, broke the compact; after which Plotinus thought himself no longer bound to keep it. Yet even now he confined himself to oral instruction; and we are told that owing to the free permission which he gave his class to put questions to him, there was some lack of order in his lecture room. This Porphyry was told by Amelius, who began to attend the classes in the third year of Philip's reign, and continued to do so for twenty-four years, till the first year of Claudius, second emperor of that name (i.e. A.D. 268). It was about fifteen years previously to this latter date, that Plotinus first began to commit his philosophy to writing. He had written twenty-one books of his Enneads when Porphyry was first introduced to him by Amelius, in the year 262 A.D., and during the six following years (the time during which Porphyry had personal intercourse with him) he wrote twenty-four books more. In the brief remainder of

his life he wrote nine more books which he sent to Porphyry. Porphyry regards the twenty-four books of the middle period as the finest of the works of Plotinus; he thinks them perfect, except in a few passages.

Plotinus died in the second year of Claudius II., or A.D. 269. It was in a time of pestilence, but he does not appear to have died of the pestilence; his malady was a quinsy, complicated by weakness of sight (to which, to some extent, he was always liable), and ulcers on his hands and feet. This illness was brought on through the want of that attendance to which he was accustomed. He had never used baths; but his servants had been used to rub him every day, and these had now died of the pestilence. Finding that his illness grew worse through his inability to resist conversation with his friends, he retired to Campania, to a house which had belonged to his old friend Zethus, an Arabian physician, now deceased. His friend Eustochius alone was present at the death of the philosopher; to him Plotinus said shortly before his last moment, "I have been expecting you; now I seek to reunite the divine part of myself with the divine principle that is in nature." As he died, a dragon (or serpent) that had been under his bed glided through a hole in the wall and disappeared. He had completed his sixty-sixth year; he would, however, never tell his birthday, being unwilling that it should be celebrated with feasts or sacrifices. Yet he himself celebrated the birthdays of Plato and Socrates with such ceremonies, and also with recitations, probably in praise of those philosophers.

The names of several of the disciples of Plotinus (besides those above named), both men and women, are given by Porphyry. Plotinus appears to have inculcated on them that abstinence from politics which he himself invariably practised; but in two cases, we are told, unsuccessfully; Zethus the physician, and Castricius Firmus (who discharged towards Plotinus the duties of an intimate attendant) continued to engage in public affairs. It is, however, very notable that Plotinus himself requested the emperor Gallienus, to restore one of the ruined cities of Campania, to rename it Platonopolis, and arrange for its government according to the laws of Plato. This design, says Porphyry, would have been carried out if it had not been frustrated by private jealousy. We may suspect that there were other obstacles. Yet it is certain that Plotinus was very highly esteemed; for many well-born persons, both men and women, in their dying moments appointed him guardian of their children; and hence his house became full of young boys and girls; a curious picture of the home of a philosopher! He is said to have managed their pecuniary affairs carefully.

Plotinus had bad eyesight; and for this reason, and also because he composed with extraordinary ease, he never revised what he had written once. Whether any amount of revision could have made his writings easy to understand, is to be doubted; the character of his philosophy, so totally divorced from practical life, made it intrinsically lacking in points of tangible clearness. His slips in orthography, which Porphyry commemorates, do not affect his modern readers. His demeanour, while he was lecturing, is characterised as full of a mild and radiant enthusiasm.

Porphyry relates various instances of the spiritual power of Plotinus. Some are not very edifying; as when an Egyptian priest, who had determined to astonish Plotinus by an exhibition of a demon, was himself astonished to find that a god, of an order superior to the demons, responded to the summons; or when Olympius, the enemy of Plotinus, found that the magical charms with which he sought to injure Plotinus recoiled upon himself—a result which Plotinus himself announced to his friends at the moment it was happening. A more certain as well as a more satisfactory instance of the good feeling as well as the perspicacity of Plotinus lay in his detecting an intention of Porphyry to commit suicide, and successfully dissuading him from it. Porphyry followed the advice of Plotinus and travelled; he was cured of his melancholy, but lost the satisfaction of staying with Plotinus till the death of the philosopher. When we read that the senator Rogatianus, in his zeal for the doctrines of Plotinus, abandoned not only his luxurious habits, but also his praetorial duties, and thereby became cured of severe and long-standing gout, we cannot but admire such a result of temperance and philosophy, but we must wonder how the city of Rome fared while the office of praetor was practically in abeyance.

Plotinus was, as far as we can judge, very far from mixing himself up with the heathen religion in the way habitual to the later Neoplatonists. This appears not only from the absence of reference to it in his writings, but from the anecdote related to us by Porphyry; that when Amelius, who was a strict observer of religious ceremonies, and paid especial regard to the feast of the new moon, requested Plotinus to assist in such a ceremony, Plotinus answered, "Those gods of yours must come to me, not I to them." Porphyry and his friends did not comprehend, and did not dare to ask the reason of so bold an answer; but it is sufficiently intelligible. It may be observed, that though Plotinus was certainly not a Christian, some of the Christian bias which was implicated with the origin of the Neoplatonic philosophy appears in this answer. Plotinus nowhere mentions Christianity; but the Gnostics, whom he attacks (Ennead ii. 9), were in some cases Christian Gnostics.

The fifty-one hexameters which the Delphic oracle returned as answer to Amelius, who had inquired after the death of Plotinus whither the soul of his master and friend had gone, and received hence the intelligence that he was partaker of immortality with the blest, will scarcely influence modern readers so much as the esteem in which the eminent critic Longinus held the philosopher. Longinus indeed appears in the interesting character of being at once an admirer and a philosophical opponent of Plotinus; at first, judging from hearsay, he had altogether despised him, and even to the end failed to understand many of his speculations; but he nevertheless writes to Porphyry that "he loved and reverenced beyond measure the manner of the writing of Plotinus," that the books of Plotinus were "most excellent;" and

he was most anxious to procure trustworthy copies of them. [LONGINUS.]

On the whole, Plotinus, in so far as we have records of him, was in his personal character one of the purest and most pleasing of all philosophers, ancient or modern; and his philosophy, though its defect on the practical side must ever prevent its exercising a commanding influence, is yet by no means without a true fervour and inspiration.

The best edition of Plotinus is probably still that by Dr. F. Creuzer (professor at Heidelberg) which was published at Oxford in 1835, 3 vols. 4to. An edition by Kirchhoff was published at Leipsic in 1856. Translations of various parts of the writings of Plotinus were published by Thomas Taylor, London, 1834. The French translation by Bouillet, Paris, 1857, may be recommended; it contains much information. The histories of the Alexandrian school of philosophy by Vacherot and Jules Simon, the last volume of Zeller's *Philosophie der Griechen*, the work of Kirchner, *Die Philosophie des Plotin* (Halle, 1854, 8vo), and the article on PLOTINUS in the Dictionary of *Greek and Roman Biography*, may also be consulted. Quite recently (1882 and 1883) studies on Plotinus have been written by H. F. Müller (Berlin) and Hugo von Kleist (Heidelberg). But the most elaborate and enthusiastic work on Plotinus is probably the set of essays by Arthur Richter, *Neuplatonische Studien: Darstellung des Lebens und der Philosophie des Plotins* (Halle, 1867). Richter supplies us with the following tribute to Plotinus by St. Augustine, with which the present article may fitly end: "Osque illud Platonis, quod in philosophiâ purgatissimum est et lucidissimum, dimotis nubibus erroris, emicuit, maxime in Plotino, qui Platonicus philosophus ita ejus similis judicatus est, ut ... in hoc ille revixisse putandus sit."—*De Civitate Dei*, viii. 12. [J. R. M.]

PLUSIANUS (Πλουσιανός), a Meletian bishop reconciled to the church (Athanas. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 69; Tillem. viii. 658, 664). [C. H.]

PLUTARCHUS, June 28. Martyr at Alexandria with Potamiaena and others in the persecution of Severus. He was converted by Origen, and was brother to Heraclas, afterwards bishop of Alexandria, in succession to Demetrius. (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 3, 4, 5.) [G. T. S.]

PNEUMATOMACHI [HOLY GHOST, p. 121.]

PODDA, the sixth bishop of Hereford. He succeeded Cuthbert on his election to the see of Canterbury, in the year 741 (*M.H.B.* 621; Flor. Wig. ad ann. 741; ib. 543). He was present with the other two Mercian bishops at the great council of Clovesho in 747 (*Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 362; Will. Malmesb. *G.P.* i. § 5). His successor Hecca appears first in a charter of 758. The date assigned in some MSS. of Florence of Worcester (*M.H.B.* 546) for Podda's death, A.D. 786 is a mere matter of calculation. [S.]

POEMEN (1), (Ποιμήν, PASTOR), Aug. 27, a famous anchorite of Egypt. He retired when very young into the monasteries of Scete, about the year 390, and continued there seventy years, dying about 460. He had five brothers, solitaries like himself, two of whom were ANUPH and Paësius (Cotel. i. 586; Tillem. xi. 449). His life occupies much space in Rosweyd's *Vitae Patrum*, v. 15, in *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii., and in Cotelerii *Monum. Eccl. Graec.*, t. i. pp. 585–637. The anecdotes told in the last-mentioned authority give the best idea of the man. He treated his aged mother with neglect, refusing to see her when she sought him. His solitary life destroyed all feelings of human nature. On one occasion some presbyters came to visit the solitaries, commissioned we suppose by the bishop to see after their spiritual life. Paësius came to Poemen and proposed to entertain them, but could extract no answer from him. Paësius thereupon waxed wroth and demanded a reply, when Poemen opened his mouth and replied, "I am a dead man, a dead man does not speak." The governor of the province desired on another occasion to see a man so famous for sanctity. He could devise no other plan than that of arresting Poemen's nephew, his sister's only son. He announced that he would put him to death unless Poemen came and sought his release. His sister besought him to free her son, but all in vain. "He had no children and no trouble," and therefore would not trouble himself about her son. The governor thereupon volunteered to release him if Poemen simply asked the favour. But he would not take even this step, but said, "If the youth has deserved death, let him suffer it. If not let the governor release him." The life of Poemen was however considered a marvel of divine grace, as the Greeks in their office for August 27, describe him as "the light of the universe and the model for monks." His story is concisely told in Ceillier, viii. 468–470, and Till. *Mém.* xv. 147. In the *Vitae Patrum*, iii. 19, Poemen tells a story which shows how these Egyptian solitaries scattered themselves over the world. One took up his abode near Constantinople, where the emperor Theodosius II. visited and consulted him. After the imperial visit he fled back into Egypt, fearful of the notoriety he had obtained. [G. T. S.]

POEMEN (2), one of the three "wretched Egyptian bishops" (ἐλεεινοὶ ἐπίσκοποι) sent by Theophilus to Constantinople with the canon of Antioch forbidding the restoration of a deposed bishop, this canon being intended to be used as a weapon against Chrysostom. (Pallad. p. 76.) [E. V.]

POEMENIUS (1), a presbyter of Sebaste, who vehemently opposed Basil at the synod at Sebaste in 372 (Basil, *Ep.* 99 [187.]) [E. V.]

POEMENIUS (2), bishop of Satala in Armenia, a near relation of Basil, who had been brought up with him, and with whom he lived in close intimacy. In 372, in obedience to the imperial mandate to appoint bishops for Armenia and to the earnest entreaties of the people, Basil disregarding his own convenience, Poemenius's own wishes, and the lamentations of his widowed mother, and the people of Caesarea, by whom he was highly esteemed, appointed him to the see of Satala, which had been for a long time without a bishop. Basil earnestly commended his friend to the good offices of his new flock in a

letter sent by Nicias (Basil, *Epp.* 102 [183]; 99 [187]). The following year, 373, Basil wrote to Poemenius on the subject of Faustus's irregular ordination to an Armenian see by Anthimus [ANTHIMUS, Vol. I. p. 119 b], stating that he declined to admit Faustus to communion until he had received a testimony to his character and conduct from Poemenius. Basil wrote again to him in 375, warmly commending the promptitude of his action in translating Euphronius from Colonia to Nicopolis (*Ep.* 122 [313]; EUPHRONIUS, (2), Vol. II. p. 297 a). [E. V.]

POETRY, SACRED. [VERSE WRITERS.]

POLEMIUS (1) (Πολέμιος), a disciple of Apollinaris and a founder of a branch of his sect, teaching that in the person of Christ, there was a combination of substance (συνουσίωσις), and a mixing (κρᾶσις) of the divine and bodily natures. [SYNUSIASTÆ.] (Theod. *Haer. Fab.* iv. 9; Tillem. vii. 605, 631.) [C. H.]

POLEMIUS (2), a prefect of Gaul in the 5th century, descended from Tacitus the historian and Ausonius the poet. A letter addressed to him by his friend Sidonius Apollinaris survives (iv. 14). Sidonius also addresses an epithalamium to him and his wife Araneola (Carm. xiv. xv., with prefatory Epistle; Tillem. xvi. 262, 263). [S. A. B.]

POLEMIUS (3), bishop of Astorga, attended the second council of Braga in A.D. 572. It was to him that MARTINUS (2) of Braga addressed his sermon *de Correctione Rusticorum.* (*Esp. Sag.* xvi. 108; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 631.) [F. D.]

POLEMO (1) (Πολέμων), an Apollinarist, who wrote against Gregory Nazianzen (Phot. *Cod.* 230 in *Pat. Gr.* ciii. 1045; Tillem. ix. 518). [C. H.]

POLEMO (2), bishop of Myra, who when presbyter of that church is named by Basil among those who desired to separate themselves from the bishops of Asia and unite themselves to him (Basil, *Ep.* 218 [403]). As bishop he attended the Council of Constantinople in 381 (Labbe, i. 665). [E. V.]

POLEMO (3), Neocorus of Smyrna. He conducted the preliminary examination of St. Pionius and his companions, but had no power of life and death, as he acknowledges in cap. x. of the Acta Pionii. (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* p. 124.) On the office of Neocorus, see Le Bas and Waddington's *Asia Minor*, t. iii. p. 63. [G. T. S.]

POLIANUS, bishop of the colony of Milev, (Mileum, or Milevum), colonia Sarnensis Milevitana (the see of Optatus) in Numidia, near Cirta, hod. *Mila.*—Sent. 13. Episcopor. in Syn. Carth. de Bap. 3. Ep. 70—one of the eight with NEMESIAN, q.v.—To subscription of Ep. 79, is added "Polianus legi." [E. W. B.]

POLITIANUS, Melchite patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 780 (Pagi). Being a physician he healed a daughter of the caliph Haroun al Raschid, and thus brought about a temporary reaction in favour of the orthodox or Melchite party. The Jacobites, however, soon regained their ancient superiority. Eutychius in his *Annal.* fixes his death at A.D. 801, and the duration of his episcopate at forty-six years. Politianus is called Balatianus by this last-mentioned writer. He was represented in the 2nd Nicene council by the monks John and Thomas (Mansi, xiii. 624). (Le Quien, ii. xvii. 462; Renaudot, *Hist. Pat. Alexand.* 240; Neale, ii. 128–136.) [G. T. S.]

POLLENTIUS, a friend of St. Augustine, known through the treatise of St. Augustine, *De Conjugiis Adulterinis*, in two books. i. In his discourse on the Sermon on the Mount, then some years old, St. Augustine had given his opinion, that women who leave their husbands on account of their unfaithfulness to them ought not to be allowed to marry again, in order to give an opportunity of return, and shews that St. Paul added a necessary rider or condition to our Lord's command in this respect, viz. that this prohibition is meant to extend only to the lifetime of each party respectively (*Serm. de Serm. Dom. in Mont.* i. 14, 39, see Matt. v. 31, xix. 7, 8; 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11). With this opinion Pollentius disagreed, thinking that St. Paul's meaning is to prohibit re-marriage only to women who leave their husbands for other reasons than that of unfaithfulness; but St. Augustine points out that, except for this cause on the part of the wives, they ought not to leave their husbands at all, much less be allowed to marry again. For if this liberty were allowed on both sides a cause of divorce might on the plea of continence be created leading to re-marriage. Thus, says St. Augustine, where no fornication has been committed on either side, three courses are open both to husband and to wife. 1. To remain with each other. 2. To separate, but continue unmarried. 3. If separated, to return to each other. He then condemns any separation for the sake of continence except by mutual consent, and refutes the opinion of Pollentius that the reason why a woman, leaving her husband when he is unfaithful to her, is forbidden to marry is only in order to save her from reproach, and shews that his view of the divine precept leads to separation, even without the cause of unfaithfulness on either side. Again Pollentius thought that it is not lawful for Christians to put away wives who are not Christians, and that a Christian widow or widower ought not to marry any one but a Christian. St. Augustine thinks that, on the principle laid down by St. Paul, these things are lawful but not expedient; that a man who repudiates his wife for unfaithfulness, and marries another in order to make her a Christian, is guilty of adultery, and that those who make vows of continence, and wish to break them on a similar plea, are guilty of grievous sin. He concludes by saying that nothing can be expedient which is not lawful, nor can anything be lawful which the Lord forbids. But Pollentius propounds another very difficult question as to the meaning of St. Paul's advice respecting a widow marrying, when he says, "only in the Lord," and which may be understood in two ways, (*a*) remaining a Christian, (*b*) marrying a Christian. Nowhere, St. Augustine says, does Scr. forbid Christians to marry persons who are not Christians; and though St. Cyprian was distinctly opposed to this, what

does St. Paul say? see 1 Cor. vii. 12–39. It seems therefore to be lawful to do this, but not expedient. Pollentius appears also to have put another question as to baptizing catechumens at the point of death without any request for baptism on their part, perhaps for inability on their part to do so. St. Augustine thinks that such cases may be treated like those of infants; that it is better to give what is not refused than to refuse what is requested, and that it is permissible to do this even for married persons living in adulterous connection with others, either in hope that if they recover they may repent and amend their lives, or that if they do not this sin may with the rest be blotted out in their baptism; for the church ought not to be willing to let them depart without an earnest at least of peace on their behalf. ii. Since addressing his questions to St. Augustine, Pollentius put together some more to which he wished him to reply, and St. Augustine would have included his replies in his former book, but that in compliance with the importunity of his friends it had been already published, and he was now in consequence obliged to put forth a second. Pollentius suggested that "dead" (1 Cor. vii. 39) means guilty of adultery, and that consequently a woman who left her husband or a husband his wife for this cause, was at liberty to marry again. St. Augustine replies that if fornication is to be regarded as equivalent to death, and if a wife is tied to her husband as long as he lives, the commission of this act would at once set free either husband or wife, and enable them to marry some one else. He proceeds to speak of the iniquity of husbands guilty of adultery who sought to punish their wives for similar conduct, and to pronounce an eloquent eulogy on the law of Antoninus which, extending the operation of the Julian law, enacted equal punishment on this offence for both husband and wife (Baron. ann. 161. ii.; see also Digest. xlviii. 8. Tit. v. 13. 2). He also replies to other difficulties arising out of the view taken by Pollentius, and states his own opinion as to the true purpose of matrimony in which his influence upon the composition of the Anglican marriage-service may perhaps be traced (lib. ii. 12, 12; see *Serm.* li. 22). [H. W. P.]

POLLIO (1) (Polius, Publius, according to the Greek Menaea), proconsul of Pamphylia, under whom Nestor of Side or Magyda, Feb. 26, suffered in the Decian persecution. [Nestor.] See Acts of Nestor by Aubé, *Rev. Arch.* April, 1884, p. 219. [G. T. S.]

POLLIO (2), April 28, lector; martyr, by fire, at Abalis, an episcopal city in Pannonia, about A.D. 304, under a president named Probus. [Irenaeus (3).] (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* p. 435. Le Blant, *Les Actes des Martyrs*, p. 72.) [G. T. S.]

POLLUX (Πολυδεύκης), a Libyan bishop ordained by the deposed bishop Secundus of Ptolemais, and accused of some offence (Athan. *De Synod.* § 12). [C. H.]

POLYBIUS (1), bishop of Tralles (Ignat. *ad Trall.* 1). [G. S.]

POLYBIUS (2), a lay friend of Chrysostom's at Constantinople, to whom he wrote after his arrival at Cucusus in 404 (Chrys. *Ep.* 43); and again in 406 from Arabissus (*Ep.* 127). The second letter contains a moving description of the perpetual panic caused by the incursions of the Isaurians. [E. V.]

POLYBIUS (3), fabulous bishop of Rhinocorura, to whom is ascribed the life of Epiphanius prefixed to his works; see Migne, *P. G.* t. xli col. 63, 73. Tillemont (x. 802, 804) points out the absurdities of his story and pretended writings. Polybius claims to have been a contemporary of Epiphanius, cf. cap. lxvii. of the life. [G. T. S.]

POLYCARPUS (1), bishop of Smyrna, one of the most prominent figures in the church history of the second century. He owes this prominence less to intellectual ability, in which he does not appear to have been pre-eminent, than to the influence gained by a consistent and unusually long life. Born some thirty years before the end of the first century, and raised to the episcopate, as it would seem, in early manhood, he held his office to the age of eighty-six or more. He claimed to have himself known at least one apostle, and must in early life have met many who could tell of things they had heard from actual disciples of our Lord. The younger generation then into which Polycarp lived on, naturally recognised him as a source of peculiarly trustworthy information concerning the first age of the Church. During the later years of his life Gnostic speculation had become very active, and many things unknown to the faith of ordinary Christians were put forth as derived by secret traditions from the apostles. In the face of such pretensions it was a matter of course that high value should be attached to the witness Polycarp was able to give to the genuine tradition of apostolic doctrine, his testimony condemning as offensive novelties the figments of the heretical teachers. Irenaeus states (iii. 3) that on the occasion of Polycarp's visit to Rome this testimony of his was the means of converting many disciples of Marcion and Valentinus. And Polycarp crowned his other services to the church by a glorious martyrdom. When he was now at the extremity of human life, and it seemed as if he could do no more for the church than by the pattern he had already set of holiness, piety, and orthodoxy, a persecution broke out in which his position as the venerated head of the Christian community in Asia Minor marked him out for special attack. He gave then a noble exhibition of calm courage, neither courting nor fearing martyrdom, sheltering himself by concealment while concealment was possible, and when it was no longer so, resolutely declaring in defiance of threats his unshaken love to the master he had served so long. Such a death, following on such a life, made Polycarp's the most illustrious name of his generation in the Christian annals.

Irenaeus states (III. iii. 4) that Polycarp had not only been instructed by apostles and conversed with many who had seen Christ, but had also been established "by apostles" as bishop in the church at Smyrna; and we cannot doubt that Tertullian (*De Praescrip.* 32) is right in understanding this to mean that he had been so estab-

lished by St. John, whose activity in founding the episcopate of Asia Minor is spoken of also by Clem. Alex. in his well-known story of St. John and the robber (*Quis div. salv.* p. 959). The testimony of Irenaeus is conclusive evidence as to the current belief in Asia Minor during the old age of Polycarp, and if we have any hesitation in accepting that belief as decisively establishing the fact, it is only because in the case of one so venerated and whose episcopate had lasted so long, the known fact that he had been a hearer of St. John would under any circumstances be likely to receive the addition that he had been made bishop by John. In any case we count it as certain that Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna at the time of the martyrdom of Ignatius, i.e. somewhere about A.D. 110. Ignatius on his journey from Antioch to Rome made his first halt at Smyrna, where, as at his other resting-places, the Christians flocked to him from all the neighbourhood to receive his counsels and to bestow attentions on him. From the city where he next halted he wrote back in separate letters to the church of Smyrna and to Polycarp its bishop. A later stage of his journey was Philippi, to the church of which city Polycarp some time after wrote a letter still extant, sending them copies of the letters of Ignatius, and enquiring if they could give him information about Ignatius, the detailed story of whose martyrdom appears not yet to have reached Smyrna.

The question concerning the genuineness of the extant epistle of Polycarp is very much mixed up with the question concerning the genuineness of the Ignatian letters. The two bear witness to each other, the letter of Polycarp, as has been said, speaking of letters written by Ignatius, and the Ignatian letters containing directions that letters should be written by Polycarp. The theory then that the Ignatian letters were a forgery, naturally received as a necessary complement the addition that Polycarp's letter is also a forgery, proceeding from the same workshop and intended to help on the success of the Ignatian imposture. However, the course of modern investigation has been decidedly favourable to the genuineness of the Ignatian letters (see the article IGNATIUS, Vol. III. 209), while the epistle of Polycarp is guaranteed by external testimony of exceptional goodness. It is mentioned by Polycarp's disciple Irenaeus (III. iii. 4), and an important passage, of which we shall speak presently, is quoted by Eusebius. Further, as Lightfoot has conclusively pointed out (*Contemp. Rev.* May 1875, p. 840), it may confidently be pronounced impossible that Polycarp's letter and those of Ignatius could have had any common authorship. Some of the topics on which the Ignatian letters lay most stress are absent from that of Polycarp; in particular, Polycarp's letter is silent about episcopacy, of which the Ignatian letters speak so much, and it has consequently been thought probable either that episcopacy had not yet been organised at Philippi, or that the office was vacant at the time. The forms of expression in the two letters are different; New Testament quotations, which are profuse in Polycarp's letters, are comparatively scanty in the Ignatian; and, most decisive of all, the Ignatian letters are characterised by great originality of thought and expression while Polycarp's is but a commonplace echo of the apostolic epistles. And when we compare Polycarp's letter with the extant remains of the age of Irenaeus, the superior antiquity of the former is evident, whether we attend to their use of the New Testament, their notices of ecclesiastical organisation, their statements of theological doctrine, or observe the silence in Polycarp's letter on the questions which most interested the church towards the close of the second century. The question has been raised whether, admitting the genuineness of Polycarp's epistle as a whole, we may not reject as an interpolation chap. xiii. which speaks of Ignatius. The extant MSS. of Polycarp's letter are derived from one in which leaves were wanting, containing the end of Polycarp's letter and the beginning of that of Barnabas, so that the remaining part of Barnabas seemed to be the continuation of Polycarp's epistle. The concluding chapters of Polycarp are therefore only known to us by a Latin translation.[a] But the hiatus in the Greek text begins not at chap. xiii. but at chap. x.; and the part which speaks about Ignatius is exactly that for which we have the Greek text assured to us by the quotation of Eusebius. There is therefore absolutely no reason for rejecting chap. xiii. unless on the supposition, that the forgery of the Ignatian letters has been demonstrated.

It has been already stated that Polycarp's epistle is remarkable for its copious use of New Testament language, but there are no formal quotations, except that the fact is mentioned that Paul had written to the church of Philippi to which Polycarp's epistle is addressed. The language in which Paul's letters are spoken of, both here and in the epistles of Ignatius, is decisive refutation of the theory, that there was opposition between the school of John and of Paul. It illustrates the small solicitude of Eusebius to produce testimony to the use of the New Testament books undisputed in his time, that though he takes notice (iv. 14) of the use made by Polycarp of St. Peter's first epistle, he passes over in silence this express mention of Paul's letters. Polycarp's Pauline quotations include distinct recognition of the epistles most assailed by modern criticism, viz. that to the Ephesians and the two to Timothy. There are besides passages clearly shewing a use of Rom., 1 Cor., Gal., Phil., 2 Thess. The employment of 1 Peter is especially frequent and may well have arrested the attention of Eusebius. There is one unmistakable coincidence with the Acts. The use of 1 and 2 John is probable. The report of our Lord's sayings agrees in substance with our gospels, but may or may not have been directly taken from them. The coincidences with Clement's epistle are beyond what can fairly be set down as accidental, and in fact it seems to me likely that it was the celebrity gained by Clement's epistle which set the example to bishops elsewhere of writing to foreign churches. Polycarp states, however, that his own letter had been invited by the church of Philippi. Some church use of Polycarp's epistle would seem to have continued in Asia down to the time of Jerome; if we can lay stress on his rather

[a] Zahn in his edition of Polycarp runs the risk of misleading a hasty reader by printing in his Greek text, though with the protection of brackets, his own restoration of those chapters.

obscure expression (*Catal.*) "epistolam quae usque hodie in conventu Asiae legitur." The chief difference between Clement's and Polycarp's letters is in the use of the Old Testament, which is perpetual in the former, very rare in the latter. There is coincidence with one passage in the book of Tobit, two in the Psalms, and one in Isaiah; and certainly in one of the last three cases, possibly in all three, the adopted words are not taken directly from the Old Testament, but from the New. This difference, however, is explained when we bear in mind that Clement had in all probability been brought up in Judaism; Polycarp, on the contrary, was the child of Christian parents and familiar with the apostolic writings from his youth.

Our knowledge of the life of Polycarp between the date of his letter and his martyrdom is almost entirely derived from three notices by Irenaeus. The first is contained in his letter to Florinus, on which see the articles FLORINUS (II. 544), and IRENAEUS (III. 254); the second is in the treatise on Heresies, III. iii. 4; the third is the letter of Irenaeus to Victor, of which a portion is preserved by Eusebius, v. 24. Irenaeus, writing in advanced life, tells how vivid his recollections still were of having in his youth been a hearer of Polycarp, then an old man; how well he remembered the place where the aged bishop used to sit, his personal appearance, his ways of going out and coming in, and how frequently he used to relate his intercourse with John and others who had seen our Lord, and to repeat stories of our Lord's miracles and teaching all in complete accordance with the written record. One characteristic of the reminiscences of Irenaeus, in which they are in striking agreement with Polycarp's extant letter, is the picture they present of his attitude towards heresy. He does not appear to have had the qualifications for successfully conducting a controversial discussion with erroneous teachers, nor perhaps to have had the capacity for feeling the difficulties which prompted their speculations, but he could not help strongly feeling how unlike these speculations were to the doctrines which he had learned from apostles and their immediate disciples, and so he met with indignant reprobation their attempt to supersede Christ's gospel by fictions of their own devising. Irenaeus tells how, when he heard their impiety, he would stop his ears and cry out, "O, good God! for what times hast thou kept me that I should endure such things!" and would even flee from the place where he was sitting or standing when he heard such words. In so behaving he claimed to act in the spirit of his master, John, concerning whom he told that once when he went to take a bath in Ephesus and saw Cerinthus within he rushed away without bathing, crying out, "Let us flee, lest the bath should fall in, for Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is within." And on one occasion when Marcion meeting Polycarp asked him, "Do you recognise us?" he answered, "I recognise thee as the first-born of Satan."

This last phrase is found in the extant letter. He says, "Every one who doth not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is antichrist; and whosoever doth not confess the testimony of the Cross is of the devil; and whosoever perverteth the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts and saith that there is neither resurrection not judgment, this man is a first-born of Satan." This coincidence between the anecdote and the letter has, not very reasonably, been taken as a note of spuriousness of the latter; the idea being that a writer under the name of Polycarp who employs a phrase traditionally known as Polycarp's betrays himself as a forger striving to gain acceptance for his production. It might rather have been supposed that a coincidence between two independent accounts of Polycarp's mode of speaking of heretics ought to increase the credibility of both; but even if we admit that one who once used such a phrase as "first-born of Satan," was incapable of using it a second time, and that we therefore cannot accept both the anecdote and the letter, it is the former which in that case we must reject. Irenaeus who reports it was acquainted with the letter, and it is conceivable that his recollection of it may have coloured his version of the story he was repeating.

One of the latest incidents in the active life of Polycarp was a journey which, near the close of his episcopate, he made to Rome, where Anicetus was then bishop. We are not told whether the cause of the journey was to settle points of difference between Roman and Asiatic practice; but points of difference we are told they had, which however were not allowed to interrupt their mutual accord. In particular Asiatic Quartodecimanism was at variance with Roman usage. We cannot say with certainty what kind of Easter observance was used at Rome in the time of Anicetus, for the language of Irenaeus implies that it was not then what it afterwards became; but it is certain that the Asiatic observance of the 14th day had been unknown in Rome, and that although Polycarp averred the practice of his church to have had the sanction of John and of other apostles, and therefore to be what he could by no means consent to change, Anicetus was equally determined not to introduce into his church an innovation on the practice of his predecessors. Yet this difference was not allowed to disturb their mutual communion, and Anicetus, we are told, shewed his reverence for his aged visitor by "yielding to him the eucharist in his church." This phrase seems capable of no other interpretation than that generally given to it, viz. that Anicetus permitted Polycarp to celebrate in his presence. This suggests the interesting question in what language did Polycarp celebrate? and what was at the time the habitual liturgical language of the church of Rome?

We come now to the martyrdom of Polycarp, the story of which is told in a letter still extant, purporting to be addressed by the church of Smyrna to the church sojourning (παροικούσῃ) in Philomelium (a town of Phrygia), and to all the παροικίαι of the holy Catholic Church in every place. This document was known to Eusebius, who has transcribed the greater part of it in his *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 15. The occurrence of the phrase "Catholic Church" which we have just quoted, has been regarded as a note of spuriousness; but not very reasonably, in the absence of evidence to make it even probable that the introduction of this phrase was later than the death of Polycarp. All we know for certain is that the phrase is very early. It is

used in the Ignatian letters (*Smyrn.* 8), by Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* vii. 17), in the Muratorian fragment, by Hippolytus, *Ref.* ix. 12, and by Tertullian. Remembering what we have already remarked as to the warfare waged by Polycarp against heresy, we know not why it should be imagined that in his lifetime the need could not yet have arisen for a name to distinguish the main Christian body from the various separatists. To us the whole narrative of the martyrdom appears so plainly to bear the stamp of a story told by an eye-witness, that to imagine, as Lipsius and Keim have done, that some one was capable of inventing it a century after the death of Polycarp, seems to require a great stretch of critical credulity. In our acceptance of the martyrdom as authentic Hilgenfeld coincides (*Zeitschrift*, 1874, p. 334), and Renan (*Église Chrét.* 462). We see no good reason for doubting that the narrative was written, as it professes to be, within a year of the martyrdom, by members of the church where it occurred, and who had actually witnessed it; and we believe it to have been written with the special object of inviting members of other churches to attend at the commemoration held on the anniversary of the martyrdom. The narrative has been rejected because it is deeply tinged by a belief in the supernatural; but when the question is not as to the occurrence of a fact, but as to the genuineness of a document, it is uncritical to assume that Christians of the 2nd century, under the strain of a great persecution, must have held exactly the same views as their 19th century critic, with regard to the possibility of their receiving supernatural aid or consolation.

The story relates that Polycarp's martyrdom was the last act of a great persecution, which took place on the occasion of games held at Smyrna, and in which eleven others had suffered before him. In all probability these games were held in connection with the meeting of the Asiatic diet (τὸ κοινὸν τῆς 'Ασίας), which met in rotation in the principal cities of the province.[b] If more information should come to light as to this rotation, and as to the seasons when these meetings were held, it is likely we should be able to fix the date of Polycarp's martyrdom with more certainty. The proconsul came from Ephesus, the ordinary seat of government, in order to preside. It may have been in order to provide the necessary victims for the wild beast shows that the Christians were sought for (some were brought from Philadelphia) and were required to take part in the imperial cultus of the season, by swearing by the fortune of the emperor and offering sacrifice. The proconsul appears to have discharged his unpleasant duty with the humanity ordinary among Roman magistrates, doing his best to persuade the accused to save themselves by compliance, and no doubt employing the tortures, of which the narrative gives a terrible account, as a merciful cruelty which might avert the necessity of proceeding to the last extremities. In one case his persuasion was successful. Quintus, a Phrygian by nation, who had of his own accord presented himself for martyrdom, on sight of the wild beasts lost courage and yielded to the proconsul's entreaties not to throw away his life. The Christians learned from his case to condemn the wanton courting of danger as contrary to the teaching of the gospel. The proconsul lavished similar entreaties on a youth named Germanicus, but the lad was all the more resolute in his resistance, and instead of showing fear of the wild beast to which he was exposed, provoked it in order to gain a speedier release from his persecutors. The act may have been suggested by the language of Ignatius (*Rom.* v. 2); and certainly this language seems to have been present to the mind of the narrator of the story.

At sight of the bravery of Germanicus, a conviction seems to have seized the multitude that they had wrongly chosen their victim, and that the guilt most deserving of punishment was that of the teacher who had inspired the sufferers with their obstinacy. A cry was raised "Away with the atheists! Let Polycarp be sought for!" Polycarp's own wish had been to remain at his post, but he yielded to the solicitations of his people and retired for concealment to a country house, where he spent his time, as was his wont, in continual prayer, not for himself and his own people only, but for all the churches throughout the world. Three days before his apprehension he saw in a vision his pillow on fire, and at once interpreted the omen to his friends: "I must be burnt alive." The search for him being hot, he retired to another farm barely in time to escape his pursuers. But they seized two of the slave boys and put them to torture, under which one of them betrayed the new place of retreat. It was late on a Friday night when the noise of horses and armed men announced to Polycarp's party that the pursuers were at hand. There seemed still the possibility of escape, and they urged him to make the attempt, but he refused, saying "God's will be done." Coming down from the upper room, where he had been lying down, he ordered meat and drink to be set before his captors, and only begged that before he was carried off he might be allowed an hour for uninterrupted prayer. This was granted him; and for more than two hours he prayed, making mention by name of every one whom he had known, small or great; and besides for the whole Catholic Church throughout the world. At length the time for departure came, and he was set on an ass and conducted to the city. Soon they met the irenarch Herod, the police magistrate under whose directions the arrest had been made, in whose name the Christians afterwards found one of several coincidences which they found pleasure in tracing between the arrest of Polycarp and that of his Master.[c] Herod, who was accompanied by his father Nicetes, took Polycarp up to sit with them in their carriage, and both earnestly urged him to save his life: "Why, what harm was it to say Lord Caesar, and to sacrifice, and so on, and escape all danger?" Polycarp at first was silent; at last he bluntly answered, "I will not do as you would have me." When their persuasion

---

[b] On these provincial councils, see Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 503 sqq. and on the office of Asiarch, *ib.* p. 523.

[c] A most absurd suspicion has hence been suggested, that the story was invented in order to exhibit such coincidences. If this were so, Polycarp would surely have been made to suffer on Friday, not Saturday.

availed nothing, disgusted at the old man's obstinacy, they thrust him out of the carriage so rudely that he scraped his shin, the marks no doubt being visible to his friends when he afterwards stripped for the stake. But at the time he took no notice of the hurt, and walked on as if nothing had happened. When the party reached the racecourse, where the multitude was assembled, there was a prodigious uproar; but amid the din the Christians could distinguish a voice which cried as Polycarp went in, "Be strong, Polycarp, and play the man!" [d] Under the protection of the tumult the speaker remained undiscovered; and the Christians believed that the voice had come from heaven. After the formal preliminary interrogatories, the proconsul pressed Polycarp to have pity on his old age: "Swear by the fortune of Caesar, say 'Away with the atheists!'" Then the martyr, sternly looking round on the multitude of assembled heathen, groaned, and looking up to heaven said, "Away with the atheists!" "Swear then, now," said the proconsul, "and I will let you go; revile Christ." Then Polycarp made the memorable answer, "Eighty and six years have I served Him, and He has never done me wrong; how, then, can I blaspheme my King and my Saviour!" The eighty-six years must clearly count from Polycarp's baptism; so that if we are not to ascribe to him an improbable length of life, we must infer that he was the child of Christian parents, and that he had been baptized, if not in infancy, in very early childhood. When the magistrate continued to urge, Polycarp cut matters short by plainly declaring himself to be a Christian, and offering, if a day were assigned him, to explain to him what Christianity was. "Obtain the consent of the people," answered the proconsul. "Nay," replied Polycarp, "I count it your due that I should offer my defence to you, because we have been taught to give due honour to the powers ordained of God, but as for these people, I owe no vindication to them." The proconsul then had recourse to threats, but finding them unavailing, ordered his crier thrice to proclaim in the midst of the stadium, "Polycarp has confessed himself to be a Christian." Then arose a furious outcry from heathen and Jews against this "father of the Christians," this teacher of Asia, this destroyer of the worship of the gods. Philip the asiarch, or president of the games, was called on to let out a lion on Polycarp, but he refused, saying the wild beast shows were now over.[e] Then with one consent the multitude cried out demanding that Polycarp should be burnt alive; for his vision must needs be fulfilled. And rushing to the workshops and baths they collected wood and faggots, the Jews, as their custom was, taking the most active part. We have evidence of the activity of the Jews at Smyrna at an earlier period, Rev. ii. 9, and at a later in the story of the martyrdom of Pionius. When the pile was ready Polycarp proceeded to undress himself; and here the story has an autoptic touch, telling how the Christians marked the old man's embarrassment as he tried to take off his shoes, it having been many years since the reverence of his disciples had permitted him to perform such an office for himself. When he had been bound (at his own request, not nailed) to the stake, and had offered up a final prayer, the pile was lit, but the flame bellied out under the wind like the sail of a ship, behind which the body could be seen, scorched but not consumed. The fumes which reached their nostrils seemed fragrant to the Christians, whether this were the effect of imagination, or that really sweet scented woods had been seized for the hasty structure. The heathen seeing that the flame was dying out without doing its work, an executioner was sent in to finish with the sword, when so much blood came out that the flame nearly went out altogether. The Christians were about to remove the body; but Nicetes, already mentioned, here further described as the brother of Alce,[f] interfered and said, "If you give the body, the Christians will leave the crucified one and worship him," an idea deeply shocking to the narrator of the story, who declares that it was impossible for them to leave, for any other, Christ the holy one who died for the salvation of the world. Him, as the Son of God, they worshipped; martyrs they loved on account of the abundance of their zeal and love for Him. The Jews eagerly backing up Nicetes, the centurion had the body placed in the midst of the pyre, and saw to its complete consumption, so that it was only the bones, "more precious than jewels, more tried than gold," which the disciples were able to carry off to the place where they meant on the anniversary to commemorate the martyr's "birthday." The epistle closes with a doxology. Euarestus [g] is named as the writer, Marcion [or Marcianus] as the bearer of the letter.

Then follows by way of appendix a note, stating that the martyrdom of Polycarp took place on the 2nd of the month Xanthicus, the 7th before the kalends of March [there is a various reading May], on a great Sabbath at the 8th hour; the arrest having been made by Herod, Philip of Tralles being chief priest, Statius Quadratus proconsul, and Jesus Christ King for ever.

A second note states that these acts had been transcribed by Socrates (or Isocrates) of Corinth, from a copy made by Caius, a companion of Polycarp's disciple Irenaeus. A third note states that this again had been transcribed by Pionius from a copy much decayed by time, the success of his search for which was due to a

[d] The words are those of Josh. i. 10, translated in our version, "Be strong and of a good courage."

[e] Riddell, quoted by Simcox (*Early Church History*, p. 321), suggests that the beasts had been already fed that morning.

[f] The Alce thus mentioned must have been a well-known personage, and since the chronology fits perfectly, we cannot doubt that she is the same as the Alce who is recognised as a leading member of the church of Smyrna in the salutations of the letters of Ignatius both to that church and to Polycarp. Simcox suggests that she may have been the wife of Polycarp; but his reasons are considered and refuted by Lightfoot (*Ignatius*, i. 424, ii. 349).

[g] The name is found in inscriptions from Smyrna (Boeckh, 3148, 3152, 3162). We have mentioned, Vol. III. p. 254, the tale noted in the Moscow MS. of the martyrdom that the news of Polycarp's death was miraculously communicated to Irenaeus, then teaching at Rome.

revelation made by Polycarp himself, "as will be shewn in what follows," from which we may infer that the martyrdom was followed by a lifs of Polycarp.

To speak first of the last note, it seems clear that by the Pionius there mentioned is intended the presbyter of Smyrna whose martyrdom Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 15) found subjoined to the same volume as that which contained the martyrdom of Polycarp. Eusebius hastily speaks of the two martyrdoms as having occurred at the same period of time, and accordingly Jerome in his Chronicle places them under the same year. But there is every reason to believe (see PIONIUS) that the martyrdom of Pionius took place under the emperor Decius, nearly one hundred years after that of Polycarp. The extant Acts of Pionius, which are probably founded on those known to Eusebius, state that the arrest of Pionius took place on the 2nd Xanthicus, the day on which the martyrdom of Polycarp was then commemorated. It seems probable then that Pionius, a leading member of the church of Smyrna, did strive to brace the minds of his brethren for the then impending persecution by reviving the memory of the heroic acts of their former martyred bishop Polycarp. And we may reasonably believe that Pionius did then save from perishing the epistle to the church of Philomelium, which he found in a very old MS. with the two appendix notes already cited. This epistle is so amazingly different in freshness and marks of antiquity from the other literature connected with it, that it may be pronounced impossible to have been forged by the authors of this other literature; and there seems no good reason for refusing to accept the pedigree of its transcription which the document itself claimed.[h] We believe then that the text as copied by Pionius was that read by Eusebius, and is the parent of our extant MSS. And here it is necessary to speak of a corruption which we believe Pionius to have introduced into the text. In what the MS. evidence obliges us to recognise as the Pionian text, we read that when the executioner struck Polycarp with the sword, there came out *a dove* and a great quantity of blood. Eusebius omits the dove, yet the probability that he used the Pionian recension is so great that we assent to the opinion of those who hold that Eusebius was staggered by the miracle and designedly left out a word which he found in his copy. We do not know whether the phrase used by Eusebius, that the document proceeds *κατὰ λέξιν ὧδέ πως*, will bear to have stress laid on it as an acknowledgment that he is not quoting with absolute accuracy. But we believe that he might well, on critical grounds, have rejected the words as no part of the original document. The words, where they occur, interrupt the sense in such a way as to bear the marks of being intrusive—"There came out a dove and a great quantity of blood, so as to quench the flame," &c. If the narrator had intended to relate so great a miracle as the coming forth of a dove, he surely would have thought the matter worth a sentence or two, and would have told what became of the dove; he never would have been content to dispose of it in two words. This is not like his method of dealing with other circumstances which seemed to him supernatural, nor do we believe that there is any parallel in all hagiology for such a way of telling a miraculous story. Certainly Lucian's story, which has been imagined to be a parody on this one, occupies several sentences.[i]

It has been contended that Lucian must have read our martyrdom with the word *περιστερα*, because in his story of the burning of Peregrinus he represents a vulture as flying up from the pyre, which it was supposed was meant for a parody on Polycarp s dove. But no one who reads the story of Peregrinus will find the least evidence that Lucian was thinking of Polycarp. Lucian tells that, when he had come away from the burning of Peregrinus, he was much questioned by persons who had been too late to see it; that to sensible persons he told the simple truth, but that he hoaxed the silly ones by dressing up the story in order to see how much they could swallow; that among other things he told how he had seen a vulture fly up from the pyre uttering, in human voice, the words, "I leave the earth and go to Olympus," and that next day he was much astonished when a respectable personage told him back his own story and assured him he had witnessed it himself. There is nothing in all this to indicate that Lucian was thinking of, or had even read, the story of Polycarp; and as he had mentioned a little before that Peregrinus had referred to the story of the phoenix in connection with his own death by fire, it is natural to think that Lucian's vulture was intended to take the place of the phoenix of Peregrinus and not of Polycarp's dove. It may also have been suggested by the letting loose of an eagle as part of the ceremonial performed at an emperor's funeral pyre. See the account given by Herodian (*Hist.* iv. 2 § 11) of the funeral of Severus, and also an epigram in the life of Plato by Diogenes Laertius, where Plato's soul is represented as flying off in the form of an eagle.

We come now to the chronological note, which we accept as, if not part of the original document, at least added by one of its first transcribers, and therefore deserving of high confidence.[j] Recently it has received a new

[h] The above stands as it was in type before the publication of Lightfoot's Ignatius. There strong reasons are given for regarding the last appendix note as coming not from the true, but from a pretended, Pionius. Lightfoot agrees with the above in looking on 'the dove' as an addition made by this Pionius, but he holds Eusebius to have used a pre-Pionian text.

[i] Bishop Wordsworth ingeniously accounts for the presence of the intrusive words by supposing that the original story told that when the sword was plunged in, there came out a quantity of blood "round the hilt," and that Pionius in his copy, which he tells us was much decayed by age, misread the words *περὶ στύρακα* into *περιστερὰ καί*. I would gladly accept this solution if I could find evidence that *στύραξ* is ever used to denote the hilt of a sword. Another conjecture is that the original had *ἐπ' ἀριστερά*. Bishop Fitzgerald suggests, that instead of *πλῆθος αἵματος* there was a marginal variant *περισσεία*. But we are safe in rejecting the Pionian addition, whether we can explain or not how it came to be made.

[j] Lightfoot has given a decisive proof that it was part of the original document. The opening of that document is clearly imitated from the opening of the epistle of Clement of Rome. The doxology at the end of this note bears an equally striking resemblance to the doxology at the end of the same epistle.

confirmation from a lately discovered Olympian inscription, *Archäolog. Zeitung*, 1880, i. 62, referred to by Lipsius (Schürer. *Theol. Literaturzeit.* 1881, p. 304), which mentions PHILIP OF TRALLES [see that article] as asiarch in the year 149. The office was one which could be held more than once, and indeed was so oftener than not, the number of persons rich enough suitably to discharge it being limited. It may therefore be regarded as a coincidence that our document represents him as filling the same office a few years later. But the most important name is that of the proconsul Statius Quadratus, which gives our best guide to the determination of the date of the martyrdom. Eusebius in his Chronicle had put it in the 6th year of Marcus Aurelius, i.e. A.D. 166, and his authority had been generally accepted as decisive, although on account of the difficulty of reconciling so late a date with what is told of Polycarp's acquaintance with the apostle John, Dodwell (*De Succ. Rom. Pont.* p. 286) and others had endeavoured to put back Eusebius's date some twenty years. A recent investigation by M. Waddington (*Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1867, xxvi. 235) has made it possible to dispute Eusebius's date with more success. And we need have the less scruple in doing so, because Eusebius seems to have had no real knowledge of the date, and to have put it down somewhat at random, for he places Polycarp's martyrdom and the Lyons persecution under the same year, though it is now generally recognised that the Lyons martyrdoms were as late as 177. The proconsulship of Asia was an annual office, and it has now been ascertained that at the period with which we are concerned the rule was that the two senior men of consular rank (if otherwise unobjectionable) who had not yet received high appointment, drew lots for the proconsulships of Asia and Africa. A man who had been named as consul was on the ladder of promotion and might count on high provincial office when his turn came. It has also been ascertained that at this time the ordinary interval between the consulship and proconsulate ranged between twelve and sixteen years. There is often a difficulty in turning our knowledge of this rule to account, arising from the fact that we have no records of the *consules suffecti* of each year, although these had a right to proconsular appointment as well as the two after whom the year was named. But this difficulty does not arise in the case of Quadratus, whom we know to have been consul A.D. 142. We are at once led to reject Eusebius's date as placing the inadmissible interval of twenty-four or twenty-five years between the consulship and proconsulate. And, for the same reason, we cannot place the proconsulate in the reign of M. Aurelius at all;[k] the accession of that emperor only taking place in 161, or nineteen years after the consulship of Quadratus. Waddington confirmed this conclusion by an extant inscription (Boeckh, 3410) belonging to the proconsulship of Quadratus, in which mention is made of the fiscus of the emperor, in the singular number, not emperors; from which he inferred that it belongs to the reign of the sole emperor Antoninus, not of M. Aurelius, who from the first took his brother Verus to share his throne. However, in deference to Mommsen he has since ceased to lay stress on this argument. But independently of it there are sufficient grounds for the conclusion, that the proconsulship of Quadratus is to be placed in the reign of Antoninus, and in all probability between the years 154–158 inclusive. So far we are on firm ground. A more precise determination of the date has been sought from the orations of Aelius Aristides. Aristides was a rhetorician, greatly admired in his own day, but whose extant remains would now be scarcely rated above the level of schoolboy exercises. They are frigid declamations on mythological and historical subjects, panegyrics for instance on Jupiter, Minerva, and Bacchus, imaginary orations supposed to have been delivered in the Athenian Assembly after the battle of Leuctra, &c. Aristides has even the courage to take subjects treated by Isocrates and Demosthenes, and attempt to improve on them. He was contemporary with Polycarp, and lived for some time in the same city; but he never mentions either him or his religion. No doubt he would have been equally incredulous and humiliated, if he could have been told that it is only in the hope of gaining some light on the history of Polycarp that any one at the present day cares to look into his orations. The orations serviceable for that purpose are called Sacred Discourses, Ἱεροὶ Λόγοι. They are autobiographical, containing details of a sickness under which he laboured for seventeen years. Though the medical science of his age can boast of Galen and other eminent representatives, he did not seek to physicians for his cure, but relied on the interposition of the god Aesculapius, whose advice was communicated to him in dreams and visions. It may be doubted whether modern practitioners would regard either the mode of treatment or the rapidity of the cure such as to do great honour to the god of medicine; but it was with the object of doing honour to the god that the grateful orator, when at length restored to health, published these Sacred Discourses containing details of the changes of his malady, and of the dreams which guided his treatment of it. In these there are several occasional notices of proconsuls who ruled Asia in various years of the illness, and of the honours they bestowed on our orator. From these Waddington elicits an argument to determine the date of Quadratus, of which the following are the steps: (1) Julianus was proconsul of Asia from May 145 to May 146. This is satisfactorily proved by inscriptions. (2) Julianus was proconsul in the second year of the illness of Aristides. This is not directly stated, but is inferred from a comparison of what Aristides says about the features of his malady; in one place, during the proconsulate of Julianus, in another, during the second year of his illness. (3) Severus was proconsul in the tenth year of the illness, *i.e.* (if there is no flaw in the last step of the proof) in the year 153–154. (4) Quadratus was proconsul the year after Severus and therefore from May 154 to May 155, so that the martyrdom of Polycarp, which took place in February, must have been in 155. This last step of the proof is the most doubtful of all. What Aristides says is only "Severus, I think,

[k] Consuls of the years 141, 143, 144, 145, are proved by inscriptions to have held one or other of the two great proconsulships during the reign of Pius (Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, i. 448).

was proconsul the year before my companion," ἡμετέρου ἑταίρου. Quadratus is supposed to be the companion, because both were rhetoricians by profession, and because in an earlier part of the same oration mention is made of honours bestowed by Quadratus on Aristides. On the other hand it does not appear that they had known each other before this year, and bearing in mind the possibility that Aristides had other friends among the proconsuls, we cannot consider this step of the argument to have been at all certainly established, and therefore we do not think that Waddington has made out of Aristides more than a probable case for the year 155. But another argument for the same year appears to be more decisive. The martyrdom is stated to have taken place on Saturday, Feb. 23, and among the years between which our choice lies, 155 is the only one on which Feb. 23 fell on Saturday. The reading of this chronological date is not free from variations. Polycarp is stated to have been martyred on a great sabbath, the 2nd of Xanthicus, the 7th before the kalends of March. Here some MSS. read May instead of March, and an inferior authority gives April. But we can account for these variations. The great sabbath would in Christian times have been understood to mean the Saturday in Easter week, and as Easter could not occur in February, there was an obvious temptation to alter March into May, but none to make the opposite change. Besides we have independent knowledge that Feb. 23 was the day on which the Eastern church celebrated the martyrdom. But there remains the difficulty, that no explanation can be given why Feb. 23 should be a "great" sabbath. It has been suggested that perhaps it was a Saturday of the feast of Purim, but that feast was held at the full moon, which the day in question was not.

We believe the true explanation of this difficulty to be that the Latin date in this note is not of the same antiquity as the date by the Macedonian month. In fact, we suppose that Pionius, when, as already stated, he recovered the very ancient copy of the martyrdom, translated the date 2nd Xanthicus, which he found there, into one more widely intelligible, and thus determined the date of subsequent commemorations of the martyrdom. The Macedonian months were originally regulated solely by the moon. In later times they were determined to fixed dates in the solar year. When this change was made Xanthicus became the sixth month of a year, beginning with the autumnal equinox, and accordingly the 2nd Xanthicus did correspond to February 23. We have every reason to believe that this change was fully established in the time of Pionius, but the age of Polycarp was exactly one of transition. Ideler (*Chronol.* i. 412) borrows from Ussher a quotation from Polycarp's contemporary Galen, which states (*Comm.* i. in *Hippoc. Epidem.* l. 1, *Opp.* Hippoc. and Galen, ix. P. 2, p. 8, or xvii. 21, ed. Kühn) that in his time the solar year was generally used in Asia, but that the Greek cities mostly retained the lunar reckoning.

If Xanthicus be here taken as a lunar month, all chronological difficulties disappear. When it was a lunar month it corresponded to the Jewish Nisan, and since the Jewish day began with the evening, the 1st Nisan commencing with the appearance of the moon on the evening of the 1st Xanthicus would include the morning of the 2nd, so that Polycarp suffered not only on the 1st Sabbath, but on the 1st day of the Jewish ecclesiastical year, a day which would therefore count as a great sabbath. Again, by taking Xanthicus as a lunar month the date of the martyrdom is transferred, as we shall see, from February 23 to March 23. We perceive then that the games at which Polycarp suffered were held at the time of the vernal equinox, a time which we might beforehand have conjectured as highly probable, while we have confirmatory evidence that this was the season of these annual games, the great time of danger for the Christians. For (see Vol. III. p. 896) the martyrdom of Sagaris took place at Laodicea on the 14th Nisan; but the 14th Nisan of one year very easily fell on the same day of the solar year as the 1st Nisan of another year; and, in fact, in the article referred to, we have given reason for thinking that the date of the martyrdom of Sagaris was almost precisely the same as that which we here fix for that of Polycarp. We accept, then, the 2nd Xanthicus as an original note of time faithfully preserved for us by a scribe who did not himself understand its meaning, because he interpreted according to the usage of his own day.[1]

With respect to the martyrdom of Sagaris, to which we have just referred, it may be added that we can gain hence confirmatory evidence for the earlier date of the martyrdom of Polycarp. We have given (*u.s.*) independent reasons for thinking that the date of that martyrdom was 164 or 167. Now Polycrates (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24) mentions the Asiatic martyrs in the order —Polycarp, Thraseas, Sagaris, from which we may infer that Polycarp's was the earliest. Perhaps we could tell the exact interval if we only knew the rotation of the meetings of the Κοινόν. Polycarp was martyred in a year when the assembly was held at Smyrna, Thraseas when the rotation came round to Smyrna again; Sagaris, after that, when it was the turn of Laodicea. It may be further added that this rotation of the meetings of the assembly explains how it was possible for the Christians to collect together to celebrate the anniversaries of their martyrs, as we know they did in the case of Sagaris, and as it was intended to do in the case of Polycarp. The time of the annual meeting would be exactly that when it would be most dangerous for Christians to attract the notice of their enemies; but the place where a martyrdom had occurred one year would be a place of safety the next year, as the assembly would meet elsewhere.

When we have abandoned the date Sat. Feb. 23 we lose one clue to fixing the exact date of the martyrdom, but we gain another in its place. Since the 2nd Nisan was Saturday, the year must be one in which that lunar month commenced on a Friday. Now the dates which

[1] The solution offered above was proffered in the *Academy*, July 21, 1883, but Lightfoot, i. 672, has since satisfactorily shewn that the lunar calendar had been superseded, at Smyrna, by the solar before the time of Polycarp. Nevertheless, I allow what has been printed above to stand, as presenting matter for consideration in the absence of any other admissible explanation of the 'great sabbath.'

we calculate for 1 Nisan are as follows:[m]—154, Sunday, April 1; 155, Friday, March 22; 156, Tuesday, March 10; 157, Sunday, March 28; 158, Saturday, March 19; 159, Friday, April 7; 160, Tuesday, March 26; 161, Saturday, March 18.

It is seen that among these 155 and 159 are the only admissible years, and since the former agrees best with the usual interval between consulship and proconsulate our calculation leads us to the same year as Waddington, viz. 155, only changing the month from Feb. 23 to March 23. The date April 8, which the year 159 would require, is likely to be too late, otherwise the claims of that year might deserve attention. The chief difficulty raised by the date 155 is that if we adopt it the chronology of the Roman bishops obliges us to put Polycarp's visit into the last year of his life and the first of the episcopate of Anicetus.

A life of Polycarp, purporting to have been written by Pionius, was published in Latin by the Bollandists, AA. SS., Jan. ii. 695, and a Greek text was edited from a MS. in the Paris library by Duchesne in 1881. It is so completely unhistorical that the only question to be discussed about is whether it may not be identical with a life of Polycarp read by Macarius Magnes at the end of that century, who refers (p. 109) to miracles wrought by Polycarp in producing change of weather at one time when the country was suffering from scorching heat, at another time from excess of rain. He also refers to the efficacy of Polycarp's laying on of hands at the time when he was acting as steward to a widow before his elevation to the episcopate. On comparing these notices with the extant life there is such a want of closeness of agreement that (independently of other reasons) we cannot believe that the extant life was that read by Macarius. But there is enough of general agreement to make it credible that the extant life is a reworking of a life current in the fourth century. Whether the latter were as old as the Pionius of the third century is a matter on which we have not materials to form a judgment. The letter to the Philippians is the only extant one of Polycarp's, though Irenaeus was acquainted with other letters of his both to churches and individuals (Euseb. v. 20). Jerome (*Ep. ad Lucinium*) contradicts a report that he had translated "the volumes of Papias and Polycarp," but we cannot build on this expression as proving that more writings of Polycarp were known to him than to us. Five fragments purporting to be Polycarp's were published from a Catena by Feuardentius in his notes to Irenaeus iii. 3. Pitra (*Spicileg. Solesm.* i. 266) has added two more, though, as Zahn (xlvii.) has pointed out, Pitra's authority produces them not as Polycarp's, but as from the *Liber Responsorum* of Victor of Capua. Pitra assumed the *Liber Responsorum* to be a work of Polycarp because the title cited by Feuardentius is "Victor episcopus Capuae ex responsione capitulorum Sancti Polycarpi, Smyrnensis episcopi, Discipuli Johannis Evangelistae." Zahn, accepting, on the authority cited by Pitra, that Victor was the author of a book of "Answers," rejects the two fragments which claim no higher origin, but prints, p. 171, five others which he supposes to have been quoted by Victor as Polycarp's in this book of "Answers." Zahn leaves the question of their authenticity to be determined by the reader. The impression they produce on us is that they are ancient but not Polycarp's.

We are here referring to the latest and best edition of the remains of Polycarp, by Zahn in Gebhardt's *Patres Apostolici*, vol. ii.[n] The letter of Polycarp is also published in almost all editions of Apostolic Fathers, besides in other works, of which we only mention Routh's *Script.* Ecc. *Opusc.* For the literature connected with Polycarp's letter it may be enough to refer to the list given at the end of the article Ignatius, adding Lightfoot's valuable article *Contemp. Rev.* May 1875. Of modern discussions on the date of martyrdom, in addition to Waddington's memoir already cited we mention Steitz, *Jahrb. f. deutsch. Theol.* 1861; Hilgenfeld, *Pascha Streit*, p. 230; articles by Hilgenfeld and Lipsius, *Zeitschrift für wiss. Theol.* 1874; by Lipsius, *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.* 1878; Schürer's *Literaturzeitung* 1881, p. 308; Wieseler, *Christenverfolgungen*, and *Stud. u. Krit.* 1880; Keim, *Aus dem Urchristenthum.* [G. S.]

POLYCARPUS (2), bishop of the wealthy colonia Hadrumetum (metropolis of Prov. Byzacena, in Prov. Afr. Proc.) mentioned by Cyprian as present at 1st Council of Carthage, A.D. 251 (*Ep.* 48), signs encyclical letters of Councils of Carthage 2nd, 4th and 5th, and gives 3rd suffrage in 7th Council (de Bap. 3), see Epp. 57, 67, 73 and Sentt. Epp. [E. W. B.]

POLYCARPUS (3), bishop addressed in a letter by the Pseudo-Dionysius (*Ep.* 7), suggesting arguments against the Sophist Apollophanes (DIONYSIUS (1), p. 846; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 226; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 551–3, citing the editions). [J. G.]

POLYCARPUS (4), a bishop, translated from Sexantaprista in Moesia to Nicopolis in Thrace, mentioned with other examples of translation. (Soc. vii. 36; Tillem. xi. 328.) [C. H.]

POLYCARPUS (5), Moyses of Aghel (circ. 550) in a *Letter to Paphnutius* prefatory to his Syriac version of the *Glaphyra* of Cyril of Alexandria, prepares his readers to find variations from the Peshitto in Cyril's citations of Scripture after the Greek, by referring them to "the translation of the New Testament and of David into Syriac" from the Greek, which "the Chorepiscopus Polycarpus made for Xenaias [Philoxenus] of Mabug" (Assem. ii. p. 82; see also Dr. Ign. Guidi in *Rendiconti della R. Academia dei Lincei*, 1886, p. 397). Now we know from Gregory Barhebraeus (*Prooem. in Horr. Mystt.*) that, "after the Peshitto, the New Testament was more accurately translated again from the Greek at Mabug *in the days* of Philoxenus." And the same facts are stated

[m] The calculation is made by the help of a table of new moons furnished me by Professor Adams.

[n] This article was in type before Bp. Lightfoot's edition of Ignatius, which now supersedes all previous works on the subject. It is not possible now to rewrite the article, but a few supplemental notes have been added.

in a note purporting to be written by THOMAS OF HARKEL in 616, appended in slightly varying forms to many MSS. of the version of the N. T. known as the Harklensian, one of which (Assem. xi., now Cod. Vat. 268) is probably (Bernstein, *Das Heil. Evang. des Joh.*, p. 2) of the 8th century. In this MS., and others, the note gives also the date of this Philoxenian version, A.D. 508. In all of them it proceeds to describe the Harklensian version as based on this,—in fact a revision of it; and the same description in more direct terms is given by Barhebraeus in two places in his *Chronicon Eccl.* (i. 49; ii. 22: Assem. ii. pp. 334, 411). We may safely infer that this earlier version was made by the Polycarp named by Moyses (though mentioned by no other writer) at the instance of his bishop, the great Monophysite leader (485–522). Barhebraeus indeed, in the passages last referred to, calls it "the version which *was rendered by the care* (ܒܝܘܨܦܢܘܬܐ) of Philoxenus," "which *was made by* Philoxenus;" and other late writers have also spoken of it as his work (Assem. ii. 23, 91). But these are mere *obiter dicta*, and are to be read by the light of the more precise statement of Barhebraeus himself in his *Chr. Eccl.*, and of the much earlier MS. authorities, in which the expression "translated *in the days* of Philoxenus" distinctly implies that the translation was not executed by him. Indeed it might be pronounced *a priori* incredible that in the course of his busy and troubled life he could have found leisure for such a work. His aim in having the version made was probably, as the remark of Moyses suggests, to enable Syriac-speaking Monophysites to read the Scriptures as they were read by those Greek Fathers whom he owned as authorities, and by their Greek-speaking brethren within the Antiochian Patriarchate. But it does not appear that the translation shewed, or was ever impugned as shewing, a doctrinal bias.

Of the Philoxenian N. T. as it was before Thomas revised it, we only know with certainty the few small fragments of St. Paul recovered by Wiseman from the margin of his MS. of the Karkaphensian Syriac, and published by him in his *Horae Syriacae* (p. 178, n. 11). Adler (*Verss. Syrr.* p. 55) conjectured that the Gospels contained in a Florentine MS., dated 757 (*Biblioth. Laurent.* i. No. 40), usually regarded as the oldest Harklensian MS. extant, were of this version: but he himself admits that the internal evidence of its text is against him. Bernstein (l. l. pp. 3, 25) puts forward instead the claim of the Angelic MS., probably of the 11th century, belonging to the Augustinian Convent in Rome, and shews that the variations of its text from the usual Harklensian type are very numerous. But they are for the most part minute, and many of them are such as may naturally be ascribed to a copyist consciously or otherwise reverting to the familiar words of the Peshitto: and the subscription of the MS. (see above) asserts that its text is Harklensian; a fact apparently conclusive against Bernstein, but met by him with the explanation that the subscription has been wrongly appended by a later hand, as in the case of a Peshitto MS. noted by Adler (l. l. p. 76). Recently, Professor Isaac H. Hall, of New York has called attention to a peculiar recension of the Gospels which he believes to be probably the true Philoxenian, contained in a MS. of the Syriac N. T., belonging to the "Syrian Protestant College" at Beirût, apparently of the 9th century (see *Academy*, vol. xii. p. 170, also in *Journal of Soc. of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1882), of which he has published a few specimens (two pages) reproduced by photography. It may be conjectured that these and other MSS. are examples of mixed texts, analogous to the well-known MSS. of the Vulgate which abound with Old Latin readings.

It seems highly probable that we have a considerable portion of this original Philoxenian, in the version of the four minor Catholic Epistles (2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude) not included in the Peshitto though printed with it in the Polyglots and in most Syriac New Testaments;—first published by Pococke (1630) from a MS. of no great age (Bodl. Or. 119). A copy of this version had previously been brought to Rome by the Maronites, whence these four Epistles, translated into Latin by Balthasar Etzel, a Jesuit, were printed by Nic. Serarius, also a Jesuit (both being of Mayence) in his *Comm. in Epp. Canonic.* (1612, p. 52; see also his *Prolegg. Bibl.*, xv. 1). It seems that another copy must have been in the hands of Gabriel Sionita, and furnished the text given in the Paris Polyglot (1633), and adopted thence by Walton, which is evidently derived from an independent source, and not (as it has been assumed to be) a mere corrected reprint of Pococke's. This may perhaps have been part of the MS. of the New Testament in Syriac, including all the portions wanting to the Peshitto, which Andreas de Leon, in a letter to Le Jay (editor of that Polyglot) describes as written by himself for Pope Paul V. (Lelong, *Biblioth. Sacra*, tom. i. p. 184; Boerner's edition, 1709). We hear also of a Syriac MS. brought by Moses of Marden when he returned from the East to revisit Europe (De Dieu, *Praef. in Apocalypsin*) containing these Epistles with the Apocalypse. A similar MS., transcribed for Archbishop Ussher and sent to him from Aleppo in 1626 (which has been wrongly described as a complete Syriac New Testament and supposed to be lost) is in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin (B. 5, 16). These four Epistles in the version in question are found also in a few Paris MSS. (see Zotenberg's *Catal.*), in one (formerly Wetstein's) at Amsterdam, in Lord Crawford's MS. (see under THOMAS HARKL.), in the Cambridge MS. (Oo. i. 1, 2), and in several MSS. in the British Museum; one of which, Add. 14623 (7), written 823, is the oldest extant copy of this version. It is included also in the "Williams MS." of the N. T. Epistles, whence Prof. Hall has recently issued it in photographic facsimile. This version is distinct from the Harklensian rendering of the same Epistles, which however, though more servilely exact and graecised, is unmistakably founded on it;—following it even (to give a decisive instance) in its curious mistranslation of δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις (Jude 6) by ܐܣܘܪ̈ܐ ܠܐ ܝܕܝܥܐ, "*unknown* chains." And where the Harklensian leaves it, to follow a different Greek reading, it most frequently retains on its margin the words that have been removed from its text. Inasmuch then as we have in this version the unmistakable basis of

the Harklensian, and as the Harklensian is known to have been a revision of the Philoxenian, the identity of this version with the Philoxenian proper (as distinguished from the Philoxenian usually so-called, viz. the Harklensian revision) follows by necessary inference. Assuming then that this version of the Epistles in question is the work of Polycarp, we have in it the materials for judging of his merits as a translator, and we find reason to form a high estimate of them. The translation is in the main accurate, and close without being servile. Dr. Scrivener (*Introd. to N. T.*, p. 646, ed. 3) justly describes it as one which "well deserves careful study . . . of great interest and full of valuable readings," siding as it does frequently with the oldest Greek uncials.[a] The blunder just referred to is not a gross or strange one (the *Etymologicon Magnum* goes quite as wrong on the same word), yet it may indicate that Greek was not Polycarp's native tongue, but acquired, as we know it was in the case of Thomas. Here also we have a field of comparison between his work and Thomas's revision of it, in order to determine their mutual relation. (See THOMAS HARKL.) And the result we are led to is, that the latter work is not (as has been taken for granted by many) a mere corrected re-issue of the earlier one, with simply linguistic alterations in the text and variants inserted on its margin; but is substantially a new version, proceeding indeed on the lines of the former, but freely quitting them on occasion when the translator saw fit.

The Apocalypse as printed in modern Syriac Bibles, following the Polyglotts, differs materially in diction from the Four Epistles, and comes much closer to the manner of the Harklensian New Testament. See for it under THOMAS HARKL. A fragment (Rev. vii. 1–8) in a version distinct from, though akin to the printed text, preserved in Add. 17193 (f. 14*b*), may perhaps belong to the unrevised Philoxenian. Another possible remnant is that from Rev. xvii. 3–6 cited in a *Catena* in Genesis, printed in the Roman edition of Ephraim Syrus (*Op. Syr.* tom. i. p. 192). But inasmuch as this *Catena* consists in part of extracts from Jacob of Edessa, the translation of these verses may perhaps be his work.

We are not informed what books of the Old Testament were included in the work of Polycarp. Moyses, as we have seen, mentions only his version of the Psalms, which is lost. But we have conclusive evidence that a Philoxenian Isaiah also existed: for a rendering of Isai. ix. 6, differing from the Hexapla and from the Hebrew, but closely agreeing with a reading found in several MSS. of the LXX. (Holmes's 22, 36, 48, 51, 62, 90, 93, 106, 147, 233), is inserted on the margin of the Ambrosian Syro-Hexapla (8th century), and is there introduced as being "from the other text which was rendered into Syriac *by the care* of Philoxenus, bishop of Mabug," the word being the same as in the first citation (above) from the *Chron. Eccl.* of Barhebraeus. Moreover, a considerable portion of Isaiah in Syriac (about ten chapters with lacunae), translated from the LXX. but quite distinct from the Syro-Hexapla, preserved in a Nitrian MS. of the 7th century (Add. 17106: edited by Dr. Ceriani, *Monn. S. & P.*, V., i.) is supposed to belong to the same version as the fragment on the margin of the Ambrosian MS. This conjecture cannot be verified with certainty, as Isai. ix. 6—indeed all the first 27 chapters—are wanting from 17106; but there are good grounds for admitting the identification. The Greek text followed in 17106 is, in the main, that of the same MSS. of the LXX. whose reading of ix. 9 the fragment reproduces. And the character of the translation in its ten chapters harmonizes well with that of the fragment, and of the Pauline fragments given by Wiseman; being intermediate in literal accuracy, and in idiomatic propriety, between the Peshitto on one hand and the Syro-Hexaplar and Harklensian on the other (Ceriani, l. l. pp. 2, 5–7). Besides, it bears to the Hexaplar version of PAUL OF TELLA, of the same chapters, such a relation (similar to that above described, as borne by the ordinary version of the Four Minor Epistles to the Harklensian), as to prove that Paul used it in making his version just as his fellow worker Thomas is known to have used the Philoxenian New Testament as the groundwork of his. Moreover, confirmatory evidence is given by a Nitrian MS. of the 6th or 7th century (Add. 14555), which contains a Syriac version of part of the *Glaphyra* of Cyril of Alexandria, apparently that of Moyses above referred to. Several citations from Isaiah occur in this work. The present writer has compared with the text of 17106 such of these citations as fall within the ten chapters of Isaiah as given in that MS., and has found them to agree almost verbatim;[b] a fact which raises well-nigh into a certainty the opinion that we have here the version known to Moyses, and described by him in the words cited in the opening of this article. Thus the external as well as the internal evidence confirms the natural supposition that Polycarp was the person employed by Philoxenus to translate not only the Psalms but Isaiah, and whatever other parts of the O. T. fell within the scope of his design. This Isaiah everywhere shows traces of the influence of the Peshitto; but whether the translator worked in the lines of any previous version from the LXX., we have no direct evidence. That the LXX. was in the hands of Syriac writers and translators before the time of Philoxenus is certain. Many Peshitto MSS., notably the great Ambrosian MS. of 6th century (B. 21 *Inf.*), nearly coeval with him, prefix to the Psalms a heading in which they are said to be translated "from Hebrew into Greek, and from Greek into Syriac." Yet internal evidence conclusively proves, that the Hebrew and not the LXX. is in the main the basis of the Peshitto Psalter. The LXX. however must have been known to the early Syriac translators of the O. T.;

[a] The writer of this has collated the MS. Add. 14623 above mentioned, and some of the rest; and has found that it, and Add. 14473 (2), and others, yield many valuable readings, correcting most of the blemishes shewn by the printed texts of these Epistles, and bringing the version into still closer conformity with the best Greek text.

[b] The passages which the writer has found available for this enquiry are four:—Isai. xxxviii. 14 (*Glaph.* 49 B); xliii. 10 (40 C); xlv. 21, 22 (87 D); xlix. 9 (432 C).

for all the books which are in the LXX. but not in the Hebrew (except Tobit and 1[3] Esdras) are contained in the oldest MS. of the Peshitto O. T., and their diction agrees with that of the canonical books among which they are inserted. The translators who had the LXX. in their hands when making their version of these Apocryphal books, can hardly have failed to consult, more or less frequently, its renderings of the canonical books. But the passage of Ephraim Syrus where he cites the LXX. rendering of Jonah iii. 4 (Greg. Barh. ap. Assem. i. 70), which has been adduced as bearing on this matter, fails to prove that in his time (4th century) a Syriac version of the LXX. existed, unless it can be established that Ephraim was unable to read Greek (see above, Vol. II. pp. 142, 143). A contemporary of Philoxenus, Mar Abas, a Nestorian [see THOMAS EDESSENUS], is said by Ebedjesu to have translated the Old Testament from Greek into Syriac (Assem. iii. 75); but it is not likely that a translator employed by Philoxenus would have used the work of a Nestorian, even if it were executed early enough to become known to him. That the Isaiah of Add. 17106, above described, cannot be part of the version of Mar Abas, seems to be satisfactorily established by Ceriani (l. l., p. 6), on the ground that that version was made at Alexandria, no doubt from MSS. there preserved, and would therefore represent a Greek text of Alexandrian type; whereas the type of the MSS. to whose text Add. 17106 most closely approaches, is Antiochian.* Assemani (i. 612, ii. 83) mentions also one Simeon "Abbas Monasterii Licinii," as having translated the Psalms into Syriac, but this seems doubtful. But it is certain that Rabulas, bishop of Edessa (412–435), translated the New Testament. (*Vita Rabulae* ap. Overbeck, *S. Ephraemi*, *Rabulae*, *&c.*, *Opera*, p. 172; see also Wright, *Catal.*, p. 651). The evidence of Ephraim Syrus has also been called in to prove the existence in his time of a Syriac translation of the Four Epistles and Revelation, which he cites in his works; but as we have already seen, this argument cannot be relied on. Intrinsically however it seems highly probable that these books, all of which were admittedly current among the Greek-speaking Christians of the East long before the time of Philoxenus, may have been rendered into Syriac early enough to serve as a groundwork for the version of the four minor Epistles which (as above shown) is apparently the work of Polycarp; as well as for his version, if he made one, of the Apocalypse.

For further information concerning the Philoxenian version, see THOMAS HARKL. For Simeon's, see Dr. Guidi as above (p. 416). For that of Jacob of Edessa, see above, Vol. III. p. 334. [J. Gw.]

* Bishop Marsh, note 1, on ch. vii. s. xii. of Michaelis's *Introduction*, says, "The only translation hitherto discovered of Mar Abba . . . is the Story of the Adulteress in the Cod. Barsalibaei;" and in note 41, s. ii. he states that this translation is "ascribed to Mar Abba" in that MS. (now in the Library of New Coll., Oxford, No. 334). But this is a manifold mistake. *First*, Mar Abba is confused with Maras (see under NONNUS (5)). *Secondly*, the MS. is given as the authority for Ridley's statement (*De Verss. Syrr. Indole*, p. 50) that Maras was the translator; whereas Ridley only gives his own opinion (no doubt founded on Assemani, *B. O.* ii. pp. 53, 61), and the MS. is silent on the subject. *Thirdly*, the Maras version (given in the *History* of Zacharias Rhetor; see Land's *Anecdota Syrr.* vol. iii. p. 252), is quite different from that found in Cod. Bars., which latter is the same as that printed in Walton's Polyglot (see PAULUS TELLENSIS). And *fourthly*, Maras wrote in Greek, his recension of the passage being distinct from all known Greek copies; and the Syriac in which we have it is due to Zacharias's continuator or translator. Tregelles (*Introd.*, p. 282) corrects Marsh's error as to the person named, but introduces a fresh one as to his date, which he cites from Ridley incorrectly as A.D. 622, for 522.

POLYCHRONIUS (1), bishop of Babylon, martyred in the Decian persecution (Baron. a. 254, § 27); commemorated Feb. 17 (Bolland. Feb. iii. 5). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (2), martyr of Ancyra. [THEODOTUS.]

POLYCHRONIUS (3), an Arian bishop deposed by the Illyrian synod of A.D. 375 (Theodoret. iv. 9). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (4), brother of Theodore of Mopsuestia and bishop of Apamea on the Orontes in Syria Secunda. He belonged to a wealthy family of some position at Antioch, and the literary character of his remains justifies the belief that his early education was liberal and many-sided. A Polychronius was among the correspondents of Libanius (*Epp.* 27, 207, 228, etc.); but his identity with the subject of this memoir is more than doubtful. That the brother of Theodore fell more or less directly under the influence of Diodore may be taken for certain. Polychronius was probably the younger brother; at any rate his consecration to the episcopal office took place some ten years later than Theodore's. In the see of Apamea he must have followed Agapetus, who succeeded Marcellus A.D. 398 (Theodoret. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 27; *Hist. Relig.* § 3). He was still bishop at the time of his brother's death, A.D. 428; comp. Theodoret. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 40: *Θεόδωρος τοῦ βίου τὸ τέλος ἐδέξατο . . . καὶ ὁ τούτου δὲ ἀδελφὸς Πολυχρόνιος τὴν Ἀπαμέων ἐκκλησίαν ἐποίμαινεν.* But within the next three years he had died or otherwise vacated the see, for in the records of the Council of Ephesus the name of Alexander occurs more than once as bishop of Apamea (Mansi, iv. 1235, 1270). Both Le Quien (*Oriens Christ.* ii. 911) and Gams (*Series Episc.* p. 436) strangely omit Polychronius from their lists of the bishops of Apamea. The testimony of Theodoret however is unequivocal, and it is that of the contemporary bishop of a neighbouring see. The city of Apamea was raised by Theodosius II. to metropolitan rank (Joh. Malal. *Chronogr.* xiv.; Migne, *P. G.* xcvii. 543), and the see attained a corresponding dignity. If this change took effect during the episcopate of Polychronius, he filled a position of greater ecclesiastical importance than his brother, who as bishop of Mopsuestia was the subordinate of the metropolitan of Anazarbus.

In the history of the church, however, the name of Polychronius occupies a comparatively insignificant place. Our knowledge of him is drawn almost exclusively from the scanty encomiums of Theodoret re-echoed by Cassiodorus and Nicephorus. We must be content to learn that, as a bishop, he was characterized by the

excellence of his rule, the grace of his oratory, and the conspicuous purity of his life (ἐποίμαινεν ἄριστα καὶ τῇ τοῦ λόγου χάριτι καὶ τῇ τοῦ βίου λαμπρότητι χρώμενος. Theodoret. *H. E.* v. 40; cf. Cassiod. *Hist. Tripart.* x. 34; Niceph. xiv. 30).

It has been generally assumed that the bishop of Apamea is identical with the recluse of the same name whose ascetic life, fervent piety, and occasional miracles are enthusiastically depicted by Theodoret in his *Religious History* (§ 24). But such evidence as we possess points in an opposite direction. The monk passed his whole life in retirement (*Hist. Relig.* l. c.: γήρᾳ παλαίοντα ... ἐν πόνοις γεγηρακότος), and was still alive when Theodoret wrote the *Religious History*, i.e. in A.D. 443–4 (cf. § 21, τῶν ἔτι περιόντων ... τὴν πολιτείαν συγγράψομεν). The bishop, on the other hand, disappears before A.D. 431. Again, it is almost incredible that the duties of so important a see could have been reconciled with the habits of a recluse; yet in his account of the monk Polychronius, Theodoret seems unconscious of any break in his hero's solitary life. Lastly, though the *Religious History* was written several years before the *Church History*, the brief allusion of the latter to Theodore's brother is not supplemented by any reference to the ample story of the anchorite which is to be found in the earlier work. Indeed not a word is dropped in either of Theodoret's accounts which could suggest the identity of the bishop and the monk. They have nothing in common but the name—one sufficiently common in the annals of the church.[a]

As a disciple of the school of Antioch, Polychronius could not have failed to apply himself to the task of Biblical exegesis. No traces occur of any comments by him on the New Testament, but the catenae teem with scholia upon the Old Testament which bear his name. Mai was disposed to conclude that he had written on almost all the books of the Old Testament (*Scr. Vet. Nov. Coll.* i. p. xxx.); but the inference is scarcely a safe one, since there may have been more than one expositor of the name. The following have been ascribed to him: 1. Scholia on the Pentateuch in the catena of Nicephorus, printed at Leipsic, 1772 (Dowling, *Notit.* p. 210). 2. Prologue and fragments of a commentary on Job, first published in a Latin form by the Jesuit Comitolus in his *Catena Absolutissima* (Venice, 1587), and afterwards in Greek (London, 1637) by Patrick Young from two Bodleian MSS. of the catena of Nicetas (Fabricius, ed. Harles, viii. 647–8). One of the most important of these fragments, dealing with the causes of the obscurity of Holy Scripture, is appropriated by Photius (*Quaest. Amphil.* 152, Migne, *P. G.* ci. 816), but without acknowledgment (cf. Mai, *Scr. Vet. Nov. Coll.* i. pp. xxxi, 170–1). 3. Scholia on the Proverbs, printed in the Latin catena of Theod. Peltanus (Antwerp, 1614). 4. A MS. exposition of Ecclesiastes, said to be preserved in several of the libraries of Europe (Fabricius, ed. Harles, x. 363). 5. Scholia on the Canticles, printed by J. Meursius (Leyden, 1617). 6. Scholia on Jeremiah, collected in Michael Ghisler's commentary (Lyons, 1623). 7. An exposition of Ezekiel, cited by Joannes Damascenus (*De Imag.* iii.; Migne, *P. G.* xciv. 1380, Πολυχρονίου ἐκ τῆς εἰς τὸν Ἰεζεκιὴλ ἑρμηνείας). This work happily survives in an almost complete form, and has been given to the world by Mai (*Nov. Patr. Bibl.* vii. p. 2, pp. 92 sq.). 8. A commentary on Daniel, quoted in the 9th century by Nicephorus (Pitra, *Spic. Solesm.* i. p. 352: ἐκ τῶν Π. ἐπισκόπου Ἀπαμείας εἰς τὸν προφήτην Δανιὴλ ὑπομνημάτων τόμου β'). It furnished Nobilius with some of the notes appended to his Latin version of the LXX. (Rome, 1588), and Broughton with materials for his English commentary (London, 1597). A copious collection of the Greek fragments was published by Mai from Vatican MSS. in the first volume of his *Scriptorum Vet. Nova Collectio* (p. 105 sq.).

Of these remains, however, the scholia on Proverbs, Canticles, and Jeremiah, are of more than doubtful genuineness. Those on Proverbs and Canticles are in some MSS. ascribed to "Polychronius the Deacon" [POLYCHRONIUS (5)]; and all these collections are characterized by a partiality for allegorical and mystical interpretations quite alien to the instincts of the Antiochians.

The style of Polychronius has been described (Bardenhewer, *Polychronius*, p. 36) as clear and concise, contrasting favourably with the loose and complex manner of his brother Theodore, a criticism which agrees with the verdict of Theodoret (*supra*).

As an expositor Polychronius follows the historico-grammatical method of his school, condemning expressly the Alexandrian tendency to convert history into allegory. "His manner of exposition is scholarly and serious, breathing at the same time an air of deep piety." So Mai, who points out also the especial value of his commentary on Daniel on the score of its fulness of historical illustration. His comments are based (the book of Daniel excepted) on the LXX., but he calls in the aid of Symmachus and Theodotion; and the frequency of his references to the Hebrew, taken together with the remarkable fragment on the "Obscurity of Scripture" already mentioned, show him to have possessed some acquaintance with that language. In dealing with questions relating to the Canon, Polychronius assumes an independent attitude. Against his brother he stoutly maintains the historical character of the narrative of Job. On the other hand, it is not a little remarkable to find him discriminating between the Hebrew Daniel and the Greek additions, refusing to comment upon the Song of the Three Children on the ground that it is not a part of the original (εἰδέναι δὲ δεῖ ὡς οὗτος ὁ ὕμνος οὐ κεῖται ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραϊκοῖς ἢ ἐν τοῖς Συριακοῖς βιβλίοις· λέγεται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰρημένων παρὰ τινῶν μετὰ ταῦτα συντεθεῖσθαι· διόπερ καὶ αὐτὸς τῶν καθ' ἑκάστην αὐτῶν ἑρμηνείαν παρήσω, τῆς ἑρμηνείας μόνον ἐχόμενος τῆς βίβλου).

As to the doctrinal standpoint of Polychronius little can be learnt from his published remains. Expressions such as ἡ ἕνωσις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἡ ἐνοίκησις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, may suggest, but do not prove, that he shared Theodore's tendency to fall into what has since been known as the Nestorian view of

[a] The argument has been worked out with great care in the recent monograph of Dr. Otto Bardenhewer. (*Polychronius Bruder Theodors*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1879.) The present writer had been led to the same conclusion independently, by a comparison of Theodoret's histories.

the Person of Christ. One of the catenists (Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coisl.* p. 61) describes him as "heretical," applying the same term however to Origen and Theodoret. But such has not been the general verdict of the church. The temper of Polychronius was not controversial, and his name claims no place in the history of polemical theology—a circumstance which has at once saved him from the stigma of heterodoxy, and consigned his life and his works to comparative obscurity. [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (5), deacon, to whom a letter was addressed by Nilus (*Epp.* iii. 11; Migne, *P. G.* lxxix. 372). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (6), presbyter, to whom Nilus addressed another of his letters (*Epp.* iii. 142; *P. G.* lxxix. 449). Bardenhewer (pp. 18, 19) is disposed to identify this Polychronius with the preceding, and both with the solitary (7). A Polychronius who was among the correspondents of St. Isidore of Pelusium (*Ep.* iv. 59) is possibly the same person. [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (7), bishop of Jerusalem mentioned in the Acts of Sixtus II., who is said to have claimed priority for his see, but to have been deposed by a Roman Council on a charge of simony, and deprived of all but a small portion of his lands. What remained to him (the story goes) he sold, and gave the produce to the poor; whereupon he was restored to his episcopal office. The story is repeated by Peter Damiani, Nicholas I. and others, but the Acts upon which it rests are manifestly spurious (Baron. a. 433, § 38; comp. Fabric. ed. Harles, xii. 241). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (8), bishop of Verdun and disciple of Lupus Trecensis, who was believed to possess miraculous powers of healing the sick (Baron. a. 479, § 15; cf. Bolland. Apr. iii. 751). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (9), bishop of Epiphania, one of the Oriental prelates who sided with John of Antioch at the council of Ephesus, and joined him in signing the deposition of Cyril and Memnon (Labbe, iii. 599); and was deposed with him by the opposite party. He took part in the synod of Antioch, which deposed Athanasius of Perrha in 445 (*ibid.* 728), and in the general council of Chalcedon, when he signed the condemnation of Dioscorus (Labbe, iv. 83, 329, 588 &c.). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 897; Baluz. 706, 726.) [E. V.]

POLYCHRONIUS (10), bishop of Antipatris in Palaestina Prima, attended the "Robbers' Synod," at Ephesus, in 449, as a supporter of Dioscorus (Labbe, iv. 117), but on the confession of his fault was acquitted and restored at Chalcedon (ibid. 82, 118, 738, 805). [E. V.]

POLYCHRONIUS (11), anchorite, warmly panegyrized by Theodoret, and styled by him "the Great" (ὁ μέγας, ὁ πάνυ, *Hist. Relig.* § 24). He had been a pupil of the still more famous recluse, St. Zebinas, and reproduced the lineaments of his master's character as closely "as wax answers to the seal." His encomiast expatiates on his marvellous power of abstraction, his sleepless vigils, the miraculous efficacy of his prayers, his persistent labours in the teeth of complicated disorders; his refusal to accept the smallest gift, even a goatskin cloak, which he declined as too warm and well made for a monk. This Polychronius has generally been identified with the brother of Theodore, but upon insufficient grounds [POLYCHRONIUS (3)]. He is commemorated together with his master Zebinas and two other anchorites on Feb. 23 (Bolland. Feb. iii. 377). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (12), presbyter of Constantinople, concerned in the discovery of the relics of the forty Cappadocian martyrs who suffered under Licinius (Soz. ix. 2; Niceph. xiv. 20). In his younger days he had been intimate with Caesarius, who was consul A.D. 397 (Socr. vi. 2) and Prefect of the East A.D. 401 (*Cod. Theodos.* viii. *tit.* v. 62). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (13), abbat, to whom three letters were addressed by Maximus Confessor (Phot. *Cod.* 192). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (14), presbyter and monk of the Monothelite party, and who was condemned and deposed from the priesthood by the sixth Council (Mansi, xi. 606 sq.). He undertook to work a miracle before the Council in support of his heresy, but failed (Baron. a. 681, § 36; Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coisl.* p. 266). Proving incorrigible, he was sent to Rome and shut up in a monastery for the remainder of his life (Baron. a. 683, § 4; cf. Phot. *Cod.* 19). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (15), father of the Greek pope Zacharias (Baron. a. 741, § 13). [H. B. S.]

POLYCRATES (1), bishop of Ephesus in the last decade of the 2nd century. When Victor of Rome aimed at bringing the practice of the whole Christian world to uniformity in the matter of Easter celebration, he took the preliminary step of asking that meetings of bishops should be held in different places, in order to report the practice of their respective localities. This request was made, not in his own name, but in that of his church, as we learn from the use of the plural number in the reply of Polycrates. From every other place, as far as we can learn, the answer was that it was their practice to celebrate the feast of our Lord's Resurrection on no other day than Sunday; but Polycrates, writing in the name of the bishops of Asia, declared it to be the tradition which they had preserved untampered with, to celebrate only on the fourteenth day of the month, the day when the Jewish people put away their leaven. He appeals to the authority of the great luminaries which the Asiatic church could boast, and whose bodies lay among them, Philip, one of the twelve apostles, and his three daughters, John, who lay on our Lord's breast, a priest who wore the πέταλον,[a] Polycarp of Smyrna, Thraseas of Eumenia, Sagaris, Papirius, Melito, all of whom had observed the fourteenth day, according to the Gospel, walking according to the rule of faith. Polycrates himself had followed the traditions of his kindred, seven of whom had been bishops before him, and had

[a] On this expression, see Lightfoot's *Galatians*, p. 345.

been confirmed in his view by his own study of the whole Scripture, and by conference with brethren from all the world. Although his letter bore no signature but his own, he claims for it that it had received the assent of a great number of bishops, who, notwithstanding his insignificance, reverenced his hoary hair, for he had been sixty-five years "in the Lord." The Roman church appears to have menaced the Asiatics with excommunication if they persisted in their singularity; but Polycrates declares that he was not scared by such menaces, for greater than he had said, We must obey God rather than man (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24). For the sequel of this story see the article IRENAEUS, Vol. III. pp. 255, 256. [G. S.]

POLYCRATES (2), an author mentioned only in PRAEDESTINATUS. [G. S.]

POLYCRATIA, Laodicean virgin, daughter of Publius, and said by St. Athanasius (*S. Ant. Vit.* ap. *Opp.* i. 842) to have been cured by the prayers of St. Anthony (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iv. 223). [J. G.]

POLYEUCTUS, Feb. 13. Martyr in the Decian persecution at Melitina on the Euphrates. He was a centurion of the Legio Fulminata, stationed from the age of Augustus in that district (cf. Dion Cassius, lv. 23). His name is never found in any of the ancient Church historians till the time of Gregory of Tours, who mentions him in *Hist. Franc.* vii. 6, and in *De Glor. Mart.* § 103, where he writes his name Polyoctos, and tells us he was venerated at Constantinople as the avenger of perjury. His cult was, however, practised at Melitina prior to A.D. 377, cf. Migne, *Patr. Grae.* t. cxiv. p. 597. His name was also venerated in Egypt, cf. Boeckh *Corp. Ins. Graec.* No. 8981; De Rossi, *Bullet.* iv. 72. Corneille wrote his drama out of his acts, as told by Surius. Combefis, in 1660, found what he considered his original acts in the volume of MSS., whence he drew the Acts of SS. Phileas and Philoromus. [PHILEAS.] They profess to have been written by Nearchus, a friend of Polyeuctus, and an eye witness of his martyrdom. Aubé has lately published them in Greek and Latin, with an elaborate defence of their authentic character, *Polyeucte dans l'histoire*, par B. Aubé, Paris, 1882, pp. 116. [G. T. S.]

POMERIUS. [JULIANUS (72).]

POMPEIANA (1), matron at Thebaste in Numidia, who received the headless body of St. Maximilian A.D. 295 (Ruinart, *Act. Mart.* 340), conveyed it on a litter to Carthage, and buried it near St. Cyprian. She died three days later, and was herself interred there (*ib.* 342; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* ii. 480). [J. G.]

POMPEIANA (2) (POMPONIANA), devout lady in Sardinia. [EPIPHANIUS (53).] In 573 Gregory directed the defensor Sabinus to assist her and Theodosia in coming to Rome, as they requested. (Gregorius, *Epp.* i. 48, iii. 36, xi. 25.) [F. D.]

POMPEIANUS (1), bishop of Emesa, took part in the council of Antioch which deposed Athanasius, bishop of Perrha. (Labbe, iv 727, 729.) Theodoret wrote commending to his charity Celestianus, a senator of Carthage, who when the city was entered by the Vandals had lost his all. (CELESTIANUS.) (Theod. *Ep.* 36; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 840; Ceillier, *Auteurs Eccles.* x. 66.) [E. V.]

POMPEIANUS (2), abbat of one of the twelve monasteries founded by St. Benedict. (Gregorius, *Dial.* ii. 4.) [F. D.]

POMPEIUS (1), African bishop in ii. Syn. Carth. (see Rettberg, 6) A.D. 252 sub Cyp.—almost certainly the same as Pompeius who was with Bp. Stephanus accidentally at Rome at the time of the counter-elections of Cornelius and Novatian to the popedom. They brought the particulars to the first Council of Carthage, A.D. 251, before the proper ambassadors returned; Cyp. Epp. 44, 45. Again, he is apparently the same as the Pompeius Frater to whom is addressed *Ep.* 74, of Cyprian on baptism and the Bp. of Sabrata on Syrtis, who votes by proxy through Natalis, Bp. of Oea in his neighbourhood suffr. 84 of Sentt. Epp. in Syn. Carth. vii. [E. W. B.]

POMPEIUS (2), nephew of the emperor Anastasius, and patrician: with his wife Anastasia, he was a great defender of the council of Chalcedon. He reported the peaceful condition of the Eastern church to Pope Hormisdas, and received a reply of thanks, A.D. 519 (Horm. *Epp.* ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxiii. 451, 457). [J. G.]

POMPEIUS (3), bishop, about whom Gregory the Great in A.D. 600 wrote to the bishop of Milan. Pompeius seems to have been convicted on some unnamed charge, and a confession to have been extorted from him, as he alleged by imprisonment and starvation. Gregory considered the case still doubtful. (*Epp.* x. 29.) [F. D.]

POMPONIA GRAECINA, a Roman lady, who is regarded as one of the earliest and most distinguished Roman converts. Tacitus, *Annals*, xiii. 32, tells us, referring to the year 57 or 58, "Pomponia Graecina, a distinguished lady, wife of the Plautius who returned from Britain with an ovation, was accused of some foreign superstition, and handed over to her husband's judicial decision. Following ancient precedent, he heard his wife's cause in the presence of kinsfolk, involving, as it did, her legal status and character, and he reported that she was innocent. This Pomponia lived a long life of unbroken melancholy. After the murder of Julia, Drusus's daughter, by Messalina's treachery, for forty years she wore only the attire of a mourner with her heart ever sorrowful. For this, during Claudius's reign, she escaped unpunished, and it was afterwards counted a glory to her. This is the only notice of her in ancient literature. She has in modern times come into prominence, owing to De Rossi's discoveries in the catacomb of Callistus (*Roma Sotterranea*, ii. 360–364). De Rossi's theory is that she was identical with St. Lucina, having adopted that name at her baptism (cf. Aubé, *Hist. des Persécut.* t. i. p. 180).

Schiller, *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit*, p. 446, refers the inscriptions which have been undoubtedly discovered in the Christian cemetery belonging to a family of Pomponii Graecini, to the end of the 2nd or beginning of the 3rd century, and denies that they have any connection with the Pomponia Graecina of A.D. 58. But this is a point on which archaeologists like De Rossi carry most weight. Cf. for other notices of her, Brownlow and Northcote's *Roma Sotterran.* t. i. p. 82, 83, 278–282. De Rossi, in his *Roma Sotterran.* t. i. p. 306–351, discusses the crypt and family of St. Lucina at great length (cf. also his *Bullettino di Archeol. Crist. passim*). [G. T. S.]

POMPONIUS (1), a deacon of Carthage, who with another named Tertius ministered to the martyrs Perpetua and Felicitas (*Passio SS. Perp. et Fel.* i. 2; ii. 2; iii. 2; Tillem. iii. 141). [PERPETUA.] [C. H.]

POMPONIUS (2), bishop of Dionysiana in Prov. Byzacena. 11th in Conc. Carth. iv. sub Cyp. de Basil. Cyp. *Ep.* 67, A.D. 254; 16th in Conc. v. de Bap. Haer. 1, A.D., 255, *Ep.* 70; and 48th in Conc. vii. Sentt. *Epp.* A.D. 256, called "Confessor" in the later marginal note on this place. Possibly the same bishop Pomponius to whom is addressed *Ep.* iv. *de Virgg. subintroductis*, A.D. 249. [E. W. B.]

POMPONIUS (3), a friend of Sulpicius Severus. (Sulp. *Dial.* iii. 18 in *Pat. Lat.* xx.; Tillem. xii. 595, 602.) [C. H.]

PONTIANUS (1), martyr A.D. 192. [EUSEBIUS (108).]

PONTIANUS (2), Jan. 19, a martyr at Spoletum, under a judge named Fabianus, in the reign of Antoninus Pius. His martyrdom is commemorated by the *Mart. Vet. Rom.*, Adon., Usuard, and discussed by the Bollandists in the vol. for Jan. 19, p. 929. He suffered on Jan. 14, and was buried on Jan. 19. His acts may contain some genuine fragments. [G. T. S.]

PONTIANUS (3), bishop of Rome from 21st July (?) A.D. 230 to 28th Sept. A.D. 235, during five years two months and seven days. These are the dates given in the Liberian Catalogue, and are in all probability correct, though later recensions of the Pontifical give them differently. The same record states that he was, with Hippolytus, a presbyter, banished to the island of Sardinia, which it describes as "nociva insula," implying, possibly, that he was sent to the mines there. His banishment may be concluded to have taken place under the emperor Maximinus, who succeeded Alexander after the assassination of the latter in May A.D. 235, and who, unlike his predecessor, was a persecutor. The date assigned to the end of the episcopate of Pontianus was probably not that of his death, but of his deprivation only. The expression in the Liberian Catalogue is "discinctus est," Antheros being said to have been ordained in his place on the 21st Nov. The Felician Catalogue gives the 30th Oct. as the day of his death, but without specification of the year, and adds that he had been previously "adflictus et fustibus maceratus." Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 29) makes his episcopate end in the reign of Gordianus (237); but this is apparently due to a confusion between the dates of his death and of his burial at Rome, which was not effected till the pontificate of Fabianus, who succeeded to the see in 236, Anteros having intervened, and who, according to the Felician Catalogue, brought the body of Pontianus by sea to Rome, and buried it in the cemetery of St. Callistus. The 13th of August is given in the Liberian *Depositio Martyrum* as the day of his burial, which may be concluded to have been in the year 237 from an imperial rescript (referred to in evidence by De Rossi) allowing in that year the transference and burial of the bodies of the "deportati" (*Digest.* xlviii. 24, 2). To the fact of the burial of Pontianus having been effected by Fabian is probably due the further inference of Eusebius (*in loc. cit.*) that the latter was his immediate successor, and that Anteros, who intervened, succeeded Fabian.

The only act of Pontianus during his episcopate of which there is anything to be said is his probable assent to the condemnation of Origen by Demetrius of Alexandria. Jerome (*Ep. ad Paulam*, xxix. *in Benedict. edit.*; *Ep.* xxxiii. *in edit. Veron.*) says of Origen: "For this toil what reward did he get? He is condemned by the bishop Demetrius. With the exception of the priests of Palestine, Arabia, Phoenicia, and Achaia, the world consents to his condemnation. Rome herself assembles a senate (meaning apparently a synod) against him, not on account of novelty of dogmas, not on account of heresy, as rabid dogs now pretend to his disfavour, but because she could not bear the glory of his eloquence and knowledge, and because while he was teaching all else were accounted mute." This passage, from an epistle of Jerome written before his declaration against Origenism and his consequent controversy with Rufinus, is quoted by the latter in his Apology against Jerome during the course of the controversy (Rufin. *Apolog. in Hieron.* lib. ii. c. 20). The condemnation of Origen by Demetrius being supposed (though not with certainty) to have been *circ.* A.D. 231, the Roman bishop who assembled the assenting Roman synod was most probably Pontianus.

Two spurious epistles are assigned to this pope. He is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on the 19th November as a saint and martyr, as having been banished by the emperor (said to have been Antoninus) to Sardinia, and there killed ("mactatus" instead of the "maceratus" of *Cat. Fel.*) with clubs. [J. B—Y.]

PONTIANUS (4), an African bishop, A.D. 540, who addressed a remonstrance to the Emperor Justinian against his edict about the Three Chapters. Pontianus rightly declined to anathematise men whose works he had not read, and feared that under pretence of condemning Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas men were only striving to restore Eutychianism. The letter of Pontianus will be found in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxvii. col. 995. [G. T. S.]

PONTICUS (1), a youth of the age of fifteen, who suffered with Blandina among the Martyrs of Lyons, A.D. 177 (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1). [G. S.]

PONTICUS (2), an ecclesiastic, to whom, along with another named Caricus, Serapion bishop of Antioch addressed a letter (not extant) against the Montanists. (Euseb. v. 19; vi. 12; Jerom. *Vir. Illust.* c. 41; Tillem. ii. 426.) Eusebius designates the two men ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς ἄνδρας. [C. H.]

PONTITIANUS, a soldier, perhaps of the praetorian guard, an African by birth, and a Christian, who indirectly contributed much towards the conversion of St. Augustine, who relates in his *Confessions* in his own simple and exquisitely pathetic way, how one day, while he was at Milan in company with Alypius, Pontitianus came, as it seemed by accident, having to visit his countrymen, and found on the table, perhaps a chess-board (mensa lusoria), a book containing the writings of St. Paul, and having expressed some surprise, informed the friends that he was a Christian, and in the constant habit of prayer to God both in public worship and at home. The conversation then turned upon Antony, the Egyptian monk, whose history was not unknown to them, but of which Pontitianus knew much more than they did. He told them how he had become acquainted with it. He was at Treves, in attendance on the emperor; and when one day he had gone to witness the performance in the circus, himself and three of his comrades, who are called agents, went to amuse themselves in the public gardens. Having separated, two of them met again at the dwelling of a recluse, and found there an account of St. Antony, which one of them read to the other until his spirit was stirred within him to relinquish his military life and enlist himself in the service of God as a monk, and not only so, but prevailed on his companion to join him. In a short time Pontitianus and the fourth member of the party came up, and the other two endeavoured to persuade them to follow their example, but without success. They returned to the palace while the disciples of St. Antony remained behind. Such was the tale to which Augustine listened, and he describes his agony of mind on hearing it, his vehement self-reproaches, his strong impulse to rise up and follow Christ, and the hindrances which held him back; the arguments refuted and shattered which dissuaded him from the step, but the strong curb of habit which restrained his effort, and wasted his life with nervous agitation. We hear no more of Pontitianus, and the sequel belongs to the history of St. Augustine himself. (Aug. *Conf.* viii. 6, 7.) [H. W. P.]

PONTIUS (1), May 14. Martyr under Valerian in Cimela, a city of Gaul. The acts are very corrupt, and have afforded much trouble to hagiographers. See Henschenius on them under this date in *AA. SS.* Boll.; Baron. ad ann. ccxlvi. Num. 9; Petav. *de Doct. Temp.* xi. 25; Tillem. *Mém.* v. 588; Usuard. *Mart.*; Ceill. x. 158. [G. T. S.]

PONTIUS (2), March 8, a deacon of Carthage, by whom the life of St. Cyprian was written. We know nothing about him save what we glean from his *Vita Cypriani*, found prefixed to all editions of St. Cyprian's works. From it we learn that he was a deacon attached to St. Cyprian, and as such regarded by the people as specially qualified to write his biography. He was at the same time conscious of his own incapacity. Thus, he tells us, cap. I., "In qua parte si dixero nos opibus facundiae defici, minus dico. Facundia enim ipsa deficit digna facultate, quae desiderium vestrum pleno spiritu satiet. Ita utrimque graviter urgemur; siquidem ille nos virtutibus suis onerat, vos nos precibus fatigatis." He lived as a deacon with St. Cyprian, just as Cyprian himself, after his conversion, lived with the presbyter Caecilian. This, as it has been already pointed out under CYPRIAN, Vol. I. p. 740, is the only conclusion we can draw from the obscure words of Pontius, c. iv., "Erat sane ille etiam de nobis contubernium viri justi et laudabilis memoriae Caecilii," where "de nobis contubernium" seems to signify the collective body of deacons. He was chosen by Cyprian to accompany him into exile to Curubus c. xi. and xii. (cf. Dodwell's *Dissertationes Cyprianicae*, iv. 21). His *Vita* is evidently an authentic record. Its style is rugged, and in places very obscure; yet presents all those internal marks of truth and antiquity which Le Blant has noticed in his treatise *Les Actes des Martyrs*. It uses all the correct technical terms of Roman criminal law, and refers to all the usual forms observed in criminal trials. Le Blant, in fact, on p. 111 of his work, quotes the *Vita* of Pontius to illustrate the Roman formality of reading a prisoner's sentence from a tablet, cf. Pontius, capp. xii. and xvii. cap. xv., again speaks of Cyprian as kept, the night before his execution, in "custodia delicata," an allusion which can only be understood in the light of Le Blant's explanation, p. 49. Jerome, in his *Liber de Vir. Illust.* cap. 68, mentions the life of Pontius, describing it as "egregium volumen vitae et passionis Cypriani." The bibliography of Pontius' *Vita* will be found complete in Potthast's *Bibliotheca*, *s. v.* Cyprianus, p. 662. For a critical account of the MSS. thereof see Hartel's edition of Cyprian's works in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptt. Eccles. Latin.* t. iii., pt. 1, pref. p. lxix. Ruinart gives the text in the *Acta Sincera*, p. 203; cf. also *Martyrol. Vet. Rom.*, Adon., Usuard. [G. T. S.]

PONTIUS (3), a Donatist bishop, but of what see does not appear, who with Rogatianus and others was the principal mover of a petition to the emperor Julian to reinstate the Donatists, A.D. 362. He was afterwards present at the council of Bagaia, A.D. 394 (Aug. *Ep.* 105, 9, c. *Petil.* ii. 92, 205; 97, 223; *c. Cresc.* iii. 53, 59). St. Augustine also mentions a man of this name, whom the Donatists claimed as the worker of a miracle, but his date was probably earlier, (*De Unit. Eccl.* 19, 49; *Tract. in Joann.* xiii. 17). [H. W. P.]

PONTIUS (4) LEONTIUS. [LEONTIUS (85).]

POPPAEA. [SABINUS.]

PORCARIUS, ST., martyr, an abbat of Lérins, who, with 500 of his monks, is said to have been massacred by the Saracens about the year 730. According to the story, as told in old MSS. of the monastery, when the approach of the heathen was known, the abbat hid the sacred relics lest they should be contaminated,

sent away into Italy sixteen boys who were being educated there and thirty-six monks whose constancy was doubtful, and with the rest, to the number of 505, prepared for martyrdom. All but five of these were massacred, the churches and buildings utterly destroyed, and the island left desolate. A vast multitude of sea-birds came and circled over the corpses with incessant cries, as though to celebrate their obsequies, until the wretched survivors had buried them, before seeking their comrades in Italy. It should be mentioned that some have recounted this massacre as being the work of Genseric and the Vandals. Porcarius's day is Aug. 12. (Barralis Salerna, *Chronologia Lerinensis* i. 220 seqq.; Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. ii. 733–9.) [S. A. B.]

PORFIRIUS (Porphyrius), **PUBLILIUS OPTATIANUS**, a Latin poet of the time of Constantine the Great. He is perhaps the same Optatianus who was praefect of Rome in 329 and 333, but nothing is known with any certainty concerning his life, except the episode connected with his book entitled *Panegyricus.* This work he composed when in exile for some unrecorded offence, (he himself says, on a false charge). The occasion, it would appear, was the Vicennalia of Constantine, in whose honour the work is designed. The emperor was either gratified by the flattery of the poems, or moved by the thought of the severe and prolonged suffering which their preparation must have caused to the unhappy author, and recalled him from banishment. The emperor's letter to the poet acknowledging the work is still extant, as well as a letter from Porfirius to the emperor. St. Jerome mentions this event in his continuation of the Chronicon of Eusebius under the date 329. The book must, however, have been sent to the emperor earlier, since it contains an address to Crispus, which could hardly have been inserted in a poem intended for presentation to Constantine after Crispus had been put to death by his orders:—

> "Sancte salus mundi, armis insignibus ardens,
> Crispe, avis melior."

This points to a date before 326. But the date assigned for Porfirius' recall may be accurate enough, if we take it as the date of his pardon, and not of his sending his extraordinary book to Constantine. If the date is right, the probability of his identity with the praefect of the city becomes very slight indeed.

Of the book itself, it can only be said that it is a monument of perverted ingenuity and bad taste. It consists of twenty-six pieces of verse, varying in length from four to forty lines. The author himself describes his work as "carmen quod artioribus Musarum ligaveram vinculis;" and the restrictions under which he placed himself have been observed with a certain regard to sense and metre. Some of the pieces are "shaped" poems, representing an "ara Pythia," a "syrinx," and an "organon." Others have some especial peculiarity belonging to each line, as to the number of words or letters, or parts of speech which it contains, or the variety of sense or form which can be obtained by reading the words backwards instead of forwards. Others are acrostics, while several are so arranged that the number of letters in each line being equal, the whole poem forms a solid square of letters, over which a pattern or figure is traced out by rubricating those letters which fall in particular lines; the rubricated letters, in their turn, giving a reading with a sense of its own. Thus the words "Publilius Optatianus Porfirius haec lusi, omne genus metri tibi pangens, optime Basse," result from the red letters which make a diaper pattern on the surface of one poem; another is inscribed with the monogram of the Labarum, which is made up of letters reading as follows:—

> "Omnipotens genitor, tuque, o divisio mixta
> Filius atque Pater, et Sanctus Spiritus, Unum,
> Faveas votis."

Other rubrications are appeals to the vanity or the pity of the emperor, or expressions of good wishes for his safety and fortune. Some of them are made, by a free use of the Latin letters, to give a sense in Greek. The author has appended to each poem an instruction on its peculiarities.

The poems themselves are of course obscure in sense, and devoid of any merits or graces of style, and are useless except as a curiosity. The same may be said of the "versus anacyclici" of the cod. Salmasianus, which have the name of Porfirius attached to them.

The Panegyricus was first printed in P. Pithoei *Poem. Vet.* (Paris, 1590); again, in a fuller form, from a codex in the possession of P. Velser, at Augsburg in 1595, and yet again from the same MS., with a "spicilegium criticum" by Daumius, as an addition to M. Velseri *Opera* (Nürnberg, 1682). The three "shaped" poems mentioned are to be found (with an introduction and notes) in Wernsdorf, *Poet. Lat. Min.* ii. 365. The "versus anacyclici" from the cod. Salm. are to be found in Riese, *Auth. Lat.* (no. 81), and (with some others not retained by Riese), in Meyer's *Auth. Lat.* (nos. 236–40). An edition of the poems of Porfirius, with a preface by Luc. Müller, was published by Trübner in 1870. [H. A. W.]

PORPHYRIANI, a name affixed to the Arian party by the emperor Constantine immediately after the first general council. "As Porphyry, that enemy of piety, for having composed licentious treatises against religion, found a suitable recompense, and such as thenceforth branded him with infamy, overwhelming him with deserved reproach, his impious writings also having been destroyed; so now it seems fit both that Arians and such as hold his sentiments should be denominated Porphyrians, that they may take their appellation from those whose conduct they have imitated." (*Epist. Const.* in Socrat. *H. E.* lib. i. cap. 9.) [G. T. S.]

PORPHYRIUS (1) (Πορφύριος), commonly called by English writers Porphyry, was the most distinguished teacher of the Neo-Platonic school after Plotinus. Since he describes himself (*Vita Plotini*, c. 4) as being thirty years old when he went to Rome in the tenth year of Gallienus, he must have been born A.D. 232 or 233. He calls himself (*V. Plot.* 8) a Tyrian; so that even if, as Jerome (*Praef. in Galat.*) and Chrysostom (on 1 *Cor.* Hom. vi. p. 58) assert,

he was actually born at Batanea,* he was no doubt of a Tyrian family. His original name, *Malchus* (Eunapius, *Vitae Sophist.* p. 7, ed. Boiss.) i.e. מֶלֶךְ, *Melek*, a king, seems to indicate a Semitic origin. Longinus however called him Πορφύριος (Eunap. u.s.) a kind of playful synonym for his regal name. Some Christian writers (Socrates, *H. E.* iii. 23, p. 203) state that he was born of Christian parents, but left the church in consequence of the harsh treatment which he received from Christians. While still young, he somewhere, perhaps at Tyre, met with Origen (Vincent. Lirin. *Commonit.* i. 23), whose system of allegorical interpretation of Scripture he afterwards ridiculed (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19). He became a pupil of Longinus at Athens (Euseb. *Praepar. Evang.* x. 3, 1), under whom he acquired literary culture. But his strongest bias was towards philosophy, and in the year 263, when he had already acquired a high reputation, he removed to Rome and joined himself to Plotinus. A few years later the master, perceiving that his pupil had fallen into a state of melancholy, sent him for change of air and scene to Sicily, where he still remained in the days of Eusebius the church historian (Euseb. *H.E.* vi. 19). He married in middle life a lady named Marcella, the widow of a friend (Eunap. *v. Soph.* p. 11). As he himself (*v. Plot.* 23) refers to an event which took place in his 68th year, he must have reached at least the year 301; and if Suidas (s.v.) is right in placing his death under Diocletian, he cannot have lived more than four years after that date. He is said (Eunap. p. 11) to have died at Rome.

Porphyry's learning was great and wide, but he lays no claim to originality; it is the teaching of Plotinus that he expounds and defends; but he states clearly and precisely what his master often left obscure. His gift of literary style was probably developed by the teaching of Longinus, the first critic of his time. Of the numerous treatises which Porphyry put forth on various subjects, there remain only the Ἀφορμαὶ πρὸς τὰ νοητὰ or *Sententiae*—a brief and clear exposition of his philosophic system—the tract on Abstinence from Flesh, a life of Pythagoras, a letter to Marcella, two little mythologic treatises on the Styx and on the Nymphs' Grotto, and an Introduction to the Categories of Aristotle. A certain number of very interesting fragments on the Soul and its Faculties may be gathered from Eusebius and Stobaeus; and Proclus, in his Commentary on the Timaeus, furnishes us with several passages of great value on the theological and cosmological views of Porphyry. We are here concerned mainly with his views on the nature of man and man's relation to the Deity, and especially with his attitude towards Judaism and Christianity.

Porphyry is with justice reputed the soberest of the Neo-Platonic philosophers; much more than Plotinus, he considers the bearing of philosophy on practical life. The end of philosophy is with him morality—we might almost say, holiness—the healing of man's infirmities, the imparting to him a purer and more vigorous life. Mere knowledge, however true, is not of itself sufficient; knowledge has for its object *life* in accordance with reason (νοῦς) (*De Abstinentia*, i. 29). Of what value, says he, are the discourses of philosophers, if they cannot heal the sickness of the soul? The salvation (σωτηρία) of the soul is the proper object of philosophy (*Ad Marcellam*, c. 31; fragments in Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* iv. 7, 1; 8, 1; xiv. 10, 4). Like all the Neo-Platonists, he held that the soul should be as far as possible freed from the bonds of matter. He begs his disciples—in terms which sound like an echo of the Gospel—to be ready for the salvation of the soul to cut off the whole body (*Ad Marcellam*, 34). For this reason he recommends the practice of abstinence, saying that we should be like the gods if we could abstain from vegetable as well as animal food. But with all his desire for the purification of the soul from the chains of matter, and uniting it with God (*De Abstin.* i. 57), he gave in slowly and reluctantly to the "theurgy"—the mystic incantations—which had so great a charm for most of the Neo-Platonists. This, he thought, was powerless to purify the truly intellectual or noetic portion of the soul; it could but cleanse the lower or psychic portion, and make it capable of perceiving lower beings, such as spirits, angels, and gods (August. *De Civ. Dei*, x. 9). Once only, in his sixty-eighth year, he believed that he experienced the mystic trance, and was united with the Deity (*Vita Plotini*, 23).

With Plotinus's views of religion as a personal purification and means of access to the highest divinity, it may well be supposed that he was not specially devoted to the civic and national worship of paganism. It is no matter to the philosopher what cities may do to appease their deities; for they look not to the care and culture of the soul, but to wealth and other external things, the want of which they think an evil. The true God is not honoured by sacrifice, but by pure silence and pure thoughts about Him (*De Abstinentia*, ii. 34, 43). It matters nothing in reality whether we neglect or tend the altars of the gods; but whoever honours a god as if he needed anything from him, unconsciously sets himself above the god. Do not therefore, he says, defile the divinity with the vain imaginings of men; you will not injure that which is for ever blessed, and from which every impact of corruption glances off; but you will blind yourself to the perception of the greatest and most vital truths (*Ad Marcellam*, 18). Touching the gods, four principles should be held—faith, truth, love (ἔρως), hope. For we ought to have faith that our only salvation is in turning to God to be eager to learn the truth about him; when we have learned it, to be enamoured of what we have learned; and when we are enamoured to nourish the soul with good hopes (*Ad Marcellam*, 24). If we would be free from the assaults of evil spirits, we must keep ourselves clear of those things over which evil spirits have power, for they attack not the pure soul which has no affinity with them (*De Abstin.* ii. 43).

But with all this he by no means contemplates a revolution in the popular religion. For the most part, it is true piety to worship the gods according to the custom of one's country (*Ad Marc.* 18). And he was not, as indeed he scarcely could be, altogether uninfluenced by the polytheism in the midst of which he lived; he

* See on this point Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, v. 726, ed. Harless.

acknowledged astral spirits, and good and evil daemons of various kinds. But these daemons, or visible gods, being composite, unlike the supreme deity, are neither unchanging nor immortal (*De Abst.* ii. 36, 39). His enmity to Christianity was no doubt partly due to the fact, that it was clearly destructive of the Pagan worship, for which he had a kind of lingering affection. He very much preferred the conduct of Ammonius Saccas, who, born of Christian parents, had accepted his country's paganism, to that of Origen, who, born (as he supposed) in paganism, had gone over to Christian barbarism (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19). Whatever the cause, Porphyry was keenly hostile to the Christian Church. However nearly he may have approached to the moral teaching of Christianity, he is regarded by the early fathers as the bitterest and most irreconcilable enemy of the faith. He wrote—for the hypothesis of an anti-Christian Porphyry distinct from the Neo-Platonist seems to rest on no evidence (see N. Lardner, *Jewish and Heathen Testimonies*, iii. c. 37)—fifteen books against the Christians, which were honoured with refutations by some of the most eminent doctors of the age—Methodius of Tyre, Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinaris of Laodicea. So far as we may judge from the fragments which remain, his attack was learned and skilful. He sought, as so many have done in modern times, to point out such contradictions in the Christian Scriptures as might disprove the infallibility attributed to them. He seized, for instance, on the conflict between St. Peter and St. Paul related in Gal. ii., to point out the variance between the heads of the Christian community (Jerome, *Prol. in Galat.*, *Opp.* vii. 371). He blamed the seeming change of purpose in the Lord Himself as seen in John vii. 8 compared with vii. 14 (Jerome, *Dial. c. Pelag.* ii. 17). He seems also to have accused the writers of the Gospels of deliberate falsification (Id. *Epist.* 57 *ad Pammach.* c. 9; *Quaest. Hebr. in Genes.* init.). He took the words of St. Peter to Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v. 4 ff.) as a curse—foolishly, as Jerome says (*Epist. ad Demetr.* in Semler's ed. of Pelagius's *Epist. ad Demetriadem*, p. 12). Especially notorious was the twelfth book of his work, in which he contended that the Book of Daniel was not the work of the prophet whose name it bears, but of a later writer, who lived in Judaea in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. The so-called prophecy therefore, up to that time, is not prophecy, but history (Jerome, *Praef. in Daniel.*, *Opp.* v. 617 f.). In his criticism of the Mosaic books, he blamed the allegorizing interpretations of Origen and others, which found mysteries in the plain sense of the law (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19). He propounded, too, three difficulties often repeated in modern times. If Christ is the only way of salvation, why was He so late revealed? Why did Christians reject sacrifices, when the God of the Old Testament had instituted them? How can sin entail everlasting punishment, when Christ Himself has said (Matt. vii. 2), "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again"? (August. *Epist.* 102, or *Sex Quaestiones c. Paganos*, qu. 2, 3, 4; cf. Jerome, *Epist.* 133 *ad Ctesiphont.* c. 9).

Still, Porphyry did not rail at Christianity as Celsus had done. After all his fault-finding, he still contended that there was something in the teaching of Christ worthy of all respect and even reverence. The Neo-Platonists, says Augustine (*De Consensu Evang.* i. 15), praised Christ while they disparaged Christianity; the railing, from which they exempted the Master, they bestowed upon the disciples. Jesus (they contended) said nothing against the pagan deities; rather, He wrought wonders by their aid (*ib.* c. 34). They could not follow the disciples in calling Him God, but they were ready to honour Him as one of the best and wisest of men (*ib.* c. 7; cf. *De Civ. Dei*, xix. 23; Euseb. *Dem. Evang.* iii. 8). It can scarcely be doubted that Porphyry wrote his life of Pythagoras with a view of raising the half-mythic Grecian sage to the same level with Christ. It was not without design that he represented his hero not only as the ideal of wisdom, but as a kind of incarnate deity. He can well suppose a god sojourning with men, but he cannot allot an undisputed pre-eminence to Christ. In fact, what Porphyry desired was not a new religion for mankind—for men in general might well be satisfied with existing forms of faith—but a special religion for philosophers.

Even in the storm of controversy, scarcely a word seems to have been uttered against the private life of Porphyry. His system prescribed purity, and there is no good reason to doubt that he practised it. Not one of the heathen thinkers approached in some respects nearer to the moral principles of Christianity; but the mysteries of the faith he seems to have been altogether unable to receive. Like many modern thinkers, he was ready to honour Christ as a man, even an inspired man, but the exclusive devotion which Christianity requires he refused to give. It does not appear that he gave in to Gnostic explanations of the nature of Christ's person and office; rather, he clung to the notion of His bare humanity. In fact, with his learning and candour, his evident acquaintance with the Scriptures both old and new, and yet his total rejection of the central mystery of the Christian faith, he presents a very interesting problem.

Literature.—Porphyry's *Life of Plotinus* was printed in Ficino's edition of Plotinus (Basel, 1580), and again in Creuzer's ed. of Plotinus (Oxford, 1835). His *Life of Pythagoras* was edited by Rittershuys (Amsterdam, 1707). The Ἀφορμαὶ or *Sententiae* were edited by Holstenius; also the treatise *De Abstinentia* (Rome, 1630; reprinted at Utrecht, 1769). The *Letter to Marcella* was first printed by Angelo Mai, *Auctores Classici*, iv. 356 ff. (Rome, 1831). The *Letter to Anebo* was first printed in the *Poemander* at Venice (1483); again in Gale's ed. of Jamblichus *De Mysteriis* (London, 1670); again in Parthey's edition of the same work (Berlin, 1857). There is a complete list of all the works known to have been written by Porphyry in Fabricius's *Bibliotheca Graeca*, v. 729, ed. Harless.

Information on Porphyry's life and writings may be found in the following works. Brucker, *Historia Philosophiae*, i. 236 ff.; Steinhart in Pauly's *Realencyclop.* v. 1917 ff.; *British Critic*, v. 234 (1829); Vacherot, *Histoire Critique de l'École d'Alexandrie*, ii. 11 ff.; Jules Simon, *Hist. de l'École d'Alexandrie*, ii. 17 ff.; Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2, 572 ff. [C.]

PORPHYRIUS (2), Feb. 16. A philosophical slave of Pamphilus, who suffered by fire soon after his master. (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* xi.)

PORPHYRIUS, poet. [PORFIRIUS.]

PORPHYRIUS (3), bishop of some see not far from Cucusus, friendly to Chrysostom, to whom, with other bishops, he wrote soon after his arrival, expressing his kindly feeling, and his desire to open correspondence with him (Chrys. *Ep.* 235). The title of the letter names him bishop of Rhosus. Tillemont doubts the correctness of this on account of the distance of that city from Cucusus. (Tillem. tom. xi. p. 609, *Note sur Chrys.* 90.) [E. V.]

PORPHYRIUS (4), patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 404–413, successor to Flavian (Soc. *H. E.* vii. 9). Porphyrius is described by the author of the dialogue which goes under the name of Palladius as a man of infamous character, who had disgraced the clerical profession by his intimacy with jockeys and mountebanks and the other scum of the circus, in whose obscene representations of the old pagan fables he is even charged with having taken part. He is accused of licentious life, and darker rumours of unnatural crime are hinted at (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 143). Although the bad character of Porphyrius was notorious, and his name was found in the reports of the police courts, by his natural cleverness and adroit flattery he obtained considerable influence with the magistrates, and wound himself into the confidence of some of the leading bishops of the province. The power he thus acquired he employed most unscrupulously in browbeating such of the orthodox bishops and clergy as it was not worth his while to gain by adulation, and thwarting their plans for the good of the church (*ibid.* p. 142). He is said to have watched for the vacancies of sees, and by his arts to have procured the ordination of creatures of his own, even against the better judgment of the consecrators. As Porphyry had been a long time in holy orders at the time of his usurpation of the see, and he seems to have passed his life in Antioch, he and Chrysostom must have been well acquainted with one another, and their mutual aversion can be easily conceived. Flavian's death having occurred nearly contemporaneously with Chrysostom's deposition and exile, it became a matter of first importance to the leaders of the cabal which had accomplished his overthrow, to have the vacant throne of Antioch filled with a man who could be depended on to carry out their designs for the complete crushing of his adherents, who were naturally numerous and powerful in his native city, which had been so long the scene of his ministry. Porphyrius was the person fixed on. To clear the field Constantius, the trusted friend of Chrysostom, whom the love and reverence of the people of Antioch marked out as Flavian's successor, was accused at Constantinople as a disturber of the public peace. By his bribes and by his powerful influence with the party then dominant about the court, Porphyry obtained an Imperial rescript banishing Constantius to the Oasis. By the help of his friends Constantius anticipated the execution of the decree and fled to Cyprus (*ibid.* 145) [CONSTANTIUS 4]. Porphyry then managed to get into his hands Cyriacus and Diophantus, and other presbyters of the orthodox party who were likely to be troublesome, and seized the opportunity of the first day of the Olympian festival, celebrated every fourth year at Antioch, when almost the whole population had poured forth to witness the spectacles in the suburb of Daphne, to lock himself and his three consecrators, Acacius, Antiochus and Severianus, whom he had kept in hiding at his own house, with a few of the clergy into the chief church, and to receive ordination at their hands. In fear of being surprised at their clandestine profanation of things sacred, the service was performed so hurriedly that some portions of the rite are said to have been omitted (*ibid.* 146). On the conclusion of the ordination the ordainers having received a pecuniary satisfaction, λαβόντες τὸ ἱκανὸν, consulted their safety by flight over the mountain ranges. The Antiochenes, on their return from the shows, were indignant on hearing of the artifice which had imposed so unwelcome a prelate on them. That night they kept quiet. But the next morning they attacked the house of Porphyrius, and piling fagots round it sought to burn it over his head. Porphyrius applied for protection to the general in command, who sent a body of armed men, who dispersed the crowd and forcibly occupied the church, maltreating the worshippers and trampling under foot the cross which was being carried in procession through the vicinity of the city (*ibid.* p. 147). The influence of Porphyrius with the ruling powers secured the appointment of a savage old officer as captain of the city guards, who by his threats and open violence drove the people reluctantly to attend the church, φόβῳ τῶν αἰκισμῶν, inwardly reviling their infamous persecutor and invoking the Divine retribution his wickedness merited (*ibid.* 147). To afford him the means of securing the favour of those in power, Porphyrius was accused of not scrupling to melt down the sacred vessels of the church (*ibid.* 143). Forewarned of the real character of this infamous intruder into the patriarchal see, pope Innocent received Porphyry's request to be admitted to communion with dignified silence (*ibid.* p. 141). He was completely deserted by the chief clergy and all the ladies of rank of the city, who refused to approach the walls of his church and held their religious meetings elsewhere clandestinely (*ibid.* 149). In revenge for this religious ostracism, Porphyry employed all his influence at court to obtain a decree, issued by Arcadius Nov. 18, 404, sentencing all who refused communion with Arsacius, Theophilus and Porphyry to be expelled from the churches, and instructing the governor of the province to forbid their holding religious meetings elsewhere (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 24; *Cod. Theod.* 16, tom. iv. p. 103). All his efforts to obtain the recognition of the Antiochenes as their lawful bishop proving fruitless, while Chrysostom's spiritual power in exile became greater for all his efforts to crush it, this miserable man's exasperated spirit drove him to take vengeance on the banished prelate for his disappointment. Through his machinations and those of Severianus, orders were issued for the removal of Chrysostom from Cucusus to Pityus, during the execution of which the aged saint's

troubles were ended by death (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 97). (CHRYSOSTOM, Vol. I. p. 531.) Porphyry's own death is placed by Clinton (*Fast. Rom.* ii. 552) in 413 (cf. Theod. *H. E.* iii. 5). He was succeeded by Alexander, by whom the long distracted church was united (ALEXANDER, bishop of Antioch). It is a misfortune that the chief and almost only source for the character of Porphyry is the violent party-pamphlet (as it may be not unjustly styled) of Palladius, whose warm partisanship for Chrysostom unduly blackens all who took the contrary side, and refuses to allow them a single redeeming virtue. That Porphyry was not altogether the monster of iniquity this author represents may be concluded from the statement of the calm and amiable Theodoret, that he "left behind him" at Antioch "many memorials of his kindness and of his remarkable prudence" (Theod. *H. E.* v. 35), as well as by a still stronger testimony in his favour in Theodoret's letter to Dioscorus, when he calls him one "of blessed and holy memory, who was adorned both with a brilliant life, and an acquaintance with divine doctrines" (Theod. *Ep.* 83). It is not easy to reconcile the two characters, and with our necessarily imperfect knowledge it is vain to attempt to do so. Fragments of a letter addressed to Porphyry by Theophilus of Alexandria, recommending him to summon a synod, when some were seeking to revive the heresy of Paul of Samosata, are found in Labbe (*Concil.* v. 472). [E. V.]

PORPHYRIUS (5), bishop of Gaza, A.D. 395–420. According to the biography of his disciple, Mark (MARCUS, No. 12), which, with the exception of one or two notices elsewhere, is the only authority for the facts of his life, Porphyry was born at Thessalonica, c. 352, of a good family. His parents were Christians, and took care to have their son instructed in the Holy Scriptures, as well as in secular learning. When he was about 25, he renounced the world, and retired to the desert of Scete in Egypt, which, at the end of five years, he left for Jerusalem, and passed another five years in a cavern near the Jordan. A painful disease, brought on by his austerities, having compelled him to revisit Jerusalem, he there made the acquaintance of Mark; who, from admiration of his virtues, attached himself to him as his devoted disciple and companion. By Porphyry's desire Mark visited Thessalonica, and turned the proceeds of Porphyry's share of his paternal property into money, the whole of which, on his return, Porphyry distributed to the poor and to various monasteries, supporting himself by his manual labour. About his fortieth year he was reluctantly ordained presbyter by John, bishop of Jerusalem, who committed to his guardianship the sacred relic of the True Cross. After a presbyterate of three years, in the year 395, on the death of Aeneas, he was with still greater reluctance ordained bishop of Gaza, by John of Caesarea, who had sent for him on the pretext of consulting him on some scriptural difficulty.[a] The population of Gaza was at that time almost entirely pagan, and the position of a zealous Christian bishop was one of no small difficulty and even danger. The cessation of a severe drought at the beginning of the second year of his episcopate, January 326, which was attributed to his prayers and those of the Christians, was the cause of the conversion of a number of the heathen inhabitants. This was succeeded by other conversions, arousing great exasperation among the heathen population, which vented itself in a severe persecution. Porphyry endured the ill-treatment to which he was subjected with the utmost meekness, which was not without its effect on the minds of his persecutors. At the same time he despatched his deacon, Mark, and his minister, Borocas (a young man whom he had saved from a miserable death in the streets and who displayed the warmth of his gratitude, sometimes even too zealously) to Constantinople to obtain the protection of the emperor, and his sanction for the demolition of the idol temples. Through the powerful advocacy of Chrysostom an order was obtained to destroy the idols and close the temples, which was carried into execution by an imperial commissioner, who however it was asserted. was bribed, to spare the principal idol, named Marnas, and to wink at the entrance of the worshippers into the temple by a secret passage. To these events Jerome refers in a letter to Laeta (Hieron. *Ep.* vii. p. 54). The power of the idolaters however was by no means broken. They still remained the dominant section of the inhabitants, and were able to shut out Christians from all lucrative offices and to molest them in the enjoyment of their property. Porphyry took this so much to heart that he exhorted his metropolitan, John of Caesarea, to allow him to resign his see rather than witness evils he was unable to remedy. John consoled him, and promised to be his companion on a personal visit to Constantinople to obtain an order for the demolition not of the idols alone, as before, but of the temples themselves. After having visited a famous anchoret, named Procopius, at Rhodes, on their voyage, the two bishops arrived at Constantinople Jan. 7, 401. Chrysostom was then high in the empress Eudoxia's favour, and by his influence with her their suit was successful. In addition to the wished for orders for the destruction of the heathen shrines wrung by her from Arcadius, not without much difficulty, on the day of the baptism of their infant son (the future emperor Theodosius II.), an endowment and other privileges were secured for the Christians of Gaza and of Caesarea, and a large sum of money was granted for the erection of a church, and a hospice for strangers in the former city. The bishops reached Majuma, the port of Gaza, on May 1st, and were followed ten days afterwards by a commissioner named Cynegius, accompanied by the governor and a general officer with a large body of troops, by whom the imperial orders for the destruction of the temples was put into execution. In ten days the whole were pillaged and burnt, with the exception of the temple of Marnas. The stateliness of its architecture led to some hesitation whether it might not be desirable to spare it, and convert it into a Christian church. A solemn fast was ordered by Porphyrius, with the view

[a] On the asserted irregularity of the ordination of a presbyter to the episcopate by the metropolitan without obtaining the sanction of his diocesan, see Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xv. 201. Blondel doubts the authenticity of the account (*de la primauté en l'Eglise*, p. 552, Genev. 1641.

of discovering their duty in this matter. The sudden exclamation of a child of seven years, that it should be burnt to the ground was regarded as indicating the Divine will. The magnificent edifice was utterly destroyed, and on the ground it occupied the foundations of a cruciform church were laid according to a plan furnished by Eudoxia, who also according to her promise supplied the funds for its erection. The church was five years in building, and was dedicated by Porphyry, on Easter Day, 405 or 406, and called "Eudoxiana" after its foundress. Jerome refers to its erection (Hieron. *in Esaiam*, xvii. l. vii. tom. v. p. 86). The heathen population of Gaza, who were largely the majority, irritated at the high-handed destruction of their sacred buildings and at the spread of Christianity in the city, took occasion of some dispute between a leading pagan, Sampsychus by name, and the "oeconomus" of the church, to raise a tumult, in which several Christians were killed, and Porphyry himself barely escaped with his life. The episcopal palace was pillaged, and he had to take refuge in the house of an old woman, who, with her granddaughter, though still heathen, sheltered the bishop till the danger had passed. This kindness Porphyry repaid by converting them both, and admitting them to the church by baptism, the younger, named Salaphtha, becoming a deaconess, subsequently famous for her asceticism. Porphyry lived several years after the outbreak. We may certainly identify him with one of the two bishops of this name who attended the anti-Pelagian synod at Diospolis in 415. (August. *in Julian.* lib. i. c. 15). He died Feb. 26, 419 or 420, on which day he is commemorated both in the Greek and the Latin church. By his will he directed that a certain sum should be dispensed daily during Lent to the poor of the city, according to his custom during his life, and that in default the whole sum should devolve on the church of Caesarea. Porphyry is said to have been indefatigable in his instruction of the people of Gaza, adopting a simple and popular style, based entirely on Holy Scripture, without any parade of human eloquence. (Galland. *Bibl.* v. 259; Migne, *Patrol.* lxv. pp. 1211, ff.; Ceillier, *Aut. Ecclés.* vi. 329; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* x. pp. 703–716.) [E. V.]

PORTIANUS (POURÇAIN), **ST.**, abbat of the monastery which bore his name near Clermont in the first half of the 6th century. According to Gregory of Tours, who includes an account of him in the *Vitae Patrum* (cap. v.), he was originally the slave of a barbarian, i.e. a Frank, and running away many times to the neighbouring monastery, at length was made free and given up to the abbat. He entered the ranks of the clergy, and on the death of the abbat succeeded to his place, and was famous for the ingenuity of the torments he inflicted on himself. When Theoderic invaded and desolated Auvergne in 525, Portianus obtained from him the release of some of the prisoners. On his death, which probably took place about 527, he was buried in his own monastery. In the 10th century his body was raised from the earth. The head and part of the relics were afterwards stolen by Northmen and carried to l'Aigle in Normandy, where the box containing them, preserved in the church of St. Martin, was opened in 1673. For the history of his monastery, which was reduced to the position of a dependent priory more than eight centuries ago, see *Gall. Christ.* ii. 371. His day is Nov. 24. [S. A. B.]

POSIDONIUS, priest and solitary at Bethlehem in the time of Palladius in the beginning of the 5th century. (Palladius, *Laus. Hist.* c. 38 and 39.) [J. G.]

POSSESSOR (1), African bishop, driven into exile by the Arians, and much esteemed by pope Hormisdas for remaining true to the catholic faith at Constantinople (Baron. *Ann.*, A.D. 517, no. 26; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 618). In A.D. 517 (Apr. 5) the pope wrote to him to persevere in the faith (Horm. *Epp.* no. xv. ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxiii. 403), and in A.D. 520 (July 18) he wrote to the pope respecting a book by Faustus of Riez upon the doctrines of freewill and divine grace (*Pat. Lat.* t. lxiii. 481). To this Hormisdas replied (Aug. 13) with extreme caution concerning the doctrines in dispute, but with much feeling respecting the Scythian monks (Horm. *Epp.* no. xxx. ap. *Pat. Lat.* t. lxiii. 490; Fleury, *H. E.* xxxi. cc. 50, 53; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 618, 631) [HORMISDAS MAXENTIUS (4)]. [J. G.]

POSSESSOR (2), bishop of Tarentaise, sent by Charlemagne A.D. 775, and, along with two other bishops, commissioned by pope Adrian I. to enquire and report upon the orders, etc., of Lullus of Mayence [LULLUS]. The pope complained to the emperor of an apparent slight from Possessor and the other envoys (Adrian, *Epp.* 41, 54; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 1212–5, xcviii. 297–9). But an explanation must have followed, for in A.D. 784, Possessor was archbishop, possibly of Embrun, and sat as royal commissioner with pope Adrian for enquiring into the dispute between the abbat Potho and his monks at Vulturnum (Adrian, *Ep.* 20, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 1206, xcviii. 360–5; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 702). [J. G.]

POSSIDIUS, bishop of Calama, a town of Numidia, to the south-west of Hippo, between it and Cirta, but nearer to the former place (Aug. *c. Petil.* ii. 99; *Kalma*, Shaw, *Trav.* p. 64). He appears from his own account to have been a convert from paganism, and on his conversion to have become an inmate of the monastery at Hippo, probably about A.D. 390. From that time he lived in intimate friendship with St. Augustine until his death in 430. (Possid. *Vita Aug. praef.* and caps. 12, 31.) About A.D. 400 he became bishop of Calama, succeeding though, after an interval of time, and perhaps with an intermediate successor, Megalius, the ordainer of Augustine. He seems to have established a monastery there, and probably in the early days of his episcopate consulted Augustine on the subjects, (a) of ornaments to be used by men and women, and especially ear-rings worn as amulets; (b) of ordination of some one who had received Donatist baptism. To the first point Augustine replied without hesitation, condemning unequivocally the use of ornaments and especially paint in

persons unmarried and not intending to marry, but as to others dissuading haste and recommending discretion in treatment; but as to the second suspending his judgment, for, said he, "it is one thing to do a thing when you are obliged to do it, but another to recommend its being done." (Aug. *Epp.* 104, 4; & 245.) In 401 or 402 a council was held at Carthage, at which Possidius was present, and challenged Crispinus, Donatist bishop of Calama, but in vain, to discuss publicly the points at issue between the two parties. It was after this abortive meeting that Possidius, though he modestly conceals his own name, while on his way to visit a place in his diocese called Figulina, was attacked by Crispinus, a presbyter, and narrowly escaped with his life. An account of these transactions will be found above. [CRISPINUS (2), Vol. I. pp. 713, 714; see also Aug. *Ep.* 103; and Possid. *Vit.* 12.] In 407 he was one of a committee of seven appointed by Xanthippus, primate of Numidia, at the request of Maurentius, bishop of Tubursica, to consider and decide a question, of whose nature we are not informed, but which was at issue between himself and the seniors of Nova Germania. (Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 34; Hardouin, *Conc.* ii. 922; Bruns, *Conc.* i. 185.) In 408 Possidius was again in trouble and personal danger, in consequence of the disturbances at Calama described above. [NECTARIUS (5).] In the following year, 409, on June 14, a council was held at Carthage, and a deputation of four bishops, Florentinus, Possidius, Praesidius, and Benenatus, was appointed to request the protection of the Emperor against the Donatists. We know that on this occasion Possidius was the bearer of a letter from Augustine to Paulinus of Nola, but nothing more is known as to the journey of the deputation or their interview, if any, with the Emperor, who was then at Ravenna. It is certain, however, that in 410, an edict was issued by Honorius on the same day, or nearly so, as that on which Rome was taken by Alaric, viz. Aug. 26, to Heraclian, Count of Africa, to restrain by penalties all enemies of the Christian faith, and another of a similar nature on Oct. 14 in the same year to Marcellinus, the same, no doubt, as the president of the conference in 411. (Aug. *Ep.* 95, i. 105, i; *Cod.* Theod. xvi. 5, 51; and ii. 3; Baronius, 410, 48, 49.) At the conference Possidius was one of the seven Catholic managers, and in the discussion, though not taking a very prominent part, he showed wisdom, moderation, and a judicious desire to prevent unnecessary delay. (*Coll. Carth. ap. Mon. Vet. Don.* liii. 1; ii. 29; iii. 29, 148, 168, ed. Oberthür.) He was with Augustine at Hippo in 412 (Aug. *Ep.* 137, 20), and in 416 was present at the Council of Mileum and signed the letter sent on that occasion to pope Innocent concerning the Pelagian heresy. (Aug. *Ep.* 176.) He also joined with Augustine, Aurelius, Alypius and Evodius in a letter to the same on the same subject, in which mention is made of the two councils held in that year at Carthage and at Mileum. Replies to this letter and to the one from the Council of Mileum were made by Innocent in the same year. (Aug. *Ep.* 181, 182, 183.) In 418 he was present at the meeting or council of bishops held at Caesarea on Sept. 20, at which Emeritus was also present. [EMERITUS (1) Vol. II. p. 107.] He is mentioned by St. Augustine as having brought to Calama, and placed in a memorial building there, some relics of St. Stephen by which many cures of disease were effected. This was about 425. (*Civ. D.* xii. 8, 12, 20.) When the Vandals invaded Africa he took refuge in Hippo with other bishops, and there attended on St. Augustine in his last illness until his death A.D. 430, in the third month of the siege. He has left a biographical sketch of the life of the illustrious bishop, whose unbroken friendship he enjoyed for forty years, his faithful ally and devoted admirer, and from which we derive many particulars of great interest as to his mode of life, and a description, simple and from its simplicity deeply pathetic and impressive, of his last days and death. Possidius does not appear to have been remarkable for superior ability, and he had more than once to deal with matters of great difficulty, and requiring unusual discretion, and in them he certainly showed great forbearance and moderation; but it is plain that his chief function in life, so far as posterity can judge, was to be the friend of Augustine, always valued and trusted by him, and loyal to him to the end. Though there have been few men whose lives are written in their own works more fully than that of Augustine has been by himself, yet history and the Church would have lost much if we did not also possess the simple, modest, and trustworthy narrative gathered in great measure from Augustine himself, which Possidius has left behind him. It appears to have been published, not immediately after the death of Augustine, but before 439, as he speaks of Carthage and Cirta, as still exempt from capture by the barbarians, and it was in October of that year that Carthage was taken by Genseric. (Poss. c. 28; Clinton, *F. R.*) Besides the biographical memoir Possidius has also left a list of the works of Augustine which, though very full and compiled with great care, does not pretend to be complete, and of which some have not yet been discovered. It is given in the last volume of Migne's edition of the works of St. Augustine. Prosper relates in his Chronicle that Possidius, together with Novatus, Severianus, and other bishops of less note, resisted the attempts of Genseric to establish Arian doctrine in Africa, and was driven with them from his see A.D. 437. It has been believed, but on no noted authority, that he retired to Italy. The date of his death is unknown, but his memory is observed in some churches on May 17. (Baronius, 437, i.; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 140; Ceillier, ix. 564; Tillemont, vol. xiii. 354; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, May 17.) [H. W. P.]

POSSIDONIUS (1), physician, in the reign of Valens and Valentinian I., was son of Philostorgius a physician, and obtained great fame at Alexandria. He attributed more effect to the human evil than to demoniac influences (Philostorgius, *E. H.* B. viii. p. 524, Camb. ed. 1720; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 509). [J. G.]

POSSIDONIUS (2), a messenger employed by St. Cyril to carry letters to Caelestine of Rome (Cyrilli *Ep.* xl. ad fin.) A.D. 430; and again, when presbyter, by Dioscorus in 445, to carry a letter to Leo the Great. (Leonis *Ep.* ix. cap. 2, see Quesnel's note.) [C. G.]

POSTHUMIANUS (1), prefect of the praetorium at Constantinople, a Christian, and a friend of Gregory Nazianzen. Gregory wrote to him in 383, shortly after leaving Constantinople, on the occasion of the summoning of another council, entreating him to use his authority. (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 71, p. 828.) Posthumianus is styled ὁ πρῶτος Ῥωμαίων, by Libanius (*Ep.* 929). His name appears in several laws and ordinances of the year 383. (*Cod. Theod.* Gothofred, vi. p. 378.) [E. V.]

POSTHUMIANUS (2), a friend of Sulpicius Severus and Paulinus of Nola, was a native of Aquitania, and made at least two journeys to the East. After the first, when he made the acquaintance of Jerome at Bethlehem, he appears to have visited Campania in order to see Paulinus, and was the bearer of a letter from him to Jovius (S. Paulini *Epp.* 16 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 227). He then became acquainted with Sulpicius Severus, and after a second visit to Paulinus, bringing a letter from Severus (*Ep.* 27, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 306), sailed from Narbonne in A.D. 401 or 402 on a second voyage to the East. At Narbonne he met with Victor, the friend and messenger of Paulinus, on his way to him from Severus, but to whom he desired him to return before accomplishing his errand to Paulinus (Paul. *Ep.* 28, 3). Of this journey a full and interesting account is given in the first book of the Dialogues of Sulpicius Severus (*Patr. Lat.* xx. 183), in which Postumianus with Severus and Gallus are the speakers. In five days he reached Carthage, where he visited the tomb of St. Cyprian. Detained on the coast between Africa and Cyrene by stress of weather, he landed to explore the country, which was inhabited by a very primitive tribe, who however were Christians, and was hospitably entertained by a priest. Alexandria was then convulsed by the quarrel between the patriarch Theophilus and the monks about the writings of Origen, and Postumianus went on by land to Bethlehem, where he spent six months with Jerome, whom he praises highly both for his virtues and his learning. Postumianus then returned to Alexandria, and thence went to the Thebaid, and spent a year and seven months visiting the monasteries and hermitages in the deserts, where he heard a number of extraordinary stories about the monks and anchorites. He also penetrated into the Sinaitic peninsula, saw the Red Sea, and ascended Mount Sinai, whose top he was informed was inaccessible. After an absence of three years he returned, taking thirty days for the voyage from Alexandria to Marseilles. At the time the Dialogues were written he contemplated another journey to the East, and Severus exhorts him to visit Paulinus on the way, and convey to him a copy of the Dialogues that he may be informed of the virtues and miracles of St. Martin (*Dialog.* iii. 17). We have no further information about Postumianus, but he may have been the priest of that name, who was present at the death of Paulinus (Uranius, *Epist. in Patr. Lat.* liii. 861). [F. D.]

POSTHUMIANUS (3), senator at Rome. A ship, belonging to Secundinianus, had been impressed to carry corn from Sardinia to the public granaries of Rome, and in consequence of a scarcity was obliged to sail before the summer. A storm coming on, the sailors put off in a boat either to escape or to lay out additional anchors, the boat was capsized, and the whole of the crew lost, except one Valgius, who had been below, and was consequently left behind. Paulinus relates how the ship with Valgius alone on board was miraculously preserved, and having been driven first within sight of the lighthouse of the port of Rome, and then across to Africa, after twenty-three days approached the coast of Lucania, and was towed to land by two fishing-boats. Some incidents strangely resemble Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*, especially the angelic host who worked the ship, and were seen departing by the fishermen as they approached her. The ship was seized by the procurator of Postumianus, the owner of the land where she came ashore, and the cargo carried off. Secundinianus vainly sought redress before the local tribunal, as the procurator at first resisted, and then fled to Rome whither Secundinianus and Valgius, who had since been baptized by the name of Victor, were following him, when Paulinus saw them. He sent by them the letter from which we learn the story to Macarius [MACARIUS (23)], asking him to use his influence with Postumianus to obtain redress. (S. Paulini *Epp.* 49 in Migne *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 407.) [F. D.]

POTAMIAENA (June 28), one of the most celebrated of the martyrs at Alexandria in the persecution of Severus, being a virgin distinguished alike for her beauty, her chastity and her courage. Eusebius, who tells her story (*H. E.* vi. 5), relates that she was cruelly tortured, and that death was finally inflicted by burning pitch poured slowly about her from feet to head. The version of her story given by Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* 3) is that, the judge having ordered her to be cast naked into a caldron of boiling pitch, she begged to retain her clothes, on condition of submitting to the prolonged torment of being let down gradually. Her mother Marcella suffered with her. Basilides, the officer who led her to death, treated her with humanity, and checked the crowds who would have insulted her. She thanked him, and promised him that when she had departed, she would ask her Lord to give him a fitting reward. Shortly after being called on for some reason to take an oath, he refused, declaring himself to be a Christian. But when some of the brethren came to see him and enquired the cause of this sudden and singular resolve, he is said to have declared that Potamiaena for three days after her martyrdom, standing before him at night, placed a crown upon his head, and said she had entreated the Lord on his account, and she had obtained her prayer, and that ere long she would take him with her. On this the brethren gave him the seal in the Lord; and he, bearing a distinguished testimony to the Lord, was beheaded. [G. T. S.]

POTAMIUS (1), Priscillianist. [JOANNES (555).]

POTAMIUS (2), bishop of Braga, was present at the eighth council of Toledo in November A.D. 653. At the tenth council of Toledo in December, A.D. 656, a document signed by him was presented, in which he accused

himself in confused language of having committed immorality with a woman. The bishops considered the letter in secret session, and summoned him before them. He declared the statements in the letter were true and had not been made under compulsion, and added that he had for the last nine months laid aside his office, and had done penance in a cave. The bishops in consideration of his penitence and voluntary confession allowed him to retain the rank of bishop, but deposed him from his see, and appointed FRUCTUOSUS (10) in his stead, and ordered him to do penance the rest of his life. (*Esp. Sag.* xv. 136; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 385, 418; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Sp.* ii. (2), 132.) [F. D.]

POTAMIUS (3), first known bishop of Ulyssipona (Lisbon). According to the *Libellus Precum*, c. 9 (in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiii. 89), whose statements however must be received with great caution, he had been formerly a prominent defender of orthodoxy, but had been induced by a present of an estate from the emperor Constantius to embrace Arianism, and was accordingly excluded from communion as a heretic by HOSIUS, and it was in consequence of his complaints that Hosius was summoned to Sirmium in A.D. 356. In any case he and Hosius were there together, and according to Hilary (*De Syn.* 11, in *Patr. Lat.* x. 487) drew up the second "Formula of Sirmium." This statement, as far as regards Hosius, is generally discredited, and Gams (*Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (1), 237) argues with much probability, from the silence of Phoebadius (*C. Arianos*), and the extreme unlikeness in style to the known writings of Potamius, that it is also untrue as regards Potamius. It seems undoubted however that he subscribed the Formula and took an active part in its circulation (Phoebadius, c. 5). An obscure passage in the letter of pope LIBERIUS preserved by Hilary (*Op. Hist. Frag.* 4), represents Potamius as opposing the pope at the council of Ariminum, but whether he did so, as an Arian, or as a Catholic on the ground that Liberius had fallen into heresy, is uncertain. From the way in which he is there coupled with the well-known Arian bishop EPICTETUS (6), the former seems most probable. At any rate he appears after the council of Ariminum to have returned, or professed to return, to orthodoxy, and sent to Athanasius a letter written in the most stilted and pompous style. According to the *Libellus Precum* (c. 11) Potamius died on the way to take possession of the estate given him by Constantius, but it has already been remarked that its statements are of very doubtful authority, and here the death of Potamius is coupled with the alleged miraculous deaths of HOSIUS and FLORENTIUS (8), as an instance of divine judgment. Besides the letter to Athanasius two sermons by Potamius are extant, on the raising of Lazarus and the martyrdom of the prophet Isaiah (*Patr. Lat.* viii. 1110), both full of hideous descriptions, and written in a pompous and almost unintelligible jargon. (Tillemont, *M. E.* vi. 417; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Sp.* ii. (1), 224, 315; *Esp. Sag.* xiv. 178.) [F. D.]

POTAMO (1) (Ποτάμων), bishop of Heraclea in Egypt, and confessor. He became bishop there about A.D. 311, and in the persecution under Maximin lost an eye (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 581). He proved a steady friend of Athanasius, and upholder of orthodoxy against the Arians. He took part in the council at Nice A.D. 325, but is best known as having attended, along with the other Egyptian bishops, at the council of Tyre to support Athanasius (*supra*, i. 185 B). Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxviii. 8) tells how he there reproached Eusebius of Caesarea: "Do you sit there as a judge of the innocent Athanasius? When you and I were imprisoned together and I was maimed in our Lord's cause, how could you have escaped without betraying it?" When Gregory the Cappadocian was intruded upon Alexandria in the place of Athanasius, and was making a visitation of his province, he proceeded with great violence at Heraclea, and the aged Potamo died in the hands of his soldiery, A.D. 345 (Hardouin, i. 314, 315, 544; Tillem. *H. E.* vi. 273, vii. 19, viii. 18, 37, 278, ed. 1732). [J. G.]

POTAMO (2), legate from Cyril's council at Alexandria, A.D. 430, to pope Celestine [DANIEL (4)], and in the following year addressed by St. Cyril. (Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 430, c. 50.) [J. G.]

POTENTIANUS, second bishop of Sens. [POTENTINUS.]

POTENTINUS (1) (POTENTIANUS), second bishop of Sens, is counted among the preachers that were sent into Gaul from Rome in the second half of the third century with St. Dionysius of Paris. Usuard (*Mart.* Dec. 31) gives Sens as the place of his preaching and martyrdom, but does not call him bishop; the *Acts of Savinianus*, however (Mabillon, *A. S. B.* VI. i. 254–6, and *Ann. Ben.* xxxiii. 58; Surius, *Vitae SS.* xii. 384), relate how the company of preachers, headed by Savinianus, came from Rome, turned many from idolatry at Chartres and Sens, and were at last put to death, but not until Savinianus had been made bishop of Sens and Potentinus his successor. [SAVINIANUS.] In the ninth and again in the eleventh century the remains of the martyrs of Sens were elevated and re-enshrined. His feast is Dec. 31 (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 98; vi. 227–8; Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 200; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 4). [J. G.]

POTENTINUS (2), a friend addressed by Sidonius Apollinaris (lib. v. ep. 11; Tillem. xvi. 209). [C. H.]

POTENTINUS (3), probably a Romanized Briton with St. Columbanus at Luxeuil and in his banishment. He settled at Coutances in Normandy, where he had a monastery in the beginning of the 7th century (Jonas, *Vit. S. Col.* c. 20). Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 537–8) calls him a Scot, and says he wrote *Ad monachos collectos* and *Epistolae ad Columbanum.* [J. G.]

POTENTIUS, bishop in Mauritania Caesariensis, was sent by pope Leo I. c. A.D. 446, to inquire into the irregular ordinations said to have taken place in his province in connection with the Vandal incursions, to report upon and remedy them (Leo, *Ep.* xii.; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. liv. 645, 653; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 198–9). [J. G.]

POTHINUS (PHOTINUS, Greg. Tur. FOTINUS), martyr, first bishop of Lyons in the second century. Who consecrated him, and in what year is unknown, though a desire to find an apostolic commencement for the bishops of this see has suggested to different writers the names of St. Peter, St. John and St. Polycarp as authors of Pothinus's mission. His name makes it probable that he was a Greek. Of his episcopate we have no record beyond the account of his martyrdom, with forty-seven others, at the hands of pagans, contained in the letter of the Christians of Lyons and Vienne to the churches of Asia and Phrygia, which Eusebius preserves. Oppressed with the infirmities of more than ninety years, he was dragged by soldiers before the Tribunal, where he comported himself with dignity. To the question of the President what the Christians' God might be, he replied, "If thou wert worthy, thou shouldst know." The blows and ill-usage of the crowd as he was carried thence to prison caused his death two days later. His successor in the see was St. Irenaeus. (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 1; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* i. 27; *Mirac.* lib. i. *de Glor. Mart.* 49, 50 seqq. *Gall. Christ.* iv. 4.) [S. A. B.]

POTITUS, a Marcionite teacher, mentioned by Rhodo (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* v. 13). See the article MARCION, Vol. III. 819a. [G. S.]

POTO, abbat of St. Vincent ad Vulturnum. All that is known about him is derived from two letters of pope Hadrian to Charles the Great in May or June 781. (*Cod. Car.* 68, 69, in Jaffé, *Mon. Car.* 212.) There had been quarrels in the monastery, and apparently a double election of Autpert and Poto as abbat. Charles had referred the dispute to Hadrian, who summoned the rivals and the monks to appear before him. Autpert died suddenly on the way. Before Hadrian a new charge of treason was brought against Poto by the monk Rodicausus, who said that he had left the church and refused to join in singing Psalm 53 (54 in A. V.), and that he had spoken disrespectfully of Charles and the Franks. Three monks of Autpert's party also accused Poto of imprisoning them to prevent their going to the king. After a three days' trial, the pope considered Poto was not guilty, and called on him to swear that he had never uttered such words, or had been, or ever would be unfaithful to Charles. Ten of the monks, five being Lombards and five Franks, were also called on to swear that they had never heard him say anything treasonable. They all, however, requested leave to go to Charles himself, which was granted. In a second letter the pope mentions that all the monks had requested him to intercede with Charles for Poto, which he accordingly does, and asks for his restoration to his abbacy. Here our information breaks off. If the Chronicon Vulturnense (in Muratori, i. 2, 365) is to be trusted, Poto was not immediately pardoned, as Hainrad is there given as Autpert's successor. He died before March 787, as Paulus was then abbat (Sickel. *Acta Kar.* ii. 48). [F. D.]

PRAECORDIUS, priest at Corbie, near Soissons, in the department of Aisne in France. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 230–2) gives *De Praecordii translatione* ex supplemento Belfortii, and the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Feb. i. 196) *De S. Praecordio presbytero Corbeiae et Valliaci in Gallia* follow Colgan. The *Auctaria* of Usuard also notice him at Feb. 1, calling him presbyter, martyr, confessor, and "in Vastiaco" (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiii. 721–2). Praecordius was a Scot and flourished in the 5th or 6th century, but his history is unknown. The translation of his relics, real or supposed, into a gold and silver shrine in the church of St. Peter, Corbie, took place in the time of abbat Berengarius, before A.D. 943. His natale is Feb. 1, and translatio June 5. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* ii. 244–5.) [J. G.]

PRAEDESTINATUS. The writer known under this name is the author of an anonymous work, first published in 1643 from a MS. in the Cathedral Library of Rheims, by Sirmond, who somewhat inappropriately gave the book its title from those *against* whom the work was directed. The book has been several times printed since, as for instance in the Lyons *Bibl. Max. Pat.* vol. xxvii., by Galland (*Bibl. Lat.* vol. x.), by Migne (*Pat. Lat.* liii.), and the first book by Oehler in his *Corpus Haeresiologicum.* Oehler enumerates four extant MSS. of the work beside the one used by Sirmond.

The work consists of three books preceded by an introduction, in which the author complains that men were passing themselves off as fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of faith, who really were most treacherous enemies of the church. These men taught that certain were by God's foreknowledge so predestinated to death that neither Christ's passion nor baptism, nor faith, nor hope, nor charity could help them. They might fast, pray, and give alms, but nothing could avail them, because they had not been predestinated to life. On the other hand, those who had received this predestination might neglect and despise all righteousness, yet the gate of life would be opened to them without knocking, while against others who knocked, nay shouted for admission, it would remain firmly closed. A work by one of these heretics had lately fallen into the writer's hands. This work was a whited sepulchre, within full of all uncleanness, but bearing on the outside a false ascription to Augustine, an orthodox doctor, who had ever been not a patron but an opponent of heresy. The book had been brought to the knowledge of pope Caelestine of most blessed memory, who held it in execration, and condemned it to perpetual silence. But since then the book, though forbidden to be read publicly, had been handed about privately, and that almost as if it were a creed to be implicitly received, rather than a treatise admitting of controversial discussion. Thus it had become necessary to drag it to light and give it a complete refutation. This accordingly is done in the present treatise, consisting of three books. In the first the author clears himself of all suspicion of sympathy with heresy of any kind by enumerating and reprobating the ninety heresies by which up to his time Christ's truth had been perverted, the last and worst of these being that of the Predestinarians. And here it is useful to mention, because it determines limits to the date of the book that in this list the last

but one is the Nestorian heresy. From the mention of Nestorianism, and the silence about Eutychianism, we may infer that the book with which we are concerned was written between the years 431 and 449; and this was just the period when the semi-Pelagian controversy was most actively going on. The second book contains the pseudo-Augustinian treatise already mentioned, which is refuted in detail in the third book. The author professes that the heretical catalogue of his first book has been epitomised from the treatises of Hyginus,[a] Polycrates, Africanus, Hesiodus, Epiphanius, and Philaster who, he tells us, wrote against different heresies in this chronological order. Now it is remarkable that the first four of these confutations of heresy which the author claims to have used, are not mentioned by anyone else, but still more remarkable that the writer is quite silent as to his obligations to the tract on heresies which Augustine addressed to Quodvultdeus, although his list of ninety heresies agrees, article by article, with Augustine's list of eighty-eight, only with the addition of the two later heresies, Nestorianism and Predestinarianism, and although the substance of each article is manifestly taken from Augustine. The unfavourable suspicions of the writer's literary morality thus excited at the outset are confirmed as we proceed. When a writer makes a number of false statements, which form part of a system, and for which no authority can be produced, we are justified in setting them down as his own wilful invention. Now in this book it is the author's plan to mention in connexion with each heresy the name of the orthodox writer by whom it is refuted. We are in this way told of a number of personages of whom mention is made by no one else, Diodorus of Crete, who refuted the Secundians, Philo who refuted the Alogi, Theodotus of Pergamus, who refuted the Colorbasians, Crato, a Syrian bishop, who refuted the Theodotians, Tranquillus, who refuted the Noetians, Euphranon of Rhodes, who refuted the Severians, and a host of others of whom we might have expected to hear elsewhere if they had been more than imaginary personages. And when Praedestinatus ascribes the confutation of heretics to real persons his assertions are usually chronologically impossible. Thus he makes the apostle Thomas confute Saturninus, the apostle Barnabas in Cyprus confute the Carpocratians; he makes Alexander, who was bishop of Rome at the very beginning of the 2nd century, write a book against Heracleon, who lived in the latter half of the century; the Tertullianists are condemned by Soter, who must have been dead thirty years before Tertullian separated from the church; the imaginary heresiologist, Hesiod of Corinth, is made to be the bishop who first raised opposition to Arius, and in answer to whose prayers that heretic died. It is impossible to study the statements of Praedestinatus without being soon made to feel that we have before us, not inaccurate history but unscrupulous and unskilful invention. And it can only be from want of acquaintance with the character of this writer that he is ever cited as a historical authority.

[a] In consequence of this mention of Hyginus at the beginning of our work, Hincmar, of Rheims, who cites it (probably from the very copy used by Sirmond), ascribes the authorship to Hyginus.

A knowledge of the writer's mode of proceeding in the first book is especially necessary for judging of the character of the second. The statement that the treatise therein contained had been condemned by pope Caelestine has been questioned by many critics, not only on the ground that no one else mentions this condemnation, but also because it does not harmonise with the tone of Caelestine's authentic utterance on this controversy, viz., his letter to the Gallic bishops when consulted by Prosper and Hilary (Benedictine Augustine, x. 131, Ap.). But when we further take into consideration that the first book contains seven other alleged condemnations of heresy by popes, some of which are chronologically impossible, and none confirmed by any other authority, we find ourselves unable to give the least credence to what is told of Caelestine. But this raises another question. It is a common artifice with forgers of documents of alleged antiquity to anticipate the objection, why should these things be heard of now for the first time, by the statement that for some reason their circulation had been kept secret. And in the present case there is good ground to believe that the story, that the treatise of the second book had been kept private on account of its condemnation by Caelestine, is no more than an excuse, made in order that an invention of the author's own might be accepted as an approved statement of the views of the asserters of predestination. The following specimens of the work ought to leave no doubt as to its character. "Those whom God has once destined to life, even though they are neglectful, though they sin, though they do not will, shall yet against their will be conducted to life; but those whom He has predestined to death, although they run, although they hasten, yet labour in vain. Judas daily heard the word of life, he daily lived in the society of our Lord, he daily heard His admonitions, daily witnessed His miracles, but because he was predetermined to death, he was suddenly overthrown by a single blow. Saul, on the other hand, who daily stoned the Christians, and laid waste their churches, was suddenly made a vessel of election, because he had been predestined to life. Why fearest thou then, thou who continuest in sin? If God vouchsafes it thou shalt be holy. Or why art thou who livest a holy life overburthened with concern, as if thy concern could preserve thee? If God does not will it, thou shalt not fall. Wilt thou who art holy, and takest pains that thou mayest not fall, who busiest thyself day and night with prayer, fasting, reading of Scripture, and all manner of holy discipline, wilt thou be saved by these efforts of thine? Wilt thou be holier than Judas? Cease, O man, cease to be careful for thy virtue, and securely rely on the will of God." The reader can judge whether this is the language of one desirous to commend the doctrine of predestination or of an opponent of that doctrine, anxious to represent that it must lead to a relaxation of all morality. And when the document is presented to us by one who has already shewn himself to be quite devoid of literary honesty, it is an excess of charity to acquit him on this occasion, as Neander does

(iv. 411), of all attempt at imposture. Very little need be said on the question, which after all is a verbal one, whether the sect of Predestinarian heretics (Praedestinati), against which this book was directed, ever existed. In the 5th century disputes concerning the Divine decrees, the extreme on both sides branded their opponents as heretics; but however faulty the views of either might be, they neither desired to separate from the church, nor did they incur excommunication from it. Our author no doubt had been stigmatised by his adversaries, not as a half but a whole Pelagian, for the name semi-Pelagian is of later invention. In the first book he vindicates his orthodoxy by anathematising not only the Pelagian but all other heresies; and when he retorts on his opponents by a charge of heresy, although he is too respectful to include St. Augustine in his accusation, yet if Predestinarianism be a heresy, he cannot consistently acquit that saint of it. (See SEMI-PELAGIANISM.)

One MS. of the work with which we are concerned assigns to the author the name Primasius. This appears to be merely an annotator's mistake, arising out of the fact, that Isidore of Seville (*De Script. Eccl.* ix.) had stated that Primasius had written a treatise against heresies in three books. But the description given by Isidore of the contents of the three books does not answer to the present books; the work of Primasius was addressed to a bishop Fortunatus, of whom there is no mention in Praedestinatus; besides which, as we have already remarked, Praedestinatus wrote before the appearance of Eutychianism, and Primasius about a century later. The true clue to the authorship of our treatise was furnished by Sirmond, who gave a long list of coincidences, to which it would be possible to add several more, between this work and the Commentary on the Psalms by the writer known as ARNOBIUS JUNIOR. The doctrinal position of the two writers is the same. Both are inspired by the same hatred of the Predestinarians, and they refute them by the same arguments and from the same texts of Scripture. Thus both prove that God wishes all men to be saved, from Ps. xlix. 1; both argue that it is not God who puts men away from Him, but men who put themselves away from Him, from the words, "qui se longe faciunt a te peribunt," Ps. lxiii. 27; both prove that it does not follow that because fornication is a sin, sexual passion is in itself an evil thing, by the argument that it is a good thing to receive the Lord's Body, but wrong if one does so who has not been baptized; a good thing to offer priestly sacrifice, but bad if he who offers usurps a power not granted to him; so in all cases a thing in itself good becomes evil if done out of order by one not properly authorised. In this last case especially the coincidence seems to me more than casual. Both also employ the formula, "Nota tibi Praedestinate." No account of these coincidences is so simple as that the two works belong to the same author. Concerning Arnobius Junior, see the article, Vol. I. p. 170. It may be added to what is there stated that Mai has published (*Spicileg. Rom.* v. 101) a letter of Cyril of Alexandria against the Nestorians, which purports to have been translated by this Arnobius. [G. S.]

PRAEJECTUS (1) (PROJECTUS), bishop of Aquae Tibilitanae, Thibilis, or Tibilis, a place in Numidia, south-west of Hippo, near the river Abus (*Seibus*) *Hamman*, Shaw, p. 64. He is mentioned as having brought to that place some relics of St. Stephen, through which a blind woman was restored to sight. (Aug. *Civ. D.* xxii. 8, 10; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 79.) [H. W. P.]

PRAEJECTUS (2), bishop of Narnia. Gregory the Great on the occasion of a pestilence there in A.D. 591 exhorted him to use his utmost efforts for the conversion of the people there, whether Lombards or Romans (*Epp.* ii. 2). He died before A.D. 595, as his successor attended the synod of Rome in that year. (*App. ad S. Greg. Epp.* 5.) [F. D.]

PRAEJECTUS (3) (PRIE, PRIEST, PRIX, PROJECTUS), Jan. 25, elected c. 665 bishop of Clermont, son of Gondolenus and Helidia, belonging to a noble family in Auvergne. Upon the see of Clermont falling vacant, there was a general desire that Genesius, count of Auvergne, a man highly esteemed for his virtues, should succeed; but this nobleman declined, on the ground of the canons forbidding the elevation of laymen to bishoprics, and strongly recommended Praejectus, who was accordingly appointed, and proved a most zealous and munificent prelate. By his counsels count Genesius, who was wealthy and childless, founded a monastery in the suburbs of Clermont, while he himself built another on land given for the purpose, besides a hospital on his own domain. An unprincipled nobleman, Hector count of Marseille, sought to divert some of the funds given by a lady named Claudia to these foundations, but was baffled by law, and on a charge of conspiracy against the king suffered death. Hector's relations, being determined to revenge themselves on Praejectus, hired assassins, who slew him at a place called Volovicus, in his own diocese, c. A.D. 674. He was buried in the place of his martyrdom, and Rusticus succeeded in the see. The next bishop, Avitus, built a church and monastery at the tomb, and the name of the saint is famous throughout France. Two anonymous lives are given by Mabillon, *A. S. B.* ii. 640 sq.; Surius, *Vit. SS.* i. 418 sq.; Boll. *A. SS.* Jan. iii. 244. The Lives seem to be early, and embody the general tradition. (Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 670–3; Vincentius Bellov. *Spec. Hist.* xxiv. 119; Fleury, *H. E.* xxxix. cc. 49, 50; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 597.) To Praejectus when a deacon, or to a deacon of the same name, there are attributed the Lives of Austremonius, first bishop of Clermont, and of the martyrs Cassius, Victorinus, Anatolianus, Liminianus and others, but they are not extant, and those under these names belong probably to the ninth century. (Boll. *A. SS.* Mai. iii. 453; Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 93, 196–7; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 615–17; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 779, generally accepting them as the work of the bishop.) [J. G.]

PRAESIDIUS, as a deacon, bearer of a letter from St. Jerome to St. Augustine, A.D. 403, afterwards, as a priest, requested by Augustine to deliver a letter to St. Jerome, and endeavour

to appease his displeasure towards him. (Hieron. *Ep.* 103, 1; Aug. *Ep.* 74.) The same name appears among the bishops attending the Council of Mileum, A.D. 416. (Aug. *Ep.* 176.) [H. W. P.]

PRAETEXTATA, wife of Hymettius. [HYMETTIUS; EUSTOCHIUM.] [W. H. F.]

PRAETEXTATUS (1), Donatist bishop of Assuris or Assurae, a municipal town of proconsular Africa, thirty miles from Musti, and twelve from Terebentina (Ant. *Itin.* 49, 4), the same as Absuris or Azuris of Pliny (H. N. 5, 4, 29), perhaps Ἀσσοῦρος of Ptolemy, iv. 3, 30, perhaps *Kisser*, Shaw, p. 115. His history, as one of the ordainers of Maximian, and in the subsequent transactions, is so closely connected with that of Felicianus, that the reader may be referred almost entirely to that article. He died about 409, and was succeeded by Rogatus. (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 39, 45; *c. Petil.* i. 10, 11; *Ep.* 108, 5; *Ep. c. Don.* 18, 46; *de Gest. cum Emer.* 9. FELICIANUS (4), vol. ii. p. 475.) [H. W. P.]

PRAETEXTATUS (2), eighth bishop of Apt, can scarcely be the Praetextus to whom, among other bishops, the presbyter Placidus addressed his letter after the council of Arles, A.D. 475 (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1044). He was present at the councils of Epaon, A.D. 517 (*Ib.* iv. 1582), Arles, A.D. 524 (*Ib.* iv. 1623), Orange, A.D. 529 (*Ib.* iv. 1673), and Arles, A.D. 541 (*Ib.* v. 388). Baronius (*Ann.* A.D. 545, c. 7) is of opinion that it was on the conduct of this Praetextatus for some irregularity in ordinations that Pope Vigilius (*Ib.* v. 321; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxix. 29) issued his commission to Auxanius and others to make enquiries (*Gall. Christ.* i. 351; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 114, 146). [J. G.]

PRAETEXTATUS (3), ST., seventeenth bishop of Rouen between Flavius and Melantius, circ. A.D. 549–589, is rather a prominent personage in the pages of Gregory of Tours. He was strongly suspected and accused of assisting Chilperic's son, Meroveus, whom he had received from the font in infancy, in his plots against his father's crown. It is certain that in defiance of the canons he married him to queen Brunechilde, the widow of his uncle, a proceeding which gained him the implacable hatred of Chilperic and Fredegund. In A.D. 577 he was summoned by Chilperic before a council of forty-five bishops at Paris to answer these charges. The narrative of the proceedings forms one of the most graphic recitals in early French history (*Hist. Franc.* v. 19). Gregory alone ventured to defend his cause, but could not save him from banishment. It is a question whether he was formally deposed, though Melantius was consecrated to the diocese. In A.D. 584, however, after the king's death he returned to his see amid the acclamations of the people. But the enmity of Fredegund, whom he rebuked for her crimes, was unappeased, and on a Sunday, variously given as the 23rd and 24th of February and 14th of April, 586, he was stabbed in his church during service, and soon after expired. Melantius, who was accused of privity to the murder, resumed his episcopate, circ. A.D. 589. Praetextatus was present at the third Council of Paris in A.D. 554, the second of Tours in A.D. 566, and the second of Mâcon in A.D. 585. As one who perished by violence, he was for long honoured as a martyr in the church of Rouen. His day is Feb. 24. Gregory mentions some prayers he composed during his exile, and read to the bishops assembled at the second council of Mâcon, but they did not meet with general approval. (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. 19; vii. 16; viii. 20, 31, 41; ix. 20; Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 464–8; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 10, 11; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 351, 352; Ceillier, xi. 322.) [S. A. B.]

PRAGMATIUS (1), a bishop in Gaul in the latter half of the 5th century, addressed in a letter by Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist.* vi. 2). Some have identified him with Pragmatius the 11th bishop of Autun who subscribed the council of Epaune in 517, but probably incorrectly (see *Gall. Christ.* iv. 341); while Ceillier says Bourges is believed to have been his see, but it is not apparent on what grounds (x. 390). He must be distinguished from PRAGMATIUS (2). [S. A. B.]

PRAGMATIUS (2), an orator and man of letters in Gaul, who flourished in the latter half of the 5th century, seemingly at or near Vienne. He was a friend of Sapaudus and of Sidonius Apollinaris. According to the latter, who eulogizes him in the highest terms (*Epist.* v. 10), his eloquence induced Priscus Valerianus, the prefect of Gaul, to accept him as a son-in-law, and associate him in his official labours. Nothing remains of his works (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 580–1; 499). [S. A. B.]

PRAPIDAS, a solitary of Cappadocia, a chorepiscopus, who at an advanced age presided over the hospital for the poor founded by Basil at Caesarea (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 34). [E. V.]

PRAXEAS is a somewhat mysterious heretic, about whom various theories have been held. He was a Monarchian and Patripassian. Tertullian wrote a treatise against him and places his scene of activity first of all at Rome, but never mentions Noetus, Epigonus, Cleomenes, Sabellius or Callistus. While on the other hand Hippolytus, who denounces these in his controversial works for the very same tenets, never once mentions Praxeas as teaching at Rome or anywhere else. Some have regarded the word Praxeas as simply a nick-name. Thus De Rossi (*Bullet.* 1866, p. 70) identifies him with Epigonus, Hagemann (*Gesch. der Röm. Kirche.* s. 234) with Callistus. Döllinger however (*Hippol. u. Kallist.* s. 198) and Lipsius (*Chronolog. der Röm. Bisch.* s. 175) maintain that Praxeas was a real person who first of all started the Monarchian and Patripassian heresy in Rome, but so long before the age of Hippolytus that his name and memory had faded in that city. They fix his period of activity in Rome during the earliest years of Victor, A.D. 189–198, or even the later years of his predecessor Eleutherus. This explanation, however, seems to ignore the fact, that Hippolytus must have been a full-grown man all through Victor's episcopate, as he expressly asserts (*Refut.* ix. 6) that he and Callistus were about the same age. Praxeas remained but a short time in Rome, and the shortness of his stay offers a better explanation of Hippolytus' silence.

He then proceeded to Carthage, where he disseminated his views. Tertullian in his treatise (*adver. Prax.*) attacks the heresy under the name of Praxeas, the local teacher, but was really attacking Zephyrinus and Callistus. The facts of his life we gather from Tertullian's notices of him in cap. i. of the treatise just named. He was a confessor from Asia Minor, where he had been imprisoned for the faith. Asia Minor was then the seed-plot of the Monarchian views. He came to Rome when the Montanist party had just gained over the pope to their side. Praxeas converted the pope, back to his own opinion, which was hostile to the Montanists. The latest critics are indeed all agreed that the pope so converted by Praxeas was Eleutherus, cf. Bonwetsch's *Montanismus*, s. 174; Hilgenfeld's *Ketzergeschichte*, p. 569. Dr. Salmon, on the other hand, maintains that Zephyrinus was the pope whom Praxeas converted to his views. [MONTANUS, t. iii. p. 940.] By this, says Tertullian, Praxeas did a twofold service for the devil at Rome, "he drove away prophecy and he introduced heresy. He put to flight the Paraclete and he crucified the Father." He then went to Carthage, where he induced some to adopt his opinions. Tertullian opposed him prior to A.D. 202, according to Hilgenfeld, l. c. p. 618, and converted Praxeas himself, who acknowledged his error in a document extant among the Catholic party when Tertullian wrote his treatise. Praxeas then seems to have disappeared from Carthage, while Tertullian himself joined the Montanists. The controversy some years later broke out afresh, spreading itself doubtless from Rome, and then Tertullian wrote his treatise, which he nominally addressed against Praxeas as the best known expositor of these views at Carthage, but really directed against the Patripassian system in general. Hilgenfeld, l. c. p. 619, dates this work about the year A.D. 206; Harnack, about A.D. 210, *i.e.* about twenty-five years after the first arrival of Praxeas in Rome, while Dr. Salmon in the place just cited dates it after the death of Callistus in A.D. 222; so great is the uncertainty about the chronology of the movement. Harnack's article on *Monarchianismus* in t. x. of the new edition of Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie* contains a good exposition of the relation of Praxeas to the Patripassian movement; cf. Lipsius *Tertullian's Schrift wider Praxeas in Jahrb. für deutsche Theolog.* t. xiii. (1869) s. 701–724. Among patristic writers the only ones who mention Praxeas are pseudo-Tertullian; August. *de Haer.* 41; Praedestinat. 41, and Gennad. *de Eccles. dog.* 4. [G. T. S.]

PRAXEDIS, ST. Her cult, like that of her alleged sister, Pudentiana, was exceedingly ancient at Rome, her church being one of importance before the end of the 4th century (LAURENTIUS (10), Vol. III. 629). Unfortunately, the only information about her is contained in Acta purporting to be written by the priest Pastor, the brother of pope Pius I., which, however, were plainly composed at a much later date, and are full of anachronisms and mistakes (Tillemont, *M. E.* ii. 615). Whether there is any, and if so, what basis of fact underlying the Acta it seems impossible to decide. St. Praxedis is commemorated on July 21st, and with her sister on May 19th. (*Acta SS.* Mai. iv. 296, Jul. v. 130; *Bull. di Arch. Crist.* 1867, 49.) [F. D.]

PRAYLIUS (PRAYLLUS), bishop of Jerusalem 416–425, 43rd in succession, succeeded John after December 415 (Clinton, *F. R.*). According to Theodoret (*H. E.* v. 38) he was distinguished by great mildness of disposition, in keeping with the supposed derivation of his name from πραΰς, ἀνὴρ τῷ ὄντι φερώνυμος. Praylius is only known to us in connection with the Pelagian controversy. When, after the indecisive synod at Jerusalem under the presidency of his predecessor John, A.D. 415, by which the decision as to Pelagius's orthodoxy was remitted to Rome, and that of Lydda and Diospolis at the close of the same year under Eulogius of Caesarea, which acknowledged Pelagius and Caelestius as members of the Catholic church, Caelestius visited Rome in 417, he brought with him, together with Pelagius's confession of faith, a letter from Praylius, who had in the meanwhile succeeded John as bishop of Jerusalem, testifying to the soundness of Pelagius's doctrine. These documents addressed to Innocent were delivered to his successor Zosimus, and by him communicated to Aurelius of Carthage and the other African bishops Sept. 21, 417, in a letter declaring Pelagius's orthodoxy, and referring to the testimony of Praylius: "qui causae enixius astipulator intervenit." (Zosim. *Epist.* i.; Labbe, *Concil.* ii. 1561.) Before long both Zosimus and Praylius saw how they had been deceived by Pelagius, and reversing their former policy, Zosimus sent a circular letter to the bishops condemning his heresy, in compliance with which Praylius banished him from the holy city, and from all the sacred sites (Mar. Mercator. *Commonitor.* c. iii. p. 19, ed. Garnier, 1673). Theodoret mentions Praylius having ordained Domninus, a "digamus" as bishop of Caesarea after Eulogius (Theod. *Epist.* 110). [E. V.]

PREDESTINATION. Of this difficult subject, made doubly difficult by what has been written on it, and its opposite, reprobation, with which it has often been mixed up in name, no more than a general survey can be attempted, including, so far as it presupposes, or is presupposed by them, reprobation, foreknowledge, redemption, original sin, vocation, justification, election, free will, grace. Practically, St. Paul supplies us with our text, and St. Augustine with its exposition. No writer of the Old or New Testament has so much as named it but St. Paul; no father had discussed it in a special work before St. Augustine and his followers, St. Prosper and St. Fulgentius. St. Paul himself has not done this. He had been led to refer to it in discussing justification by faith, on which it bore. Consequently, we must interpret what he has said of it as having been said relatively to that subject, and therefore qualified by his argument on that subject in some measure. Similarly, St. Augustine, though he devotes a special treatise to its elucidation, was led to do so by his controversy with Pelagius on original sin and grace. From neither, therefore, can we expect either logical completeness or absolute treatment of it in an abstract form.

The *locus classicus* relating to it in the Epistle to the Romans is familiar to all; yet it should be taken out of its context for our purpose.

"We know," says St. Paul, "that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate them He also called, and whom He called them He also justified; and whom He justified them He also glorified" (c. viii. 28–30). Here we have the different stages through which each individual has to pass, from the starting-point, or *terminus a quo*, to the *terminus ad quem*, or eternal salvation, broadly traced, which would have been unreal and a mere play upon words, had each at his birth unalterably belonged to one of two classes, giving him no option of choosing between them.

In addition to this let it be noted, with regard to—

1. Reprobation.

That predestination is here not only confined to a good sense, but to a Christian sense throughout. It is limited to those whom Christ has redeemed, whom God will, accordingly, conform to His image. It may be added that it is never used by St. Paul elsewhere but in this sense. We are thus precluded from considering the term in any sense but this.

2. Foreknowledge.

That it is based on foreknowledge, though not by any means co-extensive with it. Divine foreknowledge covers a much wider range. "God foreknows all that happens in the world," as St. John Damascene says, "but God is far from predestinating all that happens." Again, "He foreknows all things that have been placed in our power, but predestinates not all even of these. For He neither wills that wickedness should be generated, nor that virtue should be forced." Thus predestination is the result of a Divine sentence, based on foreknowledge (*De Orth. Fide*, ii. 30). To the same effect, St. Augustine, "God foreknows all that is done by others, as well as by Himself . . . every sin, for instance, that is committed . . . Accordingly there may be foreknowledge without predestination; but predestination there cannot be without foreknowledge" (*De Praedest. Sanct.* c. 10). Again, Peter Lombard says, "Praedestinatio de bonis salutaribus est, et de hominibus salvandis" (*Sent.* i. dist. 4, §§ 1 and 4), quoting another passage from St. Augustine, who there defines it to be "Praeparatio gratiae." Reprobation is considered three sections on; but he refrains pointedly from calling it "predestination."

So far, then, all are agreed in the interpretation of this text. It relates to the good alone, who are predestined to be saved through grace purchased for them by Christ, and, taking effect in each of them, as they are successively called, justified, conformed to the image of Him who redeemed them, and glorified. "Christians," says Dr. Mozley, *On the Augustinian Doctrine of Pred.* c. 2, pp. 43–5, "are addressed in the New Testament upon this supposition" . . . "Each of them is addressed as one predestined to eternal glory. He is encouraged to regard himself as a favourite of heaven, singled out from the world, and stamped from the very commencement of his course with the token of future triumph . . . His life in this world is described as a passage, laborious and painful indeed, but still conducting him by a sure succession of steps to this end . . . Life is to him a purgatorial rather than a trial state; purifying him by affliction, and exercising him by conflicts, through all of which, however, he passes onward steadily with the seal of God upon him, marking him infallibly from the very beginning as His own. Nor is this position confined to a few eminent saints; but it is supposed to be the position of all Christians, who, whatever be the differences among themselves, are all saints, in comparison with the world around them . . . The conviction that he is marked out for a heavenly crown, elevates and inspires each in the pursuit of it. This is *the godly consideration of predestination*," he adds, "recommended in the 17th article of our church."

St. Paul, it cannot be repeated too often, only discusses predestination in any part of his epistles in this sense: and now, even in this sense, relatively to the subject he was expounding to the Romans, namely, justification by faith, in contradistinction to the works of the Law. Hitherto the Law of Moses had been the special boast of the Jew. Having cut away this support from beneath his feet, the apostle felt bound to furnish him with another, incomparably more secure. He unfolds to him, therefore, what God had determined from all eternity to do for those whom He has predestinated in His Son. He states their case absolutely, to give greater effect to the argument with which it supplied him then; and in so doing, he merely followed a course which is normal in Scripture. Scripture constantly lays down broad principles, leaving us to apply them. Scripture lays down one duty without qualification in one place, and another duty without qualification in another place, leaving us to strike the balance between them, when they conflict or cross each other. Or, to put the matter in a terser form, Scripture, Dr. Mozley tells us, abounds with "half-truths" . . . truths which are "truths in tendency, not absolute, not complete" . . . truths that admit of being enforced separately, and stated forcibly for influencing practice; but yet have bounds set to them by other truths belonging to the same class of subjects, and all of equal importance, which, without actually barring their path, run on for ever side by side with them in parallel lines, each throwing light upon the other, yet unable to unite. Thus Scripture is, in appearance, "two-sided" on the great subject of justification. One set of passages, taken in their natural meaning, speaks of faith, while another speaks of works as its main ingredient; and we seem left to strike the balance between them ourselves. Again, this epistle to the Romans represents the whole human race in a state of moral ruin in consequence of the transgression of the first man; incapable of doing anything pleasing and acceptable to God, or of performing any really good act; in other words it represents mankind as having lost free will in all that concerns virtue. Yet in this same letter, at its close, St. Paul commences a long and fervid appeal to his correspondents to "present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God" (Rom. xii. 1), and this he calls "their *reasonable* service."

Further, the Bible throughout, speaking to mankind in general, and addressing them on their duties and responsibilities, certainly speaks as if all had the power to do their duty, or to abstain from doing it, as being a matter in which they might please themselves; nor could any plain man infer anything from this language, other than that each moral being had a will of his own, and in spite of all temptations to the contrary, was so far free that he might be punished as a malefactor with justice, whenever he wilfully failed in his duty. Human laws, let alone divine, presuppose this, and act upon it too. Similarly, we must not invest what St. Paul says about predestination with any such meaning as will contradict, or will be found incompatible with what we read in other passages, either of reprobation which is its opposite, or of Divine foreknowledge, redemption, original sin, grace, free will, vocation, justification, sanctification, election, all bearing on the present or future condition of mankind, with which it is mixed up or has to do. In short to understand it aright we should run through broadly the limitations imposed on it in advance by what is laid down in other parts of Scripture respecting each of these. First, then—to take them in the order in which they stand—*reprobation* is a term that never occurs in Scripture, the nearest approach to it being what St. Paul writes of the Gentile world, anterior to Christ, outside the Law. "Even as they were not *minded* to retain God in *knowledge*"—such as He had given them of Himself—"God gave them over to *a reprobate mind* (*ἐδοκίμασαν . . . ἐν ἐπιγνώσει . . . ἀδόκιμον νοῦν*, Rom. i. 28), I give the Greek of the italicised words. The play between the first and last has been universally noticed, and could not have been unintentional. To supply the pronoun "their" before "knowledge" with the Revised and Authorised Versions is misleading. To render *ἐπίγνωσις*, with most lexicons and commentators, "*full* or *complete* knowledge," is misleading also. For when our Lord says, "Nobody knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth anybody the Father save the Son" (St. Matt. xi. 27)—using the same compound in both cases—He as good as tells us, surely, that, except by special revelation, no man was ever possessed of *such* knowledge as this in respect of God? Then, again, have not Christians a considerably fuller knowledge of Him than those Gentiles had, yet the same term is ever afterwards used to designate the knowledge vouchsafed to them; and, lastly, the pronoun "*their*" nowhere precedes it even in their case. Thus, this single passage must be held to settle the question of reprobation in a manner that cannot possibly be explained away. It is a key-passage to the whole subject. It explains all that we are told about Pharaoh, on whom the miracles of Moses were thrown away, and about the Jews, whom the miracles of our Lord failed to convert, in the same breath. No heart was ever hardened, no eyes ever blinded, nor any mind given over to become reprobate, from the day on which Adam was expelled Paradise until now, before the knowledge, vouchsafed by God of Himself to the individual possessing them, had been deliberately scorned and flung aside. Consequently, nothing that we read in any part of Scripture bearing upon predestination, can be pressed to an extent incompatible with this unequivocal declaration of the law ruling its opposite. "God," says Dr. Thomas Jackson, "did not from eternity decree to harden Pharaoh by His irresistible will, is true of Pharaoh in his infancy or youth, but false of Pharaoh after his wilful contempt of God's summons by signs and wonders" (book x. c. 41, § 20, ed. 1673). 2. Divine foreknowledge has been already touched upon. It only remains to be pointed out that its subject-matter is in this case limited exclusively to what Aristotle calls the contingent or indeterminate future (*De Interp.* c. 9). For there are "two classes of secondary causes, one necessary, the other contingent," as Dr. Mozley quotes approvingly from St. Thomas Aquinas (p. 256). Of these the first operates in the material world around us, below and above; the second in creatures possessed of a will. We ourselves can forecast what our contemporaries, under circumstances known to us in advance, will elect to do; but our success in forecasting it unknown to them, cannot have conduced in the slightest degree to their choice. Each such resolve was not only foreknown but taken into full account by God, long before this world began; for no human being is ever born into this world but by His permission. "Thine eye did see my substance, yet being imperfect; and in Thy book were all my members written," as the Psalmist says (Ps. cxxxix. 16), and as Dr. Mozley puts it in a few words (p. 7), "No one, who believes properly in a God at all, can suppose that He does anything on a sudden, and which He has not thought of before."

3. Redemption.

It is extraordinary that in a work on predestination of such grasp and excellence, Dr. Mozley should have passed over this fundamental topic in comparative silence—without any special treatment, or adequate recognition. For, if one thing is expressed in plainer terms or more constantly than another about Christ in Scripture, it is, that He "came into the world that the world through Him might be saved" (St. John iii. 17)—that He "wishes all men to be saved" (1 Tim. ii. 4)—"came to save sinners" (*ib.* i. 15)—"is come to seek and to save that which was lost" (St. Luke xix. 10)—"gave Himself a ransom for all" (1 Tim. ii. 6)—"died for the ungodly" (Rom. v. 6)—"died for all" (2 Cor. v. 14, 15)—was "lifted up from the earth (in His death, purposely) to draw all men unto Him" (St. John xii. 32)—"was manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil" (1 St. John iii. 8). Hence the conclusion drawn by St. Paul himself, "As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation: even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life" (Rom. v. 18). In other words, a full and perfect atonement was accomplished by Christ upon the cross, retrospective as well as prospective for the whole race descended from Adam; in which it was His intention and wish all men should participate to the full, by accepting the terms on which it was offered to each individual in turn; though it was no secret to Him in effecting it, on what numbers it would be thrown away, and only work for condemnation. "Marvel not at this," as He said Himself, "for the hour

is coming, in the which *all* that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." In the judgment scene, portrayed by Him in Holy Week, which St. Matthew records (c. xxv. 31–46), He ranges them Himself, the blessed and the cursed ones, over against each other "as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats;" representing, to their mutual surprise, the good deeds of the one to be works of mercy done to Himself, and the evil deeds of the other as works of mercy denied Him; and making them the ground in one case for everlasting reward, in the other case for everlasting woe. Could any principle be more broadly or more authoritatively laid down, than what is here laid down by the Judge Himself for the judgment day, namely, that all will have their doom fixed according to the works done by themselves; that is to say, works done by them with full intent, and of their own free choice? To suppose that one will be rewarded, for complying with what they could not resist, or the other punished for doing what they never had the option of avoiding, would be to make judgment a solemn mockery, and probation a complete farce. Again, take that tenderest of invitations addressed to *all* burdened consciences on this side of the grave, "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Would it not be sacrilege to suppose that *any such* could ever be found on earth, as would never have the option of accepting it?

4. Original Sin.

By which is meant, not so much the actual sin committed by Adam, as its effects on his posterity. But a few words on his own sin first. It was of course foreseen and permitted, but not decreed. The Supralapsarians of modern times outwent Calvin himself on this head. What *were* decreed were the consequences attaching to it. God leaves the antecedents to us, in matters where we are allowed freedom of choice. The consequents, viz. the good or evil that shall befal us on our better or worse choice, He determines Himself, and commonly without appeal. Death—in other words the decay and ultimate dissolution of the body, called in the last book of the Bible the first death—was the first consequence decreed against Adam for his sin, and it has passed on all descended from him, with only two noted exceptions. It was not—it would seem *it could not be*—reversed even by the second Adam; though, by submitting to it in His own person, He purchased exemption from the second death, or death of the soul, for all who would accept salvation at His hands, and on His terms. The second consequence decreed against Adam for his sin and transmitted to all descended from him by carnal generation, is the lifelong struggle that goes on within them occasioned by the emancipation of their lower nature from control of their higher, which all instinctively would hide from view, yet cannot help betraying, whenever it is active, by a conscious blush. By some this has been represented as a mere physical taint, by others, as a withdrawal of original righteousness, or the grace given to Adam at his birth. But, unless St. Paul is to be discarded as an authority, it is much more than the mere withdrawal of a supernatural quality. For, according to him, it is an active principle that works, without exception, in all descended from Adam. Indeed, he gives utterance to the universal conscience, in describing it as a law inherent in the natural man as now constituted, impelling and often forcing him to do wrong, even when his wish is to do right. Again, the rite of circumcision points, with all the clearness of a finger-post, equally to the stronghold of its dominion and to the never-failing instrument of its transmission. So far St. Augustine is in as full accordance with St. Paul as St. Paul with fact. Still, even on this head there is another set of passages, equally prominent in St. Paul, but almost left out of sight not merely by St. Augustine, but by most writers on original sin, ancient and modern; namely, those who dwell on the unseen agency that assails man from without, being just as much due to original sin as lust itself. "For we wrestle not," says the apostle, "against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places" (Eph. vi. 12; comp. *ib.* v. 11; Eph. iv. 27; St. James iv. 7; 1 St. Peter v. 8–9; 1 St. John iii. 8). In the rite of circumcision there was no reference to these, but in the offices for Christian baptism renunciation of the devil always came first (Bingham, *Ant.* xi. 7), and who can tell how often lust is set in motion by him unknown to ourselves? Hence the effect of leaving his action out of sight in discussing this question, must be to blacken unduly the taint inherent in man; in other words, to make lust and original sin nearly convertible terms. Accordingly St. Augustine pressed those words of St. Paul, "I know that in me—that is, in my flesh—dwelleth no good thing," to their extreme limit, in estimating the internal condition of man after the Fall. "For it is a rule in morals," says Dr. Mozley, "that the morality of the man must precede the morality of the action . . . before any particular act can be pronounced good in him. This morality of the man—the fulfilment of this general condition—is the foundation. One type, then, of a faulty character is that of a character good at the foundation and only failing in degree; the other is that of a character bad at the foundation. . . . Now, St. Augustine does not admit the power of nature to supply such a foundation in any degree whatever . . . He therefore regards heathen morality as bad at the foundation; and therefore as a hollow, false, and only seeming morality itself. Nor does he admit the existence of a good heathen: though he admits that the heathen did actions which in Christians would be good ones." Applying his argument to the condition of the world before and since Christ, his first position was generally, that hell was the proper place for all whose original sin had not been cancelled in this life; his second that circumcision under the Law, and baptism under the Gospel, were the sole means ordained hitherto for cancelling it; and then, driving this argument home more particularly for his own times, he laid down that hell in various degrees awaited all, adults or infants, heathens, Jews or Christians, who died unbaptized. See

the quotations from his works in b. ii. dist. xxx.–xxxiii. of the sentences of Peter Lombard; only the most extreme are given, art. AUGUSTINUS, Vol. I. 220–21 of this work. Yet it was part of his teaching, no less, as it was of Scripture, too, that Christ died for all, and that the entire guilt of the sin of the first Adam was cancelled on the cross by the second Adam. "Tenet ergo diabolus, liberat Christus; tenet deceptor Evae, liberat Filius Mariae; tenet qui per conjugem venit ad virum, liberat qui de conjuge natus est, quae non pertulit virum; tenet qui causam libidinis intulit feminae, liberat qui sine libidine est conceptus in feminâ . . .," as he puts it, in a way that leaves nothing unsaid (*De Pec. Orig.* § 45, ed. Ben.). It is his second position which narrows his ground, yet even here we can follow him till we come to its application. That the merits of Christ must in some way be applied to each individual separately, for each individual to have the option of profiting by them, is a point about which there can be no dispute. The whole tenor of Scripture testifies to it. Again, circumcision under the Law, and baptism under the Gospel were both of them appointed means for bringing men back into covenant with God, prospectively or retrospectively, through Christ, in other words for applying His merits to man. Of course they were; but were either of them means appointed in an exclusive sense? To those placed within reach of either, and deliberately refusing to avail themselves of either, few would think it reasonable that other means should be supplied. From all excluded from either, through no fault of their own, surely some provision must have been made by Him, from whose prescience their case could not have been hid. From whatever benefits were derived from circumcision all women were designedly shut out by His ordinance; from whatever benefits either circumcision or baptism conferred, all infants were shut out, though born within reach of them, whom He called away too soon to be recipients of either. And to whose fault has it been due that so many countless millions, under the law and the Gospel alike, have gone to their graves in utter, but not therefore wilful, ignorance of both? Can any portion of those for whom Christ died equally with ourselves, be considered out of covenant with God, condemned never to have the option of avoiding the second death, though redeemed in point of fact by His blood? Principles of reason and common sense, which have been accepted in other cases, cannot be refused extension to this. "God has not tied His power to the sacraments," in other words, God *has* bound Himself to confer grace through the sacraments, but *has not* bound Himself never to confer grace without them, says Peter Lombard more than once (*Sent.* iv. dist. 1 d, and 4 e), quoting from St. Augustine, who found that "not only death endured for confessing Christ may supply lack of baptism, but that faith and conversion of heart also may, where adverse circumstances make the celebration of baptism impossible . . . where it is not contempt of religion, but necessity, that excludes the sacrament." Elsewhere St. Augustine says, "Invisible sanctification has been conferred before now, and received with profit by some, without the visible sacraments of their time" (*Quaest. in Levit.* iii. 9, 84). It is agreed on all hands that no positive grace was conferred by circumcision; and that down to Christian times, all who were justified, were justified by their faith alone (*Estius in Sent.* iv. dist. 1, §§ 27–30). Reason brought out the meaning of Scripture, by being in general agreement with it upon this point. "The wind bloweth where it listeth," said our Lord to Nicodemus (St. John iii. 8), in interpreting all that He had previously laid down about being "born again," and paralleling the action of the Spirit in it by that of the wind, hence called *baptismus Flaminis*, in contradistinction to the *baptismi fluminis* aut *sanguinis* (St. Thom. *Sum. Theol.* iii. quaest. 66, art. 11). St. Paul, too, writes in his first dogmatic epistle on justification by faith, "We say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? When he was in circumcision or in uncircumcision? *Not* in circumcision, but *in uncircumcision*" (Rom. iv. 9, 10). Agreeably with this, he gives, in his third and last epistle on the same subject, an indiscriminate list of all the saints beginning with Abel, who lived before Christ, and were justified solely by faith; having defined the believer at starting to be simply, the man who "believes that God is, and that He is a rewarder of those who diligently seek Him" (Heb. xi. 6). Millions might be sincere believers in this sense who had never heard of the Law or the Gospel either; the Spirit, "who bloweth where He listeth," having scattered, as He passed unseen, the seeds of faith in their hearts. Whence St. Peter, in the opening sentence of his address to the household of the first Gentile convert to Christ, is inspired to say, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him" (Acts x. 34–5). *Working righteousness* may be predicated in all strictness of all who have been justified by faith—no matter to what race they belonged; no matter where, when, or how long or short a time they may have lived. But this, again, was only what St. Peter had been taught on the best authority to anticipate years before. For, in reply to another centurion, but in words intended more particularly for the bystanding Jews, our Lord had Himself said, "Verily I have not found so great faith, no! not in Israel. And I say unto you that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." After such explicit language from Christ Himself, and recorded in a gospel addressed especially to the Jews, how can we doubt that all through the ages of the Christian church the same gentle Spirit has been incessantly blowing "where He listeth," and working for good among the countless multitudes, that, for no fault of their own, are strangers to the Gospel still; inspiring each soul responding to His overtures with saving faith, in proportion to its needs, and effacing in it by that invisible baptism, for applying to all the merits of Him who died for all, the guilt of the taint inherited by all from their parents (comp. Bp. Bull, *Apol. pro Harm.* § 111). To assert this is neither Solifidianism, nor Universalism. On the same principle, those who were to be removed soonest

from this life would be soonest visited by Him. No infant of a single hour in any part of the world would be passed over. The good seed sown here would be matured under more favourable conditions elsewhere without fail. Visible sacraments, where they cannot be had, are plainly not indispensable for the removal of original sin through Christ. But for the controversy raised by Pelagius, St. Augustine would never have asserted they were.

5. Grace.

Nothing need be added here to what has been already said on this head (Vol. II. 719, art. Grace) except relatively to

6. Free-will.

Now, free-will and grace being both recognised factors in the scheme for the salvation of man set forth in Holy Scripture, we should consider ourselves barred from representing the action of either to the prejudice, and still more to the exclusion of the other. That is to say, no view of either should be permitted, that would impair their harmonious co-existence. That these bounds have been overpassed in modern times is no secret, and Dr. Mozley charges even St. Augustine with making grace irresistible—*thereby* destroying free-will. In other words, he construes a subtle distinction of his in that sense (pp. 160–8). But, surely, St. Augustine should be allowed, in preference, to explain himself. Three years before his death, A.D. 427, he wrote thus (*De Correp. et G.* c. 1): "Ac per hoc et *desiderare auxilium gratiae*, initium gratiae est. Liberum itaque arbitrium, et ad malum *et ad bonum faciendum*, confitendum est nos habere: sed in malo faciendo, liber est quisque justitiae servusque peccati: in bono autem liber esse nullus potest, nisi fuerit liberatus ab Eo, qui dixit: 'Si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc vere liberi eritis.' Nec ita, ut cum quisque fuerit a peccati dominatione liberatus, jam non indigeat sui Liberatoris auxilio: sed ita potius, ut ab Illo audiens—'Sine me nihil potestis facere'—dicat Ei et ipse: 'Adjutor meus esto, ne derelinquas me.'" What can be plainer in language, or more Christian in tone? The first act, whereby the assistance of grace is desired, is an act of free-will on the part of man; by the next, which is an act of God, grace is bestowed, whereby the will is set free; by the third more grace is petitioned for on the part of man, to co-operate with each act of the will now free to do right. Practically, no doubt, the influences of Divine grace instil themselves into the heart willing to receive them with so much tenderness and persuasiveness, as to exercise resistless power over the will; yet it is only resistless, as not being irresistible. For the will having asserted its own freedom in assenting to them, goes along with them rejoicing at each step, and surrendering itself more completely to them, as it becomes conscious of their increase. But such is not the case with all hearts by any means. Innate propensities, resulting from heterogeneous causes, peculiar to each case, differentiate widely between man and man. Some will readily sacrifice everything in this world and the next to the gratification of a single unlawful appetite, that takes such possession of them as absolutely to deprive them of free-will for some time at least. For them heaven possesses no attractions, nor hell any cause for alarm. They have inflicted judicial blindness upon themselves by a series of long-continued acts, disapproved by their conscience. Others abhorring the promptings of their lower nature from childhood, pant thirstily for the faintest whisper of the Spirit to their inner man, and are raised out of themselves at every fresh sound of His voice. To live to Him is a privilege for which they can never be thankful enough, and would gladly pay any price to get secured to them and enlarged. Thus the intention on the part of God in bestowing grace is everywhere the same; but its effects on different minds are so widely dissimilar, that we are perplexed to reconcile them. In some cases it seems as though it could never have been really bestowed; in others, as though it had been irresistible, and never could fail. The simple truth is that the grace purchased for man by Christ will have been offered to all in some form before this world ends, on the same terms. It has neither been withheld from any, nor has it ever been forced upon any; but it has systematically been increased or diminished, according to its acceptance or non-acceptance by the individual in each case. "For unto every one that hath shall be given, and *he shall have abundance*" (St. Matt. xxv. 29), but "whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have" (St. Luke viii. 18). Now this is a principle which is not in any sense peculiar to grace; but one which is thought just, and acted upon in all lands, and in all affairs of the world. There remains some little to be said about free-will in man. Dr. Mozley asserts (p. 30) "that alone to be a genuine doctrine of free-will, which maintains such a free-will in man, as is *inconsistent* with our idea of Divine power." Genuine or not, this doctrine cannot be said to be founded on fact. St. Augustine came much nearer the truth when he said that the will of the Omnipotent invariably triumphed, whatever happened, and whichever side human wills took (*Enchirid.* c. 100–2). "Illa enim voluntas," says the Master of the Sentences in epitomising him, "semper impletur aut de nobis, aut a nobis—*De* nobis impletur—licet non implemus Eam—quando peccamus. *A* nobis impletur, quando bonum facimus" (lib. i. dist. 47). His will is equally fulfilled in punishing the sinner and rewarding the just, though it is no part of His will that any should commit sin. But St. Augustine pushed his case too far when he represented it as incompatible with omnipotence that any should have the power of resisting grace. For God in creating man ordained that his will should be free; and Christ in redeeming man provided for his recovering that freedom, which he had partially lost, entire, through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. His free-will therefore could not well have been restored, to be over-ridden in the same breath. Sin it was which had caused him that partial shipwreck of the freedom of his will, which Christ became man to restore. But sin is no creation of God; it is not a substance, it is incapable of being classed under any species in the world of nature (comp. Mozley, pp. 171, 232–3, 271, and seq.). It is, in every conceivable case, the creation of a perverse will, of a will disobedient to some

general or special law of the Power who made the world. This is how sin entered into the world; how it has been perpetuated in the world ever since; how it continues in the world still. It began in the self-determining will of a creature. It will only cease when the self-determining will of every creature shall have been brought into complete harmony with Divine law again. For sin carries with it its own punishment in every case, by making the will a slave to it, whose creation it is. Thus the will that has committed sin is no longer free to that extent. Its disobedience recoils upon itself. The consequences of original and actual sin, too, though widely differing in extent, are congener in kind. Though unnatural themselves, they are the natural effects of disobedience to law. "Peccatum est factum, vel dictum, vel concupitum contra legem aeternam. Lex vero aeterna est ratio Divina, vel voluntas Dei: ordinem naturae conservari jubens; perturbari vetans." (St. Aug. *c. Faust.* xxii. 27; on which see St. Thom. Aq. 1^ma^–2^dae^, q. lxxi., art. 6 ad 2^dum^.)

Human free-will must be considered in strictness as we find it in man, and in man it never was, or was intended to be beyond that of a creature formed as man is. His own constitution, therefore, dictated limits to his free-will, in many ways from the first. His conscience should have been always supreme in him as regards duty, and his reason as regards knowledge. By a wanton act of disobedience he burst away from both at the Fall, and has inherited in each successive generation the consequences of that rebellion ever since. Those consequences Christ purchased for him—but only purchased for him by discharging them in His own person—the means of extirpating gradually through grace. Should he neglect to avail himself of the opportunity thus afforded him, the bondage to which he subjected himself by rebelling against the laws of his constitution must, with all its consequences, remain his for ever. He knows (1) that his free-will is confined strictly to things within his power, and is, even in these, constantly swayed by mixed motive, and deterred by circumstances from choosing what it would have preferred, had it felt itself perfectly free, but is powerless to alter the laws without him, as well moral as physical, in any respect with impunity. He knows (2) that he cannot exchange, for others that he might prefer, the general qualifications of his own mind or body with which he was born. He knows (3) that his own free-will is limited in action to what concerns himself, that he cannot attempt anything in opposition to the free-wills of his fellow-men without counting the cost, and that men are just as likely to resent interference with their laws as God with His. His own reason and conscience, therefore, between them should teach him that perfect freedom of the will in a creature can only consist with perfect obedience to the known laws of his Creator, and that for every creature destined for a probationary state, like himself, no condition could be conceived more natural or more fair than his own, namely, that with reason and conscience given him for guides at his birth, he should be left perfectly free to decide for himself both what he should do and what he will do; and this is precisely the condition in which every man may, if he will, occupy through Christ by grace. As Christ Himself told the Jews, "If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye *shall be* free indeed" (St. John viii. 36), and as His apostle told the Gentiles, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. iii. 17).

7. Vocation.

On this point, "we shall have no difficulty," says Calvin (*Inst.* iii. 24, 8), "in understanding those words of our Lord about the *many called* and the *few chosen*, if we will only bear in mind that *vocation* is twofold: (1) universal, whereby God invites all by a call addressed to their outward ears, namely, through the preaching of His word by man; and (2) special, in which He speaks to them by His Spirit in their hearts." According to the first of these—which the Jesuit Cornelius à Lapide praises Calvin (*ad loc.*) for connecting with Rom. xi. 29, and of which, in spite of the multitudes on whom it is thrown away in each case, the apostle there says pointedly, that it is "*without repentance*" on the part of God—the Jews were called under the Law, and the Gentiles under the Gospel. In this sense vocation includes both bad and good, and as often, probably, fails as succeeds in its purpose, and therefore contrasts rather than corresponds with election, being only the first step to it in a limited number. For thousands of Jews under the Law, and millions of Christians under the Gospel, have proclaimed their doom openly to the world beforehand by their ungodly lives. Of such St. Peter has said, "It had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness" (2 Pet. ii. 21); of such St. Paul despairs, "seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame" (Heb. vi. 6).

Calvin, too, shrinks, as the logic of facts compelled him, from taking any more sanguine view of the effects of the vocation which he calls "special," though "hidden" would have been a more correct name for it; as, to whatever extent he may have limited it in his own mind, it includes all plainly both before and since Christ, that have lived and died in ignorance, not caused by themselves, of any visible dispensation for applying His merits to man. Each individual of this world-coeval, world-coextensive class, was born with the same reason and conscience, and had the same witness of God in the visible world, that the Gentiles had, of whom St. Paul writes in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans; on each heart of this multitude, the Spirit "who bloweth where He listeth," as our Lord gave Nicodemus to understand, has in all ages been free to act; each must have, therefore, had it in his power, by opening his heart to that action at some period of his life, to have died in faith—such faith as is defined in Hebrews xi. 6. What numbers responded to that action with alacrity, we may not even guess now; but if "*compulsion*" was ever employed "*to fill*" heaven "*with guests*," we may well infer it was charity that dictated it, on behalf of those who lived on acorns "in the highways and hedges" (St. Luke xiv. 23), but who will finally "come from the east and the west in throngs, to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven" (St. Matt. viii. 11), and occupy the vacant places

of the children of the same that have been "cast out." To these two classes a third, so far as words go, might have been joined, namely, those designated "the called according to His purpose (κατὰ πρόθεσιν)" by St. Paul, did not the context and the outcome of his argument in the next chapter shew that "the elect" are there meant, of whom presently.

8. JUSTIFICATION.

Which, owing to the controversies raised about it in modern times requires going into with extra fulness. First as to the word—anglicised from the Latin "justificatio"—which may have been coined by Tertullian, as he often employs its cognates. Speaking of the passages in the Epistle to the Romans left untouched by Marcion, he says, "Monet justificatos ex fide Christi, non ex lege pacem habere" (*c. Marc.* v. 13); quoting the parable of the Publican and Pharisee, he says, "alterum reprobatum, alterum justificatum descendisse" (*ib.* iv. 36). By comparing two more passages (*ib.* ii. 19, with *ad Ux.* 8), we find he makes "justificare = justè facere," shewing it was the forensic sense that he attached to them, of "*doing* justice" to a person, either by condemning or acquitting, agreeably with the Greek verb δικαιόω, so often used by St. Paul, which was also the sense given to it in numerous charters and constitutions of the middle ages (v. Du Cange, *s. v.*). Similarly, St. Augustine, referring to the versions of the Old Testament, current in his time previously to the Vulgate says, "Justificationes sane Latini interpretes eas esse dixerunt, quae Graeci δικαιώματα appellant" (*Quaest. in Exod.* ii. 95). And no doubt his own frequent employment of this word in the singular number was suggested to him by finding it in the Latin versions of the New Testament, also then current, from which he quotes. But, on the other hand, when he asks, "Quid est justificare?" and then replies, "Justum facere" (*Serm.* ccxcii. § 6), and again "quid est aliud justificati, quam justi facti?" (*De Spir. et Lit.* § 45) taking *facere not* in the sense of doing, but of "*making*," he was adventuring a bold gloss of his own, determined entirely by the mere form of the Latin word, without reference to the Greek for which it stood, but which settled at once and for ever the theological meaning of that Latin verb and its cognates for the Western church. Thus Becau, one of the ablest Jesuit controversialists of the 17th century, says, without hesitation, as if admitted by all, "Justificatio *nihil aliud* est, quam mutatio, quâ quis ex impio seu peccatore *fit justus*" (*Manual.* i. 16). Nor was it till the middle of the same century that attention was first called by our own bishop Bull to the astounding fact, that the Greek verb δικαιοῦν and its cognates, which had long been classical before they became theological, had a different meaning almost invariably throughout the New Testament from what had been assigned *uno ore*, from the 5th century downwards, to their received Latin equivalents; in short that Rev. xxii. 11—assuming the received reading to be the correct one—was a solitary case where δικαιοῦσθαι = *justum fieri*, and not *justum censeri*, which it meant everywhere else (*Harm. Apost.* i. 6). So far, then, on the origin and the meaning attached to the Latin term, to which the little discussion there was of the subject in patristic times was confined, not by any means that there was no generally received doctrine respecting it in the collective church. Perhaps the clearest statements of it are to be found in the earliest fathers—St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius, and St. Irenaeus—already quoted under another head. [FAITH.]

It may be summed up in a few words. Justification was, according to them, an act of grace on the part of God; Who justifies man—that is, accounts him righteous, and purged from sin, not for any deserts of his own, but solely for the merits of Christ, Who died for him, on condition of his accepting salvation through Christ, and ever after abiding in Christ. In default of the first it would not issue, in default of the second it might be cancelled at any moment. But on his assenting, his regeneration was accomplished for him by the Holy Ghost in due course, subject only to his power of saying "no" to it at each stage. Faith was the first of inward gifts, and baptism the first of outward ordinances for effecting his new birth and union with Christ in the same breath. Other virtues and other means of grace followed, in proportion to his willingness to receive them, and turn them to the best account he could, Christ making up for the rest. Thus it was all done, in every case where it was done, by God, for the sake of His Son, and by gift of His Spirit. The whole Trinity was a party to it in conferring it; man was a party to it only by accepting it, and co-operating with it sincerely to the best of his power. The faith by which he believed in Christ was his only by gift; the good works that were the fruits of his faith were the fruits of the Spirit in the first instance, which, in answer to prayer, he got strength from above to perform; in the sacrament of baptism it was not man who *gave*, but men who *received* the Holy Ghost; "In nullo gloriandum, quandò nostrum nihil sit," and the correlative to it: "In Deum solum fidendum, et in Ipso gloriandum," as St. Cyprian says (*Test.* iii. 4 and 10). Holding this principle warmly and thoroughly, the fathers were comparatively not careful how they expressed it themselves, nor again jealous of any merely verbal inconsistencies about it in others; least of all, copious in distinguishing between instrumental and efficient, meritorious and formal, causes in this joint but disparate work of God and man. Yet any false doctrine connected with the action of either would have been discovered and disowned by them in a trice, with as much recoil as St. Augustine professes, on first becoming acquainted with the notions of Pelagius on original sin. "I was perusing," he says, "a few days ago, certain writings of Pelagius, a holy man as I am told, and a Christian of no moderate standard, containing some short comments on the epistles of St. Paul, and among them I found *à propos* to Rom. v. 12, the argument of those persons stated, who deny the existence in infants of original sin, an argument which I confess not to have refuted as yet in any of my voluminous works, simply from never having dreamt that anybody could have entertained or given vent to it" (*De Pecc. Mer. et Rem.* iii. i.). Further on, he adds: "When this first began to be disputed I know not, but this I *do* know, viz. that even St. Jerome, who still lives, devoted to ecclesiastical studies, and in

high repute for the learning and labour he brings to bear on them, unhesitatingly takes this doctrine for his standpoint in deciding various questions which he has to solve. For instance, when he comes to that passage of the prophet Jonah (iii. 5), in which even children are stated to have been forced to fast. 'It was to begin,' he says, 'from the eldest, and go down to the youngest. For there is nobody without sin, be he but one day old, or numbers of years. For if the stars are not clean in the sight of God, how much more are not the worm, and corruption, and they to whom the sin of Adam has descended by inheritance.' Could we, without difficulty, put the question to this most learned man, how many commentators on the holy Scriptures in either tongue, how many writers on Christian controversies, would he produce, who never held a different doctrine since the Christian church began, never received a different doctrine from their predecessors, never handed down a different doctrine for generations unborn?" (*Ib.* c. 6). Both St. Augustine and St. Jerome must have said precisely the same thing of "justification," had it been assailed in their time. Yet they so far differed in their own incidental allusions to it, that St. Jerome in arguing against the Pelagians, adhered strictly to the teaching of the earliest fathers, with whose language he was critically acquainted. St. Augustine innovated upon them in some respects from not understanding their language.

Their doctrine shall now be given in their own words. St. Clement of Rome, to whom reference has been already made, requires a little elucidation, partly from having been mistranslated by his standard editor, and partly from having expressed himself at times so as to need harmonising. This is his fullest statement: "We, then, having been called through His good purpose in Christ Jesus, are justified, not through ourselves, nor through our own wisdom . . . . nor work done by us in uprightness of heart, but through faith: through which Almighty God justified all that ever were (justified) since the world began" (*Ep.* i. 32). Coteler makes him say here: "Non per nos ipsos *justi efficimur* . . . . sed per fidem, per quam cunctos qui unquam *justi fuerunt*, justificavit Deus omnipotens." This, we repeat, is not rendering but glossing upon the Greek verb, as St. Chrysostom says on Rom. viii. 33: "He wrote not, 'God that remits sins,' but 'God that justifieth;' which was far greater. For when the *sentence of the judge*—and such a judge too—*declares one righteous*, what count is made of the accuser? . . . . For God both chose and justified us—yea, marvel of marvels! —justified through the slaying of His Son . . ." And Theodoret (*ib.*):—"God that justified—in other words, that declared them righteous." And St. Basil, on Rom. vi. 7; "that is, discharged, freed, purged from all sin" (*de Bapt.* i. 2, 15). Again, the prominence which is here given to faith must be construed side by side with two strong expressions elsewhere: "justified by works and not by words" (*ib.* 30); and "charity covereth a multitude of sins" (*ib.* 49). It is perfectly consistent with both. The faith here contemplated is proved by the context to be *not* our own, but a divine gift; and works that are the fruit of it; and charity, planted in us by the same Hand as faith — "charity" which he describes as being "in Christ" (*ib.*) —are naturally sharers in its prerogatives. One more passage completes his meaning. On Ps. cxviii. 19, "Open me the gates of righteousness, that I may go into them, and give thanks unto the Lord," he says: "Many gates having been opened, that in righteousness and that in Christ, is the same: into which all the blessed having entered and made straight their path, perform all things in holiness and righteousness without fear . . . . " (*ib.* 48). Union with Christ alone secures permanence for their faith and love: neither are safe, neither avail for our justification, except so far and as long as we are one with Him. As St. Chrysostom observes (on Phil. iii. 9), "It is well said, 'not having my own righteousness;' not that which I acquired through toil and labour, but that which I found from grace . . . and what is this? that which is from the faith of God; in other words, which has also been given from God; at once the righteousness of God, and a gift whole and complete. For the gifts of God far exceed in measure the poorness of our best achievements." And Theodoret, on Rom. iv. 4: "The righteousness which is of faith is a gift of the God of all things." and St. Cyril of Alexandria, first, on 2 Cor. v. 21: "Him who never sinned He made to suffer all the penalties of the most determined sinner, that He might declare righteous us who have accepted faith in Him . . . For we have been justified from before God and the Father, not by works in righteousness that we have done ourselves, but according to the greatness of His mercy, through faith which is in Christ;" second, on Is. xxviii. 22: "What are the things thus consummated and concise? The preaching of the Gospel, the grace which is through faith, justification which is in Christ, sanctification which is through the Spirit . . . ." third, *ib.* on v. 26–9: "As it was not possible for man to be justified in law, the only begotten Word of God appeared with a consummated and concise thing in His hands for our acceptance— viz. the justification which is in faith . . . ." Finally, St. Chrysostom on St. John xv. 1: "He saith not that the root enjoys the care of the husbandman, but the branches; and the root is introduced for no other purpose than that they may learn that they can work nothing without His power; and that they ought to be united with Him by faith, as the branch with the vine . . . . the abiding in the root is that which makes the branches to be fruit-bearing:" or, as St. Augustine interprets the same passage for the West: "Ita quippe in vite palmites, ut viti non conferant, sed inde accipiant, unde vivant: ita vero vitis est in palmitibus, ut vitale alimentum subministret iis, non sumat ab iis. Ac per hoc et manentem in se habere Christum, et manere in Christo, discipulis prodest utrumque, non Christo. Nam praeciso palmite, potest de vivâ radice alius pullulare: qui autem praecisus est, sine radice non potest vivere" (*in Joh. Ev. Tr.* lxxxi., repeated by Prosper, *Sent.* 368, and Conc. Arausic. ii. can. 24).

Three more sets of passages remain to complete their teaching. 1. Where they speak of baptism in almost as strong terms as faith; but these passages are by comparison few and far

between, though at the same time they would be repudiated by none. St. Clement has nothing explicit, for instance, to this effect, though he refers to the sanctification that follows on baptism in his salutation; nor St. Basil either, though he composed a tract on baptism. But when we come to commentators, we find St. Chrysostom explaining Rom. viii. 30: "*justified* through the laver of regeneration;" and Theodoret (*ib.*)—"justified through baptism;" and Primasius (*ib.*) speaking for the Latin church—"justificantur per baptismum;" Theodoret, again, on Rom. iv. 25: "Through His resurrection we get the starting-point of our justification, and by being buried with Him in baptism we receive the remission of our sins." And St. Chrysostom on Rom. vi. 3: "What the cross and tomb were to Christ, that baptism is to us." And St. Cyril of Jerusalem to his catechumens, in the same spirit: "You went down into the water dead in sins, you ascend quickened in righteousness" (*Cat.* iv. 12). Only two chapters earlier he had said: "If any receive not baptism, he attains not to salvation: the martyrs alone excepted, who without that water receive the kingdom." From these two passages it might be inferred St. Cyril placed baptism a long way before faith. But in a still earlier chapter he says, speaking of Cornelius: "Peter came to him, and the Holy Ghost fell on them that believed, and they spake with tongues and prophesied. Then, after they had received this grace, the Scripture goes on to say, that Peter commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; that the soul having been regenerated through the faith, the body might be a sharer of the grace through the water" (*ib.* § 4). And in his fifth lecture, which is on faith, he says of Abraham: "He was not justified by works alone, but by faith too. For though he did many things well, he was never called the friend of God till such time as he believed, and every work of his had been made perfect according to faith . . . . as he therefore was justified, do you be justified also" (§ 5). The Fathers knew very well that justification by faith was a doctrine that originated, *not* with St. Paul, but with Christ Himself, whose comforting farewell to those cured by Him was habitually: "Go thy way, thy faith hath saved or hath made thee whole"—that faith, indeed, which His Spirit instilled, but which they, by accepting, had made their own—that faith which His Spirit offers to all men in all ages of the world as a means—having no other means within their reach—of justifying, or making all sharers of His merits by whom it is accepted.

2. Where good works are described as indispensable consequents on justification. For instance, St. Chrysostom on Rom. viii. 4: "For that which was the righteousness of the law . . . Christ has accomplished this for thee. Be not a betrayer, then, of so great a gift, but constant in preserving this goodly treasure. For here he shews thee that the font is not enough to insure salvation to us, unless after the font we shew a life worthy of the gift we get there . . . ." And, again, on Rom. iii. 31: "But inasmuch as after this grace, by which we were justified, there is also need of a life suited to it, let us exhibit a zeal worthy of the gift . . . ." And Theodoret (*ib.*) on the last verse of chap. iv.; "Having shewn how Abraham became possessed of the righteousness of faith, lest careless livers should deem themselves dispensed from the practice of virtue on that account, as though faith sufficed for their justification, he appends some necessary remarks on morals, and says . . . . Faith indeed gave you remission of sins, and declared you blameless and righteous through the laver of regeneration, still it behoves you to keep the peace which you have made with God." And St. Basil (*de Bapt.* ii. 2): "He that has been truly baptized into the death of Christ, as the apostle says . . . . has engaged in a covenant of the strictest kind to follow the Lord in all things: in other words, to live wholly for God . . . ."

3. Where the righteousness even of the baptized and faithful is admitted to be, *per se*, but imperfect and incomplete. Perhaps Origen, who has not been quoted hitherto, because not extant in Greek, is fullest on this point, and therefore beyond mistranslation. "Et hic ergo quod dixit: 'Non justificabitur in conspectu Tuo omnis vivens.' Non hoc sentiri voluit, quod non justificabitur omnis vivens: sed *in conspectu Tuo*, hoc est, Dei, non justificabitur. Quantumvis enim quis justus, quantumvis sanctus sit, non solum inter homines, sed et in supernis atque eminentioribus creaturis, ad comparationem Dei certum est eum justificari non posse . . . . Nullus inventus est nisi solus Agnus de tribu Juda, qui justificatus est in conspectu Dei . . . . Omnis autem creatura ex comparatione inferiorum justificatur . . . ." (*In Rom.* lib. iii. 2). He adds further on: "Potest adhuc et alio modo explanari quod dixit—'non est justus quisquam'—vel quod ait, 'Non justificabitur in conspectu Tuo omnis vivens,' quia donec quis vivit in corpore, justificari non potest, nec pronunciari justus: sed cum exierit de corpore . . ." It is a magnificent remark of St. Augustine, squaring with this last interpretation, that the whole church militant makes a daily confession of sins in the Lord's Prayer (*De Civ. Dei*, xix. 27), and it may be added that in point of fact no saint in her calendar was ever canonised while alive; and this was always his own doctrine. "Justus et justificans non est nisi Deus," as he writes to Boniface: "Absit ut *quisquam nostrum* ita se justum dicat, ut aut suam justitiam velit constituere: id est, quasi a seipso sibi datam . . . . aut sine peccato se esse jactare audeat in hâc vitâ" (*Ep.* clxxxv. 37). And still more strongly, that of his more learned contemporary St. Jerome, whose words may well pass for a landmark, as they were penned against the Pelagians: "*Tunc ergo justi sumus*, quando nos peccatores fatemur: et justitia nostra non ex proprio merito, sed ex Dei consistit misericordiâ . . . . et haec hominis summa est justitia, quidquid potuerit habere virtutis, non suum putare esse, sed Domini qui largitus est" (*Cont. Pelag.* i. 13). This is, in a few words, the whole patristic doctrine on justification finely resumed.

It was this doctrine, substantially, that was upheld also by St. Augustine, though amid some peculiarities which deserve notice. First, that owing to his slender acquaintance with Greek, he made δικαιοῦν practically synonymous with ἁγιάζειν. This misconception of his was the parent of endless confusion in the Latin church. In him it was made plausible by the

circumstances of his controversy with Pelagius. For Pelagius having denied original sin, almost the first point on which they joined issue was the necessity for baptism. And in baptism, both the death unto sin, and the new birth unto righteousness, far from being merely declaratory, expressed radical changes in each case. From this point of view, then, he may be said to have confused justification with regeneration. "Justus ex Deo, *non* ex homine, nascitur: quoniam renascendo, non nascendo, fit justus," as he maintained against Julian (*Op. Imp.* iii. 51).

Next, in one of his earliest treatises against Pelagianism, addressed A.D. 412 to Marcellinus, he allows himself to say, "Justificatio ex fide impetratur" (*de Spir. et Lit.* c. xxix.), which, as he still leant to the opinion that this faith was in part our own, hardly fell short of giving Pelagius right. He calls it himself "errorem meum" in his latest work, A.D. 429 (*de Praed.* c. iii.). But his own latest conclusion on this point is: "Tutiores igitur vivimus, si *totum Deo damus:* non autem nos Illi ex parte, et nobis ex parte committimus" (*de Persev.* c. vi.): on the part assigned to faith in justification by St. Paul: "Ex fide ideo dicit justificari hominem, non ex operibus; quia ipsa prima datur, ex quâ impetrentur cetera, quae propriè opera nuncupantur, in quibus justè vivitur" (*De Praed.* c. vii.); on good works done by justified man, and their reward: "Dona sua coronat Deus, non merita tua (*De Grat. et Lib. Arb.* c. vi.); and "Debetur, inquam, bona merces operibus hominum bonis; sed non debetur gratia, quae homines bonos operatur ex malis" (*Op. Imp.* c. Jul. i. 133) or, as Prosper alters it: "quae praecedit, ut fiant" (opera bona, *Sent.* 299).

Several of these passages, and others to the same effect, were collected from St. Augustine by Prosper for his *Sentences*, and by Gennadius for his *Ecclesiastical Dogmas*, besides inspiring the canons of the councils of Milevis, A.D. 416, and Orange, A.D. 529 (Mansi, iv. 325; and viii. 711), and hence the confusion in the Western mind, already noticed, respecting justification to this day. The council of Milevis, for instance, at which St. Augustine was present, says in its third canon, which is the twenty-eighth dogma with Gennadius: "Item placuit, ut quicunque dixerit gratiam Dei, in quâ justificamur per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, ad solam remissionem peccatorum valere, quae jam commissa sunt, non etiam ad adjutorium ut non committantur, anathema sit"; where it is the grace received in baptism, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is really meant; described further in the fourth and fifth canons, and called expressly "gratia justificationis" in the fifth. In this state the subject remained dormant till the 13th century, neither St. John Damascene nor Peter Lombard inviting attention to it in their respective works, till it was taken in hand by St. Thomas, who, following St. Augustine in distinguishing between operating and co-operating grace, made justification an effect of the first (*Sum.* II. i. quaest. 111 and 113).

But this is to confound negative with positive grace: cause with effect; justification with regeneration; the judicial act of the Father consequent on the death of Christ, with the descent of the Holy Ghost consequent on His ascension. Justification in the view of the fathers, so far as they have expressed themselves, precedes not merely co-operating but operating, grace; and is the *sine quâ non* to both, but equally conditional with both throughout on their acceptance by man. Hence the secret of its connexion with faith, baptism, and good works, in patristic literature, is, that they are the means employed, internal and external, by the Holy Ghost for giving effect to it in individuals. Justification is accordingly stated in the fathers to be through faith at one time, through baptism at another, through good works at another, though most frequently, by a good deal, through faith. And for this plain reason, namely, that where baptism is out of the question, faith alone will suffice; while baptism, on the contrary, by whomsoever administered, will never suffice for adults without faith. In the same way, there are numerous cases where faith will suffice without works; but no case where the best of works will suffice for salvation where faith is extinct. Yet neither in works, faith, nor baptism is the part played by man more than subordinate; the vitality (τὸ ζωοποιόν) belonging to them all is the gift of the Holy Ghost; union with Christ compensates for all imperfections in their reception by men; the sole contribution to them for which any credit can be taken for man is his consent. We cannot be reminded too frequently, that a gift is one thing and the application of a gift another. Christ purchased justification for us all, but the Holy Ghost applies it to each of us, and not to all of us in the same way. "Life," says Hooker, "as all other gifts and benefits, groweth originally from the Father: and cometh not unto us but by the Son: nor, by the Son, *to any of us in particular*, but *through the Spirit*" (*E. P.* v. 66, 7). He has here simply translated St. Cyril of Alexandria, whose constant *refrain* it is. All the benefits flowing from the promise made to the woman were merited by Christ, but are supplied to us by the Holy Ghost, to whose action within us, be what it may, co-operation on our part is a *sine qua non*. Our justification, our sanctification, and our union with Christ, not one of these was purchased for man by the Holy Ghost, yet not one of them is supplied to us by Christ Himself. Christ merited them all, but it is the Holy Ghost who is charged in each case with their bestowal, and man is free to reject them all on their being offered to his acceptance; or, having accepted them, to trample them under foot in after life, and "account the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing," though the consequences of his act are portrayed in the same page (Heb. x. 26 et sq.). "Save yourselves" (σώθητε, the passive form in a middle sense, as both our Revised and Authorised Versions correctly render) "from this untoward generation," exclaimed St. Peter to his countrymen on the day of Pentecost, as is stated in Acts ii. 40. And agreeably with his exhortations, we are told in the last verse of the same chapter, "The Lord added daily to the church such as were *saving themselves*" (τοὺς σωζομένους); which both versions alike fail to express.

9. Sanctification.

Which the council of Trent probably would not have confounded in its lengthy decree with

justification (Lep. vi. ed. Waterworth), had Greek been as well known to its picked theologians as it is to most university men now. Yet it is just possible that a deeper cause underlies and influences Roman theology now, as then: namely, the breach established long since between it and primitive teaching on the special prerogatives of the Sanctifier. For it was the teaching of the universal church, for at least eight centuries, that the Holy Ghost came down from heaven to be the dispenser of all the benefits of the Incarnation to be had in the church at large: and to apply them, through the sacraments, to each individual soul desiring them; first, by regenerating the soul of each catechumen in baptism, and secondly, by incorporating each regenerate soul with Christ in the Eucharist. The ancient church made no secret of her teaching on this vital point, in her public offices that have come down to us. For there was a special prayer, called Ἐπίκλησις, for invoking His presence and inviting His action, that was inseparable from her administration of baptism, confirmation, penance, the Holy Eucharist, the consecration of bishops, priests, and deacons, the anointing of the sick, the dedication of altars and churches, to say nothing of all those subjective gifts and graces enumerated by St. Paul, and attributed expressly to the Holy Ghost in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, which the church constantly prayed might be vouchsafed to her children. Professor Hoppe deserves all praise for his candid admissions (*Die Epiklesis*: Schaffhausen, 1864, 8vo.), but even his statements fall short of his subject. He, too, perhaps, had not observed that sanctification was never so much as considered, nor even named, except *obiter*, in the council of Trent, and that in its thirty-three canons on justification, the Holy Ghost is only twice named: first in acknowledgment of "His prevenient inspiration before baptism," and next of "the charity" which St. Paul says is "shed abroad in our hearts" by Him (Rom. v. 5); while in the sixteen long chapters preceding them, He is again only named in connexion with the two subjective gifts ascribed to Him in the canons, and with baptism and penance amongst ordinances. Contrariwise the apostle writes to the Corinthians (1 Cor. vi. 11), "But ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and in the Spirit of our God," evidently distinguishing between justification and sanctification, and ascribing one to the Son, and the other to the Holy Ghost. And this, again, is his summing up in writing to the Romans (viii. 1 and 14), "There is therefore *now* no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit . . . . For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Christ redeemed us, justified us, on the cross. We are sanctified by the Holy Ghost in our hearts. In other words, though the whole Trinity planned the salvation of man, part of the scheme for effecting it was assigned to the Son, and part to the Holy Ghost. Nor must Their parts be reversed, any more than Their names, by man. St. Augustine (*Serm.* viii. 13, ed. Ben.), speaking for the West, says: "Sanctificatio nulla divina et vera est, nisi ab Spiritu Sancto." St. Cyril of Jerusalem, speaking for the East (*Cat.* xxii. 7), says, "Everything which that Holy Spirit touches is hallowed and transformed."

10. Election.

But, in reality, the elect are neither more nor less than the predestinate, consisting of all those who, having been called in Christ, and justified freely through Him, have neither refused to come, nor been afterwards wanting in diligence to make their calling and election sure. All men might have belonged to this class, had they pleased, to whatever race they belonged, and in whatever age they were born—whether aggregated to the Jewish or to the Christian churches or not, in life, so that they never had the option of belonging to either. As election was never in any case founded on personal merits, so neither was non-election ever decreed against any, but such as had personally rejected, or proved unfaithful to the offer made to them by the Holy Ghost of all the benefits purchased by Christ for all in whatever form that offer may have been conveyed to each. For the mission of the Holy Ghost being to apply, without limit or stint, all those benefits to the redeemed of all ages in succession, His application of them to the millions outside the Jewish and Christian churches, would widely differ from His application of them to the individuals composing those bodies; again, even they would be differentiated from each other on the same principle that would differentiate them from those outside their pale, namely, that "unto whom much is given of him should much be required: and to whom men have committed much, of him would they ask the more" (St. Luke xii. 48), and again, "He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful in much too" (*ib.* xvi. 10). Yet further, even "the unrighteous mammon" may prove the means of receiving numbers, using it aright, "into everlasting habitations" (*ib.* x. 9).

11. Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost.

Turning back at this precise point, therefore, for a final survey of the entire subject of predestination, by the light thrown on it from what has been advanced on other subjects affecting the present and future condition of man, we find the remark forced on us, that this temporal mission of the Holy Ghost is the very point which has hitherto received least attention from predestinarians, though they would probably be the last to question its relevancy. For the admitted end and object of His mission having been to apply the full benefits of the Redemption to all willing to profit by it, to say that its application must be co-extensive with its intention, is almost to waste words. To allow that Christ died for all, and yet maintain in the same breath that the Holy Ghost passes over any for whom Christ died, or, again, applies His merits unfairly, by not giving each the same option of profiting by them as his next neighbour or his deadliest foe, would surely be treason to those pointed assurances, "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you *another Paraclete*, that he may abide with you for ever." It is an *alter ego*, surely, that is here promised; so that if One "came into the world to save sinners," it is out of the question that *any*, being sinners, should be overlooked by the other. Only those who rejected His advances would be denied anything that He had to give; their

exclusion would be purely their own act in each and every case. Now, by the confession of all, it is He who washes away sin of every kind, actual as well as original, in the sacrament of baptism; He who washes away post-baptismal sin afterwards in penitential tears; He who, before baptism by water was instituted, or wherever it cannot be had still, has never ceased to baptize, by breathing into the heart repentance and faith. Yet both the outward and inward baptism may be offered only to be refused, or, having been accepted, to have their effects marred and effaced ultimately by the workings of a perverse will. Again, "the unclean spirit" having been driven out of a man, may return, and finding the house from which he had been expelled empty, may resume possession of it with seven others more wicked than himself, making his abode there permanent (St. Matt. xii. 43–45). Judicial blindness is the penalty which is here symbolised, for it is added, "Even *so* shall it be also unto this wicked generation." St. John identifies them for us (xii. 37 and 39). "Though He had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on Him . . . . Therefore they *could not* believe . . ." St. Stephen, himself full of the Holy Ghost, assures us later, that overtures had been made by the Holy Ghost even to his persecutors, but resisted—"Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: *as your fathers did, so do ye*" (Acts vii. 51). And St. Paul, in a strong appeal to those since converted, like himself, "Wherefore, as the Holy Ghost saith, 'To-day, if ye will hear His voice, *harden not your hearts*' . . . ." (Heb. iii. 7). Meanwhile the same blessed Spirit, repelled habitually by the Jew, was hard at work in hearts of the man of Ethiopia, treasurer to queen Candace (Acts viii. 27), and of the Italian centurion at Caesarea (*ib.* x. 1), with their good will, and therefore working with effect. The same grace that became by its acceptance, the saving of the Gentile, entailed by its non-acceptance, the condemnation of the Jew. In other words, it was the unconstrained act of the individual in each case that decided his future. Putting the Scriptures out of sight, it is beyond us to conceive probation accomplished in any beings endued with reason, unless the will is left free; while the scriptural dissuasives against resisting, tempting, grieving and quenching the Holy Spirit, taken in their obvious and natural sense, go far to prove that the Holy Ghost, in offering salvation through Christ to the individual, not merely presupposes, but upholds, and invests with enhanced solemnity, those fundamental laws of his present existence, which hold him accountable for his acts on earth, by making it an additional item in his probation, and the consequences of its rejection infinitely more momentous than any with which he had ever been threatened before. Taking Scripture, then, for our guide we may be bold to say, that the Holy Ghost has been engaged, ever since the promise made to the seed of the woman, up and down the world, making overtures to all for whom Christ would in due course die; inspiring all breasts responding to His benign influence with saving faith, and gradually fitting them by a hidden process, to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven, while discovering and eliminating all the corrupt and counterfeit members of the Jewish and Christian churches, whose defilements should exclude them from fellowship with the elect of those bodies in the church triumphant. For it belongs *ex officio* to Him, in the application of His spiritual tests, to search out of what stuff each heart is made, and thus to see that not only none should be excluded from heaven who would fain get in thither if they could, but that none should get in under false pretences. Here, then, we seem to be brought face to face with the only sin pronounced by the Saviour Himself to be beyond forgiveness, and characterised as sin against the Holy Ghost (St. Matt. xii. 32), probably what St. John calls with bated breath, "a sin unto death," and past praying for (1 John v. 16). Of this sin, again, we seem to have several degrees assigned, "Resisting the Holy Ghost," with which St. Stephen charges his persecutors and their forefathers (Acts vii. 51), would be the first of course; "quenching Him," against which St. Paul warns the Thessalonians (1 Thess. v. 19), another: wilful apostasy, described in two well-known passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 4–8 and x. 26–31), the worst of all. For such, it must be plain to everybody, "no more sacrifice for sin," could be with any reason expected, nor any plea for mercy, consistently with immutable justice, sustained.

Thus the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost, estimated at its full proportions, at once and for ever negatives the doctrines of unconditional or absolute predestination, and of unconditional or absolute reprobation, in the same breath. For it precedes both, and determines both by its success or failure. Its foreseen success dictated the one, and its foreseen failure the other, before time began, in the counsels of the Most High. Consequently, predestination viewed side by side with the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost, and interpreted by it, assumes a complexion that may be scanned without any misgivings, as it is seen to include no more than its foreseen results, grounded on the report in due time to be supplied by Him of the souls that have accepted or rejected His offer made to each of them of all the benefits purchased for man by Christ under each dispensation, and outside them both, a report to be definitively comprised in two separate books—not to be opened before the judgment day—each commencing with time, and each receiving accessions to the end of time, and neither containing a single name that was not foreknown and predetermined. Hence, both the names in both, and the number of the names in both, cannot but be fixed and unalterable, not that the course which human affairs would take was brought about in the least by its being infallibly foreknown, nor again that the destinies of a single moral agent were not the effect of his own personal act in accepting or rejecting salvation through Christ, because predetermined. For if it would be impious to deny that the Son of God died for all men, and earnestly desired the salvation of all for whom He died, or that by His death adequate satisfaction was made for the sins, actual and original, of the whole race descended from Adam, it would surely be just as impious to

assert that any should have been predestined to everlasting exclusion from heaven, to whom the Holy Ghost, in the application of His merits to individuals, had not offered actual participation in them to each soul, on terms appreciable by it, and been refused. Faith, equally without the sacraments of the Christian church and the culture of modern times, appears thus once more the polar star of all the souls under the Law, and before the Law, enumerated in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, whose sixth verse, defining it, supplies a test by which no human being either now, or at any previous time, could refuse to be tried. And reason alone would suggest that more should be required from those who have received more, were Scripture silent on this point, which it is not. Again, "he that hath, to him shall be given and he shall have abundance . . ." but, "whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have . . ." whether intended or not to supply the rule, traces exactly the course observed by the Holy Ghost in bestowing grace. Predestination is but another word for election, based on this principle, and carried out in instalments on earth, but registered in the archives of heaven in advance, where its results have been always foreknown.

To enumerate, or even to classify, the different views taken of the subject of predestination from St. Augustine downwards, would be nugatory, because neither St. Augustine, nor those who followed him are consistent at all times with themselves. Dr. Mozley (note 19 to p. 139) credits Hooker alone with three different views, founded upon St. Augustine, which he illustrates by quotations. Then, in his next note, reviewing the controversy raised by Gotteschalcus, he says "a good deal of arbitrary adoption and arbitrary rejection of language on both sides, a good deal of reliance on distinctions without a difference, that is to say, on words." And, in his next, "I see no substantial difference between the Augustinian and Thomist, and the Calvinist doctrine of predestination." Once more, further on in the same note, we are told that "the same argument by which Pascal proves that the Thomists of the Sorbonne agreed in doctrine with the Jansenists, proves equally that the Jansenist or Augustinian agreed with the Calvinist." It is needless to say that all these positions are maintained with consummate skill, and illustrated with abundant extracts from the writings of each school, and accompanied, in another part of his work, by strictures on archbishop Laurence for not understanding them better (c. x. p. 280 et sq.). But the truth is, the Bampton Lecturer for A.D. 1865 only concerned himself with the opinions of the Reformers in relation to Articles 9–18 of the Church of England, and in general his quotations from the schoolmen are derived from their writings, on which his remarks and learned notes may be studied with great profit. Chapters 37–42 of the tenth book of the great work of Dr. Thomas Jackson traverse the same ground, with keen insight avoiding its pitfalls. Post-reformation opinions on the continent may be read summarised in Hagenbach's *Hist. of Doctrines*, §§ 244–52; or, again, in Blunt's *Theol. Dict.*, articles Calvinism, Sublapsarians, Solifidianism. Article Election brings out the doctrine of the Church of England on that head. A fuller insight into the "Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants" on these subjects will be found in the first four chapters of Moehler's *Symb.*, Robertson's tr. Going back to St. Augustine, the views maintained by him found a warm defender in St. Prosper of Aquitaine, whose answers to the various objections made to them by his countrymen may be read in vol. li. of the *Patrol. Lat.* of Abbé Migne. A tract of St. Fulgentius on predestination follows in vol. lxv. of the same series Another in the appendix to the works of Alcuin, vol. ci. Another by Amalus, vol. cxvi. Another by Florus, vol. cxix. Another by Ratramn, vol. cxxi., followed by the confession of Gotteschalcus, and the three works of Remigius, bishop of Lyons, favourable to him in the same vol. For the strictures on him by archbishop Hincmar of Rheims we have to go to vol. cxxv. A tract of St. Anselm may be read in vol. clviii. p. 507, et sq. This is a golden treatise, that might be studied with the utmost profit even now. All the intervening pieces between it and that of St. Fulgentius are merely collections of passages from the fathers dovetailed. This is argued out on the grounds of Scripture and cammon sense, without reference to a single father. The four books of the *Sentences* by Peter Lombard are reprinted in vol. cxcii. of the same series, and book i. dist. 35, of this work furnished a text on predestination for the schoolmen, who followed him, to work out. Part i. 9, 23, of the *Summa Theol.* of St. Thomas Aquinas, reprinted at the end of the same series, supplied them with a further text. A learned digest of their opinions may be seen in Estius, *ad Sent.* lib. i., dist. 40–48. Calvin rekindled, and stirred up fresh controversy by the views expressed in book iii. of his *Instns.* published A.D. 1536, on predestination and reprobation, making both unconditional and absolute—views which he defended afterwards in a separate tract. The council of Trent left the subject untouched. Cornelius Jansen, bishop of Ypres, accordingly, by his work published in the next century, called *Augustinus or the Doctrine of St. Augustine*, nearly precipitated a schism between the Gallican and Roman churches, on the merits of which Dr. Mozley has been already cited, while the Calvinistic proclivities of Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, which led to his deposition, were condemned afterwards in two synods of Constantinople, A.D. 1642–3, under the then patriarch Parthenius, and at Jerusalem, A.D. 1672, under Dositheus. (Kimmel's *Lib. Symb. Eccl. Orient. Proleg.* § 10; also *Conf. Orthod. P.* i. 9, 22–31; and *Synod. Hier.* c. i., contra iii.; with Dosith. *Conf. Dec.* iii.)

On justification more particularly, see Maréchal's *Concord. SS. Pat.* supplemented by Schramm's *Analysis*, Fessler's *Inst. Patrol.*, Huebner's *Hist. Ant. Dogm.*, Bull's *Harm. Apost.*, Waterland's *Summary View*, Faber's *Primitive View*, Newman's *Lectures*, Moehler's *Symb.* c. iii., Robertson's tr., Waterworth's *Council of Trent*, introd. xciii–cx. and p. 21–49, bp. Harold Browne on Art. X.; Blunt's *Theol. Dict.* sub v.; Kimmel, *Dosith. Conf. Dec. XIII. Sylloge Confm.* Oxon e Typ. Clar. 1827, under the heads given to it in each. [E. S. Ff.]

PREPON, a disciple of Marcion, whose name has been preserved for us by Hippolytus (*Ref.* vii. 31). Hippolytus states that he was his own contemporary, that he was an Assyrian, and that he wrote a book in defence of his heresy inscribed to "Bardesianes the Armenian" (see Vol. I. p. 251). [G. S.]

PRILIDAN, one of the three children martyred with BABYLAS (1). [EPOLONUS.] (Tillem. iii. 404.) [C. H.]

PRIMA, one of the martyrs with DATURUS (3) and SATURNINUS, A.D. 304. She is by some called Primaeva, her name being joined to that of the next woman on the list, Eva. Cf. *Kalend. Carthag.* iii. Kal. Sep. in Ruinartii *Acta Sinc.* p. 694; cf. the acts on p. 410, *l. c.* [G. T. S.]

PRIMAERIUS, bishop of Nocera, to whom with other bishops Gregory the Great wrote in A.D. 598, requesting him to give the ex-prefect Gregorius the relics of certain saints for a basilica he was founding. (*Epp.* ix. 25.) [F. D.]

PRIMASIUS, bishop of Adrumetum, or Justinianopolis, in the Byzacene province of North Africa. He flourished in the middle of the 6th century, and exercised considerable influence on the literary activity of the celebrated theological lawyer Junilius [JUNILIUS, t. iii. p. 534], who dedicated to him his *Institutes*, which spread the views of Theodore of Mopsuestia in the west. Primasius first comes before us as sitting in a synod of his province in 541, the decrees of which are lost, and are now known only through Justinian's decrees confirming them, as given in Baronius, *Ann.* 541, n. 10–12. He was sent to Constantinople in connexion with the controversy about the Three Chapters, about the year 551. He took part in the synod which pope Vigilius held against Theodore Ascidas, and was still in Constantinople during the session of the fifth general council, but took no part in its meetings, notwithstanding repeated solicitations (Mansi, ix. 199 *sq.*). He was one of the sixteen bishops who signed the Constitutum of pope Vigilius, May 14, 553. When, however, Vigilius accepted the decrees of the fifth council, Primasius signed them also. According to the *Chronic. Victor. Episc. Tunun.* Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. lxviii. col. 959, other motives conspired to bring about this change. He was at first exiled to a convent, and then the death of Boethius, primate of the Byzacene province, aroused his ambition to be his successor. He gained his point, but on his return home found his suffragans so hostile that they denounced him as guilty of sacrilege and robbery. He died soon afterwards. His writings are contained in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. lxviii. p. 407–936. They embrace commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles and Apocalypse, and likewise a treatise (now lost) in three books, *De Haeresibus*, dedicated to bishop Fortunatus, touching on some points of that subject which Augustine did not live to treat with sufficient fulness (Isidor. Hispal. *Vir. Ill.* xxii., in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxiii. 1095; Cave, i. 525; Tillem. xiii. 927, xvi. 21). On the impossibility of this treatise having been that now extant under the name of PRAEDESTINATUS, see that article. Our Primasius is sometimes confounded with another Primasius who succeeded Reparatus in the see of Carthage. The best account of Primasius of Adrumetum will be found in Kihn's *Theodor von Mopsuestia*, pp. 248–254, where a critical estimate is formed of the sources of his exegetical works. [CHILIASTS.] [G. T. S.]

PRIMIANUS, Donatist bishop of Carthage, successor to Parmenian, A.D. 392. A general account of his quarrel with Maximian, and its consequences, will be found above. (DONATISM, Vol. I. 887; MAXIMIANUS (2), Vol. III. 869.) The following additions, however, may be made: 1. as to Maximian, that in one place it is said that he was ordained by twelve bishops, and in another that 100 were present, viz. at Cabarsussis (Aug. *de Gest. cum Emer.* 9; *c. Cresc.* iv. 6, 7), a discrepancy easily reconciled if we suppose, as Ribbek suggests, that though 100 were present, only twelve joined in the act of ordination. (Ribbek, *Aug. und Don.* p. 216.) 2. Respecting Primian, that among the many charges brought against him by the Maximianists were the following, that he admitted the Claudianists to communion, and when some of the seniors remonstrated with him for so doing, he encouraged, if he did not even originate, a riotous attack upon them in a church, in which some of them lost their lives. Further, that he was guilty of various acts of an arbitrary and violent kind, superseding bishops, excommunicating and condemning clergymen without sufficient cause, closing his church doors against both the people and the imperial officers when summoned to appear, and taking possession of buildings to which he had no right. (Aug. *En. in Ps.* 36, 20; *c. Cresc.* iv. 6, 7; and 7, 9; also 48, 58, and 50, 60; *Mon. Vet. Don.* xxxv. ed. Oberthür. CLAUDIANISTS, Vol. I. 549. Fortunatus (4), Vol. II. 555. SALVIUS.) At the proceedings before the civil magistrate, probably Herodes, or Seranus, arising out of the decision of the Council of Bagaia, Primian is said to have taunted his opponents with relying on imperial edicts, while his own party brought with them the Gospels only. (Aug. *Post Coll.* xxxi. § 53; HERODES (2) Vol. III. 5.) When the conference was proposed he resisted it, remarking with scornful arrogance that "it was not fit that the sons of martyrs should confer with the brood of traditors." (*Carth. Coll.* iii. 116; Aug. *Brevic. Coll.* iii. 4, 4.) As one of the seven managers at the conference, A.D. 411, on the Donatist side, he appears to have done what he could to delay the opening of the proceedings, and to obstruct them during their progress, but to have shown no faculty of debate. (*Brevic. Coll.* ii. 30; *Carth. Coll.* i. 104.) The only other act of his with which we are specially acquainted is a just sentence of condemnation passed by him on Cyprian, Donatist bishop of Thubursica, for an act of scandalous immorality. (Aug. *c. Petil.* iii. 34, 40.) [H. W. P.]

PRIMITIVUS (1) "compresbyter," bishop or presbyter of Carthage, sent to convey the letter and give personal explanations from Conc. 1. Carth. to Cornelius (Cyp., *Ep.* 44): brought back the reply from Cornelius (*Ep.* 48). [E. W. B.]

PRIMITIVUS (2). [SYMPHOROSA.]

PRIMOGENIUS, patriarch of Aquileia. From the time of Candidianus the succession of the patriarchs of Aquileia had been twofold, a schismatic line being established at Cormons, Cividale, or Udine, with jurisdiction over the continental parts of the province which were under the Lombard dominion, while a line in communion with Rome went on at Grado with jurisdiction over Istria and the islands which obeyed the emperor, though each line claimed jurisdiction over the whole of the ancient province. On the flight of Fortunatus after stripping the churches [FORTUNATUS (23)], Pope Honorius informed of these facts by the bishops of Venetia and Istria in A.D. 628, sent Primogenius a subdeacon of the Roman church to be consecrated in the place of Fortunatus, and granted him the pall. (Honorii *Epp.* ii. in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 469; Jaffé, *Reg.* 157.) Honorius also wrote to the king of the Lombards, demanding the extradition of Fortunatus and the restoration of the abstracted property. Primogenius is said to have sent a mission to the emperor, who gave him more than Fortunatus had carried off, and also the chair of St. Mark which he had brought from Alexandria. He was bishop for twenty years. (*Chron. Patr. Grad.* in *Scrip. Rer. Lang.* i. 395.) [F. D.]

PRIMOLUS, confessor at Carthage, A.D. 259. He died in prison, but unbaptized, and his confession was held equivalent to baptism (Ruinart, *Act. Mart.* 275, ed. 1859). [J. G.]

PRIMOSUS (1), Catholic bishop of Lemella in Mauritania, attended the Donatist council of Theveste, A.D. 362, and complained in vain of the violence of the party (Optatus, *De Schism. Don.* ii. c. 17). [J. G.]

PRIMOSUS (2), bishop of the civitas Tigabitana in Mauretania Caesariensis, complained of by the citizens to the emperor, and by the latter ordered to appear before a general council of Africa. When this council met at Carthage in 407 (the eleventh under Aurelius), Primosus failed to appear, and when sought for could not be found. A report of the circumstance was sent to Innocentius, the primate of Mauretania Caesariensis. (*Cod. Can. Afr. Eccl.* num. 95, Hard. i. 922; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 321; Tillem. xiii. 454, 1036.) [C. H.]

PRIMULUS, Donatist bishop of Vaga, who in 411 had embraced catholic unity with all his people, both in town and country. (*Gest. Collat. Carth.* cognit. i. §§ 176, 215.) [C. H.]

PRIMUS (1), 4th bishop of Alexandria, succeeded Cerdon in the eleventh year of Trajan (Euseb. *Chron. H. E.* iv. 1), i.e. in A.D. 108–9. His name was afterwards corrupted into Abrimius, Obrimius, or Barmius (e.g. Eutych. *Annal.* i. 347). Le Quien (*Oriens Christ.* ii. 389) says that later writers also call him Ephraim; but Renaudot (*Hist. Patr. Alex.* p. 19) does not agree with Papebroch in thinking that "Primus" was altered into "Ephraim" and "Syrian" into "Egyptian" in the Coptic calendar, for the 3rd of Mesori = 27th July. It would not, he says, have been natural for the Copts to place Primus in their Calendar, which contains few names of the earliest ages, except those of martyrs. He cites Severus of Aschumin as saying that Primus was "one of the orthodox people," i.e. a layman, when elected, and adds, "Thus even the Coptic tradition refutes the story of Eutychius about St. Mark's decree that the bishop of Alexandria should be elected solely out of the college of twelve presbyters which he had instituted." He considers that Eutychius was referring to the election, not consecration, of early Alexandrian bishops; but that even so, he is refuted by the statements of Severus, a far more "accurate" writer on Alexandrian affairs. The chief event in the episcopate of Primus must have been the sanguinary insurrection of the Jews of Egypt, avenged in Alexandria itself by the massacre of the Jewish residents (Eusebius, iv. 2; compare Milman, *Hist. Jews*, ii. 420; Merivale, *Hist. Rom.* viii. 167). Primus sat twelve years, and died in the third year of Hadrian (A.D. 119–120) according to the ordinary recension of Eusebius's *Chronicle;* the Armenian form dates his death in the fourth year, and Renaudot postpones it till the fifth, and fixes it on Sunday, the 3rd of Mesori, or July 27, A.D. 122. [W. B.]

PRIMUS (2), bishop of Corinth in the middle of the second century, when Hegesippus visited the city on his way to Rome. [HEGESIPPUS.] Hegesippus was kindly received by him, and commends him for continuance in the true faith (Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. c. 22; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* 158). [DIONYSIUS (3).] [J. G.]

PRIMUS (3) Cyp. *Ep.* 50. Novatianist. [NICOSTRATUS.] [E. W. B.]

PRIMUS (4), bishop of Misgirpa (Migiripa, Migirpa), which was in Prov. Afr. Proc. according to the Notitia, but is unmentioned by the geographers, *Morcelli.* Mommsen also has no inscriptions which illustrate it. But its bishops appear in three more African councils before A.D. 485. The high place of Primus on the list of speakers, who comes from so insignificant a place perhaps illustrates the African rank of bishops by seniority. Sentt. Episcopor. 2. in Syn. Carth. de Bap. 3. [E. W. B.]

PRIMUS (5 the same). In Aug. he is called Primus Felix, whence Fell supposes the true name to be Felix, and Primus a note to distinguish him from the other Felices, but the word alius is not added to the *next* Felix, but the one after. He previously appears as 2nd bishop in the list of Syn. 4 Carth. de Basilide, A.D. 254 (Cyp. *Ep.* 67, and in the 4th place in that of Syn. v., A.D. 255. De Bap. 1. *Ep.* 70). [E. W. B.]

PRIMUS (6), June 9. A Roman citizen and martyr with Felicianus in the Diocletian persecution. They were accused by a pagan priest, and suffered under Promotus a president. Le Blant quotes their acts p. 254 and 225 as genuine illustrations of antiquity. Baronius in *Rom. Mart.* June 9 and Ceillier iii. 100 are doubtful of them. Ado gives a long extract from them, and tells us of exposure of the martyrs to lions who refused to touch them. Their bodies were stolen by the faithful, and buried "Ad arcus Numentanos intra arenarium" at the 14th milestone from Rome. [G. T. S.]

PRIMUS (7), sub-deacon, a Spaniard by birth, removed from the clerical office for irregular conduct and disobedience in respect of social intercourse with nuns. Having gone over in resentment to the Donatists, he was received by them and baptized, and was followed by two of the nuns, who also received baptism, and joined the Circumcellions in their riotous extravagances. (Aug. *Ep.* 35, 2.) [H. W. P.]

PRINCIPIA, a Roman lady who lived in virginity; the friend of Marcella (*q.v.*), and well known to Jerome. When Jerome and Paula left Rome, Principia went to live with Marcella, and remained with her in the closest intimacy till her death. (Jerome, *Ep.* cxxvii. 8, ed. Vall.) She had, like Marcella, a great delight in scriptural studies. Jerome, in answer to her request, wrote for her a commentary on the 45th Psalm (*Ep.* lxv.), in the close of which he says that she will hereafter understand not only that Psalm, but the whole of the Song of Songs. This appears to have led to a request from her that he would write a commentary on the Song. (Pref. to Comm. on Matt., end.) But whether he ever did this is uncertain. The year following (398), when Eusebius of Cremona was starting for Italy, and had persuaded Jerome to write for him the commentary on St. Matthew, Jerome in the prefatory letter to Eusebius bids him specially take a copy to Principia. She continued to live with Marcella till the siege of Rome, from the effects of which Marcella died. She then wrote to Jerome begging him to compose an epitaphion or memoir of Marcella, which however he was unable to do for about two years. At length in 412 he did so. It forms *Ep.* 127 in Vallarsi's edition of his works, and is addressed to Principia, who was her heir—the heir, as Jerome explains, of her poverty rather than her wealth, or rather the trustee of her legacy to the poor. [W. H. F.]

PRINCIPIUS (PRINCE), ST., 12th bishop of Soissons, was a brother of St. Remigius of Rheims, the apostle of the Franks [REMIGIUS (2)] and father or uncle, as is said, of his own successor St. Lupus. He was the recipient of two letters from Sidonius Apollinaris (viii. 14; ix. 8). The earlier, written between 472 and 482, is highly eulogistic of Principius himself, his father, and his more famous brother. At his death, which probably occurred in the last decade of the 5th century, he was buried by St. Remigius in the little chapel of St. Thecla without the walls, whence his remains were afterwards translated to the cathedral. They were burnt by the Calvinists in the 16th century, but an arm was preserved at Douay, in the collegiate church of St. Amé. His day is Sept. 25, but his cult is not very ancient (Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. vii. 60–2; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 335). A homily on him, ascribed to Milo, a monk of St. Amand in the 9th century, was published by Surius (see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 414). [S. A. B.]

PRISCA (1) the Montanist Prophetess (Cyp. *Ep.* 75, Firmiliani). [E. W. B.]

PRISCA (2), Jan. 18. Virg. and Mart. at Rome; date unknown, but *Roman Mart.* places her under Claudius: perhaps the second of that name, A.D. 268, as the first Claudius is out of the question. (*Mart. Vet. Rom.*, Usuard., Adon.; *Kalend.* Fronton.; Gregor. *Sacramentar.*) [G. T. S.]

PRISCA (3), wife of the emperor DIOCLETIAN, *q.v.* Vol. I. 836.

PRISCIANUS (1), a bishop, sent with two others, Eusebius and Cyriacus, by the council of Constantinople in 381 to carry its synodical letter to the council of Rome (Theod. *H. E.* v. 9). He was probably the bishop of Sebaste in Palestine, who subscribed at the former council (Hard. i. 813; Tillem. x. 150). [C. H.]

PRISCIANUS (2) CAESARIENSIS. Of the life of this celebrated grammarian and its details very little is known. He appears to have been a native of the Mauretanian Caesarea, and to have taught and written in the early years of the 6th century. From the dedication of one of his minor works (to Symmachus), it has been inferred that he had lived at Rome, while Cassiodorus (*de Orthogr.* 12) speaks of him as a contemporary teaching at Constantinople. He was the pupil of Theoctistus, whom he calls "omnis eloquentiae decus, cui quidquid in me sit doctrinae post Deum imputo." The date at which he wrote is to some extent fixed by the panegyric on Anastasius (491–518). His principal work was probably published some years before 526, as it appears to have been in the years 526–7 that his pupil Theodorus was engaged on the revision of the work from which all the existing MSS. are descended. This great work is the "Institutiones Grammaticae," in 18 books; a treatise very widely read in the middle ages (as the large number of MSS. sufficiently shews), printed several times before 1500, and still largely influencing grammatical terminology. In the dedication (addressed to Julianus, consul and patrician, who cannot be certainly identified), Priscianus explains the plan and character of his work. He admits that it is based on the works of Apollonius and Herodianus, in the same way that earlier works of the kind had been based upon the writings of the earlier Greek grammarians; and he claims for himself a higher credit than was due to his Latin predecessors, because, while they imitated "the very errors" of their Greek authorities, he has been the first to follow a more excellent model. At the same time he complains that he has been forced to publish his book more hurriedly than he desired, on account of those "qui alienis laboribus insidiantes, furtimque et quasi per latrocinia scripta ab aliis surripientes, unius nominis ad titulum pertinentis infanda mutatione, totius operis gloriam in se transferre conantur." This complaint would have something of absurdity if he had regarded his work as a mere reproduction of the treatises of older writers. Yet in substance it would appear that such was the case. In arrangement he seems to have followed his Greek authorities, in details and quotations the earlier Latin grammarians. But he makes a special claim to the merit of brevity by way of apology, declaring that his books are compendious in comparison with the "pelagus scriptorum" of Herodianus, and the "spaciosa volumina" of Apollonius; and it was possibly this combination of brevity with superior

arrangement which obtained for his work the great influence it undoubtedly possessed. The subject is divided by him as follows:—Book i. contains his treatises on sound and on letters; book ii. treats of the syllable, of the word (dictio), the sentence, and the noun; book iii., of comparatives, superlatives, and diminutives; book iv., of denominatives, verbals, participials, and adverbials; book v., of the distinction of genders by terminations, of numerals and figures, and of cases in general; book vi. deals with the terminations of the nominative, and with the ultimate and penultimate syllables of the genitive case; book vii., with the remaining oblique cases; book viii. is concerned with the verb; for which book ix. gives the general rules of all conjugations, and especially those concerning the perfect of the first and second; while book x. is devoted to the formation of the perfect in the third and fourth conjugations; book xi. treats of the participle; books xii.–xiii. of the pronouns, and of the reasons for excluding from this class certain forms previously treated as pronominal; book xiv. is allotted to the preposition; book xv. to the adverb and interjection, and book xvi. to the conjunction. The two remaining books (for which Priscianus was not able so freely to avail himself of earlier writings) treat of "construction" or syntax. These books furnish fewer quotations by way of illustration, and are less valuable in substance than those which are less original.

Of the minor writings of Priscianus, three are dedicated to Symmachus (perhaps the sole consul of 485; the same name occurs as that of a consul in 522). These are entitled "de figuris numerorum," "de Terentii metris," and "de praeexercitamentis rhetoricis." These are all borrowed in greater or less degree from Greek authors, the last being a translation of a work of Hermogenes. The work sometimes called "de delineationibus" is most likely an abridgment intended for school use. The treatise on the initial lines of the 12 books of the Aeneid is interesting as an illustration of the scholastic exercises of the author's day.

For the treatise "de accentibus," and a metrical treatise on weights and measures, which are sometimes attributed to Priscianus, he is probably not in any way responsible. He wrote, however, in metre, a translation (in hexameters) of the Periegesis of Dionysius, a work which is of more merit as a translation than as a specimen of poetry; and also an original panegyric on the emperor Anastasius, of no conspicuous excellence. This last work was edited by Endlicher (Vienna, 1828). The translation of the Periegesis is to be found in Wernsdorf (*Poet. Lat. Min.*), and is also printed with the original poem (as in the Oxford editions of 1697 and 1710). The grammatical works, published very early and often, are to be found in Keil (*Gram. Lat.*), as well as in the earlier and less accurate work of Putsche (*Gram. Vet. Lat.*).

[H. A. W.]

PRISCILLA. [MONTANUS (1) Vol. III. p. 936.] Epiphanius uses the name PRISCILLIANI as equivalent to PEPUZIANI, which see [G. S.]

PRISCILLIANUS (1), governor of Bithynia in the persecution of Diocletian. He succeeded HIEROCLES (1), and under both of them Donatus, the beloved friend of Lactantius, suffered many cruelties (Lact. *De Mort. Persec.* c. 16). Tillemont (v. 89) gives A.D. 307 as the date of his appointment. St. Antonina also is related to have suffered under him (Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Mart. i. 26). [C. H.]

PRISCILLIANUS (2), PRISCILLIANISTS, PRISCILLIANISM. The Priscillianists holding a system of doctrines, Manichaean and Gnostic in character, were organised as a sect by their founder Priscillian. The area and limits of the heresy were not wide either in time or space. The sect sprang up and flourished in Spain during the last third of the 4th century in the reigns of the emperors Gratian and Maximus. After the synod of Saragossa, 381, it ramified into Aquitaine. But it never took deep root beyond the Pyrenees. Where the heresy first appeared in Spain is unrecorded. There it spread through most provinces, especially in cities. The agitation at Cordova, Merida, Avila, Astorga, Saragossa, Toledo, Braga, are sufficient to indicate the prevalence and popularity of the sect. The council of Bordeaux, 384, followed by the violent measures of Maximus, had rather the effect of intensifying for a while the enthusiasm of Priscillian's adherents. But this was not lasting. In 390, at the synod of Toledo, many leading Priscillianists recanted, and were admitted to church communion. The sect continued to diminish in number. Pope Leo I. exerted himself vigorously to repress it. It languished and lingered still in Spain till the middle of the 5th century. After the council of Toledo, 447, and the council at Braga in Galicia, 448, especially held against the Priscillianists, they disappear from history. Priscillianism became a remembrance and a suspicion.[a]

A sad and romantic interest attaches to the annals of the sect from the martyrdom of its founder.

The death of Priscillian is an epoch in the dark history of the rise and progress of intolerance and superstition in the church. At this time the theory of persecution was being rapidly developed in the East. Theodosius published fifteen severe edicts against heretics in the fifteen years of his reign, 380–395. Already the punishment of death had been denounced against heretical leaders, at least as a threat and last resource (*Codex Theodos.* Gothfredi, xvi. tit. v. lex. 9). The extreme violence of the heretical sects, the Arians and Donatists and others, becoming rebellious political factions in Africa and the East, murdering antagonists, demolishing houses, committing all sorts of havoc, had led to this. It was reserved to Maximus to carry out the baneful theory in practice. By a singular prophetic fatality, these early persecuting edicts of Theodosius the Spaniard in the Eastern were contemporary with the first judicial shedding of blood for religious opinions under Maximus, also

[a] Neander has an interesting note (*Ch. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 507). The general dread, in the 5th century, of infection of the Priscillianist heresy is illustrated by reference to Bacchiarius, a Spanish monk driven out of Spain by civil troubles. He is compelled to justify his orthodoxy by his two treatises, *De fide* and *De reparatione lapsi*. They are published in Muratori (*Anecdota*) and Galland. (*Bibl. Patrol.* ix. Cf. Mosheim *Eccl. Hist.* cent. iv. pt. ii. ch. v. 22, note P.)

a Spaniard, in the Western empire. Thus the Genius of Persecution had its habitation in Spain. The first legislator, the first executioner, the first victims of the relentless principle that made heresy a capital crime are traceable to Spain, where the fires of the Holy Inquisition in the middle ages were kindled with such remorseless severity. All the more influential dignitaries of the Western church disclaimed at the time this violence against the Priscillianists as unjust and antichristian (Ambrose, *Ep.* 24, *ad Valentinianum*, *Ep.* 26, *ad Irenaeum*, Concil. Turin, can. vi.; Jerome, *de Script. Eccl. Liber;* Sulpic. Sever. *Hist. Sacr.* lib. ii. and *Dialog.* iii. cap. xi.). Yet it was but a perverse inference from arguments generally advanced. Truth and salvation, Augustin, Leo, Chrysostom argued, were well purchased for the souls of men, and need to be secured for them, even though at the cost of bodily pains and penalties to the heretic.

There is an importance also attaching to Priscillianism in connexion with the settlement of the canon of holy Scripture. As the early ages of Christianity receded farther and farther into the remote and distant past, what were its primary records became a question of great moment. How were the true Scriptures to be detected and separated from the false? Who were to be the guardians of the integrity of the Scriptures? At the end of the 4th century this subject was anxiously occupying the minds of Augustin and Jerome. Spain at this time is an example of the need there was for such inquiry, and for some practical form of solution of the difficulty. A vast multitude of apocryphal writings, introduced by the Priscillianists into common use, usurped the place of the Scriptures. To collect and destroy these was one of the chief cares of the orthodox bishops. The laxity of the Priscillianists on the subject of the "divine Scriptures" and the appeals of the Spanish bishops to the churches of Africa and Rome were an important element in the settlement and reception of the canon as still now received (Aug. *Liber de Haeresibus*, 70; *Common. of Orosius to Aug.* Op. vol. viii. 934–5; Aug. *Ep.* 237, *ad Ceretium*).

Regarded from a political point of view in the general history of the times, Priscillianism occupies a meagre space. It was for a while strong in popular favour, modern language would say, as a "revival" movement. It was warmly supported by the middle class. It attracted the sympathy of the lower orders. It enlisted public enthusiasm as a protest against the worldliness and secularity of the churches and their clergy. But even without movement of the tremendous machinery of the civil power, Priscillianism could only have been what we now find it in church history, an ephemeral sect of the later age of the Western empire. The intrinsic strength of the united church would have been sufficient to combat it. Its history embodies no great names. Its vitality depended on the traditions of its founder. The succession was never maintained. Priscillianism was one more new and vain attempt to recast Christianity, a new form of alloy of the pure gold of the faith, a fresh intermingling with it of other metals, a different fusing in new proportions of the current doctrines of the Scriptures with the baser Manichaean and Gnostic materials.

The rise and progress of Priscillianism suggest some interesting questions. Through all the Trinitarian controversy, in the early half of the 4th century, Spain was firm in its adherence to Athanasian doctrine. A century later, afflicted by the Arianism of Vandal and Gothic conquerors (as later still by the Mohammedanism of the Moors), Spanish orthodoxy became still more tenacious. In the intermediate half-century Priscillianism is outpoured over the peninsula; a sudden tidal wave of Oriental mysticism, the rise, flow, and ebb of a flood of Manichaean and Gnostic opinions. How was it that these Oriental doctrines had such influence in Spain? How came it about that their influence was so widely felt and for so long, while it was so limited to the peninsula? From the speculative nature of the tenets, Priscillianism never could rise in the practical West to the height of a great passionate controversy like Pelagianism. Would persecution, as searching as the Albigensian crusades in the days of Innocent III., have rendered Priscillianism, in the time of Leo I., as inveterate and difficult to eradicate as the Manichaeism of Languedoc?

We now proceed to the general history of the sect.

The Mediterranean sea, long become a Roman lake and the highway of Roman commerce, had early brought upon its waters the first messengers of the gospel. By the same channel were brought in the 4th century the Gnostic and Manichaean heresies. Marcus, a native of Memphis in Egypt, was the means of introducing them. There is nothing known of his life and history. What brought him from the banks of the Nile—why he left behind him the solitude of the Pyramids with the desert and the mirage hovering over them—what were his antecedents at Memphis—how he became imbued with Orientalism, through what Alexandrian books or teachers—what led him to the Spanish peninsula—where he landed—how long he remained—what was his condition of life—is unrecorded. The only facts mentioned are his name, his Egyptian origin, his coming to Spain, his teaching. Two of his followers were Agape a Spanish lady, and Helpidius a rhetorician. Neander considers them to have been husband and wife, but this is uncertain and unlikely (*Ch. Hist.* vol. iv. section iv. Appendix, p. 501). Their convert was the layman Priscillian. The place of his birth or residence is unknown. He was a man of good family, wealthy, and well educated. He became at once an ardent proselyte; an apostle of the Oriental doctrines. His character is described to us by the contemporary historian, Sulpicius Severus, in his *Sacred History* (ii. 46). To advantages of birth and fortune Priscillian added the accomplishments of eloquence and learning. With these was united a remarkable and original native character. Pious and sincere, austere, ardent, and zealous, Priscillian was well fitted to be the apostle and founder of a sect. From youth, eager and curious, with a love and thirst for knowledge, the ignorance of the times charged him with addiction to magical arts and practices. He is described in mature years as keen and ready in debate, intellectual, and fond of argument, acute, restless, and subtle. Frugal and moderate and self-disciplined in his way of living, liberal-handed in use of his riches, endowed with great physical power, high-minded, ambitious, persistent, he

easily acquired a commanding influence over others. Once having become acquainted with the Oriental doctrines, modifying and framing them into a system of his own, he soon became their able exponent and advocate. He attracted a large following. He organised them into a religious society. The influence of the new opinions spread. His efforts were successful both among the higher and lower orders of the people. Many of the wealthy and noble, and a great number of the people, received his teaching. Some bishops, as well as the clergy and laity, became his disciples. The Gnostic mysticism began to take root, and spread rapidly and widely in all Spain.

(1.) Among Priscillian's first and most devoted followers were two bishops, Instantius and Salvianus. This leads us to the south of Spain. Adyginus, bishop of Cordova, took alarm. He was the first to come forward in opposition to the rising sect. Adyginus reported the matter to Idatius, bishop of Emerita (Merida), and took counsel with him. Their conference led to an organised movement against the new errors. From the Guadalquivir to the Guadiana, all southern Spain became agitated by the controversy. Idatius is blamed as too rough and violent in his proceedings. By his intolerant severity he rather promoted than prevented the spread of the sect. Adyginus, dissatisfied with his colleague, turned round rather to be the protector of the Priscillianists, and incurred in consequence much reproach and odium. It was at length agreed that a synod should be held. This was fixed to be at Caesar-Augusta (Saragossa) on the Ebro. The site of the council was sufficiently northern to be distant from the localities where the Priscillianists and the orthodox were in hostility; it was neutral ground. There would be the advantage also of its nearness to Gaul. It was proposed to gather together there the bishops of Spain and Aquitaine. The synod was held in 380. The Priscillianists did not venture to appear. In their absence their opinions were condemned. The four leaders, Instantius and Salvianus the bishops, Helpidius and Priscillian the laymen, were excommunicated. The bishop of Cordova, who had first started the church movement, fell under the lash of the leaders of the synod. He had received into terms of communion some of the heretics. The anathema of the council was declared against all who shared and all who connived at the new errors of faith and practice. The task of promulgating the decrees and carrying out the ecclesiastical sentences was entrusted to Ithacius, bishop of Sossuba. The important and lamentable result of the synod of Saragossa was the assumption by Ithacius of the leadership of the persecuting party.

(2.) A preconcerted counter-movement now began on the part of the Priscillianists. At the hands of Instantius and Salvianus, Priscillian hitherto unordained, received episcopal ordination. His see was Avila (Abila), on the Adaja, a tributary of the Douro, midway been Salamanca and Madrid (Jerome, *lib. de Script. Eccl.*). This measure of defiance shewed the strength of his party. It led to further progress towards persecution. On behalf of the church authorities, Idacius and Ithacius made application to the secular government. Aid was brought against the heretics. Powers were asked for execution of the decree of the late synod. This succeeded, and in 381 the emperor Gratian granted a rescript, excluding all heretics from the use of the churches, and ordering them to be driven into exile. The Priscillianists were thus, as it were, cut off from civil protection and left at the mercy of their adversaries. Vigorous defensive measures had become necessary for their very existence. An appeal was proposed by them to the two most eminent bishops of the West, pope Damasus at Rome and Ambrose, the bishop of Milan. Their influence, it was hoped, might lead to a rescindment of the imperial decision against them. Instantius, Salvianus, and Priscillian undertook the journey to Rome to clear themselves and their party in the papal court. Their journey was not without incidents. On their way to Italy they penetrated into Interior Aquitaine. Probably they made their journey thither by sea. It is unlikely that they traversed the rugged passes of the Pyrenees. It may have been their desire to try measures of conciliation among the bishops of that province, who had condemned them unseen and unknown at Saragossa. The seeds of the heresy were meanwhile sown by them, where they travelled. Elusa (Eluso) near Eauze, a town on the Gelise, near Auch, is especially mentioned. All the church centres were, however, hostile to them. They were vigorously repulsed from Bordeaux (Burdegala), where all their efforts were foiled in the town by the vigilance of Delphinus, the bishop. Still even there, in the neighbourhood, on the lands of a noble matron Euchrocia, they met with success, and gathered together some adherents (Sulp. Sev. ii. 48; L.Pac. Drep. in *Panegyr. Vet.* xii. 29). Some years later, traces of this journey still remained. We hear of sedition at Bordeaux respecting Priscillianism, a riot of the populace and the stoning to death, in the tumult of a woman named Urbica for persistent adherence to the sect (Prosper. *Chron.* ii.). On their journey onwards to Italy, the Priscillianist leaders were accompanied by a number of those whom they infected with their errors from Gaul. Euchrocia and her daughter Procula, amongst these, ministered of their substance to Priscillian and his colleagues. A promiscuous crowd of others, especially women, are mentioned. In consequence, injurious reports, probably calumnies, were vigorously circulated against Priscillian and his retinue. Procula was said to be living in criminal intercourse with her spiritual adviser. Such charges, and perhaps such excesses, are one of the phenomena that appear to accompany times of such religious excitement. It is strange how constantly such charges are brought, as it were in very defiance of probability against the severest sectaries. Is it that amidst the stronger natures there are the instances of weaker character, examples of reaction against too rigid rule, the very violence and tyranny of asceticism over nature leading to the opposite extreme of self-indulgence and licence? There are found illustrations of this in modern times. Last century, in the first fervour of Methodism in England, it is said to have been so.

(3.) On the arrival of the Priscillianists at Rome, as might be anticipated, they found themselves shut out of court. They were refused audience. They had no opportunity allowed

them of vindicating themselves or explaining their doctrines. During their stay at Rome Salvianus died. Repulsed by pope Damasus, they retraced their steps to Milan, where the power and reputation of Ambrose were at its height. They attempted to gain a favourable hearing at Milan. Would the ear of Ambrose be open to their plea? Would the great upholder of the sacerdotal order listen to them? The liberties of the church might seem in their person to be in danger. The Priscillianists might appear to be upholding the rights of the clergy against secular encroachments. It might be worthy of Ambrose, with his lofty sacerdotal views, to sympathise with the Spanish bishops, disclaiming the right of the civil magistrate, in a question of enforcing obedience in the church. Here again they were necessarily disappointed. At Milan they found Ambrose to be steadily opposed to them. Thus having signally failed at Rome and at Milan, but one resource remained to them. Their adversaries had appealed to the secular power. Their adversaries had condescended to art and intrigue. They would meet them with their own weapons.

(4.) Thus the controversy passed on to another stage of its history. The Priscillianists put on a bold front. They began aggressive measures against their assailants. The wealth of Priscillian, the wealth of his followers was liberally employed. "The silver spears" were now in the hands of the partisans on both sides. At this time Macedonius was the master of the offices (magister officiorum). This imperial functionary, who administered justice in the emperor's household, who exercised control and superintendence over many departments of state, was won over to the interests of Priscillian and his party. Favoured by his powerful influence, the former rescript of Gratian was rescinded. Macedonius obtained a reverse decree, a rescript from Gratian in their favour, protecting them. The Priscillianists were to be reinstated in their former position, and restored to their churches and sees. Relying on this, Instantius and Priscillian returned to Spain, obtained entrance again for themselves and their party to the churches, and regained possession of the sees of which they had been dispossessed. All things now seemed to be turned in their favour. Their star was in the ascendant. They felt as if their hour of opportunity was come. Idacius and Ithacius, though for the moment powerless, had not ceased to make a show of resistance. The Priscillianists charged them with causing divisions and disturbing the peace of the church. They instituted public proceedings against them, and Ithacius was compelled to fly. Treves was at this time the residence of the Caesar who ruled Gaul, Spain, and Britain, according to the fourfold division of the empire by Diocletian. Ithacius escaped from Spain into Gaul to Treves. Gregory, the prefect there, warmly espoused his cause, and exerted himself to bring the complaints of the orthodox bishops again before Gratian. The Priscillianists had, however, secured their interests, their friends at court were powerful enough to ward off the danger. A judicious distribution of bribes, and especially the gift of a large sum of money to Macedonius, effectually thwarted the persevering hostility of their enemies. A judicial inquiry was ordered to be made, not, however, in Gaul, but in Spain. The cause was taken out of the unfriendly hands of Gregory, the prefect, and transferred to the court of Volventius, the vicar of Spain. Ithacius, no longer as accuser but as the accused, was summoned from Gaul to appear before the vicarial tribunal. Had it not been for Pritannius, the bishop of Treves, with whom he found shelter from the impending storm, Ithacius would have been humbled, and severely handled by the ascendant faction.

(5.) An unlooked for change was now, however, to come over the aspect of affairs. A great political event was about to bring new and unforeseen influences to bear. The overthrow and assassination at Paris of the unpopular Gratian, the usurpation of the purple by Clemens Maximus, his proclamation as emperor by his soldiers in Britain, his triumphant entrance into Gaul, with the consequent official changes brought about, were the destruction of all the bright hopes of the Priscillianists. Their prosperity now began to wane, the fortunes of their adversaries were retrieved. On the arrival of Maximus at Treves in 384, Ithacius placed in his hands a formal accusation with heavy charges against Priscillian and his followers. Maximus, a Spaniard by birth, did not turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Spanish bishops. He proceeded to reverse the vacillating policy of Gratian. He refused to be blindly led by the venal officers of the court. He treated the cause with a high hand, not as a matter of mere ecclesiastical rivalry and dispute, nor as one involving only serious doctrinal differences, but as one directly affecting the general interests of morality and society. In his letter afterwards to Siricius, who succeeded Damasus in 384 in the see of Rome, he expressly dwells upon these points, and glories in the part he had consequently taken against the heresy of Priscillian. The commands of the new emperor were at once ominous of no good to the Priscillianists. Joint letters were issued to the prefect of Gaul and the vicar of Spain respecting them. A synod was fixed to be held at Bordeaux (Burdegala) in 385. Both parties were summoned to appear. There had been a sufficient Priscillianist movement in Aquitaine to render Bordeaux a likely and suitable place to be selected. It had been at the same time the stronghold of orthodoxy under its bishop Delphinus, which Priscillian and his followers had assailed in vain. The commercial importance of the town, and its rank as one of the chief seats of literature and learning in the West, would give a decision and weight to a conference there, which the enemies of the Priscillianists knew well how to estimate. The distance was moderate for the travelling of all parties concerned, and sufficiently remote from the Priscillianist centres to secure the peace of the council. All who were suspected of participating in the spread of the new doctrines were called on to defend themselves. There was now no safety in inaction, and Instantius and Priscillian were the first to appear. The defence of Instantius, as might be expected, was insufficient to satisfy the synod. He was declared to have forfeited his bishopric, and sentence of deposition was decreed against him. What was now to be the attitude and policy of Priscillian? His adherents were full of dismay. They had measured the forces arrayed against them, they

understood the animus of the conference gathered together. Priscillian resolved to embark in a counter-movement. The ecclesiastics at Bordeaux were, as it were, the old Jewish sanhedrim. Priscillian felt himself to be as another St. Paul before them, he resolved to forestall the hostile judgment he might expect, he "was constrained to appeal unto Caesar." In the hurry and excitement of the council, the important religious issues involved were not understood. No protest was made. The bishops, partly from a sense of their own weakness, partly from hostility to Priscillian, consented to the transfer of the cause. The appeal of Priscillian was allowed. A purely spiritual offence was remitted for criminal trial to a secular tribunal. In due course both parties appeared before the new emperor Maximus at Treves.

(6.) In the troubled state of public affairs, after the usurpation of Maximus, it was easy for men of low motives and strong passions, and clever intriguers, to gain their ends. As a mere struggle for victory at Treves, both parties might seem to have equal chance of success, whichever would condescend to use the most unscrupulous means might appear to have the brighter hopes. The exigencies of empire were great, the exchequer of Maximus was low, a rich prospect of bribes or confiscations would be the strongest temptation and inducement to prejudge the cause in the interests of order for or against one of the parties. Amidst the rough controversy of the time, from the midst of "the strife of tongues," it is very interesting to be able to catch the voice and get a glimpse of men, for there were such, actuated by high and noble principle, the tolerant spirits of their day. At Treves there was one at this crisis of the fortunes of the church, whose prophetic insight to a great extent comprehended the real significance of the religious issues at stake. The influence of Martin, bishop of Tours, was then at its height. The vicissitudes of his remarkable career as soldier, hermit, monk, and at last bishop, his skill and energy in establishing monastic centres of religious life, his vehement iconoclasm, his consistent Christian activity and stedfastness, his humane and gentle and apostolic spirit, had won for him in Gaul from popular esteem the reputation of the working of miracles. St. Martin's strong spiritual instinct at once led him to choose for himself a definite line of action in the Priscillianist controversy. All his influence was thrown into the scale on the side of counsels of moderation. In argument with the orthodox bishops he protested on wise grounds against any abandonment of the rights of their order, as they had till then been recognised. What but evil could result from this dangerous and hasty example of the submission of a spiritual cause to the civil arbitration, this appeal amidst the hot passions of controversy, at the instance of the heretical leaders, from the ordained guides, rulers, and guardians of the church to the capricious tribunal of a relentless military dictator? Through St. Martin's mediation between the contending parties, and his influence with the emperor, the trial of Priscillian was for some time delayed, Maximus for a while yielded to his protests. He even consented to promise, at St. Martin's suggestion, that no blood should be shed, no life should be sacrificed. But at last St. Martin, at the call of other duties, was obliged to withdraw from Treves. The emperor was now surrounded by other influences. Idacius and Ithacius well knew how to seize and use their opportunity. They were ably supported by two bishops of a like stamp of men, Magnus and Rufus. These were powerful at court, and by them Maximus was unremittingly urged on to severe measures. The character of Ithacius is ably drawn for us by Sulpicius Severus (*Hist. Sacr.* ii. 50). Sulpicius, with all his aversion to the sentiments of Priscillian, has no hesitation in saying that the accusers were, in his judgment, equally blameworthy with the accused. For what manner of man, for example, was Ithacius, who undertook to set all people right, who took on himself to purge the temple of the Lord? He was a man who made little account of anything that stood in the way of his own aggrandizement. Of things divine or things human, in his heart he regarded nothing, he esteemed nothing sacred. Audacious, talkative, shameless, he might be, but he was without the least tincture of true piety. Luxurious and worldly-minded, he was abandoned to voluptuousness, and a slave to his belly. Such an one, a mere voluptuary, a man utterly destitute of all sense of spiritual things, was he a fit choice to be the man to whom should be committed the business of seeing that the decrees of church councils were put in execution? He would have accused as heretics, and as protectors and patrons of Priscillian, all who led a strict and serious Christian life, for which he had no respect or liking himself, all who were much given to the study of the Scriptures, or who often fasted. He was for fixing the charge of Priscillianism on any of those whose faculties were consecrated to the pursuit of piety and knowledge, whose lives were distinguished by acts of mortification and abstinence, or even whose ascetic cast of countenance or habit of dress might mark them out for his victims. Thus the bishop of Sossuba comes before us, the model and prototype of a figure too often repeated afterwards in the annals of religious strife and persecutions; we may see in the picture drawn of him at the close of the fourth century, the worthy model and prototype of the popular ideal of the mediaeval Spanish inquisitor.

(7.) Now came the final act of the tragedy. The trial of the Priscillianists once resolved upon was soon brought about. The last scenes follow rapidly upon one another. The Priscillianists were now to become a defenceless prey to their enemies. "The appeal unto Caesar," in their case, was truly to be an appeal to a pitiless Nero. As a stroke of state policy, nothing could be wiser in the eyes of the adherents of Maximus than their destruction. Both pagan and Christian authorities attribute mercenary motives to the emperor, and state that the possessions of the rich Priscillian and of his followers excited his cupidity. (Sulp. Sev. *Dialog.* iii. 9; *Panegyr. of Lat. Pac. Drep. on Theodosius, Panegyr. Vet.* xvi. 29.) At the same time there could not be a more brilliant inauguration of the new reign than a vigorous assertion of sovereignty on the side of orthodoxy in religion on the lines of the now famous Theodosian decrees. No harm could follow; the cause of peace and good order seemed to be involved in this. Nothing would

be more likely to strike a responsive chord in popular favour than the high-minded assumption by Maximus of the position of arbiter in ecclesiastical controversy. Past examples shewed what an immense impulse in his favour might follow upon the skilful interposition of his authority in a matter so novel and so deeply moving all the better orders of society far and near, as peace and war in the church.

Maximus entrusted the cause to the praetorian prefect Evodius, a stern and severe judge. Ithacius and his companions undertook the office of accusers. Priscillian and his chief followers were brought before the imperial consistory at Treves, and heard and condemned in two investigations. They were charged not only with heresy and false teaching, but with violation of the laws. They were convicted of magic, impiety, and lewdness. Various gross accusations, partly founded on vague and exaggerated rumours, partly established by the doubtful evidence of torture, were brought in against them. Confessions and admissions of the usual Gnostic abominations and secret mixed assemblies for immorality and obscene practices were extorted by the rack. At length Priscillian and some others were declared guilty by the prefect, remitted to prison, and ordered to be detained there till the emperor's pleasure should be known. On the adverse decision of the prefect being reported in the palace, Maximus gave his consent to infliction of a capital sentence. It was necessary that a final sitting of the court should be held for this purpose. Ithacius as a bishop withdrew from further interference in the cause. Maximus set forward as prosecutor a civil officer of the treasury (fisci patronus) named Patricius. In this last investigation and rehearing of the case, Priscillian and his chief associates were condemned to death. Several others, after confiscation of their goods, were banished to the Scilly islands, others to places within Gaul. Priscillian himself is recorded as the first of those who suffered death (gladio perempti). With him died two presbyters, lately become disciples, Felicissimus and Armenius. There also suffered at the same time Latronianus, a poet, and Euchrocia, the rich and noble matron of Bordeaux. Instantius, deposed from his bishopric by the synod of Bordeaux, was banished to the desolate Scilly isles. In following processes Asarinus and Aurelius, two deacons, were executed. Tiberianus was banished to the same place of exile as Instantius. Tertullus, Potamius, and Johannes, as meaner followers, were punished by temporary banishment within Gaul. They had turned king's evidence, and thus by the merit of early repentance won the indulgence of a lesser penalty.

The immediate consequences were not reassuring to the persecuting party. At Treves a violent strife arose between the bishops present there on the question of the merits of Priscillian's execution. Theognistes, a bishop, a man of a masculine and independent mind, boldly threw himself forward as the leader of the non-contents. He and his party refused church communion to Ithacius, and the others who had partaken in the judicial guilt of the bloodshed. In Spain the Priscillianist enthusiasm was for a while intensified by the heroic death of their founder. The opinions spread, the number of followers grew. The bodies of those who had suffered at Treves were brought to Spain, and their obsequies celebrated with great pomp and splendour. Priscillian himself, before revered as a saint, was now, says Sulpicius, worshipped as a martyr. To take oaths by the name of Priscillian became a common form of asseveration in Spain. At the same time signs were not wanting which struck terror into the orthodox, that the Priscillianist society aimed at retreating from open view, assuming more and more a mysterious character, and shrouding themselves under the attractive guise of a secret religious association, ramifying widely, full of power and energy, commanding great influence, yet invisible in its machinery and agencies.[b]

Additional severities were proposed. Maximus resolved to send military tribunes to Spain, entrusting the commission with unlimited powers. They were to investigate charges of heresy, examine heretics, take life and property from the guilty. They were men little likely to temper justice with mercy. At this juncture Martin of Tours returned to Treves. As soon as it was rumoured that he was approaching, the bishops who were in opposition to Theognistes, persuaded Maximus to send officers to meet him. They were to forbid Martin's entrance into Treves, unless he promised to keep peace with the bishops. Martin was known to be coming on the errand of imploring the regnant emperor's mercy for those implicated in the recent political struggles, Count Narses, Leucadius, and others. Martin answered the messengers of Maximus with the ambiguous answer that he would come "with the peace of Christ." He entered the city after sundown, and proceeded at once to the basilica for prayer. Next day he went to the palace, and presented himself before the emperor. He stated he had come for two principal objects, both errands of mercy. After interceding for Count Narses and Leucadius, and other adherents of the fallen Gratian, he made it his object to plead for the troubled church in Spain. Were the commissioners sent out, who would be security for the just exercise of their powers? What grounds were there for supposing there would be due discrimination between the guiltless and the guilty? Who would winnow the grain from the chaff, would not the tares and the wheat be uprooted together? Was there not a probability that the faithful and the heretics would be alike harassed, the innocent and the guilty confounded? What could be expected but venality, rapacity, and subtle intrigues through all the provinces, when matters of speculative religious opinion were to be sifted before a tribunal of soldiers? For two or three days the emperor refused to relent. He answered Martin's supplications only by evasive replies. Many thought, says Sulpicius Severus, that the necessities of the imperial treasury were urgent, the emperor's coffers were scantily filled, the prospect of rich confiscations from the estates and goods of wealthy political and ecclesiastical offenders was too powerful a

[b] The contemporary *Sacred History of Sulpicius Severus* closes with some fair and moderate reflections on the death of Priscillian. Further particulars are gathered from the *Third Dialogue* and *Life of St. Martin* by the same author.

temptation to be withstood (Sulp. Sev. *Dialog.* iii. 11; Pacat. *in Panegyr. Vet.* xii. 29). Maximus also, it was strongly suspected by many, had been in the first instance and all along moved to espouse the cause of the persecuting party by opportune advances of money by the bishops, and other such important assistance at the recent crisis of his political fortunes.

Theognistes, on the arrival of Martin, was felt to be supported by a powerful ally. Martin threw the great weight of his influence on the side of Theognistes. Anticipated and feared as this had been before he arrived, it was felt by the bishops as a keen affront on his arrival. It was vehemently resented, and every effort was made at court to inflame the royal prejudice against him. St. Martin was, however, inflexible. No efforts could induce him to be reconciled to the promoters and abettors of the late executions. Neither the persuasion nor the threats of the emperor moved him. He was at length dismissed from the imperial presence in anger. All at once, however, tidings reached Martin that the tribunes had been really sent to Spain. He hurried to the palace, though it was night. He agreed to unite with the bishops in church fellowship. The emperor yielded in turn to his importunity on behalf of the Priscillianists. His firmness and zeal on the side of humanity were rewarded. The tribunes were recalled, and the peninsula was thus spared the horrors of a religious proscription.

Little more is recorded of the final issue of the dispute between the ecclesiastics at Treves. The schism continued some time between the two parties, those that approved and those that condemned the severities against Priscillian. Ithacius was some time afterwards deposed from his episcopal office for the part he had taken in it. For fifteen years the contention was extreme between the disputants, and the merits of the controversy long continued to be canvassed. At the time, as has been already said, all the more influential dignitaries of the Western church were struck with horror and indignation at the violent measures of Maximus, and were moved to pity and compassion for the tragic end of Priscillian.

The heresy was certainly not extinguished by these means. It continued to prevail, and seemed even to take deeper root in Spain. In 400 a council was held at Toledo, where many Priscillianists came over to the Catholic side, and were re-admitted to church communion. Amongst these was Dictinnius, a Priscillianist bishop, author of the book called *The Scales* (Libra), where the Priscillianist opinions were expounded and advocated. In 415 a Spanish presbyter, Orosius, wrote to Augustine concerning the sect. A long letter of Augustine also is extant, written to Ceretius, a bishop, respecting the apocryphal Priscillianist Scriptures, especially a hymn attributed to Christ. Forty years later, Turribius, bishop of Astorga, wrote in sorrow and perplexity to pope Leo I., asking his advice in what manner to deal with these insidious and dangerous adversaries. Leo recommended the convocation of a general council of bishops from the four provinces of Tarragona, Carthagena, Lusitania, and Gallicia. If this general council could not be held, Turribius might appeal to a provincial council from Gallicia alone. Two councils pursuant were held, one at Toledo in 447, the other at Braga in Gallicia, in 448, where Priscillianism was condemned in the usual forms of anathema. A last contemporary mention of the Priscillianists comes in combination with the Arians, in the acts of the council of Braga, in 563.

None of the ancient writers have given an accurate account of the doctrine of the Priscillianists. What knowledge may be gained of this has to be gathered from such sources as the meagre accounts of their adversaries supply, the correspondence of eminent men of the time,[c] the acts and canons of councils,[d] the church histories,[e] and a few verbal allusions in contemporary Pagan writers.[f] The Priscillianist system, already sufficiently dark and perplexed, has had new degrees of obscurity added by unstinted misrepresentation and calumny. The general outline may be made out of their opinions, fantastic allegories, daring cosmogonies, astrological fancies, combined with the severest asceticism. It is more possible amidst these to compare the general resemblances of their doctrine to Cabalism, Syrian and Egyptian Gnosticism, Manichaeism, Persian and Indian Orientalism, than to detect and analyse and assign the differences.

There are no authentic records remaining of the Priscillianist writers. We hear of one book widely circulated and long held in estimation amongst the sect, called *The Scales* (Libra). This was written by Dictinnius, a Priscillianist bishop. He recanted, and returned to the church at the council of Toledo in the year 400, but his book continued to be circulated, though disowned by its author. A fragment of a letter of Priscillian himself has come down to us in quotation (Orosii *Common. in Aug. Op.*). There are allusions to a multitude of apocryphal scriptures accepted and used by them. In this respect they differed from most heretical sects, accepting alike all apocryphal and canonical books as scripture, explaining and adapting them to their own purpose in a mystical manner.

Beyond this there is no extant literature connected with Priscillian or his followers. Nothing is known to have been preserved.

"The thoughts that breathe and words that burn"

of the arch-heretic himself, or his more influential followers, have all vanished and perished with them. A specimen of the Priscillianist allegorical treatment of the Christian Scriptures on the model of Philo's interpretation of the Old Testament, and also of their wild physical myths, reminding of the philosophical romances of Valentinus and the Egyptian Gnostics, is preserved by Orosius (*Common. ad Aug.*). The clearest account of the Priscillianist tenets must be found in the controversial correspondence slightly later than Priscillian, between Leo the Great and Turribius, bishop of Astorga. The Spanish prelate summed up the doctrines in sixteen articles. Leo replies in a lengthy epistle, comment-

[c] Leo I. *Ep.* xv.; August. *Ep.* 237; Ambrose, *Ep.* 24; Maximi *Ep. ad Siricium* in Baron.

[d] Braga, Toledo, Turin.

[e] Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* and *Dialogues*; Aug. *Haeres.* 70; Orosii *Commonitorium in Aug. Op.*; Aug. *Liber de Mendacio ad Consentium*; Jerome, *de Script. Eccl.*

[f] L. Pacatus Drepanius, *Panegyr. Vet.* xii. 29; Auson. *de Profess. Burdegal.* carm. vi.

ing seriatim on each of the propositions (Leo, *Ep.* xv.).

1. Their wild cosmical speculations were based on the bold Gnostic and Manichean conceptions of a primaeval dualism. The two opposite realms of light and darkness, in eternal antagonism, were the foundation of their tenets. Believing in the canonicity of the Old Testament, they were unable to distinguish literally with the Anti-Jewish Gnostic between an evil demiurge, the Jehovah of the Old Covenant, and the higher God of the Christian Scripture. At the same time they ascribed all matter in every form and in its essence to an origin connected with the kingdom of darkness. Here the emanation theory came in to help them. They supposed a manifold series of emanations from the primeval unity in each realm, emanations in the kingdom of light, various in power and might, partaking the Divine essence, in descending grades, till the souls of men issued forth into existence—a similar gradation in the realm of darkness originated the powers of evil, at the head of which stood Satan. Thus Leo's rude statements of their faith held partly true, that they considered heaven the creation of God, and earth the creation of the devil.

2. Their anti-materialism led them very far wide from the sublime simplicity of Scripture. Perplexed with the insoluble problem of the origin of sin, they threw their teaching into the form of the most fantastic dreams and myths. Souls partaking the Divine essence had gone forth by the Divine mission from the kingdom of light to conflict with the powers of darkness. Animated by angelic exhortation they had sworn to constancy, but descending through the seven heavens, they became subjected to lowering and material influences. From each of the seven heavens, which, like the Ophites, they considered presided over by the seven star spirits, souls appropriated something of a sidereal vehicle. Thus they passed the borderland between the opposite realms, and entered the antagonist kingdom of darkness. Here, in our universe, the powers of evil prevailed against them. They became entangled in matter, and at length by birth enchained in bodies. Priscillianism thus by the idea of an earlier guilt preceding birth, accounted for the inequalities of the present life.

3. The astrological fatalism which they taught, which pope Leo condemned so sternly as subversive of all moral distinctions, was a striking peculiarity of their system (Leo, *Ep.* xv. 11–12). They believed the twelve signs of the Zodiac to have a mysterious supremacy over the members of the body. They assigned, according to Augustine (*Haeres.* 70), the head to the dominion of Aries, the neck to Taurus, the shoulders to Gemini, the breast to Cancer, the feet to Pisces, and so through all the human frame. Thus our earthly members were subject to these sidereal powers, who in some mysterious way were concerned in their creation. Thus astrology, a superstition afterwards so long and widely prevalent in Europe, assumes its first distinct form in the Priscillianist doctrine. Their allegorical treatment of the Old Testament may here be illustrated. The names of the twelve patriarchs were viewed by them in a similar, but here an allegorical manner, with reference to the soul, as the signs of the Zodiac for the body. Orosius, the Spanish presbyter, writing to Augustine, enumerates Reuben for the head, Judah for the breast, Levi the heart, Benjamin the thighs, and so through the patriarchal family. To these twelve heavenly powers, thus allegorized and under their guidance, Priscillian supposed the souls of men to be related and to stand. It is in reference to this subject that an almost unintelligible sentence remains, the only words of Priscillian that are preserved (Oros. *Comm. in Aug. Op.*). They are words of Priscillian in a letter, "Haec prima sapientia est, in animarum typis divinarum virtutum intelligere naturas et corporis dispositionem, in qua obligatum coelum videtur et terra, omnesque principatus saeculi videntur adstricti sanctorum dispositiones superare. Nam primum Dei circulum et mittendarum in carne animarum divinum chirographum, Angelorum et Dei et omnium animarum consensibus fabricatum Patriarchae tenent, qui contra formalis militiae opus possident."

4. Their Christology is difficult to gather. If they held the doctrine of a Trinity at all, it was but a Trinity of names. Their adversaries accused them of Arianism and Sabellianism. Leo sharply criticises their application and interpretation of the Scripture attributive of the Redeemer, "the only begotten."[g] The truth appears to be that confounding the separate ideas of Godhead and Spirit, they started with the principle of the soul being of divine substance as well as origin. The variable and the invariable, the unchanged and the changeable, the Creator and the creature, ideas essentially distinct, they thus attempted to blend. Starting thus, and with their anti-materialism, who and what was the Christ? Solving this question on their principles it was impossible that the human body of Christ could be real. It is not clear whether they held that Christ existed in a prior state (Milman, *Lat. Chr.* vol. i. p. 197). It is not clear what idea they had of the divine and human nature of our Lord. Probably He was to them "the one Divine Light—nature exhibiting itself to the eye of sense under the semblance merely of an object of sense" (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 509). He brought with Him into the world, through a birth entirely different from other men, a body of ethereal mould. In the Priscillianist view of the work of Christ, it is remarkable that he gave particular prominence to the sufferings of Christ. It is consistent with their Docetic views of the person of Christ, that the Priscillianists fasted on Christmas Day and on all Sundays, the days of memorial of our Lord's birth and resurrection, and thus of His first and latest contact with matter. The life and sufferings of Christ he seems to have considered in some sense symbolical. It was by them that the bond was annulled (Col. ii. 14), by which the soul was held imprisoned in the body by the powers of darkness, and was made subject to the sidereal influences. Redemption was a doctrine held by Priscillian in common with all Gnostic sects, but it was a metaphysical redemption by a metaphysical Redeemer.

[g] The Priscillianists held that all the children of promise were "conceived by the Holy Ghost," though begotten and born of earthly parentage. They attributed the term "Only Begotten" to our Lord only in the sense that He alone was born of a virgin (Leo, *Ep.* xv. 3).

5. The rigid asceticism, which was everywhere insisted on as a part of the Priscillianist teaching, resulted directly from their idea of the innate evil of matter. Marriage was proscribed by them. Austerities of all sorts were required. The dissoluteness of conduct, the orgiastic libertinism, which is so constantly a hostile calumny against the sect, can only have been the practice of the worse sort of their followers, a reaction in the less stedfast against the coercion of a too violent restraint, the recoil of impulsive and ill-governed natures. Notwithstanding the confessions extorted by torture, and admissions made by those who recanted, it is probably true, according to Gibbon's remark (*Decl. and Fall*, c. 27), "if the Priscillianists violated the laws of nature, it was not by the licentiousness but by the severity of their lives." Total abstinence from animal food was enjoined; continual prayers, fasts and vigils were inculcated as a rule of strict and perfect devotion.

6. There is one article of blame upon the moral system of Priscillian that is plainly well deserved. This was their dissimulation.[h] Holding an esoteric and exoteric doctrine, they affirmed, with some other of the theosophic sects, that falsehood was allowable for a holy end. Absolute veracity was only binding between fellow members of their sect. In dealings with the unenlightened, they did not feel bound always and absolutely to state the whole truth. This looseness of principle they supported by Scripture, distorting for example Eph. iv. 25 in support of their practice. It was a Priscillianist habit to affect to agree with the multitude, to make allowance in this way for what they considered their fleshly notions, and conceal from them what they regarded them as incapable of comprehending. (Dictinnius in *Libra*.) In the agitation of controversy many of the church ecclesiastics were in favour of fighting the Priscillianites with their own weapons, and adopting the same method against them. This led Augustine to enter the field on the subject. His treatise *De Mendacio* was expressly written in opposition to such laxity. It is easy to see how such practice arose from their principles. We may illustrate by their Gnostic ideas about Scripture. The Christian Scripture to the Priscillianists was an imperfect revelation. What the Jewish religion was to Christianity, that same place the Priscillianists considered Christianity to hold with regard to their speculations. As the Old Testament was full of types and shadows of Christianity, so the New Testament in their hands became a figurative and symbolical exposition and veil of Priscillianism. The outer form was for the ignorant and profane; the inner truth was for the wise and initiated. The grace of faith was fitted only for the rude mass of men; to know was the vocation of the privileged, the spiritual, the elect. Once having thus arrogated to themselves the pride and exclusiveness of a Brahminical caste, the Priscillianist had but to go a step further to disregard moral distinctions and believe himself entitled to prevaricate, which often led to things still worse, in his dealings with the common herd of mankind (cf. Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, Lect. XII. p. 196, IX. p. 135; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii. p. 26). [M. B. C.]

[h] "Jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli," a precept of Priscillian quoted by Augustine, *Liber de Haeresibus*, 70, and Aug. *Ep.* 237 *ad Ceretium*.

PRISCUS (1), father of St. Justin, martyr. [JUSTINUS (2).] [C. H.]

PRISCUS (2), a bishop of Africa (24th name in Conc. Carth. ii. de Pace). [E. W. B.]

PRISCUS (3), March 28. Martyr in the persecution of Valerian at Caesarea in Palestine with Malchus and Alexander, his friends, and with a woman belonging to the Marcionite sect. (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 12.) [G. T. S.]

PRISCUS (4), the judge who tortured and condemned St. Euphemia. [EUPHEMIA.] [C. H.]

PRISCUS (5), sent by Jerome to Palestine. [EUBULUS (4).] [C. H.]

PRISCUS (6), a bishop of Mauretania Caesariensis, censured for some offence, but not removed from the episcopate. His case is quoted by St. Augustine in a letter to pope Celestine concerning the case of Antonius, bishop of Fussala. Priscus aspired to the primacy of the province, and complained of the judgment passed on him, urging that if he was guilty, he ought to be removed; if not, he ought to be regarded as a fit candidate for the primacy. (Aug. *Ep.* 209; Bingham, ii. 16, 7.) [H. W. P.]

PRISCUS (7) VALERIANUS, a prefect of Gaul, in the 5th century. He belonged to the family of the emperor Avitus, and was therefore a connection by marriage of Sidonius Apollinaris, who, about the year 456, sent him a copy of his panegyric on that emperor with some dedicatory verses (*Carm.* vi. vii. viii.). If he was the Valerianus addressed by Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, in his *Epistola Paraenetica ad Val. cognatum, De contemptu mundi et saecularis philosophiae* (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* l. 711–26), written about the year 432, he was, though a man of great learning and eloquence and of excellent natural disposition, yet devoted to heathen philosophy, and apparently not a Christian. For this letter see Ceillier, viii. 444. He married his daughter to Pragmatius, an orator and man of letters, struck by his eloquence on some public occasion (Sidon. Apoll. *Epist.* v. 10). The authors of the *Hist. Litt. de la France* distinguish him from Valerianus bishop of Cémèle, near Nice, and from Priscus a historian of Attila's wars (ii. 360–3). [S. A. B.]

PRISCUS (8), solitary, to whom St. Nilus the ascetic wrote three letters upon the ascetic life (Nilus, *Epp.* iii. nos. 288, 289, 290, Allat. 1668; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 222). [J. G.]

PRISCUS (9), Nestorian of the fifth century, one of the most important authorities for the reign of Theodosius II. and his relations with Attila. (Evag. *H. E.* 5; Tillem. xv. 746.) Gibbon makes great use of him in his chapter xxxiv. [THEODOSIUS II.] A full account of him will be found in the *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* (cf. *Rev. Archéol.* 1868, t. xviii. p. 86, for three hitherto unpublished fragments of this historian, with notes by Mommsen.). [G. T. S.]

PRISCUS (10), a Jew attached to the service of Chilperic, king of the Franks, whose office it was to purchase objects of luxury. Gregory, the historian, relates an amusing incident in which he took part (A.D. 581). Chilperic, who dabbled in theology as he did in literature, provoked an argument with Priscus on the subject of their respective faiths. The king being soon worsted, Gregory came to the rescue, and with many quotations from the old Testament, silenced the Jew according to his own account, but could not induce him to confess the faith. The following year Chilperic, losing patience at their stubbornness, baptized a number of Jews by force, himself receiving some of them from the font as an encouragement. Priscus, however, was still obdurate in his unbelief, and the king resolved to imprison him until he was willing to accept the truth. But, before the sentence was executed, Priscus was murdered by one of the new converts, named Phatir, with whom he had engaged in an angry dispute (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* vi. 5; 17). [S. A. B.]

PRISCUS (11), ST., 30th archbishop of Lyons in the latter half of the 6th century, has been the subject of much controversy. Gregory of Tours, the historian, his contemporary, brings against him the gravest charges. According to the *Hist. Franc.* (iv. 36), he set himself, with his wife Susanna, to persecute and destroy those who had been the friends of his predecessor, St. Nicetius, out of malice and jealousy, and never wearied of declaiming blasphemies against his memory, in punishment for which he was smitten with a quartan ague, and various ills happened to his wife and family. The *Vitae Patrum* (viii. 5) also has an instance of his contempt for the same prelate, whose chaplain he is said to have been. On the other hand he is numbered by the church among the saints, though his cult is not very ancient, he was present at numerous councils, the 4th of Paris in 573, Châlons in 579, Mâcon in 581 or 583, 3rd of Lyons in 581, another at Lyons in 583, Valence in 584 or 585, and the 2nd of Mâcon in 585, at some of which he presided, and at one, the last, is honoured in the preface, with the dignified title, very rare in the West, of patriarcha (Mansi, ix. 949, Ceillier, xi. 896); again by Ado, who wrote in the 9th century, he is called Sanctus (*Chronicon*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiii. 111); while an epitaph was discovered in 1308, which the Bollandists ascribe to the 8th or 9th century, of a very laudatory character, as far as it has been deciphered. Finally the chapter of the *Hist. Franc.* (iv. 36) is said to be only found in one MS., that of Monte Cassino, whence it was first published by Ruinart, and does not appear in any of the French MSS. For these reasons the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Jun. vi. 120–7) refuse credence to Gregory's charges. But it seems at least as likely that the French copyists suppressed a chapter which reflected on the honour of the church of Lyons as that a foreigner inserted it, and there still remains the chapter in the *Vitae Patrum* (viii.) to be got over. The laudatory epitaph and the subsequent canonization can have little weight against contemporary testimony. Of course it is possible that Priscus repented later, and concluded his life in a manner entitling him to the honour (cf. *Gall. Christ.* iv. 35–8). His day is June 13. For his cult and the miracles attributed to his remains, see Boll. *ibid.*

[S. A. B.]

PRISCUS (12), patrician, a distinguished general in the reign of Maurice, appointed dux orientis in A.D. 588, and subsequently successful in various campaigns. (Theophylact Simocatta, iii. 1–3, vi. 4 end, vii. 5–13, viii. 2–4). Priscus was a friend of Gregory the Great, who wrote in A.D. 593 congratulating him on his restoration to the emperor's favour, and commending to him his apocrisiarius Sabinianus (*Epp.* iii. 52). [F. D.]

PRISTINUS, a confessor who, previous to his examination, had been given by his friends medicated wine in order to deaden the pain of the torture. The consequence was that he was unable to reply to the questions of the interrogating magistrate. Tertullian tells the story (*De Jejun.* 12) in order to contrast Montanist sobriety with what he counts the unchristian laxity of the Catholics. Whether Pristinus actually died under his torture depends on the correctness of a conjectural substitution "discessit" for the "digessit" of the MSS. [G. S.]

PRITANNIUS, bishop of Treves. [PRISCILLIANUS.]

PRIVATIANUS, African bishop. Cyp. *Ep.* 56, 57, *superscr.* See AHIMNIUS. [E. W. B.]

PRIVATIANUS (same), bishop of Sufetula in Prov. Byzacena, *hod.* Sbitha. Conc. sub Cyp. de Bap. iii. Carth. vii. suffrag. 19. [E. W. B.]

PRIVATION, a young man who desired to be admitted into St. Augustine's monastery, A.D. 401, as a reader; but as he had officiated as reader but once, and then with the apocryphal books only, Augustine was doubtful if he could be called a reader, and applied to Aurelius bishop of Carthage to decide. (*Ep.* 64 al. 235; Tillem. xiii. 362). The Benedictine editor suggests that his true name was perhaps Privatianus. [C. H.]

PRIVATUS (1), bishop of Sufes, Colonia Sufetana, in Prov. Byzac. (suffectana *male leg.* Aug. *Ep.* 50) now *Sbiba*, 20th suffrage in Sentt. Epp. Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. de Bap. iii. Other bishops of the see are named, and a synod was held there. See Morcelli and Mommsen.

[E. W. B.]

PRIVATUS (2), once bishop of the important but shortlived city (Gibbon, c. 41; Mommsen, *Corp. Inscr. L.* viii. p. 285) of Lambaesis in Numidia (Lambesitana Colonia, *Ep.* 59, 10—Aurelia Lambaesis; Lambaese Con. Carth. sub Cyp. de Bap. iii. suffrag. 6; Lambesis, Lambasa (inscrr.) Lambaesa Ptol.). This is not to be confounded with Lamasba, *v.* PUSILLUS, and is the present *Tazzût* or *Tezzulot* (Momms.). Privatus was condemned of heresy, and *multa et gravia delicta*, by ninety bishops at a council held under Donatus, bishop of Carthage, *Ep.* 59, xiii.; 10). From the same passage this would appear to have been under the Roman bishopric of Fabian (A.D. 240, Morcelli). If the words are accurately taken, they would seem to state that the council was held at Lambaesis, and that afterwards Donatus,

and Fabian, both issued letters condemnatory of him and his opinions.

In A.D. 250 he visited Rome, and Cyprian, apprehensive of his influence, warns the clergy against him, and they reply (*Ep.* 36. 4) that they had already detected him and his *vexillarius*, "Futurus," (but there is no such proper name in Muratori's, Gruter's, or Mommsen's Inscrr.), in a previous attempt to obtain "litterae" (*communicatoriae*) from them fraudulently.

He presented himself (vetus haereticus) and desired to be heard on behalf of the party who took the lax view as to the *Lapsi*, at the second council Id. Mai., 252, and, on being rejected, consecrated Fortunatus pseudo-bishop (*Ep.* 59, xiii.), assisted by a pseudo-bishop Felix of his own consecration, and by Jovinus and Maximus, and a lapsed bishop, Repostus Suturnicensis. His successor Januarius speaks at the council of Carthage, vii. suffrag. 6 (not as Fell supposes (note on *Ep.* 36) suffrag. 75, which is that of the bishop of Lamasba (v. l. labama, lambese) lamasva, Morcelli; Mommsen, C. Inscrr. Latt. viii. p. 445). [E. W. B.]

PRIVATUS (3), mentioned with PROFUTURUS (1) and Servilius by Evodius bishop of Uzalis in a letter to St. Augustine c. 414. The three had been with Evodius in a monastery (his own or St. Augustine's) and had spoken to him after their death, all that they said proving true. (Aug. *Ep.* 158 al. 258, § 9; Tillem. xii. 582, xiii. 661.) [C. H.]

PRIVATUS (4), second bishop of Mende, is called by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* i. c. 32; vi. c. 37; *De Mir.* ii. 30) "Episcopus Gabalitanus" and "ex Mimate." In the *Acta* (Surius, *Vit. SS.* 250–1; Venantius Bellov. *Spec. Hist.* xi. c. 75; Boll. *A. SS.* Aug. iv. 433–8, with praev. Comment.; *Acta Breviora* and *Acta Longiora*, which are probably based upon the notes given by Gregory and wrought up by anonymous writers) he is said to have been living in a mountain-cave above Mende, when the Alemanni, under their king Chrocus, penetrated into the south of Gaul, devastated Aquitania, and put many Christians to death. Among them was the bishop Privatus because he refused to give up the tower of Greze where his people had found refuge, or to do sacrifice to the German gods. If according to the *Acta* he lived under Valerian and Gallienus, he died c. A.D. 265. But Baronius (*Ann.* A.D. 280, c. 2) puts him slightly later, and seems to confound him with an African heretic; while Tillemont (*H. E.* iv. 221 and note, p. 651) would prefer to relegate him to the fifth century. He was buried where he suffered at Gabala, and the church erected on the spot became a great resort for pilgrimage. The feast is August 21 (*Gall. Christ.* i. 86; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, i. 308, viii. 511–3). [J. G.]

PRIX, ST. [PRAEJECTUS.]

PROAERESIUS, a bishop of Lycia, condemned by Chrysostom in his Asiatic visitation, 401 A.D. (Phot. *Cod.* 59. p. 56.) [E. V.]

PROASTIOI (*προάστειοι*). A book with this title was, according to Hippolytus (*Ref.* v. 14), in use among the PERATAE. It seems to have been of an astrological character; and it professed to teach the true names of the powers of nature, which ignorance had miscalled. It is not worth while to write down obvious conjectures, as to what was intended by the titles of office, *τόπαρχαι* and *προάστειοι* bestowed on some of these powers. [G. S.]

PROBA. [FALCONIA PROBA.]

PROBA (1), sister of St. Galla [GALLA (9)] and daughter of the consul Symmachus, is very greatly praised by Fulgentius of Ruspe (*Ep.* ii. c. 16; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxv. 320) for her humility, fasting and prayer: "quae cum sit avis atavisque nata consulibus et deliciis regalibus enutrita," yet devoted herself to virginity, charity, and all good works. Fulgentius addressed to her two letters, *de virginitate atque humilitate*, and *de oratione ad Deum et compunctione cordis* (*ib.* Epp. iii., iv., Migne, lxv. 324 sq.) and another not extant. She lived about the beginning of the sixth century [FULGENTIUS (3)] (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 27 sq.) [J. G.]

PROBA (2), a lady of the province of Asia, who left a large landed estate for use of the clergy and the poor. The official entrusted with its care was faithless to his trust. Pope Coelestinus in an epistle to the emperor Theodosius II in 432, solicits his interference. (Cf. Mansi, *Concil.* t. v. col. 271.) [G. T. S.]

PROBIANUS (PETRONIUS PROBIANUS), proconsul of Africa, successor to Aelianus. The council of Rome concerning the case of Caecilianus was held October 2, A.D. 313 (Aug. *ad Don. post coll.* 33, 56). The case of Felix of Aptunga was heard by Aelian February 15, A.D. 314. Probianus succeeded Aelianus in the same year, and was desired by Constantine to send Ingentius to Rome (FELIX (26) Vol. II. p. 487). He appears to have continued in office until 316. (Aug. *Brevic. Coll.* iii. 23, *adv. Cresc.* iii. 70; *Ep.* 88, 19; *Cod. Theodos.* xi. 30, 3 and 5; Optatus, i. 23, 26; Baronius, vol. iii. 314, 19, 72.) [H. W. P.]

PROBINUS (1), ANICIUS, second son of PROBUS (4), consul with his brother Olybrius, 395 (Jerome, *Ep.* cxxx. 7, with Vallarsi's note). His son Probus was consul in 406. [W. H. F.]

PROBINUS (2), priest of Seville, seems to have visited Rome at least twice during the pontificate of Gregory the Great. In A.D. 595, Gregory sent by him to Leander of Seville his *Moralia* and his book *de Regula Pastorali*, and in A.D. 599, writing to king Reccared, he mentions that he had heard from Probinus of his refusal to relax a law against the Jews (*Epp.* v. 49; ix. 122). [F. D.]

PROBUS (1), Oct. 11. Martyr at Tarsus in Cilicia with Tarachus and Andronicus. [TARACHUS.] [G. T. S.]

PROBUS (2), governor of Pannonia, tried, condemned, and tortured ST. IRENAEUS (3) of Sirmium and others A.D. 304 (Ruinart, *Act. Mart.* 432, ed. 1859; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iii. 27–8). [J. G.]

PROBUS (3) (PROMUS). [ELIAS (29).]

PROBUS (4), SEXTUS ANICIUS PETRONIUS (*Corp. Inscript.* vi. 1, n. 1752), a member of one of the most illustrious families in Rome, was consul with Gratian in A.D. 371, and was four times praetorian prefect of Italy, Illyricum, the Gauls, and Africa. He had also been proconsul in Africa in 358 (*Cod. Theod.* xi. 36, xiii.). The date of his appointment as praetorian prefect of Italy and Illyricum was A.D. 368 (Ammian. xxvii. 1). During his tenure of office he chose St. Ambrose, then a young advocate, to be one of his council, and afterwards appointed him governor of Liguria and Aemilia with the rank of consular. It was on this occasion that Probus uttered the words, afterwards considered prophetic, "Go, act not as a judge, but as a bishop;" and many years later he sent one of his servants, who was possessed with a devil, to be healed by him (Paulinus, *Vita Ambr.* 5, 8, 21; in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiv. 28, 29, 34). Probus continued praefect of Italy down to the death of Valentinian, in A.D. 374. He is accused by Ammianus (xxix. 6) of being panic struck by the invasion of the Quadi in 374; but if so, he soon recovered his courage, and took active measures for the fortification and defence of Sirmium against them. Ammianus (xxx. 5) further accuses him of oppressing the provincials of Pannonia and Illyricum, and states, that in consequence of this, and through the machinations of Leo, the master of the offices, who hoped to be appointed in his place, he fell into disgrace with Valentinian. He presided over the trial and torture of Faustinus on the charge of magic. He next appears as praetorian praefect of Italy in A.D. 380, and as praetorian praefect in A.D. 383, 4 (*Cod. Theod.* vi. 28 ii.; xi. 13 i.; vi. 30, vi.), and after the murder of Gratian, in A.D. 383, acted as regent to Valentinian II. in Italy, and accompanied him and his mother Justina in their flight to Thessalonica on the invasion of Maximus in A.D. 387 (Socrates, *H. E.* v. 11; Soz. *H. E.* vii. 13), He died before the end of A.D. 394 (Claudian. *in Prob. et Ol. Cons.* 31), at the age of sixty, less one month, after having received baptism (*Corp. Insc.* vi. 1, p. 389). It may be owing to his Christianity that Ammianus (xxvii. 11) paints him in such unfavourable colours, a remarkable contrast to the glowing panegyric of Claudian and Ausonius (*Ep.* 16). All agree as to his immense wealth and boundless liberality. His wife, Anicia Faltonia Proba, belonged to the Anician house, and their sons, Probinus and Olybrius, had the unique honour of being consuls together in A.D. 395. Christian though he was, SYMMACHUS was his intimate friend, six of whose letters (*Epp.* i. 56–61) are addressed to him. (Tillemont, *Emp.* v. 42, 72.) [F. D.]

PROBUS (5), friend of Innocent I. at Rome while that pope was at Ravenna. He received instructions from Innocent (*Ep.* 36) regarding a woman who had been carried into captivity, probably *c.* A.D. 409, and returned to find her husband married again; but the pope upheld the first mairiage. Probus is said, but improbably, to have been the son of the praefect Probus and Anicia Falconia Proba [FALCONIA] (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. xx. 602; Tillemont, *H. E.* x. 646; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* vii. 524). [J. G.]

PROBUS (6), cited by St. Jerome as one to whom Lactantius addressed some epistles (Hieronymus, *Comm. in Epist. ad Galat.* l. ii. ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. xxvi. 353; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 162). [LACTANTIUS.] [J. G.]

PROBUS (7), a Christian to whom a letter of consolation on the loss of his daughter is extant, which has been ascribed to St. Augustine, but which the Benedictine editors consider to be spurious. (Aug. *Opp.* vol. ii., *App.* 117, ed. Migne.) [H. W. P.]

PROBUS (8), Nov. 13. Martyr in Africa under Genseric in the Arian persecution, A.D. 437. He suffered with three other Spanish Catholics, Arcadius, Paschasius, and Euticus. Cf. Vict. Vit. *opp.* ed. Ruinart, p. 433, where is a long letter addressed to Arcadius by Antoninus, bishop of Cirta. [G. T. S.]

PROBUS (9), a man of letters in Gaul, in the 5th century. A friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, with whom he had been educated under Eusebius at Lyons, and whose cousin Eulalia he married some time before 469. Sidonius speaks admiringly of his erudition and his judgment as a critic, but no work of his survives (Sidon. Apoll. *Epist.* vi. 1; *Carm.* ix. 329–334; xxiv. 95–8; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 649–51). [S. A. B.]

PROBUS (10), bishop of Canusium, legate c. 468, of pope Simplicius to the East, as mentioned in a letter of pope Gelasius to the bishops of Dardania (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 1207; Baronius, ann. 467, xii.; Ughelli, *Ital. Sac.* x. 36; Tillem. xv. 287). [C. H.]

PROBUS (11), bishop of Chalcedon c. A.D. 591, was sent as ambassador by the emperor Mauricius to Chosroës II., at Ctesiphon. (Theophylactus Simocatta, *Hist.* lib. v. cap. 15.) The Latin version of Theophylact makes the see Chalcis, and Le Quien (*O. C.* i. 604; ii. 788) places him under both Chalcedon and the Syrian Chalcis. The Jacobite patriarch Dionysius, quoted by Le Quien, says he was appointed to Chalcedon on his abjuring the Monophysite heresy at Constantinople, whither he had come from Alexandria, but that at the close of his life he returned to his former opinions. [J. G.]

PROBUS (12), abbat of the monastery of SS. Andrew and Lucy, at a synod held at Rome in October A.D. 601 under Gregory the Great, petitioned that he might be allowed to dispose of his property by will, so as not to leave his son unprovided for. He had devoted himself to a hermit life, and had therefore not made a will, as his son would have succeeded if he died intestate; but going one day to Gregory, he was suddenly ordered by him to become abbat of the monastery, and had therefore been unable to make any disposition of his property before entering on the office. Gregory acknowledged the truth of his allegations, and granted his petition (*S. Gregorii Epist. Appendix* 9, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1344). It is doubtful if this monastery was the same as the famous monastery of St. Andrew on the Coelian founded by Gregory himself (*S. Gregorii Vita*, i. 3, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxv. 254, note). Probus may have been the same as the abbat Probus

employed by Gregory in the peace negotiations with Queen Theodelinda (*Epist.* lib. ix. ind. ii. 43, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 975). Monks were deprived of testamentary power by Justinian, except as regarded bequests to children, as to which there were special provisions (Nov. v. 5, cxxiii. 38). [F. D.]

PROBUS (13), bishop of Reate, uncle of PROBUS (12). He narrated to Gregory the Great (*Dial.* iv. 12) a vision of SS. Juvenalis and Eleutherius, who appeared to the bishop on his death-bed. [F. D.]

PROCESSUS, martyr. [MARTINIANUS (1).]

PROCHOROS. Prochoros (*Πρόχορος not Πρόχωρος*) is the name of one of the seven deacons of the church at Jerusalem, mentioned Acts vi. 5. Later tradition makes him one of the seventy disciples, and afterwards bishop of Nicomedia in Bithynia (comp. the lists of the seventy disciples in the texts of the so-called Dorotheus, the pseudo-Hippolytus, and pseudo-Logothetes, and with these Lipsius *Apokryphische Apostelgeschichten* i. 193 sqq. *Chron. Paschale* appendix, p. 420, ed. Bonn).

Under the name of this Prochoros has been preserved an apocryphal *History of the Apostle John*, which was first published in the Greek text by Michael Neander in the appendix to the third edition of his Graeco-Latin version of Luther's Short Catechism, along with a Latin translation by Sebastian Castalio (*Catechesis Martini Lutheri parva graeco-latina postremum recognita*, Basileae 1567, pp. 526–663). The first part of Neander's text has been reprinted by J. J. Grynaeus (*Monumenta Patrum Orthodoxographa*, Basil. 1569, tom. i. p. 85), and after him by Birch (*Auctarium Codicis Apocryphi*, Copenhagen, 1804, p. 263 sqq.). The latter added some further fragments. The complete Greek text has recently been edited by the Archimandrite Amphilochios from several Moscow MSS. (Moscow, 1879), and by Professor Zahn (Erlangen, 1880), with the assistance of the MS. apparatus left behind him by Tischendorf. A new critical edition is also in contemplation by Professor Max Bonnet in Montpellier, as part of the *Supplementum Codicis Apocryphi*, which he has undertaken. We possess, besides this Greek text, an Old Latin, an Old Slavic, an Armenian, a Sahidic, an Ethiopic, and an Arabic translation. The Latin text was first published in the interpolated form of a later recension by Margarin de la Bigne (*Bibliotheca Patrum*, Paris, 1575, tom. ii., col. 185–230), and reprinted afterwards by Laurentius de la Barre in his *Historia Christiana Veterum Patrum* (Paris, 1583), fol. 1, sqq., and in the *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum* (Lugduni, 1657, tom. ii. p. i. pp. 46–67). This text is preserved in its original form in Cod. Paris. lat. 5357, saec. xiii. f. 103–127. The Old Slavic version is given by Amphilochios, along with the Greek text, from a Moscow MS. of the 15th or 16th century. The other versions are still in MS. except only a few Coptic fragments, published by Mingarelli (*Reliquiae aegyptiorum Codd. in Bibliotheca Naniana reconditorum*, Bonn, 1785, fascic. ii. p. 302 sqq.), and Giorgi (*de Miraculis S. Coluthi*, Rom. 1793, pp. 119–121), and the beginning of the Ethiopic text in the English translation of S. C. Malan (*The Conflict of the Holy Apostles*, London, 1871, pp. 117–137).

The narrative begins with the parting of the apostles and St. John's mission into Asia. In punishment for a first refusal to go by sea he suffers shipwreck on the voyage, but, after a wonderful deliverance, arrives safe at Ephesus, accompanied by Prochoros, his disciple. Here he takes service in a public bath; restores to life the owner's son, who has been slain by a demon, destroys the image of Diana (Artemis), and expels the demon which had harboured there, is banished himself, but soon returns to be again sent in exile to Patmos by command of the emperor. On the voyage to the island he restores a drowned man to life, stills a tempest, and heals a sick guardsman. The greater part of the following narrative is occupied with the wondrous deeds of the apostle in his banishment, his victorious encounters with demons and sorcerers, his refutation of a learned Jew in a public dispute, numerous miracles of healing and raising from the dead, and triumphant issues out of every conflict in which his persecuting enemies involve him. After a residence in Patmos of fifteen years he has converted almost the whole island. Permission being now given him to return to Ephesus, he first retires to a solitary place in the island (*κατάπαυσις*), and there dictates his gospel to Prochoros, and when finished leaves it behind him as a memorial of his work among the inhabitants of Patmos. He then goes by ship to Ephesus, and makes his abode there in the house of Domnus, whom he had formerly in his youth raised to life. After residing twenty-six years more at Ephesus he buries himself alive. Prochoros and six other disciples have to dig his grave, and when he has laid himself in it, to cover him with earth. On the grave being subsequently reopened the apostle has disappeared.

The text varies considerably in the MSS. and has received many additions from other sources. Some MSS. as Cod. Vat. 654; Marcian. 363; Paris. gr. 1468; Ambrosian. A. 63, contain fragments of the old Gnostic *περίοδοι* in more or less altered form, interpolated into the Prochoros text, or mixed up with it towards the end, especially in the narrative of St. John's *μετάστασις*. Some MSS. add to the narrative of the way in which the Gospel originated a similar account of the origin of the Apocalypse. (So also the printed edition of Neander.) But this second narrative is evidently a mere imitation of the former.

This writing of the alleged Prochoros is (so far at least as its main contents are concerned) not in any way a recension of the old Gnostic acts of John, but the independent work of some Catholic author. Its object is not to supersede these Gnostic acts which, though the writer makes some use of, he can hardly have known in their original text. The purpose rather seems to be to supplement the Ephesian histories of the apostle which already existed in a Catholic recension by a detailed account of his deeds and adventures in the isle of Patmos. The author can have had no local interest in its composition. His notions of the situation, size, and general characteristics of the island, which he certainly never saw, are most extraordinary. In constructing his narrative he has made only partial

use of older materials. A comparison with the Syriac history of St. John, edited by Professor Wright (*Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, edited from Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, and other libraries*, London, 1872, pp. 3-60 of the English translation), and with the text of the Gnostic μετάστασις (ap. Tischendorf *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, p. 272 sqq. and ap. Zahn *Acta Johannis*, p. 238 sqq.), will show that for the commencement and conclusion of the work the Gnostic περίοδοι, or more probably some Catholic recension of them, has been made use of. Two other stories have, with a few alterations, been borrowed from the περίοδοι 'Ανδρέου —that of Procliana and Sosipater (p. 135, 12 seqq. ed. Zahn), with which compare the similar narrative in the Latin *Virtutes Andreae* (ap. Abdias in Fabricius *Cod. Apocryph.* N. T. ii. 461), and that of St. John assisting at a birth (p. 115 sqq. ed. Zahn), compare Fabricius ii. 295. But the most, by far, of these narrations of the pretended Prochoros are free inventions of his own. None of these independent narratives betray any leaning towards Gnosticism. The author looks with favour on matrimonial life, takes pleasure in eating and drinking, and shows no tendency to ascetic views except where he draws from older sources. Nor is he led by dogmatic interests. Even in discourses attributed to the apostle the theological element is quite subordinate. He takes no notice of the Apocalypse, and in opposition to the older tradition places the composition of the gospel in Patmos. The account given of this is certainly not derived from the Gnostic Περίοδοι.

The date of composition of this work cannot be set later than the middle of the 5th century, since it is made use of, not only in the *Chronicon Paschale* (p. 761, 470, ed. Bonn, cf. Zahn, p. 162, 3 sqq.), but also in the accounts of the apostles attributed to Dorotheus, Hippolytus, and others. The *terminus a quo* is the end of the 4th or beginning of the 5th century, since it is from that time onwards, and not before that, Catholic writers appear to have been acquainted with the Gnostic histories of the apostles. With this, moreover, agrees the fact, that the author can assume a universal diffusion of Christianity in Ephesus, and in the islands of the Aegean Archipelago. It is more difficult to determine the place of composition. The author is certainly not a native of Asia Minor, but rather perhaps of Antioch, or the coast region of Syria and Palestine. He is, at any rate, better acquainted with the topography of that part of the world than with the neighbourhood of Ephesus. Of his personal circumstances no more can be said than that he certainly was not a monk; perhaps he was a married cleric, possibly a layman.[a] Compare Zahn, *Acta Joannis*, Erlangen, 1880; Lipsius, *Die Apocryphen Apostelgeschichten*, i. 355-408. [R. A. L.]

PROCLIANITAE. Heretics mentioned by Philaster (*Haer.* 56), but concerning whom, if they existed at all, we have no independent information. [See HERMIAS, Vol. II. p. 927 b; HERMOGENES, Vol. III. 36.] Praedestinatus (*Haer.* 60) calls the sect Proclinianistae, deriving the name from Proclianus. This article, compared with its original, the corresponding article in the tract of Augustine, does honour to the writer's powers of invention. [G. S.]

PROCLIANUS, bishop, who had assisted the Christians of Suedra in Pamphylia to resist the teachings of the Arian heretics, c. A.D. 374. (Epiphanius, *Epist.* preceding the *Ancoratus*; Tillem. x. 502; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* vi. 414.) [J. G.]

PROCLUS (1) (PROCULUS), a Montanist teacher, and probably the introducer of Montanism into Rome at the very beginning of the 3rd century. For the account given by Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.* 1) of the apparently favourable reception which the new prophesying at first met with at Rome, and its subsequent rejection, see MONTANISM (Vol. III. p. 940 a). Proclus was publicly opposed by Caius, commonly called a Roman presbyter, and the record of their disputation, though now lost, was read by Eusebius and is mentioned by several other writers. [CAIUS, Vol. I. 385 a; MONTANUS, Vol. III. p. 941 a]. Pseudo-Tertullian states (*Haer.* 21) that the Montanists were divided into two sections by the Patripassian controversy, Proclus being the leader of the section whose doctrine on that subject agreed with that of the church, and Aeschines of the opposite section. This schism among the Montanists is mentioned also by Hippolytus (*Ref.* viii. 19).

We can scarcely be wrong in identifying Proclus the Montanist with the Proculus whom Tertullian in his tract against the Valentinians (c. 5) calls "Proculus noster, virginis senectae et Christianae eloquentiae dignitas." He there refers to him as one who like Justin Martyr, Miltiades and Irenaeus, had laboured successfully in the confutation of heresy. Proculus is also mentioned as a leader of the Montanists by Pacian (*Ep. ad Sympron.*), and no doubt it is his name which is disguised as Patroclus in the MSS. of Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* iii. 2). [G. S.]

PROCLUS (2), ST., patriarch of Constantinople, was ordained a reader in his childhood, and afterwards studied in the schools of rhetoric at Constantinople. The friend and disciple of Chrysostom, he became secretary to ATTICUS, who ordained him deacon and priest. On the death of Atticus, some desired him as the new patriarch, while others favoured Philippus, but the majority wished for SISINNIUS, who was ultimately appointed. Sisinnius consecrated him bishop of Cyzicus, but the people there refused to receive him, and he remained at Constantinople. On the death of Sisinnius, the

[a] The narratives of this pretended Prochoros appear to have found much favour, for they are frequently repeated. Besides the writings above referred to as having made use of Prochoros, we may mention here the Greek Menologia and Encomiasts. The great Greek *Menaea* for 26 September (Venice, 1683, p. 170 sqq.) give a long extract from Prochoros. Shorter excerpts are found in the Menologion of the emperor Basilius Porphyrogennetes (ed. Albani, i. p. 70; ed. Migne, *Patr. Graec.* cxvii. 74), the Encomium on St. John by Nicetas David the Paphlagonian (Combefis, *Auctar. Novissimum*, i. 354 sqq.) and Nicephorus Callistus (*Hist. Ecc.* ii. 42). The *Vita Joannis* of Symeon Metaphrastes (Greek and Latin text in Oecumenii *Opp.* ed. Paris, 1631, tom. ii. p. 838 sqq. and in Migne, cxvi. 683 sqq.) is also in some measure derived from Prochoros.

old rivalry broke out between the partisans of Philippus and those of Proclus, and again a third person was chosen by the emperor, namely, the famous NESTORIUS. In reply to the latter, early in A.D. 429, on a festival of the Virgin, Proclus preached the celebrated sermon on the Incarnation, which is inserted in the beginning of the Acts of the Council of Ephesus. Once more for the third time, on the deposition of Nestorius, Philippus and Proclus appear as rivals, and for the third time, the difficulty was avoided by the choice of a third person, MAXIMINIANUS (5). The excuse for passing over Proclus was, that translations were unlawful, and that he was already bishop of Cyzicus. At last, when Maximianus died on Thursday before Easter A.D. 434, Proclus was by the permission of Theodosius immediately enthroned by the bishops at Constantinople. Theodosius took this course to anticipate troubles, such as had attended the last three appointments, and the scruples felt about translation had been removed by the letters of pope Celestine to Cyril of Alexandria, John of Antioch, and Rufus of Thessalonica on the subject of translation. His first care was the funeral of his predecessor, and he then sent both to Cyril and John of Antioch, the usual synodical letters announcing his appointment, both of whom approved of it. In 436, the bishops of Armenia consulted him upon certain doctrines prevalent in their country, and attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia, asking for their condemnation. The next year Proclus replied in the celebrated letter known as the Tome of Proclus, which he sent to the Eastern bishops, asking them to sign it, and to join in his condemnation of the doctrines submitted to him by the Armenians. They approved of the letters, but from their admiration of the deceased Theodore, could not bring themselves to join in condemning the doctrines attributed to him. Proclus replied that while he desired the extracts subjoined to his Tome to be condemned, he had not attributed them to Theodore or any person dead or alive, and shewed thereby that he did not desire the condemnation of any person. A rescript from Theodosius procured by Proclus, which declared it was his intention that all should live in peace, and that no imputation should be made against any one who died in communion with the church, appeased the storm. The whole affair shewed conspicuously the moderation, and tact of Proclus. In 438, he transported to Constantinople from Comana, and interred with great honour in the church of the Apostles, the remains of his old master St. Chrysostom, and thereby reconciled to the church his adherents who had separated in consequence of his condemnation. The next year at the request of a deputation from Caesarea in Cappadocia, he selected as their new bishop Thalassius, who was about to be appointed praetorian prefect of the East. It was in the time of Proclus that the Trisagion came into use. The occasion is said to have been a time when violent earthquakes lasted for four months at Constantinople, so that the people were obliged to leave the city and encamp in the adjoining fields. Proclus died most probably in July 446, though some authorities defer his death till the following year. He appears to have been a wise and moderate man, of conciliatory temper, desirous, while strictly adhering to orthodoxy himself, to win over those who differed from him by persuasion rather than force.

The first edition of the collected works of Proclus, was that by Richard at Rome in 1630. Several other editions have since been published, and the whole is reprinted in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lxv. 651. They consist of twenty sermons, originally published by Richard, some, however, being of doubtful authenticity, of five more just published by Card. Mai (*Spic. Rom.* iv. xliii. lxxviii.), of which three are preserved only in a Syriac version, the Greek being lost, of seven letters along with several addressed to him by other persons, and of a few fragments of other letters and sermons. Proclus is commemorated on October 24. (His own works: Socrates, *H. E.* vii. xxvi.—and *passim;* Theophanes, *sub an.* 430; Tillemont, *M. E.* xiv. 704; *AA.SS.* Act. x. 639.) [F. D.]

PROCLUS (3). The last of great Neoplatonists, and second only to Plotinus among them. He was born A.D. 412, and died A.D. 485. Of his life, which was written by his disciple Marinus, the following is an abstract. His father Patricius, and his mother Marcella, were both natives of Lycia; he himself was born in Byzantium, but was shortly afterwards brought back by his parents to their native country. Here he was cured of an illness that seemed likely to be fatal, by the personal aid of Apollo, who appeared before him, and proclaiming who he was, touched the head of Proclus and vanished. After some grammatical instruction in Lycia, Proclus went to Alexandria, where he lived with the rhetorician Leonas, who treated him with great familiarity and kindness, and for whom Proclus performed some domestic offices. He also was instructed by Orion the grammarian; and was at first intended for his father's profession, that of the law. He preferred, however, the study of rhetoric, and made great proficiency in it. While engaged in this pursuit, he accompanied Leonas on a journey from Byzantium, returning from which place, he determined to abandon rhetoric, and apply himself to philosophy. He frequented the lectures of Olympiodorus, the Peripatetic (not to be confounded with the commentator of that name, who was long subsequent), and also those of Hero the mathematician. He shewed his extraordinary powers of memory on one occasion by repeating almost verbatim a speech which Olympiodorus had just delivered; which was the more remarkable, as Olympiodorus, both from the difficulty of his subjects and the quickness of his utterance, was by no means an easy speaker to follow.

Proclus, however, was dissatisfied with these instructors; and mindful of an admonition he had received from the goddess Minerva at the time of his first embracing the philosophic life, he betook himself to Athens. Here he was met by Nicolaus, also a Lycian by birth, whose guest he became. It was regarded as a favourable omen that the first place in Attica in which Proclus sat down or drank water was close to a temple dedicated to Socrates. At Athens Proclus became the disciple of the celebrated philosopher Syrianus, whose acquaintance he made under circumstances which shewed to each

of them their community in religious observances; for having met casually and exchanged some remarks, they presently went apart to pay their devotions severally to the thin crescent of the new moon, which was just appearing. Whether they saw each other while engaged in this worship, is not stated; but Lachares, who was with Syrianus at the time, observed the act of Proclus, and drew deductions favourable to his virtue and intelligence. Proclus had not completed his twentieth year when he was introduced by Syrianus to the philosopher Plutarch, then very advanced in years, who treated him with great kindness, and advised him to lay aside in part his vegetarian habits. Proclus read with Syrianus the whole of Aristotle, and afterwards Plato; his industry was unwearied, and by the time he was twenty-eight years of age he had composed a variety of philosophical works, among them his commentary on the Timaeus of Plato.

Proclus, unlike Plotinus, did not discourage his friends from pursuing a political life, and even at times took part in it himself; indeed he advised Archiadas, who was his greatest friend, towards this kind of action. He was never married; though, says Marinus, many wealthy persons were desirous of being allied to him; among whom was Olympiodorus, his first preceptor in philosophy, who offered him his daughter. He was singularly regardful of his friends; when any of them fell ill, he would first earnestly supplicate the gods with sacrifices and hymns. Afterwards he himself attended the sick, and consulted the physicians on their behalf. On one occasion he is said, with the aid of Aesculapius, to have effected a miraculous cure. He appears to have had a certain authority over the teachers of philosophy, and his rebukes of them, when they were negligent, were sometimes perhaps even too vehement; but he was easily appeased. He was very temperate, and is said to have weakened himself by abstinence. Yet he lived seventy-five years; but in the last five years of his life he is said not to have had the perfect use of his powers. He died in the year after an eclipse of the sun, which Marinus, as was to be expected, regards as a foreshadowing of so weighty an event.

It would be a waste of space to recount all the various instances, which Marinus delights in telling, of the devotion of Proclus to Minerva, Pan, and other heathen deities, and of the assistance which those deities gave their votary. In no respect does Proclus, who practically concludes the Neoplatonic school, stand in stronger contrast with Plotinus, who almost begins it, than in the flood of minute ceremonialism and specific acts of intercourse with nameable deities in which he is involved, as compared with the high and pure abstract religion of Plotinus. It must be held to be a mark of weakness in a philosophy, when it could descend in this way and to so great a degree. Nor has the life of Proclus any of those marks of true vitality, of living interest in men, which appear in the life of Plotinus; much is said of his virtues, but little in such a way as to persuade us that they were real. Nor can we regard his saying, that if he had despotic power, he would destroy all the writings of antiquity except the Oracles and the Timaeus of Plato, as anything but a proof of want of sanity of judgment, and blameable indifference to all that had interested men up to that time.

Still, we may suspect that something of the unsatisfactory impression which the life of Proclus leaves upon us, is due to the weakness of his biographer. Those of his writings which have descended to us are certainly not without power. When, leaving the concrete forms of Minerva, Apollo, and the other well-known heathen deities, we come to the exposition of deity in its own nature, as flowing out from a central unity and goodness into all the world of being, affecting different natures in different degrees, but kindling in all an image of itself, we are sensible of something sublime in such a conception. This is, indeed, one of the central ideas of the Neoplatonic philosophy; it is really the same in Proclus as in Plotinus, though there is a greater show of system and formal deduction in Proclus. This systematisation it is which appears to Victor Cousin so great a merit in Proclus, as to raise him, in a certain way, above all previous philosophers. With that opinion few have coincided; and it is an opinion the truth of which is entirely dependent on the question, whether the systematisation itself, apart from the ideas supposed to be systematised, is correct. It is impossible to answer this question entirely in the affirmative; and though to say that the systematisation of Proclus was entirely futile would be disparaging it too much, still this cannot be considered the striking element in the philosophy; it is too imperfect to count for very much. There are flashes of light in Proclus, but they derive little addition from the feebler rays around them, though there is a connection throughout the whole. The following, for example, is a striking remark: "Bonum autem non appetens esse aliquid entium impossibile. Omnia autem entia et facta sunt, et sunt propter desiderium istud, et salvantur secundum hoc." "Good, that does not seek to realise itself in the world, is an impossibility. All existent things have come into being by reason of this desire, and are preserved in accordance with it."—*De Malorum Subsistentia*, pp. 199–200 of vol. i. of Cousin's edition (the Greek original is lost; the Latin translation is by Guilelmus Morbeka, Archbishop of Corinth in the 12th century). But the speculations on the nature of evil which surround this passage, though not to be called feeble, possess no penetrative power. So again in the 140th proposition of his "Elements of Theology," the sentence, "All things sympathise with all," is one that Taylor, the translator, the celebrated Platonist, calls sublime; it may remind us, longo intervallo, of St. Paul's, "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." The following sentences, from the proof to the 122nd proposition of the "Elements of Theology," compresses into a small space what may almost be called the pith of the Neoplatonic philosophy: "The gods abiding in their uniform nature and original substance, fill all things with their power. And everything which is able to participate, enjoys the goods which it is capable of receiving according to the measure of its proper subsistence; the gods in the meantime, through being itself, or rather through a nature prior to being, pouring their illumina-

tions on everything which exists." The "nature prior to being," of which Proclus here speaks, is a phrase which recalls Hegelian philosophy; the extract, however, is intelligible enough on the whole. A specimen of Proclus, in his less lucid phase, may be found in the forty-fourth proposition of the same "Elements," which tells us that "Everything converted to itself according to energy, is also converted to itself according to essence."

There is, it cannot be denied, something pathetic in the picture we find, whether in Proclus, or Hierocles, or in the writings that have come to us under the name of Hermes Trismegistus, of expiring Paganism. The religion to which Socrates had with much simplicity and sincerity conformed, though of course he was aware of its many failings, is here seen trying to divest itself of those failings, to put on new garments, and associate itself with a living practical strength, and to support itself in the region of pure reason by a well-considered philosophy. On the whole, notwithstanding the practical failure of the complex system thus described in its entirety, there were elements in it worthy not to be forgotten, some amount of permanent truth capable of giving light in perpetuity to the generations of mankind.

There is no edition of the entire works of Proclus; but the editions by Victor Cousin, the first of six volumes octavo (Paris, 1820), containing the commentaries on the first Alcibiades and the Parmenides, and the three treatises *De libertate, providentiâ et malo* (in a Latin translation), the second of one volume quarto (Paris, 1864) containing the hymns also (besides the above-named works), will probably be the best for an English reader who wishes to obtain a knowledge of the philosopher. Yet perhaps more genius is displayed in the two quarto volumes by Thomas Taylor, containing translations of the commentary on Euclid and the "Elements of Theology," together with a variety of essays; wherein the reader will certainly not complain of want of enthusiasm, whatever be his judgment as to the opinions expressed. Besides these may be mentioned the treatise *De mundi aeternitate, viginti duo argumenta adversus Christianos, cum refutatione J. Philoponi* (Venet. 1535, fol.); *In Platonis theologiam libri sex* (Hamb. 1618, fol.); *De unitate et pulchritudine* (p. 71 of Creuzer's *Plotinus*, Heidelberg, 1814, 8vo); *Paraphrasis in quatuor Ptolemaei libros de siderum effectionibus* (Leyden, 1635, 8vo); and the *Commentarius in Platonis Timaeum*, edited by Schneider (Breslau, 1847, 8vo). This last was the favourite treatise of its author. [J. R. M.]

PROCOPIUS (1), July 8. A native of Aelia (Jerusalem) and Martyr at Caesarea in the Diocletian persecution. He was a noted ascetic, and had served three distinct offices in the church of Scythopolis, those of lector, interpreter of the Syrian language, and exorcist. The second of these shews that divine offices were then celebrated in Syriac. He was arrested by Flavianus, the president, whom he roused to frenzy by a quotation from the Iliad, ii. 204, when he pressed him to offer libations to the four emperors:—Οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη, εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω:—(Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* c. i.; Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* pp. 330, 372.) [G. T. S.]

PROCOPIUS (2), priest of Tyre, editor of the tract upon the seventy disciples of Christ attributed to his bishop DOROTHEUS (2). (Fabric *Bib. Gr.* vii. 566 ed. Harles; Ceill. xi. 747 n.) [J. G.]

PROCOPIUS (3), an officer of the Imperial Court, commissioned by Theodosius to summon Gregory Nazianzen to the council held at Constantinople in 382. Gregory wrote to Procopius to excuse himself from obeying the mandate. He had never known any good arise from councils of bishops, which rather aggravated than remedied the evils of the church. He had therefore resolved to avoid all such meetings. Had it not been so, his state of health would have forbidden his attendance. He begs Procopius will make his excuses to the emperor. (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 55, p. 814.) [E. V.]

PROCOPIUS (4), an intimate friend of Gregory Nazianzen, who addresses him in familiar terms, excusing himself for not having attended the nuptials of Olympias (*Ep.* 193, al. 57, A.D. 384 or 385; Tillem. xi. 419), and congratulating him on having another son-in-law (*Ep.* 194 al. 58). Tillemont (xi. 417) thinks that he was the uncle and guardian of Olympias, and that he might have been the son-in-law of the emperor Valens mentioned by Zosimus (v. 8, p. 257, ed. Bonn.; Du Cange, *Fam. Aug.* p. 47 in *Hist. Byzant.* ed. 1729). [C. H.]

PROCOPIUS (5), solitary in Rhodes, visited at the end of A.D. 400 or beginning of 401 by PORPHYRIUS bishop of Gaza, and John bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, on their way to Constantinople. By his counsel their mission was greatly aided. (Praetermissi for Feb. 26 and *Vita Porphyrii*, v. 34–36, viii. 55, 56, in Boll. *Acta SS.* 26 Feb. iii. 629 sq. new ed.; Tillem. xi. 164.) [C. H.]

PROCOPIUS (6), a layman of rank addressed by Chrysostom. (Chrys. *Ep.* 287.) [E. V.]

PROCOPIUS (7), Julianist bishop of Ephesus. [JULIANUS (47).] [C. H.]

PROCOPIUS (8) GAZAEUS, Christian sophist under the emperors Justin and Justinian (A.D. 518–565). Of his life nothing is known beyond his being preceptor of Choricius the sophist. His fame rests on his Scripture Commentaries, which, though diffuse, are but abridgements of the collections he had made (see his *Prologus* to the commentary on Genesis): his profession of belief regarding the nature of the Triune God, the authority and inspiration of Scripture, and the importance of the sacred volume is very satisfactory. His style is highly polished and concise. He must be distinguished from his contemporary the sophist, Procopius Caesariensis. His collected works are published by Migne, *Patr. Graec.* t. lxxxvii. in three parts, but his commentaries have also appeared separately. Of more doubtful authority and probably belonging to Procopius Caesariensis, though commonly attributed to P. Gazaeus, is *Panegyricus in Imperatorem Anastasium* (Greek and Latin) in *Corp. Script. Hist. Byz.* Bonnae 1829, pp. 489 sq., and Migne, *Patr. Graec.* t. lxxxvii. pt. iii.: *Descriptio Basilicae Sanctae Sophiae* (Greek and Latin), Migne, t. lxxxvii.

pt. iii.: and *Monodia in Sanctam Sophiam terraemotu collapsam* (Greek and Latin), in Migne, t. lxxxvii. pt. iii. (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 176 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 504; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* vi. 258; vii. 535; viii. 375; ix. 447; Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* xii. 199). [J. G.]

PROCOPIUS (9) OF CAESAREA, known as Procopius Caesariensis, in order to distinguish him from one or two others of the same name, is generally recognised as one of the last of the Byzantine historians. He enjoyed great reputation in his own time, as is clear from the fact that he is referred to in very laudatory terms by Evagrius (iv. 12, 13), and that it was in no small degree owing to the impression made by his history upon Agathias that the latter was led to take to the writing of history himself, and to continue the work which his forerunner had begun (AGATHIAS).

Procopius was born at Caesarea in Palestine, but the year of his birth is unknown. From Caesarea he went during the reign of Anastasius to Constantinople, the city to which all aspiring spirits were then attracted. There he taught rhetoric for a time, and pleaded in the courts. He must have done so with success, for he was entrusted by the emperor Justinian with highly honourable and responsible duties, received from him the rarely bestowed title of Illustrious, and in his later years was appointed a senator and praefect of Constantinople.

We meet with him first about A.D. 527, when he was sent by Justinian to accompany the celebrated commander Belisarius, as his secretary and privy councillor, in his expeditions against the Persians. This honourable position he retained, both in that and in all the subsequent campaigns of the great "Africanus of New Rome." In the year 533 he was with him in Africa, warring against the Vandals, and, after their subjection had been effected, he was left behind to reduce the conquered into order. A mutiny of the soldiers drove him in the year 536 to Sicily, which Belisarius was engaged at the time in reducing to subjection, and from this he accompanied him into Italy in his campaign against the Goths. In the year 542 he returned to Constantinople, where he appears to have remained to the end of his life, devoting himself mainly to the composition of a history of those expeditions of which he had not only been an eye-witness, but in which he had himself borne no unimportant part.

As in the case of Agathias it is a question whether Procopius was a Christian or a heathen. Gibbon speaks of the point as "an honourable problem," and concludes that the religion of both betrays "occasional conformity with a secret attachment to paganism and philosophy" (*History*, chap. xl.). It can hardly be doubted that the conclusion thus come to is just. Many expressions no doubt occur in the writings of our author which would seem to warrant the conviction that he was a Christian. He speaks of the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople as the temple of the great Christ of God (τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ μεγάλου Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *De Bello Vandal.* i. 6). He describes Jesus as the Son of God who went about clothed with a human body, showing that He was the Son of God both by His sinless life and His superhuman deeds (*De Bello Pers.* ii. 12). Christians are in his eyes these who have right opinions respecting God (*De Bello Vandal.* i. 21). The Virgin Mary is often mentioned under the name θεοτόκος (e.g. *De Aedif.* v. 7). The Hellenic religion is alluded to as impiety (*De Aedif.* vi. 4). He relates various miracles performed by good men (*De Bello Pers.* vii.); and he even gives credit to the story of the martyrs who, after their tongues had been cut out from the root by Honorius, king of the Vandals, spoke as plainly as though they had received no injury; but two of whom, having afterwards committed fornication, lost their power of speech for ever (*De Bello Vandal.* i. 8). He believed also in prodigies, although at the same time he expresses his doubts of some that he relates. On the other hand, however, he often alludes alike to Christians and heretics as if he occupied a calm position superior to them both (*De Bello Pers.* i. 18), and the latter are more especially described by him in one place as those who are "called" heretics (*Hist. Arc.*). He disapproves at the same time of theological discussions, holding that the nature of God is beyond the comprehension of man, and that it is enough for us to believe that He is wholly good, and that He has all things in His power. In one passage he speaks of the affairs of mortals as not governed by human counsels but by some divine impulse, which men, not knowing the causes of events and only marking their issues, are wont to call fortune (*Hist. Arc.* 4). In respect to other controverted points it was his opinion that every one, whether priest or layman, ought to be allowed to think as he pleases (*De Bello Goth.* i. 3). Sentiments such as these are not easily reconcileable with the idea that Procopius had fully embraced the Church's faith; and the whole tone of his writings leads to the same conclusion. He was certainly alive to the follies and impieties of heathenism, and had gathered from Christianity many just views of God and of religion; but he seems to have looked at the whole matter with the eye of a philosopher rather than with that of a humble and sincere follower of Christ. The controversies of the Church had done much to alienate him from the reception of doctrinal Christianity; and, though he does speak at times as if he had embraced some of its distinct tenets, it is hardly possible to think that he had done so in the sense in which they were understood by those who regarded them as an express revelation of divine truth to man. The hair-splitting discussions of the theologians of his time appear to have done much to awaken in his mind a suspicion of, and distaste for, theology.

The works of Procopius were numerous and extensive. They consist of a history of the Persian war in two books, embracing the time from the year 408 to the year 549; of a history of the war with the Vandals in Africa, including events from the year 395 to the year 545; of a history of the Gothic war in four books, giving an account of the wars in Italy with the Goths from the year 487 to the year 574; of a work *De Aedificiis Justiniani Imp.* in six books, and of another work entitled *Anecdota* or a secret history of Justinian, the empress Theodora, Belisarius, his wife Antonina, and others of the court. This last work, which was intended for publication only after the author's death, is

described by Cave in the strongest terms of reprobation, as written with the purpose of shewing that the court of Justinian was no better than a *diabolorum lerna*, and as exhibiting such an amount of audacity, falsehood, calumny, and unheard of crimes laid to the charge of those of whom it treats, that it has been doubted by many whether Procopius was really the author. So infamous was the work in many of the particulars which it detailed that it was thought necessary to suppress a considerable portion of it relating to Theodora, and that it is only to be found in full in MS. in the Vatican. It is unnecessary to say more of this work than that, although there may be exaggeration in many parts and a too easy reception of calumnious stories, it is not possible to gain a correct notion of the time and of its leading personages without consulting it. Much of it is confirmed from other quarters, and history has too often had to tell that the public heroes of the world were in private its scandal and its shame. (This whole point will be found discussed in Schröckh, vol. xvi., page 168, etc.) The three works first mentioned alone deserve our attention.

As to their value there can be no doubt. Procopius had enjoyed the most favourable opportunities of making himself acquainted with the events which he describes. He had borne a part in the expeditions related by him, and had been in constant and close communion with Belisarius as his adviser and friend. It is certainly possible that he may have been thus led to flatter the emperor, his general, and the other distinguished persons whom he mentions; and if the Anecdota be really his work, and written as is supposed with the view of correcting the false impressions conveyed by his history as to his leading characters, he has irretrievably damaged his own historical credibility. Even then, however, his writings must be accepted as an important contribution to the history of a period for our knowledge of which we are indeed mainly dependent upon him. His sense of the value of history was deep (*De Aedif. Preface*). He felt that truth should be its distinguishing characteristic, and his resolution was to give a faithful account of everything, whether commendable or not, which he related, concealing nothing, even in the case of his dearest friends (*De Bello Pers.* i. 1). He largely carried out his intention. His work is enlivened by descriptions of cities and buildings, as well as of the manners and customs, and of the religion and art, of the peoples mentioned by him. Among other things of this kind he gives us an interesting description of Great Britain (*De Bello Goth.* iv. 20). His occasional remarks too display shrewdness of observation, as when he says that men are more ashamed of the name of base acts than of the acts themselves (*De Bello Goth.* iv. 15). Photius speaks of him as having gained eternal fame, and Gibbon draws largely on what he calls the "sober testimony of Procopius," while he again describes him as "the gravest historian of the times" (chap. xxxviii.).

The work of Procopius *De Aedificiis* is throughout a tribute to the glory of Justinian. It consists of five books, and is devoted to an enumeration and description of the great buildings, temples, forts, castles, bridges, monasteries, and structures of every description which were erected by that emperor in all the different parts of the Roman empire. After a modest preface the author begins with a description of the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, after which he gives an account of other great buildings erected in the east. From them he turns to the west, to Epirus, Macedonia, Thessaly, and Illyricum. He then retraces his steps and passes through the different provinces of Asia Minor to Palestine and Mount Sinai. Finally, entering Africa, he speaks of what had been done at Alexandria, and in all the cities of the Proconsular province of North Africa, until he terminates his narrative at the Pillars of Hercules. The whole work is penned in a spirit of exaggerated laudation of Justinian; but, in a geographical point of view, it is extremely valuable. It is interspersed too with many notices of the different nations among whom the buildings spoken of were erected, of natural phenomena, and of religious observances.

The works of Procopius may be consulted with advantage for information on such points as the following:—the condition of the nations and tribes of the Abasgi, Bruchi, Alani, Franks, Goths, Huns, Persians, Vandals; the wars of Belisarius, together with his character and life; geographical notices of towns, rivers, seas, mountains, and countries over a wide spread area of the world; the names of the bishops, and the ecclesiastical occurrences of his time, &c.

The following editions of his works may be mentioned:—David Hoeschelius, Augustae Vindelicorum, A.D. 1607. Claudius Maltretus, Paris 1662, and again Venice 1729, with a Latin translation; also a Latin translation of the books on the Persian war, and on the war with the Vandals, Rome 1509, Basle 1531, Leyden 1594; Latin translation of the books on the Gothic war by Pers. Christ. Persona, Rome 1506, Basle 1531, Leyden 1594. The best edition is that of Dindorf in the Corpus Script. Hist. Byz., with the Latin translation of Maltritus. His history was translated into German by P. F. Kanngiesser, 4 vols. Greifswald 1827–1831. The *Anecdota* were published by Allemannus at Leyden in 1624, who defends their authorship by Procopius, and again by Eichel at Helmstadt in 1654. The latter writer disputes their trustworthiness. An English translation was published in London in 1682. Grotius embodied in his history of the Goths, etc. two books of the Vandals and four of the Goths, 1655. [W. M.]

PROCULA (1), daughter of Euchrocia, the Priscillianist, and Delpidius, an orator and poet of Gaul. She accompanied her mother from Bordeaux with Priscillian and his colleagues to Italy. Injurious calumnies against her were vigorously circulated by their opponents. Her mother shared the fate of Priscillian, and was beheaded at Treves 386. It is not recorded what became of her (Sulp. Sev. ii. 48). [M. B. C.]

PROCULA (2), a widowed matron at Constantinople, one of the deaconesses of the church under Chrysostom. She was one of those who stood by him to the last, and of whom he took the affecting farewell described by Palladius in the baptistery of the cathedral. (Pallad. p. 90.) [E. V.]

PROCULEIANUS, Donatist bishop of Hippo, having held his appointment for some years before that of St. Augustine as catholic bishop of the see, A.D. 395. Soon after his own appointment Augustine invited Proculeianus to discuss in a friendly manner the points at issue between the two parties, apologising for the somewhat excessive vehemence of his friend Evodius [EVODIUS (3) Vol. II. 429). Proculeianus at first consented, on condition that the discussion should be held in the presence of ten witnesses on each side, men of weight and good character, and be conducted on grounds of scripture. But he soon put off his consent with a frivolous condition, that Augustine should go either to Constantina or Mileum, where he said a council was shortly to be held. Meanwhile Victor, a Donatist presbyter, had received into the communion of his sect and rebaptized a young man who, having been reproved by his bishop for beating his mother, had passed over to the Donatists. On this subject Augustine wrote two letters to his friend Eusebius, requesting him to enquire whether Victor had received orders to act thus from Proculeianus, repeating his wish for a discussion, and in the second letter mentioning another instance of the same kind of behaviour in the case of a sub-deacon of the Spanish church, called Primus [PRIMUS (7)]. To the refusal of Proculeianus to meet his challenge Augustine refers in his letter to the Donatist party (Aug. *Ep.* 33, 34, 35; 76, 4; 88, 7). This was about A.D. 403. Two or three years later Augustine had occasion to complain of acts of extreme violence used by the Circumcellions, especially to a presbyter, Restitutus, of Victoriana, who had returned to the Catholic church, and also a sub-deacon under Marcianus, Donatist bishop of Urgi, whom, in revenge for his bishop's defection, the Donatist clergy (clerici) almost killed with stones, but Marcianus escaped. Of these complaints Proculeianus took no notice, and when called on by the municipal authorities to account for his behaviour, refused to do so (*Ep.* 88, 6, 7; 103, 3; *c. Cresc.* iii. 48, 53), A.D. c. 406. He was a troublesome neighbour to Augustine during his adverse tenure of the see of Hippo, but appears to have died before the conference in 411, as Macrobius is mentioned as Donatist bishop at that time. (*Carth. Coll.* i. 138; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 183; iii. p. 20.) [H. W. P.]

PROCULUS (1), proconsul of Asia. [QUINTILIANUS (1).]

PROCULUS, Montanist. [PROCLUS.]

PROCULUS (2), Numidian bishop addressed Cyp. *Ep.* 62. See JANUARIUS (1) and *Ep.* 70. Syn. Carth., de Bap. Haer. 1. [E. W. B.]

PROCULUS (3), a bishop present at the council against Paul of Samosata (Euseb. vii. 30). [C. H.]

PROCULUS (4), ST., and martyr, whose cult at Bologna is mentioned by Paulinus of Nola (*Carm.* xxiv. 427–430). He was put to death with SS. Agricola and Vitalis by having his body pierced with nails. He is said to have been a soldier, and to have suffered in the persecution of Diocletian. He is commemorated June 1 (*AA. SS.* Jun. i. 48; Tillemont, *M. E.* v. 135). On the same day a bishop of the same name is also commemorated at Bologna, who is said to have suffered under Totila. He is not recognised by Gams among the bishops of Bologna (*AA. SS.* Jun. i. 77). [F. D.]

PROCULUS (5), ST., alleged bishop of Verona, said to have presented himself in the persecution of Diocletian with SS. FIRMUS (3) and Rusticus before Anulinus, who, however, refused to gratify his desire for martyrdom, but beat him and drove him out of the city. He is said to have afterwards visited Jerusalem; to have been taken prisoner and sold as a slave on his return, but to have regained his liberty, and returned to Verona, and to have died at a very advanced age. He is commemorated on March 23 (*AA. SS.* iii. 448; Tillemont, *M. E.* v. 138). [F. D.]

PROCULUS (6), judge in Alexandria, who presided at the trial and martyrdom of SS. Didymus and Theodora V. A.D. 340 (Ruinart, *Act. Mart.* 428 sq. ed. 1859). [J. G.]

PROCULUS (7), bishop of Marseilles, in the latter part of the 4th century, but in what year he became bishop is not ascertained. He certainly was present at the council of Aquileia, A.D. 381, and joined there in condemning the errors of Palladius and Secundinianus (Ambros. *Ep.* viii. pp. 916 (786), 935 (802), 939 (805), ed. Migne). At the council of Turin, A.D. 399, or more probably 401, though Fleury places it as late as 404, Proculus claimed the primacy as metropolitan over the churches, not only of his own province, but also of Narbonensis Secunda. The council, while it laid down the rule that the bishop of the city, which was the civil metropolis in its province, should be regarded as the metropolitan, sanctioned nevertheless the claim of Proculus for his own life, in consideration of his age and high reputation (Bruns, *Conc.* ii. 114; Baronius, vol. v. 397, 43; Fleury, *H. E.* xxi. 52). His high character is acknowledged by St. Jerome in his letter to Rusticus, A.D. 411 (Hieron. *Ep.* 125, 20), but pope Zosimus appears justly or unjustly to have taken up a strong feeling against him, and in 417, September 29, decreed that Patroclus, who became bishop of Arles in 412, was entitled to the rank of metropolitan, and cancelled all consecrations made both by Proculus and by Simplicianus, bishop of Vienne, without the metropolitan's concurrence. Besides other charges Zosimus censured him for having ordained Lazarus, after his condemnation by the council of Turin, at which Proculus was present, and also Ursus and Tuentius without the participation of the bishop of Arles; but respecting these two last there appears to be much doubt (Fleury, *H. E.* xxiii. 45; Baronius, vol. v. 417, 26–44 and 51, 52; Tillemont, vol. x. p. 694). He summoned him to appear at Rome, but to this summons Proculus paid no attention, and in the following year Zosimus took steps to deprive him of his see, but towards the end of the year he died, and his decree was not carried out by his successor (Baronius, vol. v. 418, 40, 41, 75). Whether Proculus was the same as the Gallic bishop of that name, to whom St. Augustine wrote, A.D. 427, is not quite clear (LEPORIUS (1) vol. iii. 702); but if this were the case, he must have been also the bishop of Marseilles, who was

said by pope Celestine to have rejoiced over the death of Patroclus, A.D. 426, and must at the later date have reached nearly, if not quite, the fiftieth year of his episcopate (Fleury, *H. E.* xxiv. 49, 55; Tillemont, vol. x. pp. 698, 699; Ceillier, vii. p. 528–537; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* pp. 493, 573). [H. W. P.]

PROCULUS (8), sent by Genseric to compel the bishops and priests in the Zeugitane province to give up their books and sacramental vessels. His death, which followed soon afterwards, was regarded as a judgment on his impiety. [GENSERIC, Vol. II. 636] (Victor Vitensis, *de Pers. Vand.* i. 12). [F. D.]

PROCULUS (9), a poet and friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, who flourished in the latter half of the 5th century, in Gaul, though a Ligurian by birth. Nothing of his works survives, though in the ridiculous hyperbole of their côterie, Sidonius compares him to Virgil and Homer (*Epist.* ix. 15), while Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, in some verses addressed to Proculus' grandsons, makes him equal with Pindar (*Carm.* i. 3, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxiii. 311; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 538-9). There is extant a letter addressed to him by Sidonius, earnestly pleading for the pardon of a son who had fled from home (iv. 23). [S. A. B.]

PROCULUS (10), bishop of Nicotera, in Bruttii, addressed with other bishops in A.D. 599 by Gregory the Great. [PAULINUS (16).] In 603 he had returned to his see after a long absence, passed in doing penance for some offence (*Epp.* vi. 41; ix. 48; xiii. 24). [F. D.]

PROCULUS (11), deacon of Asculum in Picenum, founded a monastery on his estate of Gressianum, which Gregory the Great, in December A.D. 602, requested the bishop of Firmium to consecrate, certain conditions as to endowment being satisfied (*Epp.* xiii. 16). [F. D.]

PRODICUS, a Gnostic teacher of the second century, concerning whom trustworthy information is very scanty. He is not mentioned by the principal writers on heresies, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Epiphanius, or Philaster. Tertullian twice mentions him (*Scorpiace* 15, *Adv. Prax.* 3), and both times in company with Valentinus, in such a way as to suggest that he regarded the two heretics as of the same school. In the first passage Prodicus and Valentinus are spoken of as teaching that Christ did not wish His disciples to confess Him publicly if such confession would expose their lives to danger: in the second passage Valentinus and Prodicus are described as introducing in opposition to the Creator, not a single rival god like Marcion, but a multiplicity of gods. It is natural to infer that the Valentinian Aeonology, or something similar, was part of the system of Prodicus. Our only other source of trustworthy information about Prodicus consists in three notices by Clement of Alexandria. The first (*Strom.* i. 15, p. 357) states that those who followed the heresy of Prodicus boasted of being in possession of secret books of Zoroaster. We infer that in the time of Clement Prodicus was dead, but a sect founded by him was still in existence. Another passage (*Strom.* vii. 7, p. 854) states that the followers of Prodicus objected to the practice of prayer. Clement merely mentions their doctrine (μὴ δεῖν εὔχεσθαι), but does not delay to state or answer their grounds of objection. But the most characteristic notice of the sect is found (*Strom.* iii. 4, p. 525), where we are told that the followers of Prodicus who claim to be Gnostics (falsely so called) declare that they are by nature children of the first god, and are privileged by their noble birth to live as they choose, being "lords of the sabbath," and "as king's children above the law." And living "as they chose" meant living very licentiously. The phrase "the first god" in this quotation deserves to be noticed as harmonizing with what Tertullian says as to the opposition of their doctrine to that of the monarchy of God. Clement objects to their doctrine, that king's children though they claim to be, they find that in fact they are constantly not able to do as they choose; and as for the adulteries which they actually commit they do them, not as kings, but as skulking slaves, dreading to be found out and fearing condemnation and punishment. And as the Apostle says, he who commits sin is the slave of sin.

For additional information about Prodicus we have to come down to the fifth century to Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 6); and on reading his whole section it seems plain that Theodoret had no more real knowledge of Prodicus than what he learned from Clement whom he quotes, mixing up, however, some of the things which Clement says about other of the licentious Gnostic sects. It seems, for instance, to be an unauthorized combination of Theodoret's own to connect Prodicus with Carpocrates. And we are safe in rejecting as equally arbitrary Theodoret's assertion that Prodicus was the founder of the sect of the Adamites, of which sect Theodoret would have read in Epiphanius (*Haer.* 52). Under the article ADAMIANI (Vol. I. p. 41) has been related what Epiphanius tells as to the alleged practice of this sect to worship mother naked in rooms warmed by a special heating apparatus. But Epiphanius honestly tells that he had no personal knowledge of such people, nor had he read of them in any book. He usually tells in what part of the world the heretics whom he describes are to be found, but in this case he says he really does not know whether they existed at all in his time; only, for safety's sake, he thinks he ought to tell the stories which had come to his ears. It is no unreasonable scepticism to dismiss with contempt a tale so poorly attested. It is notorious how easily stories get into circulation among outsiders as to what takes place in Freemasons' and other secret meetings. The heathen of old believed that at the Christian meetings the lights were overturned, and all sorts of wickedness perpetrated. And really, of the two, this story is more credible than that of the deliberate building of chambers with hypocausts for the purposes of indecent worship. Epiphanius does not mention Prodicus in connection with the Adamites, nor is it likely that he thought of him in that connection. He describes these people as, notwithstanding their immodesty, ascetic in their principles, inculcating continence as a duty and turning out of their "Paradise" anyone who touched the forbidden

fruit. If Epiphanius did not know of a connection of Prodicus with the Adamites, it is not credible that Theodoret had any better means of information; and, therefore, we must limit our knowledge of Prodicus to what can be gained from the passages of Tertullian and Clement already cited. [G. S.]

PROFORUS, a companion of St. Paulinus at Nola (*vid.* p. 238 a). [C. H.]

PROFUTURUS (1), bishop of Cirta, in Numidia, previously to this an inmate of the monastery established at Hippo by St. Augustine. He appears to have become a bishop about A.D. 395; for Paulinus speaks of him as such in a letter written A.D. 396 (Paulinus, *Ep.* 7; Aug. *Ep.* 32, 1). At some time in the following year Augustine wrote to him, telling him of his own suffering from a painful disorder, requesting his prayers for himself, and mentioning as an event of which he must be well aware, the death of Megalius, bishop of Calama (Aug. *Ep.* 38). Before he became a bishop, he was to have been the bearer of a letter from Augustine to St. Jerome, but was prevented from taking it by his episcopal duties. He died before 403, for it was not until that year that the letter was sent, and in it he is spoken of as being no longer alive (Aug. *Ep.* 71). He is also mentioned by Augustine in his treatise *de unico baptismo* as having died within a very few years, and being succeeded by Fortunatus. (Aug. *de unic. bapt.* 16, 29.) He is said by Evodius to have appeared to him after his death. (Aug. *Ep.* 158, 9.) [H. W. P.]

PROFUTURUS (2), bishop of Braga. A letter dated March 1st, A.D. 538, was addressed by Vigilius, who though not then pope was acting for Silverius who was then exiled, to Profuturus, who had written to consult the pope about certain practices of the Priscillianists and Arians, and on other matters. This letter was read at the first council of Braga in A.D. 561. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 611, 1018; *Esp. Sag.* xv. 107.) [F. D.]

PROJECTUS (1), a bishop of North Africa in St. Augustine's time. Augustine informs us (*De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8) that Projectus healed a blind woman by applying to her eyes the flowers he was carrying when he was removing the relics of St. Stephen to the waters of Tibilis. [G. T. S.]

PROJECTUS (2), a Gallic bishop who complained to pope Leo the Great that Hilary bishop of Arles had ordained another bishop in his place, c. 445 (Leo, *Ep.* x. cc. 4, 5). Tillemont (xv. 78) thinks his see was in the province of Second Narbonne, and that he was not the Projectus (about whom nothing is given) placed among the bishops of Die in the province of Vienne (*Gall. Chr.* xvi. 511). [HILARIUS (17), p. 69 b.] [C. H.]

PROJECTUS (3), bishop, of Forum Cornelii (Imola) consecrated by St. Peter Chrysologus (S. Petri Chrys. *Serm.* 165 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lii. 633), who, according to Agnellus (*Lib. Pont.* 51) had been ordained deacon with him by Cornelius, the former bishop of Imola. If it is true that Chrysologus was consecrated by pope Sixtus (Agnellus 49), this Projectus cannot be the bishop of that name, one of the three legates sent by pope Celestine, the predecessor of Sixtus, to the council of Ephesus (Mansi, iv. 1287, etc.). He may be the same as the bishop Projectus, mentioned in A.D. 482 by pope Simplicius in a letter to John, archbishop of Ravenna. (Simplicii *Epp.* 2 in *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 37.) [F. D.]

PROMOTUS (1), mentioned by Chrysostom, A.D. 404, in a letter to certain Gothic monks τοῖς ἐν τοῖς Προμώτου, i.e., as the Latin version and note in Migne (*Pat. Gr.* lii. 726) make it, residing "in Promoti agro." But through the omission of the second τοῖς in another reading the expression has been taken to mean that the monks dwelt in the monastery of Promotus, viz. a monastery established in the house of Promotus, the eminent general of Theodosius. This view is taken by Tillemont (xi. 143, 179). [C. H.]

PROMOTUS (2), a priest of Chartres who was consecrated bishop of Châteaudun by Egidius, bishop of Rheims, about 572. This proceeding was the principal cause of the fourth Council of Paris. Châteaudun being in the diocese of Chartres, the action of Egidius was a direct encroachment on the jurisdiction of Pappolus, bishop of Chartres. He laid his complaint before King Guntram to whom Chartres belonged, who took up his cause, while Sigebert, the possessor of Châteaudun, upheld Egidius. The fourth Council of Paris was summoned to settle the dispute. The prelates decided in favour of the bishop of Chartres, and on Sept. 11, 573, wrote two letters which are extant, one to Egidius remonstrating on his breach of the canons, and threatening Promotus with excommunication, the other to Sigebert deprecating his support of an unrighteous cause. It seems, however, that Promotus, who did not present himself at the council, retained his position till Sigebert's death two years later, when the see of Châteaudun came to an end, in spite of an application to Guntram to reinstate him. In 585 Promotus subscribed the canons of the second council of Mâcon as a bishop without a see. (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* vii. 17; *Gall. Christ.* viii. 1098–9; Mansi, ix. 865 seqq.; 959. *Hist. Litt.* iii. 308–9, 343.) [S. A. B.]

PROMUS (or perhaps more correctly PROBUS), Dec. 19 (Bas. *Men.*), Egyptian martyr at Ascalon, in the Diocletian persecution under the president Firmilianus. He had been sent from Egypt, together with Ares and Elias, to minister to the Cilician confessors. They were arrested on Dec. 14. Ares was burned, Promus and Elias were beheaded five days afterwards (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* c. x.). [G. T. S.]

PROSDOCA, virgin martyr in Syria A.D. 305–306, daughter of Domnina and companion with her in martyrdom [DOMNINA (2)] (Ruinart, *Acta Mart.* 498–9; Boll. *A. SS.* Oct. 4, t. ii. 593 sq.). [J. G.]

PROSDOCIMUS, ST., alleged first bishop of Padua. His *Acta* are unhistorical. He is commemorated on November 7 (*AA. SS.* Oct. iii. 790, 795; Tillemont, *M. E.* v. 140). [F. D.]

PROSPER (1), supposititious primate of Numidia, to whom, with the other bishops of Numidia, pope Damasus is said to have written, but the letter is forged (Cave, i. 231; Ceill. v. 22; Jaffé, *R. P.*, *Lit. Spur.* num. clxiii.). [J. G.]

PROSPER (2), of Africa, perhaps the author of the work on the predictions and promises of God and of that entitled *de Vocatione Omnium Gentium*, sometimes attributed to Prosper of Aquitaine. Nothing is known about him. [PROSPER (4).] [H. W. P.]

PROSPER (3) TIRO. Probably the author of the poem *ad uxorem*, and of the small *Chronicle* mentioned in the next article, but nothing is known of his history. [PROSPER (4).] [H. W. P.]

PROSPER (4), ST., a native of Aquitaine, but of what place is not known, though a note to the Colbertine MS. of one of his works says, but without mention of its authority, that he belonged to Toulon. (Aug. *Opp.* vol. xi. p. 1858, ed. Migne.) He is also thought to have borne the name Tiro in addition to that of Prosper, a question which will be discussed below. By many writers he has been supposed to have been bishop of Riez in Provence (Baronius, ann. 466. xiii.), or of Reggio, in the Modenese territory, but there is no evidence to show that he was a bishop, or even if he was in holy orders at all, that he ever advanced beyond the diaconate. He was probably born about A.D. 403, and if the short piece called his *Confession* be authentic, a point which is extremely doubtful, he received baptism early in life. About 426–429, for some reason unknown, but probably in consequence of the advance of the barbarians, he removed into Provence to Marseilles, and lived there as a monk until 440, but whether in a monastic establishment does not specially appear. At that time he went into Italy with Leo I. to whom, when he became pope, he is said to have filled the office of secretary (Notarius), and according to Gennadius to have been the author of the epistle bearing his name concerning the Incarnation of Christ, against Eutyches. But before this time he became, together with Hilary, also a monk, concerning whom some remarks will be found below, engaged in an active controversy on the subject of Pelagian, or rather Semi-pelagian, doctrine. At some time between 420 and 427, John Cassian published his *Collationes* [CASSIANUS (1), Vol. I. p. 415], in which he put forth a doctrine concerning grace and free-will contrary to that which had been taught by St. Augustine. This doctrine was taken up warmly by many of the monks at Marseilles, and both Prosper and Hilary were afraid lest a doctrine which they believed to be erroneous should become prevalent among the monks, and jealous for the credit of Augustine were thinking of writing to him to request him to explain some of his statements. In the meantime came out his book *de Correptione et Gratia*, by which Prosper hoped that all doubts would be settled. This, however, was by no means the case, but while those who held what in his view was the orthodox opinion were confirmed therein, those who thought differently became more obstinate in their opposition. Although Prosper had never seen Augustine, he had written a letter to him by Leontius, a deacon, and received from him a reply, but neither the letter nor the reply have survived. He now wrote again to him in 428, as also did Hilary, and his reply to these letters is contained in the consecutive treatises *de praedestinatione sanctorum* and *de dono perseverantiae*, either in the same or in the following year, 429. (See Aug. *Ep.* 225, 226; and *Opp.* vol. x. pp. 947–1034, ed. Migne; also AUGUSTINE, Vol. I. p. 220.) Augustine died A.D. 430, and when the opponents of his doctrine in Gaul professed willingness to abide by the decision of the Roman pontiff, Hilary and Prosper went to Rome and brought back with them a letter from Celestine I. to the Gallic bishops, who appear to have been the following: Venerius of Marseilles, Marinus, Leontius of Fréjus, Auxentius of Nice, Auxonius of Viviers, Arcadius of Venice. In this he speaks of them both as men *quorum circa Deum nostrum solicitudo laudanda est*, and reproved, but without effect, the indiscretion and ill-informed zeal of their opponents. (Coelest. *Ep.* xxi. 1, 2.) To this letter are subjoined in some editions a series of so-called decisions of the apostolic see concerning grace and free-will, which, however, cannot be regarded as authentic. When Leo I. returned from his mission into Gaul, A.D. 440, to be made pope, he persuaded Prosper to accompany him to Rome, and employed him, it is said, as his secretary (Notarius). Photius says that he confuted the Pelagians at Rome in the time of Leo, and a MS. of the monastery of Corbey adds, but without mention of authority, that he was sent by him on a similar errand into Campania, to oppose Julianus of Eclanum. Gennadius says that he was the real author of the epistle of Leo concerning the incarnation of Christ against Eutyches; but see LEO I. (5), Vol. III. pp. 653, 671. The chronicle of Marcellinus shows that he was alive in 463, but in what year he died is not known, and his memory is said to have been observed on Nov. 25, by some religious communities in France, but the Roman Martyrology mentions June 25 as his day of commemoration. Fulgentius speaks of him as *eruditus et sanctus*, Photius, as one who was truly a man of God, but with no other title than Πρόσπειρός τις, who confuted the Pelagians in the time of Leo. Gennadius, who was no friend to him, speaks of him as *sermone scholasticus et assertionibus nervosus*, but such expressions as these do not show that he was in holy orders. (Fulgentius, *ad Mon.* i. c. 30; Photius, *Biblioth.* 54; Gennadius, *de Scr. Eccl.* 84; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, June 25; Ceillier, vol. x. p. 278.) The letter of Prosper to Augustine describes the view which had been taken up at Marseilles and elsewhere concerning predestination. Those who adopted it, he says, believe that mankind has sinned in Adam, and that without God's grace there can be no salvation for any one. He offers salvation to all, so that they who attain faith and receive baptism are in the way of being saved. But before the creation of the world God foreknew who would believe and be saved, and predestined them to His kingdom, being called by grace, and worthy of being chosen and of going out of life sound in faith. No man, therefore, need despair of salvation, but this selection on God's part

makes human exertion needless either for recovery from sin or for progress in holiness. Thus a doctrine is introduced of fatal necessity, or one that, if no one can become other than what he was by creation, God has created two natures, and thus the very opinions which were refuted by Augustine are received with applause; but the advocates of them when called upon to explain their view refuse to do so, as being matters above human intelligence; and, further, that the Catholic view on this subject does not conduce to edification. They also think that men can by their own merit, by praying, beseeching, knocking, attain to that state of grace in which we are born anew unto Christ. Their ground for this opinion is that as none can enter into life without regeneration, so is it in the power of all to attain to this and thus become children of God. They support their opinion by all such passages of Scripture as exhort to obedience. The transgressor is called disobedient because he chose to disobey, and the faithful man obedient because he chose to obey. To the objection as to infants dying without baptism they reply that they will be saved or not according as God foreknows what their conduct would have been if they had grown up. They forget that in saying this they really imply that the grace of God, which they regard as accompanying, not preceding human merit, lies at the root of all inclinations to godliness. But they show more reason in their view of God's foreknowledge respecting nations formerly walking in darkness, which have been called into His light, and that they are without excuse who refuse to receive the Gospel. They think that Christ died for the whole race of mankind, but that some miss this salvation because they are known beforehand to have no inclination to receive it. They also deny that the merits of saints proceed from divine grace, and that the number of the elect can be either increased or diminished, and they assert that the only way in which a man is called either to repentance or to progress in holiness is by the exercise of his own free will. They thus place obedience before grace, and the first step towards salvation in him who is to be saved, not in Him who saves. Great difficulties arise, Prosper says, in his attempts to convince the holders of these opinions of their errors, not only from his own want of ability, but also from the great and acknowledged sanctity of their lives, a remark which he probably intends especially to apply to Cassian; and also from the elevation of some of them to the highest office in the Church. He therefore begs Augustine to explain these doubtful questions: *a*, How Christian faith can escape division through these disputes; *b*, how free-will can be independent of prevenient grace: *c*, whether God's foreknowledge is absolute and complete; *d*, whether foreknowledge depends in any way on human purpose, and whether there can be any good which does not proceed from God; *e*, how those who despair of their own election can escape carelessness of life. He asks him to explain all this in such a way as to be consistent with God's previous ordinance of vessels of honour and dishonour. One among the number of these men, Hilary, bishop of Arles, is known to Augustine as an admirer of his doctrine, and as wishing to compare his own view with his by writing to him, but whether he will do so or not Prosper has no knowledge (Aug. *Ep.* 225).

The letter of Prosper was accompanied or followed very soon afterwards by one on the same subject by Hilary, concerning whom three opinions have been held: 1, That he was the same as the bishop of Arles mentioned by Prosper; 2, that he was a layman and a monk of Gaul; 3, that he was the same as Hilary, who wrote to Augustine from Syracuse, A.D. 414. See HILARIUS (15) and (17), Vol. III. p. 69, and HILARIUS (35), *ib.* p. 75. Of these opinions, the first seems to be refuted by the sentence last quoted from the letter of Prosper, compared with the address of Augustine in his reply to his "sons" Prosper and Hilarius (Aug. *de Praedest.* c. 1), and with the manner in which Hilary himself addresses Augustine, and seems to speak of Prosper as a fellow labourer. (Hil. *Ep.* i. 9, 10; Baronius, ann. 426, xx; Aug. *Ep.* 226.) That the Hilary who wrote to Augustine from Syracuse should write again to him fourteen or fifteen years later warmly on the same subject, is of course not improbable, and this view is not rejected by Tillemont (vol. xiii. 243, 343), nor by the Paris editor, though the probability seems to be lessened by the entire absence of any mention of the former letter, or of its reply either in the latter one or in the reply to it by Augustine, though the main subject of both letters is in each case very similar, and the reply to the earlier one is very long. That the later Hilary, if not identical with the earlier one, was a layman and a monk appears tolerably clear. He was evidently well acquainted with Augustine. His letter travels over much the same ground as that of Prosper, but conveys to Augustine the salutations of his parents and of Leontius, a deacon of the same name as the bearer of the former letter of Prosper, if not the same person as he, and he informs him that his brother had entered into a vow with his wife of mutual continence. He also requests Augustine to lend him his book on grace and free-will. To these letters Augustine replied in the two books mentioned above, which are in fact consecutive volumes of the same work. In the first he shows that all faith is God's gift, mentions his own former error on this point, and refers to his letters to Simplicianus, on the first of which he had corrected it. (*Retract.* i. 23, 24, 25; ii. 1; *Ad Simplic.* vol. vi. p. 101.) If it be asked, why does not God draw all men to Himself, the answer is that we cannot interfere with His will. Referring to his work against Porphyry, *de tempore Christianae religionis*, he points out that the same answer as he then gave applies to the case proposed by Prosper and Hilary (*Ep.* 102, qu. 2). Grace is given by Christ, not according to our deserts, as is apparent in the case of infants. If it be said that God deals with them according to their prospective merits, and therefore those who die early without baptism are so treated, the answer is that the Church regards baptism as removing the guilt of birth-sin, not of future works, and the argument is of no force (12, 13). The elect are called in order that they may believe, not because they already believe (17). The Pelagian says, God foreknows those who will be holy, and therefore calls them, but St. Paul's doctrine teaches otherwise, Eph. i. 4, 5.

In the book *de dono perseverantiae* Augustine

says that, as he has shewn in his book *de Correptione et Gratia*, perseverance is as much a gift of God as faith, and he quotes to this purpose Cyprian on the Lord's Prayer (Cypr. *de Dom. Or.* 12–27). Thus the prayer is sufficient to prove this point. To the question, why is not God's grace given according to man's desert, the answer is that it is so because He is merciful. If so, why not to all? Because He is our Judge. If it be asked, why do some, who seemed to be going on well, fall away? The answer is given by St. Ambrose, that our hearts are not entirely in our own power (Ambros. *de Fuga saec.* 1) (c. 8). Pelagianism really runs into Manicheism (c. 12, 13). But predestination is said to make preaching useless; No, because it forms a part of God's work of drawing men to Himself (c. 14). As to alleged inutility of prayer, or of reproof, the answer is that these are definitely commanded. These two treatises of Augustine are to be found in vol. x. of his works, ed. Migne, and are transcribed in the Paris edition of St. Prosper 1711, and its reprints.

About the same time as the letter to Augustine, Prosper wrote one on the same subject to a friend named Ruffinus or Rufinus, about whom nothing is known except that Prosper addresses him as *Sanctitas tua*, by which may perhaps be implied a member of a religious community. He wrote in answer to a letter from his friend partly to vindicate himself from unfavourable reports as to his doctrine, partly to direct his attention to the writings of Augustine, and to vindicate him from the accusation of denying free-will and setting up Manichean doctrine in its stead. The line of argument against Pelagian or semi-Pelagian views is much of the same kind as in the letter to Augustine, but he also mentions the cases of Cornelius and Lydia as instances of persons who had been led by God's grace into the way of eternal life, and as not by any means to be quoted on the side of the Pelagian theory. Why all men are not saved is a mystery of God's, not explicable by human understanding, and of which we may be thankful to be ignorant. (*Ep. ad Ruffin.*) A long account of this letter is given by Ceillier, vol. x. 279–284.

Besides the letters already mentioned, Prosper was the author or compiler of several works both in prose and in verse.

I. Works in Verse.—Of those in verse the most important, at any rate in length, is the poem *de Ingratis*, a term by which he describes those who teach erroneous doctrine about grace, viz. the Pelagians and semi-Pelagians. It is explained clearly by the following quotation from the poem itself, v. 685:—

> "Vos soli Ingrati, quos urit gratia, cujus
> Omne opus arbitrio vultis consistere vestro."

It consists of 1002 lines with a short elegiac preface, and is divided into four parts. A theological treatise in verse rather than a poem, but framed, *longo intervallo*, upon the model of Lucretius; it describes accurately the history of Pelagian doctrine, whose author it calls "coluber Britannus," and mentions the treatment with which his opinions met at Rome, in the Eastern Church and in Africa through the influence mainly of Augustine, "the light of the age." The manner in which the Roman Church is spoken of is worthy of notice, v. 40:—

> ". . . pestem subeuntem prima recidit
> Sedes Roma Petri, quae pastoralis honoris
> Facta caput mundo, quidquid non possidet armis
> Religione tenet."

Though without any claim to high rank as poetry, and exhibiting, though in a less degree than is the case with the verses of Paulinus, the degenerate standard of its age in purity both of language and of versification, it nevertheless treats its subject with well-sustained vigour, and for the most part with clearness, and now and then expresses theological truths, though perhaps with severity, yet with remarkable force and terseness. J. J. Ampère, in his account of the poem, condemns what he considers to be its violence, its hard, melancholy, and desponding tone, amounting sometimes, he says, "to a pale reflection of hell." He also points out a similarity in its sentiment to some of the works of Pascal, and the Port-Royalists, which he contrasts unfavourably with the tone of Bossuet in his essay on the fear of God. Ampère, *Hist. Litt. de France*, vol. ii. c. 16, pp. 38–58.

Besides this long poem, there are others of an epigrammatic kind which are generally regarded as genuine works of Prosper, though doubted by some editors. Two of them, doubted by Garnier, are addressed to a maligner (obtrectatorem) of St. Augustine. In the first of them he applies to him the term *lupus*, by which Antelmi thought that he meant to denote Vincent of Lerins. The second, which is mentioned by Bede as the work of Prosper the rhetorician (rhetor), is perhaps directed against a different person (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 10). There are also 106 epigrams founded in some measure on Augustine's writings, but expressing moral and theological truths of a general kind, to be found in the works of many other Christian writers. The Paris editor judged that they must have appeared shortly before the Council of Chalcedon, A.D 451. Also a so-called epitaph, of twenty-six lines, on the Nestorian and Pelagian heresies, doubted by Garnier. Besides these works, generally attributed to Prosper, there are two other poems of doubtful authenticity, one consisting of 972 lines, entitled *de providentia divina*, a sort of vindication of the ways of God towards man, which was ascribed to him with confidence for the first time in the Lyons editions of his works, A.D. 1539. The style resembles that of Prosper, but some theological statements which savour of Pelagian doctrine seem unlikely to have proceeded from his pen. But besides this the poem speaks of the invasions of the Vandals and Goths during ten years past, and still afflicting the country. Now the Vandals, according to the Chronicle of Prosper, invaded Gaul, A.D. 406, and in 409 passed into Spain. The Gothic invasion began in 412, and as Prosper appears to have been born about 403, he could have hardly passed his boyhood before the close of the ten years, even though not strictly calculated.

Another poem, entitled *Conjugis ad uxorem*, has been attributed to Paulinus, and is included in some editions of his works, but is quoted by Bede in his treatise *de arte metrica* as the work of Prosper Tiro. It consists of sixteen lines of

Anacreontic metre, or iambic dimeter catalectic which Bede calls Colophon, i.e. κολοβόν, followed by ninety-eight elegiac lines, describing the glory of the Christian life, and having some passages of considerable force and beauty both of thought and expression. It is evident that it was composed during the time of general confusion and disaster caused by the barbarian invasions, and so may be ascribed to date about A.D. 407, but there is no evidence to show that Prosper of Aquitaine was ever married, and if so, besides the improbability arising from its date, the poem is not likely to have been composed by him.

II. Prose Works. — 1. *Responsiones pro Augustino ad Capitula Gallorum.* A statement under fifteen heads, of the objections made by the Gallic bishops to the doctrines of St. Augustine on Predestination, with answers to each, followed by the same number of propositions showing in a formal manner the doctrines expressed in the pressing answers. 2. *Responsiones ad Capitula Objectionum Vincentianarum.* A similar work in sixteen chapters. The objections express in a manner which is not only harsh and revolting, but unfair, the possible results which predestinarian doctrine carried to its extreme point might suggest, and, if they are authentic, justify the severity with which Prosper rebuked the author in his epigram mentioned above; but whether the author of the objections was also the author of the Commonitorium it is not easy to determine. Baronius distinctly rejects this opinion, but his commentator Pagi supports it. Tillemont inclines to the view of Baronius, while Antelmi and Cardinal Noris reject it.[a] 3. *Responsiones ad Excerpta Genuensium.* — Some clergymen of Genoa, or, as some have thought, but on insufficient grounds, Geneva, especially two, named Camillus and Theodorus, had misunderstood various passages from the two treatises of St. Augustine, *de praedestinatione sanctorum*, and *de dono perseverantiae*, and to them Prosper addresses a kindly and courteous letter of explanation, quoting the passages cited by them, and adding his own replies, gathered in some cases from the words themselves of Augustine, and in one case pointing out with astonishment the egregious blunder made by them in quoting as his opinion words intended to express an objection made by an opponent. 4. *Contra Collatorem liber.*—John Cassian had written a book entitled Spiritual Conferences, *Collationes*, seventeen in number, in the thirteenth of which, entitled *de protectione Dei*, consisting partly of a dialogue between Choeremon, a supposed abbat, and Germanus, he condemned severely the doctrine of Augustine on predestination. This is defended by Prosper partly by arguments drawn from Scripture and the nature of the case, and partly by the authority of the churches of Rome, of the East, and of Africa. He warns his adversary, whose name he does not expressly mention, of his near approach to the precipices of Pelagianism, and expresses the hope that his doctrine may be condemned by the present Pontiff Sixtus, as it has been by those who preceded him. As Sixtus III. filled the papal chair from 432 to 440, the book must plainly have been published between those dates.

5. *An Exposition of Psalms c. to cl.*, but omitting cvii. (cviii.) because, as he says, it has been virtually explained before in the Commentaries on lvi. (lvii.) and lix. (lx.). Notker, who wrote in the 9th century, says that in his time a Commentary by Prosper on the whole book of Psalms was in existence, and from this statement coupled with that of Prosper himself the inference has been drawn that this was the case, but that the Commentary on the earlier portion is now lost. But as the whole Commentary is taken substantially and often verbally, though in a much abridged form, from St. Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, and as on Ps. cvii. (cviii.) the reason which Augustine gives for omitting any remarks upon it is the same, word for word, as the one given above by Prosper, the evidence as to his treatment of the earlier Psalms rests mainly on the statement of Notker, which there is no reason to doubt, but in support of which there is no further testimony. It may be added that the work is performed with great skill; not a mere servile curtailment, but a fair and judicious representation of the Augustinian work, together with some additions of Prosper's own. The date of its publication may perhaps be given as about A.D. 433. 6. *Book of sentences taken from the works of S. Augustine*, 392 in number, put together, it is probable, originally as a manual for his own use. The first thirty-eight are taken from Prosper's own work on the Psalms, many others from the *Enarrationes* of St. Augustine, and the rest from various other works of his. They are very short, and may be regarded as a sort of compendious index to the opinions of St. Augustine. Many of them are embodied in the canons of the second council of Orange. In older editions the number was 388, corrected by the Benedictine editors of Augustine and made up to 390, but in the Paris edition of 1711 two were added from other MSS., thus making up the total number to 392. As well as the letter to Ruffinus, and the prose works just mentioned, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, these sentences are printed in the appendix, Part 11, to the works of St. Augustine, vol. xi. ed. Migne, where also may be found the canons of the second council of Orange. 7. The two books entitled, *de vocatione omnium gentium*, ascribed by some MSS. to Prosper, and by some to St. Ambrose, were attributed by Quesnel to St. Leo, and by other writers to one of the Hilaries, and to other authors. Joseph Antelmi, canon of Fréjus in the 17th century, in his book on the writings of SS. Leo and Prosper, took great pains to show that they belonged to Prosper, but the evidence on which he supports this opinion appears to be insufficient, and is rejected by the Paris editors of 1711. They have also been attributed to a Prosper of Africa, and a bishop of Orleans of this name about A.D. 470 (Tillemont, vol. xvi. p. 29). 8. Of the letter to *Demetrias*, otherwise entitled, *a treatise on Christian humility*, attributed by Quesnel to St. Leo, but by Antelmi, with great zeal, to St. Prosper, the remark may be made that it appears to belong to the same unknown author, as the work last mentioned. 9. The short paper entitled the *Confession of Tiro*

[a] Baronius, ann. 431, clxxxviii. Pagi, *in Bar.* ann. 434, xviii., vol. v. p. 1185. Tillemont, vol. xvi. p. 13

Prosper, first published by Sirmond in 1619, is rejected both by Antelmi and by the Paris editors, but not by Tillemont, *l. c.* p. 3. 10. Three books on the *Contemplative Life*, sometimes attributed to Prosper, are probably the work of Julianus Pomerius. 11. Three on the *promises and predictions of God*, attributed to him by Cassiodorus, appear to be the work of a writer who was a native, not of Aquitaine, but of Africa, whose name is unknown.

6. *a.* We come now to the *Chronicle*, probably the most generally known of the works of Prosper, and attributed to him without hesitation by Cassiodorus, Gennadius of Marseilles, Victorius, and Isidore, though Pithou and Garnier thought that it is not his. It extends from the earliest age to the capture of Rome by the Vandals, A.D. 455, and consists of three parts:—1. From the earliest age to A.D. 326, founded, as the Chronicle itself states, on that of Eusebius, and though much abridged both in matter and in language, treating the subject in a somewhat independent manner. 2. From A.D. 326 to 378, in which a similar use is made of the continuation of Eusebius by St. Jerome, but with additions as well as omissions. 3. From A.D. 378 to 455. Some MSS. appear to have contained as much of the work as reached to A.D. 433, others carried it on as far as 444, and others to 455. Victor, bishop of Tunno in Mauretania, about A.D. 596, who wrote a chronicle which professes to be a continuation of that of Prosper, says that this reached only to A.D. 444, but as the distinct evidence of Gennadius, Cassiodorus, and Victorius, all of them living much nearer to the time of Prosper, and the first and third of them natives of the same country as he, bears witness to the later limit of his Chronicle, we may adopt the supposition of the Paris editors that the work appeared at three successive periods with successive additions. Among these one of considerable importance is the mention of the Roman consuls for every year from the date, as the Chronicle says, of the manifestation of our Lord, i.e. his public appearance, when L. Rubellius Geminus and C. Fufius Geminus were consuls, viz. probably A.D. 29 (Clinton). This addition would be still more important if it were more correct, but, as Fabricius remarks truly, there are many mistakes, especially in the earlier portions, while in the later one they are much less numerous. As might be expected, predominance is given to events of an ecclesiastical kind, especially such as concern the rise and fall of heretical doctrines. The Chronicle itself arose out of an endeavour to fix the date of Easter, for which purpose Prosper constructed a Paschal cycle which, however, is lost, though a trace of its existence may be found in the Chronicle under the consulship of Theodosius (18) and Albinus (A.D. 444, Clinton).

b. Chronicle of Tiro Prosper. Besides the Chronicle just described, another in itself much shorter, and relating to the latest period only, bearing the name of Prosper, was edited by Pierre Pithou in 1588 from MSS. in the library of the monastery of St. Victor at Paris. This Chronicle Pithou thought himself justified in naming as the work of Tiro Prosper and regarding it as a genuine part of the entire Chronicle mentioned by Gennadius, in preference to the one containing the names of the consuls usually appended to those of Eusebius and Jerome. This opinion was contradicted by Sirmond, who inferred that two Chronicles had been compiled by two men, each bearing the name of Prosper, but that the shorter one is not the work of Prosper of Aquitaine. (Sirmond, *Hist. Praedestinatiana*, Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* x. 404–414.) It has thus come to pass that, rightly or wrongly, the larger work has by way of distinction obtained the name of Prosper of Aquitaine, and the shorter one that of Tiro Prosper. That the latter is not the work of Prosper of Aquitaine appears plain from the following considerations: (*a*) that the events mentioned therein often differ very much from those mentioned in the other. The writer of the one Chronicle was doubtless acquainted with the other, but has not followed nor even simply abridged it, but often mentions in a totally different way the events to which he draws attention. (*b*) The names of consuls are altogether omitted. (*c*) The manner in which it speaks of St. Augustine is entirely at variance with the opinion entertained of him in his lifetime by Prosper of Aquitaine, and the part which he took in defending his memory after his death. Thus it speaks on the authority of two MSS. of a predestinarian heresy which arose *ab Augustino*. In some MSS. these words are corrected by a note in a later handwriting, into *ab Augustini libris male intellectis*, a correction which Pithou on his own authority transferred into the text, with the obvious view of confirming the authorship of Prosper of Aquitaine. We may remark in conclusion that, after reading the two Chronicles, it is difficult to believe that they could be the work of one and the same writer, or if they were so, to understand his object in publishing both of them nearly, as must have been the case, about the same time. The question of the authorship of them brings us to the one already mentioned of the identity or diversity of Prosper of Aquitaine and Tiro Prosper, which appears to rest mainly on the authority of Bede, who, as has been seen above, attributes the poem *ad uxorem* to Tiro Prosper, and the epigrams or at least one of them, *in obtrectatorem*, to Prosper "the rhetorician." But of these the first appears certainly not to have been the work of Prosper of Aquitaine; the second, though doubted by Garnier, and quoted by Bede under the title of rhetorician, is by general consent assigned to him, but from the ambiguity of this title does little to settle the question at issue. On the whole it seems likely that the statement of Bede as to the poem *ad uxorem* has been misapplied, and that this may be the work of Tiro Prosper, to whom also the shorter Chronicle may be ascribed. In giving the title of rhetorician to Prosper, Bede may have had in view the title of *Scholasticus* given him by Gennadius, illustrated by his prose works rather than those in verse, though these, or at least the longer of them, may fairly be regarded as rhetorical rather than poetical in character. We may conclude, therefore, that Prosper of Aquitaine and Tiro Prosper were different persons, but of an African Prosper we have no historical trace.

Special works of Prosper were printed at Mentz 1524, Cologne 1531, Paris 1534, and Venice 1538, but the first edition of them that can be called complete was published at Lyons

in 1539 by the celebrated printer Stephen Gryphius. This was reprinted with additions at Louvain, 1565. A new edition, edited with great care by Jean Olivier, was published at Douai, 1576, which was the basis of subsequent editions until 1711. In the meantime, however, the *Chronicle* of Tiro Prosper, so-called, was published by Pithou in 1588, and the *Confession* by Sirmond in 1619. Editions founded on the one of Douai were printed at Cologne in 1609, and Rome 1611, but the best which had hitherto appeared, edited by Desprez and Desessarts, was published at Paris in 1711, containing all the works rightly attributed to Prosper, together with others not belonging to him, and various pieces relating to the semi-Pelagian controversy. This was reprinted in two volumes at Bassano, and published at Venice in 1782, and a revised edition has been reprinted in the *Patrologia* of Migne, vol. li. The collected works are also contained in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Lyons, 1677, vol. viii. Fabricius has given a list of the works of Prosper with critical remarks in his *Bibliotheca Latina*, vol. iii. p. 521 sq. A very full and careful account also of him and his works apparently based, chiefly on the Paris edition, will be found in an article in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, vol. ii., of which the author is Dom Rivet. A short account of his writings with remarks upon them is given by J. J. Ampère, *Hist. de la Litt. de la France*, vol. ii. c. 19. Accounts of Prosper in connection with the Predestinarian controversy will be found in Rohrbacher, *Hist. de l'Eglise Cath.* vol. iv. p. 367; Guettée, *Hist. de l'Eglise de France*, vol. i. p. 204; Fleury, *H. E.* xxiv. 59–61; xxvi. 11; xxviii. 56; Robertson, *Hist. of Church*, book ii. c. 8, p. 442, and c. 13, p. 547; Tillemont, vol. xvi.; Ceillier, vol. x.; Schaff, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, § 291, p. 1113. See also *Dict. of Biography and Mythology*, vol. iii. and in the present work PELAGIUS (2). [H. W. P.]

PROSPER (5), ST., fifth bishop of Orleans in the 5th century, is commemorated at Orleans, July 29, and appears in Beda's martyrology on that day (4 Kal. Aug.). He is only known as a friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, whom he asked to write the history of the war of Attila and his siege of Orleans. The poet began it, but found the task too heavy a one (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* viii. 15; Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. vii. 82–3; *Gall. Christ.* viii. 1412). [S. A. B.]

PROSPER (6), responsalis, or bearer of letters from DOMINICUS (2), bishop of Carthage in A.D. 594 to Gregory the Great (*Epp.* v. 5). [F. D.]

PROTADIUS (PROTHADIUS), ST., twenty-fourth bishop of Besançon between St. Nicetius and St. Donatus (circ. A.D. 612–624), is said, on doubtful authority, to have waged war against the simoniacal practices of the time (*Vita*, § 4, Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. ii. p. 412). He is remembered for the Liturgy which he composed, at the prayer of some of his clergy, to settle disputed points of ritual. This is said to be still extant, though the original work is unrecognisable through later additions and alterations, in a document given by Migne (*Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 411), where it is followed (pp. 411–422) by a *Martyrologium* ascribed to him, but which has clearly been much added to, the saint's own name appearing on his day, Feb. 10. The anonymous life in the *Acta SS.* (*ibid.*) is very late and quite unauthentic (*Gall. Christ.* xv. 13; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 531–2; Ceillier, xi. 632–3). [S. A. B.]

PROTASIUS (1). [GERVASIUS.]

PROTASIUS (2), bishop of Milan when St. Athanasius visited that city in 345 (Athan. *Ap. ad Const.* c. 3); he also subscribed the council of Sardica in 343 (*Ap. c. Ar.* c. 50; Hilar. *Frag.* i. § 15; Tillem. vi. 31, 703). He preceded DIONYSIUS (14). [C. H.]

PROTASIUS (3), I., ST., sixth bishop of Sion, in the Valais, in the latter half of the 5th century (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 735; Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. vi. 249; Sept. iii. 72 sqq.; Ceillier, ii. 472). [S. A. B.]

PROTASIUS (4), ninth or tenth bishop of Aix following Pientius towards the close of the 6th century, was *vice dominus* of the diocese of Arles, under Sapaudus, before his elevation to the episcopate. This office was concerned with the temporalities of the diocese (cf. Greg. Magn. *Ep.* xi. 71, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1211) and Gregory the Great, to whom his good qualities were known through Augustine of Canterbury, therefore applied to him in an extant letter (vi. 55, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 839) written A.D. 614, to urge Virgilius, a successor of Sapaudus at Arles, to forward to Rome the *pensiones* which his predecessor had withheld. A blank of 200 years follows his episcopate in the history of the see. (*Gall. Christ.* i. 302; Ceillier, xi. 506.) [S. A. B.]

PROTERIUS, ST., patriarch of Alexandria, had been presbyter and church-steward under Dioscorus, and seems to have incurred his displeasure by taking an opposite view of the Eutychian question (see Ischyrion, ap. Mansi, vi. 1017). If so, however, he must have, to some extent, regained his bishop's favour, for he was left in charge of the church when Dioscorus went to attend the council of Chalcedon. After his deposition by that council, the emperor Marcian gave orders for a new election to the see. The suffragan bishops, with the exception of thirteen detained at Constantinople by a resolution of the council (Chalced. c. 30), were assembled in synod; and the chief laymen of the city came as usual to express their mind, and assent to the prelate's choice. (Compare Liberatus, *Breviar.* c. 14, and Evagrius, ii. 5.) There was great difficulty, however, in coming to a conclusion; for the majority of the Alexandrian church people were profoundly aggrieved by the action of the late council. In their eyes Dioscorus was still their rightful "pope," the representative of Cyril and of Athanasius, the victim of a Nestorianising reaction which had enlisted the aid of the East and of the West. The tyranny of a heterodox majority could never annul a spiritual right. Dioscorus lived, and had not resigned his charge; and therefore the church which had been "espoused" to him, could not, without the guilt of "adultery," form relations with any new bishop.

Ultimately, however, opposition to the imperial mandate was felt to be impracticable: not a few must have been wearied by the despotism, or scandalised by the conduct, of the deposed patriarch. The synod, according to Liberatus, included four Egyptian prelates who had sat in the council, Athanasius, Ausonius, Nestorius, and Macarius (Mansi, vi. 571); and there, after hearing a statement of Flavian's read, had followed a number of other bishops in passing over from the side where Dioscorus sat, and joining the ranks of the "Orientals" (*ib.* vi. 681). It was resolved to elect; and then "the opinion of all inclined" in favour of Proterius, who might be deemed, in one point of view, the more acceptable, as having held a post under Dioscorus. He was accordingly consecrated and enthroned (A.D. 452); but the passions of the Dioscorian and anti-Dioscorian parties broke out at once into tumultuous dissension, which Evagrius likens to the surging of the sea. He adds that Priscus the rhetorician, then arriving in Alexandria from the Thebaid, was present at a collision between the populace and the authorities, when the soldiers were called out, were pelted, were driven into the ruinous Serapeum, and there actually burnt to death. Florus, who united the functions of Augustal prefect and commander-in-chief, punished this outrage by cutting off the general dole of bread, closing the baths, stopping the exhibitions, and sending for fresh troops from Constantinople, whose insolent license, however, did but aggravate the excitement, until Florus found it prudent to meet the people in the hippodrome, and promise to cancel his restrictive measures. Theophanes, who wrote about the end of the 8th century, tells a story which is probably no more than a story, that the people on this occasion threatened to stop the corn-supplies for Constantinople, whereupon Marcian ordered that the Egyptian corn should be exported from Pelusium instead of from Alexandria; and the Alexandrians being reduced to straits, employed the intercession of Proterius with the emperor (*Chronograph.* i. 165). Proterius sent to Leo the usual announcement of his elevation; Leo replied by asking for some definite assurance of his orthodoxy (Leo, *Epist.* 113, in March of 453), and received by the hands of Nestorius of Phragon, one of the four bishops above mentioned, a letter which, as he expressed it, was "fully satisfactory," and shewed Proterius to be a "sincere assertor of the Catholic dogma," inasmuch as he had cordially accepted the Tome (*Epist.* 127, 130). Thereupon (in March of 454) he wrote again to Proterius, advising him to clear himself in his people's eyes from all suspicion of Nestorianising, by reading to them certain passages from approved Fathers, and then shewing that the "tome" did but hand on their tradition, and guard the truth from perversions on either side. Leo took care, in thus addressing the "successor of St. Mark," to dwell on that evangelist's relation to St. Peter as of a disciple to a teacher; and he bespeaks the support of the Alexandrian see in this resistance to the unprincipled ambition of Constantinople, which in the 28th canon, so called, of Chalcedon, had injured the "dignity" of the other great bishoprics (*Epist.* 129). Another question prolonged the correspondence. The Nicene fathers were believed to have commissioned the Alexandrian bishops to ascertain and signify the right time for each coming Easter; "because," says Leo, "skill in such computations appeared to be of old time traditional among the Egyptians" (*Epist.* 121). Leo had accordingly consulted Cyril as to the Easter of 444; and he now, in 454, applied to Proterius, through the emperor, for his opinion as to the calculation of the Easter of the next year, 455, which the Alexandrian paschal table appeared to him to place too late (*Epist.* 121, 127). Proterius, after studying the subject, as he expressed it, in the books of the (Mosaic) "law," and in the writings of "ancient teachers," replied to Leo at some length (*Epist.* 133, April 454). The paschal cycle of the "blessed father" Theophilus, representing, as it did, the mind of that Egyptian church which was confessedly "the mother of such laborious investigations," was demonstrably faultless; and Egypt and the East would, in conformity to it, keep the 24th of April in the coming year as Easter Sunday. But he would not seem to dogmatise without rendering a reason, and he proceeded to argue thus: (1) Our Lord kept the Passover on a Thursday evening, under the "14th moon" of the 1st month. He was crucified on the 15th, and rose again on the 17th. (2) It was fitting to follow the lines of the old paschal institution by closing the ante-paschal fast on an evening. (On the importance of this "closing of the fast" in the Easter question, see Euseb. v. 23.) Now (3) if the 14th moon were always to fall on a Thursday, it would be simple enough; but when it fell on a Sunday, what was to be done? (a) The fast could not be closed, the festival could not be begun, on the evening of that Sunday; because to fast on a Sunday until the evening would be worthy of Manicheans rather than of Christians. (b) Nor could the closing of the fast take place on the Saturday evening, because that would be a day too early, being the day of the 13th moon; therefore (c) in such a case, Easter must be put off for a week, as had, in fact, been the case in several preceding years, *e.g.* in 387. And (4) this would be the case for the year ensuing, when the 14th moon would fall on Sunday, April 17; the fast must then be continued until Saturday evening, April 23, and Easter Sunday must be April 24. If it was thought at Rome that this would drive the paschal festival into "another month," let it be considered that, the solar and lunar "courses" not being capable of exact adjustment ("quod velocissimum lunae motum cursus solis minime consequatur"), the paschal lunar month could not always begin on the same day of the year; *e.g.* in the year ensuing it could not begin on March 21, the day of the equinox, because the 14th moon of the first month would fall on April 17; therefore it must begin on April 4; and April 24, kept as Easter Sunday, would be well within the paschal limits. (The Ballerini observe that Proterius, in this assertion as to April 17, was assuming the correctness of his own church's cycle of 19 years, whereas the Latins followed a cycle of 84 years, according to which April 17 would be the 17th day of the moon.) Proterius concluded by expressing his belief, that all Christians everywhere would "observe one faith, one baptism, and one most sacred paschal solemnity," and by explaining that he had not thought it safe to entrust to

Alexandrian hands the task of translating this letter into Latin.

It was doubtless a relief to him to busy himself in these quiet studies—a distraction of thought from anxieties which must have deepened day by day. Leontius plainly exaggerates when he says that not a single Alexandrian would communicate with him (*de Sectis*, v. 1): but undoubtedly great numbers of his flock regarded him as a traitorous hireling, who had climbed up into a fold bereft of its true shepherd. He had troubles within the circle of his clergy; not long after the council, a priest named Timotheus, and a deacon named Peter, nicknamed Mongus, refused to communicate with him, because in his diptychs he ignored Dioscorus and commemorated the council of Chalcedon. He summoned them to return to their duty; they refused; he pronounced against them in synod a sentence of deposition (Liberatus, c. 15; *Brevic. Hist. Eutych.* or *Gesta in causa Acacii*, in Mansi, vii. 1062). Four or five bishops and a few monks appear to have actively supported them, and to have been included in their condemnation, and in the imperial sentence of exile which followed it (*Epist. Aegypt. Episc. ad Leonem Aug.* in Mansi, vii. 525). These bishops were probably among the thirteen whom the council of Chalcedon had terrified by its severity (Mansi, vii. 51). The monks in Egypt, as elsewhere, were generally attached to the Monophysite position, which they erroneously identified with the Cyrilline; they knew not of, or they could not appreciate, the explanations whereby Cyril had, as he thought, safeguarded the formula of "one *physis* of God the Word, but that as incarnate," meaning, "We must ever think of God the Word as of One Person, although He has assumed our humanity." They took for granted that the late council had to all intents and purposes been striking at Cyril through Dioscorus; and that what was at stake was Christ's single personality as against the error which had resolved the Incarnation into a signal association between the Word and a pre-eminent saint. Thus, besides those monks who had overtly taken part with Timotheus and Peter, others apparently had suspended communion with the archbishop; and Marcian had found it expedient to address them in gentle and persuasive terms, assuring them that the doctrine of "one Christ," symbolised by the term Theotocos, had been held sacrosanct at Chalcedon, and exhorting them therefore to unite themselves to the Catholic church of the orthodox, which was one (Mansi, vii. 481). But the schism, once begun, was not thus to be abated; the zealous seceders raised a cry, which has practically never died out, that the Egyptian adherents of the council of Chalcedon were a mere state-made church, upheld by the court against the convictions of the faithful. Even to this day the poor remnant of orthodoxy in Egypt is weighted with a name which in that connection is a stigma, Melchites, or "adherents of the king." (Comp. Renaudot, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* p. 119; Neale, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* ii. 7. They both add that the orthodox accepted the term.) Even after the death of Dioscorus in exile, Proterius had to see himself ignored and disclaimed, to know that he was the object of a hatred that was biding its time, and "during the greater part of his pontificate," as Liberatus tells us, to depend for personal safety on the presence of a military guard. Thus imperilled and thus protected, "the emperor's bishop" had to live, and to do what work he could—often surely with much sickness of heart, and with grave apprehensions as to the future. At last, in the January of 457, Marcian died, and the Monophysites thought they saw their opportunity. Some of the malcontent Egyptian bishops renewed their outcry against the council (Eulogius, in Photius, *Bibl.* 130, p. 283, ed. Bekk.); and Timotheus, having ventured back to Alexandria, began those intrigues which won for him the title of "the Cat" (TIMOTHEUS AELURUS). Theophanes quaintly couples his arrival with that of a camelopard, some "ox-deer," and other wild beasts (*Chronograph.* i. p. 170). When his plans were matured, he called to his aid a force which had for ages been proverbially terrible—the *familiaris furor* (*Hist. August.* ii. 311) of the Alexandrian mob, which had burst forth against the Jews in the days of Philo, and "polluted every street with blood" in the reign of Gallienus (Gibbon, i. 414); and by its very unaccountableness had led a pagan historian of the fourth century to refer to some oracular predictions (Ammianus, xxii. 114), even as in after days it was commonly said that the mere fracture of a vessel might be an occasion for stirring the city to wild tumult (Evagr. ii. 8). It so happened that the "dux" Dionysius was absent in Upper Egypt; and Timotheus found it all the easier to gather a disorderly following, and to procure for himself an irregular consecration. When Dionysius returned, he expelled Timotheus; and the latter's partisans in revenge rushed to the house of Proterius, and after besetting him for some time in the adjacent church of Quirinus, pursued him when he fled into its baptistery, ran him through with a sword, and completed the bloody work with many wounds. Six of his clerics perished with him. The murderers fastened the corpse to a cord, and dragged it in ghastly procession across the central place called Tetrapylon, and then through nearly the whole of the vast city, with hideous cries, "Look at Proterius!" it was beaten as if it could still suffer, torn limb from limb, and finally burnt, and its ashes "scattered to the winds"—a scene of horror which recalls the murder of George the Arian bishop in 361, but is aggravated by the fact that the performers were professing Christians, that the place of the murder was a baptistery, which, say the fourteen Egyptian bishops in their narrative to the emperor Leo, partly quoted by Evagrius, is "awe-striking even to barbarians and savages," and, to add one more circumstance which distinguishes it from the murder of Hypatia by "Christian fanatics," that the time was, according to the Egyptian bishops, the festival (πανήγυρις) of the Passion of salvation, which naturally means Easter day, or, as Theophanes says, "the first day of the Paschal festival," although Liberatus and the Breviculus say it was "three days before Easter, the day on which Coena Domini celebratur," *i.e.* Maundy Thursday. Easter Sunday in the year 457 was March 31. (For authorities see *Ep. Aeg. Episc.* in Mansi, vii. 525; Leo, *Epist.* 156. 5; *Breviculus Hist. Eutych.* in Mansi, vii. 1062; Liberatus, *Brev.* c. 15; Evagrius, ii. 8. See also Le Quien, ii. 412; Neale,

Hist. Alex. ii. 12.) The biographer of Peter Mongus, as Evagrius tells us, naturally tried to make out that Proterius provoked his death by exciting a disturbance, and that it was inflicted by soldiers, not by the people. Theophanes, in a passage which seems defective, intimates that the new emperor, Leo I., caused two men to have their tongues cut out and to be sent into exile as having taken part in the murder; but the Latin version, ignoring his ἀμφοτέρους, has merely "eos qui...caedi communicaverant." St. Proterius is venerated as a martyr in the Greek and Latin churches, on February 28. [W. B.]

PROTOCTETUS, presb. [ORIGENES, p. 101 *a*.]

PROTOGENES (1), bishop of Sardica in Dacia, comes first before us in the question of slavery, as Constantine, in A.D. 316, addressed to him the rescript (*Cod. Just.* I. xiii. 1; Kriegel, *Corp. Jud. Civ.* vii. 89) which allowed manumission to take place in church before the priest and congregation, the master also giving a written deed as permanent evidence (Fleury, *H. E.* x. 20). He subscribed the Acts of the council of Nice as "Protogenes Sardicensis," and was one of the chief disputants (Gelasius Cyz. *De Act. Nic. Conc.* ii. c. 13). "Protogenes admirabilis" was charged at the close of the council with the duty of promulgating the decrees through the churches of Dacia, Calabria, Dardanica, and their borders (*Act. Conc. Nic.* iv.; Gelas. Cyz. ii. c. 35). He and Hosius of Cordova were the most prominent bishops at the council of Sardica (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 20; Athanas. *Cont. Ar.* ii.), and had to bear the calumnies and excommunications of the council of Eastern bishops at Philippopolis (Sozomen, *H. E.* iii. 11). Among those who signed the decrees at Sardica we find, "Protogenes a Dacia, de Sardica," but though it was in his own city, he was not president of the council, that honour being given to Hosius. Gams (*Ser. Episc.* 416) dates his episcopate from A.D. 316 to 343–4. (Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 301; Tillemont, *H. E.* vi. 143, 275, 291, 293, and notes; Hefele, *Conc. Gesch.* i. 624 sq.) [J. G.]

PROTOGENES (2), a presbyter of Charrae, one of the most distinguished among the confessors of Edessa (ἀξιάγαστος, Theod.), in the persecution under Valens, A.D. 371. He and his friend Eulogius were banished to Antinous in the Thebaid, where Protogenes applied himself to the education of the youth of the city who were chiefly pagans, giving them instruction in writing and in the Holy Scriptures. His prayers having been answered in the cure of some of his pupils who were dangerously sick, he induced them to embrace the Christian faith. On the restoration of peace to the church, Protogenes and his friend received orders to return home, to the great regret of the inhabitants of Antinous. Protogenes was appointed to the charge of the church at Charrae, where the people were wedded to Gentile superstitions (Theod. *H. E.* iv. 18). [EULOGIUS (4).] [E. V.]

PROTOGENES (3), prefect of the East and consul 449, one of the leading men to whom Theodoret wrote in 449, defending himself from the calumnies of his enemies, and exhorting him to defend the truth, and do what he could to restore peace to the church (Theod. *Ep.* 94). He was officially present at the council of Chalcedon in 451. (Labbe, iv. 77.) [E. V.]

PROTONICE. [THADDEUS.]

PRUDENTIUS, MARCUS (?[a]) AURELIUS CLEMENS, the chief Christian poet of early times, was born A.D. 348 (Praef. 24, cf. *Apotheosis*, 449), in the north of Spain, near the Pyrenees (*Peristeph.* vi. 146). The exact place is uncertain; he applies the epithet "noster" to Tarragona (*Perist.* vi. 144), Calahorra (i. 116; iv. 31), and Saragossa (iv. 195), but this may refer to his dwelling-place or to the whole country. His name, as well as his education and career, imply that he was of a good family; he was educated in rhetoric and law, and his poems shew an exact knowledge of the Latin classical poets, especially Virgil, Ovid, Horace, and Juvenal; he does not seem to have known Greek, or at best only enough to apply some doubtful Greek titles to his works, and shews no knowledge of Hebrew. He speaks of his early life as stained with much sinfulness, but he must have been held in high respect, for after practising as an advocate, he twice held an important civil office, perhaps that of rector of the Provincia Tarraconensis, or only that of *defensor civitatis*, and was at last raised to some high position, either civil or military, at the emperor's court (cf. Kayser, p. 254 n.; Brockhaus, p. 16 n.; Faguet, p. 17.). Late in life, he received some deep religious impression, making him feel how little he had yet done that would be of use for a future life. In consequence of this, he gave up public life and devoted himself to Christian poetry. Some expressions of his seem to imply that he joined some religious society (*Cath.* ii. 45; iii. 56; cf. *Psych.* 551–573). He has no longer any money to relieve the poor (*Epilogus* 10); the only offering he can make to God is his poetry (*ib.*). To this and to prayer he devoted his life; making it his aim to spread among the educated classes a correct knowledge of Christianity, or, like a "Christian Pindar," to sing the triumphs of the martyrs on their festal days and so to win them greater honour. At some time in his life he paid a visit to Rome. It was a time of great anxiety to himself; on his way he passed Imola, and there poured out his soul in prayer before the picture of St. Cassian in the church (*Perist.* x. 103, 104). At Rome his anxiety remains and is increased by illness; and again he prays and implores the intercession of St. Hippolytus (xi. 127). His prayer, whatever it was, was answered. While at Rome, he was deeply impressed with the memorials of the martyrs in the catacombs and the churches (*Perist.* xi.) and composed his poem on the death of St. Peter and St. Paul (*Perist.* xii.). While there, he probably became acquainted with the poems of pope Damasus, which influenced some of his own. On returning to Spain, he wrote his poem on St. Cassian (ix.) and that on St. Hippolytus, requesting his bishop to introduce the observance of that saint's festival into Spain (xi.). In A.D. 403 or 404 he wrote the second book *contra*

[a] Cf. Dressel, p. ii. n. Migne, lix. p. 593.

Symmachum, and in A.D. 405 published an edition of his poems, with a preface that shews that all his extant works, except the *Dittochaeon*, and perhaps the *Psychomachia*, were then written. Of his later life or of his death nothing is known.

His character, as it appears from his writings, is very lovable. He is a loyal Roman, proud of the empire, for he sees in its past conquests and its capacity for government a preparation for the kingdom of Christ, and he looks forward to greater conquests under the banner of the Cross (*Perist.* ii. 1–35, 413–484, x. *passim; c. Symm.* i. 415–505; ii. 577–771). He has a great fondness for art, wishing to keep even Pagan statues if regarded only as ornaments (*c. Symm.* i. 505).

As a Christian he has an intellectual horror of heresy and heretics, though with a personal tenderness for the latter (*c. Symm.* ii. *Pref.*). He is loyal to all church customs and ordinances, and withal has a strong appreciation of spiritual truth. This is seen in his lofty conception of the Nature of God (*Cath.* iv. 7–15; *Apoth.* 84–90; *Ham.* 27 sq.; *c. Symm.* i. 325; *Peristeph.* x. 310), of the True Temple (*Cath.* iv. 16–21; *c. Symm.* ii. 249; *Apoth.* 516), the True Worship (*Perist.* x. 341), the True Fast (*Cath.* vi. 201–220), the True Nobility of birth (*Perist.* x. 123), the True Reward (*c. Symm.* ii. 750), the True Riches (*Perist.* ii. 203). He shews a pious tenderness of spirit (cf. *Apoth.* 393), kissing the sacred books (*ib.* 598), and the altar (*Perist.* ix. 100), and a deep personal humility which does not venture to contend with Symmachus (i. 609); which offers his verses to Christ, though they are but the "earthen vessel" (*Epilogus* 29) of a "rustic poet" (*Perist.* ii. 574; x. 1); which has no merit in itself, is not worthy of high thoughts at night (*Cath.* vi. 117), but pleads for the intercession of the saints that he may be transferred from Christ's left hand to His right on the judgment day (*Perist.* ii. 574; vi. 162; x. 1136), content if he be saved from the fires of hell and gently purified for the lowest place among the saved (*Ham.* 931). (Authorities—his own works, especially the Preface, and Gennadius, *de vir. ill.* cap. 13.)

Works.—Trithemius speaks of Prudentius as having written secular poems in early life. There is however no trace of them, unless the style of the later works be held to imply previous practice. He also mentions prose works and letters written later. Of these, too, there is no trace. The only non-extant work for which there seems to be any authority, is an "Hexaemeron," a poem on the Creation, attributed to him by Gennadius. The extant works are described in detail below. They fall into three classes—(a) lyrical, (b) apologetic or didactic, (c) allegorical. Their most remarkable characteristic is certainly their variety. The lyrical poems are influenced in form and expression by Horace, and also by Ambrose, and in a less degree by Damasus. The choice of metres and treatment, however, shew much originality. He uses 20 metres, 11 of which are slightly different from any in previous writers. What had been with Ambrose a short hymn, becomes a long ode with moral exhortation, rhetorical speeches, and frequent Biblical illustration; rising at times to much lyrical sweetness, and combined with a clever variety of metre. The didactic aim is however too prominent for lyrical perfection, and only a few extracts have been used in church services. The apologetic poems are also perhaps primarily *didactic*. With the exception of the *Libri c. Symm.* they do not seem called forth by any special occasion, but serve a general purpose of presenting Christian doctrine in an attractive form; naturally at the time, such an attempt would take the shape of an answer to heretics. For form they are much indebted to Virgil and, in a less degree, to Lucretius and Juvencus: for substance, to the earlier Christian apologists, especially Tertullian and Ambrose. The allegorical poem is vigorous, and mainly interesting as the first specimen of a treatment which was frequently imitated in later Christian literature, both poetry and prose. All the poems have a considerable literary value; they are written on the whole in good classical Latin, with many new words needed for church purposes, and with a touch of archaic forms and words which is characteristic of this period. The prosody is fairly correct. Final *o* is shortened in all terminations; short final syllables are freely lengthened in caesura or before double consonants: *a* in acc. plural is frequently lengthened (*utrāque*, *Cath.* x. 5; *eādem*, *Perist.* i. 3), and there are a few rare forms, and un-classical quantities, but such eccentricities are very rare in Latin words, though Greek and Hebrew are treated with great freedom (v. lists in Migne, *Prolegg.* xxiii. Obbar, pp. xvii. xviii.; and esp. Faguet, pp. 92–142, for a full examination of the language and metres).

The poems are written with great fluency, relieved by dramatic vividness (e.g. *Perist.* v.; *c. Symm.* ii. 654 sqq.), by rhetorical vigour of description (e.g. *Apoth.* 450–503; *c. Symm.* i. 415), by considerable power of satire (*Apoth.* 186–206; *Ham.* 246) and humour (*Perist.* ii. 169, 407; ix. 69, 82), and much epigrammatic terseness of expression; but at the same time there is much tasteless dwelling on unpleasant details, as in the accounts of martyrdoms (e.g. *Perist.* x. 901), or of the coarsenesses of heathen mythology (*Cath.* vii. 115 sqq.). They are full of typical adaptations of the Bible history (e.g. Prefaces to *Ham.*, *Psych.*, and i. ii. *Symm.*). In this way, and in the substance of their arguments, they have a theological value, as shewing the tone of thought common at the time. The very fact, that they shew little originality of thought, makes them even more valuable for this purpose. (For the substance of the theology v. Brockhaus, cap. vii.) But perhaps their historical value is the greatest. They give us considerable information about heathen antiquities, e.g. the kinds of torture in use (*Perist.* i. 42), methods of writing (*Perist.* ix. 23), the corn supplies of Rome (*c. Symm.* ii. 920), the gladiatorial shows (*c. Symm.* i. 384; ii. 1090), the religious rites (i. ii. *c. Symm. passim*, and *Perist.* x.). But more particularly is this true of Christian antiquities: we see the luxury and avarice of the times (*Ham.* 246; *Apoth.* 183, 210, 450), the position of deacons and archdeacons at Rome (*Perist.* ii. 37; v. 29), the times and details of fasting (*Cath.* iii. 57; vii. viii. 9), the use of anointing (*Cath.* vi. 125; ix. 98; *Apoth.* 357, 493; *Psych.* 360), of the sign of the cross (*Cath.* vi. 129; ix. 84; *Apoth.* 493; *c. Symm.* ii. 712), of lights in churches, especially on Easter Eve (*Cath.* v.), of funeral rites (*Cath.* x. 49), of the

veneration for the saints (*Perist. passim*, esp. i. 10–21; ii. 530 sqq.; x. ad fin.; xi. ad in. xii.) One point deserves to be specially noted; the illustrations of the art of the time. We have mention, and in some cases a full description, of the Lateran Church (*c. Symm.* i. 586), the church of St. Laurence (*Perist.* xi. 216), and of buildings over the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul (*Perist.* xii.) and of the catacombs (*Perist.* xi. 153) at Rome; also of a church at Merida (*Perist.* iii. 191), and a baptistery apparently at Calahorra (*Perist.* viii.). We have also descriptions of a picture of the martyrdom of St. Cassian in the church at Imola (*Perist.* ix.), of St. Hippolytus in the catacombs (xi. 123), and of St. Peter (xii. 38). The *Dittochaeon* consists of titles for pictures, and it is noticeable that nearly all the symbols which Prudentius uses to express Christian Truth (the Dove, the Palm, the Good Shepherd &c.), as well as the Bible scenes with which he illustrates his poems, are found on gems, or on the walls of the catacombs, so that Prudentius may have derived his use of them from thence (Brockhaus, cap. ix.).

From the first the poems of Prudentius were held in great honour; they are quoted with high praise by Sidonius Apollinaris, Avitus, Leo, Isidore, Rabanus Maurus, Alcuin, &c. They were edited in the 6th century by Vettius Agorius Basilius, the consul and editor of Horace. They were used as a school book by Archbishop Bruno in the 10th century, and by Vives in the 15th. On no book, except the Bible, are there so many German glosses found. No less than 33 MSS. are in existence: and as early as the 9th century a commentary on them was written by Iso, a monk of St. Gall. In the middle ages the *Psychomachia* and the *Cathemerinon* were special favourites, and the rest were rarely copied. On the invention of printing, the whole or parts of his works were frequently printed; more than sixty editions have appeared since 1470, though apparently none in England. In addition to those in the different collections of the Fathers and the Christian poets, the most available editions are those of Heinsius, 16mo. Amsterdam, 1667; F. Areval, Rome, 1788 (reprinted with very full prolegomena in Migne's *Patrologia*, lix. and lx.); Chamillard, Paris, 1687, in the "Delphin" Classics (with useful index); Obbar, 8vo. Tubingen, 1845, and Dressel, Leipzig, 1860, both of these with short but useful prolegomena, critical apparatus, and slight exegetical notes. The other editions, as well as the MSS. and chief translations, are enumerated by Obbar, by Dressel, and by Faguet, who adds the chief various readings in the Codex Puteanus. To these should be added an English verse translation of the Cathemerinon (Rivingtons, London 1845); a German translation of Cathemerinon xi. by Schmidt in *Zeitschrift für Lüth. Theologie*, 1866, and of the Apotheosis in Brockhaus, *A. Prudentius in seiner Bedeutung für die Kirche seiner Zeit*, Leipzig, 1872. This last monograph forms a most valuable introduction to the poems. A very good account of them will also be found in Ebert, *Christlich-Lat. Lit.* pp. 243–283, and Faguet, *De A. Prudentii Clementis Carm. lyricis*, Burdigalae, 1883. We give a fuller account of each poem.

A. *Lyrical.* (a) *Cathemerinon* (i.e. καθημερινῶν ὕμνων) described in the Pref. 37, 38; a collection of hymns, the first half for the different hours of the day; the latter half for different church seasons. A question has been raised whether the fifth refers to the *daily* lighting of lamps in the churches, or to the ceremonies on Easter Eve, but its position and language both favour the former view. There is no evidence of the time or place at which they were written, except that it was before A.D. 405, and apparently while Prudentius was leading a religious life. The metre is very varied, though always in strophes, and often admirably adapted to its subject; e.g. in vi. where the metre has a "lulling" character in the hymn at bed-time; and ix. where the trochaic tetrameter effectively expresses the instantaneous effect of the words of Christ. Both metre and treatment shew the influence of Ambrose (cf. i. ii. xi. xii.); the language that of Virgil, Ovid, Horace, and Juvencus. They are poems rather than hymns. The main tone is hortatory, the readers are called on to praise God, fast, lead pure lives, &c. This is enforced by long narratives from the Bible (cf. i. 49; ii. 73; iii. 101; iv. 37; vi. 57; vii. 26; x. 69), often treated typically. At times the subjects are drawn out to wearisome length (cf. vii. 115–120, 164 sqq.), but on the whole they are vigorous and clear, and at times sweet and simple (e.g. vi.), so that for their sweet simplicity they have been compared with the paintings of Fra Angelico, at times very spirited (ix. and xii.), with true lyrical inspiration. Good specimens will be found in ii. 97–112; v. 113–124; vi. 125–152; x. 117–137; xii. 125–140. Though necessarily too long for public worship, extracts were made at least as early as the 9th century, and are found frequently in the Mozarabic Liturgy (cf. v. vi. vii. ix. x.), and a few in the Roman and Salisbury breviaries; on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday at Lauds (i. ii.), Compline at Christmas (ix.), Compline on Good Friday (vi.), Easter Eve (v.), Epiphany, the Holy Innocents, and the Transfiguration (xii.). (Daniel, i. 119, and Kayser, *Geschichte der Kirchenhymnen*, 275–336.)

(b) *Peristephanon* (i.e. περὶ στεφάνων, De Coronis Martyrum), described in Preface 42; a collection of 14 lyrical poems, all (except viii. which is an inscription for a baptistery), written in honour of martyrs. The choice of the martyrs is inspired by the circumstances of the poet's life; the details perhaps taken from existing Acta Martyrum. Half of them are connected with his own native church of Spain (i. ii. (?) iii.–vi. xiii.), the rest are saints whom he found specially honoured at Rome (ii. vii. x. (?) xi. xii.) or on his journey to Rome (ix.). The reason for the choice of Romanus (x.) is doubtful. Perhaps his name had procured him honour at Rome. More probably it is due to the opportunity afforded by his life for an attack on heathenism. xii. was written at Rome, ix. and xi. in Spain after his return. The dates of the rest cannot be fixed. Though much too long for church service, extracts from many of them are found in the Mozarabic Liturgy (i. ii. iii. vi. x. xiv.). They generally begin with a reference to the blessings gained by the martyr's death, then describe the martyrdom, and end with a request for the martyr's intercession. Like the Cathemerinon, they are frequently illustrated by Old Testament stories (ii. 362; iii. 51; vi. 86, 109; vii. 61; x. 736). They have much lyrical power, the metre being varied with the subject, e.g. in i. the tetrameter used for a

soldier's death; in vi. the three-lined metre to describe the three martyrs. The narrative is often marked by dramatic vividness (ii. v.), quiet humour (ii. 169; ix. 69), and satire which in tone as well as language recalls Juvenal (x. 203, 221, 258, 515, 710), and by a deep appreciation of spiritual truth. At the same time, the details of the tortures are dwelt upon in a way offensive to modern taste; and the digressions are at times quite out of proportion to the rest of the poem, so that some of them become apologetic treatises rather than hymns (x.).

B. *Apologetic* (referred to in Preface 39). (1) *Apotheosis* = ἀποθέωσις, which is translated by Gennadius "De Divinitate," and in some MSS. "De Trinitate," as though it meant "The Divine Nature," but perhaps it is more exactly "The Deification of Human Nature in Christ" (cf. Pref. 8, 9 and 176, 177; *c. Symm.* ii. 268).

The Preface consists of a statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, followed by an iambic poem on the need of some rule of faith at a time of such controversy. A special occasion may perhaps be found for its composition in the condemnation of the Priscillianists by the council of Saragossa A.D. 380; the writer does not however mention them by name, but deals with all the chief errors on the subject of our Lord's Nature.

First he shews that there is a real difference between the Father and the Son: (a) as against the Patripassians: Christ was not the Father, for "no man hath seen God." Even in the Old Testament, it was through the Word that God appeared to the patriarchs; so now the Father has not descended, but the Son has taken up human nature to the Father's throne (1–177).

(b) As against the Sabellians: Christ is not a mere form of the Father's working. This denies God's Fatherhood, and so falls back upon the heathen conception of God as merely the ruler of the universe (178–216). He is really Father, and the Son really Son by an eternal generation, which is beyond all thought, but yet is proved by Scripture (217–320).

But secondly, the difference was not such as to imply that Christ was not God: (a) as against the Jews: The Jews deny his Divinity, but they are blind to the teaching of their prophets, and the facts of history. Christ is praised throughout the world; heathen demons and oracles and victims, as in the story of Julian, quail before the Cross. The true Christian temple is eternal, while the Jewish is in ruins (320–551).

(b) As against semi-Jewish Christians, such as the Ebionites: These say Christ is only man; but his work is immortal, and therefore his origin probably was. This is proved by the Gospels and Isaiah, by the adoration of the Magi, and by his miracles. He was the True God, redeeming the whole of human nature (552–781).

(c) A digression, perhaps against some exaggeration of Origen's teaching: It is said, the soul being inspired of God cannot perish and need redemption. But though inspired by God, it is not God; it had a beginning, is limited in power, and so liable to sin and its penalties. It did sin when united to the body, and transmitted its sin to posterity. Therefore Christ took human nature apart from sin and so conquered death (782–952).

Lastly, Christ, though really God, is also really man: as against the *Docetae.* He himself prophesied of his real sufferings; the genealogies shew a real human descent, and any unreality would be unworthy of God. He was True Man and True God, and as he has risen so we shall rise (953–1085).

The poem is even and correct. In arrangement and treatment it is very likely influenced by some earlier treatise, and shews traces of a knowledge of Tertullian adv. Praxeam (177, 305, 325). In language it has reminiscences of Ovid (212) and Virgil (312, 662, 1028); the dry argumentative character is relieved by the vigorous account of Julian (450 sqq.), and by the frequent typical use of Scripture (59, 325, 358, 995, 1005). It is edited in Hurter's *Patrum Selecta Opuscula*, Innsbruck, 1876.

(2) *Hamartigenia* = ἁμαρτιγενεία. A treatise on the origin of sin; discussed in a polemical argument against Marcion. In a short iambic preface the conduct of Cain, wrongly "dividing" his offering and murdering his brother, is explained as typical of Marcion's treatment of God's nature.

The poem itself falls into two parts.

(a) 1–639. God is not the creator of Evil. The existence of good and evil does not justify Marcion's theory of two Gods, for (i.) unity is essential to our conception of God. This is not violated by the Christian doctrine. There is a real unity in the Trinity, as real as the union of motion, heat, and light in the sun (1–94). (ii.) Such dualism leads to polytheism (95–105). (iii.) It is impossible to assign a separate sphere to either God. Marcion's theory of an evil God (110–125) is then contrasted with the Catholic truth of Satan, a created being, fallen through pride, leading man to sin, and so bringing barrenness and savagery upon earth (126–246). Through luxury and avarice man has misused his senses (246–333). All were created good (334–355), but man has misused them under the influence of Satan and of the "principalities and powers," which were typified by the Canaanitish kings in the wars against Israel. Man is as completely captive as Israel was in Babylon (356–523), but it is owing to his own free will. Like the viper, he has begotten a brood that devours himself (524–639).

(b) 640–931. God permits evil but does not sanction it. The whole object of the Incarnation was to save man from evil (640–669). The cause of evil is man's free will, but this was needed to secure moral goodness and his power of ruling creation. This implies choice: some choose good, and some evil, like Lot and his wife, Ruth and Orpah, two boys choosing different paths, or a flock of birds, half snared, half avoiding the snare (670–823). Those who choose evil pass into hell, the good into paradise; though each can see the other, as the limitations of earth are removed (824–931). The poem ends with a prayer of sweet humility that after death his spirit may be gently purified (931–966).

The poem bears no trace of its date. The thought is mainly based on Tertullian adv. Marcionem. The language shews reminiscences of Virgil, Persius (384), and Juvenal (763). Like the other poems, it is full of Old Testament illustrations, mystically applied (Pref. 409, 564, 723). The full description of hell and paradise, and also the graphic portraiture of Satan, are especially noteworthy as the earliest in Christian litera-

ture, and so probably of great influence upon later Christian art and literature. Both Dante and Milton may indirectly be indebted to them.

(3) *Libri c. Symmachum* (described in Preface 40, 41). The date and occasion of these books can be clearly determined. In 384 Symmachus had presented a petition to Valentinian II. for the restitution of the altar of Victory in the senate house, which had been removed by Gratian, and also of the incomes of the vestal virgins. Owing to the influence of St. Ambrose (*Ep.* 17, 18) this had been refused. In 392 the altar was restored by Eugenius; in 394 again removed by Theodosius. After his death the heathen party, encouraged by the invasion of the Goths, which they attributed to the neglect of heathenism, made a fresh attempt to have it restored by Arcadius and Honorius. It was at this time that Prudentius wrote these books, to counteract their influence. The date of Lib. ii. is fixed, as after the battle of Pollentia A.D. 403, and before the abolition of the gladiatorial games, A.D. 404 (ii. 710, 1114). Prob., Lib. i. is to be placed at the same time, though Faguet has argued for the earlier date, A.D. 395.

Book i. deals generally with the history and character of heathenism (cf. ii. 1–3) After a preface which applies the story of Acts xxviii. 3–6 to the new danger which was attacking the church, Prudentius explains his reason for writing (1–41), then ridicules the immorality of the gods of Olympus (42–144), of the Roman emperors with their ancestors and favourites (145–296). Such had been Rome's gods! nay, worse than this, the powers of nature, even the sun, though it is only one part of nature and has not even man's freedom (297–353), and the powers of the world below (354–407) had been worshipped, until Theodosius called on the senate to put away a religion so unworthy of an imperial state, and to adopt the Cross which had led Constantine to triumph (408–505). So he won in peace a glorious triumph over the gods (505–544). Senate and people flock to Christian altars, though a minority still dissents, and pagans like Symmachus still hold office (545–609). Would that his eloquence would tell of a nobler theme. I may not match myself with him, but I must do my best to prevent him from doing harm (609–658).

Book ii. also has a preface, with a prayer to Christ to help the poet as he once helped St. Peter on the water. The poet then deals in detail with the arguments of Symmachus.

(a) "The worship of Victory is needful for success." No; success is due to the soldier's bravery and the blessing of God Almighty, not to gods who are only the creation of that "trinity of deceit," painting, poetry, and superstition (1–76).

(b) "Custom is in favour of it; each nation ought to be allowed to worship the unknown God in its usual way."

True, man cannot know God Himself; yet faith can trust Him, and argue up to His nature from His gifts. For this there is only one way—to rise above earth and abstain from sin. The true temple is man's own heart created and redeemed by God (91–269). Mere plea of custom cannot hold against truth. It would have prevented all improvements in social life as well as in religion (270–374).

(c) "Fate has assigned this Genius to Rome." But the Genius has sanctioned many changes, why not this? Mere fatalism is foolish (402–486).

(d) "Our past victories are due to the gods." Many of them were the gods of conquered nations, conquered by Roman courage. Will they be more constant to us? Why have they permitted our defeats? In the growth of the empire God was preparing the way for Christ. Rome still gains new victories such as that of Stilicho and Honorius (487–771).

(e) "All men have a right to worship God in their own way, as they have to enjoy the sky, sun," &c. No, the laws of nature cannot consider a man's character; they treat him as they do the animals. But his character is not therefore on a level with theirs. In religion there are only two paths, one to truth, the other to error, whether of polytheism or atheism (771–908).

(f) "The stopping of the income of the Vestal Virgins is causing a famine." There is no special famine; only the ordinary changes of harvest, which do not affect Christians more than the heathen. How different is their culture of the soul! how different too their virgins from the Vestals marrying late in life, and gloating over the gladiatorial games! Appeal to the emperor to put down the games (909–1130).

The poem is very interesting, and of great historical value, both for the circumstances of the time and for the details of Roman mythology and religious rites. The prefaces consist of the typical use of Scripture, but there is no scope for it in the body of the books. They are full, however, of a sense of Rome's majesty, of vigorous description, and of high moral scorn. The language recalls Virgil (passim), Ovid, Juvenal, Horace, and Claudian (ii. 704). Plato is quoted in i. 30. The subject-matter is influenced in parts by Tertullian (i. 396) and Minucius Felix (i. 48), but mainly by St. Ambrose, whose arguments are at times reproduced almost verbally.

C. *Allegorical.*—Psychomachia = Ψυχομαχία, "De Compugnantia Animi" (Gennadius). The Spiritual Combat). The date is uncertain. Possibly Pref. 35 may refer to it (cf. *Psycho.* 875, 915), but this is doubtful. It seems to be later than the Hamartigenia as it expands a simile used there. Possibly it is later than St. Augustine's *De Civ. Dei*, for Ebert (p. 276 n.) points out a parallel between 769 f. and *De Civ. Dei* xix. 10. If so, it must have been written much later than the preceding works.

The Preface consists of a mystical application of the story of Gen. xiv. As Abraham with his 318 servants freed Lot, was blessed by Melchizedek, then begat Isaac; so the Christian, with the aid of Christ's Cross (τιη, 318, = the Cross (τ) of Ἰησοῦς), frees his soul, wins Christ's blessing, and brings forth good works. The poem itself opens with a prayer to Christ to shew how the soul is aided in its conflict (1–20). Then the conflict is described. Faith, with a legion of 1000 martyrs, defeats Idolatry (21–39). Modesty triumphs over Lust, recalling the victory of Judith and the chastity of Mary. She bathes her sword in the font and lays it on the altar (40–108). Patience, at whose side stands Job, endures all the attacks of Anger, until the latter kills herself (109–177). Pride taunts Humility, but

falls into a trap prepared by Deceit and is slain (178–309). Luxury almost wins over the Christian host, when Self-Restraint raises the standard of the Cross, and puts her to flight (310–449). Avarice seizes on the booty, and wins over many Christians, even some priests, till Reason puts them on their guard. She then disguises herself as Respectable Frugality, and so wins them to care for money. At last Active Charity slays her, and peace is restored (450–664). In the midst of the rejoicing, Discord, surnamed Heresy, who has joined the ranks in disguise, wounds Concord; but is soon slain by Faith (665–725). Concord and Faith then address the hosts, Concord dwelling on the beauties of Peace and danger of Heresy; Faith exhorting them to build a worthy temple. This is done on the plan of Rev. xxi., and Wisdom takes her seat in it (726–888). The poem ends with a thanksgiving to Christ for His aid (889–915).

The work is thus primarily a Spiritual Combat, describing the conflict between good and evil in the soul. The poet seems, however, also to have in his mind the fortunes of the church; the great Christian virtues first triumphing over heathen vices, and then having to contend against evils in the church. On this side it is akin to the *Libri c. Symmachum;* in the lines on the Incarnation (70 sqq.) and Heresy (710) to the *Apotheosis.* It has much dramatic vigour; the description of peace is of special beauty (755); and it is full of the typical use of Holy Scripture. As is natural in a military poem, the language is often based on Virgil; at times it recalls Ovid (384) and Claudian (560, 685), but its chief interest is its allegorical form. The idea seems original. The personification of virtues and vices had been common in Christian writers, especially in Tertullian; it was also common in late heathen poets, e.g. in Apuleius and Claudian (v. Ebert, pp. 276–8). The metaphor of the conflict is found in Ham. 393, but here for the first time it is worked out in detail. The poem soon became popular: it is found illustrated in some MSS.; and so it gave an impulse both to art and allegory, and proved the forerunner of Bunyan's works.

D. The *Dittochaeon*, *διττόχαιον*, (?) *δίττος*, *ὀχή*, the double food, or double Testament. (This title has more authority than Dirochaeus, or Ditrochaeus, or Cheirochaeus, or Diptychon.) This work stands by itself, and can scarcely be called a poem. It consists of 49 sets of 4 verses on scenes from the Old and New Testament. They are dry and jejune, and their main interest arises from the fact, that they seem to be composed to describe a series of paintings (cf. hoc . . . ista in 4, hoc illud in 5, &c.). These paintings depicted chiefly historical events, sometimes with several scenes in the same painting (cf. 8 and 17); also buildings and ornaments (16, 20, 24). There is however no trace to shew where the pictures were, or when the poem was composed. Many editors deny that it is by Prudentius; but it has the authority of Gennadius and internal evidence favours it. The prosody agrees with the rest of Prudentius in the shortening of the final *o* (17, 35, 45), the lengthening of short syllables (16, 25, 42), in the Greek false quantities (12, 18). There is the same typical application of Scripture (2, 14–16, 18, 20, 21, 40, 41), and many of the scenes are described elsewhere in his poems (2, 4, 8, 11, 15, 19, 21). [W. L.]

PRUNIKOS (*Προύνικος*, *Προύνεικος*). In the Gnostic system described by Irenaeus (I. xxx. see OPHITES, p. 87), SOPHIA, who is an important personage in the mythology of that system, is said to have the alternative names *'Αριστερά*, *Προύνικος* and *'Αρρενόθηλυς*; and the name Prunikos several times takes the place of Sophia in the relation of her story. The name Prunikos is also given to Sophia in the account of the kindred Barbeliot system, given in the preceding chapter of Irenaeus. Celsus, who shews that he had met with some Ophite work, exhibits acquaintance with the name Prunikos (Orig. *Adv. Cels.* vi. 34), a name which Origen recognizes as Valentinian. That this Ophite name had really been adopted by the Valentinians is evidenced by its occurrence in a Valentinian fragment preserved by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 5). Epiphanius also introduces Prunikos as a technical word in the system of the Simonians (*Haer.* xxi. 2), of those whom he describes under the head of Nicolaitans (xxv. 3, 4) and of the Ophites (xxxvii. 4, 6).

Neither Irenaeus nor Origen indicates that he knew anything as to the meaning of this word; and we have no better information on this subject than a conjecture of Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxv. 48). He says that the word means "wanton" or "lascivious," for that the Greeks had a phrase concerning a man who had debauched a girl, *'Επρουνίκευσε ταύτην*. One feels some hesitation in accepting this explanation. Epiphanius was deeply persuaded of the filthiness of Gnostic morals, and habitually put the worst interpretation on their language. If the phrase reported by Epiphanius had been common, it is strange that instances of its use should not have been quoted from the Greek comic writers. It need not be denied that Epiphanius had heard the phrase employed, but innocent words come to be used in an obscene sense, as well by those who think *double entente* witty, as by those who modestly avoid the use of plainer language. The primary meaning of the word *προύνεικος* seems to be a porter, or bearer of burdens, the derivation being from *ἐνεγκεῖν*, the only derivation indeed that the word seems to admit of. Then, modifying its meaning like the word *ἀγοραῖος*, it came to be used in the sense of a turbulent violent person. The only distinct confirmation of the explanation of Epiphanius is that Hesychius (*s. v.* *Σκίταλοι*) has the words *ἀφροδισίων καὶ τῆς προυνικίας τῆς νυκτερινῆς*. This would be decisive, if we could be sure that these words were earlier in date than Epiphanius. In favour of the explanation of Epiphanius is the fact, that in the Gnostic cosmogonical myths, the imagery of sexual passion is constantly introduced. For example, in the Valentinian extract already quoted from Epiphanius, we find the passage, *Μετὰ τοῦτο ἡ 'Αλήθεια μητρικὴν προενεγκαμένη Προυνικίαν ἐθήλυνε τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτῆς εἰς ἑαυτὴν, καὶ συνῆεσαν ἑαυτοῖς ἀφθάρτῳ μίξει καὶ ἀγηράτῳ συγκράσει.* This passage also illustrates the connection between *προυνεικία* and *προφέρω*, and it seems on the whole probable that *πρου-*

νεῖκος is to be understood in the sense of προφερής which has for one of its meanings (see the references in Liddell and Scott) "precocious in respect of sexual intercourse." The word harmonizes very well with the description of the passion of Sophia given in the second chapter of Irenaeus, προήλατο δὲ πολὺ ὁ τελευταῖος καὶ νεώτατος τῆς δωδεκάδος κ.τ.λ. The only difficulty is that in the Valentinian extract of Epiphanius, the name προυνεῖκος is applied, not only to Sophia, but to the other Aeons. [See SOPHIA (1), p. 713]. [G. S.]

PSAÏS (Ψάϊς), an Egyptian bishop at the synod of Tyre (Athan. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 79), one of the bishops driven from their sees by the Arians (*Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 72; Tillem. viii. 698). [C. H.]

PSALLIANI, a reading for Massaliani, heretics. (Aug. *Haer.* 57 and Bened. note; Tillem. viii. 528.) [C. H.]

PSATHYRIANI, a party among the Arians in the reign of Theodosius II., so-called after a certain Syrian confectioner (ψαθυροπώλης), who was an energetic supporter of the party. The question on which schism arose among the Arians was whether the Father was to be regarded as Father before the Son came into existence. A certain Marinus, who came from Thrace, was the leader of those who maintained the affirmative, and who were called Psathyriani. The schism lasted about 35 years. (Socrates, v. 23; Sozom. vii. 17.) [MARINUS (2); THEOCTISTUS; PLINTHAS.] [G. S.]

PSENOSIRIS (Ψενόσιρις), one of the Egyptian bishops banished by the Arians in 356. (Athan. *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 72; *Ap. de Fug.* § 7; Tillem. viii. 697.) [C. H.]

PSENTHESSUS, friend and pupil of St. Pachomius at Tabenna (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. 243; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iii. 358). [J. G.]

PSEUDEPIGRAPHA IN THE FATHERS.—In the present article we give references to notices occurring in the *earlier* Christian writers to a variety of ancient books and shorter documents, some falsely ascribed to the personages of Scripture, others being apocryphal accounts of their life, or of some part of it. Books known only to the Jews or Mahometans will not be noticed here. For them see especially Jon. Alb. Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphus V. T.* Hamb. 1722–3; and *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* Hamb. 1719.

I. *The Prae-Christian Era.*—Epiphanius (*De Mensuris*, § 5) tells us that the Seventy-two translated twenty-two (in § 11, "seventy-two," a manifest error) of the "Apocrypha" of the Jews (not including the Epistles of Baruch). We cannot identify the books to which he refers. Most of the known Jewish apocrypha were written in Greek, and needed no translation. It is said in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (vi. 16) that "some among the ancients composed apocryphal books of Moses and Enoch and Adam, of Isaiah also and Elijah and the Three Patriarchs." A great number of such works must have been known to St. Jerome, who speaks of "fictae revelationes *omnium* patriarcharum et prophetarum" as extant in his time (*c. Vigilant.* § 7). A list is given by Pseudo-Athanasius: "Enoch (4800 verses), the Patriarchs (5100), the Prayer of Joseph (1110), the Testament of Moses (1100), the Assumption of Moses (1400), Abraham (1300), Eldad and Medad (400), the Pseudepigrapha of Elijah the Prophet (3016), of Zephaniah the Prophet (600), of Zachariah the father of John (500), of Baruch, Habakkuk, Ezekiel, and Daniel" (*Synopsis S. Scripturae*, *Opp.* S. Ath. ii. 154; Col. 1686). The numbers of verses in the greater part of the foregoing catalogue are added from the "Stichometria of the Holy Scriptures," at the end of the *Chronographia Compendaria* of Nicephorus Cptanus (ad calc. Georg. Syncelli *Chronographia*, 787, Bonn.).

(1) There was a Gnostic forgery entitled the *Revelations of Adam.* This subject has been already handled at length. [See ADAM, BOOK OF], and cf. Renan, in *Journal Asiatique*, 1853, t. ii. 439–460; Malan's *Book of Adam and Eve*, 1882.

(2) Anastasius Sinaita refers to the *Testament of the Protoplasts* (*In Hexaem.* 7; *P. G.* t. 89, col. 967, ed. Migne), a book not mentioned by any other writer.

(3) Epiphanius describes and cites a Gnostic forgery bearing the title of the *Gospel of Eve* (*Haer.* xxvi. 2, 3, 5), which may be the same as the *Gospel of Perfection* mentioned by him (*u.s.* 2) as used by some of the Gnostics. Philastrius mentions their *Evangelium Consummationis* (*De Haeres.* 33).

(4) Eutychius Alex. (*Annal.* i. 14) gives an account of the murder of Abel and its cause, which could only have proceeded from some writer of fiction.

(5) Many books on astronomy were ascribed to Seth by the Mahometans (Fabr. *u.s.* 155, &c.), who, in making him an author, only followed the Gnostics (Epiph. xxvi. 8), and Sethians, the latter boasting of "seven books under his name" (xxxix. 5). [SETHITES.] Pseudo-Chrysostom, probably a Latin writer of the 7th century (*Opus Imperf. in Matth.* Hom. 2, inter *Opp.* Chrysost. vi. App. xxviii. ed. Ben.), tells us that a certain "nation in the very first part of the East" had a "writing inscribed with the name of Seth concerning the appearance of the star" of Bethlehem, &c.

(6) References to the Book of Enoch are very frequent, but this subject has already been fully discussed under ENOCH, BOOK OF.

(7) St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xviii. 38) seems to have known of some apocrypha ascribed to *Noah;* among which was probably the *Prayer over the Body of Adam*, printed by J. Gregory, *Observ. Sacr.* 25, from an Arabic Catena on Genesis. Georgius Syncellus (*Chron.* 83) tells us that Noah, when about to die, "gave his *Testament*" to Shem, an expression which seems to imply a written document.

(8) A book called *Noria*, compiled by the Gnostics from various heathen sources, was ascribed to the wife of Noah, who was alleged to have borne that name (Epiph. *Haer.* xxvi. 1).

(9) Many prophecies and books on philosophy, medicine, &c., were ascribed to Shem, but they do not appear to have been known to the earlier Christians. The *Prophecy of Ham* is mentioned by a writer in Clemens Alex. (*Strom.* vi. 6, § 53). Cassian relates a tradition, that Ham concealed in the ark metal plates on which were

inscribed various magical secrets (*Collat.* viii. 21). Similarly Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxix. 3). Hence many books on magic were reported to be by him (Pseudo-Clemens, *Recogn.* iv. 27). The *Elementa et Praxis Artis Necromanticae* (Sextus Senensis, *Biblioth. Sanct.* ii. 57) is, however, a very late work.

(10) *Cainan* compiled a book on Astronomy after the flood, according to Joan. Mal. (*Chronogr.* p. 6, ed. Bonn.), assisted by the inscription on stone graven by Seth and his children, who had sought to preserve their names and their knowledge of the stars from fire by stamping a record on tiles, and from destruction by a flood by entrusting it to stone. He also "found the *Book of the Giants* as he was walking through the plain" (Georg. Syncellus, *Chron.* p. 150, ed. Bonn.).

(11) Fabulous histories of *Melchisedech* abounded. One, which refers to the Eucharist and to the council of Nicaea, is among the spuria of Athanasius (*Opp.* ii. App. 189, ed. Ben.). The *Chronicon Paschale Alex.* (90) cites another, which alludes to both the great Christian sacraments. This work also supplies an epitaph derived entirely from Hebr. vii.

(12) The Sethian heretics had a book entitled the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (Epiph. *Haer.* xxxix. 5), to which Origen appears to refer in *Hom.* 35 *in Luc.* v. 217. In the Imperial Library at Vienna is a Greek MS., *Testament of Abraham*, which Lambecius (*Biblioth. Caes.* vi. 304) supposes to be taken from his Apocalypse. The Greeks, according to Suidas (v. *Abr.*), assigned to him a book on the *Interpretation of Dreams*, cf. Julius Firmicus (*De Mathesi*) and Vettius Valens of Antioch (in an unpublished MS. of the 5th century or later (Dodwell *De Tabulis Coelestibus*, 5, in Grabe, *Spicil. PP.* i. 341, ed. 2). Merely Jewish ascriptions to Abraham were numerous, of which the *Book of Jetzirah*, often printed, was the most important.

(13) A fabulous account of Lot, and of his planting the tree of the cross, is found in one MS. of the Annals of Michael Glycas (P. II. p. 254, note, ed. Bonn.).

(14) The *Ladder* (Ἀναβαθμοί) *of Jacob* was an Ebionite forgery (Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 16).

(15) The *Testament of the Three Patriarchs*, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, is quoted in that of Benjamin (*Testam. XII. Patriarch.* xii. 10). The *Testament of Jacob* is mentioned in some copies of Pseudo-Gelasius, that of *Job* in others. Both readings probably originated in the error of a Latin transcriber who supposed ιβ' in Διαθήκη ιβ', *The Testament of the Twelve*, to represent Job or Jacob (*Grabe*, i. 138).

(16) The *Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum.* See the article on that subject.

(17) The *Prayer of Joseph.* Quoted by Origen (*Comm. in Ev. Joan.* tom. ii. 25, Lomm. i. 147; and *Comm. in Gen.* tom. iii. §§ 9, 12, viii. 30, 38)—the latter reference being preserved by Eusebius in an extract, *Praep. Evang.* vi. 11; both by Basil and Gregory in *Philocalia*, c. 23, xxv. 219, 224), by Procopius of Gaza (*Comm. in Gen.*, i. p. 29) in a probable reference to Origen (*Comm. in Gen.* iii. 12), and Glycas (*Annal.* i. 321, ed. Bonn.).

(18) The *Story of Aseneth*, the wife of Joseph. See ASENETH, HISTORY OF, where the topic is fully discussed.

(19) The Septuagint gives an additional paragraph at the end of the book of *Job*, which professes to be from the Syriac Bible. Fabricius (*u. s.* 793) gives the same passage from a Greek Catena. A similar passage is found in the Arabic (794).

(20) Books falsely ascribed to *Moses* or fictions representing him are the *Sermones Mystici* (*Acta Conc. Nic. I.* lib. ii. c. 18, Hard. *Conc.* i. 397), the *Testament of Moses* (Pseudo-Athan. *u. s.*), the *Assumption* or *Ascension of Moses* (Origen, *De Princ.* iii. 2, § 1; *Acta Nic. u. s.* 18, 20, pp. 398, 408), the *Revelation of Moses*, which Cedrenus (*Compend. Hist.* 9) enables us to identify with the *Parva Genesis* (ὡς ἐν Λεπτῇ φέρεται Γενέσει ἣν καὶ Μωσέως εἶναί φασί τινες Ἀποκάλυψιν) of Jerome (*Epist.* 78 *ad Fabiol.* 18) and Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxix. 6), and the *Leptogenesis* of Pseudo-Gelasius (Hard. *u. s.* 941). The last says, "Liber de filiabus Adae *Leptogeneseos*, apocryphus."

JUBILEES (BOOK OF). It is also called by Epiphanius the Book of Jubilees. This is the most important of all the Pseud-Epigrapha, and to it we must therefore devote a notice somewhat longer than usual, referring the reader desirous of fuller instruction first of all to an able article by Dr. Ginsburg in the last edition of Kitto's *Biblical Encyclopaedia*, and then to the literature mentioned below. The Book of Jubilees, as is evident from the notices quoted above, was well known in the early ages. It was originally written in Hebrew. A Greek version of it was current in the East till the twelfth century, the age of the Byzantine historians Joannes Zonaras and Michael Glycas. After that date it was lost. In 1844 it was discovered in Abyssinia in an Ethiopic version, which was printed in a German translation by Dillmann in Ewald's Jahrbücher for 1851–53. Dillmann published the original Ethiopic in 1859. A critical English edition of the work is still a desideratum. Now as to the title of the book. It is called the Book of Jubilees because it divides Bible history from the creation to the conquest of Canaan by Joshua into fifty Jubilees of forty-nine years each. It is called the little Genesis because it selects only portions of Genesis, though from its lengthy comments on them it actually exceeds the canonical Genesis in length. The date of the book is variously fixed, but all accord to it a very early one. Every one places it prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, as its references to the Levitical and sacrificial system are made as to one in actual existence. Dillmann thinks it was written in the century immediately before the Christian era, while Ewald makes it contemporary with our Lord's birth. Its great interest for us consists in the fact, that it shews what an uninspired pious Jew thought and believed just when our holy religion took its rise, and what therefore our Gospels would have been if their origin was purely human. It gives us too a picture of the beliefs of the Jews at that time upon the following among other questions, upon the soul and a future life and judgment, upon Satan, evil spirits, and the doctrine of a Messiah. It is also of importance as regards the composition of the Talmud and the state of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament prior to our Lord; as it furnishes us with some readings differing from our Textus Recep-

tus. It throws light too upon some New Testament difficulties, as, for instance, Acts vii. 53 compared with Galat. iii. 19, and Hebrews ii. 2, distinctly declaring that the law was given through the Presence Angel, and may have been quoted in 2 Pet. ii. 4 and Jude 6. It shews also the state of Biblical criticism and tradition among the Jews as it undertakes to explain difficulties occurring in Genesis and Exodus. It accounts, for instance, for the Serpent speaking by teaching that all animals spoke before the fall; it explains also how Noah got the animals into the Ark, why Esau sold his birthright for a mess of pottage, how the infant Moses was nourished in the ark, and that it was the enemy, not God, who hardened the hearts of the Egyptians. All critics agree that the author was a Jew and wrote in Hebrew, in fact, some of its points cannot be understood till translated back into Hebrew. Some, however, make him an Essene, others a Dosithean, and others an Egyptian Jew. The Greek version was made at an early period as is manifest from Clement. *Recognit.* xxx.–xxxii.: Epiph. *Panar.* lib. I. t. iii. *Haer.* xxxix. Cap. vi. in Oehler's edit. t. ii. pars i. p. 529, and St. Jerome's *Ep. ad Fabiolam, de Mansionibus.* It has been largely discussed by German theologians as Beer, Frankel, and Krüger, and by Rönsch in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1874, p. 435.

(21) The book of *Eldad and Medad* (Num. xi. 26) is mentioned in the *Shepherd* of Hermas (I. ii. 5), where the names appear as Heldam and Modal.

(22) In 2 Tim. iii. 8, St. Paul, referring to the magicians who withstood Moses, gives them the names of "Jannes and Jambres" (much varied in other writers). Origen: "Quod ait, 'Sicut Jannes et Mambres restiterunt Mosi,' non invenitur in publicis scripturis sed in libro secreto, qui suprascribitur *Jannes et Mambres*" (*Comm. in Matth.* § 117 ad xxvii. 9; v. 29). Hilary the Deacon remarks on 2 Tim. iii. 8: "Exemplum hoc de apocryphis est" (*Comm. in Epp. S. Pauli* inter *Opp.* Ambros.). Pseudo-Gelasius (*u. s.*): "Liber qui appellatur *Poenitentia Jamnae et Mambrae*, apocryphus."

(23) Pseudo-Gelasius: "*Liber Ogiae* nomine gigantis, qui ab haereticis cum dracone post diluvium pugnasse fingitur, apocryphus." This was Og the king of Bashan (Num. xxi. 33), of whose size and age Jewish writers told many fables. Cf. Migne's *P. L.* t. 59, col. 162.

(24) Origen thought that the Magi who came to Bethlehem "had the *Prophecies of Balaam*, which Moses also compiled" (*c. Cels.* i. 60; xviii. 108); and a later writer, perhaps referring to Origen, says, "Legi apud aliquem, Magos istos ex libris Balaam divinatoris appariturae hujus stellae scientiam accepisse" (*Opus Imperf. in S. Matth. Ev.* Hom. ii. *u. s.* xxix.).

(25) In several copies of the Greek Psalter ("etiam in Horologio Graecorum, et in versione Psalmorum Arabica, Aethiopica, Syriaca Sionitae, et Anglo-Saxonica," Fabr. *u. s.* 908), a *Hundred and fifty-first Psalm* is ascribed to David. It assumes to have been written after his triumph over Goliath. It was known to Christians at an early period, as appears from the mention of it by St. Athanasius (*Epist. ad Marcell.* i. 971), and from the existence of a paraphrase in hexameter verse by Apollinaris of Laodicea (Galland. *Biblioth. PP.* v. 457). Later it is recognised in the East by Pseudo-Athanasius, who expressly ascribes it to David (*Synops. Sacr. Script. u. s.* 57, 87, 89, 90), and much later by the forger of the letter of Maria Cassib. to Ignatius c. 4; cf. Lightfoot's *Ignatius* ii. 728; by Euthymius Zigabenus (*Praef. in Psalmos;* Le Moyne, *Varia Sacra*, i. 152, 154), and others below our range. It does not appear in the Psalter with notes under the name of Athanasius (*Opp. S. Athan.* ed. Ben. iii. 289). In the Latin church the author of the *Altercatio cum Serapione*, ascribed to Vigilius Tapsensis or Arnobius the younger, cites it ("David quoque in *suo proprio* Psalmo," i. 18; Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* liii. 270. The edd. refer incorrectly to Ps. lxxvii. 70), but Arnobius himself does not notice it in his Commentary on the Psalms (see Migne, ibid. 570).

(26) The author of *Opus Imperfectum in S. Matt. Ev.* (*Opp.* Chrysost. vi. App. xxxiv.) speaks of Nathan and Esdras as having *written* prophecies, though not in the canon. It is probably from the book of Nathan that Pseudo-Epiphanius derives the story of his being hindered by Belial while hasting to Jerusalem in the hope of saving David from sin (*De Vita et Interitu Prophetarum in Nathan, Opp.* Epiph. 420, ed. Bas. 1578; Migne, *Pat. Graec.* xliii. 394).

(27) Alexander Polyhistor, according to Clemens Alex. (*Stromata*, i. 19, § 130), inserted in his history certain letters which passed between Solomon and the kings of Egypt (Vaphres = Hophra) and Tyre. Letters which we identify with these between Solomon and Vaphres, and Suron (= Hiram. "Forte interpres Graecus legerat regem Σοορ, hoc est Tyri"—Fabr. *u. s.* 1022) of Tyre, are given at length by Eusebius (*Praepar. Evang.* ix. 31–34) from Eupolemus. Josephus also gives letters between Solomon and Hiram of Tyre on the same subject (*De Antiq. Jud.* viii. 2, §§ 6, 7). Such letters, we are told by Theophilus of Antioch, were preserved in the archives of Tyre (*Ad Autolycum*, iii. 253). A correspondence on various branches of knowledge passed between Solomon and the philosophers of Tyre, which Theophilus says were reported to be extant in his time (*Ibid.*). St. Jerome refers to this in *Epist.* 70, *ad Magnum Orat.* 2. See also Josephus, *Contra Apion.* i. 17; *De Ant.* viii. 5, § 3. Josephus further ascribes to Solomon adjurations and exorcisms (*De Ant.* viii. 2, § 5), which Origen refers to as extant (*In Matth. Comm. Ser.* § 110; v. 6). Pseudo-Gelasius: "Scriptura quae appellatur *contradictio* Solomonis, apocrypha" (*u. s.* 942).

The Psalms of Solomon are contained in Fabric. *Pseud-Epig. V. T.* They are eighteen in number, and were first printed in Latin by Johan. Ludovicus de la Cerda, A.D. 1626, and lately in Greek by Hilgenfeld in his *Messias Judaeorum.* Kuenen, in his *Religion of Israel*, English trans., t. iii. p. 268, regards them as originally composed in Hebrew, and assigns them to the first century, B.C. They shewed the Messianic conception then current among the Jews, and thus illustrate the N. T. text. Cf. Salmon's *Introd. N. T.* 2nd ed. lect. 26.

(28) Origen (*Comm. in S. Matth. Ev.* § 117) mentions the "secreta (apocrypha) Eliae" (old Lat. vers.), which is, we presume, the "Apo-

calypsis Eliae" of St. Jerome (*Epist.* 57 *ad Pammach.* § 9; *Comm. in Isai.* 17, lxiv. 4). See also Epiph. *Haer.* xlii. in Ep. ad Eph.

(29) The ASCENSIO ISAIAE has been already discussed, *s. v.*

(30) St. Jerome (*Comm. in S. Matth.* iv., xxvii. 9) says of the prophecy, "And they took the thirty pieces," &c., "Legi nuper in quodam Hebraico volumine, quod Nazaraenae sectae mihi Hebraeus obtulit, *Jeremiae apocryphum*, in quo haec ad verbum scripta reperi." It is an obvious conjecture that this was a forgery, which the heretical author sought to recommend by the insertion of that text. The way had been paved for him by a suggestion of Origen that if there was no error of the copyist in St. Matth. (*u. s.*), the prophecy might be found "somewhere in the apocrypha (old Lat. vers. secretis) of Jeremiah" (*In Matth. Comment. Ser.* 117). Justin Martyr (*Dial. c. Tryphone*, 72) accuses the Jews of having omitted the following passages from their later copies of the book of Jeremiah, "The Lord remembered His dead tomb (χώματος, barrow) of Israel who were asleep in the land of the mound, and He descended to them, that He might preach to them His salvation" (see 1 Pet. iii. 19; iv. 6). It must remain a question whether this had been an apocryphal addition, or was, as Justin supposes, a fraudulent omission. The passage is cited by Irenaeus (*C. Haereses*, iv. 22) as from Jeremiah; but elsewhere (iii. 20, § 4) as from Isaiah; in other places (iv. 33, §§ 1, 12; v. 31, § 1) without any name of author.

(31) The "Baruch" of Hippolytus Pseudo-Athanasius and Nicephorus is probably the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, edited in Latin by Fritzsche, *Libri Apocryphi V. T.* Lips. 1871. See JUSTINUS (3) and Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift Wissensch. Theolog.* 1872, p. 230.

(32) The writings falsely ascribed to "Habakkuk" are probably Susannah and Bel and the Dragon. Porphyry objected to the book of Daniel that it was written in Greek, quoting Susannah to prove it. To this, says St. Jerome, both Eusebius and Apollinarius replied that the fables of Susannah and Bel and the Dragon were not in the Hebrew, but part of the prophecy of Habakkuk the son of Joshua of the tribe of Levi (*Praef. in Comm. in Dan.* v. 619, ed. Vall.).

(33) *A Life of Daniel* containing a prophecy ascribed to him is found in the *Chronicon Paschale Alex.* (298, ed. Bonn.). The prophecy however is so short that Pseudo-Athanasius and his follower probably refer to the Song of the Three Children, which has been ascribed to Daniel (so Fabricius, *u.s.* 1116), or to the *Apocalypsis Daniel* of age unknown which exists in many MSS. (Tischend. *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, Prol. xxx.).

(34) Clemens Alex. quotes a passage in which the prophet Zephaniah is made to declare that he was taken up into the fifth heaven, &c. (*Strom.* v. 11, § 78). This must be from a pseudepigraph.

(35) Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* ix. 17) relates that the head of a monastery at Gerari in Palestine found "a writing in Hebrew and ancient, not of those recognised by the church," in which an account was given of the death and burial of the prophet *Zechariah*.

(36) Justin M. (*Dial. c. Tryphone*, 72) accuses the Jews of having omitted from the book of Ezra a speech with reference to the passover (vi. 19), which in the Greek begins thus: "And Esdras said unto the people, This passover is our Saviour and our Refuge." Though the passage is also quoted as from Ezra by Lactantius (*Div. Instit.* iv. 18), it is far more probable that it was an apocryphal addition, or came from an apocryphal book. Nicephorus of C. P., A.D. 806, condemns the Apocalypse of Esdras and Zosymas (can. 13, al. 46, in Pitra, *Jus. Antiq. Graec.* ii. 331).

St. Jerome (*c. Vigilant.* § 7; ii. 393) accuses an opponent of citing "an apocryphal book under the name of Esdras." St. Ambrose also refers to a "Book of Esdras" (*Ep.* 34 *ad Horont.* 2). As the subjects indicated correspond to nothing in the Esdras of the Vulgate and our English Apocrypha, it was formerly supposed that these writers had before them a lost pseudepigraph, of which no other notice had survived. Both references were found, however, in the Arabic version of the 4th Book of Esdras, translated by Ockley (Whiston's *Primitive Christianity*, App. vol. iv. Lond. 1711), now published in the Arabic (by Ewald in *Abhandlungen der k. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1863), and occur equally in the Armenian version, printed with the rest of the Bible in 1666 (see Long, *Bibl. S.* ii. 1, p. 175; A.D. 1781), the Ethiopic published by Archbishop Laurence (with an English and Latin version, Oxon. 1823), the shorter Arabic (Ewald, *u.s.*), and the Syriac printed by Ceriani (*Monum. Sacr. et Prof.* v. 1, 1868; preceded by a Latin translation, *ibid.* i. 2). The references occur in a long passage between vv. 35 and 36 of ch. vii. in our Second Book of Esdras. In the same passage were found other quotations of St. Ambrose (*De Bono Mortis*, 10, 11, 12) from a "prophet." Quite recently the missing passage has been discovered in a MS. Esdras at Amiens, and its omission in the Tridentine Vulgate accounted for by the patient research of Mr. R. L. Bensly, to whose most learned and elaborate work on the subject (*The Missing Fragment of the Lat. Trans. of the 4th Book of Ezra*, Camb. 1875) we are indebted for the above particulars. Fritzsche had already (*Libri Apocryphi V. T.* Lips. 1871, 607–612) translated the passage from Syriac, and inserted it in his Latin Fourth Book of Esdras, from which, as given in the Vulgate, it may be well to mention in passing, he cuts off the 1st, 2nd, 15th, and 16th chapters to form a Fifth Book. The Fourth (or Second) Book was also printed by Hilgenfeld, under the title of *Esdras Propheta*, 1869, 8°, in Lat.; Syr. Lat.; Ethiop. Lat.; Arab. Lat.; Armen. Lat.; and in Arab. Lat. by J. Gildemeister, Bonn, 1877.

(37, 38) Two otherwise unknown prae-Christian apocrypha, one from an historical book, the other a fictitious prophecy, are cited in *Sermonum Arrianorum Fragment. Antiquissima*, nn. xx. xxi.; Mai, *Script. Vet. Nova Collectio* III. ii. 238–240, Rom. 1828.

II. *The New Testament.*—Among writings put forth "in the name of Christ" (*Const. Apost. u. s.*) was the *Epistle to Abgarus*, ruler of Edessa. [See ABGARUS.] This has been however already discussed under Abgarus and EPISTLES APOCRYPHAL. The Priscillianists and others professed to have the *Hymn* which Christ sang with the disciples at the Last Supper (St. Matt. xxvi. 30; St. Mark xiv. 26). For an

account of it see Augustine, *Epist.* 237 *ad Ceret.* A third production ascribed to our Lord was the *Epistle to Peter and Paul,* a book on magic, of childish absurdity, written, as St. Augustine thinks (*De Consensu Evang.* i. 9, 10), either by an enemy of the name of Christ, or by a professor of the black art, who sought by this means to recommend it to the ignorant. About the year 584, Licinianus, bishop of Carthago Spartaria [LICINIANUS], remonstrates with another bishop for receiving and giving currency to a forgery, which claimed to be an epistle of Christ that had "descended from heaven upon the altar of Christ in the memoria of St. Peter the Apostle" at Rome. This epistle, the writer says, insisted on a Judaizing observance of the Lord's day (*Ep.* iii. *ad Vincentium,* Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* 72, col. 699). In the 8th century an epistle which may be the same as the above, or an imitation of it, for its object is the same, was dispersed by the heretic Adelbert under the title of the *Epistle of Christ which fell on Jerusalem.* It was condemned by a council held at Rome in 745 (Act. ii. Hard. *Conc.* iii. 1939; see also *Epist.* Bonifacii 67, p. 173, ed. Würdtw.), and in 789 Charlemagne ordered it to be burnt (*Capit. Aquisgr.* 78, *Cap. Reg. Franc.* i. 73). (5) The Manichaeans also boasted of an epistle of Christ (Aug. *c. Faust.* xxviii. 4), of which the subject is not known.

False Gospels.—There were a great number of Apocryphal Gospels and Epistles put forth under the name of our Lord and his immediate followers. These we omit though properly falling under this head, as they have been already discussed by Dr. Lipsius under GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL, EPISTLES APOCRYPHAL, ACTS APOCRYPHAL, and by Dr. Salmon under CLEMENTINE LITERATURE, LEUCIUS (1), MELITO, and on the TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES and APOCALYPSES, APOCRYPHAL.

Books respecting the Virgin Mary.—There was a book, *De Nativitate Sanctae Mariae,* which Pseudo-Jerome (*Ep. ad Chrom. et Hel. Opp.* xi. p. ii. 280, ed. Vallars) ascribes to Seleucus (Leucius) "qui passiones Apostolorum conscripsit." This the impostor under the name of Jerome rejects as heretical, but he professes to have a Hebrew MS. on the same subject which he will translate, as innocent, but without affirming that it was written, as alleged, by St. Matthew. The fabulous narrative purporting to be his version accordingly follows. [MELITO.] The object of the Latin imposture was, apparently, to get rid of a statement in the fiction of Leucius, that Mary was the daughter of a priest, and therefore not of the family of David. This is the *Gospel of the Nativity of St. Mary* in these collections. Another history of the Virgin agreeing on this point with Pseudo-Jerome is cited by Gregory Nyssen, who styles it apocryphal (*Orat. in Diem Nativ.* ii. 778). There are still extant three romances, one in Greek (*De Dormitione Mariae*) and two in Latin (*Transitus Mariae,* A, B), of which the death of the blessed Virgin is the subject. These have been amply discussed already by Dr. Salmon under MELITO, iii. p. 899. We may also mention, though of unknown age, the *History of Joseph the Carpenter,* which is extant in Arabic and in the Memphitic and Sahidic dialects of ancient Egypt (Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.* p. xxii.). Dr. L. Stern discussed it, and gave a German translation of it in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitsch. Wissenschaft. Theol.* 1883, p. 267. He assigns the Coptic Version to the fourth century at least. The MS. is dated A.D. 1067. The Greek *Apocalypse of Mary,* found in many MSS., is much later than our period (Tischend. *Apocal. Apocr.* Proleg. xxvii.).

Pseudo-Gelasius also condemns the books entitled *The Repentance of Origen,* and *The Repentance of St. Cyprian* (*Pat. Lat.* t. 59, col. 163); and "Liber qui appellatur Nepotis," which is believed to be that work of the Egyptian bishop Nepos, against which Dionysius of Alexandria wrote (Euseb. *Hist.* vii. 24). We are told that Nepos interpreted the promises of Scripture in a Jewish sense (*u. s.*). The statement of Eusebius is cited by Vigilius, A.D. 551, *De Tribus Capitulis,* 60; Labb. *Conc.* v. 366. A book of *Proverbs* "ab haereticis conscriptus et S. Xysti nomine praenotatus." [See XYSTUS.] St. Jerome ascribes them to Xystus (Sextus) the Pythagorean, and accuses Rufinus, their translator, of the false imputation (*Ep.* 133 *ad Ctesiph.* 3; *Comment. in Jerem.* xxii. 24; and *in Ezech.* xviii. 5, without naming Rufinus). St. Augustine (*De Nat. et Grat.* 64, § 77) cites the book as by Xystus of Rome; but he discovered his error, and in *Retr.* ii. 42 he ascribes it to Sextus. Neither he nor Gennadius, A.D. 495 (*De Vir. Illust.* 17, n. Ruf.), charges Rufinus with fraud, nor does Jerome himself when quoting the *Sententiae,* before his mind was excited against Rufinus (*Adv. Jovin.* i. 49, written in 393). Rufinus himself, if the text be as he left it, only says that it was ascribed by some to Sixtus, the Roman martyr. See *Sextus Pythagoraeus* in *Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biography.* One of its Γνῶμαι is quoted by Origen (*c. Cels.* viii. 30) as acceptable to most Christians. Citing another, he says that the book was approved by many (*Comm. in Matth. Ev.* xv. 3). Hence we need not suppose that all its higher sentiments were interpolations of Rufinus. *Physiologus,* a book written by heretics, but ascribed to St. Ambrose, is also proscribed by Pseudo-Gelasius. Cf. Pitra's *Spicileg. Solesm.* III., p. lxvii.

The *Sibylline Oracles* are discussed elsewhere. [See SIBYLLINE ORACLES.]

The book of *Hystaspes* is discussed under that name, as is also the impostor *Hermes Pseudo-Trismegistus.*

The writings ascribed to *Orpheus* were classed by Faustus the Manichaean with those of the Sibyls and Hermes (in Aug. *c. Faust.* xiii. 1). St. Augustine replies that anything well said of the Son or the Father by such writers "valet quidem aliquid ad paganorum vanitatem revincendam, non tamen ad istorum auctoritatem amplectendam" (*ibid.* 15). See PROHIBITED BOOKS in DICT. CHRIST. ANTIQ. Vol. II. 1721.

[W. E. S. & G. T. S.]

PSEUDO-CHRYSOSTOMUS.—*Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum.* Among the works which have been ascribed to Chrysostom is a commentary on St. Matthew's gospel. It is at present divided into fifty-four homilies; but this division does not proceed from the author, and we find[a] (32, 132) that the work was one intended, not for oral delivery, but to be read

[a] In the references the first figure denotes the Homily; the second the Benedictine page.

by persons from whom the writer was absent in body. The work as we have it is defective, wanting from the middle of the thirteenth to the end of the nineteenth chapter, and breaking off at the end of the twenty-fifth. Hence it was known as "Opus Imperfectum" in contradistinction to the genuine series of Chrysostom's ninety homilies on St. Matthew, which have been preserved complete. This work is quoted as Chrysostom's by Nicolas I. (*Respons. ad Bulg.*) Mansi, xv. 403, and by other popes; and in the middle ages was accepted without doubt as Chrysostom's. In the *Catena Aurea*, for example, of Thomas Aquinas, it is largely employed; and Fabricius quotes Dionysius the Carthusian as saying that he would rather have this imperfect work perfect, than be lord of all Paris. Yet it is likely that if he could have had his wish he would have been very unpleasantly surprised; for it is certain that the author of this book so valued, far from being Chrysostom or any other orthodox divine, was a bitter Arian; and it is quite possible that the lost portions of the book were those most at variance with orthodoxy. Much of the heresy of the book was disguised from many of its readers by the expurgations of successive transcribers and editors, and some parts may have been so deeply tainted with heresy that no remedy short of total excision would suffice. Some early critics indeed defended the genuineness of the expurgated form, contending that the passages found in some copies, where the doctrine of our Lord's equality with the Father is formally combated, had been but scribblings by an Arian in the margin of an orthodox writer, which through mistake had obtained admission into the text. And it is true that in some cases the heretical passages can be cut out without injury to the context; but there is an abundance of passages of undisputed genuineness in which the author defines his position beyond possibility of mistake. He reveals himself as a member of a small persecuted sect which condemned the dominant church as heretical, and was in turn denounced as heretical by the state, and as such was visited with temporal penalties; and he marks the reign of Theodosius as the time when orthodoxy was overwhelmed, and when what he calls the heresy of the Homoousians became triumphant. Thus he looks (1, 18) on the revolt of the ten tribes under Rehoboam as a type of what has taken place in the last days when as iniquity abounded and the love of many waxed cold "maxima pars Christianorum" went off into heretical schism and "vix paucissimi Christianorum" remained in the church under Christ; and (19, 94) he speaks of heretics as so multiplied that "Christiani vagi potius videantur quam illi." He complains (45, 190) of the persecutions inflicted by the heretics, who thus shewed themselves to be the children of those who slew the prophets. "Did the apostles and martyrs ever wish to imitate their persecutors? Did they persuade men to believe by carnal threats or worldly promises? Their only arguments were good teaching and holy life; their only threat that of the future judgment of God; their promises, not of worldly advancement, but of the kingdom of heaven. Those men who persecute and bribe can be no children of theirs." Elsewhere (20, 94) he remarks that when our Lord said, "Beware of false prophets," in order to shew that it was not heathen or Jewish teachers he had in view, he adds "who come to you in sheep's clothing." How then are we to know those who inwardly are ravening wolves? "Does a sheep persecute a wolf, or a wolf the sheep? The Jews persecuted Christ, not Christ the Jews; heretics persecute Christians, not Christians heretics. He whom you may see on the meadows of Scripture cropping the flowery herbage of righteousness is a sheep: he who delights in the blood of persecution is a wolf." The successive trials of the church are said to be, first the Jews persecuted her, then the heathen, now it is the heretics; last of all it will be Antichrist.

We can otherwise see that the readers whom our author addressed were not only a small body but poor and excluded from the paths of worldly advancement. He teaches (38, 159) that a merchant can seldom or never please God, and therefore that any one wishing to be a merchant ought to be cast out of the church, as the Psalmist says "Quia non cognovi negotiationes,[b] introibo in potentiam domini." In all merchandise there must be cheating and perjury, the one party swearing the goods are worth more, the other that they are worth less, than their real value. It is true buying and selling takes place in lawful business; the husbandman buys steers to plough his land, and sells the corn it produces. But a man is not a merchant who buys materials and sells a manufactured article; for then it is only his own work he sells; but a merchant is one who buys a thing and sells it again unchanged. Of all merchants the most accursed is the usurer; for no other merchant wants back what he sells, but he is not satisfied with getting his commodity back none the worse but must have more besides. Elsewhere he stigmatises as "opus inhonestum" not only merchandise, but official dignity and military service. We may safely infer that the preacher who taught this doctrine had for his disciples a small sect, and not the bulk of the Christian people.[c] Still more clearly is this brought out (44, 195) where we are told that the new Jerusalem is the church, that is, the spiritual Christians who, leaving the bodily church, which the perfidious had occupied by violence, went out from them. "Nay, rather they went out from us, as the apostle John teaches; for not he leaves the church who goes out bodily, but he who spiritually leaves the foundations of the church's truth. We went out from them in body, they from us in mind: we left the foundations of walls, they the foundation of the Scriptures: we went out from them according to the sight of men, they from us according to the judgment of God." And this is the trial of the last days, that now the abomination of desolation is in the temple: that is to say, heresy occupies the church of God (43, 204). "Then must they who are in Judaea flee to the mountains, that is to say, Christians, who, as the apostle teaches, are the true Jews, must betake

[b] The Vulgate has "literaturam," corresponding to a various reading in the Greek, *γραμματείας* for *πραγματείας*.

[c] Compare St. Augustine on the same passage in Psalm lxx.

themselves to the mountains of holy Scripture, of which it was written (Ps. lxxv. 5) 'Illuminas tu mirabiliter in montibus aeternis,' and (Ps. lxxxvi. 1) 'Fundamenta ejus in montibus sanctis.' For now, except the Scriptures, no means are left of distinguishing the true church from the false. Heretics have their churches, they read the same Scriptures, they have bishops and the other orders of clergy, they have baptism, eucharist, and in short everything. In former days miracles were a means of distinguishing the true church, and unbelievers could only exhibit barren wonders, not beneficial miracles like the Christian; but now the working of miracles has ceased and more are alleged to be done among false Christians. Peter foretold (Clem. *Recog.* iii. 60) that Antichrist is to have the power of working even beneficial miracles. Formerly you could tell the true church by the morals of its members; for the conversation of all, or at least of the greater part, exhibited a holiness not to be found among the impious. But now Christians are as bad or worse than the heretics or the heathen. Indeed you will find more continence among these schismatics than among Christians. God, then, foreseeing the confusion of the last days, warned those desiring to know the true church to flee to the Scriptures, for if they betake themselves anywhere else they will be scandalised and perish."

Passages where the reign of Theodosius is named as the time when the church was overwhelmed by heresy will be found (48, 199; 49, 20). It being clear from the proofs we have given that the author was not a member of the Catholic church, it is unreasonable to doubt the genuineness of the passages where he exhibits his Arianism, as, for instance, where he explains that our Lord called heretics "spinas et tribulos," because, foreseeing what heresy would prevail above all others, he called them "tribulos, quasi trinitatis professores et triangulam bajulantes impietatem." We must therefore rather take the expurgation of the heretical passages as illustrating the difficulty of transmission to our times of sentiments of ancient authors at variance with later orthodoxy. Thus, in the present case, it was not only the Arian passages which were expurgated. For instance, where the writer speaks (19, 93) of "offering the sacrifice of bread and wine," he is made to say "the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood;" and a passage is cut out altogether where he argues that if it be dangerous to transfer to private uses the consecrated vessels "which contain not the Lord's real body, but the mystery of His body," how much more to profane the vessels of our own body which God has prepared for His dwelling-place.

When the controversial passages had been expurgated, there was nothing to excite orthodox suspicions in our writer's language about our Lord's divinity. The Arians, it will be remembered, were quite the reverse of Unitarians, their doctrines, on the contrary, being open to the charge of Ditheism. Accordingly our writer uses very high language concerning our Lord, speaks of Him as "our great God and Saviour," as does also Maximinus (of whom we shall say more presently, and whose doctrine is in accurate accordance with that of the present work). His formula is "Deus genitus de ingenito Deo." Sometimes it is "unigenitus Deus" (μονογενὴς θεός). If in his controversial passages he is eager to argue that the Son, "to whom all things were delivered by the Father," can neither be identical with the Father nor equal to Him, he is equally energetic in repelling the doctrine that He was mere man; and the heresy of the Homoousians is not more reprobated than that of Photinus, who, in his recoil from Arian ditheism, completely separated the Saviour's manhood from the one supreme Divinity. The third person of the Trinity is comparatively seldom mentioned, but on this head the writer's doctrine is even more distinctly heretical. The Holy Spirit is evidently regarded as a third being, as much inferior to the Son as the Son is to the Father (34, 146). This is the representation also of the "Ascension of Isaiah," a work quoted in the present treatise.

The heretical character of the book being recognised, it becomes manifest how much light it must throw on the history of Arianism, which it presents in a more favourable aspect than any in which it can be seen elsewhere. Arianism, as known from other sources, we are tempted to regard as a mere creature of court favour, contending against the religious feeling of the Christian world. Its utterances are controversial and negative, and we have scanty information as to the influence on the heretics of the positive truth which they held in common with other Christians. Naturally a better side of Arianism is exhibited in this work, in the main not controversial but exegetical and practical, written when all court favour had long been lost, and when the sect met from the state with nothing but persecution. How much there was in the book to recommend it to a religious mind is evident from the fact that it passed so long as Chrysostom's. We cannot explain how the mistake originated, for the work itself makes no claim to such authorship; the writer is evidently addressing persons who knew him, and to whom he had no motive for trying to pass himself off as other than he was. He had also written commentaries on St. Mark (49, 211) and on St. Luke (1, 23; 9, 56). Fragments of ancient Arian homilies on St. Luke have been published by Mai (*Bib. Nov. Vet. Pat.* iii.), but they have no resemblance to the work of the present writer. It would be easy, if space permitted, to give many favourable specimens of this commentary which would well justify the estimation in which it was so long held: see, for instance, the whole comment on the text "Seek and ye shall find" (Hom. 17). But possibly the book was commended to medieval readers less by its merits than by what a modern reader would count its faults. The whole spirit of the commentary is utterly unlike that of Chrysostom, who may be referred to the Syrian school of rational historic and literal interpretation, whereas this writer constantly follows the mystical and allegorical method which is commonly connected with Alexandria. And in this style he shews a remarkable amount of ingenuity. A reader only acquainted with modern commentaries could little divine what lesson would be deduced from any given text. This may appear from the example already given of his exegesis of the text "Flee ye to the moun-

tains," and we merely give one illustration more. The name Bathsheba, or as he reads it Bersabee, he finds in Hebrew denotes seven wells. But he deduces from Prov. v. 15 that "well" denotes a wife. Bathsheba was the seventh wife of the literal David; but we learn spiritually that Christ is the spouse of seven churches, for so the one church is designated on account of the seven Spirits by which it is sustained, and accordingly both Paul and John wrote to seven churches. This last remark may suggest that the writer was acquainted with the work of which the Muratorian fragment is a part.

The writer shews a strong preference for the ascetic life. He remarks (24, 135) that when the disciples said "If the case of the man be so with his wife it is not good to marry," our Lord did not contradict them or say it was good to marry. The writer holds (1, 24) that conjugal union is bad, and in itself considered is a sin; and although on account of God's permission it ceases to be sin, yet it is not righteousness. In the beginning of the world men married sisters—a sin excusable at the time on account of the fewness of men. Afterwards this was forbidden, but a man was allowed to have more wives than one; then, as population increased, this too was forbidden, but a man was allowed to have one wife; "now that the world has grown old we know what is well-pleasing in God's sight, though on account of incontinent men we dare not say it." Some hard language concerning the female sex will be found (24, 135). Yet to those who will not take his counsel he condescends to give advice concerning the choosing and the ruling of a wife—"See that she comes of a good stock; if both parents are virtuous you may safely venture. If both are bad have nothing to say to her; if one is good, the other bad, it is an even chance how she will turn out. If, after marriage, she plays the harlot, send her away. If her misconduct stop short of adultery, she is to be dealt with in three ways: first, admonish her before God; secondly, if that avail not, publicly rebuke her, that she who regards not the fear of God may be influenced by shame of men; but if, after repeated rebukes, she will not reform, beat her with a stick, for it is meet that she who cannot be made to blush like a freewoman should be chastised like a slave." The writer does not even withdraw the apostle's permission of a second marriage, though regarding this as but license given on account of the hardness of men's hearts, a second marriage, in itself considered, being but "honesta fornicatio." This is quoted as Chrysostom's in the *Decretum* of Gratian (pars 2, caus. 31, quaest. 1, 9). It has been already mentioned that the writer owns there were more examples of continence in the dominant church than in his own sect, but he is not a whit the more on that account disposed to condone that church's heresy. A heretical sect is no more a church than an ape is a man. If you see a man who does not worship God in truth doing what seem to you good works, do not believe your eyes and say he is a man of good life, but believe God, who says "An evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit." If you call him good you make Christ a liar; you only see the outside, God sees the heart. The works of a man who does not care to believe rightly can spring from no good motive, for it is better to believe rightly than to act rightly. Faith without works is dead, but still it is something; works without faith are nothing at all. The foolish virgins had the lamps of right faith, but not the oil of good works to burn in them; but what avails the oil of good works to Jews or heretics who have no lamps wherein to light it? The writer will not even own the baptism of heretics as valid.

It has been questioned whether the original language of this commentary were Greek or Latin, but it appears to us that the original was certainly Latin. Some proofs may be rejected as indecisive; for instance a translator may conceivably have modified the language "Jesse latino sermone refrigerium appellatur" (p. 16), or "in graeco non dicit 'beati pauperes' sed 'beati egeni' vel 'beati mendici'" (9, 56). But there are other passages where the argument turns on the use of Latin, as, for example (53, 223), money passing from hand to hand—"usu ipso multiplicatur, unde dicitur usura ab usu," or (7, 53) where an explanation is suggested why, at the call of the apostles, Peter and his brother are described as "mittentes retia," John and his brother "retia componentes," "quia Petrus praedicavit evangelium et non composuit, sed Marcus ab eo praedicata composuit; Joannes autem et praedicavit evangelium et ipse composuit." The commentator, however, clearly uses Greek authorities. From such he must have derived his explanation (49, 205) why the commandments are ten—"secundum mysterium nominis Jesu Christi quod est in litera iota, id est perfectionis indicio" (see also 1, 23). The writer knew no Hebrew, though he lays great stress on the interpretation of Hebrew names, making use for this purpose of a glossary which we have not been able to identify with that used by any other writer. It must have been from the work of some Oriental writer that he came by the name of Varisuas as that of a heretic (48, 199), for it would seem plain that Barjesus is intended. The commentator does not use Jerome's Vulgate, but a previous translation. Thus (Matt. v. 22) he has "sine causa," which Jerome omits, and he anticipates bishop Butler in his observations as to the uses of anger —"Justa ira mater est disciplinae, ergo non solum peccant qui cum causa irascuntur sed e contra nisi irati fuerint peccant." In the Lord's prayer he has "quotidianum," not "supersubstantialem." He has the doxology at the end; in this differing from the usage of Latin versions but agreeing with the Apostolic Constitutions (iii. 18), a work which he highly valued. In the beatitudes he follows the received text in placing "Blessed are they that mourn" before "Blessed are the meek," contrary to Jerome and the bulk of the Latin versions. Both here, however, and in the case of the doxology, he agrees with the Codex Brixianus. He reads "neque filius" (Matt. xxiv. 36); he distinctly omits Luke xvii. 36 (50, 213).

Besides the Scriptures he uses the Shepherd of Hermas (33, 142), but acknowledging that it was not universally received; the Clementine Recognitions (20, 94; 50, 212; 51, 214), the Apostolic Constitutions or Canons as he calls them (13, 74; 53, 221). The first of these

passages does not appear in our present text of the Constitutions; the second is from the eighth book, which Krabbe gives good reason for thinking to be an Arian addition to the previously known work. It would seem that in the latter half of the 4th century the Arians made active use of literary forgery. In their interests was made the longer edition of the Ignatian epistles, which Zahn has conjecturally attributed to Acacius of Caesarea. Interpolations of Arian tendency were also made in the Clementine Recognitions. Our writer used Josephus. We have already referred to his use of the "Ascension of Isaiah;" he had also another Old Testament apocryphal book (not the book of Jubilees), from which he learned the names of Cain and Abel's sisters, fuller details about the sacrifice of Isaac, was enabled to clear Judah from the guilt of incest in his union with Tamar, &c. He had further New Testament Apocrypha, which, though not absolutely authoritative, might, in his opinion, be read with pleasure. These related in full detail the story of the Magi, compendiously told by St. Matthew, telling how they had learned to expect the appearance of the star from a book preserved in their nation, called the book of Seth, and had in consequence for generations kept a systematic look-out for this star. It was probably the same book which told that Joseph was not present when the angel appeared to Mary; and related how our Lord conferred His own baptism on John the Baptist. Directly or indirectly the writer was much indebted to Origen. We think that we discern traces of his acquaintance with two or three other of the antenicene fathers, but his fanciful interpretations of Scripture, though including some few of what may be called patristical commonplaces, are for the most part, as far as we know, original. But with reference to the question of authorship, it would be important to determine whether his coincidences with St. Augustine are purely accidental. The author is certainly no follower of Augustine. In his commentary on St. Matthew he has little in common with Augustine's treatment of the same passages; and he differs from him in a number of details, as for instance (49, 205), he follows Origen's division of the commandments, making "Honour thy father and mother" the fifth and (p. 218) counting it as belonging to the first table, in these points differing from Augustine; yet it appears to us that he was acquainted with Augustine's "Enarrationes" on the Psalms. There is scarcely a quotation from the Psalms in the "Opus Imperfectum" which does not shew some resemblance to Augustine's commentary on the same passage. A few examples must suffice: (4, 43) in Psalm viii. 4, "The heavens, the work of thy fingers" mean the Holy Scriptures; (5, 37) on Psalm xc. 11, the remark, "Portatur non quasi infirmus sed propter honorem potestatis" verbally agrees with Augustine's "Obsequium angelorum non ad infirmitatem domini pertinet sed ad illorum honorificentiam." There is a striking verbal similarity (7, 52) between the comment on "mittentes retia" and Augustine's remarks on the same subject in Psalm lxiv. 4. The interpretation already quoted that the "mountains" to which Christians are to flee are the Holy Scriptures, may have been suggested by Augustine in Psalm lxxv. 2; see also the sermon (46) "De Pastoribus." Other examples might be added.

With regard to our author's date, he himself lays claim to no great antiquity. He says (52, 218) that the time since our Lord's ascension had been nearly as long as the life of an antediluvian patriarch. Accordingly Mill (*Praef.* N. T.), taking him literally at his word, fixes his date A.D. 961. In favour of the late date may be urged the use of the medieval word "bladum" for corn, though such a point cannot be rigidly insisted on in the absence of information as to the exact date when such words crept into popular language.[d] But the argument for an earlier date is very strong, that the author's studies appear all to have lain in Christian literature earlier than the middle of the 5th century; and that he appears to know nothing of, or to take no interest in, any of the controversies which distracted the Christian church after that date. Making all allowance for the narrowing influence of a small sect, we find it hard to believe that the type of Arianism which existed at the time just specified could have been preserved in such complete purity two or three centuries later. It must be observed that our author does not appear to have lived in an Arian kingdom outside the limits of the Roman empire. He draws illustrations (30, 130) from the relative powers of the offices praefectus, vicarius, consul; from the fact that a "solidus" which has not the "charagma Caesaris" is to be rejected as bad (38, 160). When our author wrote, heathenism was not extinct, as appears from the end of Hom. 13, and from what he says (10, 30) as to the effect on the heathen of the good or bad conversation of Christians. All things considered, we are not disposed to date this work later than the middle of the 5th century, which would allow it time to grow into such repute in an expurgated form as to pass for Chrysostom's with Nicolas I. If so early a date can be assigned to the work, we have at once a claimant for its authorship in the Arian bishop Maximinus, who held a conference with St. Augustine. The *Opus Imperfectum* was written by an Arian bishop at a distance from his people, as Maximinus was at the time in question. The doctrine of the two writers is identical, and there are also points of agreement in what Maximinus says as to the temporal penalties to which the expression of his opinions was liable, and as to the duty, notwithstanding, of confessing the truth before men. Maximinus, while in Africa, could hardly help making some acquaintance with the writings of St. Augustine, and might very conceivably adopt his exegesis of particular passages, though on the whole slightly regarding his authority. This quite falls in with what we have noticed as to the relations between the two writers. [G. S.]

PSEUDO-DIONYSIUS [DIONYSIUS (1)].

PSYCHICI. In the New Testament a contrast is made between the ψυχικοί and the πνευματικοί, in the former of whom the mere animal soul predominates, the latter exhibiting

[d] The word *callicula*, given by Ducange on our author's sole authority as a medieval word for ink, really means an inkbottle, being only a diminutive of *calix*. (See Freund's "Dictionary.")

the working of a higher spiritual nature (Jude 19; 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15; compare also xv. 44–46). In the Valentinian system this contrast is sharpened, and is made to depend on an original difference of nature between the two classes of men, a mythical theory being devised which professed to account for the origin of the different elements in men's nature (see GNOSTICISM, Vol. II. 682 *b*, VALENTINUS); the psychic element being something higher and better than the mere material element, but immeasurably inferior to the pneumatic. It may well be believed that in the language of the Gnostic sects, the "pneumatici" were those who had been initiated in the mysteries of the sect, ordinary Christians being branded as "psychici."

Such was also the use made of the latter word by Tertullian, who in his latest works, written after his Montanism had involved him in complete separation from the church, habitually uses the word Psychici to designate those from whom he had separated. [G. S.]

PTOLEMAEUS (1) (Πτολεμαῖος), a disciple of Valentinus [VALENTINUS], some remains of whose writings have come down to us. He is spoken of in the *Philosophumena* (vi. 35) along with Heracleon as head of the Italic (i.e. Western) school. He was still living circa A.D. 180, when Irenaeus composed his great work Against Heresies. Irenaeus writes in his *Praefatio*, c. 2: "Καὶ καθὼς δύναμις ἡμῖν, τήν τε γνώμην αὐτῶν τῶν νῦν παραδιδασκόντων, λέγω δὴ τῶν περὶ Πτολεμαῖον, ἀπάνθισμα οὖσαν τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς, συντόμως καὶ σαφῶς ἀπαγγελοῦμεν καὶ ἀφορμὰς δώσομεν κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν μετριότητα πρὸς τὸ ἀνατρέπειν αὐτήν." In these words he not only declares his intention to give a special description and refutation of the Ptolemaic form of Valentinian Gnosis, but expressly intimates that he is moved thereto by the fact that οἱ περὶ Πτολεμαῖον are his own contemporaries. The phrase appears to admit of no other interpretation than this, that Ptolemaios was still living when Irenaeus wrote, and standing at the head of his school. We know no more of the circumstances of his life. For Hippolytus he belongs already to the past. In the *Syntagma* against all heresies he is associated with Secundus, in the *Philosophumena* with Heracleon, without our informant seeming able to give us any further account of him. The excerpt in Pseudo-Tertullian (*Haer.* xiii.) joins together Ptolemaeus and Secundus as Valentinus' two first disciples (*post hunc sc. Valentinum extiterunt Ptolemaeus et Secundus haeretici*); but all the epitomator is able to tell us is taken from the statements of Irenaeus (I. ii. 2; 5) concerning Secundus and other Valentinians who are unnamed. Philaster dedicates a special article to each of these heretics, and places Ptolemaeus at the head of all the *successores Valentini* whom he enumerates (*Haer.* 397); but what he relates concerning a double tetrad of Aeons finds its explanation in Pseudo-Tertullian, according to whom "Ptolemaeus and Secundus" added (*addiderunt*) a double tetrad to the thirty Aeons of Valentinus. Hippolytus, on the other hand (as is evident from the epitomators), had no longer any acquaintance with Ptolemaeus and his system. The Philosophumena introduce a notice (vi. 38, p. 199) taken from Irenaeus (I. 12, 1) concerning those "qui sunt circa Ptolemaeum scientiores" with the words, οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον . . . λέγουσι. Otherwise they have nothing more to tell us about Ptolemaeus than what was mentioned above, that he was a head of the Italic school. For in the third place, where they yet again refer to him (vi. 38, p. 198) they put him in conjunction with Secundus just after the manner of the excerpt in Pseudo-Tertullian—Σεκοῦνδος μέν τις κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ἅμα τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ γενόμενος οὕτως λέγει. The system of teaching which is reported in the sequel is the same as that given by Irenaeus (I. 11, 2), or the older source from which he borrows, as that of Secundus only. Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* 1, 8) barely mentions the name of Ptolemaeus. Epiphanius, on the other hand, has a whole article upon him based on Irenaeus (I. 12, 1), in which he makes more definite use than the Philosophumena of the notices there given concerning the "more knowing" adherents of Ptolemaeus, and that for the purpose of describing Ptolemaeus' own doctrine (Epiph. *Haer.* 33, 1). Tertullian appears however to have had a more correct view of Irenaeus' meaning when he refers what he says of the doctrine of the γνωστικώτεροι περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον not to Ptolemaeus and his original school, but to certain reformers of it (*emendatores Ptolemaei Adv. Valentin.* 33).

Concerning the date of Ptolemaeus no safe conclusion can be drawn from the order of succession in which later haeresiologists mention his name. If Hippolytus and his epitomators assign him a place at the head of the disciples of Valentinus in advance of both Secundus and Marcus, this is simply explained by the fact, that Irenaeus names Ptolemaeus before either of the others (and independently of the οἱ περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον of the Preface) at the end of the fragment taken from one of his writings (I. 8, 5); while Secundus is first mentioned (I. 11, 2) in a summary account drawn from another source; and Marcus, although certainly one of the oldest disciples of Valentinus, is brought in still later (I. 13 sqq.). A further and independent notice concerning Ptolemaeus is found in Tertullian, who relates (*Adv. Valentinian.* 4) of him that in distinction from Valentinus, who had regarded the Aeons as mere affections of the Deity, he (Ptolemaeus) made of them independent personal subsistences:—*Eam* (sc. viam) *postmodum Ptolemaeus intravit nominibus et numeris Aeonum distinctis in personales substantias, sed extra Deum determinatas, quas Valentinus in ipsa summa divinitatis ut sensus et affectus et motus incluserat.* The accuracy of this statement, no less than its origin, we are quite unable to determine; we can only conjecture that Tertullian may have derived it from the work of Proculus against the Valentinians.

To what extent the account given by Irenaeus (I. 1–8) was drawn from the writings of Ptolemaeus must likewise remain doubtful. One fragment only can with certainty be referred to Ptolemaeus himself (Iren. I. 8, 5). After giving in previous paragraphs an anthology of allegorical interpretations of Scripture made by Valentinians, Irenaeus adds a long connected piece of a Valentinian commentary on the prologue of St. John, and follows up this extract with the words (omitted by Epiphanius): *et*

Ptolemaeus quidem ita." Beside this fragment we possess further *an Epistle of Ptolemaeus* addressed to a Christian lady named Flora, in which he informs this lady of the origin of different parts of holy Scripture. This important document is preserved by Epiphanius (*Haer*. 33, 3–7), and also in the editions of Irenaeus by Grabe and Stieren. It was published also in a separate form by Hilgenfeld in 1881 (*Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theologie*, pp. 214–230).

The fragment in Irenaeus (I. 8, 5) endeavours to prove that John, "the Lord's Disciple," had expressly indicated the first Ogdoad. St. John (according to him) wishing to describe how the Father produced the Universe, lays down first a Principle (ἀρχήν τινα), generated by God and called Νοῦς, Υἱός and Μονογενής, in whom the Father produced the Universe σπερματικῶς. From this he says was produced the Λόγος, and in him the whole substance of the Aeons, to which the Λόγος afterwards gave form. Having to speak of the first origin of things John rightly begins his doctrine with the ἀρχή, i.e. the Υἱός and the Λόγος (St. John i. 1). He first distinguishes these three—God, the ἀρχή, and the Λόγος, and then joins them again together in One, in order to exhibit at once the emanation of the Υἱός and the Λόγος, and their oneness with each other and with the Father. For in the Father and from the Father is the ἀρχή, in the ἀρχή and from the ἀρχή is the Λόγος. Well says he therefore ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, for the Logos was in the Son; and ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, i.e. in the ἀρχή (read ἐν ἀρχῇ, instead of ἡ ἀρχή) and θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος rightly follows; for that which is born of God is God; οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν· hereby he exhibits the order of emanation, πάντα γὰρ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδ' ἕν· for to all the Aeons after him is the Logos the Cause of their origin and form. But when he adds ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἐστιν, he intimated the Syzygy. For he says—Everything came into existence through him, but the Ζωή in him. But that which is in him must be more nearly related to him than that which is through him, and being united to him through him produces fruit. And when he adds καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων by naming the Ἄνθρωπος he by the like name with Ἄνθρωπος indicates also the Ἐκκλησία, in order by the likeness of the name to intimate also the communion of the Syzygy. For Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία proceed from the union of Λόγος and Ζωή. But Ζωή he calls the Light of Men, because they are enlightened by her, i.e. are by her formed and manifested. The same is also said by Paul in those words, πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστίν. Because there the Ζωή has manifested and produced Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία, she is called their "Light." With these words then has John plainly indicated the Second Tetrad, Λόγος and Ζωή, Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία. And so he has also the First Tetrad. For in treating of the Σωτήρ, and saying that everything outside the Pleroma has been formed by Him he calls Him the fruit of the whole pleroma. He calls Him the light shining in the darkness, and not comprehended thereby, inasmuch as He has given form to everything produced by the suffering (of the Sophia), and yet remained unknown to her (the darkness). Further, he calls Him "Son" and "Truth" and "Life" and Logos (or Word) made flesh, whose δόξα we have seen as it was, he says, His δόξα as that of the Μονογενής, and given Him by the Father, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας (John i. 14). In this way he clearly indicates the first Tetrad also—Πατήρ and Χάρις and Μονογενής and Ἀλήθεια. And thus has John spoken of the First Ogdoad, the Mother of all the Aeons, consisting of Πατήρ and Χάρις, Μονογενής and Ἀλήθεια, Λόγος and Ζωή, Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία.

It is possible that the other allegorical interpretations of Scripture given by Irenaeus in his cc. 3 and 8 are taken from the same work of Ptolemaeus as the above fragment. But from the little which we can with certainty trace back to Ptolemaeus no conclusion can be drawn as to the nature of that work. It is only probable, not certain, that like the writings of Heracleon, it was mainly exegetical in its character. Of more importance is it that the agreement of the fragment with the description given of the Gnostic doctrine in I. 1, 1, confirms the assumption that, in that description, Irenaeus had the Ptolemaic form of the Valentinian system really in view. For in both cases the doctrine of Aeons is in complete agreement. But at the same time it is clearly proved that by the "scientiores" (*Haer*. i. 12, 1) are not meant the whole party of Ptolemaeus, but only one branch of it which, like those mentioned at I. 12, 3, would fain be more 'knowing' than the rest.

A more exoterical character belongs to the *Epistle of Ptolemaeus* to Flora. Its purpose is to impart instruction concerning the origin of the Mosaic Law. One may suppose that the lady to whom it is addressed had sought for instruction as to how the (Gnostic) view of two different authors, one of the gospel the other of the law, could be brought into harmony with Christian Monotheism. The answer given by Ptolemaeus represents his own opinion as the right medium between two opposing errors, one deriving the law from God the Father and the other from the devil (Marcion?). It cannot indeed come (so argues Ptolemaeus) from the perfect God and Father, being itself imperfect, needing that another should come and fulfil it, and containing precepts discordant with the essence and the will of the Perfect God. Neither can we assign its origin to the unrighteous adversary, seeing it forbids unrighteousness, and a house or city divided against itself cannot, as the Lord saith, stand. This latter view were as impossible as that which would assign the creation of the world to the author of destruction, instead of the righteous and all evil-hating God. Both sides are in error, the one as not knowing the God of Righteousness, the other as ignorant of the Father of All, whom the only one who knew Him (Christ) has revealed at His advent. In opposition to both these errors Ptolemaeus promises to solve the question concerning the nature of the law and the lawgiver on the basis of the Redeemer's own utterances, these alone shewing us the way to apprehend the truth (cap. 1). In the first place the whole of that complex of precepts contained in the Pentateuch did not proceed from one author. On the contrary, the Redeemer's own words suggest a threefold division—(1) Commandments given by God Himself through Moses; (2) Commandments derived by Moses from his own specula-

tion; and (3) Commandments invented by the elders of the people. This is proved partly by the words of Jesus, Matt. xix. 6 sqq., where he speaks of Moses having allowed what God forbids in the matter of divorce on account of the people's hardness of heart, and partly by reference to Matt. xv. 4 sqq., where Jesus expressly opposes to the divine command to "Honour father and mother" the human traditions (*παραδόσεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων*) which enjoined its transgression (c. 2). Of these three constituent divisions, the first, consisting of Divine commandments, may again be subdivided into three parts. (*a*) The first of these consists of the purely moral precepts constituting the law in the strict sense which the Redeemer came not to destroy but to fulfil; (*b*) the second are the ordinances which, being mingled with that which is worse and with unrighteousness, the Saviour has abrogated as contrary to His own nature; (*c*) the third part are the typical and symbolical ordinances which, passing over their application to things sensible and visible, the Redeemer has transferred to the spiritual and unseen. The first and pure portion of the ordinances of the law is the Decalogue, which only needed to be fulfilled by the Saviour. The second portion, which is intermingled with unrighteousness, includes such ordinances as sanction retaliation (Lev. xxiv. 20). It is a condescension to human weakness, but in itself opposed to the nature and goodness of the Father of All, though based on a certain necessity, as that of requiting murder with the punishment of death. The third, the typical and symbolical portion, has reference to sacrifices, circumcision, the Sabbath, fasting, the Passover, Azyms, and the like. For all these are but figures and symbols of the truth, which in their literal sense are done away, but in their spiritual are retained, the things being altered, while the names remain. In the place of animal sacrifices and incense-offering the Saviour has enjoined sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving; instead of bodily circumcision the circumcision of the heart; instead of the sabbatical rest an abstaining from bad works; instead of bodily fasting the spiritual fast which is interpreted as abstinence from all evil. Bodily fasting is indeed (he adds) also practised among our people, because it may in some degree benefit the soul, if performed with reason (*μετὰ λόγου*), not from mere imitation of an alien example, not for mere custom's sake, or because a certain day has been enjoined for the observance. At the same time it may serve to remind us of the true spiritual fast, and admonish us to steer with all our might to keep that. In like manner as Paul himself teaches (1 Cor. v. 7 sqq.), Passover and unleavened bread are figures the one of Christ, the other of heart-purity (c. 3).

The Saviour has then confirmed the first portion of God's law (Matt. v. 22, 28, 34); for the second He has substituted other and opposing precepts (Matt. v. 39); the third, the symbolic portion, He has interpreted spiritually, and so put the truth itself in the place of the figure. The same things taught also His disciples and the Apostle St. Paul, who has shewn in one case how a precept is to be understood spiritually (namely in the words already referred to concerning the feast of the Passover and unleavened bread). That portion of the law which is mixed with unrighteousness St. Paul designated (Eph. ii. 15) as *τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι*, which has been done away. Finally, the pure and unmixed portion he has in view when (Rom. vii. 12) he calls the law holy, the commandment holy and just and good (c. 4).

Now at length Ptolemaeus turns to the question who the God is who was giver of the law. It cannot have been the perfect God, as has been shewn already, neither can it have been the devil, a thought which it was not even lawful to utter, but a third one, the Demiurge and creator of this present world, who occupies a middle place between the other two, and has therefore received the name of the Midst (*τῆς μεσότητος*). The perfect God is good by nature, and indeed (according to St. Matt. xiv. 17) the only good; the adversary is bad, wicked, and unrighteous; he who stands in the midst, between the two, is neither good nor bad nor unrighteous, but properly called 'righteous,' the Umpire and Prizegiver of his own righteousness. He is inferior to the perfect God because he is begotten and not unbegotten, as is that only One, but he is greater and more exalted than the adversary. Moreover, he is of a different essence from both the others. The essence of the adversary is corruption and darkness, for he is hylic and multiform. The essence of the unbegotten Father is incorruption, and a one simple, uniform and self-existent Light. But the essence of the Demiurge is the product of a *διττὴ δύναμις*, he himself being an image of the better. The epistle concludes with an admonition to Flora not to suffer herself to be disturbed in the conviction that along with the one *ἀρχὴ τῶν ὅλων*, the unbegotten, incorruptible and good, which is also confessed and believed in by us, the two other Natures had a co-existence, that of Corruption and that of the Midst, and this notwithstanding that they were not of the same essence (*ἀνομοούσιοι*), though it be the nature of the good to bring forth that which is like to and consubstantial with Himself (*τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῷ καὶ ὁμοούσια*). A full insight into this condition of things is held out to Flora as what she may look for in future times, and at the same time assurance is given her that she must be made partaker of the apostolic tradition, which has also been transmitted to us, along with the injunction to judge of all words by the rule of the Saviour's doctrine (*ἀξιουμένη τῆς ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως ἣν ἐκ διαδοχῆς καὶ ἡμεῖς παρειλέφαμεν, μετὰ καὶ τοῦ κανονίσαι πάντας τοὺς λόγους τῇ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν διδασκαλίᾳ*). [R. A. L.]

PTOLEMAEUS (2), Oct. 19. A martyr at Rome, mentioned by Justin Martyr in his Second Apology. He suffered under the city prefect Urbicius, with LUCIUS (14) and another unknown martyr. He converted a woman to the faith, and her husband in anger accused him of being a Christian (Just. Mart. *Apol.* ii. cap. 2; Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 17; Dodwell, *Dissert. Cyprian.* xi. 33); Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* fixes the date of his martyrdom A.D. 166. Cf. the article on JUSTINUS MARTYR, t. iii. p. 569. [G. T. S.]

PTOLEMAEUS (3), Dec. 20. Soldier of Alexandria, and martyr there under Sabinus, in

the Decian persecution. He is mentioned by Dionysius Alexand. as quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 41). [G. T. S.]

PTOLEMAEUS (4), bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, but probably intruded (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 540). He attended the Councils of Seleucia in 359 and Constantinople in 360. He was a partisan of Acacius of Caesarea [ACACIUS (2)], and is called Μελιτιανόν τινα by St. Athanasius (*De Synod.* § 12), as a follower of Meletius of Lycopolis [MELETIUS (2)]. (Baron. *Annal.* A.D. 359, lxix.; Tillem. vi. 469, 488; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iv. 333.) [J. G.]

PTOLEMAEUS (5) (συγκλητικός), addressed by St. Nilus the ascetic (*Epp.* i. nos. 1, 2, 3, 8–21) upon the honour attached to the monastic life. [J. G.]

PTOLEMAEUS (6), bishop of Rhinocorura, upon whose information to Timotheus patriarch of Alexandria the presbyter Alphaeus was degraded for embracing the Messalian heresy (Phot. *Cod.* 52; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 543). Tillemont (viii. 536) thinks that the Timotheus here spoken of was Salofaciolus. [C. H.]

PUBLIA, Oct. 9, deaconess and widow of Antioch, and confessor under Julian. She was mother of a certain John, presbyter of Antioch, whom some have taken to be John Chrysostom. She was head of a community of women who tormented Julian by chanting psalms, ridiculing the worship of idols. On one occasion he was so vexed by her audacity in thus bearding him, that he ordered a soldier to strike her on the face. (Theodoret, *H. E.* iii. 19.) [G. T. S.]

PUBLICOLA, son of Melania [MELANIA (1) Vol. III. p. 888], the only one remaining to her after the loss of two others, who from his station and fortune might have attained to senatorial rank, but of whom his mother was anxious that he should renounce the world and live a monastic life. However, he married Albina, daughter of Rufius Ceionius Albinus, and by her had a daughter, Melania. He died before A.D. 406, for in that year his widow was residing for a time at Nola in the house of Paulinus, together with her mother-in-law, the elder Melania and others. (Paulinus, *Ep.* xxix. 8–11; *Carm.* xxi. 281–295.)

He was probably possessed of property in Africa, near Arzuges, perhaps the name of the heathen native inhabitants of Arsura or Azzura, a place of unknown site in the province of Byzacene in Africa, and wrote to St. Augustine to consult him as to his own conduct towards them and also on some other cases of conscience which troubled him (Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 84). Surrounded by heathens he found himself and the business transactions of his estate in contact frequently with them. I. In respect of oaths taken by them in the names of their deities: (*a*) respecting carriage of goods; (*b*) respecting care taken by them of agricultural produce belonging to him; (*c*) respecting passage through their territory. He was in doubt whether they who relied on such oaths, whether taken to the owner or to the magistrate of the district, were not polluted by receiving them, and not only so but also the goods in respect of which they were taken. Again, supposing that he knew by hearsay only of the oaths being taken, and the information should turn out to be untrue, would not the doubt until it should be cleared up contaminate the object, and also its price, and make it unfit for him to meddle with: following out the principle laid down by St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 28, what ought he to do in such a case? If a heathen should induce a Christian proprietor or magistrate, heathen or Christian, to swear that he will keep a promise, is the Christian polluted by such an oath, and in any case are the objects in question polluted: (*d*) If he sends a messenger to the Arzuges, is he at liberty to take an oath from them, or does he pollute himself by so doing? II. As to Offerings. (*a*) May a Christian eat of produce out of which an idol-offering has been taken: (*b*) May he cut wood from an idol-grove: (*c*) Going to market and buying meat, if a doubt crosses his mind as to its origin, does he commit sin by eating it: (*d*) Does doubt about the nature of a good action involve the doer of it in sin: (*e*) If a man says falsely that such or such food is idol sacrifice, and afterwards confesses his un truth, is a Christian justified in eating or selling it or making use of the price paid for it: (*f*) Is he justified in eating such food in extreme necessity, in order to save his own life: (*g*) May he drink of a well, with which any portion of idol-sacrifice has entered, or of a spring in a deserted temple not so tainted: (*h*) At a feast if a Christian have idol-meat set before him, and refuses to eat it, and afterwards in ignorance buys the same meat when exposed for sale, is he guilty of sin: (*i*) May he buy vegetables from a temple-garden, or from a heathen priest: (*j*) Ought a Christian to bathe in places where idol-sacrifices are offered, especially on heathen festival-days, either at the same time as heathens, or in their absence: (*k*) Ought he to sit on the same bathing-seat (*solium*) on which heathens here sat on such occasions. III. *Conduct in general.* (*a*) Is a man justified in killing another to prevent his killing him: (*b*) Is he at liberty to surround his property with a wall, and thence defend it even to the killing of invaders?

On all these questions he begs Augustine to give him immediate and decided answers so as to leave no doubt concerning them, and quotes many scriptural passages and instances bearing on them. (Aug. *Ep* 46.)

In his reply, St. Augustine, while expressing his great anxiety to calm his friend's sensitive mind, expresses also his doubts as to his ability to do so. He points out (*a*) that a man who swears by false gods and breaks his promise is guilty of two faults, but that no one would blame him for keeping his promise: (*b*) he that makes use of the true promise of one who has sworn by false gods involves himself in no sin on that account. Not that his faith can be placed on a level with that of a Christian, but it is plainly a less evil to swear truly by a false god than untruly by the true one, for as the object of appeal is greater, so also is the perjury more heinous. It is a question therefore whether he who causes another to swear by false gods is not guilty of sin, a question which he

should consider more serious, but for the cases mentioned by Publicola of Isaac and Abimelech (Gen. xxvi. 31) and Laban and Jacob (Gen. xxxi. 53). The command also of our Lord about not swearing at all (Matt. v. 34, 36) seems to be directed mainly against perjury, from which, as a heinous sin He wishes Christians to be as far removed as possible. As a Christian ought not to swear at all, so he ought not to compel others to do so, though scripture nowhere forbids him to take an oath from another, for if so, there would be no such thing as peace, and not only produce guarded by heathens would be polluted, but every thing included in a treaty of peace with them. (*c*) To permit any produce from floor or press to be used to idols is plainly forbidden to Christians, but there can be no reason against their using the general store to which it belongs, as water, even though some be taken for sacrifice. We do not scruple to breathe the air into which the smoke of sacrifice ascends. The point to be considered is to do nothing, nor be thought to do any thing in honour of false gods, and when temples or groves are overthrown, Christians ought not to use the stores, or the timber for themselves, but only for the service of God, as was the case with Jericho, and in other cases. As to meat offered to idols we have St. Paul's rule. He who eats idol-meat in ignorance, sins not: so vegetables in general are a part of God's creation, but if offered to idols ought to be rejected. But if it be unlawful to eat a vegetable grown within a temple-enclosure, St. Paul would have been precluded from eating any at Athens, which was wholly consecrated to Minerva. So also with water, unless any parts of an idol-sacrifice be thrown into it. We behold the sun and breathe the wind, though some offer sacrifice to them both. Doubts concerning an idol-sacrifice, if it be proved not to be so, cannot cause sin, because every one is at liberty to correct falsehood, and turn it into truth. To do a bad deed which the doer thinks at the time to be good is a sin of ignorance: (*d*) As to killing those who are endeavouring to kill us, the church thinks it wrong to do so, except in the case of soldiers, and bearing in mind Matt. v. 39. A man who builds a wall round his property is not guilty of murder if another man be struck from it, nor if his beast wound him. So St. Paul was justified in revealing the plot laid against him, and accepting the guard provided for him. If it were otherwise, no iron tools or ropes could be used, lest people should destroy themselves with them; nor windows, lest they should throw themselves out: (*e*) As to the case of the famishing Christian, if he knows food to be idol-meat, he does better to reject it, but if he does not know this, he may lawfully partake of it. The letter and its reply are not without importance, and though the former may appear over-scrupulous and even frivolous in its doubts, it is an instance of conscientious casuistry, in respect of the questions which must have arisen frequently in the minds of Christians living among heathens, and which to a feebler and over-sensitive mind presented difficulties which the clear judgment, strong common sense, and better informed mind of Augustine were able in most cases easily to solve. (*Ep.* 47.)

[H. W. P.]

PUBLIUS (1), bishop of Athens in the 2nd century, and martyr in some persecution of that time. He was succeeded by Quadratus, who revived the faith of the Athenian Church, which had almost failed. Cf. Ep. of Dionysius of Corinth in Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23 [DIONYSIUS (3)]. The exact date of Publius is a matter of doubt, and depends upon the identification of Quadratus. If Quadratus, bishop of Athens, were the apologist mentioned by Euseb. (*H. E.* iv. 3), he lived in the time of Hadrian, and Publius may have been the successor of Dionysius the Areopagite as bishop of Athens. This, however, is disputed by Valesius in his notes on Eusebius, though asserted by Jerome in his *Catalog.* (cf. Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* praef. p. xxxv.). Valesius's principal objection is this; Eusebius (iii. 37) says that Quadratus was distinguished for his prophetical gifts; Dionysius on the other hand calls his Quadratus a bishop. But a bishop could also have been a prophet. Cf. the words of the **Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων**, ed. Bryennios, cap. 15. Upon this controversy see writers cited by Fabricius in his *Biblioth. Graeca,* t. vi. p. 154, when discussing Quadratus. [G. T. S.]

PUBLIUS (2), the eighteenth bishop of Jerusalem, followed Cassianus as the third of the Gentile succession. The beginning of his episcopate is placed in the 4th year of Marcus Aurelius, A.D. 165. Two years of office are assigned him by Eutychius (361) (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 12; Epiphan. *Haer.* lxvi. 20; Chron. Armen.).

[E. V.]

PUBLIUS JULIUS. [AELIUS.]

PUBLIUS, persecutor. [POLLIO.]

PUBLIUS (3), a solitary, commemorated by Theodoret in his *Religiosa Historia*, cap. v. born at Zeugma, on the Hellespont, of a family of senatorial rank. His person was singularly handsome, and his mental endowments were equally remarkable. On his father's death Publius sold all that he inherited from him, and distributed it to those in need, and built for himself a small hut on a high ground about seven miles from his native town, where he passed the remainder of his days. He devoted his whole time to psalmody, reading the Scriptures, and prayer, together with the labour necessary for his maintenance and the entertainment of strangers, and latterly for the government of his brotherhood. His reputation for sanctity gathered many about him whom he lodged in small huts contiguous to his own, but not under the same roof. Over these he exercised a very strict oversight, imposing on them a very severe rule of abstinence, and nightly prayer. After a while, on the advice of one of these fellow ascetics he erected a common house, or coenobium which they might occupy together, and each derive profit from the virtues of his companions, while all would be more immediately under his eye. At first all his fellow coenobites were Greeks. But the native Syrians having expressed a desire to join the society, he built another house for them, and between the two erected a church common to both, where each might attend mattins and evensong, singing alternately in their own language. This

double coenobite establishment remained to Theodoret's time, and he gives a record of its successive provosts. (Theod. *Rel. Hist.* c. v.) [E. V.]

PUCH, a "comes," residing at a township ("villa") about two miles from the monastery of Inderauuda (*i.e.* Inderwood, perh. = In Deira Wood), afterwards named Beverley, while John bishop of York, JOANNES (201) BEVERLACENSIS, was living there in retirement (*i.e.* 718–721), and Berchthun was abbat. Puch becomes known to us from the following incident related by Bede (*H. E.* v. 4) in the words of Berchthun, who was Bede's personal friend. Puch's wife, suffering under an acute disorder, had been three weeks confined to her room when the bishop, upon Puch's invitation, came from Inderauuda accompanied by the abbat, to consecrate a church close by, erected, as we should infer, by Puch himself. After the consecration the bishop was bent on returning to his monastery, but overcome by the entreaties of Puch and Berchthun remained at the villa to dine. One of his attendants carrying from him some of the holy water which had been employed at the consecration to the sick lady for her to use both as a medicine and a lotion, she forthwith arose cured, and ministered to the guests during their repast. Folchard's *Life of St. John of Beverley* places Puch's villa at South Burton (Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. ii. 170 B). An anonymous life of the same bishop seen and described by Leland (*Collect.* iii. 155, Hearne's vol. iv. 100) also makes Puch possessed of a manor at South Burton, not far from Beverley, and further adds that his daughter Yolfrida became a nun at Beverley, where she died March 13, 742, and was buried, and that her father bestowed with her the manor of Walkington upon the monastery. The same statement occurs without reference to the source in Dugdale (vol. i. p. 170, ed. 1682), and in the modern edition of the *Monasticon* (ii. 127). South Burton (also called Bishop Burton) is a likely spot for Puch's township; it is two miles west of Beverley, and its antiquity is attested by three circumstances. Sepulchral tumuli abound in the neighbourhood, an ancient road of Roman date has been found to have run between the spot and Beverley (Oliver's *Beverley*, pp. 5, 13); and two Roman tesselated pavements in two separate fields were discovered there about 1721, as narrated in Gent's *Beverley*, 1733, p. 77. Kemble in his essay on *The Names of Anglosaxons*, p. 85 (in the volume *Proceedings at Winchester*, Sept. 1845, of the Archaeological Institute of G. B. and I.), reckons Puch among the names of the Anglo-Saxon period allied to Cymric or Pictish roots, suggesting a not inconsiderable admixture of blood between the conquerors and the natives, instancing also the names of Pecthelm (Bed. v. 23), Padda (iv. 13), Oiddi (*ib.*), Pehtat (*Cod. Dipl.* 34) occurring in this dictionary. We may further remark that Puch survives nearly unaltered, both in the common Welsh name Pugh, and in that of Pook which occurs in Devonshire. [C. H.]

PUDENS (1), a pro-consul of Africa, who favoured the Christians and discouraged persecution at the end of the 2nd century (Tertull. *Ad. Scap.* 4; Tillem. iii. 127). [G. T. S.]

PUDENS (2), a soldier, who guarded the martyr Perpetua and her companions. He was converted by them, and received a ring from Saturus bathed in his blood. A Pudens was commemorated in the ancient Carthaginian calendar on April 29, with whom our martyr may have been identical (*Passio SS. Perpetuae et Felicit.* c. vi.). [G. T. S.]

PUDENS (3), a friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, who addressed him (lib. v. ep. 19) in reference to a crime committed by one of his serfs (Tillem. xvi. 206). [C. H.]

PUDENTIANA. [PRAXEDIS.]

PUDENTIANUS, bishop of Cuicul (if that is its name, for none but oblique cases occur) in Numidia, between Sitifis and Milevum; recently made a bishop, and on that ground voting with the majority in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. de Bap. iii. suffr. 71. The city was a very fine one, as notices of it and its remains and numerous inscriptions indicate. It is called a "respublica" and a "colonia." It had bishops till after the middle of the sixth century. Now Djemila. [E. W. B.]

PULCHERIA (1), daughter of Theodosius I. She died in 385, aged six years. Gregory of Nyssa delivered an eloquent funeral oration over her [GREGORIUS (15)] (Greg. Nyss. *Opp* t. ii. p. 946; Ceill. vi. 210). [G. T. S.]

PULCHERIA (2), Sep. 10, daughter of the emperor Arcadius and sister of Theodosius II. She acted as guardian of the latter, and practically ruled the eastern empire for many years. Her secular history will be found in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, her religious history alone will therefore here be told. She must have been a precocious young person, as she was only two years older than her brother, whose education she superintended, having been born Jan. 19, 399. She was declared Augusta and Empress July 4, 414, and at once entrusted with the management of affairs. She was learned and vigorous, could speak and write Latin and Greek, personally investigated the affairs of state, directed much attention to religion, and brought up her brother in the strictest orthodoxy (Soz. *H. E.* ix. 1). She was a correspondent of St. Cyril during the Nestorian controversy, two letters are still extant addressed by him to her in the year 430, requesting her assistance (see Mansi, iv. 618–883). [CYRIL.] Twenty years later again she had a long correspondence with pope Leo and his archdeacon Hilarius on the subject of Eutyches and the Monophysite heresy (see Mansi, tt. v. vi. vii.) [LEO (5) in t. iii. p. 657–659; HILARIUS (18)]. We possess also an epistle of hers addressed to the Palestinian monks in defence of the council of Chalcedon, and another to one Bessa, abbess of a convent at Jerusalem, on the same topic. Bishops and clergy from every part of the empire appealed to her and on every subject. Theodoret (*Ep.* 43) wrote to her in 445 about the taxation of his episcopal city of Cyrrhus; the clergy of Ephesus, in 448, concerning the episcopate of Bassianus. Pulcheria had in early life taken a vow of virginity in conjunction with her sisters, Arcadia and Marina. In 450 she was obliged to assume the government of the empire, and feeling herself

incompetent for the task married Marcian, an eminent general. She reigned till her death, Feb. 18, 453. During that period she convoked and assisted at the fourth general council of Chalcedon. Her devotion to the culture of relics was very great. She transported to Constantinople the relics of St. Chrysostom with great pomp in 438, and those of the forty martyrs of Sebaste in 446 (Soz. *H. E.* ix. 2). [FORTY MARTYRS.] Ceill. viii. 471, 533, x. 20, 67, 213–226 gives full details of her religious history. Suidas, *s.v.* Pulcheria, reports a horrible charge that was brought against her: it was almost certainly only the outcome of intense religious hatred. Hefele's *Councils*, Clark's translation, t. iii., gives the details of her action against Nestorius and Eutyches. [G. T. S.]

PUPPIANUS. [FLORENTIUS (3).]

PURPURIUS, bishop of Limata, or Liniata, a place of unknown site in Numidia, a truculent ruffian, whose case is mentioned both by Optatus and Augustine as a sample of the leaders of the Donatist party. (Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 205.) For some cause unknown he murdered his own nephews in the prison of Mileum, and when taxed with the crime made no attempt to deny it, but threatened to do the same by any one who stood in his way. (Opt. i. 13; Aug. *Brevic. Coll.* iii. 15, 27; *c. Gaud.* i. 16, 17; *c. Cresc.* iii. 27, 30.) At what time this had taken place is not mentioned, but it was brought up against him by way of retort at the council of Cirta, A.D. 305, at which he taxed Secundus, bishop of Tigisis, the president, with tradition, a charge which Secundus endeavoured to evade, but which was pressed upon him with characteristic violence by Purpurius, who taunted him with cowardice and criminal leniency towards the bishops who were guilty of "tradition." (Aug. *c. Gaud.* i. 37, 47; *Ep.* 43; 3, 6.) In order also to terrify Secundus, he threatened with the other bishops present to leave him, and thus place him in the position of a heretic standing alone against the rest. (*C. Cresc.* iii. 27, 30.) But Purpurius was not only violent but dishonest. For the money distributed by Lucilla in bribes (A.D. 311), he had a share amounting to 100 *folles* [LUCILLA, Vol. III. 751]. At some time not mentioned, but perhaps soon after A.D. 313, when Christian worship was made legal, and heathenism became unpopular, advantage appears to have been taken by some of the "baser sort" of Christians to plunder the heathen temples, and among these Purpurius carried off some cups from the temple of Serapis, probably of Carthage. This theft was brought to light at the inquiry held by Zenophilus, A.D. 320, at which also two letters written by Purpurius were produced, one addressed to Silvanus, Donatist bishop of Cirta, and intended to bring about a reconciliation with him, the other to the clergy and seniors of the same place, mentioning that Mundinurius was aware of the cause of quarrel between himself and Silvanus, which no doubt came out of the bribery of Lucilla. But what the result of the inquiry was we know not, as the MS. is imperfect. (*Mon. Vet.* Don. iv. pp. 172, 173; ed. Oberthür.) [FERTES (2), Vol. II. p. 550; MUNDINARIUS DONATISM, Vol. I. p. 882.] [H. W. P.]

PUSA, the name assigned to the fourth abbat of Medeshamstede (*Mon. Angl.* i. 346). According to the Peterborough copy of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Pusa was abbat in the days of Offa, succeeding abbat Beonna, and was a great friend of the king. The mention of him occurs under the year 778, which may therefore be regarded as the conjectural date; and in connexion with the confirmation of a grant made by the ealdorman Brorda, of the monastery called Wocingas, to Medeshamstede and its abbat Pusa (*M.H.B.* 335). The Black Book of Peterborough however contains a charter which, whether genuine or not, is inconsistent with this story, and represents an earlier tradition. According to this (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 168) Pusa was abbat of Woking, in Surrey, and had a grant from King Offa at a place called Freoricburna, which Kemble dates in 796, but which has no date of its own. The Black Book contains likewise a privilege of pope Constantine (708–715) to abbat Hedda, in which certain rights are conferred on the abbeys of Woking and Bermundsey, both in Wessex, and both dedicated to St. Peter (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 276). These charters somehow found their way into the possession of the monks of Peterborough, and were the foundation of the story that Hedda and Pusa were abbats there. The Peterborough annalist, and after him Hugo Candidus, the historian of Peterborough, used these to fill up a vacant space in the traditional history of the abbey; for there is no connexion historically between Woking or Bermondsey and Peterborough. Subsequent antiquaries have tried to identify Wocingas with Wicken, and Vermundesei with Wermington; but the charters place both in Surrey. Pusa thus disappears from the Peterborough Fasti. The abbat who ruled at the time assigned to him was Bothwin, 758–789; after whom came Beonna, 789–805. (Birch, *Saxon Abbots*, pp. 50, 51; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 462; and Kemble, *C. D.* n. 156, 193, &c.) [S.]

PUSILLUS, bishop of Lamasba (Lamasva) in Numidia, not far from Lambesae with which Fell confuses it apparently (Suffr. 75. Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii.). [E. W. B.]

PUSINNA, ST., a virgin, in Champagne, in the 5th century. According to her *Acta*, as published by the Bollandists (April iii. 166 sqq.), she was born in the Pertois, and, together with six sisters, also famed for their sanctity, was educated first by pious parents, and then by Eugenius, a priest. She received the veil from Alpinus or Albinus, bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne, and after a life of good deeds, died, and was buried at Bansion, where her tomb became celebrated for miracles. In the year 860 her remains, or supposed remains, were translated to the nunnery at Hervordia (Herford), in Westphalia (*ibid.* p. 170, sqq.). Her day is April 23. [S. A. B.]

PUTTA, the sixth bishop of Rochester and first bishop of Hereford (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 2, 5, 12). Bede describes him as a man "instructed in ecclesiastical discipline and contented with simplicity of life rather than strenuous in the affairs of the world;" and as especially skilled

in church music, which he had learned, after the Roman method, from the disciples of St. Gregory. He was ordained priest by Wilfrid whilst he was in Kent, before Theodore's arrival (Edd. v. Wilfr. c. 14). He was made bishop of Rochester by Theodore in the place of bishop Damian, after a long vacancy in the see, about 669, and was present at the council of Hertford in the year 673 as "episcopus castelli Cantuariorum quod dicitur Hrofescaestir." In the year 676 Ethelred of Mercia invaded Kent and sacked Rochester, whereupon Putta retired under the protection of the Mercian bishop Saxulf, taking no trouble about recovering his see or restoring the church of Rochester, but contenting himself with a church and a small estate, on which he resided continually, only occasionally leaving it to give instruction in the songs of the church. This new home of Putta is identified, although not by Bede himself, with Hereford, and Putta ranks as the first bishop of that see (*M.H.B.* 621; W. Malmesb. *G.P.* iv. § 163). Although there is little direct authority for this, there does not seem much reason to question it, as probably the creation of the diocese of Hereford was, like that of the other new dioceses of Mercia, an immediate result of the measures taken by Theodore in 679 (*Councils*, &c., Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 130). Putta's death is dated, on the very questionable evidence of a MS. of Florence of Worcester, in 688 (*M.H.B.* 538). His successor Tyrhtel attests a charter of 693 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 36). [S.]

PUTUBASTES (PUTUBATES, Πουτουβάστης, Πουτουβάτης), an Egyptian solitary in the time of Antony (Soz. iii. 14, vi. 30). [C. H.]

PYNUPHIUS (PINUFIUS), presbyter and governor of a large coenobium near Panephysis, in the east of Lower Egypt, in the 4th century. Finding the position he held unfavourable to the cultivation of humility, he withdrew by stealth, and proceeded alone to the coenobium of Tabenna in Thebais, where his person but not his fame was unknown, and where having obtained admission as a novice he was set to the performance of the meanest offices. After three years, through a travelling monk of his former monastery, it was discovered who he was; he was at once treated with the utmost deference and induced to return. He fled again, and embarking for Palestine, where he believed his very name was unknown, was received in the coenobium of Bethlehem, where Cassian then was. Here, too, some Egyptian monks discovered and brought him back. Cassian, on visiting Egypt, c. 390, called at his monastery, and it was there with him that his twentieth conference, *De Poenitentiae Fine*, was held. (Cassian, *Inst.* iv. 30–32, *Collat.* xx. 1; Tillem. xiv. 160, 165, 166.) [C. H.]

PYRAMUS, said to have been one of the British bishops of York. Geoffrey tells us that he was king Arthur's chaplain, that he was appointed by Arthur to the see after the expulsion of Sanxo, and that he restored the churches, etc., which had been destroyed (*Hist. Brit.* ix. 8). The chroniclers of the Arthurian school repeat this, and there is no other evidence for the assertion. [J. R.]

PYRRHUS, patriarch of Constantinople, succeeded his friend SERGIUS at the end of A.D. 638, or beginning of A.D. 639. He had previously been abbat at Chrysopolis. He was, like his predecessor, a Monothelite. Soon after his consecration he convened a synod in which he confirmed the ECTHESIS. (Mansi, x. 674, 1002, 1014; Maximus, *Disput.* 194, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xci. 352.) He also wrote to pope Joannes in support of Monothelism, referring to the forgery purporting to be by MENNAS. (Max. *Disp.* 181; Agatho, *Epp.* i. in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 1205). He was a friend of Heraclius, who before his death deposited large sums with him for the use of the empress Martina, in case her stepson CONSTANTINUS III. should expel her from the palace. This money Constantine obliged him to give up. Theophanes accuses him and Martina of poisoning Constantine, on whose death Pyrrhus, to appease the people, swore on the true Cross that neither through him nor through any one else, should Constantine's sons suffer any injury, but he was compelled by them to crown CONSTANTINUS IV., the eldest. The people were still incensed against him, invaded the church, tore the altar cloth, and carried off the keys. Pyrrhus fearing further violence, entered the church the following night, and laid his omophorion on the altar with the words, "I do not resign my bishopric, but I yield to the disbelieving people." This happened in September or October, A.D. 641. Sheltered for a time in a pious woman's house, he took a favourable opportunity of escaping to Carthage, PAULUS being appointed patriarch in his place. Pope Theodore while condemning the heresy of Pyrrhus, asserted that he should have been canonically deposed. [PAULUS (19).] Pyrrhus in Africa encountered MAXIMUS (23) his successor as abbat, with whom, in July A.D. 645, he held his celebrated Disputation. He was convinced by his arguments, and going to Rome presented a libellus, in which he condemned the heretical opinions of himself and his predecessors, and was received into communion by the pope, and treated as the legitimate patriarch, while on the other hand he was excommunicated by PAULUS. For the details of his reception see MARTINUS (3), Vol. III. 856. The exarch Plato sent to Rome and induced Pyrrhus to go to Ravenna, where he was persuaded to recant his recantation. Pope Theodore then pronounced a sentence of excommunication against him with unusual solemnity. [PAULUS.] Pyrrhus returned to the East, and on the death of Paulus on December 26th, A.D. 654, managed to get himself reappointed Patriarch, but died between four and five months afterwards. (*Lib. Pont.*, *Vitae Martini et Theodori*; Theophanes, 275, 276, 282, 283, 286; Nicephorus; *Passio S. Martini*, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 117; Mansi, x. 878; *AA. SS.* Aug. i. 78*.) [F. D.]

Q

QUADRAGESIMUS, subdeacon of Buxentum, Gregory the Great's authority for his account of the miraculous restoration of a dead man to life by a monk (*Dial.* iii. 17). [F. D.]

QUADRATUS (1), proconsul. [POLYCARPUS, (1).]

QUADRATUS (2), bishop of Athens, apparently contemporary with Dionysius of Corinth, who, writing not long after A.D. 170 (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23), tells how by the exertions of Quadratus, the church of Athens was revived from a low state into which it had fallen on the martyrdom of its bishop, PUBLIUS. St. Jerome identifies, but probably erroneously, this Quadratus of Athens with QUADRATUS (3) the Apologist, *q. v.* [G. S.]

QUADRATUS (3), the author of an apology for the Christians, presented to the emperor Hadrian, who reigned A.D. 117–138. Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 3) reports that the work was still in circulation in his time, and that he was himself acquainted with it. He quotes one sentence, which proves, as Eusebius observes, the great antiquity of the work. Quadratus remarks that the Saviour's miracles were no transient wonders, but had abiding effects. Those who had been cured, or who had been raised from the dead, did not disappear, but remained, and that for a considerable time after the Saviour's departure, so that some had even survived to the times of Quadratus himself. Accordingly Quadratus is called a disciple of the apostles by Eusebius in his Chronicle, under the eighth year of Hadrian according to the Armenian, the tenth according to the Latin.

St. Jerome twice (*De Vir. Illust.* 19; *Ep.* 70, ad Magnum) identifies the apologist with Quadratus bishop of Athens, and states that the apology was presented on the occasion when Hadrian visited Athens and was initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries. But on chronological grounds we must reject this identification. For it is improbable that any one contemporary with subjects of our Lord's miracles should survive to A.D. 170. We may doubt also whether the apologist resided at Athens. A writer against the Montanists (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* v. 17) contrasts the behaviour of the Montanist prophetesses with that of those who had been recognized in the church as prophets, such as the daughters of Philip, Ammia, and Quadratus. Eusebius evidently understood the reference to be to a Quadratus whom he speaks of (*H. E.* iii. 37) under the reign of Trajan, and who to all appearance is the same as the apologist. But since the author whom Eusebius quotes wrote in Asia Minor, it is likely that it was there Quadratus enjoyed the reputation of a prophet, as did the other prophets referred to, who lived, the daughters of Philip in Hierapolis, and Ammia in Philadelphia.

The *Apology* of Quadratus seems to have survived so late as the 6th century, for several passages were quoted in the controversy between the monk Andrew and EUSEBIUS (86) (Photius, *Cod.* 162). [G. S.]

QUARTILLOSIA, Feb. 24, a companion of St. Montanus and St. Lucius, African martyrs and disciples of St. Cyprian. The acts, as given in Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* are marked by numerous visions, like those narrated in the acts of Perpetua. [G. T. S.]

QUARTO-DECIMANI. In the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, t. i. pp. 588-591, under the head of EASTER, will be found an account of the Quarto-decimans till the time of Epiphanius. In the 4th century the supporters of this view seem to have separated themselves into a distinct party, as their baptism is allowed as valid by the seventh canon of the council of Laodicea, held some time between 343 and 381. (Cf. Mansi, t. ii. 563 sqq.) It continued to flourish in Proconsular Asia and the neighbouring provinces in the 5th century, as we find Nestorius among the first acts of his episcopate, at Constantinople, in A.D. 428, fiercely assailing the Quarto-decimans of those parts. They had clergy of their own too, cf. Mansi, t. iv. 1358, where a Quarto-deciman priest is mentioned in the proceedings of the sixth session of the Council of Ephesus, by name Patricius, who was so illiterate that he could not write. Socrates *H. E.* vii. 29, cf. v. 22, tells us that their church discipline was very strict, excluding from communion those who had sinned after baptism. At the close of the latter chapter Socrates informs us that the Novatians also had divided into parties which refused communion to each other because of their diverse views about the time of Easter. Cf. the three volumes of Hefele's *Councils*, trans. in Clark's series, for a minute account of the Quarto-decimans especially t. 1, pp. 298–334, secs. 37 and 38. The ancient Irish church is sometimes called Quarto-deciman, but without any foundation. She retained the old Roman method of computing Easter practised prior to A.D. 460. She long refused to adopt the new Roman method invented by Victorius of Aquitaine and revised and improved by Dionysius Exiguus, but she was no more Quarto-deciman than Rome was prior to that date, cf. Salmon, *Introd. to N.T.* pp. 303–315. [G. T. S.]

QUARTUS, a Roman martyr, mentioned by Bede alone in his *Martyrology*, Aug. 6, as having suffered with pope Sixtus. The *Roman Martyrology* only mentions Felicissimus and Agapetius, together with four subdeacons, as the pope's fellow martyrs. The name Quartus may be an explanation of an abbreviation, "et cum eo d. iiii." for the "cum eo diaconi quatuor" of St. Cyprian's. *Epist.* lxxx. (Cf. the note in Usuardi *Mart.* Aug. 6, Migne's *P. L.* cxxiv.) [G. T. S.]

QUATUOR CORONATI. See *Dict. Christ. Antiq.* t. i. p. 461, for notice of the legend and liturgical use; and SIRMIUM, STONE MASONS OF, in this Dictionary. [G. T. S.]

QUENBURGA (1), sister of Ine [CUENBURH]; **(2)** a nun [COENBURGA].

QUENDRIDA, wife of Offa, king of Mercia (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 469, note). [CYNETHRITHA.] [C. H.]

QUENTIN, ST. [QUINTINUS.]

QUERTINUS, ex-praefectus in A.D. 602, requested Gregory the Great to use his influence to procure the appointment of Bonitus as prefect. Gregory declined, for the reasons he gave (*Epp.* xii. 27). [F. D.]

QUICHELM. [CUICHELM.]

QUICUNQUE VULT. The title of the Psalmus *Quicunque vult* (or, sometimes, simply

the Psalmus *Quicunque*) has been commonly given for nearly 700 years to the document which, in its Latin form, begins with these words. It is almost needless to observe that it was usual in the medieval Church thus to designate the Psalms of Holy Scripture, and other Canticles, both scriptural and ecclesiastical; as *e.g.* the *Magnificat* or the *Te Deum.* The *Quicunque vult* has, for an equally long period, been also known as the *Symbolum S. Athanasii.* Other titles were occasionally applied to it in Gaul, the country where it seems to have been best known. Such were *Fides S. Athanasii Episcopi, Fidei Catholicae S. Athanasii Expositio, S. Athanasii de Fide Sermo, S. Athanasii de Fide Libellus, Fidei Catholicae Sermo.* The schoolmen, who were generally far keener as metaphysicians and theologians than as literary critics, for the most part assumed the authorship of Athanasius. But even between 1050 and 1450 some varieties occur. At the earlier of the dates just named, Gualdo of Corby is content to speak of it as *ascribed* to S. Athanasius (*quem composuisse fertur B. Athanasius*). Manuscripts of the 12th century assign it to pope Anastasius, as does also a Bodleian MS. of A.D. 1400.

The association, however, of the *Quicunque* with the name of pope Anastasius I. or II. does not seem to have been seriously urged by many critics of note. The earlier Anastasius died in A.D. 402 [ANASTASIUS I.], and was not specially involved in any of the controversies connected with the *Quicunque*; the latter, who was pope in A.D. 496–8 [ANASTASIUS II.], is noticeable for his effort to promote peace between the Churches of the East and West. Now, although it is very possible to exaggerate the anti-Orientalism of this famous document, still it is hardly probable that it was the composition of an ecclesiastic, who was eminently bent on the restoration of friendly intercourse between Rome and Constantinople. The substitution of the name of Anastasius for that of Athanasius may have originated in the error of some copyist.

The authorship of Athanasius, for the most part unchallenged from the sixth century to the period of the Reformation, was not at first assailed amidst the controversies connected with that event. Not only Roman Catholic theologians, as Cardinal Bona, Bellarmine, Petavius and others, but many of the Reformed—it must here suffice to name Luther and Rivet—accepted without hesitation what had become the traditional theory. Nor can that theory be said to have been, even in our own day, thoroughly resigned. One of the most vigorous defenders of the Creed, the late Rev. J. S. Brewer, seemed rather inclined to uphold its Athanasian authorship; and a similar tone is apparent in the Roman Catholic *Encyclopaedia* of Drs. Wetzer and Welte. Athanasius is alleged to have composed it during his sojourn at Treves, and on the occasion of his visit to Rome to have presented it to his friend and ally pope Julius.

But the difficulties connected with this view are too grave and serious to warrant its being considered even a probable hypothesis. Athanasius is said by one of the most ardent students of his writings (J. H. Newman) "to have spent his long life in fighting for a theological term." Is it probable that he would have composed a Psalm or Creed, call it which we will, in which this term (*ὁμοούσιος consubstantialis*) finds no place? Again, how is it that good editions of that great doctor's works do not comprise the *Quicunque*, that it is absent from nearly all MSS. of his writings, and that those which do contain it bear the heading "commonly attributed to St. Athanasius"? It must be added that neither the panegyrist of Athanasius, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, nor any early biographer, make any distinct reference to such a composition. Above all, why was it never appealed to in any of the controversies of the century subsequent to the death of the great bishop of Alexandria in A.D. 373? Our Latin copies of the creed exhibit, on the whole, a very substantial uniformity. But the same cannot be said of the Greek copies, and this is one of the arguments in favour of a Latin and not a Greek original ([a]). Indeed, the Greek copies do not look like the compositions of men accustomed to write in that language.

On the whole, then, the case for the Athanasian authorship of the *Quicunque* must be regarded as non-proven; we may almost venture to say disproven. Of course, if it could be proved, it would fix the date of the authorship as being necessarily prior to A.D. 373, and would impart to the creed whatsoever amount of authority is conferred by so great a name as that of Athanasius. If, however, with the great majority of critics, we regard this as an extreme and untenable view, it must be added that almost similar language may be employed respecting another and entirely opposite hypothesis.

We refer to the supposition that the *Quicunque* is a deliberate forgery, put forth through the influence of the emperor Charlemagne, and composed by divines who were numbered among his friends. The object of the forgery is suggested to have been a wish to deepen the breach between Eastern and Western Christendom. This theory is, we believe, entirely due to one divine of our own times, the Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes.

But not all the learning and ingenuity of this distinguished author, nor the deserved influence of his name, have sufficed to convince students of the problems connected with the *Quicunque* of the probability of such an origin. The one well-nigh unfailing mark of every forgery, which is made for the support of a political or ecclesiastical cause, is wanting to this document. That mark is the almost invariably undue prominence and definiteness, which is given to the point at issue. Now in the case before us the one topic, which would aggravate the dissension between East and West, would be an assertion of what is commonly known as the double procession of the Holy Ghost. Such an assertion is indeed contained in the *Quicunque*. But it only occupies one single verse; and though Constantinople might be inclined to repudiate that verse, still the doctrine is so stated that many Orientals have hesitated about the entire condemnation of a proposition so nearly approximating to

[a] The evidence on this head is well and briefly given by Canon Lumby. "The History of the Creeds" (Cambridge, 1873), Chap. IV. with its Appendix. But to the present writer the one passage of St. Gregory's panegyric which is claimed as a reference to the *Quicunque* cannot be made to bear such an interpretation. How can that creed be called specially "a thoroughly royal and magnificent gift concerning the Holy Ghost"?

the language of St. John of Damascus. A forger would, in all human probability, have both expressed the doctrine more emphatically, and would have enlarged upon it, as the *Quicunque* does enlarge upon the doctrine of the Incarnation. Moreover, the charge of forgery implicates the great names of Paulinus and of Alcuin. To suspect these men of complicity in such a proceeding is to go against all that we know of their characters; and the letter of thanks from Alcuin to Paulinus on the subject of some such symbolic composition thanks its author for the condemnation of errors, to which the *Quicunque* does not contain the slightest allusion. We believe that we are right in stating that the author of this hypothesis has not succeeded in procuring a single ally.[b]

Between these two extreme views, namely that of the Athanasian authorship in the 4th century, and of deliberate forgery at the commencement of the 9th century, there remains room for a considerable variety of opinion. The question of date, and even the question of authorship (when that of Athanasius has been resigned) might seem to be problems, which could be discussed without passion or prejudice. In some quarters this may be the case. Many sincere upholders of the main doctrines set forth in the *Quicunque* regard both the name and epoch of its author as problems of so subordinate a character as hardly to repay the trouble of investigation, and a brilliant bystander describes the whole matter as infinitesimal, if the doctrine of the Incarnation be accepted.[c] But this is hardly perhaps the general view. The *Quicunque* cuts directly across two leading principles. All religion, it has been said, must be either dogmatic or undogmatic. And, again, there either is, or there is not, such a thing as a responsibility of the intellect in matters of faith. The *Quicunque*, more trenchantly than either the Apostles' creed or (in its present form) the Nicene creed, takes one side on both these problems. Those who, on the whole, sympathise with its tone, are naturally inclined to support the view, which assigns an early origin to this document. Those who are unsympathetic are attracted in an opposite direction.

The present writer has no right, any more than some of those from whom he is inclined to differ, to claim immunity from prejudice. He can only state the considerations which lead him, though without wishing to dogmatise, to lean to the side of those who assign the composition of the *Quicunque vult* to some time about the middle of the 5th or (at the latest) about the middle of the 6th century. The argument, as in all such cases, must depend upon (1) external and (2) internal evidence.

1. The external evidence is, it must be owned, far from copious and precise. For a time it seemed as if the question might be set at rest. This creed was copied into many Psalters; and in 1873 a Psalter known as that of Utrecht, containing a copy of it (possibly a copy which was known to Abp. Usher and to Waterland) was discovered in Holland. The Master of the Rolls (Lord Romilly) commissioned the Deputy Keeper of the Records (the late Sir T. Duffus Hardy) to prepare a report upon the subject; and that eminent and impartial critic gave it as his opinion that the MS. was of the 6th century.[d] This opinion for a time to many seemed conclusive, and in some quarters it is still accepted as such.[e] But palaeographers of equal eminence have assigned the origin of the manuscript to a much later date; and consequently this evidence cannot be pressed.

Nevertheless, though demonstrative proof may be lacking, there does remain a mass of testimony which to many looks like a strong probable evidence on behalf of an earlier date for the creed, i.e. as has been said between A.D. 450 and 550: or rather perhaps between A.D. 450 and 500. By A.D. 700 and onward we have abundant manuscripts of it. Commentaries, numerous and varied, can be shown. Canons of local councils refer to it. Sermons use its phraseology. What similar case can be alleged? Twice only, we believe—and that in the later middle ages, when intercourse between countries had grown freer and literature more widely spread—did any writings, other than imperial laws or productions of oecumenical councils, attract commentators within the space of a single generation. We refer to the *Libri IV. Sententiarum* of Peter Lombard, bishop of Paris, who died in 1164; and the *Divina Commedia* of Dante, who died in 1320. Peter Lombard's famous book found a commentator (the first of a long series) in his disciple, Peter of Poitiers: and Dante's wonderful poem brought out at least three commentators and public lecturers while many of its author's friends and enemies were yet alive. But this is recorded by historians of literature as a great marvel, and neither of these compositions can be said to have given rise to a creed.[f]

Let us glance at some illustrations of the probable date of the *Quicunque*. There is the commentary upon it given by Waterland in his famous disquisition, and reproduced by Dr. Heurtley in his small volume *De Fide et Symbolo*. Let it be granted that there is some lack of

[b] For details of reply the reader is referred to Dr. Heurtley's "Reasons for rejecting Mr. Ffoulkes's Theory," and to Mr. Ommaney's earlier volume. See also Canon Maccoll's volume (to which reference will be made further on), and chap. xxvii. in Dr. Swainson's volume on the Creeds.

[c] "The essence of the belief is the belief in the divinity of Christ. But accept that belief: think for a moment of all that it implies, and you must admit that your Christianity becomes dogmatic in the highest degree. Every view of history, every theory of our duty, must be radically transformed by contact with that stupendous mystery. Whether you accept or reject the special tenets of the Athanasian creed is an infinitesimal trifle." Freethinking and Plainspeaking, by Leslie Stephen (London, 1873).

[d] On this head may be consulted the Report by Sir T. D. Hardy: the Counter Report by other experts with a Preface by the late Dean Stanley and Sir T. D. Hardy's Reply. Also the *Church Quarterly Review* for April, 1876, and Mr. Ommaney's *Early History of the Athanasian Creed*.

[e] *E.g.* In the Roman Catholic Dictionary of Messrs. W. Addis and Thos. Arnold. *Art.* "Creed." London, 1884.

[f] Drs. Wetzer and Welte give a list in their Encyclopaedia (*sub voce* Lombard) of the commentators on the Book of Sentences. For the case of Dante, Maffei may be consulted, *Storia della Lett. Italiana* (lib. i., cap. 4). Boccaccio took the lead.

definite evidence respecting the claim of authorship for this commentary made on behalf of *Venantius Fortunatus*. Still there seems fair ground for supposing that it was written somewhere about the date to which Waterland assigns it; namely A.D. 570. If we subtract from this date even so little as the thirty years usually allowed as the term of a generation, this would give us a time anterior to the middle of the 6th century. Then, again, there is the decree of the council of Autun. That council may have been held as late as 677. Its records, as they have come down to us, contain the following canon: "Si quis presbyter, diaconus, subdiaconus, vel clericus, symbolum, quod inspirante Sancto Spiritû apostoli tradiderunt, *et fidem sancti Athanasii praesulis irreprehensibiliter non recensuerit*, ab episcopo condemnetur." Unless the genuineness of this canon can be disproved, the *Quicunque* is so thoroughly accepted in the Gaul of the latter part of the 7th century, that for the clergy not to know it by heart has become penal. Clearly then, it cannot in that case be a production of the 8th or of the 9th century.[g] It could not have been completed by Hincmar about A.D. 870.

Further, we are bound to take into account the large number of manuscripts, respecting some of which we have the judgment of eminent palaeographers, such as Montfaucon and Muratori, that they are not later than the 8th century. The theory which would assign the production of the *Quicunque* to the 8th or 9th century involves the belief, that it at once sprang into notice in Western Christendom, and was everywhere deemed of such importance as to be copied into Psalters and Litanies. The theory which assigns it to some time within the hundred years between A.D. 450 and 500 (or at least 550) leaves time for a gradual recognition of its value, for its insertion into collections of authorised documents, for its sanction by local councils, for the appearance of its phraseology in sermons.[h] To the present writer this view commends itself as possessing by far the larger share of probability.

2. But this probability is greatly strengthened, when from the external we turn to the internal evidence. Of this or that document, for which a certain date is claimed, we are able to say: "Not such is the theology of the period, not such is the language of the period." But neither objection holds good against the supposition, that the *Quicunque* belongs to the latter half of the 5th century. The supporters of this earlier date maintain that, in its general outlines, it is sufficiently Athanasian to render it intelligible that it should have been ascribed to Athanasius, although they admit that it betrays a closer resemblance still to the theology of Augustine, and (perhaps closest of all) to that of Vincent of Lerins. [VINCENTIUS LIRINENSIS.]

Objections have been urged to the effect, that it is anti-Athanasian (*a*) in respect of its employment of the term *Persona*, (*b*) in the expressions *homo ex substantiâ matris*, and (*c*) in its assertion of the double Procession of the Holy Spirit. Even if these objections can be substantiated, it would not militate against a Western authorship of A.D. 450 or A.D. 500: and it would still remain Athanasian in its general doctrine concerning God the Holy Trinity, and the Incarnation of the Eternal Son.

But can they be substantiated? The present writer thinks that they cannot.

(*a*) That the Latin doctors found a difficulty in adequately representing the Greek terms ὑπόστασις and οὐσία is known to every student of the Arian controversy. It is recognised by the Fathers, both Western and Oriental, as *e.g.* by St. Hilary of Poitiers (*de Synodis*), and by St. Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* xxxi. 46), and referred to in modern compositions, as *e.g.* the Augsburg Confession, the works of Bull, Pearson, Waterland, Newman's *Arians*, and Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*.[1] But the fact remains that, despite the danger of introducing an earthly sense of individuality, the Easterns had by the date even of the Second General Council fully acknowledged that *Persona* was the best term which the Latin-speaking races could employ in the enunciation of the Catholic faith concerning the Holy Trinity. [Cf. ATHANASIUS, Vol. I. p. 198.] Its use has been untouched by the Reformation, as may be seen in the confessions of foreign Protestants, in the Anglican 39 Articles, and in the admission of Roman Catholic controversialists. Nor is there any evidence to show that Athanasius disapproved of it.

(*b*) Materialism is a grave and abiding danger in connexion with religion, and one which ever calls for watchfulness. But it must not be forgotten that there is such a thing as a false and dangerous anti-materialism, of which the Gnostic heresies were the earliest and most extravagant example. That matter was not in itself evil; that God made all things good; that every creature could be hallowed by the word of God and prayer; such were the Scriptural tenets adduced by the church against Gnosticism. Further, the orthodox doctors maintained that matter had been specially honoured by the Saviour of the world, in that He chose material substances to be the outward form of His sacraments; and, even more highly, in that He took to Himself a material body to be for ever united to His divine personality. That He took this body *in utero*

[g] Labbe, *Concilia*, tom. iii. p. 1013 (Paris, 1714). The case against the canon of the Autun council may be seen in the works of Mr. Ffoulkes and of Canon Swainson. [See list of books at the end of this article.] The counter-case has been set forth by Mr. Ommaney. The theory of Gieseler, that by *fidem sancti Athanasii* is meant the Nicene creed, is little worthy of so eminent a man, and hardly needs refutation. No product of a General council was ever called or regarded as the creed of an individual. Gieseler also stands alone in considering Spain rather than Gaul as the birth-place of the *Quicunque*.

[h] On behalf of the earlier date may be named Vossius, Waterland, Antelmi, Ussher, Mr. Harvey, Bishop Harold Browne, Caspari, and Mr. Ommaney. The two volumes of the last-named writer form a perfect storehouse of evidence. Lists of testimonies, of commentaries ancient and modern and of manuscripts, will be found in Waterland's *Critical History*. Additions to all three sources of information (especially in the matter of MSS.) have been made by Mr. Ommaney.

[1] We subjoin the language of the Augsburg confession: "Et nomine Personae utuntur eâ significatione, quâ usi sunt in hâc causâ Scriptores Ecclesiastici, ut significent non partem aut qualitatem in alio, sed quod proprie subsistit." (Art. I. De Deo.)

beatae Virginis, ex illius substantiâ (to employ the language of our second article), has ever been thought a fair and legitimate inference from the words of Holy Scripture, such as St. Matthew i. 20–23; St. Luke i. 30–38, 41–43; Galat. iv. 4, &c. Here, again, the Reformation has altered nothing. But how it can be supposed that St. Athanasius would have regarded such phraseology as materialising, is to the present writer simply perplexing. It would, he believes, be possible to adduce from his works a *catena* of passages which virtually contain, not only the statement on this head contained in the *Quicunque*, but also that embodied in our own articles. For brevity's sake, a single passage only shall be set down. "For no one else is found in the Scriptures, except the common Saviour of all, the Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ. For this is He who proceeded from a Virgin and appeared on earth as man, and who has a generation according to the flesh that is indescribable. For there is no one, who can name His father according to the flesh, inasmuch as His body is not from a man, but from a Virgin alone." [k]

(*c*) Concerning the assertion of the double procession of the Holy Spirit it must be said, that however wrong it may have been to try and force it upon the Orientals as part of a creed, there is not only a sense in which it embodies true doctrine, but that such sense is frequently found in patristic writings of the West and in at least, one utterance of a local council anterior to A.D. 550. We refer to the creed appended to the canons of the first council of Toledo, held in A.D. 400, in which the Holy Spirit is described as the Paraclete, "*qui nec Pater sit, ipse nec Filius, sed à Patre Filioque procedens.*" It is indeed possible that this document has been placed too early, but even in that case it is held to have been promulgated by a council held between those commonly reckoned as the first and the second of Toledo; *i.e.* between A.D. 400 and 531. The language of individual Western Fathers, and the admission of even St. John of Damascus that there must be a sense in which the Holy Spirit is the "Spirit of the Son" (Galat. iv. 6) need not be dwelt upon here, inasmuch as they will hardly be disputed. But against the assertion that the language of the *Quicunque* on the Procession of the Holy Spirit can rightly be termed anti-Athanasian, we must refer to page 124 in the article on the HOLY GHOST in Vol. III. of this Dictionary, where the statements of St. Athanasius are analysed, and the just remark appended, "It is impossible not to see in these statements another approach to the Western doctrine of the Procession."

Evidence for the date of documents is to be sought not only in what they contain, but also in what they do not contain. Here, again, there appears to those, who believe in the early date of the *Quicunque*, a large amount of probable evidence in favour of their view. No one, for instance, doubts that this creed, or psalm, contains protests against the heresies of Arius and of Apollinaris. It gives us something which the Apostles' creed and the Nicene creed do not give us: namely, a more distinct assertion of the unity of the threefold Personality of the Godhead; and, so to speak, a separate treatment of the doctrine of the Incarnation. Doubtless they in turn have each some precious truth. The Apostles' creed, in its present form, alone expresses a distinct belief in the communion of saints; the Nicene creed is possibly the most clear of all respecting the *Principatus Patris.* But the scholastic form into which the propositions are cast in this creed has also special merits of its own.[1]

Theologians, from Waterland down to bishop Harold Browne and Dr. Pusey, have been greatly struck with what it does not contain. The prominent heresy in the days of Charlemagne was that known as Adoptionism; but against Adoptionism we have here no protest. At an earlier date, apparently about A.D. 616, the heresy of the Monothelites (which archbishop Trench calls "a struggle for life and death") may be said to have assumed its shape. The *Quicunque vult* is silent concerning it. Nay, it is far from pronounced on the earlier errors of Nestorius and of Eutyches. Why? Is the answer of Dr. Pusey too emphatic? "Its language fixes it as belonging to the fourth or fifth century. It is inconceivable that so accurate a writer would not have used more definite language on the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies, had he lived after their rise." [m]

It is right to specify the originality of the Latin as distinct from the Greek form, and the first rise of the creed being in Gaul, as points on which an almost unbroken unanimity may now be said to prevail.

Bp. H. Browne gives the following as the probable dates of the reception of this creed in various parts of Europe: in "Gaul as early as A.D. 550; Spain 630; Germany 787; England 800; Italy 880; Rome 930." It is remarkable that the Sarum Breviary contemplates the *daily* recitation of the *Quicunque* at Prime. The Roman (at the same hour) requires its recitation on Sundays only, and then only when the dominical office is used. There are exceptions even to this rule. It is to be omitted on Sundays falling within the Octaves of Christmas,

[k] Ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἄλλος ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς εὑρίσκεται, πλὴν τοῦ κοινοῦ πάντων Σωτῆρος, τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐκ παρθένου προελθὼν καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ γῆς φανεὶς, καὶ ἀδιήγητον ἔχων τὴν κατὰ σάρκα γενεάν. Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ὃς δύναται τὸν κατὰ σάρκα πατέρα τούτου λέγειν, οὐκ ὄντος τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἀνδρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐκ παρθένου μόνης. De Incarnatione Verbi, cap. xxxvii. Compare also the proper preface for Christmastide in our present Office for Holy Communion.

[1] "It is a very remarkable fact, that every missionary Bishop in Convocation insisted on the value of the Athanasian creed even in the case of neophytes. Bishop Claughton found it useful among the natives of Ceylon, Bishop Macdougall among his Chinese converts in Borneo, and the Bishop of Lichfield among the Maories of New Zealand. The late Bishop Cotton, too, having gone to India with some prejudices against the use of the Athanasian creed, found it so valuable as an antidote against the various forms of Oriental theosophy that he became one of the most earnest advocates for its use in congregational worship." "The Damnatory Clauses of the Athanasian Creed," by the Rev. Malcolm Maccoll (London, 1872). P. 25.

[m] Letter to Dr. Liddon on the Clause "And the Son" (Oxford, 1876). Pp. 51.

Dr. Pusey refers to Waterland's Critical History, chap. vii., which states the same thing in a more detailed manner.

the Epiphany, the Ascension, and *Corpus Christi*, also upon Easter Sunday and Whit Sunday. The rule concerning the use of the dominical office also excludes it on a Sunday when a saint's day is observed. As it is followed by the Apostles' creed in this office, it seems to be treated more as a psalm than as a creed. If, however, the Breviary Offices are employed by our Roman Catholic fellow Christians in domestic worship (as one of their highest dignitaries in England is said to desire) the *Quicunque* will be heard by some Roman Catholics more often than by Anglicans, who at most hear it only once a month.

The *Quicunque* (though usually, we believe, with some modification of the clause respecting the Procession of the Holy Ghost)[n] has obtained a certain amount of reception in the Eastern Church. A deceased theologian,[o] who had enjoyed special opportunities of examining the question, states: 1. That it is printed in a kind of Appendix to the *Horologium* and therein stated to be "consonant with the doctrine of the orthodox church." 2. That in the Σύνοψις Ἱερα, an abbreviation of the Hours, it is described as "useful to each Christian." 3. That Macarius, a Russian divine of repute, places the Athanasian creed among "the expositions of the faith, which though not examined and expressly approved by the Councils, are yet received by the whole Catholic church."

Here, for the present, must rest our epitome of the case on behalf of the earlier date assigned to *Quicunque vult* being the more correct one. It is by no means impossible but that still more definite evidence may one day be forthcoming. Undoubtedly, it does deserve consideration whether those who believe in the value and usefulness of this psalm, or creed, may be unconsciously biassed in their interpretation of the evidence. But this is a consideration which does not tell in one direction only. Enthusiastic admirers, such as Martin Luther or John Keble,[p] may be regarded as prejudiced. Can it be supposed that bishop Jeremy Taylor and archbishop Tillotson would be utterly unprejudiced? Those, who value it most, regard the (so-called) damnatory clauses as simply a charitable warning against wilful resignation of known truth, against the notion that man is not responsible for use of the intellect. (Gal. i. 8, 10; 1 St. John 9–11; St. Jude 3, 20; cf. also St. Mark xvi. 17, a passage not to be rejected hastily, as may be seen by Dr. Salmon's support of Dean Burgon's defence of its genuineness.)[q] They do not suppose it to refer to any who have not received the faith, or whose non-admission of it from hereditary teaching, or any like cause) is involuntary and free from deliberate purpose.

Literature. The following are leading writers: Vossius *de tribus Symbolis* 1642 [he assigns the Quicunque to A.D. 600]; Archbishop Usher 1647 [fixes on A.D. 447]; Quesnel, A.D. 1675 [assigns it to Vigilius Tapsensis, A.D. 484]; Dr. Cave 1683 [follows Quesnel, as do Dupin and Pagi a little later; also Natalis Alexander in 1714, and Bingham in 1716]; Antelmi, 1693 [Vincent of Lerins before 450]; Muratori 1698 [Venantius Fortunatus in A.D. 570]; Bingham. For fuller information the reader is referred to what still remains the classical treatise on the subject, the Critical History of the Athanasian Creed, by Daniel Waterland, D.D., Cambridge 1724. Among more recent publications may be named Essays in the *Contemporary Review* of August and November 1870, by Dean Stanley (reprinted separately), the Literary History of the Nicene and Apostles' Creed, and that commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius, by Canon Swainson, D.D., London 1875, the History of the Creeds by Canon Lumby, D.D. Cambridge. [These two present the ablest case for the later date of the *Quicunque*. Dr. Swainson assigns it to Hincmar, A.D. 700.] The essay by Mr. Ffoulkes has been already noticed.

On the other side are Mr. Harvey's "The History and Theology of the Three Creeds," London, 1854, the reply to Dean Stanley by Mr. Brewer ("The Athanasian Creed vindicated," London, 1871), and the replies to Mr. Ffoulkes by Dr. Heurtley and Mr. Ommaney. The last-named writer's "The Athanasian Creed" and "The Early History of the Athanasian Creed" (London 1875 and 1880), deserve the very fullest recognition. It is worthy of notice that Dr. Caspari,[r] acknowledged on all hands as a competent specialist, is inclined to trace this creed to the fifth century, or at least to some time between 450 and 600. (Letter to Dr. Schaff, cited in Schaff's History of the Creeds.) This "indefatigable investigator," as Dr. Schaff calls him, will publish in due time some of the evidence on which his inferences are based. [J. G. C.]

QUIETUS. [African] bishop at Syn. 4, Carth. sub Cyp. *de Basilide* (A.D. 254), Cyp. *Ep.* 67. He may be the same as the Mauretanian bishop, Quietus of Buruc (? Burca, Ptol. not mentioned apparently in inscriptions), whose speech is twenty-seventh in *Sentt. Epp.* at Syn.

---

[n] Oriental divines are believed, for the most part, to be satisfied if the preposition *a* (in the clause *a Patre et Filio*) is in Greek versions rendered by ἀπὸ as it fairly may be. They object to ἐκ, as it seems to them (however mistakenly) to deny the μόνη ἀρχὴ of the Godhead enshrined in the Eternal Father, Who is, in the language of Western Theologians, confessed to be the *Fons et Origo Deitatis*.

[o] Rev. George Williams, cited by Dr. Pusey in Sermon on "The Responsibility of Intellect." (Appendix p. 82.)

[p] Luther doubted "whether anything more important and glorious (*etwas Wichtigeres und Herrlicheres*) had been written since the time of the Apostles." (*Werke*, ed. Walch, vi. 2315) cited in Schaff's *History of the Creeds of Christendom*," p. 41 (London, 1877). Keble's Sonnet in the *Lyra Apostolica* is well known. The writer does not intend any allusion to *living* critics of the question at issue.

[q] On this point the reader may be referred to the work of Canon Maccoll already cited in a note, and to Dr. Pusey's discourse on *Responsibility of the Intellect in Matters of Faith* (Oxford, 1873). One, who is probably the most learned of living Scotch Presbyterian Divines says of this sermon, in reference to such responsibility: "Perhaps it has never been better expounded and enforced." Professor Flint, D.D., Theism, p. 337; Edinburgh, 1877. Dean Burgon's work on the passage in St. Mark is well known. Dr. Salmon's judgment may be seen in his *Introduction to the New Testament* (London, 1885). Lect. IX. *sub fin.*

[r] Dr. Caspari is Professor of Theology in the University of Norway. He published at Christiania (vol. i. in 1866, vol. ii. in 1869, vol. iii. in 1875): "Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Tauf-Symbols und der Glaubens-Regel."

Carth. vii. sub Cyp. *de Bap.* 3, A.D. 256. (Through misreading the name as Quintus, Morcelli confounds him (there is no *var. lec.*) with the bishop Quintus to whom *Ep.* 71 is addressed.) [E. W. B.]

QUILLIANUS, bishop. [CILIAN.]

QUINIDIUS, ST., bishop of Vaison, c. 573–578. There is a life of him, with miracles, and a commentary by Bolland. (*Acta SS.* 15 Feb. ii. 829; *Gall. Chr.* i. 923). [C. H.]

QUINTA, martyr at Alexandria by stoning. Mentioned by Dionysius Alexand. in his epistle to Fabius of Antioch (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 41). [G. T. S.]

QUINTIANUS (1), Christian (? Carthaginian refugee) at Rome, A.D. 250. [MACARIUS (20)] (Cyp. *Ep* 22). [E. W. B.]

QUINTIANUS (2), bishop of Gaza, an Arian intruder into the see of the orthodox Asclepas, deposed by the Eusebians at Antioch (Soz. *H. E.* iii. 8, 12; Theod. *H. E.* ii. 8). He attended the council of Sardica in 347, and was one of the seceders to Philippopolis (Labbe, ii. 711). The orthodox bishops thereupon denounced Quintianus, together with Basil of Ancyra and Gregory of Alexandria, as "wolves," who were unworthy of the name of Christians, with whom it was unlawful to hold communion, or even to receive letters from them (Theod. *u.s.*; Hilar. *Fragm.* ii. tom. ii. p. 628; *Fragm.* iv. p. 665; Athanas. *Apolog.* ii. p. 766; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 606). [E. V.]

QUINTIANUS (3), priest of Badesila, a place which Morcelli, with much probability, regards as identical with Vegesela in Numidia, who had allowed to be read in his church some non-canonical writings put forth by heretics and Manicheans, contrary to an express decree of the council of Carthage, A.D. 397 (Can. 47, Bruns, i. p. 133). The see of Vegesela was then vacant by the deposition of the late occupant, and Aurelius, bishop probably of Macomadia (Morcelli, iii. 12), who was administering the diocese, refused to communicate with him until the matter had been thoroughly investigated, which he proposed to do on Christmas-day at the place itself. A short time before that day Quintianus wrote to Augustine a letter which was received by him the day or next day but one previous to it. The letter appears to have embraced three subjects: 1. A request to Augustine to interfere in the matter, and to write to the people of the place on his behalf; and expressing his fear lest they should be disturbed in their minds by the visit of Aurelius. In his reply, though expressing the utmost kindness towards Quintianus and assuring him that he had taken care that the matter should be laid duly before Aurelius, Augustine declined altogether to take any part in the matter at present, as being entirely beyond his province so to do. He exhorted him to be patient, as there could be no doubt that it had been postponed only from pressure of necessary business. But he did not scruple privately to blame him for troubling the church by what he had allowed to be done. ii. Quintianus also requested Augustine not to receive into his monastery at Hippo Privatianus, probably the reader in question, who had left his post and sought admission there, and founded his objection on a decree of the same council (Can. 21). Augustine points out (1) that the decree is directed not against laymen but against clerical persons, and that it made no mention of monasteries, though he does not suppose them to be excluded. (2) That the respect which Quintianus paid to the council in this matter is hardly consistent with his neglect of it in the other. (3) As a matter of fact Privatianus had not been admitted, but the matter was left to the decision of Aurelius. (4) That he cannot understand how any one can properly be regarded as a reader, who has read only once, and then only non-canonical writings. How can he be called a reader of the church who reads what the church does not appoint? iii. As to the people of Vegesela, they cannot be compelled to receive a bishop degraded by the council. No one can be more culpable than he who seeks to recover by secular force an office of which the church has deprived him (Aug. *Ep.* 64). The view of Morcelli seems to bring the various topics of the letter into consistency with each other, but Tillemont does not regard Badesila as identical with Vegesela, and thinks that, of the two places of the same name, this was in Byzacene, not in Numidia, of which Aurelius was certainly not at this time primate. (Till. vol. xiii. 137, p. 362.) [H. W. P.]

QUINTIANUS (4), father of pope Leo I. *q. v.*

QUINTIANUS (5), ST., second bishop of Rodez, between St. Amantius and St. Dalmatius (A.D. 506–515), and afterwards fifteenth of Clermont, between Apollinaris and St. Gallus I. (circ. A.D. 520–527), was born in Africa, and was the nephew of a bishop Faustus, probably either of Castra Seberianensium [FAUSTUS 9], or of Buronia [FAUSTUS 8]. Like the Gallic clergy generally he favoured the orthodox Franks in their struggle for the mastery of Gaul, and was forced to fly from the violence of the Goths, who were then dominant at Rodez. He took refuge at Clermont, where the bishop Eufrasius provided him with the means of subsistence. On Eufrasius's death the people elected him as his successor, but he was half cajoled, half forced into relinquishing the office to Apollinaris, a son of Sidonius Apollinaris. However, upon the usurper's death three or four months later, king Theoderic, who recognised a debt of gratitude for his sufferings in the Frankish cause, raised him to the see of Clermont. Here, as at Rodez, his episcopate was a troubled one. Private foes harassed him on the one hand, while a devastating army of king Theoderic overran his diocese. He died in 527, at a great age, and was buried in the church of St. Stephen. His day of commemoration is Nov. 10. Gregory of Tours held him in special reverence, and the details of his account of him give curious glimpses of the French church at that time. (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 36; iii. 2, 12, 13; iv. 5, 35; *Vitae Patr.* iv. 1–5; vi. 3; *Gall. Christ.* i. 198; ii. 236.) [S. A. B.]

QUINTIANUS (6), bishop in the Byzacene. The priest Adeodatus complained to Gregory the Great that Quintianus had taken advantage of his two months' absence from his church caused by illness, to ordain another priest in his stead. Gregory in A.D. 593 directed the primate of the province to inquire into the matter (*Epp.* iv. 13). [F. D.]

QUINTILIANUS (1), proconsul of Asia, under whom Pionius suffered. His full name was Julius Proculus Quintilianus. Several proconsuls called Proculus ruled Asia in the second century (cf. Waddington, *Fastes des Prov. Asiat.*) as in A.D. 103, 112, and under Antoninus Pius, (*AA. SS.* Boll. Feb. i. 45). [PIONIUS.] [G. T. S.]

QUINTILIANUS (2), brother of EXUPERANTIUS (*q.v.*), invited by Jerome to come with his brother to stay at Bethlehem (Jerome, *Ep.* 145, ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

QUINTILIANUS (3) a bishop, but of what see does not appear, to whom St. Augustine wrote, A.D. 425, commending to his good offices Galla, a widow, and her daughter Simpliciola. (Aug. *Ep.* 212.) [H. W. P.]

QUINTILLA AND THE QUINTILLIANI. Following on his article on the Montanists (*Haer.* 48), Epiphanius has an article (*Haer.* 49) on a sect to which he gives the alternative names of Quintilliani, Pepuziani, or Priscilliani; but he gives no sign that he had any real knowledge of the sect which he describes, or of any features distinguishing it from other forms of the Phrygian heresy. It is on the Quintilliani that Epiphanius, after some hesitation, decides (p. 417) to fix the story referred to in the article MONTANUS (Vol. III. p. 960, etc.), that the sacrifice of an infant and the partaking of its flesh formed part of the mysteries of the sect. Epiphanius derives the name Quintilliani from a supposed Montanist prophetess named Quintilla; but in asserting the existence of this woman (concerning whom, indeed, he speaks very doubtfully) he stands alone; all other authorities mentioning only two Montanist prophetesses, Maximilla and Prisca, or Priscilla.

Tertullian in the first chapter of his treatise on Baptism speaks of a female teacher, a viper "de Caiana haeresi," who opposed that rite; and according to several editions, in the end of the chapter, he gives her the name Quintilla. But the editio princeps, which Oehler follows, instead of "ita Quintilla," reads merely "itaque illa." [G. S.]

QUINTINUS (QUENTIN), ST., and martyr, said to have suffered in the Vermandois, in the time of Diocletian, circ. A.D. 287. His *Acta*, published by Surius (Oct. 31), are not included in Ruinart's *Acta Sincera*, and the critics assign them to the early years of the 7th century (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 500; Ceillier, iii. 100). Though his cult was firmly established, and a church dedicated to him was in existence in the time of Gregory of Tours (*De Glor. Mart.* lxxiii.), yet the position of his tomb was forgotten until about the year 641 St. Eligius rediscovered the remains, or supposed remains, and moved them again (Audoenus, *Vita S. Eligii*, ii. 6, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 515). In 881 they had to be carried to Laon to escape the devastations of the Northmen, but were brought back again after a few years, and from this time the town came to be called after him—St. Quentin. For his cult in later times, see Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, Oct. 31, and for the history of the city and church, La Fons, *Hist. de Saint-Quentin.* [S. A. B.]

QUINTUS (1), a Phrygian, who in the beginning of the persecution at Smyrna in which Polycarp afterwards suffered, of his own accord presented himself to the tribunal, but afterwards on sight of the wild beasts lost courage and recanted. From this example the Christians learned to condemn the rashness of self-confident rushing into danger without due cause. (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 15.) [G. S.]

QUINTUS (2) I. Mauretanian bishop (Cyp. *Ep.* 72, 73), to whom Cyprian wrote *Ep.* 71, on the baptism of heretics. [E. W. B.]

QUINTUS (3) II. An African bishop, who appears in Council on Baptism, i., as answering the questions which Quintus I. asks later, and whose seniority seems to identify him perfectly through the following lists as present in A.D. 252 at the second Synod. Carth. *de pace maturius danda*, Cyp. *Ep.* 57; in A.D. 254, at Syn. Carth. iv. *de Basilide;* Cyp. *Ep.* 67; in A.D. 255, at Syn. Carth. *de Bap. Haer.* i.; and as giving the sixty-fifth suffrage as bishop of Aggya or Aga, in Prov. Procons.; in Conc. vii. *de Bap. Haer.* iii. (*Sentt. Epp.*), which like 'Episcopus *Agensis*,' in Conc. Lat. A.D. 649, seems to be corrupt for *Agbia*, Momms. Inscr. L. vol. viii. p. 189, etc.; in Prov. Procons. *M. and T.* read *Acbia*, though Hartel keeps Aggya. [E. W. B.]

QUINTUS (4) III. Either of the above, I. and II., may possibly be the same with Quintus, Cyp. *Ep.* 55, African (bishop?) "*compresbyter*," who brought to Cyprian the second letter of bishop Antonian, in which he takes a doubtful tone as to Cornelius, whom at first he supported. [E. W. B.]

QUIONIA, otherwise CHIONIA, q.v. An account of her may also be seen in Baron. *Ann.* 304, xli., Tillem. v. 240, and *D. C. A.* [C. H.]

QUIRICUS (1), bishop in Iberia, wrote to Gregory the Great to inquire whether rebaptism was necessary in the case of priests and laymen who had renounced Nestorianism. The bearer lost the letters on his journey at Jerusalem, but informed Gregory verbally of their purport, who replied in A.D. 601 by a letter addressed to Quiricus and the other bishops of Iberia (*Epp.* xi. 67). It deals not only with the case of the Nestorians, but also with that of other heretics, such as the Arians and Montanists, and lays down the rule that, if while heretics they had been baptized in the name of the Trinity, they were not to be baptized again. [F. D.]

QUIRICUS (2), bishop of Barcelona otherwise CYRICIUS, q.v. To that article it may be added that he was present at the 8th council of Toledo in A.D. 656 (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Canones de la Iglesia Española*, ii. 417), when probably he had been bishop several years. He was the author of the hymn in honour of ST. EULALIA of Barcelona, in the Mozarabic liturgy (*Patr. Lat.* lxxxvi. 1099), though Arevalo, in his note on Prudentius's hymn in honour of St. Eulalia of Merida, doubts this (*Patr. Lat.* lx. 340). It appears from the hymn that he had introduced monks instead of secular clergy into the church of the saint. He probably died

c. 666 [IDALIUS]. (*Esp. Sag.* xxix. 134, 439; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. [2], 152). [F. D.]

QUIRINUS (1), a Christian of Carthage, who, together with Cyprian, sent relief to the bishops and martyrs in the mine (*metallum*) of Sigus in Numidia and elsewhere, A.D. 257, Cyp. *Ep.* 77, 78; not impossibly the same layman for whom in the first instance Cyprian compiled the *Testimonia*, when apparently he was a Neophyte (*ad prima fidei lineamenta formanda*). [E. W. B.]

QUIRINUS (2), June 4, bishop of Siscia, in Illyricum, and martyr in the Diocletian persecution, under Amantius, president of Pannonia Prima. His acts are genuine. They are embodied in the *Acta Sincera* of Ruinart, and are often quoted by Le Blant in his *Actes des Martyrs*, as in pp. 42, 52, etc., for illustrations of Roman criminal procedure. [G. T. S.]

QUODVULTDEUS (1), bishop of Centuriae in Numidia (Procopius, *Vandal.* ii. 13), present at the council of Mileum, A.D. 402, at which a question was raised against him by an opponent. At first he professed willingness to submit to the decision of the council, but on another day withdrew his consent. The council then forbade communion with him until the matter should be decided, but refused to depose him. The charge was probably withdrawn, as no further mention of it appears, and he was present at the conference A.D. 411. (Bruns, *Conc.* i. 178; *Carth. Coll.* i. 126; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 126, ii. 15.) [H. W. P.]

QUODVULTDEUS (2), Donatist bishop of Asi, a sea-port of Mauretania Caesariensis (Anton. *Iter.* 16, 3), who, having signed at Carthage the document preliminary to the conference held there in 411, died on his way home before the proceedings began. When the list of signatures was examined, and his death became known, much altercation took place as to the genuineness of the signature, and the Catholics accused the Donatists of forgery. The simple explanation however offered by Adeodatus of Mileum, as to the fact of the case founded on the wording of his signature *aeger subscripsi*, at length satisfied the imperial commissioner, and the business was allowed to proceed. (*Carth. Coll.* i. 207, 208.) [H. W. P.]

QUODVULTDEUS (3), an African bishop, probably of Girba, a place of unknown site in Proconsular Africa. A bishop of this name, but without mention of see, was among the twenty who were deputed by the council of Carthage, A.D. 401, to inquire into the case of Equitius. [EQUITIUS (3).] A bishop of Girba of this name was present at the conference, A.D. 411, and the same name occurs among the members of the council of Carthage against Pelagianism, A.D. 416 (Aug. *Ep.* 175). [H. W. P.]

QUODVULTDEUS (4), a clergyman said by Petilianus to have been ejected from the Donatist community on a charge of two acts of adultery, and received by the Catholics, but not, said Augustine, until he had proved his innocence. (Aug. *c. Litt. Petil.* iii. 32, 37.) [H. W. P.]

QUODVULTDEUS (5), a deacon, who wrote to Augustine from Carthage, A.D. 427, requesting him, for the benefit of many ill-informed clergy there who read but little, to give him a brief account of the number and nature of the heresies which had arisen since the introduction of the Gospel, as to its cardinal doctrines, faith, the Trinity, Baptism, the human and also the divine nature of Christ, the Resurrection, the Old and New Testaments; which of them requires baptism, and which reject it, after what heresies the church permits baptism, *i.e.* not re-baptism, and on what conditions it receives returning penitents (Aug. *Ep.* 221). In reply, Augustine excuses himself from fulfilling his request, on the ground that the work has already been done by Philastrius and Epiphanius. In reply to this letter, Quodvultdeus still pressed his request, and in the course of the following year, 428, Augustine was able to fulfil his friend's desire by the composition of his work "concerning heresies," of which he gives a list in alphabetical order to the number of eighty-eight. This work, entitled *de Haeresibus*, will be found at the beginning of vol. viii. of the works of St. Augustine, ed. Migne. [H. W. P.]

QUODVULTDEUS (6), bishop of Carthage at the time of the capture of that city by the Vandals, A.D. 438. He was probably the same person as the one mentioned by St. Augustine in his letter to Honoratus, who had consulted him, A.D. 428, on the subject of seeking safety during invasion. (HONORATUS (11) Vol. III. p. 138.) The letter of Augustine to Quodvultdeus, which he sent to Honoratus by way of reply is lost, excepting one passage quoted in that to Honoratus. After the capture of the city Genseric ordered him and many others of the clergy, having been plundered of their goods, to be put on board some leaky vessels, which, however, reached Campania in safety. He appears to have died at Naples about 444, and his name was mentioned in a Neapolitan Kalendar as to be observed on Feb. 20, but nothing is known of his life after his arrival there. (Victor Vitensis, *Persec. Afr. Prov.* 1, 5; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 54; iii. 142–152.) In *Cal. Carth.* his feast was 8 Jan. and in *Mart. Rom.* 26 Nov. [J. G. & H. W. P.]

QUODVULTDEUS (7), African bishop at the council of Junca in 524. [FULGENTIUS (3)] (*Vit. S. Fulg. Rusp.* c. 29, s. 60; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 9, 828). [J. G.]

QUODVULTDEUS (8), abbat of St. Peter's at Rome, bearer of the first letter of Pelagius II. to Elias, the schismatic patriarch of Aquileia, and the other bishops of Istria c. 585 (Pelagii II. *Epp.* 3, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 710). [F. D.]

QUODVULTDEUS (9), African bishop, one of the bearers to Gregory the Great of the letters of DOMINICUS (2), bishop of Carthage in A.D. 592 (*Epp.* ii. 47). [F. D.]

QUOENTHRYTH (Kemble, *C. D.* 198. [QUENDRITHA.]

R

RABBÛLAS, bishop of Edessa, 412–435. The name in Syriac is *Rabbûlâ*, ܪܒܘܠܐ, which the western Syrians pronounced *Rabûlô*. The chief authorities for the life of Rabbûlas are (1) a panegyric in Syriac, compiled soon after his death by a contemporary cleric, himself a native of Edessa, extant in a MS. of the 6th century, of which Bickell has furnished a German translation in Thalhofer's *Ausgewählte Schriften der Kirchenväter* (vol. x. pp. 56–68), and (2) the later and less trustworthy biography of Alexander the founder of the Akoimetae. According to the panegyrist, Rabbûlas was born in the city of Kenneschrin, known by the Greeks as Chalcis, in Osrhoene, of rich and noble parentage. His father was a heathen priest, but his mother was a Christian. He received a liberal education, and was well versed in pagan literature. On his father's death he inherited a considerable fortune, and was chosen prefect of his native city At this time he was still a heathen, and for a long time resisted his mother's entreaties to become a Christian. He yielded however so far as to take a Christian wife, and in due time he was brought to embrace the true faith. Various instrumentalities contributed to his conversion. The panegyrist attributes it to his intercourse with Eusebius of Chalcis and Acacius of Beroea, and to two remarkable miracles witnessed by him. The biographer of Alexander, on the other hand, ascribes it to the influence of his teaching. Both accounts probably are substantially true. On his conversion Rabbûlas went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem and was baptized in the river Jordan, having previously renounced his property and manumitted his slaves. His wife and daughters and all the females of his household devoted themselves to a religious life, and Rabbûlas himself retired to the monastery of St. Abraham at Chalcis. The discipline here enforced not being severe enough for his newly-awakened religious enthusiasm he left the monastery for a cave in an adjacent mountain side, but at the request of his brother he returned to the monastery. The see of Edessa having become vacant in 412 by the death of Diogenes, Rabbûlas was appointed his successor by a synod meeting at Antioch. His episcopate was a powerful one, characterised by great activity and zeal, which was not always exhibited in a gentle or conciliatory manner. His temper was fiery, and Ibas does not scruple to call him the tyrant of his city, who lorded it over all, and violently persecuted those who opposed his imperious will (Labbe, iv. 663). His panegyrist describes him in more favourable terms as manifesting earnest solicitude for the discipline of his clergy and the spiritual health of his flock. The sick and poor of his city, especially widows and orphans, were the objects of his unremitting care. Edessa was famous for its intellectual activity; the children of the higher classes, still chiefly heathen, were sent to its schools from great distances for education. These, according to his biographer of Alexander, Rabbûlas used to gather together twice a month and instructed them in the principles of the Christian faith and caused them to be baptized (*Acta Sanctorum*, i. 1020–1029). By the force of his character Rabbûlas became the leading prelate of the Oriental Church, regarded, according to the exaggerated language of the biographer of Alexander, as "the common master of Syria, Armenia, Persia, nay of the whole world."

The theological position of Rabbûlas in the early part of his career was not altogether consistent. The author of the panegyric describes him as having steadily opposed the doctrines of Nestorius from the very first. But the church of Edessa, together with the East generally, followed the teaching of Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, in which these doctrines were virtually contained, and Ibas, who having been a presbyter of his church must have spoken from personal knowledge, tells us that Rabbûlas was no exception. He speaks of him as having been a diligent student of Theodore's writings, and an attentive listener to his discourses, testifying his approbation by applause. By degrees however Rabbûlas veered round, and after some vacillation ended as the most vehement and uncompromising opponent of Theodore's teaching, using his utmost endeavours to bring about the complete suppression of his works. Ibas ascribes this change of opinion to personal pique, from his having been publicly rebuked by Theodore at a synod. This story may safely be regarded as an exaggeration, but it indicates a divergence of views regarded by the elder teacher of so much importance as to deserve a public reprimand. (IBAS, *Epist. ad Marium*, Labbe, iv. 666; Liberat, *Breviar.* c. 10, Labbe, v. 752.) This growing separation from Theodore's school of doctrine is strongly exhibited in a letter to Andrew of Samosata, written in the winter preceding the Council of Ephesus, 430–431, a fragment of which is printed by Overbeck among the Syriac documents published in his edition of Ephrem Syrus (Oxford, 1865). Rabbûlas here upbraids Andrew for having attacked Cyril in a manner which led him at first to ascribe the document to Nestorius himself. From Andrew's reply we learn, what is also stated by Theodorus Lector (lib. ii. p. 565), that Rabbûlas's fiery zeal for the orthodox faith had caused him publicly to anathematize Andrew before his congregation at Edessa. Not content with this Rabbûlas, according to the panegyrist, when visiting Constantinople took the opportunity of having to preach in the presence of Nestorius to denounce his doctrine. After this undisguised manifestation of his theological views, it is somewhat surprising to find Rabbûlas at the council of Ephesus ranging himself with the Orientals and joining them in their opposition to Cyril. His signature appears to the letter to the clergy and laity of Hierapolis (Baluz. col. 705) and to that addressed to the deputies despatched by the Orientals to Constantinople (*ib.* 725), in both of which the heretical nature of Cyril's teaching and the illegality of the actions of the council are asserted. From this temporary vacillation, to be attributed perhaps to his reluctance to separate himself from his patriarch and com-

provincial prelates, Rabbûlas speedily recovered. A visit to Constantinople in the winter succeeding the council, 431–432, when he had an opportunity of conferring with Nestorius's successor in the see, the wise and pious Maximian, confirmed him in his opposition to the Nestorian doctrine, which he returned to his diocese determined to eradicate. This was no easy task. No doctrine was more firmly planted among the clergy of Osrhoene and of the East generally. The dogma identified with the name of Nestorius, as having been formulated by him and pushed to an extreme, was not originated by him. It was to be found substantially in the writings of Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. The defenders of Nestorius and of his doctrines claimed, not without good reason, to be the disciples of these great men, whose names were universally revered through the East. To denounce Nestorianism and to accept Cyril's anathemas was to repudiate the teaching of theologians whom they had been taught to regard with veneration as infallible guides. Rabbûlas saw clearly that if the Nestorian doctrine was to be combated effectually among his clergy, it was not enough to denounce the actual teaching of Nestorius and prohibit the reading of his writings. The evil must be attacked at its source in the heretical works of Diodore and Theodore. To this end therefore he laboured with fierce unremitting zeal, in the midst of a recalcitrant clergy. To aid him in his object he called in the strong will and unscrupulous pen of Cyril. He appears to have been the first to open Cyril's eyes to the character of Theodore's writings, as the true fountain of Nestorius's teaching. The heresy would never be crushed so long as, while the doctrine of Nestorius was condemned and his writings prohibited, works in which the same heterodox tenets were declared, often in more offensive terms, were suffered to be circulated, without censure, and even recognized as theological authorities. Nestorianism might be repudiated in name, but an equally deadly crypto-Nestorianism was dominant in the East, sheltering itself under these two great names. To root out the error effectually the writings of these men must be subjected to the same sweeping enactment as those of Nestorius their disciple. We have a letter from Rabbûlas to Cyril (Labbe, v. 469), denouncing Theodore as the author of the heresy of Nestorius, which denied that Mary was truly the mother of God, thus laying snares of perdition for the unwary. These were all the more dangerous as Theodore had never ventured to propound these dogmas in his public teaching, but committed them to his books, which were recommended to general perusal by the persuasiveness of his tongue and his popularity as a preacher. These books however were treasures of impiety, containing arguments from hell which it was unsafe to write down, and which his adherents sought to keep secret for fear of offending the pious ears of the orthodox. That Rabbûlas' words fell on receptive soil is shown by Cyril's reply, of which a fragment is preserved (*ibid.*), lauding Rabbûlas as "the pillar and ground of the truth to all the easterns," for his zeal in expelling the blasphemy of the new and abominable heresy of Nestorius, as a pestiferous malady, and indicating Theodore, though guarding himself from mentioning so generally revered a name, as "the Cilician," from whose root this impiety proceeded. The suppression of these writings, so fatal to the establishment of his own system of doctrine, became a chief object with Cyril. An extension of the Imperial decree was obtained comprising "the sacrilegious books" of Diodore and Theodore in the same condemnation previously passed on the writings of Nestorius (Labbe, v. 471, cf. *ib.* iii. 1209). It prohibited their perusal, and ordered them to be publicly burnt, and threatened all who disregarded the decree with confiscation. This decree carried out on a general scale the line of action previously inaugurated by Rabbûlas in his own diocese, where a most determined persecution had been set on foot of the crypto-Nestorians, *i.e.* of all who were unwilling to accept Cyril's anathematisms, or to repudiate the doctrine of their venerated masters Diodore and Theodore. The letter of Ibas to Maris describes the violent and audacious conduct of Rabbûlas, ὁ πάντα τολμῶν, in publicly anathematizing Theodore before the church "punishing not the living only, but those also who had long since gone to God," and hunting up his works for the purpose of destruction (Labbe, iv. 663). A similar picture of Rabbûlas' violence is given us in a letter of Andrew of Samosata, written to his metropolitan Alexander of Hierapolis shortly after Easter, 432. Andrew complains that Rabbûlas was dealing with a high hand in Edessa, openly anathematizing Theodore's teaching of one nature in Christ, persecuting all the orthodox, excommunicating all who refused to accept the Cyrillian dogmas, as well as those who read Theodore's books, which he was everywhere committing to the flames. He had been asked by the oppressed party how long they were to endure this tyrannical treatment, and if they would not be right in separating from Rabbûlas, and he requests Alexander's advice on the point. (Baluz. c. xliii. col. 748). Alexander's answer is not preserved. Measures however were speedily taken in the direction indicated by Andrew. A synod was summoned at Antioch by the patriarch John, by which letters were despatched to the bishops of Osrhoene desiring them, if the reports of his tyrannical conduct were true, to suspend communion with Rabbûlas until the matter had been fully investigated, and he had either cleared himself or submitted to ecclesiastical discipline for his fault (*ib.* c. xliv. col. 749). Meanwhile Rabbûlas was corresponding with Cyril on the terms of reconciliation between himself and the East. The two uncompromising prelates were fully agreed that nothing short of complete submission on the part of the Orientals and the withdrawal of the condemnation of Cyril's anathematisms could be accepted. We have a letter of Cyril's to Rabbûlas (Baluz. c. cviii. col. 812) written in 432, expressing the impossibility of his accepting the proposition communicated by Acacius that Cyril should repudiate all that he had previously written on the subject, to leave a clear field for the reconciliation of the church. As we know, the reconciliation was effected in the spring of 433. Andrew of Samosata, long one of the most determined opponents of the Cyrillian dogmas, by which he had, as we have seen, incurred the open denunciation of Rabbûlas, having become convinced of his orthodoxy by the perusal of his manifesto, at once

left his diocese for Edessa to make reparation to his former antagonist, and satisfy him of his orthodoxy. On his way he was arrested by sickness. Whether he ever reached Edessa is uncertain. Alexander's anger having been aroused, Andrew wrote to the oeconomi of Hierapolis to justify himself. He had not yet seen Rabbûlas, but he accepted communion with him, together with Cyril, and embraced the peace of the church (*ib.* cc. ci. cvi.; col. 807–810).

The celebrated letter of Ibas, at that time a presbyter of the church of Edessa, written to Maris in this year 433 (Labbe, iv. 662), presents a highly coloured picture of the violent conduct of Rabbûlas in his determination to rid his diocese of heretical taint. It is needless to repeat what may be found in another place (Ibas, Vol. III. p. 192). Bickell calls attention to the fact that, however tyrannical his proceedings may have been, the acts of the "Latrocinium" prove that he cannot be rightly charged with the banishment of Barsumas, the learned head of the famous theological school of Edessa, and afterwards bishop of Nisibis (Thalhofer, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, *u. s.*).

Not content with eradicating the doctrines of Theodore in his own diocese Rabbûlas, in conjunction with Acacius of Melitene, wrote to warn the Armenian bishops of the poison of the Nestorian heresy which was being offered to them in the writings of Diodore and Theodore. Perplexed at this denunciation of those whom they had looked up to with reverence as the great teachers of the church, which their Cilician brethren had informed them was the result of personal jealousy, they summoned a synod, and despatched two presbyters, Leontius and Aberius, to Proclus, who in April 434 had succeeded Maximian on the throne of Constantinople, taking with them the opposing documents, and entreating the patriarch to indicate which was the true orthodox teaching. Proclus replied in his celebrated "Tome" on the Incarnation, in which he condemned Theodore's opinions but without naming him, a precaution which was counteracted by the officiousness of the messengers who conveyed the document (Liberat. *Breviar.* c. 10, *ap.* Labbe, v. 752; Garnerii *Praefat. in Mar. Mercat.* p. lii. ed. Par. 1673). The fiery old man did not long survive this letter. His death is placed Aug. 7, 435, after an episcopate of nearly a quarter of a century. According to Theodorus Lector (lib. ii. p. 665) he was blind before his death. He was succeeded by his presbyter Ibas, the ardent champion of the doctrines Rabbûlas had spent so much energy in exterminating. His name continued in high honour in his former diocese. In the proceedings against Ibas at Edessa we learn from the Acts of the Latrocinium that the prayers of Rabbûlas as a saint were invoked against his heretical successor by the excited mob (Martin, *Actes du Brigandage*, pp. 20, 31).

Nearly all the few surviving works of Rabbûlas have been printed by Overbeck in the original Syriac text, in his edition of Ephrem Syrus, Oxford, 1865, pp. 210–248; 362–378. They comprise (1) the scanty remains of the 640 letters which, according to his biographer, he wrote to the emperor, bishops, prefects, and monks. These consist of (*a*) a fragment of a letter to Andrew of Samosata, (*b*) two long fragments of a letter to Gemellinus, bishop of Pharan, against certain monks who regarded the Eucharist as ordinary bread and wine, (*c*) the letter to Cyril against Theodore, with Cyril's answer (given in Latin, but with variations, Labbe, v. 469). (2) A dogmatic sermon preached at Constantinople, imperfect at the end. (3) Canons for the regulation of the lives of the secular and regular clergy. These last are given in the Greek version, Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* lxxvii. 1474; and by Mai, *Script. Vet. Nov. Collect.*, x. part ii. p. 6. (4) Hymns for liturgical use addressed to the Mother of God, Saints and Martyrs, on Repentance, the Cross, the Resurrection, the Footwashing, the Eucharist, etc. (See Wright's Catalogue of Syriac MSS.) (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 420; Bickell *ap.* Thalhofer *Ausgewählte Schriften der Kirchenväter*, band x. 56–68; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xiv. 504–506, 563–565; Schröckh, xviii. 262, 306 ff.) [E. V.]

RACIMIR. [Suinthila.]

RADEGUNDIS, ST., queen of Clotaire I. and founder of the nunnery of Sainte-Croix, at Poitiers, was the daughter of a Thuringian prince named Bertharius, and was born in 519. When the plunder was divided after the successful invasion of her country by the three Frank kings, Theoderic, Theodebert, and Clotaire the young princess, now about ten years old, fell to the share of the last, and was sent to Aties, on the Somme, one of the royal residences, to be educated. Destined to be the king's bride, she was sedulously instructed in all the learning, both religious and secular, which France at that day possessed, but seems early to have developed an eager inclination towards the ascetic side of Christianity, and a strong distaste for marriage.

After her espousal by Clotaire her austerities and religious exercises were so incessant that it was commonly said the king had wedded a nun (Venant. Fort. *Acta S. Rad.* cap. i.). Abhorring the married state from the first, she seems to have been finally decided to escape from it, by her husband's treacherous murder of her brother. Withdrawing to Noyon, on the pretext of some religious observance, she besought the bishop Medardus to consecrate her as a deaconess. The bishop hesitated, and some Frank nobles present even dragged him from the altar; but at length the queen's urgency overcame his irresolution, and she obtained her desire. She then escaped from her husband's territory to the sanctuary of St. Martin of Tours, and thence to St. Hilary's, at Poitiers. Here she founded her monastery within a mile or two of the city; finally, with the consent of Clotaire, from whom the exhortations of the bishops wrung a reluctant acquiescence in the loss of his bride. Clerks were sent by her to the East for wood of the true cross, to sanctify it, and the rule of St. Caesarius and St. Caesaria of Arles was adopted for its government. Here she passed the remainder of her life, first as abbess, then as simple nun, under the rule of another. We happen to be very well informed about the beginnings of this institution from the two lives of Radegund, one by Venantius Fortunatus, her intimate friend (*Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 651), the other by one of her nuns called Baudonivia (*ibid.* 663), and

also from the fact that in Gregory's time, after Radegund's death, the attention of all France was drawn to the spot by the scandalous outbreak of a body of the nuns, headed by Chrodieldis, a natural daughter of King Charibert I. After a residence of about thirty-seven years, spent in the mingled religious exercises and literary studies enjoined by the Caesarian rule, she died Aug. 13, 587, and was buried by Gregory of Tours, whose account of the matter is interesting (*De Glor. Conf.* cap. cvi.). In addition to the authorities above referred to, see Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iii. 4, 7; vi. 29, 34; vii. 36; ix. 2, 39–43; x. 15; and *De Glor. Mart.* cap. v.; Venant. Fort. *Carmina* passim; Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. iii. 46 sqq.; *Hist. Litt.* iii. 346. Her story is told in lively fashion by Auguste Thierry in his *Récits des Temps Mérovingiens*, v. [S. A. B.]

RADO, eleventh abbat of St. Vedastus at Arras A.D. 795–815, and archicancellarius of Charles the Great (Mabillon, *De re Dipl.* 118, 122; see also pp. 404, 520, 521, 522, 524 for documents of state countersigned by him). He was a friend and correspondent of Alcuin, whom he persuaded to write the life of St. Vedastus, to be found with a prefatory letter to Rado in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* ci. 663. He also composed at the request of the abbat and his monks some masses and various dedicatory verses for a copy of the Scriptures and the shrines in the monastery church of St. Peter, which Rado rebuilt. (*Patr. Lat.* c. 215, ci. 731, 741, 211; cf. Ceillier, xi. 190; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 375.) [S. A. B.]

RAETHUN (Kemb. 177, 210.) [RETHUN.]

RAGNEMODUS (RAGNIMODUS, RAYMOND), twenty-first bishop of Paris, was deacon and priest under St. Germanus, whom he succeeded c. A.D. 577 (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. c. 14; *De Glor. Conf.* c. 89, and *De Mir.* ii. c. 12; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 595). In the disorders prevailing at the period he seems to have sided with Chilperic as against Praetextatus, bishop of Rouen (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. c. 19), and yet at the council of Paris, A.D. 577, he spoke in favour of the position of Praetextatus (*Ib.* vii. c. 16) and when Chilperic was murdered in A.D. 584 [CHILPERIC I.], the widowed queen Fredegundis fled with her infant and treasure to the bishop for protection (*Ib.* vii. c. 4). Fredegundis may the more readily have taken this step as in A.D. 580 her infant son, Theodoric, had been received from the font by Ragnemodus (*Ib.* vi. c. 27), and in the same year he had taken part in the council of Braine, which had exculpated her and St Gregory (*Ib.* vi. c. 50; Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 958). In A.D. 585 he subscribed at the council of Mâcon (Labbe, iv. 988). He was a severe enforcer of discipline, made many pilgrimages to the tomb of St. Martin, and died A.D. 591 (*Gall. Christ.* vii. 21; Duchesne, *Hist. Franc. Scrip.* i. 332 sq.; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 214 et al.; Fleury, *H. E.*, xxxiv.–v.). [J. G.]

RATBOD (RADBOD), duke of Frisia, was a powerful chief at war against Pippin and Charles Martel and opposed the spread of Christianity [CHARLES MARTEL] (*Gest. Reg. Franc.* c. 50; Fredegar. *Chron.* c. 102, 105; *Ann. Franc.* A.D. 716). His war with Charles Martel drove St. Boniface from his work, but at Ratbod's death, A.D. 719, the missionary returned [BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINENSIS] (*Vit. S. Bonifacii*, §§ 17, 24, ap. Boll. *A. SS.* Jun. t. i. 447, 456–8; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxxix. 611, 691; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xii. 46). [J. G.]

RAURACIUS (RAURACUS), ninth bishop of Nevers, belongs to the middle of the seventh century. He was at the council of Châlons A.D. 650, and wrote a letter still extant (Duchesne, *Hist. Franc. Scrip.* i. 884; Canisius, *Thes.* i. 646; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxvii. 259) to Desiderius, bishop of Cahors, recommending some friends to his good offices (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 627; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 583; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 734). Rauracus buried St. Austregisilus, bishop of Bourges, A.D. 624. (Boll. *A. SS.* Mai. v. 63*). [J. G.]

RAVENNIUS, archbishop of Arles in succession to Hilary. *Gall. Christ.* (i. 531) numbers him as fifteenth bishop, but Gams (*Ser. Episc.* 493) as thirteenth. Of his birth and family we have no account. We find him first a priest at Arles, in much favour with Hilary, and sent by him to Rome to sustain his suit with St. Leo regarding the metropolitanship over all Gaul. [HILARIUS ARELAT.] (*Vit. S. Hil. Arel.* c. 17; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* l. 1238.) This he did in such a way as to procure the lasting favour and respect of both the prelates, so that St. Hilary designated him his successor at Arles (*Vit. S. Hil. Arel.* c. 19), and St. Leo (*Ep.* 41; Migne liv. 815) heartily approved of the appointment. In the year 449 he was unanimously elected, and "secundum desideria cleri, honoratorum, et plebis unanimiter consecrastis" as St. Leo (*Ep.* 40; Migne, liv. 815) wrote to the Gallican bishops; he continued to have great influence both in Gaul and Italy. He was moderate and peace-loving, though rigorous in his own form of life (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 354). Soon after his election he seems to have consecrated Fonteius bishop of Vaison (*Ib.* ii. 355), or otherwise renewed the quarrel between the sees of Arles and Vienne regarding the office of metropolitan. The suffragan bishops of Arles wrote a letter to St. Leo A.D. 450, in which they related the election of Ravennius, the ancient privileges of Arles, and generally demanded a confirmation to Arles of all ecclesiastical rights (Leo, *Ep.* 65; Migne, liv. 879 sq.). But St. Leo (*Ep.* 66; Migne, liv. 883 sq.) in his reply gave no decision beyond requiring the archbishops of Vienne and Arles each to restrict himself to his own province. In the following year, however, he treated Ravennius as metropolitan by requesting him to announce the time of Easter in 452, yet when St. Leo sent the *Exemplar sententiae* into Gaul it was addressed to Ravennius along with the other Gallican bishops (St. Leo, *Ep.* 103; Migne, liv. 988 sq.), and his name follows that of Rusticus of Narbonne. When the *Tome of S. Leo* was sent him to communicate to the Gallican bishops (St. Leo, *Ep.* 67; Migne, liv. 886), he called and presided at the provincial council of Arles, A.D. 451 (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1010, A.D. 452), and he headed the bishops in their synodical letter to the pope, in which c. Dec. A.D. 451 they express their approval of his letter to Flavian (S. Leo, *Ep.* 99; Migne, liv. 966; *Hist.*

Litt. de la France, ii. 320–21). He presided again in the council of Arles, c. A.D. 455 (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1023–25; *Hist. Litt.* ii. 456), but we hear no more of his activity, and he died, c. A.D. 461. (The date of the council and of Ravennius's death are not exactly fixed. Fleury, *H. E.* xxix. 16; *Hist. Litt.* ii. 456.) Beyond his letters to St. Leo, mentioned above, he has left no writings. The Life of St. Hilary of Arles, which has been attributed to him under the name of Reverentius, is now generally ascribed to Honoratus of Marseilles. [HONORATUS (14).] (Fleury, *H. E.* xxvii.–ix.; Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 449–453; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 437 sq., x. 215 sq., 708 sq.; Fabricius, *Bib. Lit.* vi. 60.)

[J. G.]

REATHUN (Kemble, *C. D.* 209.) [RETHUN.]

RECCARED (1) I. (the uniform spelling in coins and inscriptions), younger son of LEOVIGILD by his first marriage. A sufficient account of his parentage and life till the death of his father will be found under LEOVIGILD and HERMENIGILD. Between April 12th and May 8th, A.D. 586 (Hübner, *Insc. Hisp.* n. 155; Tejada y Ramiro, ii. 217), he succeeded his father without any opposition, having been already associated with him in the kingdom, and the power of the nobles having been broken by the severe measures of the last reign. He first secured his position at home and abroad. He allied himself with his stepmother Goisvintha, the mother of Brunichilde, and grandmother of CHILDEBERT II. By her advice he sent ambassadors to Childebert and his uncle GUNTRAM (2), proposing peace and a defensive alliance. The first were favourably received, the second were detained at Mâcon, were not allowed to approach Guntram, and their proposals were rejected. This rejection was followed by a prohibition of all intercourse between Septimania and Burgundy.

Then followed the great event of Reccared's reign, his conversion from Arianism to Catholicism. Unfortunately we can only conjecture his motives for this momentous step, whether, as Dahn supposes, he was actuated mainly by political reasons, the desire to conciliate the Roman and Suevic populations, to remove the chief obstacle to union between the latter and their Gothic kinsfolk, and to deprive the Byzantines in the south of a lever for working on the feelings of their fellow catholics, and the hope of strengthening the throne against the nobles by an alliance with the catholic episcopate, or whether he yielded to the influence of the catholic leaders such as Leander or Masona. Soon after his accession, Sisbert, the slayer of Hermenigild, was put to death, and in January 587 the king declared himself a catholic; and, convening a synod of the Arian bishops, induced them and the mass of the Gothic and Suevic nations to follow his example. Some of the Arians did not submit quietly, and the next three years witnessed several dangerous risings, headed by coalitions of Arian bishops and ambitious nobles. Perhaps, from the geographical situation, the most formidable was that in Septimania, which was headed by bishop Athaloc, who, from his ability, was considered a second Arius. Amongst the secular leaders of the insurrection the counts GRANISTA and Wildigern are named. They appealed for aid to Guntram, whose desire for Septimania was stronger than his detestation of Arianism, and the dux Desiderius was sent with a Frankish army. However Reccared's army defeated the insurgents and their allies with great slaughter, Desiderius himself being among the slain. (Paul. Em. 19; J. Bicl.; Greg. T. ix. 15.) The next conspiracy broke out in the West. It was headed by Sunna, the Arian bishop of Merida, and Count Seggo. If Paulus Emeritanus is to be trusted, Witteric the future king was one of the conspirators, to whom it had been assigned to kill bishop MASONA. His attempt being miraculously frustrated, he revealed the whole plot to Masona and to Claudius the dux Lusitaniae, who put down the attempted rising, Sunna being banished to Mauritania and Seggo to Galicia, the latter having his hands cut off. In the latter part of 588 a third conspiracy was formed, headed by the Arian bishop Uldila and the queen dowager Goisvintha, but they were detected, and the former banished. Goisvintha died, whether by a natural death or by her own hand is uncertain. One more conspiracy, immediately after the council of Toledo, was headed by the dux Argimund, but it was detected; his accomplices were executed, and he himself was beaten, and paraded on an ass through Toledo with his right hand struck off and his head shaven.

To return to Reccared's relations with the Franks. After his conversion he again sent to Guntram and Childebert in A.D. 587. The implacable Guntram refused to receive the embassy, asking how could he believe those by whose machinations his niece INGUNTHIS had been imprisoned and banished, and her husband slain? Childebert gave them a better reception. He and his mother Brunichilde accepted the present of 10,000 solidi, and were satisfied with Reccared's declarations that he was guiltless of the death of Ingunthis. They also favourably received the request of Reccared for the hand of her sister Chlodosinda, but said they could not give her in marriage without Guntram's approval. This Guntram at first refused, but consented if Childebert faithfully performed the stipulations of the treaty of Andelot (Easter 588). The marriage, however, never took place, or the bride must have died immediately, as Baddo was the wife of Reccared in May 589. In the spring of 589 Guntram, perhaps in concert with Goisvintha, made one more attempt on Septimania. Carcassonne was betrayed to his dux Austroaldus, and an army under Boso's command was sent to reduce the other cities; but they were surprised, and defeated with great loss by the Goths under Claudius the dux Lusitaniae. They lost all their baggage, and all the infantry were taken prisoners. Gregory admits a loss of 5000 slain and 2000 captured, while Jo. Bicl. puts the number of Goths at only 300, and that of the Franks at 60,000, and declares that most of them were slain. After this we hear nothing further of relations with Franks, whether friendly or hostile. The rest of Reccared's reign was peaceful, with the exception of some expeditions against the Romans on the south and the Basques on the north.

Third Council of Toledo.—This, the most important of all the Spanish councils, assembled

by the king's command in May, A.D. 589. On the 4th the king shortly declared his reasons for convening them, and the next three days were spent in prayer and fasting. Reccared, in a short speech, referred the assembly to a *tomus* for the business to be transacted, and it was accordingly read by a notary. After reciting that, though God had raised him to the throne for the welfare of his people, he knew that he was mortal, and that everlasting happiness could be secured only by the profession of the true faith, there followed an orthodox confession of belief. He then declared that God had inspired him to lead the Goths back to the true faith, from which they had hitherto been led astray by false teachers. Not only the Goths but the Suevi, who by the fault of others had been led into heresy, had been brought back by his exertions. These noble nations he offered to God by the hands of the bishops, whom he called on to complete the work he had begun. He then anathematized Arius and his doctrine, and declared his acceptance of the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and all other councils that agreed with these. He then pronounced an anathema on all who returned to Arianism after being received into the church by the chrism, or the laying on of hands; then followed the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople and the definition of Chalcedon, and the *tomus* concluded with the signatures of Reccared and Baddo his queen. It was received with acclamation from the whole synod. Its praises of Reccared, its numerous scriptural quotations, and the clearness with which the Catholic and Arian doctrines are defined show that it was the work of a theologian, probably of either bishop Leander or abbat Eutropius, who had the chief management of the council (Jo. Bicl.). One of the catholic bishops then called on the bishops, clergy, and Gothic nobles who had been converted to declare publicly their renunciation of Arianism and their acceptance of Catholicism. They replied that though they had done so already when, following the king, they had gone over to the church, they would comply. Then followed twenty-three anathemas directed against Arius and his doctrines in general and in detail, succeeded by the creeds of Nice and Constantinople, and the definition of Chalcedon, and the whole was subscribed by eight Arian bishops and their clergy, and by all the Gothic nobles. The bishops were Ugnas of Barcelona, Ubiligisclus of Valencia, Murila of Palencia, Sunnila of Viseo, Gardingus of Tuy, Bechila of Lugo, Argiovitus of Oporto, and Froisclus of Tortosa. The names of at least six of the eight show their Gothic descent. It is remarkable that five come from sees within the former Suevic kingdom, probably showing that Leovigild, after his conquest, had displaced the Catholic by Arian bishops. Reccared then addressed the council again, calling on them with his license to draw up such canons as were requisite, and in particular one directing that the creed should be recited at the time of Holy Communion, that henceforward no one should be able to plead ignorance as an excuse for misbelief. Then followed twenty-three canons with a confirmatory edict of the king. The first confirmed the decrees of previous councils and synodical letters of the popes; the second directed the recitation of the creed of Constantinople at the Communion; the third forbade the alienation of church property by bishops; the fourth permitted a bishop, with the consent of his council, to convert one parochial church into a monastic; by the fifth, the Arian bishops, priests, and deacons, who had been converted, were forbidden to live with their wives; by the sixth, freedmen who had been duly manumitted were to remain free, but they and their descendants were to be under the protection of the church; the seventh directed the Scriptures should be read at a bishop's table during meals; the eighth, with the king's approval, forbade any one from claiming as an alleged gift from the king clerics belonging to a family which formed part of the king's property, and ordered that they should pay their poll-tax to the church to which they were attached; by the ninth, the former Arian churches were transferred to the bishops of their dioceses; the tenth forbade widows who wished to remain single being forced to remarry, and in like manner it was forbidden to compel virgins to marry against their own or their parents' will; the eleventh and twelfth related to penitents; the thirteenth forbade clerics to proceed against clerics before lay tribunals; the fourteenth forbade Jews to have Christian wives, concubines, or slaves, ordered the children of such unions to be baptized, and disqualified Jews from any office in which they might be required to punish Christians—Christian slaves whom they had circumcised, or made to share in their rites, were to be *ipso facto* free; the fifteenth related to churches founded or endowed by slaves of the fisc; the sixteenth ordered bishops, in conjunction with the civil governor, to seek out and destroy idols in their dioceses; the seventeenth was directed against child murder; the eighteenth ordered that a synod of each province should be held every year on November 1st, which the judicial and fiscal officers were to attend, and the bishops were to observe their behaviour to the people under them, and if necessary warn them to alter their conduct, and, if they refused, to inform the king; the nineteenth directed that the control of churches should be with the bishop, not the founder; the twentieth forbade bishops levying exactions on their clergy; the twenty-first forbade civil authorities from laying burdens on clerics or the slaves of the church or clergy; the twenty-second forbade wailing at funerals; the twenty-third forbade celebrating saints' days with indecent dances and songs.

The canons were subscribed first by the king himself, and then by five out of the six metropolitans, of whom Masona signs first, and Pantardus of Braga signs for Nitigisius of Lugo as well as for himself. The metropolitan of Tarraconensis was absent, but, according to one MS., signed by proxy. Sixty-two bishops signed in person, and five, besides Nitigisius, by proxy. All the bishops of Tarraconensis and Septimania appeared personally or by proxy. In the remaining provinces several were missing. The absence of Licinian of Carthagena, and Severus of Malaga, is explained by the fact, that these cities were in the hands of the Byzantines. In five cases, Valencia, Tuy, Oporto, Tortosa, and Lugo, both Arian and Catholic bishops

appear in possession of the same see. The proceedings were closed by a homily by Leander on the conversion of the Goths.

At the council of Toledo our best authority, Joannes of Biclaro, breaks off, and the information for the rest of Reccared's reign is most scanty. He is praised by Isidore for his peaceful government, for his clemency, and his generosity. He restored various properties, both ecclesiastical and private, which had been confiscated by his father, and founded many churches and monasteries.

A letter of Reccared's to Gregory the Great is preserved among the letters of the latter, but Gams considers it a forgery founded on the genuine letter of Gregory to Reccared, written in August, A.D. 599 (Gregorius, *Epp.* ix. 61, 121). He had sent certain abbats to Rome with presents, but disheartened by a shipwreck, they had returned to Spain. Gregory extols him for not only embracing the true faith, but inducing his people to do the same. He also praises him for refusing the bribes offered by the Jews for procuring the repeal of a law against them. He sends him a piece of the true cross, some fragments of the chains of St. Peter, and some hairs of St. John Baptist. He refuses his request to procure for him from Constantinople a copy of the treaty concluded between Justinian and Athanagild, in the first place, as the record office at Constantinople had been burnt; and, in the next place, because Reccared ought to have in his own possession the documents that were unfavourable to him. Reccared died at Toledo in A.D. 601, after a reign of 15 years, after publicly confessing his sins. He was succeeded by his son Leova II. then a youth of about eighteen, whose mother was a person of low birth, and who was probably illegitimate. He was dethroned in A.D. 603 by Witteric, and his right hand cut off, and died in consequence soon afterwards.

Laws.—In a palimpsest from Corbei, now in the National Library at Paris, fragments of an ancient Gothic code are contained which have been edited by F. Bluhme. This must be later than A.D. 506, as c. 285 contains an extract from the *Visigothic Lex Romana* of that date, and before Kindasvinth. Further, the author must have been a king whose father was also a lawgiver (c. 277). There is no king in the period mentioned complying with this condition except Reccared I. The direct evidence of his promulgating a code rests indeed only on the late authority of Lucas of Tuy, who gives the sixth year of his reign = A.D. 591, as the date of its composition, but a Jew-law of Reccared's is referred to by Sisebut (Bluhme, xiv.). This code consisted of at least 336 chapters, and may have contained many more. Of these, in the palimpsest, fifty-five are preserved, some in a perfect condition, while of others only a few words are left.

Sources.—Joannes Biclarensis's *Chronicon* down to A.D. 589; Isidorus, *de Reg. Goth.*; Paulus Emeritanus, *De Vit. et Mir. Patr. Em.* 16–19; Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* ix. 1, 15, 16, 20, 31, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 868, lxxxiii. 1071, lxxx. 151, lxxi. 481; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Canones de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 213.

Coins in Florez, *Medallas*, iii. 191, and Heiss, *Monnaies des Rois Wisigoths*, 87.

Literature.—Dahn, *Könige der Germanen*, v.; Helfferich, *Entstehung und Geschichte des Westgothen-Rechts*; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2). [F. D.]

RECCARED (2) II., succeeded his father SISEBUT in A.D. 621, being then a minor, and died a few days afterwards. (Isidorus, *de Reg. Goth.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxiii. 1074.) [F. D.]

RECCESVINTH, spelt always with double *c* in coins (Heiss, *Monnaies des Rois Visigoths*, 121) and inscriptions (Hübner, *Insc. Hisp. Chr.* 117, 143, 159, 175), king of Spain, was associated in the kingdom by his father KINDASVINTH, on January 22 (Julianus, *Vita Ildephonsi*, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcvi. 44), being the day of St. Vincent, Kindasvinth's patron saint (Braulio, *Ep.* 33), A.D 649, on the petition of bishops BRAULIO of Saragossa and Eutropius, and Celsus, the governor of the district in which Saragossa lay (Braulio, *Ep.* 37), and became sole king on his father's death in A.D. 653. Soon after his accession a formidable insurrection of the Basques broke out, headed by a Gothic noble named Froya. They penetrated as far as Saragossa, and committed great atrocities. There, however, they were totally defeated by Reccesvinth and their leader slain (Tayo, *Ep. ad Quiricum* i.), not without heavy loss on the part of the victors (Isidorus Pac.). Reccesvinth on his becoming sole king relaxed his father's iron rule. He submitted to the council that assembled soon after he became sole king, a nice question of casuistry, namely, whether the oath taken by the nation never to pardon those who had plotted the murder of the king or the ruin of the nation (cf. the first canon of the seventh Council of Toledo) was absolutely binding under all circumstances.

By a decree of the same council, and a law promulgated by the king, a distinction was drawn between the personal and official capacity of the king, and it was implied that previous kings had increased their property by unjust exactions and confiscations. It was accordingly enacted that while all the property which had belonged to Kindasvinth before his accession should pass to his sons, as belonging to him in his personal capacity, all that he had acquired after his accession should devolve on Reccesvinth in right of his crown, and that he should thereout make satisfaction to those whom he considered to have been unjustly treated, and apply the rest to the service of the state. It appears by this law that Kindasvinth left other sons besides Reccesvinth, but as their names are unfortunately omitted, we cannot test the truth of the legend tracing the descent of RODERIC and PELAYO from Kindasvinth.

Four councils were held in this reign. In December, A.D. 653, the eighth council assembled at Toledo. This council was in many ways remarkable. Its composition, and the combination of civil and ecclesiastical business gave it the character of a diet as well as that of a synod. It was the first council the decrees of which were signed by others than bishops or their representatives. Eleven abbats, an archpriest, and a primicerius sign before the representatives of absent bishops, and then follow the signatures of seventeen of the great court digni-

taries, a nobility of office growing up as in other Teutonic countries beside the more ancient nobility of birth. Thus it was in some measure not only more representative of the church than any previous council, but it also contained a lay element. The king, after commending himself to the prayers of the council, in a short speech referred them to a *tomus* for the business he wished them to transact. After a profession of orthodoxy it specially directed their attention to the question already mentioned of the oath, and the repression of Judaism. Some Jews still adhered to their faith, while others had relapsed after baptism. The council, after reciting the Nicene creed with the addition of the *Filioque*, discussed at great length the question propounded, and decided that such an oath, which excluded forgiveness under any circumstances, was not binding; the third canon related to simony, the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh, dealt with the married or unchaste clergy of various ranks, from bishops downward. the eighth forbade the ordination of ignorant persons, and the ninth eating meat in Lent. The tenth regulated the mode of election of a king. He was to be chosen either at the capital or at the place where the last king had died, by the bishops and great officers of the palace; he was to defend the Catholic faith against Judaism and heresy, he was not to oppress his subjects with heavy exactions, only what a king had possessed before his accession was to pass to his heirs, while property acquired during his reign was to belong to his successors. The king was, before his consecration, to swear that he would observe these provisions. The eleventh visited non-observance of the decrees of the council with excommunication, while the twelfth re-enacted the decrees of the fourth Council of Toledo against the Jews.

Two years afterwards the ninth council of Toledo met. It was properly a provincial council, but Tayo and Maurellus the bishops of Saragossa and Urgel attended. Most of the canons relate either to the property or the freedmen of the church, the status of the latter being one of serfdom. The tenth canon not only disqualified the offspring of clerics from inheriting their parents' property, but declared they should be slaves of the church to which their father had belonged, while the seventeenth ordered baptized Jews to celebrate the chief church festivals with the bishops in order to prevent evasion on their part.

In 656 the tenth council, a national one, assembled. The first canon ordered the Annunciation to be commemorated on December 18 instead of March 25, because the latter day always falling in Lent prevented the feast being properly observed, the second visited with deprivation a cleric who violated his oath to the king, the third was directed against nepotism or favouritism on the part of bishops, while the seventh forbade selling Christian slaves to Jews or heathens. This council also dealt with the case of POTAMIUS (2) and the will of RECHIMIR.

After these three councils in three years a strange break occurs, and with one exception no other council was held in the rest of the reign. The causes of this sudden change are unknown. That the king did not prohibit councils is shewn by the meeting of the council of Merida in A.D. 666; and that he interested himself in church matters by his restoring the province of Merida to its ancient limits [ORONTIUS]; while his munificence to the church, which rested only on the late testimony of Roderic of Toledo, has been proved by the discovery in the treasure-trove of Guarrazar in 1858 of the magnificent crown he had offered. The crown, which is preserved at the Hôtel de Cluny in Paris, is described, with an illustration in *Dict. Christ. Ant.* i. 509. Expressions in the proceedings of the council of Merida (a prayer that victory might be granted to Reccesvinth over his enemies, and a direction that every priest should say mass daily for the safety of the king and his army whenever he marched against his enemies) point to foreign war or civil disturbance, and either or both may have been the cause of the cessation of the councils. Reccesvinth died on Sept. 1st A.D. 672 at Gerticos near Salamanca (Julianus, *Vita Wambanis*, 3).

The letters interchanged between Reccesvinth and Braulio (Braulio, *Epp.* 38–41) show that the former had, like his father, a taste for literature. Like him too he was an active legislator. Not only does the Visigothic Code known as the *Liber Judicum*, or *Codex Visigothorum* (*C. V.*), contain numerous laws by him, a summary of which is given by Helfferich 172–180, but early in his reign (probably in A.D. 654, v. Helfferich, 181) he issued a code, which alone he declared was thenceforward to have the force of law, all previous laws being repealed (*C. V.* ii. (1), 9, 12). Of his new legislation by far the most important is the law permitting intermarriage between Goths and Romans (*C. V.* iii. (1) 2). His father had abolished the dual systems of law, one for the Romans and one for the Goths; Reccesvinth completed his work by abolishing the barrier which kept the two races distinct.

Reccesvinth re-enacted in his code the laws of RECCARED, SISEBUT, and SISENAND against baptized and unbaptized Jews, and added a stringent prohibition of relapse. The penalty for violating any of these laws was death by stoning or by fire, or if this was remitted, perpetual slavery and forfeiture of all property (*C. V.* xii. (2), 4, 12). This strange severity is borrowed from the *placitum* of the baptized Jews of Toledo presented (no doubt under compulsion) to Reccesvinth in February A.D. 654 (*C. V.* xii. (2) 6). Admitting their relapse in the past, they swore to be good Christians for the future and to abandon all Jewish rites and practices, pledging themselves that any one who violated the oath should be burnt or stoned by themselves or their sons. Apparently therefore the penalty in question was one imagined by the Jews themselves in their overstrained zeal to show their sincerity and to lull suspicion, and was then adopted by Reccesvinth *in terrorem*, while the penalty really intended to be enforced was the slavery or confiscation afterwards mentioned. (Grätz, *Die Westg. Gesetzgebung in Betreff der Juden*, 13, 22.)

Authorities.—The Acts of the eighth, ninth, and tenth councils of Toledo, and of the council of Merida in Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 361, 396, 407, 703; the laws, and the letters of BRAULIO and TAYO already referred to; two sentences in Julianus' *Vita Ilde-*

phonsi and *Historia Wambanis;* Isidorus Pacensis; Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen*, v. 200; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (2), 126, 143; Helfferich, *Entstehung und Geschichte des Westgothen-Rechts*, ubi supra. [F. D.]

RECHIMIR (RICIMER), bishop of Dumium, signs seventh among the suffragans, preceding nineteen others, at the seventh council of Toledo, in October A.D. 646, so that he had then been some time bishop. Florez conjectures that GERMANUS (22) his predecessor died, c. 637 or 8, as no bishop of Dumium appears at the sixth council of Toledo, held in January A.D. 638. He was alive at the eighth council, in November A.D. 653, but apparently in bad health, as abbat Osdulg signs as his deputy. He died soon afterwards, as before the tenth council of Toledo, held in December, A.D. 656, FRUCTUOSUS (2) had succeeded. He was liberal to a fault, giving away in alms the whole revenues of the church, and leaving nothing for its support. He also manumitted a large number of the slaves of the church, and shortly before his death ordered all the furniture and utensils of his official residence to be given to the poor, to whom, by his will, he bequeathed his whole private property. After his death, the church of Dumium complained to king Rekesvinth, who referred the matter to the tenth council, laying before them the wills of Rechimir and of ST. MARTIN (2), the founder. The council decided that the losses of the church furniture and utensils should be made good out of Rechimir's private property, subject to which his will was to be valid. The case of the manumitted slaves was left to the discretion of FRUCTUOSUS. For the whole story compare that of GAUDENCIUS. (*Esp. Sag.* xviii. 41; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 358, 386, 420; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, 2 (2), 132.) [F. D.]

REDEMPTUS, a disciple of St. Isidore of Seville, mentioned as a cleric (*Pat. Lat.* lxxxi. 17, 30, 33, 34, 139) and addressed as an archdeacon (lxxxiii. 905). From Redemptus clericus we have the testimony as that of an eyewitness, of the death of St. Isidore, A.D. 636; and to Redemptus archidiaconus a letter (*Ep.* 7) is addressed by St. Isidore in favour of the Eucharistic use of unleavened bread in the Western church. But it is questioned whether they are one person or two, and the letter is probably not genuine. (Vossius, *Hist. Lat.* lib. ii. 252, ed. Lugd. 1627; De Castro, *Escrit. Espan.* ii. 345, ed. Madrid, 1786; Fabricius, *Bibl. Lat.* ed. Mansi, vi. 60; Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. iv. 327, 349; *Pat. Lat.* lxxxi. 500; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 722.) [J. G.]

REDUX, bishop of Naples, A.D. 581. When Naples was attacked by the Lombards in that year he caused a copy of the *excerpta ex operibus S. Augustini* by St. Eugippius to be made and preserved in the cathedral of Naples, adding his own subscription as a guarantee of its fidelity, cf. *Corp. Scriptt. Ecclesiast.* Latinorum, vol. ix., Eugippii *Opp.* praef. p. xxiv. ed. P. Knoell. Vindobon. 1885. [G. T. S.]

REDWALD (REDUALD, RAEDWALD, REODWALD), king of the East Angles. He was the son of Tytla, son of Wuffa, the first East Anglian king, and so eleventh in descent from Woden (*M. H. B.* p. 628). Nothing is known of the date of his accession to his throne, but he was certainly a powerful prince very early in the 7th century, and before the death of Ethelbert of Kent had attained such fame as to eclipse that king and obtain the hegemony of all the states south of the Humber except Kent. He is thus the fourth of those rulers to whom later writers gave the name of Bretwalda (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 5). He was on friendly terms, as it would seem, with Ethelbert, and at his court in all probability he was persuaded to receive baptism (*ib.* ii. 15), but on his return home, under the influence of his wife, he relapsed into semi-heathenism, revering Christ as one of his gods, and having a temple dedicated to him in conjunction with the pagan deities (*ib.*). Redwald's great achievement was the defeat and slaughter of Ethelfrith, king of Northumbria, in 617 (*Chr. S. M. H. B.* 308). He had before this received at his court Edwin, son of Ella, the head of the rival family in Northumbria, and whilst in East Anglia Edwin had received the first impressions which inclined him towards Christianity. [EDWIN.] The vision which Edwin saw at Redwald's court has been rationalised in a way that leads to the belief, that Christianity was at least tolerated there (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 12). Ethelfrith tried to induce Redwald to betray or kill Edwin. The East Anglian king long resisted the temptation, but, under a threat of invasion, agreed to the treacherous act. Before it was executed, however, he repented, and turned his arms against Ethelfrith, who perished in a great battle on the east of the river Idle, in Nottinghamshire. Raegenher, a son of Redwald, fell in the battle (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 12). Redwald is supposed to have died about 627; the mission of Felix the apostle of East Anglia, being most probably dated about 631, and the conversion of Earpwald, the first Christian king of the East Angles, some four years earlier. Nothing certain, however, can be affirmed as to this. Earpwald was the son and successor of Redwald, and Sigebert, the successor of Earpwald, is described by Bede (*H. E.* ii. 15, iii. 18), as his brother. It has been doubted whether he was a son or stepson of Redwald, who was at enmity with him. [SIGEBERT.] (See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 88, 89; *Liber Eliensis*, ed. Stewart, i. 12, 13; Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* p. 527; W. Malmesb. i. § 97.) [S.]

REDWULF, bishop, among the spurious signatures to the council Clovesho in 742 (Kemble, *C. D.* 87). Haddan and Stubbs (iii. 342) consider him the same as Eardulf, bishop of Dunwich. [EARDULF (3).] [C. H.]

REGINUS, count, probably in Africa, about the close of the 5th century, had written some letters, now lost, to Fulgentius of Ruspe [FULGENTIUS (3)] upon two points, (1) as to whether the body of Christ was corruptible or incorruptible, and (2) as to the life a man in arms should lead. Death prevented Fulgentius replying to the second query, which was done by his pupil Ferrandus, but to the first he gives a long reply (Fulgentius Rusp. *Ep.* 18 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxv. 493; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 50). [J. G.]

REGULUS (RULE), abbat or bishop, the leading character in the Scottish *Legend of St. Andrew*, and in the foundation of the town and see of St. Andrews in Fifeshire. The legend in three different forms or stages of development is given by Skene (*Chron.* 138, 183, 375), who also endeavours to explain or interpret it (*Celt. Scot.* i. 296, ii. 261; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* iv. 300). But Fordun's version (*Scot. Chron.* ii. cc. 58–60, iv. cc. 13, 14) precedes the date of Skene's third legend from the *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. SS. p. hyem. f. lxxxii.). The later Scotch annalists only amplify details.

In the 4th century, in the reign of Constantius, Regulus, abbat or bishop, was divinely directed to flee from Patrae in Achaia, with the relics of St. Andrew, who had been martyred there, and was afterwards instructed to betake himself with a part of them to the western regions of the world, where a church should be built and dedicated to the honour of the saint. He was thus carried by wind and wave to the coast of Fifeshire, and built his church at Muckross, or Kylrimont, now St. Andrews, where king Hungus, or Ungus, son of Urguist, received him, presented him with lands, and liberally endowed the church. [HUNGUS.] Fordun says that he continued at St. Andrews for thirty-two years after the shipwreck, and died there, full of days. But in this there is a badly assorted collection of legends, relating first to the legend of St. Andrew by itself, and then attaching to it a legend of the Pictish church and its foundation in Fifeshire in the 8th or 9th century. As connected with Scotland, the foreign element is probably wholly fictitious with its persons and dates, while the main body of the legend may probably rest on historical facts. In seeking for an interpretation of the legend in whole and details, Skene traces the leading features to the time of the Pictish king Ungus I., son of Urguist, who reigned about A.D. 730–761, and was engaged in war with the Saxons; he further draws attention to the church of Hexham at this same date, and the banishment of bishop Acca from his see A.D. 732. During his exile he may have been at Candida Casa, but more probably was farther distant among the Southern Picts, and leaving there, as he had at Hexham, a church dedicated to St. Andrew, with chapels to St. Michael the Archangel and St. Mary the Virgin. At this time the relics of St. Andrew, which Acca believed he had at Hexham, would naturally be introduced in St. Andrews, and hence the legend takes its origin. As to the original character from which we have the missionary Regulus, Reeves (*Culdees*, pt. iii. § 2) and Skene (*Celt. Scot.* ii. 267) are of opinion that the name has been borrowed from the Irish Kalendar and latinised, the feast of Riagail, abbat of Muicinis in Loch Derg, being on Oct. 16, and that of Regulus of Mucross or St. Andrews on Oct. 17. The legend of St. Regulus would thus refer to some movement in the native Pictish church under the temporary influence of St. Acca when in exile, and the motive of the fictions would be to honour the metropolitan see. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 437 sq.; Lyon, *Hist. St. And.* i. pass.; Grub, *E. H. Scot.* i. 6 sq.; Gordon, *Scotichr.* i. 69 sq.; Moran, *Ir. SS.* 199.) [J. G.]

REMACLUS, ST., tenth bishop of Maestricht, between St. Amandus and St. Theodardus, and founder of the monasteries of Cougnon, Stavelo and Malmédy, about the middle of the 7th century, was a native of Aquitaine. His first training is ascribed to St. Sulpicius, but at an early age he became a disciple of St. Eligius at Solignac, where he may possibly have been abbat for a time. About 642 he founded the monastery of Cougnon in the diocese of Trèves, and some years later St. Amandus resigned the see of Utrecht in his favour (circ. A.D. 649). We know little of his episcopate except that he assisted St. Sigebert, king of Austrasia, in founding the monasteries of Stavelo and Malmédy in the Ardennes, and after ten years of office resigned the see in his turn to St. Theodardus and ended his days at Stavelo about 668. He is commemorated Sept. 3. The principal authority for his life after the charters of the monasteries (*Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 321 sqq.) is a biography by an anonymous monk of Stavelo, written about the middle of the 9th century, to be found in Mabillon's 2nd vol., and Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. 1, 692 (cf. Sigeb. Gembl. *Vita S. Sigeb. Reg.* v. 14, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 311; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 545, 556 and Boll. ibid. *Comm. Praev.* p. 669). [S. A. B.]

REMIGIUS (1), bishop [OCTAVIUS (4)].

REMIGIUS (2) (REMEDIUS, REMI), **ST.**, archbishop of Rheims and called the Apostle of the Franks (circ. A.D. 457–530). He holds an important position in the history of the Western Church, and is honoured as one of the three great patron-saints of France. The exact part he played in the winning of Clovis and his Franks to orthodox Christianity, which probably decided the belief of Western Europe, it is not easy to say, since Gregory's account of these matters, which happened considerably before his time, is plainly not to be trusted for details, and an earlier life which seems to have existed (see Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 31) was lost before the 9th century. How far Clovis was convinced by the exhortations of either Remigius or Clotilda, or both of them, or how far he saw his advantage in the partizanship of the orthodox clergy in his struggle with the Arian Burgundians and Visigoths, has been much discussed and differently viewed (see CLOVIS, CLOTILDA, and the authorities there referred to). But it must be regarded as a happy event for orthodoxy that a man of ability and force of character to impress a barbarian like Clovis was stationed in the pathway of his conquests. Considering his importance, few details are known of his life. He was born about 435, his mother's name being Cylinia, and the canons notwithstanding, was consecrated to the episcopate in his 22nd year (circ. A.D. 457). The first we hear of intercourse with Clovis is in the latter's campaign against Syagrius (circ. A.D. 486), when the incident of the restoration of the stolen church vessel seems to betoken the existence even at that time of friendly relations. About 492 the king married the Catholic Clotilda, who proved a powerful ally for the bishop. The story of his baptism on Christmas Eve, 496, together with his sister Albofledis, another sister, Lanthechildis, who now renounced her Arianism, and more than 3000 Franks, is well known. "Mitis depone colla, Sicamber, adora quod incendisti,

incende quod adorasti," are the words put by Gregory into Remigius's mouth (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 27). For the fable of the dove descending with the ampulla of holy oil for the consecration, which first appears in Hincmar (*Coron. Regiae*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* 125, 806; cf. Flodoardus, *Patr. Lat.* cxxxv. 52) and the political uses it subserved, see Herzog (sub nom.). Though the letter variously ascribed to the popes Hormisdas and Symmachus, congratulating Remigius on the happy event, and establishing him papal vicar throughout Clovis's dominions, saving the rights of other metropolitans, is probably spurious (*Patr Lat.* lxv. 961–76), the importance of the event seems to have been recognized (see Avitus, *Epist. ad Clov.* Bouquet, iv. 49). And the conversion was sufficiently thorough to resist the sinister omen of Albofledis' death a few days after her baptism. His episcopate is said to have lasted seventy or more years, his death being placed about 530. Though he is believed to have died Jan. 13, his feast has been usually celebrated Oct. 1, on which day several solemn translations of his body were made in after times, notably one on Oct. 2, 1049, in the presence of pope Leo IX. to a new and splendid church (Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. 1, 59 sqq.; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 13). His cult was fully established in the time of Gregory, who relates miracles performed by him both during his life and after death (*De Glor. Conf.* lxxix.). His piety and vigour were equalled by his learning and eloquence (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 31). Sidonius Apollinaris too speaks in the highest terms of the eloquence of some *Declamations* of Remigius which he had read. None of them however have survived, and his literary remains are represented by four letters (one of them to three bishops, presenting a curious picture of contemporary manners), a spurious will, and a few verses ascribed to him (*Patr. Lat.* lxv. 961–76; cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 158 sqq.).

The references in Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 27, 31, viii. 21, ix. 14, x. 19; *Hist. Epit.* xvi.; *De Glor. Conf.* lxxix.), Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist.* ix. 7), and Avitus (*Collat. Episc.* sub init.; *Patr. Lat.* lix. 387), comprise all that is historical about him. The short life by Venantius Fortunatus (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 527 sqq.) is little but a tissue of miracles, and the narratives of Hincmar and the later Rheims historians are entirely untrustworthy. Everything both historical and mythical concerning him may be found gathered together in the exhaustive notice of the Bollandists (Oct. 1, 59–187). For the modern accounts of him, and critical estimates, see Potthast's Manual and the authorities quoted in the articles CLOVIS and CLOTILDA. [S. A. B.]

REMIGIUS (3) (REMEDIUS), **ST.**, twenty-ninth bishop of Rouen, between Raginfredus and Magenardus, is said to have been a son of Charles Martel, though his mother's name is unknown. According to Adrevaldus (*De Miraculis S. Benedicti*, cap. xvi., xvii., *Patr. Lat.* cxxiv. 918), he was sent by his half-brother Pippin to obtain the relics of St. Benedict from the monks of Fleury, but was deterred by supernatural manifestations in the saint's church. He was also deputed to urge Desiderius, the Lombard king, to make restitution of property taken from the Holy See, for which pope Paulus I. renders thanks in a letter to Pippin, written in the year 760 (*Epist.* viii., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcix. 1152). Remigius co-operated with Pippin in the introduction of the Roman chants and ritual into the French churches. He was present at the Convention of Attigny in 765, and died about 772. He is commemorated Jan. 19. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 235; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 19–20.) [S. A. B.]

REMIGIUS (4) (REMEDIUS), twenty-third bishop of Strasburg, succeeded Etho in A.D. 778, and in that year dedicated a church in honour of the Blessed Virgin and St. Trophimus; he died A.D. 803, and his feast is April 13 (*Gall. Chr.* v. 784). The *Testamentum Remigii Episc. Argent.*, dated A.D. 778, is a very curious and interesting specimen of early legal conveyancing, based upon the principles of Roman procedure. It is given in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 1582 sq. [J. G.]

RENATUS (1), a monk and layman, of Caesarea in Mauritania, the bearer of a letter to Augustine from Optatus bishop of Mileum, which he delivered to him at Caesarea, A.D. 418. [OPTATUS (9).] A young man, named Vincentius Victor, having met with some remarks by Augustine on the nature of the soul, which displeased him, wrote against them a work in two books, which he addressed to Peter, a Spanish presbyter Renatus having seen this, sent it to Augustine from Caesarea, and Augustine at his earnest request wrote his work on the soul and its origin, of which he addressed the first book to Renatus, A.D. 419 (Aug. *Retract.* ii. 56, *de Anima et orig. ejus* ii. 1, *Ep.* 190). [H. W. P.]

RENATUS (2), a presbyter of the church of Rome, under the title of St. Clement, who was deputed by pope Leo, together with Julius of Puteoli, and Hilarius the deacon (afterwards Leo's successor) to represent him at the synod of Ephesus (subsequently called the "robbers' synod") in 449. (Leon. Magn. *Ep.* 29 [24].) Renatus died on his voyage out during a temporary halt at Delos. (Labbe, iv. 1079.) It is rather surprising to find a letter addressed to Renatus by Theodoret, after his deposition at that synod, begging him to use his influence with Leo to have the contending parties summoned to the apostolical see to receive judgment on the controverted points, and claiming for himself to be judged by his writings alone. (Theod. *Ep.* 113.) We must suppose either that the superscription of the letter is mistaken, and that it was really addressed to Hilarius; or that Theodoret had received insufficient information with regard to the circumstances of that scandalous assembly, which from the first was a scene of violence and confusion. This is the view taken by Tillemont, in opposition to Quesnel, who discredits the fact of Renatus's death (tom. xv. p. 901, note 21). [E. V.]

RENOVATUS, bishop of Merida, is known only by the *De Vita Patrum Emeritensium*, ch. 2, 21, ascribed to Paulus Diaconus (in *Esp. Sag.* xiii.) A tall and handsome Goth of noble birth, he became abbat of the monastery

of Cauliana, eight miles from Merida on the Guadiana. A curious story is told in ch. 2 (which is of doubtful authenticity, *vid.* Gams, *Kirchg. von Sp.* ii. 2. 117), of his treatment of a gluttonous and thievish monk. He afterwards presided for many years over the church of Merida. Florez places his episcopate between A.D. 616 and A.D. 632. Paulus praises him highly for his learning and virtues. (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 208.) [F. D.]

REOLUS (REGULUS, RIEUL), twenty-sixth bishop of Rheims. He had aided Nivardus in the administration of the see, and c. 672 became his successor. He was a great builder of monasteries within his diocese, and consolidator of church property; his chief foundation was the Monasterium Orbacense on ground given by Theodoric, A.D. 680. He died, A.D. 698, after a rule of twenty-six years. Before his consecration he had married a daughter of Childeric III., king of France. His feast is Sept. 3. (Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. c. 10, Duchesne, *Hist. Franc. Script.* F. v. 788; Fredegarius Schol. *Chron.* ii. A.D. 680, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t lxxi. 669, giving an incident in his persecution by EBROINUS.) He subscribed at the council held at Rouen c. A.D. 682. (*Gall. Chr.* ix. 22.) [J. G.]

REPARATUS (1), bishop of Carthage, succeeded Bonifacius, probably in A.D. 533; but if there be any truth in the story of a movement made during his episcopate and the pontificate of Boniface II., to subject the Carthaginian church to the Roman see (Binius, *Conc.* ii. pt. i. 643, 644; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxv. 32, 43; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 115), he must have been bishop earlier, since the pope died in A.D. 532: the authorities however are very doubtful. In A.D. 533 he held a council of 227 bishops at Carthage, for the purpose of restoring the discipline that had been destroyed by Vandal persecutions, and of arranging on what footing the Arian bishops when converted were to be received. The general feeling was against acknowledging their episcopal status, but an encyclical letter (Binius, *Conc.* ii. pt. i. 664) was drawn up to be presented to Joannes II. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxvi. 25, *Ep. Afr. Episc.*) for his advice. The letter, which was entrusted to Liberatus, the deacon, did not leave Carthage till word had arrived of that pope's death, and of the election of Agapetus in June, A.D. 535, when Reparatus added a letter of congratulation to the new pope. Agapetus sent at once a reply (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxvi. 43, ep. 2) to the questions referred to him by the council, and a special letter (*Ib.* lxvi. 45, Ep. 3; Binius, *ib.* 666, 667) to Reparatus, restoring to him the whole of his metropolitan rights (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 115, 119). In the Origenistic controversy that followed, Reparatus kept steadily in favour of *The Three Chapters*, and held a council at Carthage in A.D. 550 to excommunicate pope Vigilius for condemning them (Walch. *Ketz.* viii. 185; Fleury, *H. E.* xxiii. 32). In the year preceding the fifth oecumenical council, he was invited to Constantinople by the emperor and strongly urged by favour and threats to accept the imperial edict, and condemn *The Three Chapters*, but, remaining unmoved, he was condemned on a false charge, deprived of his property, and banished, Primasius being appointed in his place (Victor Tun. *Chron.* A.D. 552 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxviii. 959; Fleury, *H. E.* xxxiii. 43, 54; Gieseler, *H. E.* ii. c. ii.; Robertson, *E. H.* b. ii. c. 12). [J. G.]

REPARATUS (2), vir spectabilis in the time of the Gothic kingdom. (Greg. *Dial.* iv. 31.) [F. D.]

REPOSTUS (1). Cyp. *Ep.* 59, xiii. A lapsed bishop of African see uncertain, but probably Tuburnuc, Tuburnica, a small municipium, with hot wells, in the proconsular province. No trace remains of any place answering to Hartel's reading, Sutunurcensis, or the various readings, Suturnucensis, Quoturnicensis, Sutun-Urcensis, Utunarcensis. In Numidia there was a Θουβούρνικα κολωνία (Ptol.), an *oppidum civium Romanorum* (Plin.), ap. Mommsen, *Inscr. Latt.* viii. I., p. 121; Lagnat. *Explor. en Tunisie*, fasc. ii. p. 96, seems to have identified the Numidian Tuburnuc with Sidi-el-Kassen; Mommsen assigns to this latter the bishops Tuburnicenses of A.D. 411 and 646. Morcelli gives these to the former, and one would naturally place Cyprian's lapsed Repostus nearer to him. He carried the chief part of his flock back with himself into paganism, and he took part in the pseudo-consecration of FORTUNATUS. See PRIVATUS. [E. W. B.]

REPOSTUS (2). Cyp. *Ep.* 42 (see AUGENDUS?); perhaps not likely to be the same person as (1) excommunicated with FELICISSIMUS by CALDONIUS, *Ep.* 42, and there described as *de extorribus*, which, taken in conjunction with *Irene Rutilorum*, may seem to mean that he had been banished for Christianity, or else that he was a foreigner in refuge at Carthage. Cf. *si qui de peregrinis episcopi*, *Ep.* 32. [E. W. B.]

RESTITUTUS (1), bishop of London at the council of Arles in 314. [EBORIUS (1).] (Godwin, *De Praesulibus*, 1743, p. 170; Stubbs, *Reg. Sac.* 152.) [C. H.]

RESTITUTUS (2), bishop of Carthage, and president of the council of Ariminum, A.D. 359; his name at least appears at the head of its acta. He was one of the deputation sent to the emperor by the orthodox section of the Council. He betrayed the cause, however, under court influence and received back Ursacius, Valens, and Germinius to church communion, from which he had excluded them. (Hilar. *Frag.* viii. 1346; Hefele's *Councils*, Clark's ed. t. ii. pp. 251–258; Ceill. iv. 555; Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. Wissen. Theolog.* 1884, p. 243.) [G. T. S.]

RESTITUTUS (3), a Donatist, ordained by Primian to the see of Membresa in the place of Salvius, one of the ordainers of Maximian [MAXIMIANUS (2), Vol. III. p. 869]. The council of Bagai, which condemned the Maximianists, A.D. 394, allowed a delay of eight months to be given to the bishops of the party, as an opportunity for them to submit to the decree and avoid expulsion; but, according to St. Augustine, Restitutus was appointed before the expiration of the time allowed (Aug. *Ep.* 108, 14; *c. Creso.* iii. 60; 62). He endeavoured to dispossess Salvius of the see, and when he resisted this intrusion, brought the case before the pro-

consul Herodes, A.D. 395, in which suit his cause was pleaded by Nummasius (HERODES (2), Vol. III. 5 (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iv. 5. 82; *Ep.* 108. 13). Salvius, however, appears to have maintained his ground, and when a further attempt was made to intrude into buildings belonging to him as bishop, the matter was brought before a subsequent pro-consul, Seranus (A.D. 398), who, on the ground of the decree of the council of Bagai, decided against Salvius. The treatment with which Salvius met in consequence of this belongs to his own history. [SALVIUS (3).] Restitutus appears to have retained possession of the see as Donatist bishop, and to have been present at the conference, A.D. 411 (Carth. *Coll.* i. 133). His case is used by St. Augustine in his argument against the Donatists, to shew their inconsistency in complaining of persecution, of which, as in his case, they were flagrantly guilty towards the Maximianists (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iv. 58; 82; Ribbek, *Aug. und Don.* p. 227). [H. W. P.]

RESTITUTUS (4), a Donatist presbyter of Victoriana, a place in Numidia, about thirty miles from Hippo Regius (Aug. *C. D.* xxii. 8. 7), who, having become convinced of the errors of his party, and returned to the Catholic church, was attacked by some clerical persons and Circumcellions belonging to the sect, and having been treated with extreme violence and indignity for eleven days, with difficulty obtained his release. Augustine complained of this outrage to Proculeianus, Donatist bishop of Hippo, but with little success (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 53; *Ep.* 88, 6; 105, 2, 3). [H. W. P.]

RESTITUTUS (5), an African bishop, sent together with Florentius also a bishop, perhaps of Hippo Diarrhytus, by the council of Carthage, A.D. 408, to represent to the emperor the excesses committed in Africa by Donatists and pagans (Aug. *Ep.* 97 to Olympius; Bruns, *Conc.* i. 188, Can. 106); Tillemont, vol. xiii. 175; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 180; iii. 38). [H. W. P.]

RESTITUTUS (6), bishop of Tagona, probably the same as Thagura in Numidia (El-Matnainia), one of the four keepers of the documents on the catholic side at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411 (Carth. *Coll.* i. 143; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 301). [H. W. P.]

RESTITUTUS (7), a presbyter of Calama, mentioned by Augustine as having the power at pleasure to remain in a state of apparent insensibility (catalepsy), yet able, as he said afterwards, to hear the voices of those who spoke loudly, as if they came from a distance. He gives the case as an instance of the variety existing in human constitutions as the work of the Creator (Aug. *Civ. D.* xiv. 24, 2). [H. W. P.]

RESTITUTUS (8), a catholic presbyter, as it seems, of Hippo Regius, murdered by the Donatists, an outrage of which Augustine complained to Marcellinus the tribune, A.D. 412, and also to Apringius the pro-consul (*Ep.* 133, i.; 134, 2). [H. W. P.]

RESTITUTUS (9), a deacon, to whom Augustine wrote, recommending him to read, but with caution, the works of Tychonius, and to exercise forbearance and patience in respect of evil existing in the church, which we lament and condemn, but are unable to remove (Aug. *Ep.* 249). [H. W. P.]

RETHUN (RAETHUN, REATHUN, HRETHUN), bishop. The *Chronicle of Abingdon* (i. 15, ed. Stevenson) mentions him as a Mercian bishop, who, smarting under contumelious treatment, retired to the monastery of Abingdon, where he became abbat. It further relates (p. 21) a journey he took to Rome, and his dealings with Kenulf king of Mercia. Haddan and Stubbs (iii. 579) are of opinion that these statements are for the most part legendary and false; that he can be traced by the charters as abbat of Abingdon as late as 814, and as a bishop from 816 to 839. The *Registrum Sacrum* (10,162) gives him as Hrethun bishop of Leicester 816, subscribing as bishop down to 839. The *Monast. Anglic.* (i. 505) makes him succeed Conan abbat of Abingdon in 784, and assigns him the see of Dorchester 814–835. In the charters of Kenulf we trace him within our period as follows:—799, bishop (Kemble, *C. D.* 177 spurious); 811, abbat of Abingdon (*C. D.* 208 spurious); 814, presbyter and abbat (*C. D.* 201, 207); 816, bishop (*C. D.* 209). [C. H.]

RETICIUS, ST. (RETICIUS, RHOETICIUS), bishop of Autun, in the early part of the 4th century. An account is given of him, but more from a legendary than a historical point of view, by Gregory of Tours, who says that he was born of noble parents, and that he became distinguished when a boy as a scholar. He married young, but lived with his wife in a state of voluntary continence. When she died, she begged that she might be buried in the same grave with him. After this he became bishop of Autun by the choice of the people, and was greatly endeared to them by his piety and kindness. When, after his death, his body was placed on the bier, the bearers found themselves unable to move it, until an old man present rehearsed to the company the wish of his deceased wife. When they reached the grave a voice was heard from the corpse addressing his wife, and reminding her of the agreement between them. He was buried in or near the cemetery of the town, and in the neighbouring parish church of St. Peter of the Stirrup, a tomb may be seen beneath a small arch in the wall with the inscription of modern date.

S. tus Rheticius Ep. s. Aeduensis, cccxiv.

(Greg. Turon. *de Gloria Conf.* 75, and note, ed. Migne). He is called a saint by Gregory of Tours and others, and in the Breviary of the church of Autun his memory as a saint is appointed to be observed on July 19, but no mention of him is found in the *Roman Martyrology*. He died probably about A.D. 334. Besides some particulars of doubtful authority related by the Bollandists, we know that he was one of the three Gallic bishops who met at Rome, A.D. 313, to discuss the case of Caecilianus (MATERNUS (2), Vol. III. 362), and that he also attended the council of Arles in the following year (Optatus, i. 23; Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iv. p. 94; *Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 201, ed. Oberthür). He is spoken of by St. Augustine as a man of great authority in the church, especially in Gaul, and his opinion on the subject of baptism

is quoted by him in his treatises against Julian (Aug. *c. Jul.* i. 7; *Opus imperf. c. Jul.* i. 55). St. Jerome, speaking of him as a man highly esteemed in Gaul in the time of Constantine, says that he wrote a commentary on the Song of Songs, and a large volume against Novatianus (Hieron. *de Vir. Ill.* 82). In a letter to Florentius, written probably A.D. 374, he hopes earnestly that Ruffinus will be able to lend him the commentaries of Rheticius, in which, says Jerome, he has discoursed on the Song of Songs in noble style. But ten years later, writing to Marcella, he declines to lend her this treatise, which he describes as written in a lofty Gallic style (Gallicano cothurno fluens), but so full of blunders from the writer's ignorance of Hebrew, as to be worthless as a commentary. It is probable that the difference in tone at the two periods is due to his own progress in the Hebrew language (id. *Ep.* v. *ad Florentium*, xxxvii. *ad Marcellam;* Gams, *Ser. Episc.* p. 499; Tillemont, vol. vi. 12; Ceillier, iii. c. 4; Baronius, vol. iii. 337. 47). [H. W. P.]

RHAIS (HERAIS), Sep. 5, virgin and martyr at Alexandria in the persecution of Diocletian under Culcianus, at first president of the Thebaid and then Praefectus Augustalis at Alexandria. On the career of Culcianus cf. Georgii *SS. Coluthi et Panesnui Miracula*, p. 233 seq. (*AA. SS.* Boll. *Sep.* ii. 525). [G. T. S.]

RHEGINUS, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, and Metropolitan, who attended the council of Ephesus, 431, and at the seventh session successfully defended the independence of the island from the claims of the see of Antioch (Labbe, iii. 787, 801; Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, iii. 71, Clark's transl.). He also delivered a short discourse, "de fide," characterized by exaggerated condemnation of Nestorian doctrine (Labbe, iii. 577). He signed the deposition of Nestorius (*ibid.* 536) and the condemnation of his teaching (*ibid.* 690) (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1046). [E. V.]

RHETORIUS, RHETORIANI; according to Philaster (*Haer.* 91) an Egyptian who praised all heresies, asserting that all walked rightly and that none were in error. Augustine, who copies this account (*Haer.* 72), cannot believe that anyone could have held so absurd an opinion. Fabricius makes the plausible suggestion that Rhetorius is not a proper name, and that the person intended may be the "rhetor" Themistius, who held that variety of opinion on religious questions was not offensive, but rather pleasing to the Deity (*Orat.* 12 ad Valent., 5, ad Jovinian.). [G. S.]

RHODANIUS, fourth bishop of Toulouse, between St. Hilarius and St. Silvius, about the middle of the 4th century. Influenced by Hilary of Poitiers' strong character, he stood by him at the council of Béziers, where the Arians triumphed, shared his condemnation, and was driven into exile, where he died, probably about 358 (Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* ii. 39, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 151; *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 4.) [S. A. B.]

RHODO (1), a Christian writer of the end of the second century, our knowledge of whom now exclusively depends on the account of his writings, and some extracts from them, given by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 13). He was a native of Asia, but was converted to Christianity at Rome by Tatian, as he himself tells in a treatise against Marcion addressed to Callistion. In this work he tells of the sects into which the Marcionites split up after the death of their founder (see Vol. III. p. 819); and he gives an interesting account of an oral controversy held by him with the Marcionite Apelles, then an old man (see Vol. I. p. 127). In the same work, Rhodo mentions a book of "Problems" published by Tatian intended to exhibit the obscurity of the Holy Scriptures, and he promises to write a reply giving the solutions of these problems; but Eusebius does not seem to have met with this work. Rhodo also wrote a treatise on the Hexaemeron. It seems to be only through a lapse of memory that Jerome (*De Vir. Illust.*) speaks of Rhodo as the author of the anonymous treatise against the Montanists from which Eusebius makes extracts (*H. E.* v. 16). [G. S.]

RHODO (2), one of the seven emissaries sent by Peter of Alexandria to watch for a favourable opportunity for carrying out the plot for the consecration of Maximus [MAXIMUS (11)]. Whether he and his companions were bishops or not is not certain. Gregory's language is wavering. That they were so is however rendered probable by his words: κατάσκοποι οὐκ ἐπίσκοποι (Greg. Naz. *Carm.* lib. ii. sec. i. ver. 838, in *Pat. Gr.* xxxvii. 1087; Tillem. ix. 447, 713, 714). [E. V.]

RHODO (3), an Asiatic bishop who took refuge at Mitylene, being driven from his see by the enemies of Chrysostom. (Pallad. p. 195.) [E. V.]

RHYDDERCH HAEL (RHYDDERICH, RYDERCHEN, REDERECH, REDERCH, RODARCHUS, RODERCUS, RODERICK), king of Cumbria in Strathclyde. He was son of Tudwal Tudglud, descended from Macsen Wledig, but seems on the mother's side to have been of Irish descent. In the Welsh Triads (*Myv. Arch.* ii.) he is praised for his generosity, which has obtained for him the surname *Hael*, or the magnificent, and he was in close communication and friendship with the two chief saints of that age, St. Kentigern of Strathclyde, and St. Columba of Dalriadic Scotia: the former he recalled from exile in Wales, and from the latter in reply to his message he received the assurance of a peaceful death on his own pillow. He was baptized in Ireland, but it is not evident whether he was driven thither as an exile from his kingdom by a usurper Morken, or was in Ireland previously to being regulus in Cumbria. If both he and St. Kentigern had to flee before the same tyrant, the motive would be clear for his afterwards seeking the saint's restitution. On Morken's death Rhydderch became sole king of Cumbria, and had his residence at Alcluyd, now Dumbarton, on the Clyde; he consolidated the Christian agencies in his kingdom, and fought the last great battle between Christianity and paganism. This took place in the year 573 at Arderydd, now Arthuret, on the Esk, five miles north of Carlisle (Skene, *Chron.* xciii.) when Rhydderch

defeated Gwendolin ap Ceidau, who was aided by the British Maelgwn and the Dalriadic king Aidan, the latter, though a friend of St. Columba's, being probably afraid of a powerful neighbour in Strathclyde. (On this battle, see Bp. Forbes, *SS. Nin. & Kent*, 360 sq.; *Notes and Queries*, 2 ser. viii. 71–2.) He ruled for twenty-eight years, and died in peace A.D. 601. The Welsh legends place his grave at Abererch, Carnarvonshire, but Reeves (*S. Adamn.* 44) thinks it more likely to have been in the neighbourhood of Glasgow. (Skene, *Chron.* xciii. sq. 12, 15, and *Celt. Scot.* ii. 190 sq.; Grub, *E. H. Scot.* i. 37–9.) [J. G.]

RHYSTUD ap Hywel, Welsh saint of the 6th century, and patron of Llanrhystud, Cardiganshire. His feast was on the Tuesday before Christmas. If he was bishop at Caerleon on Usk, it must have been as monastic bishop or as suffragan of Menevia or Llandaff. (*Myv. Arch.* 51; Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 598.) [J. G.]

RIAGHAIL (RIAGAIL, REGULUS), abbat of Muicinis on Lough Derg in the Shannon, commemorated on Oct. 16 (*M. Doneg.*). He was contemporary with St. Columba in the 6th century, and is supposed to have been the original of St. REGULUS of St. Andrews in Scotland. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 337, c. 7.) [J. G.]

RICBODUS (RICHBODUS, RIGBODUS), Archbishop of Trèves, and called MACARIUS by Alcuin. He was monk at Milan, and promoted to the see of Trèves A.D. 791. He stood in the relation of pupil and friend to Alcuin with whom he corresponded (Albinus, *Opp.* pt. i. Epp. 169–172 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. c. 440 sq.), but Alcuin reproaches him for remissness in writing, and rather much fondness for Virgil. When, however, Felix, bishop of Urgel [FELIX (176)] began to develope his heresy, Alcuin recommended Ricbodus to Charlemagne (Migne, t. c. 276) as one of the three scholars fit, along with Alcuin himself, to meet the false teaching. But if Ricbod wrote, his treatise is lost. He died A.D. 804, and his feast is Oct. 1 (*Gesta Trev.* 25; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 18, 329–30, 432; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xii. 161, 200–1). [J. G.]

RICHARIUS, ST., the founder and first abbat of the Benedictine monastery of Centule (which, with its adjoining town, afterwards took his name, Saint Riquier), lived in the first half of the 7th century. We possess a biography of him written by Alcuin, early in the 9th century, at the request of the abbat Angilbertus and Charles the Great, who visited the monastery. The preface shews that it is based on an earlier, but meagre record, which, with a narrative of his miracles also referred to, has been lost. According to Alcuin, he was born at Centule, in Picardy, and passed his early years there in rustic occupations. The turning-point of his life was the advent of two Irish priests, Caidocus and Frichorius (the apostles of the Morini, see CAIDOCUS, FRICOREUS), who on their way through the village being insulted and maltreated by the people, were received by Richarius into his house and kindly entreated. Touched by their exhortations, he became a Christian. In time he entered the priesthood and devoted himself to preaching, the relief of the poor and sick, and the redemption of captives. Afterwards desiring a wider sphere he crossed over to Great Britain, as a missionary, and continued his labours there for a time. On his return to Centule he founded his monastery. His fame spread widely, and he was visited by king Dagobert (628–638), who granted him a small estate (according to the *Chronicon Centulense*, cap. xvii. in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* clxxiv. 1230, a spot called Campania, comprising three villae), 'ad luminaria domus.' His own ambition, however, was for the solitary and ascetic life, and so entrusting the young community to its second abbat (Ocioaldus), he soon withdrew with one companion, his disciple Sigobardus, to the forest of Crisciacum (Crécy), about ten miles from Centule. Here he took up his abode in a little hut, and courting all privations, earned a widely extended reputation for sanctity, so that the sick flocked to him to be healed. When he died (April 26), his disciple buried him by his desire on the spot where he had lived, but before long the abbat and monks of Centule came and took away the body to their monastery, where it became renowned for its miraculous powers. This life was first published by Surius, then more correctly by Mabillon. It may also be found among other places in Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. iii. 442–7, and among the collected works of Alcuin in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* ci. 681–94 (see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 319, for the editions). In the *Acta SS.* it is followed by a book of posthumous miracles written by a monk of Centule (pp. 447–56), a history of the relics in later times (pp. 457–9) and a versified rendering of the last extracted from the work of Angelrannus or Ingelramnus, abbat of Centule, at the beginning of the eleventh century. The *Chronicon Centulense*, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* clxxiv. 1215 sqq. amplifies to some extent Alcuin's story. The metrical version of it by Angelrannus, from which the Bollandists give an excerpt, is to be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxli. 1423 sqq.

The little cell in the forest of Crécy developed into another and separate monastery known as Foresti-Monasterium (Forest-moûtier). For its history, see *Gall. Christ.* x. 1307 sqq.; and for that of Centule, or Saint-Riquier, *ibid.* 1241, sqq. Besides April 26, the supposed day of his death, October 9 and June 3 commemorate translations of his relics (Boll. *ibid.* p. 442).

The exact dates of Richarius' history are a matter of controversy, but he probably died about 645.

Baronius (*Annal.* 640, xii.) identifies him with a Sicharius, who was sent by Dagobert on an embassy to the Slavi, but erroneously, as is shewn by Pagi (640, ix.). [S. A. B.]

RICHBERTUS (RIGEBERTUS), thirty-ninth bishop of Mayence c. A.D. 712. (*Gall. Chr.* v. 437.) [J. G.]

RICIMER, patrician, the most powerful man in the western empire for the sixteen years that preceded his death in August, A.D. 472. For his history see DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY. Like the rest of the barbarians he was an Arian, and erected and decorated with mosaics for his Arian countrymen the church now known as S. Agata de' Goti on the south-eastern part of the Quirinal. These mosaics were extant in the time of Baronius, who gives Ricimer's inscription (*Ann.* viii. 313). [F. D.]

RICTRUDIS (1) (ROTRUDIS), abbess of Marchiennes, known to us through a Life written by Hucbald, monk of Elno, c. A.D. 907 (Hucbaldus, *Opp.* t. i. in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxxxii. 827 sq.; Mabillon, *AA. SS. Ben.* ii. 937 sq.; Boll. *AA. SS.* Mai. iii. 81 sq.). Born of noble parents, named Ernoldus and Lichia, in the south of France, c. A.D. 614, Rictrudis was early brought under the influence of St. Amand, but her marriage with the Frankish noble St. Adalbald directed her work to Flanders, where she had four children, all numbered among the saints (SS. Maurontus, Clotsendis, Adalsendis and Eusebia). When her husband was murdered, she devoted herself the more sedulously to the duties of religion under the advice of St. Amand, and at last took the veil. Her chief foundation was at Marchiennes, in the diocese of Arras, c. A.D. 647, and herself ruled over a monastery for women forty years. Her daughter Adalsendis soon died, and her son and remaining daughters gave themselves over to the conventual life. She died c. A.D. 687, and was buried in her own monastery, which became famous in the Middle Ages. But in A.D. 1024 it became a monastery for monks (Boll. *A. SS.* Mai. iii. 80). Her feast is 12 May (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, xv. 89 sq.; Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 632, c. 2). [J. G.]

RICTRUDIS (2) (RECTRUDA, RICHTRUDA), daughter of Charlemagne, and, with her sister Gisla [GISLA], was pupil of Alcuin, who has dedicated to Rictrudis the first five books of his *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, and the other two to Gisla (Alcuin, *Comment. in Joan.* Epist. Praeviae; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. c. 637 sqq.). [J. G.]

RICULA, sister of Ethelbert, king of Kent, and wife of Sledda, king of the East Saxons, by whom she was mother of Sebert, the first Christian king of that nation. We have no data either of the time or circumstance that throw any light on her character or history, nor are we told whether or not she was a Christian. (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 3; and the pedigrees in *M. H. B.* 629.) [S.]

RICULFUS (RICHULFUS), third archbishop of Mainz, between St. Lullus and Atulphus or Haistulphus (A.D. 787–813), was one of the higher clergy who surrounded the throne of Charles the Great, whose chaplain he had been before his consecration at Fritzlar on March 4, 787. (*Annal. Wirziburg.*, Pertz, *Script.* ii. 240.) His chief work was the building of the church and monastery of St. Albanus, one of the fugitives from Africa in the time of Hunneric, who had suffered martyrdom at Mainz. It was consecrated in 805 (*Annal. Wirziburg.* ibid.). He was accused of ostentatious magnificence in his office, in particular of having caused to be carried before him a pastoral staff of gold, which brought down upon him a rebuke from Charles (cf. the curious stories in Monach. Sangall. *Gesta Kar.* i. 16, 17, Pertz, *Script.* ii. 737, 738). According to Hincmar of Rheims, it was he who introduced the False Decretals from Spain to Germany (*Opusc. et Epist.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxvi. 379), but this statement is probably not correct. In 809 and 811 he was at Fulda, mediating between the monks and their abbat Ratgar. In the latter year, among other prelates, he attested the will of Charles the Great (Pertz, *Script.* ii. 463), and two years later, with Hildebald of Cologne, he presided at the council of Mainz. To the same year relates the charge against him of burning the wooden bridge at Mainz, which had cost Charles ten years to build, because it was the haunt of robbers, who threw the bodies of their victims into the river (*Mar. Scot. Chron.*, Pertz, *Script.* v. 549). He died Aug. 9, 813 (Pertz, *Script.* i. 63, 121). Though we have no writing of his, several letters addressed to him survive, one from pope Leo III. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cii. 1030), and several from Alcuin, who corresponded with him under the name of Damoetas (*Epist.* xlv., cxxii., *Patr. Lat.* c. 211, 356). If he was the recipient of the 123rd letter (*ibid.* 357) he must have been one of the delegates who escorted Leo III. back to Rome in 799. For his life see *Gall. Christ.* v. 443, and Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 578. [S. A. B.]

RIGOBERTUS, twenty-seventh bishop of Rheims, was closely related to Reolus and succeeded him at the close of the eighth century: his father's name was Constantinus. From the account given by Flodoard (*Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. cc. 11–15), which is our primary authority, we learn that he was the great organiser in his diocese, and put the monks under better discipline. "Canonicam clericis religionem restituit ac sufficientia victualia constituit, et prædia quaedam illis contulit, necnon aerarium commune usibus eorum instituit" (*Ib.* ii. c. 11). He methodically took an account of all the temporalities and privileges of the see, and had the titles preserved in the archives of the church of Rheims. As he was probably afraid even of a deliverer, he refused to open the gates of Rheims to Charles Martel when driving out the Saracens; and when the city was taken he fled to Gascony, c. A.D. 721, while one Milo was intruded into the see. He was afterwards allowed to return to France and visit Rheims, but was not restored to his office. If he returned on the death of Charles Martel, this occurred A.D. 741, but it is believed to have been much earlier, as he probably died c. A.D. 732, and was buried in the town where he used to live, but in the middle of the ninth century Hincmar had his remains translated into the church of St. Dionysius in Rheims. His feast is 4 January. His dates are all doubtful, some putting his death as late as A.D. 773, and his other dates to correspond to this. (*Acta* are in Surius *Vit. SS.* i. 60 sq.; Mabillon, *A. SS. Ben.* iii. i. 496 sq.; Boll. *A. SS.* Jan. 174 sq. See also *Gall. Christ.* ix. 24; Fleury, *H. E.* xli. c. 29; Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 717, cc. 6 sq.; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 475.) [J. G.]

RINGAN, bishop of Whithern. [NINIAN.]

RIOCATUS (RIOCHATUS), Breton bishop, who had been sent by Faustus of Riez to Clermont, with presents to Sidonius Apollinaris, the bishop; he had left his Breton see in consequence of the incursions of the heathen. Sidonius calls him, in his letter to Faustus (*Ep.* ix., Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lviii. 625), a double stranger in the world, from his monastic vow and by

his enforced banishment. But his chief interest lies in his having, in a roundabout way described by Sidonius, given to Sidonius the means of reading Faustus' works; in his letter Sidonius reproaches Faustus for keeping his writings a secret from him (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 395).

[J. G.]

RIPARIUS, a learned presbyter of Aquitaine, in the beginning of the 5th century, and friend of Desiderius (q.v.), known to us from his connexion with the controversies caused by Vigilantius and Pelagius. Vigilantius, after a stay in Palestine, where he had been received by Jerome, returned to his old diocese, in which Riparius lived, and commenced spreading his opinions, which condemned various superstitious practices, especially the adoration of relics. Riparius, finding that his bishop to some extent countenanced Vigilantius, wrote to Jerome, who replied in a short letter which is extreme both in its contempt of Vigilantius and in its advocacy of the practices impugned. This was in 404. Jerome having asked for the work of Vigilantius, Riparius sent it him by the Deacon Sisinnius, and thus called forth the treatise of Jerome, *Adv. Vigilantium*, in 406.

At a later time (417) Riparius again solicited the help of Jerome in combating the views of Pelagius. Jerome replied in a short letter of encouragement, exhorting him to stand fast, and telling him how the partisans of Pelagius had attacked the monasteries at Bethlehem, but had since been almost driven away from Palestine. Jerome speaks of Riparius as a well-known defender of the faith, and addresses him as "domine verè sancte et suscipiende frater. (DESIDERIUS, HIERONYMUS, VIGILANTIUS, SISINNIUS; Jerome, *Epp.* 109, 138; Id. *Adv. Vigil.* 3.)

[W. H. F.]

RIQUIER, ST. [RICHARIUS.]

RODANUS, count, bearer of a letter from Leo the Great to JULIANUS (27) of Cos, dated the 25th of June, A.D. 453 (Leo, *Epp.* 125, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 1069). In it reference is made to other letters sent by another person of the same name, entitled *subadjuva*, a title signifying that he was one of the assistants of an *adjutor*. For these offices see the Commentary of Panciroli on the *Notitia Imperii*, chaps. 12 and 16. The former Rodanus may be the same as the "Rodanus vir honorabilis," bearer of a letter, dated May 21, A.D. 449, to Flavian (Leo, *Epp.* 27, in *Patr. Lat.* liv. 751). [F. D.]

RODERICUS, last Gothic king of Spain, is one of those persons whose prominence in legend contrasts strongly with the meagreness of our authentic information about them. He had long been governor of part of Southern Spain, and on the death of Wittiza seized the throne at the instigation of the Gothic magnates. ("Tumultuose regnum hortante Senatu invadit," Isid. Pac. "Furtim magis quam virtute invadit regnum," continuer of J. Biclarensis.) The evidence is against the story of a previous insurrection in which Wittiza perished, which is first found in Rodericus of Toledo, and is there mixed up with the legendary outrage against Roderic's alleged father Theodifred, said to have been a son of Reccesvinth or Kindasvinth. Against this late authority, there is the silence of all earlier writers, Sebastian of Salamanca's statement that Wittiza died a natural death, and the fact that his brothers and sons commanded in Roderic's army.

There are indications that Roderic's short reign was troubled with civil war. The Arab narrative, translated by Dozy (*Recherches*, i. 43), represents him as besieging Pampeluna, when he received the news of Tarik's landing; coins exist of the same type as those of Wittiza, struck by a certain king Achila, whose name is not found in any document, at Narbonne and Tarragona, from which places no coins of Roderic are known (Heiss, *Monnaies des Rois Wisigothes*, 141); finally Lucas of Tuy's story that Roderic, by Julian's advice, sent arms and horses to Gaul, seems a confused reminiscence of some disturbance in the North-East. All these indications suggest that, as in WAMBA'S case, Septimania and North-East Spain did not acquiesce in the election at Toledo, but set up a king of their own.

We need only allude to the famous story of Roderic's seduction of Florinda or La Cava, and the vengeance of her father Julian. The first Spanish chronicle that contains it, or, in its present form, mentions Julian, is that of the monk of Silo (c. A.D. 1100), but it occurs in early Arab sources, and is considered by Dozy (*Rech.* i. 41; *Histoire*, ii. 31) to be true. To us the examination of the chronology given below seems to disprove it. In any case Julian was a real personage. He is mentioned in the earliest Arabian chronicles (Dozy, *Rech.* i. 58), and Dozy, by a brilliant emendation ("*Juliani*, Africanae regionis sub dogmate Catholicae fidei *exarchi*" for *Urbani* and *exorti*) restores him to the text of Isidorus Pacensis, who relates that a noble Christian of that name had accompanied Mousa through all the provinces of Spain, and to the caliph's court. No other author mentions such an Urban, who must have been a prominent person, and the corruption of *Urbani* for *Juliani* is an easy one. Thus Julian would have been the governor of the scrap of territory about Ceuta still held by the Byzantines. This tallies exactly with the best Mohammedan writers of Spain (Gayangos, i. 538), who narrate that when Okba invaded Western Africa, the governor of Ceuta, whose name was Ilyán, the same who afterwards led Tarik into Spain, came out to meet him with presents and asked for and obtained peace. He is called Ilyán, which, according to Gayangos, is the equivalent not of Julian but of Aelian. At the instigation, or, at any rate, with the assistance of Julian, Mousa, the caliph's lieutenant in Africa, in July, 710, sent over a reconnoitring detachment of 400 foot and 100 horse under Tarif. He landed at the point called Tarifa after him, ravaged the country and returned laden with booty. Mousa determined to repeat the expedition, and the next summer despatched 7000 men under Tarik, occupied Gibraltar (April 30, 711) (Gayangos, i. 522), and proceeded to plunder the country. Roderic marched against him with 100,000 men, on which Mousa sent a reinforcement of 5000. The armies met on the banks of the Wâdî-Becca (now the Salado), near the Lago de la Janda on July 19. The battle was decided by the treason of the brothers or sons of Wittiza, who com-

manded the two wings of Roderic's army, and who fled with their contingents at the commencement of the battle. [OPPAS.] The centre where Roderic commanded in person held its ground for some time, but at last was broken, and the whole Christian army was routed with great slaughter. Later accounts make the battle last eight days. Roderic probably perished in the rout, but his body was never found.

The chronology of the last two Gothic kings is extremely confused and uncertain. We begin by giving the statements of the four oldest authorities, reducing the years of the Spanish era to their equivalents in the Christian:

Continuer of J. Biclarensis c. A.D. 721.	Isidorus Pacensis c. A.D. 750.	Chron. Albeldense c. 880.	Sebastian of Salamanca c. 880.
687 Egica begins to reign	688 Egica begins to reign, and reigns 15 years	Egica reigns 15 years	Egica reigns 10 years alone and 5 with his son.
694 Associates Wittiza	698 Associates Wittiza	Wittiza 10 and Roderic 3	Wittiza reigns 10 years and dies in 710.
	700 Wittiza "decrepito jam patre pariter regnat"	So called Chronicle of Wulsa.	
702 Wittiza succeeds alone	701 ? Wittiza succeeds alone	Wittiza is anointed king, Nov. 14, 700.	
711 Roderic succeeds	711 Roderic succeeds and reigns one year		
	Wittiza reigns 15 years		

Egica having begun to reign Nov. 24, 687, completed his fourteenth year Nov. 24, 701. Having reigned ten years alone, late in 697 (Isidorus Pacensis, being a year too late, in the beginning of Egica's reign, gets the association also a year late) he associates Wittiza, who, his father becoming incapable from age or illness, is anointed king, Nov. 14, 700. Egica then dies, after Nov. 24, 701, in 701 or 702, in the fifteenth year of his reign. Wittiza then reigns ten years, counting from his coronation till early in 711, having reigned thirteen complete years plus parts of 697 and 711, making fifteen years in all. The importance of the result of the comparison is the establishment of the fact, that Roderic began to reign not earlier than the beginning of 711. Now the first expedition under Tarif took place in 710. The part therefore that Julian took in the invasion of Spain was not caused by a quarrel with Roderic; the foundation therefore of the La Cava legend fails. Again, the mysterious notice of THEODEMIR'S naval victories over the Greeks in the reigns of Egica and Wittiza may refer to some successes against Julian and his Byzantines, who had submitted and become tributary to Okba.

Authorities.—The continuation of the *Chronicle* of J. Biclarensis; Isidorus Pacensis; the *Chronicle* of Sebastian of Salamanca; *Chron. Albeldense*, in *Esp. Sag.* vi. 436, viii. 298, xiii. 478, 449; the Arabian writers in Gayangos' *History of the Mohammedan Dynasties*, vol. i., and in Dozy's *Recherches*, vol. i.; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (2) 184; Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen*, v. 227; Dozy, *Histoire des Musulmans en Espagne*, ii. 31. [F. D.]

RODING (ROUIN, CHRAUDINGUS), patron of Beaulieu, between Verdun and St. Menehould. He was an Irish Scot, who went from Ireland to the monastery of Taballium near Treves before A.D. 642, and set about erecting a monastery in the wood of Argonne. His work was interrupted by the proprietor of the district, but he afterwards received land and permission to build the monastery of Beaulieu, of which he was the first abbat. He died about A.D. 680, and his feast is Sept. 17. (Mabillon, *Ann.* A.D. 642, 680 and *Acta SS.* Sec. iv. pt. ii. App. pp. 513–7; Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. 17, v. 508–17.) [J. G.]

ROGATIANUS (1), an aged presbyter and confessor, addressed by Cyprian *Ep.* vi., along with Sergius and others, who are urged to imitate his courage. In *Ep.* 13 the same confessors are exhorted to consistency, with allusions to grievous irregularities, *Ep.* 7. He was entrusted with the distribution of Cyprian's bounty, and the general relief of distress and administration of discipline, *Ep.* 41, *Ep.* 42, along with CALDONIUS and the other delegates still associated with Numidicus during Cyprian's retirement; *Ep.* 43 commended for his activity in both functions, and his sound teaching and influence. [E. W. B.]

ROGATIANUS (2), Cyp. *Ep.* 3. A bishop who appeals against his contumacious deacon to the authority of Cyprian. [E. W. B.]

ROGATIANUS (3), possibly the same in Syn. Carth. 2 sub Cyp. *de pace maturius danda*, *Ep.* 57. [E. W. B.]

ROGATIANUS (4), possibly the same in Syn. Carth. 2 sub Cyp. *de Basilide et Martiali*, *Ep.* 67. [E. W. B.]

ROGATIANUS (5), two bishops of the name appear in Cyp. *Ep.* 70: the first being one of the Numidian bishops who unite to give their views on the baptism of heretics in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 2, *de Bap.* One of these two is doubtless identical with Rogatianus (4), as well as with the bishop of Nova (Noba, Oppidum Novum, hod. *Duperré*, a colony in Mauretania Caesariensis), whose sentence is sixtieth in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. *de Bap.* 3. [E. W. B.]

ROGATIANUS (6), Carthaginian deacon, sent A.D. 256 by Cyprian to FIRMILIAN, with a letter on the subject of re-baptism, as well as with former letters on the same subject, to Stephanus and to Jubaianus. He returned with Firmilian's reply before winter, but after September 1st. [E. W. B.]

ROGATIANUS (7), May 24, martyr with Donatianus, his brother, in the Diocletian persecution at Nantes. His acts contain genuine fragments. They dwell on the worship of Apollo, which was specially enforced in the Diocletian persecution, and the offer of imperial favour if the martyrs would recant, which Le Blant, *Actes des Martyrs*, p. 76, notes as a special mark of genuineness. Rogatianus died without baptism. The acts intimate that his martyrdom supplied its place (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 279). [G. T. S.]

ROGATIANUS (8), a Donatist bishop, but of what see does not appear, who was associated by his party with Cassian and Pontius in the petition to Julian, A.D. 363. (DONATISM, Vol. I. p. 884; Aug. *c. Petil.* ii. 224; *Ep.* 105, 9; Optatus, ii. 16.) A Donatist bishop of this name was present at the council of Cabarsussis, A.D. 394, but whether the same man as the above there is no evidence to show (Aug. *En. in Ps.* 36, 20). [H. W. P.]

ROGATUS (1), African bishop in Syn. Carth. 2 sub Cyp. A.D. 252, Cyp. *Ep.* 57. [E. W. B.]

ROGATUS (2), called by Augustine the Moor, Maurus, bishop of Cartenne (*Tenez*), a town near the sea-coast of Mauretania Caesariensis, not far from the mouth of the river Cartennus (*Habrah*), and called by Pliny Colonia Augusti (Plin. *H. N.* v. 2. 11. 20; Ant. *Itin.* 14, 2; Ptol. iv. 2. 4; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 15). Belonging to the Donatist party, for some reason not known, he seceded from it about A.D. 370, when Augustine was a young man. He was followed by a few congregations, in number never exceeding ten (brevissimum frustum de frusto majore praecisum), to whom the name of Rogatists was given. They are said by Augustine to have been less violent in their conduct than other Donatists, perhaps as Augustine hints, from the weakness of their own party, though Rogatus himself was a man of litigious temper. The secession however irritated the Donatists greatly, and they made use of the power of Firmus, of whose revolt the chief strength lay in that part of Africa, to harass the Rogatists, who retaliated by calling their persecutors partisans of Firmus (Firmenses). Rogatus and his party appear to have made common cause with the Maximianists, and at some time in 395 or 396, on the death of Praetextatus, he was made bishop of Assuris, and was succeeded in the see of Cartenna by Vincentius Victor. At a later time he returned to the Catholic church, but by so doing incurred the hatred of the Donatists, and was attacked and mutilated by the Circumcellions. His sect, never numerous, appears to have died out in course of time, but Augustine, in arguing against the Donatists, does not fail to make frequent use of the arguments furnished: 1. By their secession and the consequent division of the original party; 2. the persecution of them under Firmus; 3. the outrages of the Circumcellions; 4. the inconsistent behaviour of the Donatist party (*a*) in condemnation (*b*) in virtual restoration of them, together with the Maximianists by accepting their baptism. (Aug. *in Joann. Ev.* x. 2; i. 6; *Serm.* 138, 10, 10; *Ep.* 87, 10–93; 1, 11, 24; 4, 12; 7, 23, 24; 8, 24; 11, 46; *c. Parm.* 1, 10, 16; 11, 17; *c. Petil.* ii. 184; *c. Cresc.* iii. 62; iv. 73; *de Gest. cum Emer.* 9; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 86, 122; ii. 322; Tillemont, vol. vi. 61; DONATISM, Vol. I. 886; FELICIANUS (4); MAXIMIANUS (2).) [H.W.P.]

ROGATUS (3), Donatist bishop of Rusiccada, who made a bargain with Firmus to deliver up the city to him (Aug. *Ep.* 87, § 10), and that the Catholic inhabitants should be destroyed. [H. W. P.]

ROGATUS (4), father of Paula the friend of Jerome. He was probably a Christian, since no mention is made of Paula being a Christian otherwise than by birth. Though having a Roman name, he was of a Greek family, who traced their descent from Agamemnon. He was very wealthy, and owned the whole town of Actium, or Nicopolis, which he bequeathed to Paula, his only child. [PAULA, Jerome, *Ep.* cviii. 3; Id. *Pref. to Comm. on Titus.*] [W. H. F.]

ROGATUS (5), Aug. 17, a monk and martyr at Carthage under Hunneric. He suffered with Liberatus and his companions on July 2, they are usually commemorated on Aug. 17, the date of their translation. [LIBERATUS (3).] (Victor Vit. *de Wandelica Persecutione*, v. 10, and *Passio S. Liberati* in Migne's *Patr. Lat.* lviii., 262.) [G. T. S.]

ROMANIANUS, a wealthy citizen of Tagaste, where, as well as at Carthage, he possessed a house and other property. He shewed great kindness and true friendship towards Augustine in his early life, which was never forgotten by him, and which he did not fail in later days gratefully to acknowledge. In a passage of the second book against the heathen philosophers Augustine relates with pathetic simplicity how when he was but a boy and in poverty, arising no doubt from his father's "spirited" disregard of expense, he had found in Romanianus a friend who provided him not only with a home and pecuniary help for carrying on his studies at Carthage, but also showed him what he valued still more than these, friendship and kindly encouragement. When this plan was interrupted by the death of his father in 371, Romanianus was again his comforter and friend in need, receiving him into his house at Tagaste as his honourèd guest, and though, in a patriotic spirit, he endeavoured to dissuade him from returning to Carthage, when he saw that his youthful ambition desired a wider range of action than his native town could afford, he changed his dissuasion into liberal encouragement, and supplied him with the means necessary for his purpose. Nor, as Augustine mentions with special gratitude, did he take offence when the young man left to himself neglected to write to him, but passed over his neglect with considerate kindness (Aug. *Conf.* ii. 3; vi. 14; *c. Acad.* ii. 2; *Ep.* 27, 4). Romanianus had a son named Licentius, and it is not unlikely that he may have been a pupil under Augustine while he was teaching rhetoric at Carthage, but of this there is no evidence, though this was undoubtedly the case ten or twelve years later at Milan. Besides Licentius Romanianus appears to have had another son, Olympius, frequently mentioned in the various discourses composed by Augustine at Cassiciacum near Milan, who received baptism at the same time as Augustine, and who afterwards became bishop of Tagaste, of which place he was certainly a native, and of a rank in life agreeing entirely with that of Romanianus (Aug. *Conf.* vi. 7). Of this the following particulars furnish evidence: 1. In his book against the academic philosophers, dedicated to Romanianus Augustine speaks, though not very definitely, of Alypius as his son (*c. Acad.* ii. 3. 8), and in a letter to Paulinus calls him a near relative (cognatus) (*Ep.* xxvii. 5). 2. In a letter to Alypius, then a bishop, A.D. 394, Paulinus

requests to give him an account of himself, mentioning his former sojourn at Milan, of which he had heard. (Paul, *Ep.* 3, 4). 3. In his verses included in a letter to Licentius, two years later, A.D. 396, Paulinus speaks of Alypius as his brother (pater . . . sanguinis . . . consors) (Paul. *Ep.* 8). Like Augustine himself, perhaps, in some degree, through his influence, Romanianus fell into the prevailing errors of Manicheism, which, however, he appears to have cast off, though without adopting as yet the true philosophy of the gospel, by the time when, as we gather from the description of Augustine, he visited him at Milan in 385. He had gone thither on important business, and while there entered with some warmth into the scheme, in whose success his wealth made his participation all important, of a life in common of ten members, of whom two should annually act as purveyors for the rest, an airy idea which came to nothing before any serious step was taken to carry it out. In the next year, while Augustine was occupying with his friends the house of Verecundus at Cassiciacum, near Milan, and was meditating the great change of life which he brought to pass in the year following, he composed the four discourses, of which the one against the Academic philosophers in three books he dedicated to Romanianus as an argument and earnest entreaty to him to abandon their doctrines, declaring at its conclusion his own intention to abide by the authority of Christ, "For," says he, "I find none more powerful than this" (*c. Acad.* i. 1; iii. 20; *Retract.* i. 1–4). At some time in the course of the three years following the conversion of Augustine Romanianus also became a Christian, a change which drew still closer the intimacy between Augustine and himself, and we may add his family, for in a short letter written in 390 Augustine speaks of communication with his uncle, and also thanks him warmly for informing him of some happy event in his own family, perhaps, as the language of Augustine may be understood to mean the settlement of the business which had disturbed him four years before (*Ep.* 15). In the same year, according to his promise in his book against the Academic philosophy, three years before he composed and addressed to Romanianus his book on true religion, sending it to him as he did with most of his own works (*c. Acad.* ii. 3. 8; *de Ver. Rel.* 12; *Ep.* 27, 4; 31, 7). But the love and gratitude of Augustine towards Romanianus was not confined to him alone. We find him writing, A.D. 395, to his son Licentius, entreating him in the most affectionate manner to shake off the bonds in which he was held by the world, to visit Paulinus at Nola, and learn from him how this was to be accomplished (Aug. *Ep.* 26, 3). This letter he followed up by one to Paulinus himself, introducing to him Romanianus, the bearer of the letter, and commending Licentius to his attention (*Ep.* 27, 3, 4, 6). Early in the following year, 396, Augustine wrote to Paulinus announcing his appointment as coadjutor to Valerius, bishop of Hippo (*Ep.* 31–4), and in the same year Paulinus wrote to Romanianus, whose acquaintance he had made at Nola, congratulating the church of Africa on this appointment, and the advantage which it was likely to produce, sending both to him and to Licentius loaves of friendship, and expressing the hope that the trumpet of Augustine may sound in the ears of Licentius. At the same time he wrote both in prose and in verse to Licentius himself, exhorting him to renounce his worldly plans and devote himself to God. (LICENTIUS (1), Paulinus, *Epp.* vii. viii.) But after this we hear no more of him. [H. W. P.]

ROMANUS (1), one of the seven martyrs of Samosata in the persecution of Diocletian. [HIPPARCHUS.] [G. T. S.]

ROMANUS (2), Nov. 18, deacon and exorcist of Caesarea, and martyr of Antioch, under the prefect Aesclepiades. He suffered with a child seven years of age, named Barulas. The tongue of Romanus was cut out and he was then beheaded. His story is told in Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* cap. 2; lib. 2, *de Resurrect. et Ascens. Dom.*; Prudent. *Hymn.* 10, where the story of the child Barulas is told without mentioning his name, which is also given as Theodulus in the Breviary of Toledo; Chrysost. t. i. Orat. 43 and 48. Ruinart in *Acta Sinc.* collects all the authorities. [G. T. S.]

ROMANUS (3), a Roman officer, count of Africa, during the time of Valentinian, employed by him to put down the Circumcellions, A.D. 365, which he probably did without much mercy, and for which reason he was called by Petilian a persecutor (Aug. *c. Petil.* iii. 29). He was an able officer, but a bad character is given of him by Ammianus, and he was accused of having caused the revolt of Firmus, but his general history does not otherwise touch that of the Church (Amm. Marc. xxvii. 9; xxix. 5; Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vol. v.; arts. 12, 28, pp. 25, 63; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* ii. 271–279). [H. W. P.]

ROMANUS (4), a military confessor under Julian. According to Theodoret he was actually led to execution and with his neck bared was awaiting the final blow when he was reprieved. Rendall regards the action of Romanus as mutinous; cf. his *Emperor Julian*, p. 173; Theodor. *H. E.* iii. 16, 17; Greg. Naz. *Or.* iv. 83. [G. T. S.]

ROMANUS (5), a presbyter of Antioch, to whom, at the request of Castus and his brother presbyters, who were maintaining the orthodox cause against Porphyrius, Chrysostom wrote from Cucusus in 405, assuring him of the continuance of his friendship and begging his letters and his prayers. This letter was sent through Castus and his companions, with the request, that they would inform Romanus that he had been deferring his letter until he had received one from him, but readily acceded to his desire that he would write first (Chrys. *Epp.* 22, 23). We have two other letters of Chrysostom's to Romanus, in which he thanks him for the zeal manifested in his cause, the fame of which had spread to Armenia and Cappadocia and even further, commends his courage and firmness, and begs him to write frequently. (*Epp.* 78, 91.) [E. V.]

ROMANUS (6), a Christian, much valued by Paulinus and Augustine, and with Agilis, a bearer of letters between them on more than one occasion. (Aug. *Ep.* 30, 31, 45.) [H. W. P.]

ROMANUS (7), a solitary, born and brought up at Rhosus, who retired to a cell on the mountains near Antioch, where he passed his life to extreme old age practising the utmost austerities, denying himself fire and lamp light, and taking no more food than would barely support existence. Theodoret describes him as conspicuous for simplicity and meekness, attracting large numbers to his cell by the beauty of his character, over whom he exercised a salutary influence. He was accredited with miraculous power in curing diseases and removing barrenness (Theod. *Hist. Relig.* c. xi.). [E. V.]

ROMANUS (8), priest and abbat, founder of Monasterium Condatescense and others in the Jura mountains, c. A.D. 489. Gregory of Tours (*Vitae Patrum*, c. 1, in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxi. col. 1011 sq.) gives an account *De Lupicino atque Romano abb.*, and the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 743 sq.) add another Life of Romanus that is said to be written by a contemporary monk of Condat: their comment. praev. contains the notices in the Martyrologies. His acts are very closely related to those of his brother Lupicinus [LUPICINUS (6)]. He is said to have been of a milder disposition than his brother, and to have wrought miracles, for which after his death his burial-place became a famous place of pilgrimage. His feast is Feb. 28 (Fleury, *H. E.* xxix. c. 40; Tillemont, *H. E.* xvi. 142 sq., 743 sq.; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 60 sq., 73 sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 610, xi. 379). [J. G.]

ROMANUS (9), ST. A celebrated and prolific hymn writer of the Eastern Church, by which he is commemorated on Oct 1st. He is said to have written more than 1000 hymns, of the kind called *κοντάκια*. There is reason to think that he was the inventor of this form of hymn, and that it derives its somewhat disputed name from the legend as to its origin, which is to be found in the Synaxasion of St. Romanus's day (*Menaea*, Oct. 1st). This legend is to the effect that the Blessed Virgin appeared to him, and commanded him to eat a roll (*κοντάκιον*) which she gave him, and that, obeying, he found himself endowed with the power of composing hymns. If he was the first who wrote *κοντάκια*, it is an argument in favour of the opinion (in which Pitra and the Bollandists agree) which places him in the reign of Anastasius I. (491–518) rather than of Anastasius II. (713–719). W. Christ, who takes the later date, supports his opinion by pointing to certain words and phrases which appear inconsistent with the earlier date. But Pitra does not think the difficulties which these raise sufficient to induce him to assign so elegant and forcible a writer to the 8th century.

Of the life of the saint we know nothing except from the Menaea, and what we learn there contradicts many statements which later writers have made (see Pitra, *Anal. Sacr. Spicil. Solesm.* I. xxvi. n.). He appears to have been born at Gruesa, to have been a deacon at Berytus, and afterwards attached to the churches of Blachemae and of Cyrus at Constantinople. Pitra, in the first volume of his Analecta, has collected several poems which he sees reason to attribute to the saint, and expresses a confident hope that more of his works will before long be discovered or identified. [H. A. W.]

ROMANUS (10), archimandrite of a monastery at Eleutheropolis, in Palestine, in the beginning of the 6th century, in succession to MAMAS (2), like whom he is said to have there indoctrinated Severus of Sozopolis in Eutychianism (Liberatus Diac. *Brev.* c. 19 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxviii. 1033). [J. G.]

ROMANUS (11), monk, who alone knew of St. Benedict's retreat in the cave at Subiaco, and fed him with food swung over the cliff by a rope with a bell attached [BENEDICTUS OF NURSIA] (Greg. M. *Dial.* ii. 1; *Vit. S. Benedicti*, Prol. in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxvi. 127 sqq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 156). [J. G.]

ROMANUS (12), exarch of Ravenna, appointed some time before the middle of A.D. 590 (*Letter to King Childebert*, in Troya, *Cod. Dipl.* i. 66), carried on the war against the Lombards with vigour, aided by the Frankish army sent by CHILDEBERT II. He retook Altinum, Modena, and Mantua, the Franks penetrated to Verona, Authari, the Lombard king, was obliged to shut himself up in Pavia, and the Lombard dukes who held Parma, Reggio, and Piacenza, surrendered without fighting, as did GISULF in Istria. The ravages of disease among the Franks, however, compelled their commander to conclude a ten months' truce, of which Romanus bitterly complained (Troya, i 63). Romanus, c. 592, marched to Rome and captured several of the towns in that part of Italy, including Perugia, which was betrayed to him. Perugia was soon, however, recovered by king Agilulf, who advanced to the walls of Rome, and took many prisoners, some of whom were sold as slaves to the Franks, and others sent into the city with their hands cut off (Gregorius, *Hom. in Ezechiel.*, ii. preface, and 10 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvi. 934, 1072). Gregory complained bitterly of the defenceless state in which Romanus left Rome, withdrawing most of the troops to garrison Perugia and other outlying towns, while those that remained were unpaid, and could hardly be persuaded to do their duty The exarch would neither conclude a general peace, nor allow Gregory to make a separate one for the duchy of Rome (*Epp.* ii. 10, v. 40). In a letter to SEBASTIANUS of Sirmium, he expresses himself freely against Romanus, declaring that the oppressive conduct of himself and his subordinates was more grievous than the Lombard swords (*Epp.* v. 42). In A.D. 595, Agilulf became more inclined for a general peace (*Epp.* v. 36), or if this were impossible, to make a separate peace with Gregory, but none was made till after the death of Romanus (Paulus Diac. iv. 12), which probably happened c. 596 or 7, as in the summer of 597, Gregory alludes to the arrival of one Callinicus, probably the new exarch (*Epp.* vii. 29). There are several letters from Gregory to Romanus; in one (i. 33) he demands that Blandus, bishop of Ortona, who had been long imprisoned by him, should be tried by a synod without delay, in another (v. 24) he warns him to desist from protecting the priest Speciosus in his resistance to his bishop, and from supporting certain nuns, who had left their nunnery. (Ersch and Gruber, *Encycl.* xxxix. 314.) [F. D.]

ROMANUS (13), defensor, is mentioned in several letters of Gregory the Great, and no less

than twenty-four are addressed to him (lib. ix. ind. ii. 18, 24, 26, 27, 39, 40, 60, 62, 94; lib. x. ind. iii. 1, 10, 13, 53, 64; lib. xi. ind. iv. 11, 21, 37, 39, 41; lib. xii. ind. v. 15, 25, 37, 42, 49). They treat of all kinds of business, and give a vivid notion of the amount of work transacted by the pope. The first in A.D. 599 appoints him defensor over the property of the Roman church in the districts of Syracuse, Catana, Agrigentum, and Mylae. The defensor Romanus, mentioned in connection with Sicilian business in A.D. 591 (lib. ii. ind. x. 32), was therefore either a different person or was now re-appointed. The most noteworthy of these letters are the seventh, referring to bishops who were said to have women living in their houses; the tenth dealing with the case of the deposed bishop of Melita, who had appropriated some of the property of the see; and the twenty-first forbidding Romanus to allow the serfs on ecclesiastical property to leave the estate to which they belonged or to marry off it. [F. D.]

ROMANUS (14) and DOMINICUS, Roman clerics, had left Rome for Ravenna without permission. Gregory the Great (April A.D. 596) pardoned them on condition of their returning (*Epp.* vi 29). [F. D.]

ROMANUS (15), had by his will ordered a monastery to be founded in his house at Naples. Gregory the Great in A.D. 599 gave directions about the consecration of the church of the monastery, and about the management of the slaves of the deceased, so that the monastery should receive the profits of their labour (*Epp.* x. 2, 3). [F. D.]

ROMANUS (16). In A.D. 603 Gregory the Great requested him, Catulus, and Vintarith to assist the bishop of Spoleto in preventing certain priests at Nursia having women living with them (*Epp.* xiii. 35). [F. D.]

ROMANUS (17), twentieth bishop of Rouen. He was by descent a Frank; his father was named Benedictus and mother Felicitas. He was early called up to the court of Clotaire II., and when Hidulphus, bishop of Rouen, died, c. A.D. 629, Romanus was invited by clergy, king and people to succeed him, c. A.D. 630. He died A.D. 639, and was buried in the church of St. Godard outside the city, but was translated to the church of Our Lady in the 11th century He is special patron of Rouen, and his feast is Oct. 23 (Ordericus Vit. *Hist. Eccl.* i. c. 22, v. c. 8, Boll *AA SS.* 23 Oct. x. 91, *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 73–4; Lelong, *Bibl. France*, i. 9831 sq., Rigaltius, *Vit. S. Romani Ep. Rot.*, e vet. mart., Lutetiae 1609; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 12). A curious privilege in honour of St. Romanus, and called the *Privilegium Feretri*, or *Privilegium S. Romani*, belonged to the Cathedral Chapter of Rouen, by which a prisoner condemned to death could annually be claimed and set free. It is supposed to date from the 12th century, and was abolished only in the end of the last century (see Floquet, *Hist. du Priv. de S. Romain*, i. ii., which is the chief authority). [J. G.]

ROMANUS (18), the second bishop of Rochester. He was probably one of the missionaries sent by St. Gregory to Britain with Augustine. When Justus, in 624, was appointed to Canterbury, Romanus was nominated to Rochester, and was consecrated by the new archbishop as soon as he received his pall from Rome. His episcopate was short. He was sent as ambassador "legatarius" by Justus to Rome, and perished by shipwreck in the Italian sea. As Justus died probably in 627, Romanus's career as bishop of Rochester can have scarcely exceeded two years (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 8, 20). [S.]

ROMANUS (19), a priest who, with James the deacon, assisted Wilfrid in the Paschal controversy at the council of Whitby in 664. He was from Kent, and appears to have been the chaplain of queen Eanfleda, whom he advised to maintain the Catholic custom of Easter, and that so firmly that some years the court kept two Easters (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 25). [S.]

ROMULA (1). [SEVERINA.]

ROMULA (2), nun, who lived at Rome with Redempta and another. She was for many years stricken with paralysis. Gregory the Great (*Dial.* iv. 15) describes a celestial vision that appeared to her shortly before her death. [F. D.]

ROMULFUS, twentieth bishop of Rheims, succeeded on the removal of Egidius, c. A.D. 590 [EGIDIUS] (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* x. c. 19; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. lxxi. 553), and perhaps was the "Romulfum palatii comitem," sent by Childebert into Poitiers (Greg. Tur. *Ib.* ix. c. 13), along with Florentianus, the major-domo. According to the memoir given by Flodoardus (*Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. c. 4, Duchesne, *Hist. Franc. Scrip.* t. 450, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. cxxxv. 101), he was of noble birth, son of Lupus and brother of Joannes, who was then duke. His heritage he spent in building churches and enriching the see of Rheims by gifts, which are named in the memoir. The date of his decease is unknown, but Cointius (*Hist. Eccl. Franc.*) suggests A.D. 593. (*Gall. Chr.* ix. 17.) [J. G.]

ROMULUS (1), March 24, subdeacon of Diospolis and martyr, with seven others, at Caesarea, under the president Urban, in the Diocletian persecution (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* c. iii., *Mart. Roman.*). [G. T. S.]

ROMULUS (2), a correspondent to whom St. Ambrose addressed *Epp.* lxvi. and lxviii. The letters are expositions of passages of the Old Testament. [J. Ll. D.]

ROMULUS (3) and **BYZUS**, two monks, personal strangers to Chrysostom, who had been very desirous to visit him at Cucusus, but had been prevented by the length of the journey, the winter, or fear of the Isaurians. Chrysostom wrote to thank them for their intention, A.D. 404. (Chrys. *Ep.* 56.) [E. V.]

ROMULUS (4), a Christian whom Augustine had been the means of converting, and whom probably he had baptized. He employed as agents to manage his property three men, Ponticanus, Valerius, and Aginesis, but with no definite understanding as to their dealing with

the tenants who were probably natives, and certainly ignorant people. In some cases he gave written instructions, in others only such as were verbal and general, as to the work to be done, and the payment of money due. Two cases of hardship and disingenuous treatment of the tenants arose out of this uncertainty of management. Upon the shuffling and unjust behaviour of Romulus in these matters Augustine founded a letter of calm and grave, but crushing rebuke, pointing out his gross injustice, and his duty to make amends. The letter is a model of Christian reproof, weighty and exhaustive in its keenness as to particulars, but full of dignity and self-renouncing love. (Aug. *Ep.* 247.) [H. W. P.]

ROMULUS (5), bishop of Man, consecrated by St. Patrick, and successor of Conindrus or Conindrius (Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 45, 265). Ussher's date is 498 (*Wks.* vi. 181), and Stubbs's A.D. 447 (*Reg.* 154). *Ann. Tig.* notices them at A.D. 471. [J. G.]

ROMULUS (6), bishop of Chalcis in Coele Syria, a bishop of orthodox principles, who through timidity, sided with the party of Dioscorus at time of the "Latrocinium." He wrote to Theodoret, urging indulgence towards those who had been led into error. Theodoret replied that the time was one for justice, and not for mercy, the truth of God being at stake. (Theod. *Ep.* 136.) He attended the council of Chalcedon in 457. (Labbe, iv. 82, 570, 575, 787.) [E. V.]

RONAN (1), hermit and bishop at Leon and Quimper in the 6th or 7th century. Boll. (*Acta SS.* Jun. 1, i. 80–2) have *De S. Ronano episcopo Eremita in Britannica Armorica* with comment. praev. by Papebrochius, and *Vita* ex Brev. Corisop. Albert le Grand also gives a Life among his *Vitae SS. Brit. Arm.*, but the saint's life and identity are obscure. He is said to have been a Scotic bishop, who went from Ireland to Leon, led an eremetic life in the forest of Nemea or Nevet, and worked many miracles. His relics were preserved at Quimper, and his feast was June 1. (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 87.) [J. G.]

RONAN (2), Finn, of Magheralin, co. Armagh (Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 313, 378; *Ult. Journ. Arch.* iv. 58–9), was son of Saran, of the family of the Oriels, and brother of St. CAIRNECH (2). In O'Clery's *Mart. Doneg.* he is said to have cursed Suibhne, son of Colman Cuar, king of Araidhe, for violence done to the saint, and in the curious old tract entitled *Buile Shuibhne* there is an account of the king's maniac wanderings as the effect of the saint's ban. Suibhne fell in the battle of Magh Rath A.D. 637 (*Ann. Tig.*), and Ronan Finn must belong to the 7th century. The staff of St. Ronan Finn is mentioned at the capture of Downpatrick by John De Courcey in the time of Henry II. (*M. Doneg.* p. xxxi.) [J. G.]

RONAN (3), Scot, prominent in the paschal controversy at Lindisfarne in the 7th century. In Gaul or Italy he had learnt what Bede (*Eccl. Hist.* iii. c. 25) calls the "regulam ecclesiasticae veritatis," or later Roman mode of calculating the Easter feast, and very keenly maintained it against bishop FINAN (7), and the Columban school. Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 563*) calls him ROMANUS or ROMIANUS, and attributes to him *De celebratione Paschae pro Ecclesiae Catholicae ritu*, and *De tonsura clericorum*, but we cannot go beyond Bede's simple statement with safety. [J. G.]

RONAN (4), abbat of Kingarth in Bute, died A.D. 737 (*Ann. Tig.*). He is identified by Skene (*Celt. Scot.* ii. 282–3) with the companion of St. Modan and the patron of Kilmaronog on Loch Etive, Argyleshire, and Kilmaronock, Dumbartonshire. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 441; *Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. pt. i. 296–7; Martin, *West. Isles.* 19 sq. ed. 1716.) [J. G.]

RONAN (5), bishop of Lismore on the Blackwater, co. Waterford, commemorated Feb. 9: said by Ware (*Bps.* Lismore, ed. Harris, i. 549) and Archdall (*Mon. Hib.* 692) to have died A.D. 763. [J. G.]

ROSCIA, daughter of Sidonius Apollinaris, who in a letter to his wife Papanilla (*Ep.* 16), speaks of the good health of Roscia, whom he had seen in journeying to Lyons, and of her careful education. [R. J. K.]

ROTERIUS, a native of Agde, born in the reign of Reccared, king of the Goths, and the author of a history detailing the ravages which Attila had caused to the Gauls, and particularly to Agde. He was not the author of the life of Saint Severus, bishop of Agde, as some have supposed. (*Hist. Litt. Fr.* ii. 429, 430, iii. 403, 404; Ceillier, x. 385). [R. J. K.]

ROTRUDIS. [RICTRUDIS (1).]

RUADHAN (RUADAN, RUAN, RUODANUS, RUFFILLUS, RUFFINUS, ROADANUS, CANDANUS), abbat of Lorrha, co. Tipperary, one of the twelve saints of Ireland, and commemorated April 15. Boll. (*Acta SS.* Apr. 15, ii. 378 sq.) give a life of the 12th century with preface and notes by Papebrochius. (For MS. and other material see Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. pt. i. 164–5, pt. ii. 872, noticing four lives; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* iii. 480, 485, vii. 373.)

Ruadhan, son of Fergus Bern, was educated at the school of St. Finnian, at Clonard, in the beginning of the 6th century, and had many of the chief Irish saints as his companions there (Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 472–3). His chief foundation was at Lorrha about A.D. 550, where "there were one hundred and fifty persons in his congregation" or house (*M. Doneg.* Apr. 15), and many miracles are told of him. He is best known for his curse upon Tara. Diarmaid, son of Fergus Ceirbheoil, monarch of Ireland (A.D. 539–558), had invaded and violated the sanctuary of St. Ruadhan, carrying off to his palace at Tara a person who had sought refuge with the saint. For this St. Ruadhan and a bishop went to the royal residence at Tara, cursed it with all solemnity, and rang their bell energetically, that the place might be for ever waste without court or palace (Petrie, *Ant. Tara Hill*, 125 sq.; *Trans. Roy. Ir. Acad.* xviii. 25 sq.). Under this Petrie thinks there is a basis of fact, and credits the act of St. Ruadhan with the later desolation of Tara as a natural or spiritual

result. He died A.D. 585 (*Ann. Tig.*), and his arm as a relic is said to have been kept in a silver case at Lorrha (*Ult. Journ. Arch.* ii. 207 sq. 217). St. Ruadhan's bell, of bronze, is still preserved in Ireland, having been found in the saint's well at Ormond (O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 337). The writings, *Contra Diarmod regem; De mirabili fontium in Hibernia natura; De miraculosa arbore* are extremely doubtful. (Ware, *Ir. Writ.* by Harris, i. c. iii. 16–7; Nicolson, *Ir. Hist. Libr.* 12, ed. 1736.) [J. G.]

RUDBERTUS. [RUPERTUS.]

RUFFIANA, an unmarried relative of Gregory Nazianzen, to whom in his will he bequeathed an annual pension, as well as the choice of a house wherever she pleased, and her female slaves in order that she might live in accordance with her rank. The slaves she might emancipate, if she pleased, otherwise they, together with the house were to return to the Church. (Greg. Naz. *Testam.*) [E. V.]

RUFINA, fourth daughter of Paula, the friend of Jerome. She was of marriageable age when her mother left Rome for Palestine, and vainly begged that her mother would wait till she was married. She died when still young; but nothing more is known of her. (Jerome, *Ep.* cviii. 4, 6.) [W. H. F.]

RUFINIANUS (1), an Egyptian bishop addressed by St. Athanasius. He had written, asking about the reconciliation of repentant Arians, as we gather from St. Athanasius's *Letter to Rufinianus*, written c. A.D. 372. The reply of St. Athanasius is very valuable as showing the system on which the Arians were dealt with by the champions of catholicity: those clergy, who had voluntarily espoused Arianism and then drawn back, were to be received into communion, but not into the ranks of the clergy; while those who had joined the Arians in the persecutions were to be readmitted to their former status on renouncing their errors (Migne, *Pat. Graec.* xxvi. 1180; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 229. [J. G.]

RUFINIANUS (2), bishop, c. A.D. 449, whom Fulgentius of Ruspe went from Syracuse to an island near Sicily to consult about proceeding to Egypt ; he had taken refuge there from the violence of persecution [FULGENTIUS (3)] (*Vit. S. Fulg. Rusp.* c. 13; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxv. 130; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 4). [J. G.]

RUFINIANUS (3), the third abbat of St. Augustine's, Canterbury; he is made to rule the monastery from 618 to 626 (Elmham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 2, 3). He is mentioned by Bede, *H. E.* i. 29, as one of the party sent by St. Gregory with the pall to Augustine in 601: all else that is said about him is matter of legend or tradition. According to the Canterbury writers he succeeded abbat John, being elected by the monks with the licence of king Eadbald, and maintained a close friendship with archbishops Laurentius, Mellitus and Justus. He was buried in the church of St. Mary, and afterwards translated into the great church, with two lines for epitaph. (Elmham, pp. 92, 94, 148–154; Thorn, ap. Twysden, cc. 1768, 2230.) [S.]

RUFINUS (1). Roman deacon and confessor A.D. 250. See MOYSES, Cyp. *Ep.* 31, tit. 32. [E. W. B.]

RUFINUS (2) (RUFFINUS), praefectus praetorio under Theodosius, and consul A.D. 392. He is first met with as urging Theodosius to the massacre at Thessalonica, A.D. 390, and then, as promising to Theodosius that he would persuade St. Ambrose to receive him and forgive the offence; but the promise was vain (Theodoret, *H. E.* v. c. 18; Ambros. *Epp.* no. 53, Zosimus, *H. E.* iv. cc. 51 sqq.; Fleury, *H. E.* xix. c. 21; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* v. 219 sqq.). He continued in favour with Theodosius, received special charge of his son, Arcadius, with whom he was consul, and has several of the Theodosian laws addressed to him in 392 and 393; after Theodosius' death he retained his office of prefect under the weak Arcadius (Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* xi. 3; *Cod. Theod.* vi. pt. ii. 82). As perhaps partaking in the penitence of his master, he built a palace and church at a place called "Drus" and in the time of Sozomen "Rufinianus," near to Chalcedon, where he dedicated the church, A.D. 394, in honour of St. Peter and St. Paul, and established a body of monks in it for the clerical duties (Sozomen, *H. E.* viii. c. 17). He invited a number of bishops to the dedication of the church, and was himself baptized, Evagrius of Pontus being his sponsor (Heraclides, *Parad.* i. c. 2 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiv. 262). With this, but in the September following, there is connected the council held at Constantinople, A.D. 394, by the bishops who had been invited to the dedication (Mansi, *Conc.* ii. 1151; Soz. viii. c. 17; Binius, *Conc.* ii. pt. i. 566; Fleury, *H. E.* xix. c. 50; Ceillier, vii. 716). Though in favour with the emperors, and made governor of the East, he was unpopular with the people, who thought he was aiming at supreme power and felt his weight as administrator of the laws, especially those against idolatry and heresy; he was suspected also of treating with the Huns for his own elevation to the throne, and incurred the dislike of Eutropius and Stilicho, his rivals in office. When the army returned from the war with Eugenius, and Arcadius went forth to meet them, the soldiers of Gainas massacred Rufinus, A.D. 395, before the gate of Constantinople, and, according to Philostorgius (*H. E.* xi. c. 3), they treated his body with every indignity, and his goods were confiscated in the following year (Socrates, vi. c. 1; Sozomen, viii. c. 1; Marcell. Comes, *Chron.* A.D. 395 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. li. 920; Fleury, *H. E.* xx. c. 10; Baronius, *Anal.* A.D. 395, v. sqq.). [J. G.]

RUFINUS (3), TYRANNIUS, of Aquileia, the translator of Origen and Eusebius, the friend of Jerome and afterwards his adversary. Born about 345, died 410; a Latin ecclesiastical writer of some merit, and highly esteemed in his own time; born at Concordia in North Italy; baptized at Aquileia about 371; lived in Egypt some eight years and in Palestine about eighteen years, 371–397; ordained at Jerusalem about 390; in Italy, mostly at Aquileia, 397–408; died in Sicily, 410.

Sources.—The works of Rufinus himself, especially his *Apology* (otherwise *Invectives*) two

books, against Jerome; Jerome, *Apology against Rufinus*, three books; Id. *Chronicle*, Ol. 289, An. 1, A.D. 378; Id. *Ep.* 3–5, 51, 57, 80–84, 97, 125, 133; Id. *Pref. to Comm. on Ezekiel*, on *Jeremiah*, B. i.; Paulinus, *Ep.* 28, 40, 46, 47; Augustine, *Ep.* 63, 156; Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 118; Gennadius *de Script. Eccl.* c. 17; Sidonius Apollinaris, lib. iv. *Ep.* 3; Gelasius in *Concil. Rom.* (Patrologia, vol. 59, col. 173.)

Literature.—There is no modern Life of Rufinus, whose career has usually been treated as an appendage to that of Jerome In this way, however, it is fairly well known, and reference may be made by students to the various Lives of Jerome. [HIERONYMUS.] There is a full Life of Rufinus by Fontanini—originally published at Rome in 1742, and reprinted by Migne in his edition of Rufinus (*Patrologia Latina*, vol. 21)—minute and exhaustive in its details, and in fixing the dates. A shorter account is given by Schoenemann, *Bibliotheca Historico-Literaria Patrum Latinorum*, Lips. 1792, also reprinted by Migne).

Works and Editions.—The genuine original works of Rufinus still extant are: *A Dissertation on the Falsification by heretics of the works of Origen*, prefixed to his translation of Pamphilus's *Apology for Origen*; *A Commentary on the Benedictions of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Gen. xlix.); the Apology for himself against the attacks of Jerome, in two books; a short Apology for himself addressed to the pope Anastasius; two books of Eccl. Hist., being a continuation of Eusebius; a History of the Egyptian Hermits; and an Exposition of the Creed. Besides these are several Prefaces to the translations from Greek authors.

His Translations, on which his chief labour was expended, include *The Monastic Rule of Basil*, and his eight *Homilies*; the *Apology for Origen*, written by Pamphilus and Eusebius; Origen's Περὶ Ἀρχῶν and many of his Commentaries; ten works of Gregory Nazianzen; the Sentences of Sixtus or Xystus; the Sentences of Evagrius, and his Book addressed to Virgins; the Recognitions of Clement; the ten books of Eusebius's History; the Paschal Canon of Anatolius of Alexandria.

Several works are known to have existed, which have not come down to us; namely, *A reply* to the first two books of Jerome's Apology, a series of letters, amongst which Gennadius especially mentions those addressed to Anicia Falconia Proba; and some works translated from Greek into Latin.

Some translations of Origen exist, which are without any sure evidence attributed to Rufinus; namely, The Seven Homilies on Matthew · one on John; a treatise on Mary Magdalene, and one on Christ's Epiphany.

Supposititia.—The translation of Origen on St. Luke, which is by Jerome; the translation of Josephus' works; a *Commentary on the first seventy-five Psalms*, and one on Hosea, Joel and Amos, the *Life of S. Eugenia*; and *Libellus de Fide.*

The genuine works have never been collected. The Exposition of the Creed was one of the first books printed in England (Oxford, 1468). In 1580, La Barre published a few of them, but no attempt at a full edition was made until 1745, when Vallarsi, the editor of Jerome, published a volume which has been reprinted by Migne in the *Patrologia*, vol. 21. It contains the Genuine Works, and Supposititia, and also the *Vita Rufini* by Fontanini; to which Migne has added Schoenemann's account of Rufinus and his works. Vallarsi intended to have published a second volume, containing Rufinus's translations; but this was not accomplished; and the student must search in the Latin editions of the authors whom Rufinus translated for many facts which his prefaces contain. Those to the Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, to the *Ep.* to the Romans, and to the Book of Numbers, and the dissertation on the Falsification of the works of Origen, which can only be found in this way, are of the highest importance.

Name and place of birth.—There being many contemporaries of Rufinus who bore the same name, it is well to keep the praenomen Tyrannius (sometimes written Toranus). That Tyrannius is the right orthography may be inferred from Jerome's play upon the word in *Apol.* i. 1, "Audio mihi objici in Scholâ Tyranni." The usual appellation Rufinus of Aquileia is somewhat misleading, since Aquileia, though the place of his baptism, was not that of his birth nor of his ordination. He was born at Concordia, as is shown by the letter of Jerome to Florentius (*Ep.* ii. 2, ed. Vall.), in which he speaks of Paulus of Concordia (*Ep.* 10) as writing from the 'patria' of Rufinus, and afterwards (*Apol.* ii. 2) he says that Rufinus, his parents being dead, had left his home and gone to reside at Aquileia. Concordia was a place of some importance; it was destroyed by the Huns in 452, but afterwards rebuilt.

Early Life, Concordia and Aquileia.—It is probable that Rufinus's parents were Christians, since there is no trace of other than Christian associations in his writings. His mother did not die till Rufinus's sojourn in Rome in 398 (Jerome, *Ep.* lxxxi. 1). The year of his birth is uncertain; but his close friendship with Jerome, and the fact that Jerome speaks of him in their earlier days as of one somewhat above him, indicate that he was born a short time before him, and accordingly Rufinus's birth is usually placed in 345, a year before that of Jerome. He was not baptized, however, till about the year 371. That he made the acquaintance of Jerome in early life is shown by his request to him when about to go into Gaul, about the year 368, to copy out for him the works of Hilary upon the Psalms and upon the Councils of the Church (Jer. *Ep.* v. 2). Either before, or about the time of the return of his friend from Gaul, Rufinus had gone to Aquileia, and had embraced a monastic life (in monasterio positus, Ruf. *Apol.* i. 4). The life of the company of these young ascetics has been described in the article on Jerome (HIERONYMUS, section *Aquileia*). It was there, about 30 years before the writing of his Apology against the attacks of his former friend, that Rufinus was baptized (*Apol.* i. 4) by Chromatius and his brother Eusebius (then respectively presbyter and deacon), and Jovinus the archdeacon, all of them belonging to the company of ascetic friends, and all subsequently bishops. This must have been at the close of his stay at Aquileia (Ille modo se lavit—Jer. *Ep.* 4, A.D. 374).

Life in the East: Egypt.—We do not know

how long the company of friends lived together at Aquileia, nor what was the cause of its dissolution. But when the "subitus turbo" drove Jerome to the East, Rufinus left Italy in the company of Melania, who appears to have been known in Aquileia, since her slave or freedman Hylas accompanied Jerome in his journey. They went at once to Egypt, and visited the monasteries of Nitria (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 118; Jerome, *Ep.* iii. 2); and Rufinus appears to have intended to remain there. But the church of Alexandria was at that time in a state of trouble. Athanasius died in 372, and his successor, the Arian Lucius, acting with the successive governors of Alexandria, Tatianus and Palladius (the emperor Valens being also an Arian), came as a wolf among the sheep (Ruf. *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 3; Socrates, iv 21–3, Soz. vi. 19). Not content with persecuting those opposed to him in Alexandria, he turned his anger against the solitaries of Nitria (Eremum vastat, Ruf. ib.). Rufinus himself was thrown into prison, and afterwards, with many other confessors, was banished from Egypt (*Eccl. Hist.* ii. 4; Apol. ad Anastasium, 2 "In carceribus, in exiliis"). Melania went to Palestine, where, at Dio Caesarea, she received the exiles on their way to their various destinations. Rufinus, probably, after a time joined her; but he must have returned to Egypt as soon as the stress of the persecution was abated. Possibly also the influence of Melania may have procured him some favour He declares that he was for six years in Egypt, and again, after an interval, for two more (*Apol.* ii. 12). There he saw and heard Didymus, who wrote for him a book on the questions suggested by the death of infants (Jerome, *Apol.* iii. 28), and whom he praises in his *Ecclesiastical History* (ii. 7). He also was a pupil of Theophilus, afterwards bishop of Alexandria (Jerome, *Apol.* iii. 18); but this must have been only in private, if, as Jerome declares, Theophilus never taught in public till he was bishop. He saw also the hermits, whose teaching he prized still more—Serapion and Menites and Paulus; Macarius, the disciple of Antony, and the other Macarius, Isidore, and Pambas. On their teachings he says that he attended earnestly and frequently; and it must have been partly from his own observation that he afterwards described them in his *Historia Monachorum.* After six years, Rufinus went to Jerusalem. Whether Melania had been with him in Egypt is not certain, though Palladius implies that he was her companion throughout. Certainly he settled with her on the Mount of Olives at the close of his stay in Egypt. But it would seem that, "after a short interval," he returned to Egypt again for two years (*Apol.* ii. 22). Melania's settlement at Jerusalem is placed by Jerome in his Chronicle in the year 379, that is, according to the present or Dionysian computation, 377. We may place Rufinus's final settlement there with her in 379. There is, however, some reason to believe that they made one more journey to Egypt; for Palladius states, as one of the facts that he had heard from Melania, that she had been present at the death of Pambas, which took place after the accession of Theophilus in 385. (Fontanini *Vita Rufini*, l. c. ii. § 7.)

Palestine.—For eighteen or twenty years, reckoning either from 377 or 379 to 397, Rufinus lived on the Mount of Olives. He was ordained either by Cyril or by John, probably by the latter (made bishop 385). He built cells for monks at his own expense ("Meis cellulis," *Apol.* ii. 8 a), who occupied themselves not only in ascetic practices but in learned pursuits. He describes how, after Jerome's coming, they often copied for him MSS. of the classical writers (*Ap.* ii. 8 a); and the satirical description of his professorial lectures afterwards given by Jerome (*Ep.* cxxv. 18) relates, no doubt, to this period of his life. If we separate from it the malicious turn given to its features, we may get a vivid picture of the man. He had some tricks of the voice which earned him, from Jerome, the name of Grunnius. 'He entered with a slow and stately step; he spoke with a broken utterance, sometimes as with disjointed sobs rather than words. He had a pile of tomes upon the table; and then, with a frown and a contraction of the nostrils, and his forehead in wrinkles, he snapped his fingers to call the attention of his audience. What he said had no depth in it; but he criticized others, and pointed out their defects, as though he would exclude them from the Senate of Christian teachers. He was rich and entertained freely, and many flocked round him in his public appearances. He was as luxurious as Nero at Rome, as stern as Cato abroad; as full of contradictions as the Chimaera.' In other places, Jerome uses the same expressions about him. Palladius, on the other hand, who was at Jerusalem and Bethlehem for some time before he went to Egypt in 388, speaks thus of Rufinus:—"He was a man of noble birth and manners, but very strong in following out his own independent resolutions. No one of the male sex was ever gentler, and he had the strength and the calmness of one who seems to know everything." We learn from Palladius that, in common with Melania, Rufinus exercised an unbounded hospitality, receiving and aiding with his own funds bishops and monks, virgins and matrons: "So" he says, "they passed their life, offending none, and helping almost the whole world." Jerome also, in the early part of their stay at Jerusalem, spoke of Rufinus in the highest terms of praise; he mentions in his Chronicle at the year 378, as a fact of general history, that 'Bonosus of Italy, and Florentius and Rufinus at Jerusalem, are held in special estimation as monks;' and when he himself settled in Palestine in 386, he had frequent intercourse with Rufinus and his monks for literary purposes; Rufinus records that Jerome was at one time his guest at the Mount of Olives (*Apol.* ii. 8, a); and Jerome acknowledges (*Apol.* iii. 33) that, up to the year 393, he had been on terms of intimacy with him.

Amongst those who thus became friends and guests of Rufinus, two are specially mentioned by him; Bacurius, who had been king of the Iberi, and afterwards became count of the Domestics under Theodosius, and was duke or governor of Palestine during the first part of Rufinus's sojourn there (*Eccles. Hist.* i. 10, end); and Oedesius, who had been the companion of Frumentius the missionary of the tribes in the N. W. of India (*Hist.* i. 9). Rufinus also records a journey which he made to Edessa and Charroe,

where he saw settlements of monks like those which he had seen in Egypt (*Eccles. Hist.* ii. 8). It is possible that he may have gone there to visit some of the exiles from Egypt before his establishment at Olivet. It is also recorded by Palladius, that he and Melania were the means of restoring to the communion of the church four hundred schismatic monks, who had separated themselves on account of Paulinus; and this statement has very naturally been supposed to refer to some extension to Jerusalem of the disputes at Antioch between the parties of the rival bishops, Meletius and Paulinus. But Wastel, followed by Fontanini (*Vit. Ruf.* I. iv. 2), has pointed out that it was more likely to refer to the schism at Jerusalem, arising from the ordination of Paulinian, Jerome's brother, the healing of which is commonly attributed to Melania. To that dispute and its consequences we must now turn.

It will not be necessary to go over again the ground covered by the articles on John, bishop of Jerusalem, and Hieronymus (sections on John and Rufinus), except so far as to add personal details about Rufinus. Aterbius, who first stirred up the dispute, fixed upon Rufinus as an Origenist, and so "barked against him" (Jer. *Ap.* iii. 33), that Rufinus drove him away, if we may trust Jerome, with the threat of a cudgelling. He also (*ibid.*) began to "bark" against Jerome because of his intimacy with Rufinus; but he found Jerome more pliable; and the willingness of Jerome to submit to the "Ketzermacher" (to use a German term) seemed to condemn Rufinus, and thus made a rift between the two friends which rapidly widened. When, the next year, Epiphanius came to Jerusalem, Rufinus was present at all the scenes so vividly described by Jerome (see Epiph. to John in Jerome, *Ep.* i. 2). The bishop of Salamis gave him the kiss of peace, and joined with him and bishop John in prayer (Jer. *Ap.* iii. 23). But when the dissension between the two bishops arose, Rufinus was at John's right hand,—the leader of the clergy who supported their bishop. Jerome describes their conduct on the occasion (chorus tuus canino rictu naribusque contractis, *Cont. J. Hieros.* 11) in words which he afterwards applies to Rufinus personally (*Ep.* cxxv. 18; *Ep.* lvii. 3); and the abusive expressions which he says they used about Epiphanius (delirus senex) he quotes as used by Rufinus (*Apol.* iii. 23). And Epiphanius in his letter of warning to John mentions Rufinus as the chief of John's supporters (Te autem et omnes fratres qui tecum sunt et maximè Rufinum Presbyterum, Jer. *Ep.* li. 6). We know that Jerome accused Rufinus of stealing his translation of this letter; and the use which he made of the translation, and his comments upon it, elicited Jerome's letter (57) to Pammachius on the best method of translation. Jerome also accuses Rufinus (*Apol.* iii. 18) of having prevented Isidore from giving him the letters of Theophilus, and thus rendering abortive the mission of Isidore; and it is possible that it was to Rufinus ("ducem exercitus sui" *Cont. Joan. Hieros.* 37) that Isidore wrote, before coming to Jerusalem, the letter which fell into the hands of Jerome's friend Vincentius, and which showed a strong prejudice against the monks of Bethlehem. We do not know what further part Rufinus took in the controversy between John and Jerome. If, however, the words of Palladius, above quoted, are to be interpreted of this controversy, we may infer that he showed a willingness at least to bring about a reconciliation. He himself was for the time fully reconciled to Jerome, who speaks frequently of their "reconciliatas amicitias" (*Ep.* lxxxi. 1; *Apol.* iii. 33). They met (probably with many friends on both sides) at a solemn Communion Service in the Church of the Resurrection; they joined hands in token of a renewal of friendship; and, on Rufinus's setting out for Italy with Melania, Jerome accompanied him some little way on his journey, perhaps as far as Joppa. They were once more friends, as in their youth.

Italy, 397–409.—The return of Melania to Italy had for its object the promotion of ascetic practices in her own family. Rufinus, whom Paulinus speaks of as being to her "in spiritali viâ comitem," returned also, as he had originally gone, in her company. His mother was still living, and he wished to see his relations and his Christian friends again (Jer. lxxxi. 1; *Apol.* ii. 2). They made the voyage in twenty days, and arrived at Naples in the spring of 397. Thence they went to visit Paulinus at Nola, all the nobles of those parts and their retinues accompanying them in a kind of triumph (Paulinus, *Ep.* xxix. 12). Melania, who was connected, probably, by ties of property with Campania, since Palladius speaks of her successors Pinianus and Melania living there (*Hist. Laus.* 119), stayed with Paulinus some time, and then went on to Rome, where her son Publicola and his wife Albina and her granddaughter Melania with her husband Pinianus were living. Rufinus went to the monastery of Pinetum near Terracina, of which his friend Ursacius or Urseius was the abbat, and there he stayed probably for a year, from the early spring of 397 till after Lent, 398. His intention had been to go direct to Rome, and, having passed on to his native country, to return to the East (Paulinus, *Ep.* 46, 47, in the first of which the expression "Romam peti judicastis" shows, that, when these letters were written, Rufinus was between Nola and Rome, and on his way northwards). But he was detained, either by the urgency of his friends or the delay of Melania.

He had brought with him many works of the Eastern Church writers, which were but little known in Italy; and his friends were eager to know their contents. Rufinus, having used the Greek language more than the Latin for some twenty-five years, at first declared his incompetence; "Ad Latinum sermonem tricennali jam pene incuriâ torpuisse." (*Apol.* i. 11.) But by degrees he accepted the task, which, in fact, occupied almost all the remainder of his life. He began with the Rule of Basil, which Urseius desired to have for the use of his monks. Next, probably, he translated the Recognitions of Clement [CLEMENTINE LITERATURE]. He had left the Greek MS. of this book with Paulinus, begging him to translate it and to improve his knowledge of Greek for the purpose. But Paulinus's first attempts were found to contain so many mistakes, that he despaired, occupied as he was, of making progress, and urged Rufinus to undertake the task. He at the same time begged for his assistance in the interpretation of the blessing upon Judah in Gen.

xlix., and, some months later, of the rest of the blessings on the Patriarchs. The commentary on this portion of Scripture written in reply to this request has come down to us. Meanwhile Rufinus had accomplished a more difficult task, the translation of Pamphilus's Apology for Origen, and of Origen's great work the Περὶ Ἀρχῶν. A scholar named Macarius, who was at Pinetum, had been much exercised by speculations on the subjects of Providence and Fate, and in controversy with the Mathematici (astrologists and necromancers) who abounded in Italy at the time. About the time of the arrival of Rufinus he dreamed that he saw a ship coming from the East to Italy which would bring him aid, and this he interpreted of Rufinus. He expected that he would gain help from the speculative works of Origen, and besought Rufinus to translate some of them for him. Rufinus, though knowing from the recent controversy at Jerusalem that his orthodox reputation would be imperilled by the task, yet undertook it. (*Apol.* i. 11; Prefaces to B. i. and iii. of the Περὶ Ἀρχῶν.) He began, however, by translating the Apology for Origen written by the martyr Pamphilus in conjunction with Eusebius [PAMPHILUS, EUSEBIUS], adding a treatise on the corruption of Origen's works by heretics, and a profession of his own faith, which he held in common with the churches of Aquileia and Jerusalem and the well-known bishops of those sees. Having thus prepared the way, he translated the Περὶ Ἀρχῶν itself, adding to the two first books, which he finished during Lent, 398, a very memorable Preface.

In this Preface he speaks of the odium excited by the name of Origen, but asserts his conviction, that most of the passages which have given him the reputation of heresy were either inserted or coloured by the heretics. In consequence of this, he felt himself at liberty to leave out or soften down many expressions which would offend orthodox persons, and also, where anything was obscure, to give a kind of explanatory paraphrase. He pointed out at the same time that he was not the first translator of Origen, but that Jerome, whom he did not name, but clearly indicated, and of whom he spoke in high terms of praise, had in the time of Damasus translated many of his works, and in the Prefaces (especially that to the Song of Songs) had praised Origen beyond measure. Two questions arise as to this memorable Preface which set the world in flames: First, was this reference to Jerome justifiable? Secondly, was Rufinus's dealing with the book itself legitimate? We can hardly say that the reference to Jerome was quite ingenuous. If the praises he bestows are not, as Jerome called them, 'fictae laudes,' they are certainly used for a purpose to which Jerome would not have given his sanction, and their use in view of the controversy at Jerusalem, without any allusion to Jerome's altered attitude towards Origen, was ungenerous and misleading. As to the second point, though it is obscured by the fact that the chief part of the Greek of the Περὶ Ἀρχῶν has been lost, we have still enough to enable us to form a judgment. A specimen of the omissions made by Rufinus is given in his *Apology*, B. i. c. 19, where a copy of his own translation is said to have been produced which bore the words "as the Son does not see the Father, so the Holy Spirit does not see the Son"; but Rufinus declares that it was not so in the Greek from which he had translated it, and that, had it been there, he would not have let it stand in his translation. Of this passage the Greek is not extant, nor is it clear to which passage he alludes. But in a similar passage in Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, B. iv. c. 35, the Greek has survived, and contains the words "Ὥστε καὶ ἐν τῷ νοεῖν ὁ πατὴρ μειζόνως καὶ τρανοτέρως καὶ τελειοτέρως νοεῖται ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἢ ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ." And these, though vouched for by Jerome and translated by him (*Ep.* cxxiv. 13), were, with much that leads up to them, omitted by Rufinus. The licence of paraphrasing difficult expressions is also carried to an extreme length. But it must be admitted that the texts of Origen were somewhat uncertain, that the standard of literary honesty was not in those days what it is now, and that Jerome himself had in his letter *De Opt. Gen. Interpretandi* (*Ep.* 57) sanctioned a mode of interpretation almost as loose as that adopted by Rufinus. (See also his words to Vigilantius (*Ep.* lxi. 2), Quae bona sunt transtuli, et mala vel amputavi vel correxi vel tacui. Per me Latini bona ejus habent et mala ignorant.) We may therefore acquit Rufinus of more than a too eager desire, unchastened by any critical power, to make the greatest exponent of Oriental Christianity acceptable to Roman ears.

Rome.—The two first books Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, with the Preface, were first published probably in the winter of 397–8; the other two, having been translated during Lent, 398, when Macarius had already gone to Rome, were carried by Rufinus to the city when he removed there himself to stay with Melania and her family. During his stay with them, Apronianus, a noble Roman, was converted, partly through Rufinus, who addresses him as "Mi fili"; and the friends of Melania were, no doubt, numerous. The pope Siricius also, who had been elected in 385, when Jerome had himself aspired to the office, was favourable to Rufinus. But the expectations formed by Rufinus in his Preface were realised at once. Many were astonished at the book of Origen, some finding even in Rufinus's version the heresies which they attached to the name of Origen; some indignant that these heresies had been softened down. Jerome's friends at first were dubious. Eusebius of Cremona, who came to Rome from Bethlehem early in 398 (Jer. *Ap.* iii. 24) lived at first on friendly terms with Rufinus, and communicated with him (Ruf. *Apol.* i. 20). But Jerome's friends Pammachius, Oceanus, and Marcella resented the use that had been made of their master's name, and suspected Rufinus's sincerity. According to his account, Eusebius, or some one employed by him, stole the translation of the last two books of the Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, which were still unrevised, from his chamber, and in this imperfect state had them copied and circulated, adding also in some cases words which he never had written (*Ap.* i. 19, ii. 44). But, being in uncertainty as to the value of the translation, Pammachius and Oceanus sent the books and the Prefaces to Jerome at Bethlehem. He sat down at once and made a literal translation of the Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, and, having done this, sent it to his friends with a letter (84) written to refute the insinuations through which, as he considered, Rufinus's

Preface had associated him with Origenism. He sent them at the same time a letter (81) to Rufinus, which expostulates with him for his "fictae laudes," but which refrains from any breach of their restored friendship.

But when these documents arrived in Rome the posture of affairs had changed. Rufinus had gone; Siricius the pope had died (date in Fagius Nov. 29th, 398); the new pope Anastasius was ready to lend his ear to the friends of Jerome; Rufinus the Syrian, Jerome's friend, had arrived in Rome (Jer. *Ap.* iii. 24), and with Eusebius of Cremona had gone through the chief cities of Italy (Ruf. *Ap.* i. 21), pointing out all the heretical passages in the writings of Origen. Rufinus, a little before the death of the pope Siricius, had obtained from him the letters of recommendation (literae formatae), to which he appealed afterwards as showing that he was in communion with the Roman Church (Jer. *Ap.* iii. 21). He went to Milan, where he met Eusebius in the presence of the bishop, and confronted him when he read heretical passages from a copy of the Περὶ Ἀρχῶν received from Marcella, and purporting to be Rufinus's work (Ruf. *Ap.* i. 19), especially the passage above referred to, which says that the Son cannot see the Father, nor the Holy Spirit the Son. He then went to Aquileia, where the bishop Chromatius, who had baptized him twenty-seven years before, received him.

Aquileia.—He had been but a short time at Aquileia when he heard that Jerome's translation of the Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, though intended only for Pammachius and his friends, had been published, and that the letter of Jerome written against him was also in circulation. Of this letter he received a copy from Apronianus (*Apol.* i. 1); but Pammachius kept back the more friendly letter addressed to Rufinus himself. This act of treachery, which Jerome subsequently in his anger at Rufinus's Apology brought himself to defend (Jer. *Apol.* iii. 28), was the cause of the fierce invectives with which Rufinus and Jerome now assailed each other. [HIERONYMUS, Section RUFINUS, JOHN, bishop of Jerusalem.] That controversy having been described in the article on Jerome, as also the letters of the pope Anastasius to Rufinus and John of Jerusalem, and Rufinus's letter of Apology, we may pass on to the scenes in the last decade of Rufinus's life.

His friends at Aquileia were as eager as those at Pinetum had been for a knowledge of the Christian writers of the East; and Rufinus's remaining years were almost entirely occupied with translation, though several of his original works belong also to this period. A few remarks upon these works may therefore now be introduced.

The translations have no great merit, but on the whole are accurate, there being no need in the subsequent works for omissions and paraphrases such as those adopted in dealing with the Περὶ Ἀρχῶν. They were undertaken in no distinct order, but according to the request of friends. Rufinus wished, indeed, to translate the Commentaries of Origen on the whole of the Heptateuch, and only Deuteronomy remained untranslated when he died. The Commentary on the Romans, however (see Preface), and several others, besides other works, intervened.

The Exposition of the Creed is of importance, not only as a testimony to the variations in the creeds of the various churches (that of Aquileia having "Patrum *invisibilem et impassibilem,*" "in Spiritu Sancto" and "*hujus* carnis resurrectionem" as distinctive peculiarities), but also from its intrinsic merits, and as showing the influence of Eastern theology, harmonized by a clear and sound judgment, on the formation of Western theology.

The History is on a par with those of Socrates and Sozomen, exhibiting no conception of the real functions of history nor of the relative proportion of different classes of events, yet dealing honestly with the facts which came within the writer's view. It was translated into Greek, and valued in the East, as his translation of Eusebius, of which it is a continuation, was in the West. (Gennadius, *De Script. Eccl.* xvii.)

The History of the Egyptian monks presents many difficulties. It is distinctly attributed to Rufinus by Jerome (*Ep.* cxxxiii. 3). Yet it is not reckoned among his works in the list of them given by Gennadius, who says that the work is commonly attributed to Petronius, bishop of Bologna (Gennad. *De Scr. Ec.* xli.). The preface says that it is written in response to the repeated requests of the monks on the Mount of Olives. Fontanini (*Vita Rufini*, lib. ii. c. xii. § 4) grounds upon this with much reason the theory that Petronius, having been in the East, and having received the request of the Olivetan monks, but having himself, as Gennadius testifies, but little skill in composition, on his return to the West begged Rufinus to write the history. The adventures recorded would thus be those of Petronius, not of Rufinus. The Historia Lausiaca of Palladius is in many of its sections identical with the Historia Monachorum. It is, however, more probable that Palladius, who did not leave the solitary life in Egypt till 400, and wrote his History for Lausus at Constantinople, apparently some time afterwards (he lived till 431), was indebted to Rufinus rather than Rufinus to him.

Rufinus had not, like Jerome, any large range of literary knowledge, and his critical powers were defective. He quotes stories like that of the Phoenix (*De Symbolo* 11) without any question. He had no doubt of the *Recognitions* being the work of Clement, and he translated the sayings of Xystus the stoic philosopher, stating, without further remark, that they were said to be those of Sixtus, the Roman bishop, thus laying himself open to the attack of Jerome upon his credulity.

The Apology is well composed, and more methodical than that of Jerome. Its reasoning is at least as powerful, though its resources of language and illustration are fewer. His attempt to make peace, and his refusal to reply to Jerome's last invectives, though the temptation offered by a violent attack in answer to a peaceful letter was great, shows a high power of self-restraint, and a consciousness of holding a secure position.

Last years.—The years at Aquileia were uneventful. The letter of Anastasius which told him of the rumours against him at Rome, and requested him to come there to clear himself, drew from him the "Apologia ad Anastasium," a short document of self-defence not lacking in dignity. He enjoyed the friendship of Chroma-

tius, at whose request he consented to cease his strife with Jerome, though Jerome, adjured by the same bishop, refused to do so (Jer. *Apol.* iii. 2). He enjoyed the friendship of the bishops living near him, Petronius of Bologna, Gaudentius of Brixia, Laurentius, perhaps of Concordia, for whom he wrote his work upon the Creed. Paulinus of Nola continued his friendship for him; and Augustine, in his severe reply to Jerome, who had sent him a copy of his work against Rufinus, treats the two men as equally esteemed, and expresses his grief that such men should attack one another. "I grieved, when I had read your book, that such discord should have arisen between persons so dear and so intimate, bound to all the churches by a bond of affection and of renown. Who will not in future mistrust his friend as one who may become his enemy when it has been possible for this lamentable result to come to pass between Jerome and Rufinus?" (Aug. *Ep.* 73 ad Hieron.)

Last Journey and Death.—Chromatius had died in 405, and Rufinus's thoughts turned again to Melania, and of both to Palestine. He joined the company of Melania in Rome, in 408 or 409, Anastasius having been succeeded in 403 by Innocent, who had no prejudice against him. Owing to the danger from Alaric's invasion, they left Rome, with Albina, Pinianus, and Melania the younger (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 119), and resided in Campania and Sicily. Rufinus records that he was in the "coetus religiosus" of Pinianus on the Sicilian coast, witnessing the burning of Rhegium across the straits by the bands of Alaric, when he wrote the preface to the translation of Origen's Commentary on the book of Numbers. Soon after writing these words he died.

The cloud which rested on the reputation of Rufinus on account of Jerome's attacks has, through the overweening influence of Jerome, unduly depressed the character of his adversary. In the list of books to be received in the church promulgated by the pope Gelasius at the Roman council, in 494 (Migne's *Patrologia*, vol. lix. col. 175), we read: "Rufinus, a religious man, wrote many books of use to the church, and many commentaries on the Scripture; but, since the most blessed Jerome infamed him in certain points, we take part with him (Jerome) in this and in all cases in which he has pronounced a condemnation." With this official judgment may be contrasted that of Gennadius in his list of Ecclesiastical writers (c. 17). "Rufinus, the presbyter of Aquileia, was not the least among the teachers of the church, and in his translations from Greek to Latin shewed an elegant genius. He gave to the Latins a very large part of the library of Greek writers." After a list of his writings, Gennadius proceeds: "He also replied in two volumes to him who decried his works, shewing convincingly that he had exercised his powers through the insight given him by God and for the good of the church, and that it was through a spirit of rivalry that his adversary had employed his pen in defaming him."

[W. H. F.]

RUFINUS (4), a Roman presbyter in the end of the 4th century. He was an admirer of Jerome, and espoused his cause in the Origenistic controversy and the personal controversy with Rufinus of Aquileia. Eusebius of Cremona, who was sent by Jerome to Rome in 398, reported the kindness of Rufinus, who wrote to Jerome to ask an explanation of the judgment of Solomon. This Jerome gives him, making the false and true mothers to be the Synagogue and the Church. Jerome speaks of him with gratitude and respect, hoping that he may not only publicly defend him, but in private judge him favourably (Jerome, *Ep.* 74, ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

RUFINUS (5), a friend of Jerome, known as the Syrian, to distinguish him on the one hand from Rufinus of Aquileia, and on the other from Rufinus the presbyter of Rome, both his contemporaries. He was one of the company of Italians settled at Bethlehem with Jerome; and in the year 390 was sent by him to Rome and Milan in the cause of their friend Claudius, who was accused of a capital offence. Jerome expected him to go also to Aquileia, and, in his letter to Rufinus then at that place, commends him to him, and hopes the two may have met at the house of the bishop Chromatius (Jerome, *Ep.* lxxxi. 2, Cont. Ruf. iii. 24).

This Rufinus must be identified with one of that name who is mentioned by Celestius (Aug. *de Pecc. Orig.* c. 3) as having been known by him at the house of Pammachius at Rome, and having asserted there that sin was not inherited. Marius Mercator goes further, and asserts that it was this Rufinus who instilled into the mind of Pelagius the views which are known as Pelagian (Mar. Merc. *Lib. Subnotationum in Verba Juliani*, c. 2). [W. H. F.]

RUFINUS (6), a lay friend of Chrysostom's, who wrote to him from Cucusus apologizing for the infrequency of his letters. (Chrys. *Ep.* 46.) [E. V.]

RUFINUS (7), a bishop (according to Savile, of Rhosus in Cilicia; cf. Tillemont, *note* 90 *sur Chrysost.*), whom Chrysostom had only once met for a short time at Antioch, which however had been long enough to manifest his piety, his intelligence, and his affection. Chrysostom wrote to him from Cucusus stating that his place of exile, with its desolation and constant dread of the Isaurians, would at once become more tolerable if he were assured of his love. (Chrys. *Ep.* 109.) [E. V.]

RUFINUS (8), a presbyter, marked out by Chrysostom as fitted to take the lead in the mission to the pagans in Phoenicia; to whom, on the outbreak of the violent disturbances which almost threatened to crush the undertaking, Chrysostom wrote, earnestly exhorting him to make no further delay, but to start at once. He must write to him from every post-house on the way, and let him know as soon as he reached his destination. All anxiety will cease the moment he learns that Rufinus has arrived in Phoenicia and commenced his work, which for his part he promises to render as free from outward hindrances as possible, even if he has to send a thousand times to Constantinople to effect it. He begs him to spare no pains in getting the unfinished churches roofed in before winter. He need be in no anxiety about relics, for he has sent Terentius to Otreius bishop of Arabissus,

who has a large store of unquestionable ones. He must let him know if he wants more missionaries, and he will endeavour to send them. (Chrys. *Ep.* 126.) [E. V.]

RUFINUS (9), friend of Prosper of Aquitaine, and probably cleric, had written to Prosper regarding rumours about Prosper's falling into heresy. Prosper received the letter kindly and replied in another (*Epistola ad Rufinum*, ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. li. 77 sq.), which is entitled from its subject *De Gratia et libero arbitrio*, being an argument against Pelagianism. As it refers to St. Augustine as living, but in his closing years, it was probably written c. A.D. 429, but nothing is known of Rufinus (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 279–80). [J. G.]

RUFINUS (10), archimandrite at Constantinople, addressed by pope Felix III., A.D. 484. [FELIX (3).] (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 937, *Ep.* xi.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 416.) [J. G.]

RUFINUS (11), bishop of Ephesus. Gregory the Great wrote to him in A.D. 596, commending to him the bearer, a cleric, who was unable to read (*Epp.* vii. 11). [F. D.]

RUFINUS (12), bishop of Vibo in Bruttii, was directed in July, A.D. 596, by Gregory the Great to ordain a priest for the inhabitants of the estate Nicotera, of which he was visitor during the absence of PROCULUS (10) (*Epp.* vi. 41). [F. D.]

RUFUS (1), first bishop of Avignon, said to have been appointed by St. Paul, and still honoured as such at Avignon, where his reputed relics are kept. His feast is Nov. 12 or 14. (*Gall. Chr.* i. 795; Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 196, ed. 1732; Usuardus, *Mart. Auct.* Nov. 14.) [J. G.]

RUFUS (2), a bishop. [PRISCILLIANUS.]

RUFUS (3), bishop of Thessalonica, appointed, in A.D. 412, as his vicar by pope Innocent for the provinces of Achaia, Thessaly, Epirus, Crete, the two Dacias, Moesia, and Dardania Praevalitana, being in fact the Eastern part of the ancient prefecture of Illyricum, which on the division of the empire had been allotted to the empire of the east (Innocentius, *Epp.* 13, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 515). Two other letters from Innocent to him and to other Macedonian bishops are extant (*Epp.* 17, 18). For a summary of their most important contents, see GERONTIUS (8), where the number of the first letter is wrongly given as 15. [F. D.]

RULE, ST. [REGULUS.]

RUMOLDUS (RUMONDUS, RUMBOLD, RUMALDUS), called bishop of Dublin, and martyr at Mechlin in Belgium. His legend is full of uncertainty, and nothing is really known of him. His life was written by Theodoric, abbat of St. Trudo or Tron, in the beginning of the 12th century (Surius, *Vit. Sanct.* iii. 24), and much has been added to supply its deficiencies in historical points connecting Rumbold with Ireland, Scotland, Saxon England, and the continent. (Other chief authorities are *Vita, Passio et Miracula S. Rumoldi Arch. Dubl.* by J. Van Wachtendonck, Mechlin, 1634 and 1638; *S. Romoldi Mart. Inedit. Arch. Dubl. Acta*, &c. by Ward, Louvain, 1662, glossed by Sirinus; and *Acta S. Rumoldi Ep. Dubl. et Mart.* by Sollerius, Antwerp, 1728. For the lives, Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. pt. i. 256–7, pt. ii. 874, 880; Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. 1, i. 151–237, with Comment. Praev. of twenty-five sections by Sollerius and *Vita* auct. Theodorico from Ward's edition.)

In Harris's additions to Ware (*Ir. Bps.*), Rumold is included among the bishops of Dublin (also by Cotton, *Fast.* ii. 8; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 218), but the *Irish Annals* know nothing of bishops at Dublin before the 11th century. In the *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. 33 p. aest. f. xvi.) his see is transferred to Dunblane in Scotland, with even less probability; his birth is placed at Berwick, and his parents are named David and Cecilia (see Nicolson, *Scot. Hist. Libr.* 48, ed. 1736). Theodoric says he came from Scotia, passed through Gaul to Rome, and on his way northward reached Mechlin. There he settled and taught till he was murdered by two travelling companions, June 24, A.D. 775. His body was cast into the river to hide the crime, but it was soon discovered, and his friend count Ado gave him honourable burial. A church was afterwards erected in Mechlin to his memory, and his feast is July 1. (Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 283, Ind. Chron. A.D. 775; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* iii. 197 sq.; Usuard. *Mart. Auct.* Jul. 1.) [J. G.]

RUPERTUS (ROBERTUS, RUDBERTUS, RUDPERTUS), bishop of Worms and Salzburg, and Apostle of Bavaria, belongs to the noble band of Christian evangelists, who were bringing the Gospel to Central Europe about the 6th and 7th centuries, but who owe their fame to writers of a much later age. Except the fact of his missionary work, almost every point in his Life is disputed. The oldest Life seems to be that attributed to Arno, bishop of Salzburg (A.D. 785–821); it is given by Surius (*Vit. SS.* iii. 267–8). Colgan (*AA. SS.* 756 sq.) gives four Lives and extracts from Arno's. Canisius (*Thes. Mon. Eccl.* iii. pt. ii. 260 sq.) gives a series of Lives or Memoirs in his *Monumenta Salisburgensia*, and the Bollandists (*AA. SS.* Mart. iii. 696 sq.) have two Lives with *comment. praev.* But unfortunately the Lives have not been classified, and assured inferences cannot be drawn from them. (For a list of Lives given, but without definition, in different authors, see O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, iii. 972–3; Chevalier, *Repert.* 1968–9.)

St. Rupert is reputed by some (e.g. Colgan, *AA. SS.* 761, 767–8) to have been an Irishman, or at least of Irish descent, but Arno has no authority for making him baptized by St. Patrick; others call him a Frank and allied to the royal house (see the above Lives). Of his kindred we read only of a sister or niece, Erentrudis, abbess of Nonnenberg [ERENDRUDA], and a brother Trudbertus, who had a hermitage near the Rhine. St. Rupert forsook all his possessions, paid a visit to Rome, and, crossing the Alps into the Rhine valley, came at last to Worms, where he settled and was much resorted to. But from the persecution of the tyrant Bor-

charius he had afterwards to leave this field of labour. After two years and another visit to Rome, he turned eastward into the valley of the Danube, and, on the invitation of Theodore, duke of Bavaria, took up his residence at Ratisbon: there he finally established the faith, and completed the Columbanian mission of Eustasius [EUSTASIUS (6)] by baptizing duke Theodore and his courtiers. In the restless spirit of the Celt, he left Ratisbon and proceeded further down the Danube: for a time he was at Laureacum, and at last fixed upon the ancient Juvavum, now Salzburg on the river Salza, a confluent of the Danube, as his seat. After visiting his own country, and returning with twelve missionaries and his niece, St. Erentrude, for whom he built the monastery of Nonnenberg, he died and was succeeded by Vitalis as bishop. But the dates are altogether uncertain, his death being placed in years varying from A.D. 560 to A.D. 718, the latter being the more likely. He was buried in his own church of St. Peter's in Salzburg, and his feast is March 27 (Mabillon, *Anal.* iv. 63 sq. and *A. SS. O. S. B.* iii. i. 325 sq.; Canisius, *Thes.* iii. pt. ii. 264, sq.; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 448; Herzog, *Real-Enc.* xiii. 167, giving a critical sketch and the later date; *Gall. Christ.* v. 662). [J. G.]

RURICIUS (1) I., thirteenth bishop of Limoges between Petrus I., if he belonged to this see, and Ruricius II., in the latter half of the 5th century, is known as the author of two books of letters, which have survived. He belonged to an illustrious Gallic family connected with the Anicii of Rome (Venant. Fort. *Epitaph.*), and married Iberia the daughter of a patrician house of Auvergne. Sidonius Apollinaris wrote their epithalamium (*Carm.* xi., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 705–8). After some years they separated to lead the religious life (Faustus, *Epist.* ix., *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 861), and about 484 he was elected bishop of Limoges, a see which had been vacant some years, and was in a depressed condition (cf. Rur. *Epist.* ii. 32). We know little of his episcopate, except that he built a church in honour of St. Augustine of Hippo, in which he was afterwards buried, and that chronic ill-health interfered with the discharge of his duties. The letters written by and addressed to him shew that he was on terms of friendship with the chief ecclesiastical personages in Gaul of his time, Sidonius Apollinaris, Faustus of Riez, Caesarius of Arles, and others. His death occurred about 507. Though usually counted among the saints, he has no day in the hagiologies. Together with his grandson, Ruricius II., he formed the subject of a laudatory epitaph by Venantius Fortunatus (*Patr. Lat.* lviii. 123).

The two books of letters are of little importance historically, being chiefly occupied with trivial matters of personal interest and pious reflections. They were first published by Canisius, and may be also found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 67–124. They are discussed in the *Hist. Litt.* iii. 49 sqq., and Ceillier, x. 607–9. For letters addressed to him see Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 545, 602, 863 seqq., and Ceillier, x. 609–10. [S. A. B.]

RURICIUS (2) II., 14th bishop of Limoges, between Ruricius I. and Exotius, was, with his grandfather Ruricius I., the subject of an epitaph by Venantius Fortunatus, from which it appears that he built the church of St. Petrus de Quadrivio (*Patr. Lat.* lviii. 124). There was probably an interval between him and his predecessor, though we are unable to fill it up. He was present in 535 at the first Council of Clermont, and in 541 at the fourth of Orleans, and was represented by deputy in 549 at the fifth of Orleans. He probably died about 553 (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 503). [S. A. B.]

RUSTICA, patrician lady of Naples, mentioned in two letters of Gregory the Great (*Epp.* iii. 63; ix. 24). From them it appears she had died about A.D. 579, having by her will directed a nunnery and oratory to be founded in honour of the Virgin in her house at Naples, and bequeathed to it one-third of her property. She bequeathed the residue of her property to her husband on condition of his founding a monastery in Sicily, and paying her legacies to her freedmen within a year of her death, with a gift over if the condition was not fulfilled to the Roman church of her estate at Cumae on the same trusts. Her intentions were not carried out for many years. [F. D.]

RUSTICIANA (1), daughter of Symmachus the patrician, and wife of Boethius, who praises her highly (*De Cons.* ii. Pr. 4). After the deaths of her husband and father, she lived on at Rome, giving largely to the poor of her great wealth. She lost all at the taking of Rome by Totila, and was herself reduced to beg her bread. The Goths wished to kill her, accusing her of having bribed the Roman generals to destroy the statues of Theoderic in revenge for the murders of her father and husband, but Totila allowed no harm to be done to her. (Procop. iii. 20.) [F. D.]

RUSTICIANA (2), a Roman lady of high rank and great wealth, probably a descendant of the SYMMACHI (Mai, *Praefatio in Symmachi Orat.* xvii.), an intimate friend and correspondent of Gregory the Great (*Epp.* ii. 27; iv. 46; viii. 22; xi. 44; xiii. 22). It appears from these letters that she made a pilgrimage to Palestine and Mount Sinai; that she afterwards lived for several years at Constantinople, where she had much influence with the emperor Maurice; that she sent at different times ten pounds of gold to redeem prisoners, curtains for St. Peter's, and alms for the monastery of St. Andrew, at Rome; that she had estates in Sicily, and that she suffered from gout. [F. D.]

RUSTICIANUS (RUSTICANUS), a young subdeacon, who, being excommunicated by the presbyter under whom he served, on account of his misconduct, and the debts which he had contracted, and having taken refuge in the Donatist party, was rebaptized by them (Aug. *Ep.* 106, 107, 108; MACROBIUS (2). This must have been about A.D. 409. In the art. MAXIMINUS (5) will be found an account of a similar transaction, in respect of a deacon of Mutigenna, whose name is not mentioned (Aug. *Ep.* 23. 2). The date of this latter case would be about A.D. 392. A discourse, discovered by Jerome Vignier in a single MS., and attributed to St. Augustine, combines the two transactions, identifying the subdeacon Rusticianus with the

deacon of Mutigenna, and, besides other inconsistent particulars, introduces Valerius the predecessor of Augustine, who died A.D. 395, as exerting himself to reclaim the young man from his evil ways, a date plainly inconsistent with that of the affair of Rusticianus. Though the story is well told, it cannot be accepted either as correct in itself, or as the work of St. Augustine. It is to be found in vol. ix. of the works of Augustine, p. 753, ed. Migne, see Tillemont, xiii. note [33]. [H. W. P.]

RUSTICULA, ST., abbess of the convent of St. Caesarius at Arles. She belonged to a noble family at Vaison in Provence, and at a tender age entered the convent, of which she was made abbess when only eighteen. She died in 632 at the age of seventy-six (Boll. *Acta SS.* 11 Aug. ii. 657). [G. W. D.]

RUSTICULAS, Novatianist bishop at Rome when pope Celestine proscribed their services [COELESTINUS (1)] (Socrates, *H. E.* vii. c. 11). This must have been before July, A.D. 432. [J. G.]

RUSTICUS (1) Q. JUNIUS, cos. suff. under Hadrian, cos. ord. for second time A.D. 162, Prefect of the City under Marcus Aurelius, 163. He is celebrated as the prefect under whom Justin Martyr suffered, Ex Actis S. Just. ap. Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* p. 43; Epiph. *Haer.* xlvi. cap. 1. *contra Tatianos.* Borghesi fixes the date of Justin's martyrdom as A.D. 163 (*Oeuvr. Comp.* v. 54–60; viii. 549; ix. 307–309). Ulpian mentions him in *Digest*, lib. xlix. tit. 1, l. 1, § 3. Lightfoot (*Ignatius*, t. i. p. 494) discusses date of his city praetorship, pp. 445 and 510, his relations with M. Aurelius, p. 512 with Epictetus. [G. T. S.]

RUSTICUS (2), a cousin of St. Augustine, present at the discussion concerning happiness, held at Cassiciacum, A.D. 386 (Aug. *de Beat. Vita*, i. 6). [H. W. P.]

RUSTICUS (3), a young man of Gaul, in the beginning of the 5th century, whose history is instructive as an example of the evil effects occasionally flowing from asceticism. He was related to Hebidia (q.v.), and through her, no doubt, brought under the notice of Jerome. He had, with his wife Artemia, made a vow of separation, but, under temptation, had broken it. About the same time, their home having been destroyed by the barbarians, and there being danger of their falling into the enemy's hands, Artemia determined to go to Palestine, and Rusticus promised to follow as soon as possible. She went, but he did not follow. She was constantly engaged in prayer for him in the sacred spots at Jerusalem and Bethlehem, and at length, assisted by a letter from Hebidia to Jerome, prevailed on him to use his influence, then so powerful throughout the West, to bring her husband to her (*Ep.* 122 ed. Vall. A.D. 408). The result of his appeal is not known. Tpere seems to be no foundation for Erasmus's conjecture, that Rusticus was a name assumed so as not to expose the real person to obloquy. [W. H. F.]

RUSTICUS (4), a monk of Hippo, to whom, as well as to Felicitas, Augustine, c. 423, addressed a letter exhorting mutual forbearance (Aug. *Ep.* 210, 211) [FELICITAS (5)]. [H. W. P.]

RUSTICUS (5), bishop of Narbonne in the first half of the 5th century. He was brought up by a pious mother, who took great pains with his education, giving him the best teaching which Gaul afforded, and sending him to Rome to study rhetoric. In early youth he was attracted to the monastic life, but appears to have looked on it mainly as a preparation for the active ministry. He wrote from Toulouse, where he was living, in the year 411, to consult Jerome, the oracle of the Western Church, then living at Bethlehem. The letter, or treatise, which he received in reply (*Ep.* 125, ed. Vall.) is singularly wise and moderate in comparison with the other ascetic works of Jerome. He recommends Rusticus to maintain intercourse with his mother, though living a solitary life; he praises the coenobitic above the hermit life; and gives some curious examples of the manner in which monks could aid one another. He recommends him to adopt some regular manual occupation, the making of nets, baskets, or beehives, or some study such as that of Hebrew, which he had himself pursued in the Syrian desert. He shews from an example then well known what hindrances the family life presents to devotion, and how, in the case cited, large sums amassed for purposes of piety had been diverted into private channels. He also speaks of false monks who lived in pleasure while pretending to asceticism; and of others who made a pretence of learning. Under this last head he draws a satirical picture of Rufinus, who had just died, under the name of Grunnius. He gives rules which are a kind of sketch of the later monastic system, but guards against the opposition which afterwards grew up between regulars and seculars by praising the clergy of the cities and their followers, and he bids Rusticus seek the advice of two well-known bishops, Proculus of Marseilles and Exuperius of Toulouse (qq. v.).

In later life Rusticus became bishop of Narbonne. With other of the Gaulish bishops he received the letters of Leo the Great relating to the council of Chalcedon, in the titles of which his name occurs. He also wrote to the pope for advice as to many questions arising in the troubled times of the Huns' invasion, and received a full reply (Leo, *Ep.* 167). From that letter it appears that he had contemplated, with the timidity of one who had been a recluse, resigning his bishoprick, but is dissuaded by the pope from doing so (Leo, *Epp.* 167, 99, 102, 103, with Quesnel's note, p. 1567 in *Pat. Lat.* liv. 1472). [W. H. F.]

His chief work was the rebuilding of the burnt church of Narbonne, which we learn from an inscription was begun in 444, and completed in 448. (For this inscription, which gives details of the rebuilding, see Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. x. 860 sqq., and *Gall. Christ.* vi. 7.) Rusticus was one of the assembly of forty-four bishops who, at the close of 451, approved the letter of Leo to Flavianus, and about four years later was especially invited to the third Council of Arles, held to compose the quarrel between Theodorus, bishop of Fréjus and the monastery of Lérins (Mansi, vi. 161, 181, vii. 874, 907). He probably died in 461, as Hermes, his archdeacon, had succeeded him on Nov. 3, 462. His day is Oct. 26 (Boll. *ibid.*) [S. A. B.]

RUSTICUS (6), bishop, to whom, with Leontius [LEONTIUS (22)], Arnobius Junior dedicated his *Commentary on the Psalms* (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. liii. 527). Some think he is the bishop of Narbonne (no. 5), but it is wholly uncertain (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 330). [J. G.]

RUSTICUS (7), of Bordeaux, an intimate friend of Sidonius. In the only letter (*Ep.* 11) which remains of their intercourse, Sidonius complains of the distance which separates them from each other, and addresses his friend by the title of "dominus illustris." This Rusticus (or, possibly another of the same name) had asked of Eucherius bishop of Lyons (*Pat. Lat.* lviii. 24), his two books on the Scripture, that he might transcribe them. In thanking Eucherius for granting his request, he passes a beautiful eulogy upon the two books. (*Hist. Lit. France*, pp. 428, 429; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. p. 444; Ceillier, x. 385). [R. J. K.]

RUSTICUS (8), Aug. 17, a sub-deacon of Carthage, and martyr under Hunneric with Liberatus. [LIBERATUS (3).] [ROGATUS (5).] [G. T. S.]

RUSTICUS (9) (popularly RUSTICE, or RUSTIQUE), ST., 22nd archbishop of Lyons, between St. Lupicinus and St. Stephanus (circ. A.D. 493–8). His pre-episcopal life is unknown, but the authors of the *Histoire Littéraire* (ii. 676) believe he was the son of Aquilinus, the friend of Sidonius Apollinaris (see Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* v. 9, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 540). If this is correct, he was a member of a distinguished family which had for several generations been intimately connected with the poet's ancestors. Shortly after his consecration he sent pecuniary aid to Gelasius with a letter of sympathy. The pope's reply, written Feb. 22, 494, in which he recommended to his kind offices Epiphanius, the bishop of Pavia, then on his way to Gaul to redeem Italian captives held by Gundobald, is extant (*Epist.* xv. *Patr. Lat.* lix. 138, cf. Ceillier, x. 505). From Ennodius' life of St. Epiphanius we find that the pope's injunction was not neglected (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 230). The same work characterises Rusticus as one who "sub praetexta fori gubernatorem gessit ecclesiae" (*ibid.*). He probably died before 499, and is said to have been buried in the church afterwards named from St. Nicetius (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 28). His day is April 25 (Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. iii. 368). [S. A. B.]

RUSTICUS ELPIDIUS. [ELPIDIUS (32).]

RUSTICUS (10), nephew of pope Vigilius, was appointed by him one of the seven deacons of Rome. Almost our only source of information about him is the pope's letter excommunicating him and his fellow-deacon Sebastianus. According to it Rusticus had originally been a strong opponent of the Three Chapters, and had not only warmly approved of the Judicatum of Vigilius, published at Easter A.D. 548, at Constantinople, but had caused copies of it to be transmitted to various parts of the empire without the pope's knowledge or consent. Sebastianus, on the other hand, had been temporarily appointed a deacon of Rome by Vigilius, and had promised to resign on the return of two absent deacons. Sent afterwards to Dalmatia, he is severely blamed by the pope for neglect of his duties and for communicating with Honorius of Salome. [HONORIUS (9).] On his arrival at Constantinople he, like Rusticus, warmly approved of the Judicatum, and condemned the Three Chapters. On Christmas-day A.D. 549 (Jaffé, *Reg.* 80) Vigilius summoned him, and, taxing him with his proceedings in Dalmatia, threatened him with a trial on his return to Rome. This, according to Vigilius, was the cause of the hostility of Sebastianus towards him, who won over Rusticus, and they both communicated with abbat FELIX [194] and other opponents of the Judicatum and defenders of the Three Chapters. Rusticus and Sebastianus had also ventured to preach without the permission of Vigilius, had sent letters to all the provinces falsely charging the pope with holding opinions contrary to the council of Chalcedon; and, to crown all, had asserted in a document presented to Justinian that Leo the Great had approved of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Vigilius, therefore, early in A.D. 550, degraded them from the diaconate, and declared them incapable of restoration unless they repented in his lifetime. (Vigilius, *Epist.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxix. 43, Mansi, ix. 352.) Of Sebastianus nothing more is known; after the council of Constantinople, Rusticus, with Felix and others, were banished to the Thebaid. (Victor Tun. *Chron.* in *Patr. Lat.* lxviii. 960.) Two works of Rusticus are extant. The first is a dialogue against the Acephali, or extreme Monophysite party. The last edition, that of Galland, is reprinted in *Patr. Lat.* lxvii. 1167. The second consists of scholia on and collections of various readings of the acts of the council of Chalcedon composed in A.D. 549. The most complete edition of them is that of Card. Pitra. (*Spic. Sol.* iv. 192.) [F. D.]

RUSTICUS (11), deacon of Ancona, one of three candidates recommended to Gregory the Great (*Epp.* xiv. 11) during a vacancy of that see, the others being FLORENTINUS (17 and 18). Gregory was informed that, though Rusticus was vigilant, he had not learned the Psalter sufficiently, and he directs bishop Joannes, to whom he is writing, to inquire into the alleged disqualification of Rusticus, and also into the objections to the other candidates. [F. D.]

RUSTICUS (12), 11th bishop of Cahors, between Eusebius and Desiderius, was archdeacon at Rodez, and Palatine abbat to Clotaire II., before his succession to the episcopate. For his family see the anonymous *Vita* of St. Desiderius (cap. i., *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 219), who was his brother. After an episcopate of seven years he was murdered in 629, by treacherous *incolae* of his church at Cahors, apparently in revenge for cruel punishments meted out by Clotaire after a great disturbance in the church and palace (*ibid.* cap. v. col. 223). The letter in which his mother, Harchenefreda, announced the event to his brother and successor, Desiderius, is extant (*ibid.* cap. vi. col. 225). The latter afterwards built a church on the spot where the murder was committed (*ibid.* cap. ix. col. 228). [S. A. B.]

RUSTICUS (13), ST., 13th abbat of the monastery of Condat, or, as it was afterwards called,

St. Claudius, in the Jura, circ. A.D. 696–731. He was prior, or praepositus, under his predecessor St. Claudius, and after becoming abbat, governed for thirty-five years (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 245). He is said to have been the author of a work illustrating the piety of the monks of the Jura, possibly a life of his predecessor. But it has not survived (*Hist. Litt.* iii. 649). Though a saint he appears to have no day. [S. A. B.]

S

SABAOTH. Some of the Gnostic sects indulged in a rather complicated mythology, and without much knowledge of the language, had recourse to Hebrew for their nomenclature. Irenaeus (I. xxx.) and Origen (*Adv. Cels.* vi. 31) agree in telling us of Ophite sects who gave names to the seven rulers of the planetary spheres. The highest was Ialdabaoth, whose planet we are told was φαίνων or Saturn. The next two were Iao and Sabaoth, who, it may be presumed, answered to Jupiter and Mars respectively.

Epiphanius tells several times (*Haer.* xxv. 2, xxvi. 10, xl. 5, xlv. 1) that, besides the Gnostics who gave the highest place to Ialdabaoth, there were others who gave that place to Sabaoth, and who identified him with the God of the Jews. Some of them ascribed to Sabaoth the form of an ass or a swine (Epiph. xxvi. 10), accounting thus for the Jewish prohibition of the use of swine's flesh. There were those who said that Sabaoth had hair like a woman; and who taught that after death the fully enlightened Gnostic, having climbed through the realms of the other Archons, would step on the head of Sabaoth in order to attain the upper district presided over by Barbelo.

Both Irenaeus and Epiphanius censure the ignorance of Hebrew exhibited in the Gnostic appropriation of Scripture names. Irenaeus (ii. 35) tells us that Sabaoth with the long o denotes "Voluntarius," but with the short o (Sabaŏth) manifests the first heaven [HEBREW LEARNING, Vol. II. p. 854.] But Epiphanius (xxvi. 10, xl. 5), correcting with more skill, explains that Sabaoth in the Bible ought not to be translated as if it were a noun in apposition to Κύριος, but as a genitive case, and that Ἀδωναΐ Σαβαώθ was to be translated Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, or as Aquila had rendered, Κύριος στρατιῶν.

In *Pistis Sophia* we have at least three personages called Sabaoth, viz. (1) Sabaoth magnus ἀγαθός, whom Jesus describes as his father, as having received from him a power which in him took the place of the ψυχή (pp. 14, 193). (2) Sabaoth parvus ἀγαθός, "quem vocant in κόσμῳ Δία" (p. 232), and (3) Sabaoth Adamas, once ruler over six of the twelve Archons (p. 360), now one of the archons of punishment, whose satellite hands the cup of oblivion to souls about to migrate into new bodies (p. 380). [G. S.]

SABARIUS, of Auxerre. [SAVARICUS.]

SABAS (1), ST., Apr. 24, a Gothic officer, martyred at Rome, with seventy others, under Aurelian. (*AA. SS.* Boll. 24 April. iii. 261.)

SABAS (2), April 12, a more celebrated Gothic martyr, who suffered under Athanaricus king of the Goths towards the end of the fourth century. His acts seem genuine, and contain many interesting details of Gothic life in the lands bordering on the Danube. Thus village life, with its head men and communal responsibility, appear in cap. ii. After various tortures he was drowned in the river Musaeus, which flows into the Danube. The acts are in the form of an epistle from the Gothic church to the church of Cappadocia, whither Soranus, who was "Dux Scythiae," had sent his relics. (Ruinart. *Acta Sincera*, p. 670; *AA. SS.* Boll. April. ii. 88; Ceill. iv. 278); C. A. A. Scott, *Ulfilas, Apostle of the Goths*, 1885, p. 80. On the topography of the region where he suffered there is an exhaustive article in the *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad.* 1881–82, t. xcix. p. 437–492, by Professor Tomaschek, of the University of Graz. [G. T. S.]

SABAS (3), a monk of Mount Sinai. He suffered, with many of the brethren, at the hands of the Saracens, who invaded Palestine and Arabia under Mavia their queen, December, 373. Soz. *H. E.* vi. 38.) [G. T. S.]

SABAS (4), one of the original Messalian or Euchite leaders, condemned at a council, and exiled by Flavian of Antioch. [EUCHITES, Vol. II. p. 259; cf. Ceill. x. 47.] [G. T. S.]

SABAS (5) (Σάββας), bishop of Paltus in Syria Prima (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 799). He was present at the council of Antioch, c. 445, in the matter of Athanasius bishop of Perrha, and took an active part (Hard. i. 579, 583, 587, 594, 595; Tillem. xiv. 650). He was also prominent at the council of Constantinople, 448, against Eutyches (Hard. ii. 138, 170; Tillem. xiv. 659, xv. 283, 285, 511–513, 534), and at Chalcedon in 451 subscribed the condemnation of Dioscorus (Hard. ii. 370; Tillem. xv. 663). In 458 he subscribed the letter of his province to the emperor Leo I. (Mansi, vii. 549). [C. H.]

SABAS (6), ST., Dec. 5, abbat in Palestine and founder of the Laura of St. Sabas. He was born in A.D. 439, near Caesarea in Cappadocia. At eight years old he entered a neighbouring monastery and at eighteen went on a pilgrimage to the holy places at Jerusalem, where he entered the monastery of St. Passarion. At the age of thirty he established himself as an anchorite in the desert, where he lived in a cavern. Several persons joining him there, he laid the foundations of his monastery on a rock on the Kidron river, where it still remains. Cf. Murray's *Handbook for Syria*, p. 229. He was ordained priest by Sallustius, patriarch of Constantinople, in the year 491. Several Armenians united themselves soon after to this community, which led to a mixture of Greek and Armenian rites in the celebration of Holy Communion. Sabas ordained that the first part should be celebrated in Armenian, but the actual words of consecration be said in Greek. In 493 the original monastery had increased so much that he built another at a short distance. He was sent as an ambassador

to Constantinople in A.D. 511, by the patriarch Elias, to counteract the influence of Severus and the Monophysites with the emperor Anastasius, [ELIAS (1)] and again by Peter, Pat. of Jerusalem, in A.D. 531, to ask from the emperor remission of the taxes due by Palestine, and help to rebuild the churches ruined by invasion. He died Dec. 5, 531, aged 91 years. His life was written by Cyril of Scythopolis [CYRILLUS (13)]. Copious extracts from it will be found in Ceillier, xi. 274–277; and Fleury, *H. E.* lib. vii. § 30–32. The whole life is in Coteler. *Monument.* t. iii. [G. T. S.]

SABAZIUS, a Phrygian deity, under whom the Fathers recognised Jupiter. In the mysteries connected with his cult, variously called Sabazia, Sabadia, Sebadia, the serpent was made use of, a shape which Sabazius assumed in order to make love to his own daughter Proserpina. (Cf. Arnobius, v. 21; Firmicus Maternus *de Errore Prof. Rel.* c. 11; *AA. S. Theodot.* c. 24, in Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.*). Lenormant collects all the references to the cultus of the deity and his mysteries in a learned article in the *Rev. Archéol.* (1874), t. xxviii. p. 300. (Cf. A. Maury's *Religions de la Grèce*, t. iii. 101–106.) [G. T. S.]

SABBATIANI. [SABBATIUS (2).]

SABBATIUS (1), Sep. 19, martyr with Trophimus at Antioch in Pisidia, under Heliodorus the governor, in the reign of Probus. (*Vid.* refs. in *D. C. A.* and Tillem. iv. 366.) [C. H.]

SABBATIUS (2), a Novatianist presbyter, ordained by Marcianus as Novatianist bishop of Constantinople. He seceded, previous to 380, from the main body of that sect, with two others, Theoctistes and Macarius. They maintained that Easter ought to be celebrated on the same day and in the same manner as the Jews. Sabbatius also complained that unworthy persons were admitted to the Novatianist communion. In fact, he and his followers found the same fault with the Novatianists which the Novatianists found with the church. The same tendency to repeated schisms has often been seen among some modern sects of the same type. Any minute question forms a basis for renewed separations. He became bishop of a small sect called after him, Sabbatiani, whose baptism was recognised in the seventh canon of the second general council. Sozomen (*H. E.* vii. 18) gives a long account of his secession, and thereupon takes occasion to treat of the various times and modes of observing the Paschal feast. [G. T. S.]

SABBATIUS (3), a great friend of the monks, but himself married. He was a native of Jericho, and visited, in the secrecy of the night, all the cells round Jericho, where he left food for the monks. (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* c. 112.) [J. G.]

SABELLIANISM is the Eastern name for the movement designated Patripassianism in the West. It formed a portion of the great Monarchian movement, and can only be rightly understood in connexion therewith. We can trace the rise of this heresy back to the age of Justin Martyr. In his *Apol.* i. § 63, he refers to those "who affirm that the Son is the Father," and condemns them; a condemnation which he repeats in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, § 128, cf. Bull's *Defence of Nic. Creed*, t. i. 138; t. ii. 626; *Judgm. Cath. Ch.* iii. 198; Dodwell, indeed, in *Dissert. Iren.* vi. 26, ascribes its origin to Simon Magus, cf. *Iren. Haer.* i. 23. However this may be, its development came only later on. The 2nd century was the age of Gnosticism. Now one of the essential principles of Gnosticism is the emanation theory, which places a number of aeons, emanations from the Divine Being, intermediate between God and the Creation. The champions of Christian orthodoxy were led, in opposition to this view, to insist most strenuously upon the Divine Monarchy, God's sole, independent and absolute existence and being. Thus we find Irenaeus writing a treatise περὶ μοναρχίας some time about A.D. 190 [IRENAEUS, Vol. III. p. 263], addressed to a Roman presbyter, Florinus, who had fallen away to Gnosticism. Asia Minor had always been the chosen haunt of Gnosticism. There too the reaction to the opposite extreme found its chief development. Asiatic Gnosticism placed many emanations, subordinate divine beings, between God and man; and pointed to the Son and the Holy Ghost as specimens of such aeons or emanations. Cf. Tertull. *Cont. Prax.* c. 8. Their opponents, as Christians, were obliged to uphold the existence of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and yet had to devise some theory whereby that existence could be reconciled with the Divine Monarchy. Some therefore adopted the view which Dorner calls Ebionite Monarchianism. They defended the Monarchy by denying the deity of Christ. Others fell back on the theory which identifies the Persons of the Godhead with the Father, and which goes by the name of Sabellianism, though, as with many another sect and heresy, that name is not derived from the original inventor of this view. Sabellianism in fact was one of the inevitable mistakes men must fall into, while groping their way to the complete Christological conception. It was in the 2nd century an orthodox reaction against Gnosticism, as in the 4th century the Sabellianism of that period in the hands of Marcellus of Ancyra was a reaction against Arianism. Tertullian indeed expressly asserts, in the opening of his treatise against Praxeas, that this heresy had sprung out of a desire to maintain orthodoxy. We might conclude *à priori* that Sabellianism would have sprung up first of all in Asia Minor. But we are not left devoid of positive evidence to this effect, for all the earliest leaders of this party belonged to that district. Praxeas was a confessor from Asia Minor, Noetus and his brother were from Smyrna. The secondary leaders of the sect, Epigonus, Cleomenes and Sabellius, were members of the Roman Church, but yet its Eastern origin is still further confirmed by the persistent description of Sabellius as an Egyptian or African in the writers of the 4th or 5th centuries. In fact, in the second, as in every succeeding century, the Roman Church was devoid of speculative ability sufficient to originate a heresy. Historians naturally concluded therefore that such a theory must have been devised in the East. But yet though unable to originate, the Roman

Church was one of the chief stages whereon the controversial struggle was waged. From the year 190 till the death of Hippolytus, about A.D. 236, the anti-Gnostic party at Rome was divided into three great sections; 1st, there were the followers of Noetus, or the Patripassian party; 2nd, the party of Hippolytus, which insisted so strongly upon the personal distinction between the Father and the Son, as to be called by their opponents, Ditheists; while there was, 3rd, the intermediate party of Zephyrinus and Callistus. Hippolytus in fact accuses Callistus (*Refut.* ix. 7) of inventing a new heresy, which identified the Father and the Son, and taught that they both were one with the Holy Ghost, which became incarnate in the Virgin's womb. The visit of Origen to Rome, which happened some time in the years 211–217, must have introduced him to a knowledge of the controversy, as we find abundant reference to it and refutations of it in his various writings. The materials for tracing the development of Sabellian views during the 3rd century are very defective. Novatian on the Trinity, capp. 12, 18, 21, 22, deals with the subject and treats it as an acknowledged heresy, using the very same Scripture arguments as Justin Martyr in his *Dial. cum Tryp.* §§ 126–129. Novatian is indeed the earliest author who distinctly calls this view the Sabellian heresy. The controversy next emerges into the full light of day in North Africa, about the year 260. It permeated very largely the district of Pentapolis in Libya, under the leadership of two bishops of that district, Ammon and Euphranor [EUPHRANOR]. Dionysius of Alexandria wrote against their teaching, whereupon he was himself accused of heresy to his namesake, Dionysius of Rome. The documents bearing on the discussion between these two fathers have been industriously collected in Routh's *Reliquiae*, t. iii. 370–400, while the merits of the controversy have been already explained under DIONYSIUS of Alexandria. In the 4th century the controversy again burst forth in connexion with the teaching of Marcellus of Ancyra, who, in his opposition to Arianism and the subordination theory of Origen, was led to a denial of any personal distinction between the First and Second Persons of the Trinity. Marcellus, indeed, was probably only guilty of loose expressions, but his disciple Photinus worked out his system to its logical conclusions and boldly proclaimed Sabellian views. Eusebius of Caesarea wrote against Marcellus, and it is from the extracts in his two treatises, *Cont. Marcell.* and *De Ecclesiast. Theolog.* that we derive most of our information concerning Marcellus. [EUSEB. of CAESAREA, Vol. II. p. 341.] (Cf. Epiph. *Haer.* lxxii.) The controversy continued to rage throughout the remainder of the 4th century. Athanasius, Basil, Hilary, Chrysostom, all condemned Marcellus and his teaching. Basil's letters are a repertory of information about the state of this controversy during the latter half of 4th century. Basil first called Sabellius an African, solely, as it would seem, because of the prevalence of Sabellianism in the Pentapolis, under Dionysius of Alexandria, when probably Sabellius himself was long since dead. The interest in the controversy ceased by degrees as men became engaged in the great Nestorian and Eutychian discussions of the 5th cent. Yet Sabellianism continued to linger on in various quarters. Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxii.) says that in his time they were still numerous in Mesopotamia and in Rome—a fact which an inscription discovered at Rome in 1742 confirms; it runs thus, "qui et Filius diceris et Pater inveniris," evidently erected by Sabellian hands. (Northcote's *Epitaph. of Catacombs*, p. 102.) Augustine speaks of them, however, as practically extinct in Africa. Cf. *Ep. ad Dioscorum*, cx. We have thus sketched the direct history of Sabellianism, but we can trace it in other directions. The Montanist section of the church was in general enthusiastically orthodox, Tertullian's work against Praxeas is sufficient evidence of this. Yet one portion of it fell into this speculative error. The Pseudo-Tertullian in his treatise against heresies, c. 21, tells us of one section of the Montanists, headed by a certain Aeschines, who, in addition to the ordinary theories of the sect, held that Christ was both Father and Son. This subdivision of the sect may have spread into Pontus and given employment to Gregorius Thaumaturgus, whose writings were, in the 4th century, quoted on both sides of this question. Thus in Basil, *Epistles*, no. ccx, we find him arguing against the Sabellian party in Gregory's own episcopal city of Neo-Caesarea and striving to explain away the force of a sentence they brought forward out of Gregory's *Ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως* which ran as follows: *Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν ἐπινοίᾳ μὲν εἶναι δύο, ὑποστάσει δὲ ἕν*; where the confusion between *ὑπόστασις* and *οὐσία* led, as in the controversy between the two Dionysii, of Rome and of Alexandria, to much debate between persons who were substantially agreed. [DIONYSIUS (6).] The Patripassian and Sabellian views spread into the most distant East before the middle of the 3rd century, as the adoption of somewhat similar views led to the discussion between Origen and Beryllus of Bostra [BERYLLUS]. In the amalgam of heresies taught by Paul of Samosata, Sabellian views seem to have had an important share.

We shall conclude with a brief statement of this heresy. Those who wish a more lengthened one may consult Dorner, who is, however, more than usually involved when dealing with this heresy. Much of his statement sets forth not indeed what the upholders thereof taught, but what he conceives they must have taught, which is very different. At the beginning of this article we stated that the Monarchian party were divided into two sections. One guarded the Monarchy by denying to Christ any real share in the Divine Nature. They were Ebionites, or pure humanitarians, in their view of Christ's person. The other guarded it by denying any personal distinctions in the Godhead, and thus identifying the Father and the Son. Still the difficulty stared them that Christ is called the Son of God, and that a son necessarily supposed a Father distinct from himself. Tertul. *Cont. Prax.* c. 10. They evaded this difficulty by making a distinction between the Logos and the Son of God. The Logos was itself eternally identical with God the Father. The Son of God did not exist till the Incarnation, when the Eternal Logos manifested its activity in the sphere of time, in and through the man Christ Jesus. "In the Old Testament," says Sabellius, "no mention is made of the Son of God, but only of the Logos." Athan. *Orat.* iv. s. 23. The Sonship is only a

mere temporary matter, however (cf. Gregor. Nyss. *Cont. Sabell.* in Mai's *Coll. Nov. Vett. Scriptt.* t. viii. pars ii. p. 4), and when the work of man's salvation is completed the Logos will be withdrawn from the humanity of Christ, into that personal union and identity with the Father which existed from eternity, while the humanity will be absorbed into the original Divine nature. All this was in fact summed up in the distinction which was drawn between the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and the λόγος προφορικός. Here it was that Sabellianism merged into Pantheism. The ultimate end of all things, according to Sabellius, was the restoration of the Divine Unity; that God, as the absolute Μονάς, should be all in all. If then the absorption of Christ's humanity into the absolute Μονάς was necessary for this purpose, much more the absorption of all inferior personal existences. Neander points out that this system presents many points of resemblance to the Alexandrian-Jewish theology. Epiphanius, indeed, expressly asserts (*Haer.* lxii. cap. 2) that Sabellius derived his system from the apocryphal gospel of the Egyptians, where it was related that Christ had taught his disciples, as a great mystery, the identity of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. This gospel insisted upon the element of Sabellianism most akin to Pantheism, viz. that all contrarieties will be finally resolved into unity. Thus, according to it, Christ replied to the question of Salome when His kingdom should come, "When two shall be one, and the outer as the inner, and the male with the female; when there shall be no male and no female." Cf. Lipsius on GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL, Vol. II. p. 713.

Neander, *H.E.* t. ii. p. 317–326, Bohn's ed. gives the clearest exposition of this heresy and its connexion with kindred systems. Baur's *Church Hist. of First Three Centuries*, by Menzies, t. ii. pp. 92–99, is rich in references to modern German dissertations on the subject. Harnack's article in Herzog's Encyclop. new edition, on Monarchianism, brings down these refs. to the latest date; other authorities are Dorner's *Doctrine of Person of Christ*, Div. I. t. ii.; Hilgenfeld's *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, pp. 608–626, Leipzig, 1884; Caspari's *Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, t. iii.; Döllinger's Hippolytus und Callistus; Gieseler in *Stud. u. Kritik*, 1853, p. 759. Dissertations on the subject from very different points of view may be seen in Newman's *Arians*, and Schleiermacher's collected works, t. ii. pp. 485–575. Newman's exposition is very good, but his history is defective, having been written before the discovery of Hippolytus' *Refutation.* The older church historians, Lardner, Mosheim, Tillemont, etc., may be consulted, and specially Ch. Wormii *Hist. Sabellianismi*, ed. Francof. 1696. The patristic authorities, Hippolytus, Tertullian, the Dionysii, Athanasius, Eusebius, Basil, etc., have been already quoted. Athanasius, Disc. 4, against the Arians, in Library of the Fathers, Oxf. 1869, apparently often quotes the very words of Sabellius. Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, t. i. p. 254–256, points out traces of the Sabellian controversy in the long recension of the Ignatian Epistles. The seventh canon of the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, declared Sabellian baptism invalid. It describes the sect as numerous in Galatia. [PATRIPASSIANS, MONARCHIANS, NOETUS, PRAXEAS.] [G. T. S.]

SABELLIUS gave the name to the sect of the Sabellians which lasted till the middle of the 5th cent. at least, as their baptism is declared invalid in an epistle from the Church of Constantinople to Martyrius of Antioch, in the latter half of 5th cent. (Van Espen's *Jus Ecclesiast.* t. iii. p. 181), a declaration which is repeated in the 95th canon of the quinisext synod, A.D. 692. Sabellius has been usually assigned to the middle of cent. iii. Mr. Clinton giving A.D. 256–270, as his active period. The discovery of the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus has proved this to be a mistake and thrown his period back to the close of the 2nd and beginning of the 3rd century. The known facts of his history are but few. All 4th century writers agree that he was born in Africa. Timothy of CP., in his book on the reception of heretics, says there were two heretics of this name, one of Libya, the other from Pentapolis, but in this opinion he stands alone. There is, however, no contemporary authority fixing his birth in Africa. Basil is the earliest writer who asserts this. It rests simply on the fact that his views met with special favour in the Pentapolis about the middle of cent. iii. The scene of his activity, at any rate, was Rome. Doctrines of a similar character to those he afterward held were flourishing in Rome during the latter part of the 2nd century, Praxeas having introduced them from Asia Minor during the pontificate of Eleutherus, bishop of Rome A.D. 174–189 [ELEUTHERUS (1)], while Noetus and his brother brought the same views from Smyrna some ten years later.

We find Sabellius in full activity at Rome during the episcopate of pope Zephyrinus, A.D. 198–217. The great questions then at issue in Rome, were the doctrinal one, concerning the Monarchia, and the practical one, concerning strictness of discipline. The Monarchian party were heretical in doctrine, and favoured the liberal view about discipline. The Montanists were orthodox in doctrine and rigid in discipline. Sabellius, from the statement of Hippolytus, would seem to have been undecided in his views when he came to Rome, or when he first began to put forward his views at Rome, for the silence of Hippolytus about his birthplace would incline us to regard Sabellius as a native of Rome. In *Refut.* ix. 6, Hippolytus tells us Callistus perverted Sabellius to Monarchian views. Hippolytus took him in hand and argued with Sabellius, as also with Noetus and his followers, l. c. cap. iii. Hippolytus indeed, about the year 200, was the leading controversialist of the Roman Church. Sabellius was convinced for a time, but was again led astray by Callistus. In fact during the episcopate of Zephyrinus, Callistus, Sabellius and the pope seem to have been united in persistent opposition to Hippolytus. Soon after the accession of Callistus, A.D. 217, we find him launching an excommunication against Sabellius, wishing to gain, as Hippolytus puts it, a reputation for orthodoxy, and to screen himself from the attacks of his persistent foe. Sabellius thereupon disappears from the scene. He seems to have written some works, to judge from apparent quotations by Athanasius in his 4th treatise against Arianism. [G. T. S.]

SABIANS (SABEANS, SABEITES, ZABIANS, SSABIANS, SUBHAS, MANDAEANS, MENDEANS,

CHRISTIANS OF ST. JOHN). Uncertainty besets the form, etymology, origin, applicability, and real application of this ancient name. The Sabian peoples and religion have been described as the very "dust-heap of Orientalism."

The genuine Sabians are perfectly distinct from the *Sabaioi* of the Caspian Sea, and from "the *Sabeans*" of the Bible, who are probably identifiable with the Omerites or Hamayarites of S. Arabia. Nor are they to be identified with the Zabians or Ssabians of the Hauran, who can be historically shewn, during the 9th century, deliberately to have adopted their name in order to avoid the persecution of the Mohammedans. After the 9th century Mohammedan writers give to these Pseudo-Sabians, as well as to the Mandaeans, this name, and some of the peculiarities of the one sect are attributed to the other. Inextricable confusion prevailed on the subject until, in comparatively recent years, the sacred books of the Sabians proper have been with very varied ability edited by Tychsen, Matt. Norberg (*Codex Nasareus, Liber Adami appellatus, Syriace transcriptus, Latineque redditus*, 2 vols. 4°. 1815), and H. Petermann (*Thesaurus sive Liber Magnus, vulgo Liber Adami appellatus opus Mandaeorum summi ponderis*, 2 vols. 1867). The last-mentioned work is lithographed in the singular character of the Mandaeans, but not translated either into Syriac proper or Latin. The knowledge thus placed before European students has been supplemented by Petermann's personal researches given in his *Reise in Orient*, and his brief articles in Herzog Real-Cycl. arts. *Mandaer* and *Zabier* or *Ssabier*. To these publications may be added the brochure of M. Siouffi, vice-consul of France at Mosul, in his "*Etudes sur la Religion des Soubhas ou Sabéens, leurs dogmes, leurs mœurs*," &c. Petermann brought to his research scientific knowledge, and the priest who gave him information was far more competent to impart it than was the half-instructed youth from whom Siouffi derived his facts. So far as present customs prevail, the two informants do not seriously differ. D. Chwolson, Professor in the Imperial University at St. Petersburg, has also thrown much light upon the subject in his learned and laborious work, entitled *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus*, two vols., 1856. Four-fifths of this treatise are devoted to the *Hauranite* Sabians, or pseudo-Sabians, whom he carefully discriminates from the Mandaeans or Sabians proper. He has filled a volume with the Arabic documents upon which he bases his conclusions concerning the history, the dogmas, the worship, the philosophy of this eclectic sect and its offshoots. The name "Christians of St. John" is a title which was given to the Mandaeans in the 17th century by Portuguese travellers (Chwolson, i. 100). They do not designate themselves by this term, although there may have been some slight colour for the ascription of it to them, in the contents of some of their sacred books, in the high place assigned to *Yahia* (John the Baptist) in their tradition and worship, and in their frequent use of baptism for the removal of all impurities. M. Norberg prefixed to his edition of the *Liber Adami* a strange recital by Conti the Maronite (1650), to the effect that a Johannine sect had migrated to Mergab in the Lebanon from Galilee about 150 years previously to his time. This sect considered John the Baptist to be their founder. Their ministers wore turbans and garments of camel's hair. Their sacrament consisted of locusts and wild honey, which was administered to those present in their assembly, and also carried to the absent. Though the minister commenced his discourse with the sentence "In the beginning was the Word," they held the Messiah to be a mere prophet who succeeded John. Images and pictures they abhorred. Their days of assembly were Sunday and Thursday. Their annual feasts were four in number: (1) The birthday of John; (2) A commemoration of the institution of baptism; (3) A lamentation for John on the day which commemorates his decapitation; (4) A feast in honour of the destruction by John of a dragon (see *John the Baptist*, &c., by the present writer, p. 476). This narrative is not confirmed by any ancient source of information touching the practices of either the Hauranites or Mandaeans.

It is important to determine who were the *Sabians*, to whom Mohammed referred in the Koran. In *Surah* ii. 59, we read: "The believers, be they Jews, Christians, or *Sabians*,* if they believe in God and in the judgment day and do what is right, will find reward with the Lord; let neither fear nor dismay torment them." In *Surah* xxii. 17: "Verily on the day of the resurrection, God will discriminate between believers, Jews, *Sabians*, Christians, Magians, and Polytheists." The same sentence occurs v. 73. Clearly the Sabians, whosoever they may be, were believed by Mohammed to worship one God only. Chwolson shews that those to whom Mohammed referred could be no other than the Mandaeans of Southern Babylon, whom the Mohammedan writers carefully distinguish from the Hauranites. They are discriminated from the latter by Masudi, A.D. 958, who says they turn towards the North Pole in their worship. This peculiarity is justified by their sacred books and present habits. About A.D. 987 Mohammed b. Isaac, after speaking of the Hauranites, devotes a chapter to Dualists, and enumerates among them *El-Moqtasilah*, the sect that purifies itself by washing, but he calls them the *Sabians* of the marshy district between Arabian deserts and the Euphrates and Tigris.

Chwolson gives at length, vol. ii., the *Fihrist* of Moh. b. Isaac, En Nedim of the 10th century, who interprets the word *Sabiyun* from *tsaba*, "dip" or "plunge" or "dye," corresponding with the Syriac word *Saba*—"tinxit," "baptizavit." This is the etymology which Renan prefers (*Vie de Jésus*, c. vi. *Histoire des langues Sémitiques*, iii. 4. i.); also, with misgiving, Bp. Lightfoot (*Ep. to Galatians*, p. 312, *Ep. to Coloss.* p. 165). Later Mohammedan writers have referred its origin to the Arabic word *saba*, "to change one's religion," *i.e.* "to become an apostate." Petermann inclines to this last origin of the word, while Sale (*Koran, Introd.* p. 15) thought that it might refer to *Seba*, the host of heaven, or the leader of the stars, which Sabians were supposed to reverence.

Much additional interest has been thrown around the subject, from the strongly supported conviction that these Mandaeans, or Sabians proper, are either direct descendants, or col-

* Palmer spells the word *Sabaeans*, Qur'ân, vol. i. c. 8, and ii. 58. Rodwell, "*Sabeites*."

lateral offshoots of the heretical sect of the Hemero-baptists, or the Elchasaites of the 1st and 2nd centuries. [BOOK OF ELCHASAI.] The accounts given by Origen (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 38), Hippolytus (*Adv. Haer.* lib. ix. 8–12), Epiphanius (*Adv. Haer.* xix. 1), are far from harmonious. Hilgenfeld (*Novum Test. extra Canonem receptum*, fasc. ii. p. 153) thinks that the word may have been a proper name derived from the name of the village *Elchesi*, where Jerome reports that Nahum was born. Ritschl and Lighfotot accept the interpretation which Epiphanius offers of the word 'Ηλξαι, viz. that it is equivalent to *δύναμις κεκαλυμμένη*, or "power veiled," while Origen and Hippolytus, followed by many modern scholars, assert that he was a man who lived during the reign of Trajan, preached Gnostic views of Christ and of the universe, repudiated asceticism and sacrifices, and recommended frequent baptism for remission of the foulest sin, and also deliverance from hydrophobia (Hipp. *l. c.* ix. 15). The association by Epiphanius of the name of Sampsean with that of the followers of 'Ηλξαι, and the view of Hippolytus that 'Ηλχασαί entrusted his revelations to *Sobiai* (qy. baptized ones or (Ritschl and Hilgenfeld) sworn members) have led Chwolson to identify the Sobiai, the Sampsaeans, and the Sabians, the Sobiyun of the Koran, and the Mandaeans of later times, with each other. It is true that Epiphanius is not altogether consistent with himself in treating of the *Sampsaeans* (*Adv. Haeres. Haer.* liii. 1, 2), whom he identifies with 'Ηλιακοί, sun-worshippers, and yet refers to one Elchseus as their founder. He says they are neither Jews, Christians, nor Hellenes; they reject prophets and apostles, and display a divine reverence for water. In *Haer.* xxx. 3 and 17, the false prophet Elchsaios is made a link of connection between the Ebionites, the Sampsenoi, and Elchesaiei, and sundry Gnostic extravagances touching Christ are attributed to him. Amongst other views this, that Christ was incarnated first of all in Adam, and frequently since, thus adopting (as Hipp. *l. c.* says) the doctrines of the Pythagoraeans. The same peculiarity is found in the Clementine *Recognitions*, and also in Theodoret (*Haer.* ii. 7). Chwolson entertains no doubt that these church Fathers, under different names, are describing the early history of the *Sabians* of the Koran or Mandaeans of history. He even goes further and identifies Elchasai, their founder, with SCYTHIANUS, the reputed Buddhistic teacher, who was the teacher of MANI, the founder of MANICHAEANISM.

Everything points to the high antiquity of the group of sects of which the diminishing tribe of Mandaeans is the instructive relict.

They call themselves מַנְדָּיֵיא, Mandăyē, contracted from Mandă dĕchăyē = "the word of life." In the presence of others, and as claiming the protection of the Koran, they call themselves "Sabians." Another title, *Natsoreans*,[b] is the name given to their most distinguished men. Though they have been inaccurately called "Christians of St. John," they are not Christians in any sense.

When Norberg first published his Syriac transliteration and Latin translation of the silk MS. in the Paris Library, grave discussion arose as to its value between Tychsen, De Sacy, and the editor, who proved that it was not a modern forgery, but contained the relics of an ancient faith.

The sacred literature in the more accurate texts of Petermann, consists of the following books: i. *Sidra Rabba*, "great book," or *Ginsa*, *i.e.* "treasure." It is the work of many centuries, places, and authors; is divided into two parts, one having reference to the living and the other to the dead; it contains prayers and rules. ii. *Sidre mesmatha*, or "book of souls,"—a liturgy. iii. *Q'olasta*, "liturgy for marriage ceremonial." iv. *Bavatha d'rakhma*, "prayers for special days." v. *D'rasha d'yakhya*, "narratives of John the Baptist." vi. *As'phar Malvasheya*, "astrological rules."

According to Ignatius-a-Jesu, there was another book called the *Diwan*, but living priests know nothing of it. Petermann's judgment is that this book consisted merely of illustrative talk concerning the Sidra Rabba.

The *Sidra rabba* contains three accounts of the origin of all things. The report which M. Siouffi offers, on the authority of the young priest, differs materially from that which Petermann's informant gave to him. The latter corresponds with other Gnostic systems, more particularly with the scheme of Valentinus. The source of all, the Aether of Great Light, the Lord of Glory, and the Great Jordan, form a kind of ultimate triad, sometimes called Mana Rabba, who, having called life (*Hajje qadmaje*) into existence, retired into profound concealment; communion with him is granted only to holiest Mandaeans, and to the souls of such only after death, in the form of one beatific vision. The "First life" does not correspond with the Demiurgus of the Gnostics, but rather with the Logos, for all the great honours of Mana Rabba are attributed to Him, he is enthroned in the aether, and countless angels minister around Him in eternal blessedness. From the "first life," emanate "the second life," *Hajje tinjânê*, and *Manda de hajje*, who correspond with the evil and good principle. To the latter is attributed all kinds of glowing honours and titles; he is the Redeemer and Saviour in the Mandaean system; he has revealed himself in three sons, called also his Brothers, Abel, Seth, and Enos. The Abel or Hibil-zino is by far the most sacred and important personage, and he is confounded and his qualities are interchanged with those of *Manda de hajje*. From Hajje tinjane have proceeded a host of spiritual beings, of whom *Abathur*, "Father of the Aether," is the chief. He is the "Concealed one," the "Judge of all." Abathur sits on the border of the world of light, and determines the destiny of all, who pass before him, and according to his decision move on into the light or back into darkness. He looked into the dark waters of the abyss, and there saw his own reflection, which he called *Pethahil*, and whom he entrusted with the creation of the world of men. But Mana Rabba would not allow man to suppose Pethahil to be his creator, and so authorized the three sons or brothers of

---

[b] Bar Hebraeus says they received this name from Nazriyah, a village near Kufa, where they first appeared in the close of the 9th century, but they frequently give themselves this name in the *Liber Adami* or *Sidra Rabba*, and in the so-called *Codex Nasareus*.

Manda de hajje to breathe into them the breath of life, and Hibel-zino becomes the ruler of the world, and Pethahil is sent elsewhere to await the final judgment. The four hells for disobedient spirits might have given some hint to Dante himself. Hibel-zino or Manda de hajje overcame the power and the malice of their rulers, and produced from their own forces the seven planets and the twelve signs of the zodiac and five sons. The heavens are built of solid crystal. The stars move in them round the pole star, the station of Abathur, towards which Mandaites turn to pray. Divergence from Christianity is great and fundamental, and it is easy to discern echoes that are antagonistic to it. Thus Jesu Messechah was a false prophet, who by sorcery walked on the waters and was transfigured, who called Himself God and Son of God, was proved to be a deceiver, and put to death by the Jews. *Jahia* (John the Baptist) was the only true prophet; to him they attribute the miracles of healing and resurrection. Mohammed is the last false prophet, after whom there can come no other. After four or five thousand years the world is to be swept by a terrific storm, and the human race once more to be created from a heaven-descended pair, whose posterity will remain for fifty thousand years in happiness and virtue. Then Leviathan is to throw all into confusion, and destroy all worlds save one of perfect light.

M. Siouffi's informant declares that the *D'ravchod Jahio* (which Petermann calls *D'rasha d'yakya*) is the most sacred of their books, and contains the narrative and the words of Jahia. The Mandaeans had fallen into an evil case from their neglect of circumcision. *Manda de hajje* caused Inochwei, the aged childless wife of Saoûa, to drink water, which made her pregnant with a child of promise. To avoid the threatened destruction of this child, he was caught away to paradise, and there instructed in all that would make him legislator of the people. He was brought back again to earth, and while traversing the river Euphrates was recognized by father and mother, who were baptized by him. He satisfied the incredulousness of the Jews by signs and wonders. They accepted his baptism, and amongst them Jesus Messiah came for baptism. Jahia hesitated on foolish grounds, but was subsequently encouraged to proceed by a message from *Abathur*, and most extraordinary phenomena accompanied the rite. Jahia on his first appearance adopted a celibate life, but since multitudes followed his example and threatened to bring the entire community to an end, Jahia married a wife. Some of the conversations between these two are very piquant and strange. The story of the death of Jahia is full of supernatural details, with no resemblance to the Synoptic narrative or that of Josephus. Manda de hajje overcame the reluctance of Abathur, and Jahia mounted at once on his death to a home in paradise. After the death of Jahia, the legends, weaving every kind of recital together, mingling up Pharaoh, Moses, Eleazar, Ezra, Mohammed, in one inextricable jumble, bring down their records to A.D. 1831, when the plague nearly destroyed them.

In the 17th century they numbered 20,000 families. They now do not exceed 1500 souls; inhabit villages south of Bagdad, between the Euphrates and the Tigris. They are gold-beaters, iron-workers, ship-builders, and are scarcely distinguishable from the Mohammedans among whom they live.

Their customs and the laws of their community are remarkable.

Siouffi and Petermann agree that the lowest order of their clergy is called *shganda* or deacon, though Siouffi says they must spend twelve years in committing the Sidras to memory. They are ordained to the office by baptism and imposition of hands. The ceremonial required to raise a *shganda* to the rank of *tarmida* or priest consists of intricate and prolonged purgations, with fasting from food and sleep for seven days and nights. The next stage is that of *gansibra*, whose function is episcopal, the consecration of other gansibras, and the conduct of nuptial ceremonies. One very curious custom is that the Gansibra, before he can be consecrated, must send a message by some dying Mandaean to *Abathur*, and often the country has to be searched for such an opportunity, or the service is delayed. They have also in theory, but not in fact, a supreme pontiff. The clothing of the priest is a white tunic, white trousers, girdle, and turban, with a gold or signet ring, and a white scarf connecting the right arm and turban. They go bare-foot in all religious services. Their churches are small huts, without altar or ornament, built near to the running water which is so necessary for their constant ablutions.

In addition to Sundays, they have four great festivals, ruled by the zodiacal signs. As their year consists of 360 days, five days are intercalated between Virgo and Libra and called *Pantsha*, on which occurs the great annual baptism of their whole community. Their sacrament is celebrated with an unleavened cake made by the priests in the church and with water. Their laws of purification for women after childbirth, and for both sexes after the normal operations of nature are most exacting. If a person quits the water before the rite of baptism is completed, the *Tarmida* has to remain in the river until some one of the same name can be brought to him who will go through the whole process. According to Siouffi, the baptismal formula is "Thou art baptized with the baptism of the three" (ALAHA (qy. Mana-Rabba), MANDO-SHAIY = Manda de Hajje, and JAHIA-YOUHONO), "may it keep thee from all evil and cause thee to rise to paradise." Baptism of infants is accompanied by frequent kissing of the dress and anointing. If a child dies under the complicated process, the *Tarmida* has to remain in the river until other priests have made an imaginary baby of dough and brought it to him. He then completes the ceremony, and the image is subsequently buried as if it were a real corpse. The rite of *Massakto* is of the most complicated character, and is supposed to ensure one who has submitted to it, from the otherwise terrible consequences of unexpected death. The marriage and mortuary rites are very elaborate and revolting to Western notions. Their ideas of purgatorial fires are very exacting and terrible. They entertain a curious phase of the Mohammedan belief, as to the part which Jesus will take in the final scenes of judgment. At that

dreaded time, they will all fall at His feet, but refuse to accept His religion. Whereupon they will all be killed, but their souls will go straight to paradise. Then the world without Mandaeans will be in sore case, and everything will go wrong, until compensation is made by their triumphant return to earth. Many of their other notions about Jesus correspond with the legends of the Koran, themselves derived from apocryphal and Gnostic sources.

The greater part of Chwolson's great work is occupied with a minute description of the Ssabians of the Hauran, who are proved to differ from the true Sabians in many ways. The expedition of Chalif el Mamûn, between 813 and 883 A.D., brought him into contact with this strange community. As they declared that they were neither Christians, Jews, nor Magians, they were thereupon advised by Mohammedan scholars to call themselves "Sabians," and thus come under the protection of the Koran and the Suras quoted above. Their religion was a strange amalgam of Roman, Greek, and Syrian deities, of Biblical and Buddhistic names, and of astrological speculation. According to Mohammedan writers, they had temples to the planetary bodies under their Roman names, in which they offered sacrifices, even human sacrifices, with most revolting ceremonies. They had also, according to Masûdi (Chwol. ii. 367), temples to the First Cause, to Reason, to the World-Order, and to Necessity.

The most interesting portion of this treatise is an account of a philosophical sect that dissented from the old community and which held a recondite Pantheistic theory, blending Buddhistic and Neoplatonic speculations with these curious ancestral ceremonials (Chwolson i. 717). The whole system, though it starts on signal lines of metaphysical mysticism, ingloriously terminates in gross superstition and magical rites. Their doctrines of the evil inherent in ὕλη, of the eternity of matter, of their cycles of change and renewal remind the reader of several forms of Gnosticism. Their burnt offerings to the planets connect them with idolatrous systems of both East and West; they resemble the Mandaeans in their frequent ablutions and in their habit during prayer of turning to the North Pole. They differ from them in discountenancing polygamy, in their nine orders of priesthood, and other particulars.

[H. R. R.]

SABINA (1), POPPAEA, empress, second wife of Nero. Just as in the case of certain members of the Flavian family it can be asserted with a very high degree of probability, but without absolute certainty, that they were Christians, so in the case of Poppaea, though it is almost certain that she was a Jewish proselyte, there still remains some doubt on the subject. The language of Josephus, θεοσεβὴς γὰρ ἦν (*Ant.* xx. 8, 11), almost implies that she was, and the fact that her body was embalmed and not burnt after the Roman custom (Tac. *Ann.* xvi. 6), has been used as an argument to shew that she had embraced a foreign religion. At any rate on at least two occasions (Jos. *supra*, and *Vita*, 3) she exerted her influence with Nero in favour of the Jews (see Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 5 *note*). It has even been conjectured that it was due to her that the Christians and not the Jews were selected as the victims who were to suffer for the burning of Rome. A romantic theory has lately been put forward by M. Latour St. Ybars of a rivalry between the Jewish Poppaea and Acte the former mistress of Nero, who, on the strength of a passage in St. Chrysostom (*Hom. in Acta* xlvi. in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lx. 325), is conjectured to have been a Christian. (Schiller, *Geschichte des Römischen Kaiserreichs unter Nero*, 436 *note*, and Aubé, *Histoire des Persécutions*, 421 *note*.) For the general history of Poppaea, see Merivale, ch. liii. [F. D.]

SABINA (2), Aug. 29, a widow, suffered at Rome with Seraphia, a virgin, who converted her under a prefect named Helpidius, and a magistrate named Berillus in the reign of Hadrian. Their acts are mingled up together. Seraphia seems to have suffered first, but is commemorated Sep. 3. Sabina was the widow of a man of high position named Valentinus. She was the daughter of a certain Herodes Metallarius. They were both buried in the tomb of Sabina, at the arch of Faustinus, "juxta aream Vindiciani, in oppido Vindinensi." Till. t. ii. 246, 597, rejects their acts, while Le Blant, *Actes des Mart.* pp. 63, 117, 143, 239, uses them as genuine illustrations of ancient Roman criminal procedure. They seem to have a historical germ, but to have been interpolated in later times. They will be found in their most ancient form in Boll. *Acta SS.* 29 Aug. vi. 500–504. [G. T. S.]

SABINA (3). See MACARIUS (20); Christian at Rome, Cyp. *Ep.* 22. [E. W. B.]

SABINIANA, an aged deaconess, probably of the church of Antioch, who, careless of her advanced years and infirmities, had started for Chrysostom's place of exile, reaching Cucusus the same day with himself, and apparently at an earlier hour, and had met with a kind reception from the members of the church there. Sabiniana expressed her readiness to follow Chrysostom to whatever place of banishment he might be sentenced to, even if, as had been currently reported, it was in Scythia, and her determination never to leave him (Chrys. *Ep.* 13). Tillemont is disposed to regard her as the same whom Palladius speaks of having seen at Antioch, about 410 A.D., and whom he praises as one of the most illustrious for piety he had ever known. He calls her the paternal aunt of Chrysostom. If there had been this relationship between them —supposing the two Sabinianas to be the same —it is hardly likely that Chrysostom would have spoken of her to Olympias simply as "my lady Sabiniana, the deaconess," ἡ κυρία μου Σαβινιανὴ ἡ διάκονος. (Pallad. *Hist. Laus. Vit. Patr.* append. p. 965; Tillemont, tom. xi. pp. 263, 519.) [E. V.]

SABINIANUS (1), martyr at Troyes under Aurelian (*Vid. D. C. A.* and Tillem. iv. 347). [C. H.]

SABINIANUS (2), a deacon of Rome in the end of the 4th or early in the 5th century, probably the latter. He was ordained by a bishop whom Jerome highly esteemed, probably therefore Anastasius (400–403), but had

to leave Rome on account of an intrigue with the wife of a barbarian. The bishop, not knowing the cause, gave him letters of recommendation, and he was received by Jerome and his friends at Bethlehem. He then endeavoured to corrupt a nun in the convent, and all had been arranged for their flight, when they were discovered by a letter placed by the guilty man in a crevice of the altar. Sabinianus fled, and afterwards wrote to entreat Jerome's pardon. Jerome, in his letter to him (14 Ed. Vall.), gives an account of all that has occurred, and, while forgiving all the injury to himself, shows his knowledge of evil deeds which he was still committing and exhorts him to repent. [W. H. F.]

SABINIANUS (3), bishop of Perrha, appointed successor of Athanasius after his deposition by the council at Antioch, A.D. 445, and ordained by Stephen, metropolitan of Hierapolis and his suffragans (Labbe, iv. 719, 722). He was deposed by the "Latrocinium" in 449, and Athanasius re-established (Labbe, iv. 719, 754). Sabinianus appealed against this act of injustice, and claimed to be heard in his defence and reinstated in his see. Theodoret wrote to remonstrate with him strongly on this weakness. In the existing crisis when wickedness was triumphant only two courses were open to the lovers of truth. Either boldly to resist the dominant party and so expose themselves to persecution, or absolutely to refuse to hold any communion with the advocates of false doctrine. (Theod. *Ep.* 126.) Sabinianus attended the council of Chalcedon and signed the acts as bishop of Perrha, Athanasius also signing under the same title. (Labbe, iv. 602, 590.) The council decreed his temporary re-establishment, with the proviso that Athanasius should be heard within eight months by Maximin of Antioch, and if acquitted should be restored to his see. We hear however of no further proceedings (Labbe, iv. 718–754) (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 944.) [E. V.]

SABINIANUS (4), a priest of Narbonne, whose excessive zeal against a person charged with adultery upon insufficient testimony, and subsequent disobedience to his spiritual superiors, when called to account, form part of the subject of a letter of pope Leo to Rusticus, bishop of Narbonne (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 1199). The letter is assigned to the year 448 (Ceillier, x. 200). [S. A. B.]

SABINIANUS (5), bishop of Jadera (Zara) in Dalmatia, had at first taken the side of MAXIMUS (18), bishop of Salona, but afterwards abandoned it in obedience to Gregory the Great (*Epp.* vii. 17, viii. 10, 24), who commends him for doing so, and also directs him to inquire into the case of FLORENTIUS (30), bishop of Epidaurus, who was said to have been uncanonically deposed and banished by NATALIS. [F. D.]

SABINIANUS (6), (SABINUS), bishop of Callipolis, to whom Gregory the Great wrote in A.D. 599, charging him to defend the inhabitants from unjust exactions, and sending him copies of the privileges of that church from the record office at Rome, and placing under his care the church estate at Callipolis. He succeeded JOANNES (95) in A.D. 596 (*Epp.* ix. 100, vi. 21). He had been a monk in Gregory's own monastery. (Joan. Diac. *Vita S. Greg.* iii. 7.) [F. D.]

SABINIANUS (7), vir clarissimus. Gregory the Great, in A.D. 600, directed Fantinus, the defensor, to adjudicate in certain causes between him and Decius, the bishop of Lilybaeum. Sabinianus alleged that a composition had been made between the citizens and Theodorus, the late bishop, by which the church in return for a grant of certain property, undertook to entertain the strangers, who, according to custom, were chargeable to the citizens. Sabinianus claimed to be recouped the payments he had made as defensor during the bishop's absence, on this account. (*Epp.* x. 28.) [F. D.]

SABINIANUS (8), bishop of Rome, after Gregory the Great, who died 12 March, A.D. 604. He was elected five months and more after the vacancy had occurred, probably on the 13th of September in the same year, and held the see for about a year and a half only, dying 22 February, A.D. 606 (Pagi, *critic.*). He was a native of Volaterra in Tuscany, and the son of one Bonus. When Gregory I. died, Rome was relieved for a time from the aggressions of the Lombards, a truce having through him been concluded with them; bnt, with other parts of Italy, it was suffering grievously from famine (Paulus, *Diacon.* l. 4, c. 9). The deceased pope had relieved distress by liberal, and perhaps too indiscriminate, charity, doling out food daily, and corn without charge from the granaries of the see. After his death, the ungrateful populace is said to have attributed the prevailing scarcity to his prodigality, and to have been on the point of expressing their feeling against him by burning his library, had not his friend, the deacon Peter, interposed. [GREGORIUS (51).] Sabinianus is said by Sigebert (*Chron. ad ann.* 606), and by Onuphrius Panvinus to have encouraged the popular feeling against his predecessor, but to have himself run into the opposite extreme of penuriousness, "withholding his hand from the poor." Anastasius (*Vit. Sabiniani*) speaks of his having sold corn to the people, instead of giving it as Gregory had done. But the manuscripts vary as to the price at which he sold it; so that it is uncertain whether it was for one, or thirteen, or thirty solidi per modius. Sigebert (*ib.*) tells the story that he was thrice visited in vision by the deceased Gregory, who reproached him for his derogation of himself, and for his niggardliness, and that on a fourth occasion, with horrible imprecations, the saint struck him so hard on the head that his death ensued in consequence of the blow. His body after death, according to Anastasius, was buried in St. Peter's, but conveyed thither over the Milvian bridge, and thence outside the city. This may have been done in order to avoid attacks on the funeral procession by the hungry populace who had become incensed against him. Nothing more is told of the short career of this unhappy pope, except that Onuphrius attributes to him the introduction of the custom of ringing bells at the canonical hours, and at the celebration of the Eucharist. [J. B—Y.]

SABINUS (1), prefect of Egypt under the emperor Decius, mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.*, vii. 11). His cruelties are described by Dionysius in vi. 41. [G. T. S.]

SABINUS (2), bishop of Emerita (Merida), or Legio-Asturica (Leon-Astorga). The question which see he was bishop of, is fully discussed, and the authorities given, under FELIX (99). He had succeeded BASILIDES and Felix MARTIALIS (2), libellatics in the Decian persecution, who had been deposed, Basilides having spontaneously declared himself unworthy. Cyprian enlarges on the regularity of the appointment of Sabinus; the bishops of the province had met in the city for which he was to be consecrated, and had chosen him in the presence of the people. When BASILIDES repented of his resignation, and in order to get himself restored went to Rome, and won the support of pope Stephen by misrepresenting the facts, Sabinus and Felix were sent with letters by the churches over which they presided, to Carthage to Cyprian, who assembled a council in the autumn of A.D. 254, which decided that Martinus and Basilides were canonically deposed and their successors canonically appointed. [CYPRIANUS (1), Vol. I. 747.] [F. D.]

SABINUS (3), a bishop, who wrote to Silvanus of Cirta, entreating him to be reconciled to Nundinarius before the ensuing Easter, A.D. 305, so as to prevent scandal arising from apparent disagreement. He wrote also to Fortis, urging him to use his influence for the same purpose, but by all means to keep the matter secret. (*Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. p. 173, ed. Oberthür; p. 169, ed. Dupin.) [FORTIS (2).] [H. W. P.]

SABINUS (4) I., bishop of Seville, was present at the council of Elvira, c. 306, and subscribes the canons (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Espan.* ii. 21, 27). He may have been the bishop who took up the body of St. JUSTA (3), from the well into which it had been thrown, and buried it (Ado, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiii. 304), but the readings vary between Gabinus and Sabinus (*Esp. Sag.* x. 130). [F. D.]

SABINUS (5), bishop and martyr at Assisi in the reign of Diocletian. [EXUPERANTIUS (3)]. [C. H.]

SABINUS (6), bishop of Placentia, took part in the council of Aquileia, in A.D. 381, against the Arians Palladius and Secundianus, and in that of Milan, in A.D. 390, against Jovinian (Mansi, iii. 599, 664; Ambr., *Act. Aq.*, *Ep.* 42 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xvi. 916, 1124). He was the intimate friend of St. Ambrose, six of whose letters are addressed to him (*Epp.* 45–49, 58 in *Patr. Lat.* xvi. 1142, 1178). In one, he asks him to criticise the works he is sending with it; in another he informs him that Paulinus and his wife had sold their property and given it to the poor, and that he had retired to Nola. He is probably the same as the Sabinus, deacon of Milan (Mansi, iii. 460), the bearer, in A.D. 372, of the letter from pope Damasus and the council of Rome to the East, who brought back the letter of St. Basil to the bishops of Illyricum, Italy and Gaul (Basil. *Epp.* 89, 90 in *Patr. Gr.* xxxii. 171, 172). He is said to have been bishop forty-five years. He is commemorated on Jan. 17th. (*AA. SS.* Jan. ii. 163; Tillemont, *M. E.* x. 106.) [F. D.]

SABINUS (7), bishop of Constantia in Cyprus. He had been the provost of a monastery in that island and succeeded St. Epiphanius on his death in 403. There was another Sabinus in this see in 458. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1045, 1047; Labbe, *Concil.* iii. 801.) [E. V.]

SABINUS (8), bishop of Tucca in Numidia. He stated at the Carthaginian Conference in 411 that he had been a Donatist presbyter of the same place, had brought all his people into catholic communion, and had been appointed their bishop. (*Carth. Coll.* cogn. i. 130 in Hard. i. 1084; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 334; Tillem. xiii. 350.) [C. H.]

SABINUS (9), friend of Sulpicius Severus, mentioned by Paulinus of Nola. (Paul. *Ep.* 13; Tillem. xiv. 89.) [C. H.]

SABINUS (10), bishop of Heraclea in Thrace, and a leader of the party and sect of Macedonius. He was the author of a collection of the Acts of the councils of the church from the council of Nicea to his own time. This work was much used by Socrates in compiling his *Ecclesiastical History*. He speaks of it as being untrustworthy, because Sabinus was an unscrupulous partisan, and omitted, and even wilfully altered, facts and statements adverse to his views and interests (cf. Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* i. 8, ii. 15). In these passages Socrates shews how Sabinus tries to disparage those who met at the council of Nicea, in the face of the evidence of Eusebius to the contrary, and makes no mention whatever of Macedonius, lest he should have to describe his evil deeds. Baronius speaks in strong language of Sabinus's unscrupulous handling of history (cf. Baronius, ad ann. 325, xxxix., ad ann. 344, iii. etc.), calling him "homo mendacissimus," and suggesting that Sozomen gives a garbled account of the election of Athanasius, "ex officina Sabini." Cave (*Hist. Lit.* i. 411) fixes the date at which he flourished as about A.D. 425. [G. W. D.]

SABINUS (11) II., bishop of Seville, was expelled from his see in A.D. 441, and EPIPHANIUS (3) wrongfully consecrated in his place (Idatius, *Chron.*). He returned to his own church from Gaul in A.D. 461 after an absence of twenty years (Idatius, *Chron. Parvum; Esp. Sag.* iv. 426, ix. 137). [F. D.]

SABINUS (12), ST., bishop of Canusium, was the chief of the legates sent by pope Agapetus to Justinian in A.D. 535, and in the next year attended the council of Constantinople under Mennas, on whose right hand he sat with the other legates, and subscribed the decrees (Mansi, viii. 877, 1141). He was a friend of St. Benedict, who prophesied to him the coming destruction of Rome. Gregory the Great relates how Totila made trial of his prophetic powers, and how his archdeacon tried to poison him, and was miraculously punished. He lived to a great age, and in his later years was totally blind (*Dial.* ii. 15, iii. 5, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxvi. 162, lxxvii. 225). There appears to have been

an earlier bishop of the same see and name, a contemporary of pope Gelasius, who died in A.D. 496. Sabinus is commemorated on February 9th (*AA. SS.* Feb. ii. 310). [F. D.]

SABINUS (13), defensor of Sardinia, directed with JOANNES (578) by Gregory the Great in A.D. 593 to cause JANUARIUS (25) and EPIPHANIUS (44) to appear at Rome for trial. (*Epp.* iii. 36.) [F. D.]

SABINUS (14) (SAVINUS), sub-deacon, addressed and mentioned in letters of Gregory the Great from 591–603. The first charges him to place the nunnery of St. Euprepia in possession of the garden of the deceased priest, Felicianus, in Rome. He separated from the church on the question of the Three Chapters, but his scruples were appeased by Gregory's arguments. He afterwards was sent to Bruttium, where he inquired into the case of the priest Sisinnius, of Rhegium, who was charged with idolatry and sodomy, and also with refusing to repay to the children of the deceased priest, Victorianus, a loan he had borrowed. He had also to investigate the complaint of Stopaulus and Marcellus, the freedmen of Comitiolus, who alleged that their master's daughter and representative, Maria, wife of the cleric Pardus, refused to pay the legacy of one-sixth of his property bequeathed to his freedman, and, to gain time, was raising questions as to the legality of their manumission. Finally, Sabinus procured timber from the forests of Bruttii for repairs of the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome. (*Epp.* ii. 4, iii. 10, ix. 47, 60, x. 4, 5, xii. 21, 22, 23, 37, xiii. 24, 25.) [F. D.]

SACCOPHORI, a subdivision of the Manichean sect, which cultivated the solitary life. They are denounced, under pain of capital punishment, in a law of Theodosius, dated A.D. 382, addressed to Florus, praetorian prefect of the East. This law is the first document which contains the word inquisition, as applied to official persecutors. (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. 5, leg. 9.) [G. T. S.]

SACERDON, heretic in the list of Sophronius (Mansi, *Concil.* xi. 499), doubtless transcriber's error for CERDON. This interchange is also found in the text of Hippolytus (*Ref.* vii. (10). [G. S.]

SACERDOS (1), a youthful presbyter of Caesarea, brother of Thecla, for whom, as for his sister, Gregory Nazianzen felt no common regard, calling him his son, his young hope, the comfort of his old age, the sharer of his sufferings, who in his youth manifested the ripeness of old age (Greg. Naz. *Epp.* 93, 212). Having been appointed superior of the hospital for the poor, founded by Basil at Caesarea (*Ep.* 233), one of the younger members of the community, Eudocius (EUDOCIUS), who had formerly been his friend, jealous of his promotion, quarrelled with Sacerdos, and brought charges against him before Helladius, Basil's successor in the episcopate, which led to his being removed from his office. (*Epp.* 216, 217, 235.) Gregory wrote him several consolatory letters (*Epp.* 213, 214, 215), and at the same time rebuked Eudocius for his unkindness to one who still desired to be his friend, and who had spoken of his behaviour with brotherly forbearance (*Epp.* 235, 236). He also pleaded his cause with Helladius, calling on him not readily to believe charges against one who had endured such great trials for the truth; nor, even if he had given him cause of offence to deprive him of his office, but at least to continue him in some part of it; and as to the rest not to distress him and the older members of the community by any hasty innovations. Helladius's reply, courteous in terms, but reiterating the charges against Sacerdos, caused Gregory great pain, he being unwilling to believe evil of his young friend, while grieved that ungrounded calumnies should cause alienation between those who had once been so closely united. (*Ep.* 217.) We are ignorant of the issue of the matter. Sacerdos, however, retained Gregory's confidence, who sent letters by him to friends at Constantinople (*Epp.* 91, 92), not long after which he was removed by death (*Ep.* 202). [E. V.]

SACERDOS (2), ST., 28th bishop of Lyons, presided at the 5th Council of Orleans in 549, and may have been present at the 2nd of Paris in 551 or 552. Shortly after the latter council he fell ill at Paris, and was visited by Childebert, in whose favour he stood high, and of whom he made the dying request, that his nephew Nicetius might succeed him in the episcopate. The king assented in the words, "Fiat voluntas Dei." He ranks as a saint, his day being Sept. 12 (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 36; Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. iv. 31 seqq.; *Gall. Christ.* iv. 32). [S. A. B.]

SACERDOS (3) (popularly SARDOS, SERDOT, or SADROC), ST., 26th bishop of Limoges, between Aggericus and Ausindus, according to his biographers, was born at a village called Calabre, now Calviac, between Cahors and Bordeaux, his father being Laban, a man of distinction in the latter city, and his mother, St. Mundana, the martyr. He is said to have been received from the font by Ecdicius, the son of the emperor Avitus, and brother-in-law of Sidonius Apollinaris, but upon very conjectural grounds (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. ii. 12). Ordained a deacon by St. Capuanus, bishop of Cahors, he became in time priest and monk in a monastery situated at his birth-place. As abbat he was reputed to have performed many miracles, and his fame spread so widely that he was chosen bishop of Limoges, upon the death of Aggericus. After an episcopate of about ten years, feeling the approach of death, he set out for his monastery, but died on the way. His body was carried thither, but in the time of Charles the Great was translated to the monastery of Sarlat, in the Dordogne. The church in which it lay was in the 14th century made a cathedral dedicated to Sacerdos, himself (Boll. *ibid.* p. 12, 17). He is commemorated at Limoges, May 5, and two towns derived their names from him, one in Aquitaine and the other in the diocese of Agen. Though a popular saint in his district, there is very little trustworthy information concerning him, and even his approximate date has been the subject of controversy, some placing him in the 5th and 6th centuries (Boll. *ibid.* p. 13), others as late as the 7th and 8th (*Gallia Christiana*, ii. 505). The authorities for his life are very late, consisting of

a biography by Hugo Floriacensis in the 11th century, and another by Bernardus Guidonis in the 14th. The former may be found in Boll. *ibid.* 14–22, and Migne, *Patr. Lat.* clxiii. 975 seqq. The latter was published by Labbé, *Nova Bibl.* ii. 661–5. Neither is of much value, and the catalogues of the bishops of Limoges are confused and of little assistance. [S. A. B.]

SACLAS. For this name in the Ophite system see HEBDOMAS, Vol. II. p. 850. From the Ophites the name was borrowed by the Manicheans. According to Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* iv. 9) Saclas was accounted by the Manicheans the prince of matter, and to him was ascribed the creation of man. The Manichean myth about Saclas is related somewhat more fully by Augustine (*Haer.* 46). [G. S.]

SADOSH (SADOST, SADOTH, SAADUST, SCHADOST, SCIAADOST), tenth catholicus of Seleucia on the Tigris, succeeded his uncle, Simeon Barsaboë, and in the following year, probably A.D. 342, suffered martyrdom at Seleucia with 128 companions. His feast is Feb. 20. (Assem. *B. O.* i. 188, iii. 399, 613; Greg. Barheb. *Chron.* ii. 38; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1108.) [J. G.]

SADWEN (1), abbat of the abbey of St. Docunni, in South Wales (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, 388–459). As witness to Gwidnerth's grant of Llangadwaladr [GWAEDNERTH] to God and St. Cadoc, he is "Saturn princeps altaris Docgwinni." (Rees, *Cambr. Brit. SS.* 93, 391.) [J. G.]

SADWEN (2), (SADYRNIN, SATURNINUS), surnamed FARCHOG, Welsh saint of the 6th century. He was son of Bicanys of Armorica, was married to St. Canna [CANNA], and related to many of the Welsh saints. Sadwen was born in Armorica, accompanied St. Cadfan to Britain in his old age, and founded churches in Anglesey and Wales. His feast is Nov. 29. (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 52; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 123, 213, 222.) [J. G.]

SAETHRYTH, queen, attesting a charter of Ethelbald king of Mercia in 734. (Kemble, *C. D.* 78.) [C. H.]

SAEWARD, king of the East Saxons. See SEXRAED. Saeward was the father of Sigebert the Little, and also of Sebbi, who succeeded Sigebert the Good. [S.]

SAFFARACUS, 18th bishop of Paris, present at the 5th council of Orleans in 549, and soon afterwards was deposed for some crime at the second council of Paris, the date of which is variously given in 551, 552, and 555 (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 36; Mansi, ix. 739; *Gall. Christ.* vii. 17). [S. A. B.]

SAFFARIUS, 10th bishop of Perigueux, was present at the synod of Poitiers, A.D. 590. (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ix. c. 41; Labbe, *Conc.* v. 1596; *Gall. Chr.* ii. 1454.) [J. G.]

SAFRIDA, mother of ST. FRIDESWIDA.

SAGARIS, Oct. 6, bishop and martyr at Laodicea, mentioned by Polycrates in his letter to Victor of Rome (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24). Melito, in his work on the Passover, mentions his martyrdom under Servilius (?) or Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Asia (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 26). As pointed out in t. iii. p. 895, this probably fixes his martyrdom between A.D. 164 and A.D. 166. [MELITO.] [G. S.]

SAGITTARIUS, 7th bishop of Gap, was a brother of Salonius, 10th bishop of Embrun. The two were notorious for their crimes in the time of Gregory of Tours, whose account is instructive as a picture of one aspect of the church of the 6th century. They were educated by St. Nicetius of Lyons, and ordained to the diaconate. Made bishops, the one of Gap and the other of Embrun, they threw off the mask and gave themselves up to usurpations, murders, adulteries, and other excesses. At the head of a troop of armed retainers they fell upon Victor, bishop of Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux, while celebrating his birthday, slew his servants, maltreated himself, and carried off his plate. King Guntram summoned the fourth, or, as it is generally called, the second council of Lyons in 566, to sit in judgment on the two. The bishops presided over by St. Nicetius, sentenced them to deprivation, but they induced the king to allow them to appeal to the pope, probably the first instance of the kind in France. At Rome they succeeded in persuading Paul that the sentence was unjust, and he sent them back with letters to the king, commanding their reinstalment. Their conduct now became more outrageous than before. When Mummolus engaged the Lombard invaders near Embrun (circ. A.D. 572) the two brothers fought in his ranks in full armour, and slew many of the foe. At length the clamours of their own flocks, whom they savagely beat and oppressed, induced Guntram to summon them to his palace. Because they were not straightway admitted to the presence, Sagittarius fell into a passion, and vilified the king and his race. Guntram's anger led him to forfeit their property and immure them in separate monasteries, but with his customary weakness he soon had superstitious scruples and let them out again. At first they made a show of repentance and a new life, but soon relapsed into shameless and continued debauchery. But in 579 the council of Châlon-sur-Saône once more at Guntram's bidding heard the charges against them, which now included that of treason. They were again deprived of their office and imprisoned in a monastery, but escaped and wandered from place to place. Sagittarius afterwards joined the pretender Gundovald, who landed at Marseilles in 582, and was promised by him the bishopric of Toulouse. When the cause became desperate, he prepared to save himself by betraying his leader, but it was then too late, and after witnessing the death of Mummolus he was himself slain while attempting to escape (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 43, v. 21, 28; vii. 28, 34, 38, 39; Aimoinus, *Hist. Franc.* iii. 28; *Gall. Christ.* i. 454–5). [S. A. B.]

SAHADUNAS, second bishop of Mahuza, a city of the Garmaei, abjured Nestorianism while he retained his see, and was bitterly opposed by Jesujabus, bishop of Adiabene, both personally and in a series of letters given by Assemani (*Bibl. Or.* iii. 116 sq.). Sahadunas is included among the Syriac Nestorian writers (*ib.* iii. 453); he flourished about the beginning of the 7th cen-

tury, and is said to have been sent on an embassy from Siroas king of Persia to Heraclius the Greek emperor. (Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1320.) [J. G.]

SAHAG. [ISAACUS (7).]

SALABERGA, Sep. 22, widow and abbess. She was born in Northern Gaul about A.D. 665. After her husband's death, to whom she had been married by order of king Dagobert, she built a monastery for perpetual praise. Her fame was celebrated in the middle ages. Her story is told at great length by the Bollandists. (*AA. SS.* Sep. vi. 516–530.) [G. T. S.]

SALAMANES (1), (Σαλαμάνης). [PHYSCO.]

SALAMANES (2), a solitary of Capersana, a village on the right bank of the Euphrates, who shut himself up in a cell on the opposite bank, having neither door nor window. Once a year he dug himself out and provided himself with food for the next twelve months and returned to his cell, having exchanged a word with no one. The bishop of the diocese being desirous to confer the gift of orders on so distinguished an ascetic, had the wall of the cell broken down, and laid his hands upon him, Salamanes manifesting neither consent nor dissent. With equal passiveness he allowed himself to be transferred to a cell on the opposite side of the river by the inhabitants of the village, and to be taken back again by his former neighbours. (Theod. *Hist. Relig.* c. xix.) [E. V.]

SALAPHTHA, of Gaza. [PORPHYRIUS (6).]

SALATIEL, one of the martyrs of Raythu with PAULUS (96). [C. H.]

SALERIUS, notary and chartularius of the Roman church, is mentioned three times in connection with Sicilian business by Gregory the Great. (*Epp.* ix. 55, xi. 49, xiii. 34.) [F. D.]

SALGAMIUS, one of the four deacons condemned by Primian. [MAXIMIANUS (2.) PRIMIANUS.] [H. W. P.]

SALIBA-ZACHA (1), 39th catholicus of Seleucia on the Tigris, succeeded Ananjesus A.D. 714. He was a native of Carchan near Tirhana, and seems first to have been the 3rd Nestorian bishop of Anbara (Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1124, 1172), then 7th bishop of Hazza and Arbela (*ib.* ii. 1231). He died at Seleucia A.D. 728. (Assem. *B. O.* iii. 616; Greg. Barheb. *Chron.* iii. 150.) [J. G.]

SALIBA-ZACHA (2), 3rd Nestorian bishop of Tirhana in Assyria, A.D. 767; he is best known in connexion with the licence given to the Nestorians to build a church at Tagrit. (Greg. Barheb. *Chron.* iii. 156; Assem. *B. O.* ii. 112; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1169.) [J. G.]

SALLUSTIUS (1), pretorian prefect under Julian, whose persecuting orders he was obliged to execute, much against his will, although he was a pagan. The case of Theodorus, who exhibited remarkable constancy under torture, at length led Sallustius to remonstrate with the emperor, to whom he pointed out how such proceedings discredited their party and conferred honour on the Christians. (Rufinus, *H. E.* lib. x.; Theod. *H. E.* iii. 7 al. 11; Soc. iii. 19; Soz. v. 20.) [C. H.]

SALLUSTIUS (2), praefect of Rome, A.D. 386 (*Cod. Theod.* xiv. i. ii. 3, xviii.), perhaps the Sallust addressed in three letters of SYMMACHUS (v. 55–57) and mentioned in three others (iii. 30, 31, vi. 35). It was to him that Valentinian wrote, thanking him for the information he had given about the site of the basilica of St. Paul, and directing him, with the approval of the senate and people, to divert the road to Ostia, so as to enlarge the site, and to have plans prepared for the extension of the basilica. (Baronius, v. 607.) [F. D.]

SALLUSTIUS (3), a presbyter of Constantinople, attached to the party of Chrysostom, who with Theophilus, his brother-presbyter, caused great dissatisfaction to their exiled bishop by withdrawing, the one through indolence and the other through cowardice, from the public assemblies of their brethren, neither uniting with them regularly in worship, nor instructing them, as behoved them, by preaching. Sallustius had only preached five times between Chrysostom's expulsion in June and November, and Theophilus not once. Chrysostom on receiving the painful intelligence wrote first to a friend, Theodore by name, who had great influence over Sallustius, reproaching him for not having written to inform him of their neglect of their ministerial duties, nor endeavour himself to correct it, and stating that he had written to Theophilus sharply rebuking him, but knowing Theodore's affection for Sallustius he preferred leaving him in his hands, begging him to stir up his friend and not allow him to go to sleep at his post (Chrys. *Ep.* 210). Neither this letter nor that to Theophilus (*Ep.* 212) having apparently had the desired effect, Chrysostom wrote to Sallustius himself, telling him with what grief he had heard the account of his own and his companion's base neglect of their duty as presbyters, which had made his banishment more desolate. If the charge was false, he begs that Sallustius will lose no time in contradicting it, and thus relieve him of his grief. But should it be true he entreats them to rouse one another from their torpor, lest they should bring down the judgment of God on their heads, if when their brethren are being persecuted, banished, and driven from their homes, they do not even contribute their presence and instruction to the tempest-tossed church (*Ep.* 203). We may hope that these severe remonstrances had their due effect, for both Sallustius and Theophilus were among those who were driven from Constantinople in the persecution of Alticus, the former being banished to Crete, and the latter to Paphlagonia (Pallad. p. 196). The Sallustius of *Ep.* 219, on whom Chrysostom lavishes many laudatory epithets, who as a γραμματηφόρος was able to convey letters to him from Constantinople, was probably a different person. [E. V.]

SALLUSTIUS (4), governor of the Euphratensian province, to whom Theodoret wrote a complimentary letter on his receiving the appointment for a second time, praising the integrity of his former administration which had caused the people of the province to hail his return with delight, and apologizing for having been compelled by the approach of Easter to leave Hierapolis without offering him

his congratulations in person. At his request he sent him a deacon who was skilled in hydraulics. (Theod. *Ep.* 37.) [E. V.]

SALLUSTIUS (5), patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 486–494 (Clinton, *F. R.*, Theophan. *Chron.* p. 124). He succeeded Martyrius in A.D. 486. Cyrillus Scythopolitanus frequently mentions Sallustius in his life of St. Sabas in terms of eulogy. As a bishop he exhibited wisdom and freedom from partiality, with perfect incorruptibility, never accepting evidence without thoroughly sifting it. St. Sabas was ordained presbyter by Sallustius, who also appointed him abbat of his Laura, to the mortification of some of the brethren, who scorned Sabas on account of his holy simplicity and rustic manners. He also consecrated the church of the Laura known as Theoctista, A.D. 491 (*Vit. S. Sab.* c. 19). Two or three years afterwards, on his deathbed, Sallustius also appointed Sabas superior of all the solitaries of his diocese (at the same time that he made Theodosius superior of the coenobites), with the view of checking the worldly and avaricious spirit which was beginning to invade the monasteries of Palestine, and to stay the spreading schismatical tendency. In spite of Cyril's eulogium Sallustius's orthodoxy admits of doubt. Eutychius says candidly that he was a Jacobite, *i.e.* an Eutychian (Eutych. ii. 108). It is certain that he signed the Henoticon, and communicated with Athanasius, the successor of Peter Mongus (Liberat. *Breviar.* c. 18; Labbe, v. 271), but more in the interests of peace, and to avoid schism, than from decided sympathy with his heretical views. He died July 23, A.D. 494, and was succeeded by Elias (*Vit. S. Sab.* c. 31; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 174; Baron. *Annal.* vi. pp. 428, 468; Cyr. Scythop. *Vit. S. Sab.* passim; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xvi. 377). [E. V.]

SALLUSTIUS (6), bishop of Seville, addressed and granted vicariate jurisdiction by pope HORMISDAS, q.v. [Vol. III. 161.] [F. D.]

SALOME. The New Testament notices of Salome will be found collected in the article on her name in the *Dictionary of the Bible*. With regard to the use of her name in apocryphal writings may be added here that in the protevangelium, or Gospel of St. James, she is made to attest the perpetual virginity of our Lord's mother, her incredulous refusal to believe the report of the midwife who attended at His birth being punished by miracle until on her repentance she obtains healing by touching the child. She appears as an interlocutor in some fragments of the "Gospel according to the Egyptians," preserved by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 13). See GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL, Vol. II. p. 713. She appears as a speaker in *Pistis Sophia*, p. 102, and her name was so used by other heretical sects as to become known to Celsus (Orig. *adv. Cels.* v. 62, see HARPOCRATIANI). According to Epiphanius Salome was one of two daughters of Joseph by a former marriage. The other he calls Mary (*Haer.* lxxviii. 6), but Anna (*Ancor.* 62). [G. S.]

SALOMON (1), (SOLOMON), solitary near Antinopolis in Egypt, visited by Palladius, who much extols him and speaks of his grace of patience in particular. He had then passed fifty years in a cavern, and had learnt the whole Bible. Heraclides also visited him. (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 96; Heracl. *Paradis.* 45; Tillem. xi. 519.) [C. H.]

SALOMON (2) (SALMON), abbat of the monastery at Marseilles over which Cassian had once presided (*Gall. Chr.* i.); addressed in a metrical epistle, c. 450, by the poet Victor (*Pat. Lat.* lxi. 935; Ceill. viii. 420, 421, x. 443). [VICTOR (39).] [C. H.]

SALONIUS (1), bishop of Genoa, according to some, of Vienne, according to others, about the middle of the 5th century. He was the son of Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, and the pupil of Salvianus, under whom he was educated at Lerins. Salvianus dedicated to him his two works, *De Avaritia* and *De Providentia*. He is supposed to have died before A.D. 475, because in the acts of the Council of Arles, held in that year, a certain Theophlastus is described as bishop of Genoa. He wrote a work variously styled *Expositio Mystica in Parabolas Salomonis et Ecclesiasten*, or *In Parabolas Salomonis Dialogi ii.*, or *In Parabolas et Ecclesiasten Salomonis Dialogi*, in the form of a conversation between himself and his brother Veranus. This exposition was adopted almost verbally by Honorius of Autun, in the 12th century, and published under his name at Cologne, in 1554. Cornelius à Lapide, in his *Comment. in Eccles.* p. 6, pointed out this fact. We have also a letter written by him to pope Leo the Great, thanking him for a copy of his epistle to Flavianus, of Constantinople, and requesting him to annotate a copy he had made of it. (Migne's *Pat. Lat.* tt. liii. 967; liv. 887; Ceill. xiv. 300); [EUCHERIUS (1) t. ii. p. 255.] [G. T. S.]

SALONIUS (2), 10th bishop of Embrun, was a brother of Sagittarius, 7th bishop of Gap. The two were notorious for their crimes. Salonius's history is the same as that of his brother until their escape from the monastery in which they were imprisoned after the sentence of deprivation passed on them by the council of Châlon-sur-Saône in 579. Salonius then disappears from history, and his end is unknown [SAGITTARIUS]; (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 43; v. 21, 28; vii. 28; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 1061–2). [S. A. B.]

SALVIANUS (1), bishop of Gazaufala (Hartel; v. l. cazauphala, gazauphalia. The true form is in inscr. 4800, Mommsen, vol. viii., gadiaufala. Procop. Γαζοφυλα, ap. Momms.) in Numidia Procons. He is called "martyr" in later MSS. Has seventy-sixth suffrage in Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. [E. W. B.]

SALVIANUS (2), a bishop of Spain in the last half of the 4th century. He and another Spanish bishop Instantius were the first followers of PRISCILLIAN. At the synod of Caesar Augusta (Saragossa) in 381, attended by the bishops of Spain and Aquitaine, where the Priscillianist doctrines were first condemned, sentence of excommunication in their absence was passed against Salvianus and the other leaders of the sect. After the rescript of the emperor Gratian banishing heretics, Salvianus accompanied Priscillian and Instantius from Spain to Italy. The

journey was undertaken with the view of clearing themselves and their party at the papal court. At Rome pope Damasus refused them audience. During their stay in the city Salvianus died (Sulp. Sev. ii. 46–48). [M. B. C.]

SALVIANUS (3), priest of Marseilles, and a writer whose works illustrate most vividly the state of Gaul in cent. v. The one external authority for the events of his life is Gennadius, *de Scriptor. Eccles.* cap. 67, where we find a list of his writings. All the rest almost of our information is gained from his own works. He was born about the closing years of the 4th century. He must have been a priest eminent for piety from the year 429 at least, when St. Hilary of Arles, in a sermon on St. Honoratus, describes him as "the most blessed man Salvianus, the presbyter." We conclude from his own expressions (*De Gub. Dei*, vi. 72) that he was born in Gaul, probably at Trèves, the manners and customs of which place he knew intimately and reproves sharply. He resided at Cologne, at least some of his relations did, as the first epistle of his which now remains to us is one addressed to a community of monks soliciting admission for a young man, son of a widow, his own relation, who had been captured at Cologne. His people occupied a respectable position in that city. His words about the youth are, "Quondam inter suos non parvi nominis, familia non obscurus, domo non despicabilis et de quo aliquid fortasse amplius dicerem, nisi propinquus meus esset. Hoc enim fit ut minus dicam, ne de me ipso dicere videar de illo plura dicendo." When a young man he married Palladia, daughter of Hypatius and Quieta, by whom he had one daughter, Auspiciola. After her birth Salvianus and his wife agreed to adopt the monastic life, which greatly incensed Hypatius who was originally a Pagan. He had embraced Christianity, but could not understand the ascetic tendency which was then seizing all ranks. He retired therefore to a distant region, and refused to hold any communication with Salvianus and his wife for seven years. We possess in *Epist.* iv. a very earnest appeal made by Salvianus and his wife, together with their daughter Auspiciola, pleading for the renewal of the love and friendship of Hypatius. We are not told what success attended their appeal, but from this time all disappear from history save Salvianus himself, who still survived in extreme old age when Gennadius wrote. He was then held in the highest honour, being expressly termed, "Episcoporum Magister," and regarded as the very type of a monk and a scholar. His title "Master of bishops" appears justified by the style of *Epist.* ii. and viii. addressed to Eucherius, whom he sharply reproves for want of courtesy to himself, of *Epist.* iii. addressed to Agrycius, and of *Epist.* ix. to Salonius, which are marked by the tone of one who was regarded by all as their literary and spiritual director. Gennadius tells us (*l. c.*) that he had read the following works composed by Salvianus, three books *On Virginity* addressed to Marcellus, a presbyter; four books against Avarice; five books *de Praesenti Judicio*, now commonly called *De Gubernatione Dei*, addressed to Salonius the bishop; an exposition of the close of Ecclesiastes or Ecclesiasticus, addressed to Claudianus bishop of Vienne; a book of Epistles; a poem on the first chapter of Genesis; and numerous homilies. Of these various writings there now exist only the following: *De Gubernatione Dei*, in eight books, not in five as Gennadius says; nine Epistles and the work in four books, variously called *Timotheus*, *Ad Ecclesiam*, or *Adversus Avaritiam*. All the other works have perished, unless as Peter Allix thinks, his poem on Genesis is identical with that on Genesis i., found among the metrical fragments of Tertullian. The writings of Salvianus are important from a social, political and ecclesiastical point of view. In the *De Gubernat. Dei*, lib. iv.–viii., he gives a lively picture of the social changes which were going on within the empire owing to the iniquitous fiscal system in vogue. Thus lib. v. capp. 4–9 show clearly the cause of brigandage, the origin of the serf system, and the evils of vast estates. He gives significant hints as to the social and commercial state of the country. Thus in iv. 14, he refers to the crowds of Syrian merchants who inhabited all their cities, a fact which the discovery of Syrian, Assyrian, and other Oriental inscriptions in France has amply confirmed. Cf. Le Blant's *Ins. Chrét. de la Gaule*, Diss. nos. 225, 557, and 613. He helps us again to understand the interruption of intercourse between Roman and English Christianity, which took place to a great extent in 5th and 6th centuries. The empire was gradually surrounded by a ring fence of hostile states, all barbarous, and several of them heretical, which served as a retreat from the power, and a barrier to the religion of Rome. At any rate for a century and a half the new kingdoms of the Franks and Burgundians afforded ample employment for her missionary zeal without troubling herself with the regions beyond. The treatise against Avarice is simply an extravagant laudation of the ascetic life and the practice of almsgiving, which he pushes so far in the first book as seriously to discuss whether a man should leave any property at all to his sons. Ceillier (x. 359) devotes a lengthened notice to Salvianus, with a full analysis of his writings and their bibliography down to the publication of Migne's *Patrol. Lat.*

The latest modern edition of his works has been published in the *Corpus Ecclesiast. Scriptorum* of the Vienna Academy, t. viii. Vindob. 1883, edited by Fr. Pauly, for which the best Mss. have been collated. He has elaborately set forth his views on the formation of Salvian's text in the *Sitzungsber. der phil.-hist. Classe der Kaiserl. Akad. in Wien*, xcviii. Hft. i. p. 3 ff. [G. T. S.]

SALVINA (SILVINA), daughter of the Moorish chief Gildo, count of Africa, and wife of Nebridius, nephew on the mother's side of Flacilla, the first wife of the emperor Theodosius the Great. The Christian virtues which, according to Jerome and Chrysostom, distinguished the ladies of Gildo's family, were in strong contrast with brutal and savage vices which rendered his name detestable. His wife is designated as "a holy woman" by Jerome, from whom we also learn that Cyria, Gildo's sister, had devoted herself to a life of perpetual virginity (Hieron. *Ep.* 9). While still a girl, Salvina was transferred by Theodosius to his own court, as a pledge of the loyalty of her father and of the province of Africa of which he was governor.

She was brought up with the young members of the imperial family, and was married some years before her father's miserable death, somewhere about A.D. 390, to the young Nebridius, the son of the empress's sister, who had been educated with his cousins, the future emperors, Arcadius and Honorius. Her union was of short duration, Nebridius dying soon after A.D. 390. He left her with two children, a son, named after his father Nebridius, and a daughter (Hieron. *ibid.*). Salvina devoted her widowhood to God's service, and, as her husband had been, became the patroness and protectress of Oriental churches and ecclesiastics at the court of Arcadius. Her fame having spread to Palestine, Jerome, though a stranger to her personally, addressed to her a letter—the arrogant tone of which might (we may well think) have offended, if the coarseness had not shocked her—calling upon her to maintain her state of widowhood unimpaired, and that she might the better avoid the temptations to break her vow, exhorting her, though living in a palace—"aula regalis"—to adopt a rule of strict abstinence; foregoing meat and wine and baths, and devoting her time to prayer and the reading of the Scriptures and holy books. The education of her son and daughter should be her first care, together with the management of her large and opulent household. At the time Jerome wrote—which he did chiefly through the importunity of "his son Avitus"—the young widow and her children formed one household with her mother, Gildo's widow (his death had taken place A.D. 398) and her paternal aunt at Constantinople (Hieron. *Ep.* 9; *De servandi virginitate*, *Ep.* 11 *ad Geront.* ad fin.). Salvina's ardent piety speedily attached her to Chrysostom. She became one of his deaconesses, equalling in her devotion Olympias and Pentadia, and bound to him by the strongest of ties. She remained with him to the last, and, together with the above-named and Procula, took a final farewell of him in the baptistery of the cathedral, the night of his final expulsion. (Pallad. p. 90.) [E. V.]

SALVIONUS (Galbionus), a layman to whom Chrysostom wrote stating that he had heard of his fervent affection for him from many who had come to Cucusus, and though he felt no doubt of it, he begged that he would prove it by the frequency of his letters. (Chrys. *Ep.* 209.) [E. V.]

SALVIUS (1), martyr at Carthage in the fourth century, and commemorated in the Calendar of Carthage. (*Vid. D. C. A.* and Tillem. v. 555.) [C. H.]

SALVIUS (2), Donatist bishop of Ausapha, or Ausafa, a place of unknown site, present at the council of Cabarsassum, A.D. 393, and condemned at that of Bagai, A.D. 394. (Aug. *En. Ps.* 36. 20; *c. Cresc.* iii. 59, iv. 5; *c. Gaud.* ii. 7.) [Maximianus (2).] [H. W. P.]

SALVIUS (3), Donatist bishop of Membresa, Membrissa, or Membressa (*Medjez el Bab*), a town mentioned by Procopius as distant 350 stadia from Carthage, near the river Bagradas (Procop. *Vand.* ii. 15); placed between Musti and Sicilibba, 45 miles from Carthage, by Antoninus, *Itin.* 45. 3. Salvius was one of the twelve ordainers of Maximianus. [Maximianus (2).] He was not present at the council of Cabarsassum; and another bishop, Miggin, signed its resolutions in his stead. For this he was condemned by the council of Bagai (Aug. *En. Ps.* 36. 20; *c. Cresc.* iii. 59, iv. 5; *c. Gaud.* ii. 7). He is mentioned as one of those who practised re-baptism (Aug. *Parm.* iii. 22). Refusing to return to the party of Primian, he was displaced, and Restitutus appointed in his stead; but when he attempted to take possession of the house and land belonging to the see, Salvius resisted him, believing that his opponents could not take advantage of the laws against heretics without implicating themselves in its operation (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iv. 57, 58, 60, 82; *Ep.* 108. 14; *En. Ps.* 57. 18; *Cod. Theodos.* xvi. 5, 22, 25, 26). The action appears to have been brought during the proconsulate of Herodes, A.D. 394, but not to have been decided until that of Seranus, A.D. 398. [Herodes (2); Restitutus (3); Seranus.] When the judgment was published, the people of Membresa, by whom Salvius, now an old man, was greatly beloved, appear to have supported him in opposition to the edict, but the people of Abitina, a neighbouring town, took upon themselves, without any official sanction, to execute it, and having attacked Salvius maltreated him cruelly and ignominiously. They dragged him in a mock triumphal procession, with dead dogs tied to his neck, and compelled him in this condition to join in their disgusting antics, an act of brutal mockery, the truth of which Augustine said could not be denied, and which, comparing it to that of Mezentius (Virg. *Aen.* viii. 485), he said was as bad as death by burning, and ought to justify the Maximianists in regarding him as a martyr (Aug. *Parm.* iii. 29; *c. Cresc.* iv. 59, 60). Whether this attack caused the death of Salvius we know not, nor do we hear of him again in subsequent history, but his case is often quoted by Augustine when he retorts on the Donatists their charge against the Catholics of persecution. [H. W. P.]

SALVIUS (4) (Silvius), ST., 5th bishop of Martigny (Octodurus), whence the see was transferred to Sion, flourished in the middle of the fifth century. There are indications that he was an author of some note. St. Eucherius of Lyons addressed to him his history of St. Maurice and his companions, the supposed martyrs of Agaunum, situated in Salvius' diocese (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* l. 827). In return Salvius dedicated his *Laterculus* to Eucherius in terms which imply that he had written other works (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. i. *Praefat.* p. 44). The author of the life of St. Hilary of Arles speaks of a Silvius, who may well be identical with this bishop, as among the learned doctors of the time who had made themselves celebrated in Gaul by their writings (*Vita S. Hilarii*, cap. xi., *Patr. Lat.* l. 1232). But nothing of his works has survived beyond the above mentioned *Laterculus*, which however is of considerable interest. It is a sort of calendar, sacred and profane. According to the preface it is not an original work, but founded on and elucidating that of others, and was undertaken in the year 448. The same preface promises an enumeration of the names given to the month by different

nations, the princes and tyrants who had reigned, the Provinces of the Roman Empire, the known quadrupeds, birds and fishes, directions for finding the new moon and Easter day, and other information. But the work itself falls short of this somewhat, which has induced the belief that we have only a part of it. The preface and a part of the calendar were first published by Bollandus in the *Acta SS.* Jan. i. *praefat.* 43–4, and the full calendar by his successors Jun. vii. 178 seqq. It is also to be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiii. 671 seqq. For comments on it see the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 294–6 and Ceillier, viii. 452; and, for the whole subject of these early calendars, Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, i. 48 ff. [S. A. B.]

SALVIUS (5) (SAUVE), ST., bishop of Alby, towards the close of the 6th century, an intimate friend of Gregory of Tours, who gives us the story of his early life from his own lips. He had been an advocate, and had led an active and worldly life though unstained by the passions of youth. After his conversion he entered a monastery, to embrace a new life of poverty, austerity, and worship. In time the monks made him abbat, but craving for still higher sanctity, he withdrew to a solitary cell, where, after a fever, he fell into a sort of trance, and was laid out for dead. While unconscious he was conducted by two angels to heaven, and shewn the glory of it, but not permitted to remain, as work still awaited him on earth. The account of this Dantesque vision, which Gregory calls God to witness, he heard from the bishop's own lips, is interesting (*Hist. Franc.* vii. 1). It should, however, be noted that the authenticity of this chapter has been called in question. (See Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. iii. 575–6.) As bishop he indignantly scouted the heretical and somewhat crude views which king Chilperic unfolded to him on the subject of the Trinity, and wished to force upon the church (*ibid.* v. 45). He was at the council of Braine in 580, and while bidding farewell to Gregory in the vestibule of the house they had occupied there, he pointed to the king's palace, and asked his companion if he saw aught above it. Gregory could see nothing but the upper story just built at Chilperic's command. Then Salvius, drawing a deep sigh, uttered these words: "Video ego evaginatum irae divinae gladium super domum hanc dependentem," and after twenty days the two sons of the king were no more (*ibid.* v. 51). In his diocese he won the people's love by many good deeds, for but few of which the historian has space. When Mummolus carried off some of his flock as prisoners, he followed and ransomed them at his own cost; and when Alby was almost depopulated by a plague that ravaged southern France, he refused to desert the city (*ibid.* vii. 1). He was, Gregory says, magnae sanctitatis, minimaeque cupiditatis, aurum nunquam habere volens (*ibid.*), and there are few contemporary French bishops of whom he says as much. He died about 584, and was succeeded by Desideratus (vii. 22). He is commemorated September 10, and though only mentioned by Rabanus among the ancient hagiologists, the Bollandists think the cult was already established in the time of Gregory, who survived him. See the *Acta SS.* for the history of his relics, and two churches dedicated to him, one being at Nevers (Sept. iii. 574). [S. A. B.]

SALVIUS (6), ninth bishop of Amiens, succeeded Honoratus c. A.D. 588 [HONORATUS (17)], and died A.D. 612. A life, not written by a contemporary, but probably embodying an old tradition in the eighth century, is given by the Boll. (*Acta SS.* Jan. i. 703–6). He was consecrated at the suggestion of Theudericus (Thierry III.), king of the Franks, and long after his martyrdom, c. A.D. 612, his remains were found by Charlemagne. His feast is 11 Jan. (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 50. 195; Vincent Belv. *Spec. Hist.* xvii. 90; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 982.) [J. G.]

SALVIUS (7) I., 8th in the list of the bishops of Valence. In St. Ouen's Life of St. Eligius, mention is made of a Salvius, doctissimus episcopus, who at a council of bishops held at Orleans (circ. A.D. 638) overthrew in controversy a certain heretic from beyond seas, who had done much harm to the faith (Audoenus, *Vita S. Eligii*, i. 35, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 507). Conjecture has assigned this Salvius to Valence (*Gall. Christ.* xvi. 294). [S. A. B.]

SALVIUS (8) II., 13th in the list of the bishops of Valence, a contemporary of Charles the Great. Mention is made in the *Chronicon Elnonense* and by Sigebert of a bishop Salvius who came from Aquitaine to Valenciennes, a royal fiscus, and there was martyred. But it is pure conjecture to assign him to this see. (*Gall. Christ.* xvi. 296.) [S. A. B.]

SAMAEL (SAMANNA). The chief of the seven demons in the Ophite system, was the Serpent, having the two names Michael and Samael (Iren. i. 30, p. 111). The latter name in Theodoret's report (*Haer. Fab.* i. 14) takes the form Samanna. The name Michael is attested also by Origen (*Adv. Cels.* vi. 30). [G. S.]

SAMHTHANN (SAMTANN, SAMTHANNA, SAMTHANUS, SAMTHAND), virgin, abbess of Clonbroney, co. Longford, died A.D. 739 (*Ann. Tig.*). Her life, quoted by Ware *Ir. Writ.* i. c. 13), is now lost: a prophecy by her is referred to in *Ann. Tig.* A.D. 738. O'Reilly, *Ir. Writ.* p. li.) [J. G.]

SAMLED, Welsh saint of the 7th century, patron of Llansamlet, co. Glamorgan. (Rees, *Welsh SS.* 309.) [J. G.]

SAMMONAS (AMMONAS), bishop of Neapolis (Sichem) in Palestine A.D. 529. He was murdered in one of the frequent revolts of the Samaritans. (Cotel. *Mon.* iii. 339; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 649.) [G. T. S.]

SAMONA. [HABIBUS (2), SARBELIUS.]

SAMPSAEI (Σαμψαῖοι), heretics, also called Elkesaites (Epiph. *Haer.* 33 sive 53). [ELKESAI.] [C. H.]

SAMSON (1) (SAMPSON), Welsh saint, bishop of Dôl. The legend of this bishop is evidently obscured by the admixture of several traditions, and by considerations which were found con-

venient in the ecclesiastical controversies of the middle ages. The materials for his life are of their kind very abundant. Leading authorities are *Vita S. Samsonis Episcopi Dolensis in Armorica*, auctore anonymo, printed first in Mabillon, *Acta SS. O. S. B.* i. 154, ed. Ven. (165, ed. Par.), and then in the Bollandists' *Acta SS.* 28 Jul. vi. 573, with learned Commentarius Praevius and appendix, discussing the comparative values of the British and Gallican authorities (pp. 568–593); another of similar import, but calling him "archiepiscopus et confessor" in *Lib. Land.* by Rees, with English translation, pp. 8–25, 287–305; another in Du Bosc, *Bibl. Flor.* 464, and Surius, *Acta SS.* iii. 338; another in Capgrave, *Nov. Leg. Angl.* f. 276; and another by Balderius of Dole, never printed, is also mentioned. (See for the bibliography and his acts generally, Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 141–4, pt. ii. p. 881; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 158–9, append. E.; *Hist. Lit. de la France*, iii. 265, 546.)

Taking the life in *Lib. Land.* as a type of the British tradition as distinguished from the Gallican, Samson was son of Amwn Ddu, prince of Armorica in the 5th century. He was born in Glamorganshire, educated by St. Illtyd at Llantwit Major, ordained deacon and priest by St. Dubricius, and became for three and a half years abbat of St. Peirio or Piro's monastery on an island near Llantwit; some say at Llantwit. Afterwards he went to live in a desert near the Severn, was consecrated by St. Dubricius and others to the episcopate, though, according to the common Celtic custom, without reference to a specific see, and in course of time proceeded to Armorica, where he became the champion and deliverer of the captive prince Judual, and died at Dôl (*Lib. Land.* 305). Thus far, and excluding the miraculous elements, the tradition is generally consistent and complete, though some of the Welsh traditions bring him back to die at Llantwit in Wales. But to this are added several fictions which probably belong to the 12th century, and are traceable to Geoffrey of Monmouth and to Girald. Cambr. Geoffrey's is that Samson was archbishop of York, and when he had to flee before the Saxons, he carried the pall with him to Dôl; that of Giraldus is that he was 25th archbishop at Menevia, after St. David, and similarly carried the pall with him to Dôl, when he left Wales on account of the yellow plague; in either case he thus became archbishop of Dôl. But obviously there was a purpose to be served by these additions. The church of Dôl was ecclesiastically subject to Tours, and against this the bishop and clergy of Dôl were struggling for freedom. At the same time the Welsh church, as represented by Giraldus and Bp. Bernard of St. David's, was resisting the power of Henry II. and the encroachments of Canterbury, so that they brought this forward as a convenient plea for exemption from the English metropolitan. But with the argument inherently weak, and the English king in opposition, the appeal even to Rome failed (Pryce, *Anc. Br. Ch.* c. 4). There seems, however, to be no doubt that a Samson bishop of Dôl was present, and signed the canons at the council of Paris in A.D. 557 (Mansi, ix. 752), but the Gallican authorities give him an entirely Gallican tradition as to birth, life, and labours. As he was not present at the second council of Tours in A.D. 567, he is supposed to have died in the interval, so that the dates of his episcopate given by Gams (*Ser. Ep.* 546) are A.D. 557, 565 (567), but Ussher places his death at 599. When Giraldus names him as the 25th archbishop of Menevia after the founder, he must place him about the 10th century, which is evidently a fabrication for controversial purposes, but a Samson at all, at either York or Menevia, rests upon only the slenderest authority (Stubbs, *Reg.* 153, 155; Gams, *Ser. Ep.* 186, 200). Samson's feast is July 28. In his memoir, *De Sansone Demeta*, A.D. 567, Pitseus (*Angl. Script.* p. 99) ascribes to him *De patientia in adversis*, ep. i., with Bale and Leland. (See also Rees, *Welsh SS.* 218, 228–9, 253 sq.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 442, c. 13; Moran, *Ir. SS.* c. ii.) The monumental inscribed stones to SS. Illtyd and Samson found in the churchyard of Llantwit Major cannot be of the early date at one time imagined, as there can be no doubt that the Samson there mentioned as placing the cross for his own soul and for the souls of Juthael, the king, and Arthmael, must have lived in the 9th century, and the lettering would agree with that date. (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 626–8; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 181, 255.) [J. G.]

SAMSON (2) (SAMPSON), Scotic priest in Germany, complained of archbishop Boniface of Mayence, and censured as "vacuus a spiritu sancto, et alienus a gratia Christi atque a consortio sacerdotali abjiciendus," by pope Zacharias (*Ep.* No. 11) and as erring from the truth in affirming that, without the outward form of baptism, we can become Christians by the imposition of the bishop's hands. (The whole letter is given in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. lxxxix. 943 sq., and the part about Samson and Virgilius by Ussher, *Wks.* iv. 473, *Ep.* 17.) Bale (*Script. Brit.* par. post. 200) gives a long account of Samson and his companions, and of their contentions with St. Boniface, but much seems of no value. Dempster (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 579) and Tanner (*Bibl.* 650) take from Bale, but say he wrote *Super controversia cum Winfrido misso* (or *Winifrido Bonifacio*). He flourished about A.D. 750 (Fleury, *H. E.* xlii. 57; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xii. 32). [J. G.]

SAMSUCIUS, bishop of Turris, or Turris Caesaris, a town of Numidia, forty miles south-east from Cirta (*Burgh Twill*, Shaw, p. 43), mentioned by St. Augustine as prepared to debate the question of Donatism with Proculeianus, Donatist bishop of Hippo Regius (Aug. *Ep.* 34. 6). He also consulted Samsucius on the question of the property of Honoratus [HONORATUS (24)] (Aug. *Ep.* 83. 4), and joined him and Alypius in a letter to Severus about the case of Timotheus (*Ep.* 63). [TIMOTHEUS (8).] [H. W. P.]

SAMPSYCHUS, of Gaza. [PORPHYRIUS (6).]

SAMUEL (1) Feb. 16, martyr, with four other Egyptians, under Firmilian at Caesarea, in the Diocletian persecution. They suffered with Pamphilus. (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* cap. xi.) [G. T. S.]

SAMUEL (2), a Persian martyr, put to death with his brother, Bar-Hadbesciaba, by Sapor, for supporting the forty martyrs, "ex facultatibus suis" (Asseman. *Bibl. Or.* i. 192). [E. V.]

SAMUEL (3), established by Pachomius as oeconomus in the monastery he founded at Panis. (*Vit. Pachom.* in Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii. 315, ed. 1866; Tillem. vii. 222.) [C. H.]

SAMUEL (4), 1st bishop of Tus in Chaldea, about A.D. 430. He was a favourite with Beheranus or Vararenes, king of Persia, and kept his people in peace. (Assem. *B. O.* iii. 214, 397; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1337.) [J. G.]

SAMUEL (5), Syrian patriarch of Armenia, A.D. 432. Another Samuel of Ardzge was patriarch in 492. (Saint-Martin, *Mém. sur l'Arménie*, t. i. p. 437, ed. Paris, 1818.) [G. T. S.]

SAMUEL (6), a presbyter, of Edessa, the chief of the accusers of his bishop, Ibas, at Antioch (A.D. 448), Tyre and Beryhoea (A.D. 449), in revenge for having been inhibited from preaching by him for unsoundness of doctrine (Labbe, iv. 654) [IBAS, Vol. III. p. 193]. Gennadius states that he was the reputed author of many works in Syriac, directed against the enemies of the Church, but especially against the Nestorians, Eutychians, and other recent heretics, and that when Gennadius wrote he was still alive at Constantinople, A.D. 493. (Gennad. *de Virr. Illust.* c. 82; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 451; Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* i. 669; Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* i. 259; Hefele, *Counc.* iii. 178.) [E. V.]

SAMUEL (7), abbat of the monastery of St. Isaac at Gabula, addressed by James, bishop of Batna, in a letter wherein he attacks the council of Chalcedon and avows Eutychean sentiments (Ceill. x. 641; Asseman. *Bib. Orient.* i. 294; cf. however JACOBUS (4), t. iii. p. 328 of this dictionary). [G. T. S.]

SAMUEL (8), 5th Jacobite bishop of Amida, was intruded into the see by Chosroes II. A.D. 616, but was rejected in the patriarchate, as he had been appointed by the Maphrian and not by the patriarch. (Greg. Barhebr. *Chron.* i. 266; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1413.) [J. G.]

SAMUS, bishop. [SYMPIUS.]

SANCTAN (SANTAN), son of Samuel Ceinnisel (or Chendisel), was bishop of Cill-dales, or Kill St. Ann, near Tallaght, co. Dublin. (On the identification of place and change of name, see Joyce's *Ir. Names of Places*, 2nd ser. p. 22.) His feast is May 9. (*M. Doneg.*: *Book of Obits C. C. Dublin*, lx.) [J. G.]

SANCTINUS, first bishop of Meaux, but his life is of very doubtful authenticity (Boll. *AA. SS.* 11 Oct. v. 585; *Gall. Christ.* viii. 1597). The sees of Meaux and Verdun each claim a Sanctinus as its first bishop in the fourth century, and it is disputed whether these two are the same (Vincent. Belvac. *Spec. Hist.* xi. 22: Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 466, 721, 722; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ix. 518–9). [J. G.]

SANCTISSIMUS, a presbyter probably deputed by Damasus to convey to Basil and the other prelates of the Eastern Church in 373 the assurance of the fraternal regard and sympathy of the Western Church with troubles under which they were then labouring. Basil sent him on his way with letters of introduction to the leading members of his communion to Meletius (*Ep.* 120 [58]), Theodotus (*Ep.* 221 [195]), Vitus of Charrae (*Ep.* 225 [314]), Pelagius of Laodicea (*Ep.* 254 [311]), Abraham of Batnae (*Ep.* 132 [315]); to the presbyters of Antioch (*Ep.* 253 [199]); together with a circular letter, which they were requested to sign. Sanctissimus appears to have returned to the West with Dorotheus in 374, and to have visited the East a second time in 375 or 376, and to have followed much the same course, visiting the chief orthodox bishops, conveying letters and messages of sympathy from the Western Church, and obtaining their signatures to circular letters for him to carry back with him (*Ep.* 256 [200]; 239 [200]). (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* ix. 259.) [E. V.]

SANCTULUS, a simple and illiterate priest of Nursia, near Spoleto, who visited Gregory the Great at Rome every year. Gregory tells various stories about him, and especially how some Lombards gave a deacon they had taken prisoner in charge to him, on condition that if he let him escape his life should be forfeited. Sanctulus freed him and ordered him to fly; the Lombards accordingly resolved to behead him; he knelt to receive the stroke, but the raised arm of the executioner was miraculously arrested, and its use was restored to him only at the intercession of Sanctulus. The astonished Lombards offered him all the cattle they had taken, but he refused, and obtained from them instead the release of all their prisoners. Gregory makes the reflection, "comparemus cum hac nostra indocta scientia illius doctam ignorantiam." (Gregorii *Dial.* lib. iii. 37, in Migne *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 305.) It was Sanctulus who narrated to Gregory the story referred to under EUTYCHIUS (31). [F. D.]

SANCTUS (1), deacon of Vienne, martyred at Lyons, A.D. 177. (Euseb. v. 1.) [C. H.]

SANCTUS (2), addressed along with Amandus in two letters by Paulinus of Nola. Sanctus and Paulinus had been friends before the conversion of the latter. Paulinus had written to Sanctus, and had received only a short answer, followed by a long silence broken at last by a letter, with which Paulinus was overjoyed. He deprecates, however, the praises, of which he declares himself unworthy. The letter contains a curious explanation of the verse, "I am become like a pelican in the wilderness," &c., in which Paulinus uses information about the pelican received from a friend who had been a great traveller (probably Rufinus). From the expressions of Paulinus it appears that Sanctus had also been converted. In the second letter Paulinus thanks Sanctus for some hymns he had sent him, and explains the parable of the ten virgins. (Paulini *Epp.* 40, 41, in Migne *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 367, 377.) [F. D.]

SANXO, bishop. [SAMPSON.]

SANSALA, a Gothic presbyter and confessor, mentioned in the acts (§ 4) of the Gothic martyr St. Sabas. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 12 Ap. ii. 89, ed. 1866; C. A. A. Scott's *Ulfilas*, p. 81.) [C. H.]

SAPAUDUS (1) (SABAUDUS), twenty-second archbishop of Arles, between St. Aurelianus and Licerius, a son of the patrician Placidus, and descendant of the emperor Avitus, was an intimate friend and correspondent of Pope Pelagius I., who, with the gift of the *pallium*, appointed him his vicar in Gaul (A.D. 557), and stoutly maintained the privileges of the see against the attempted infringements both of King Childebert and the neighbouring bishops. In the struggle between Sigebert and Guntram for the possession of Arles, Sapaudus secured the success of the latter by a daring ruse (A.D. 571). He presided at the fifth council of Arles in 554, was present at the second of Paris in 555 or 551, according to some, the fourth of Paris in 573, the second of Valence in 584, and by deputy at the second of Mâcon in 585. In the following year he died. (Pelagius, *Epist.* 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxix. 401–7; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 30, viii. 39; *Gall. Christ.* i. 539; Trichaud, *Hist. de l'Église d'Arles*, ii. 106–122.)

Magnan has a story that by his preaching he converted the Allobroges, whose country thenceforward was called after him Sabaudia, or Savoy (*Vies des SS. de l'Église de Marseille*, p. 84). [S. A. B.]

SAPAUDUS (2), professor of rhetoric at Vienne, had a famous school, and belonged to a family of rhetoricians. He was contemporary with Mamertus Claudius (*Ep.* ii.) and Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist.* v., no. 10) and received letters from both, complimenting him on his eloquence and encouraging him in study. He lived towards the end of the sixth century (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. liii. 783, and t. lviii. 541; *Hist. Lit. de la France*, ii. 450–1, 498; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 355, 389, 554). [J. G.]

SAPIDA, a virgin, who presented to St. Augustine a garment which she had made for her brother, probably named Timotheus, a deacon of the church of Carthage, but which his death prevented him from receiving. Augustine accepted it with pleasure, and tells her in a letter that he had begun to wear it. Expressing his sympathy with her in her great sorrow, he exhorts her to maintain her virgin life, as being thereby brought nearer to her deceased brother; for whose loss he endeavours to console her by the thoughts, that her treasure is now the safer for being laid up in store, that in the resurrection she will be reunited to him, and that the garment which he is now wearing is an emblem of the never-fading one in which her brother will hereafter be clothed (Aug. *Ep.* 263). [H. W. P.]

SAPIDIANUS, vicar of Africa, to whom was addressed, Feb. 25, 400, a law of Honorius, ordaining that a rescript which the Donatists had obtained from the emperor Julian in 362, containing a disreputable request of theirs, should be set up in the most public places. (*Cod. Theod.* vii. 155, ed. Godefr.; Tillem. xiii. 525.) [C. H.]

SAPOR (1) II., king of Persia A.D. 310–381. The secular history of this monarch will be found in the Dictionary of *Greek and Roman Biography* under the title Sassanidae, and in the authorities there quoted, to which may be added Gibbon, cap. xviii., Le Beau, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, De Broglie, *L'Eglise de l'Empire*, t. iii. p. 180; Saint-Martin's History of Armenia in *Journal Asiatique*, March 1830, p. 178; Clinton's *Fasti*, and Rawlinson's *Seventh Oriental Monarchy*, p. 143–253. He is noted in ecclesiastical history for the violent persecution raised by him against the Persian Christians, which has furnished many narratives to Asseman's *Eastern Martyrs*. Theodoret (i. 25) inserts a letter written by Constantine the Great to Sapor, in which he commends the Christians of his dominions to the care of the king. It is evident that his hostile intentions were already manifest, but were restrained through fear of Constantine. As soon as that emperor was dead the persecution burst forth and raged for many years with more or less violence. War was thereupon declared by Rome. The Persians attacked Nisibis, which endured three distinct sieges at their hands. Its deliverance is attributed by Theodoret (*H. E.* ii. 30) to the piety and skill of James, bishop of that city, of which he tells some wondrous tales. [JACOBUS (4).] Sapor is also celebrated as the sovereign by whom Julian's Persian expedition was defeated. Cf. JULIANUS (103), Vol. III. p. 513 of this dictionary. [G. T. S.]

SAPOR (2), a bishop and martyr in Persia, under the king Sapor II., about A.D. 340. Assem. *AA. MM.* i. 226; Ceill. iii. 341.) [G. T. S.]

SAPOR (3), 3rd Nestorian bishop of Beth-garma in Chaldea, died A.D. 342 in the persecution under Sapor II. (Assem. *B. O.* i. 189; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1237.) [J. G.]

SAPOR (4), a Roman general, to whom the emperor Gratian confided the task of expelling the Arians from the churches of the East, and restoring them to those who were in communion with Damasus, bishop of Rome. (Theodoret. *H. E.* v. 2, 3, cf. the edict. "De Catholica Fide" in *Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi.) He drove Apollinaris of Laodicea out of the church. [APOLLINARIS, Vol. I. p. 134.] [G. T. S.]

SAPRICIUS, priest of Antioch, A.D. 260. He refused to be reconciled to his former friend Nicephorus, and became an apostate through his lack of charity. The story is told under NICEPHORUS, Feb. 9. (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* p. 243.) [G. T. S.]

SARA (Σάῤῥα), female solitary, entitled ἀμμᾶς, i.e. mater, the feminine of abbas, near Scetis. She was thirteen years constantly assaulted by an unclean demon, and for sixty resided near the river without looking at it. (Rosweyd, *Vit. Pat.* v. 7, § 19; Cotel. *Mon. Gr. Eccl.* i. 691; Tillem. x. 473.) [C. H.]

SARAGOSSA, MARTYRS OF, April 16. Eighteen persons are celebrated under this name by Prudentius, Hymn. 4. They suffered under the president Dacianus. Their names are Optatus, Lupercus, Successus, Martialis, Urbanus, Julia, Quinctilianus, Publius, Fronto, Felix, Caecilianus, Evotius or Eventius, Primitivus, Apodemius, and four Saturnini. [DACIANUS (1).] [G. T. S.]

SARAN (2), surnamed UI CRITAIN, died A.D. 662 (*Ann. Tig.*). He is the Saranus who is classed with the "Caeteris doctoribus seu abbatibus Scotis," in the paschal letter from the pope elect to the Irish church, A.D. 640 (Bede, *E. H.* ii. c. 19; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 17 n.). [CRONAN (11).] He is identified by O'Donovan (*Four Mast.* i. 572 n[d]) with the patron of Tisaran, bar. Garrycastle, King's Co., and Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 581, and *Men. Scot.* Jan. 23, Mar. 10) ascribes to him *Epistolae ad Hilarium, Super Controversias de Paschatis celebratione*, and places his relics at Tungland. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 190, 194; Boll. *Acta SS.* 10 Mart. ii. 3 praet., 30 Jul. vii. 139, praet., both upon Dempster.) [J. G.]

SARAPAMMON (Σαραπάμμων), one of the Egyptian catholic bishops banished by the Arian party. (Athan. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 79.) [C. H.]

SARBELIUS (1) (SHARBIL.) [See EDESSA, MARTYRS OF. Vol. I.] To what has been stated in the article just referred to must here be added that Syriac acts of Sarbelius, and other Edessan martyrs, were included by Cureton in his *Antiqua Monumenta Syriaca*, 1864, and that a Latin translation of these acts, together with abundant illustrative matter, has since been published by Moesinger, Innspruck, 1874. According to these acts, Sarbelius was the chief priest of the idol worship of Edessa. Trajan, in the 15th year of his reign (which is also described as the third year of Abgarus, the 7th king, and the 416th of the era of Alexander the Great) issued a command to the rulers of the provinces of his empire that sacrifices and libations should be renewed and increased in every city, and that those who refused to take part should be punished with cruel tortures. On the announcement of this command, Barsimaeus, the bishop of the Christians, accompanied by a priest and deacon, waited on Sarbelius, and warned him of the responsibility he incurred by leading so many into the error of worshipping gods made with hands. They briefly tell him of the doctrine concerning our Lord's Incarnation and death, taught by Paluth, the disciple of Addai, the apostle, and believed in by the earlier king Abgarus. Sarbelius is at once converted; is admitted to baptism that night, and makes his appearance next day clad in the Christian baptismal robes. A great multitude, including some chief men of the city, join him in his conversion. The acts then relate how the governor Licinius brings Sarbelius before him and commands him to sacrifice. Licinius makes it a point of honour to overcome the constancy of the martyr, and as each form of torture is tried without success, orders a new and more severe one. The series of tortures described actually runs to the number of eighteen. Finally, he is put to death with new tortures, being partially sawn asunder and then beheaded. His sister Barbea is united with him in martyrdom. There are separate acts of Barsimaeus, evidently by the same hand. They relate how Barsimaeus, after the martyrdom of Sarbelius, is brought before the tribunal, and how the magistrate commences a like series of tortures in order to shake his constancy. But when the torments have not proceeded beyond the second or third stage, a letter, ordering the cessation of the persecution, arrives from Trajan, who has by this time become convinced of the excellence of Christian morality, and of the general agreement of their laws concerning conduct with the laws of the empire.

These Edessan acts acquired very considerable celebrity. Moesinger publishes an Armenian translation, and the name of Sarbelius is commemorated in the Greek Menaea under the dates Jan. 29 and Oct. 15, and in the Latin martyrologies under the same dates. There is also a Thathuel commemorated on Sept. 4, whose story is identical with that of Sarbelius, so that it may be assumed that the same person is intended. Moesinger labours hard to maintain that the extant acts were written by a contemporary of Sarbelius, and that they are historically trustworthy; but his arguments are too weak to deserve serious refutation. It is not worth while to discuss the details of the story, or to enquire how the state of things described answers to the date A.D. 105 or 106, which the acts assign to the martyrdom. Two marks of fiction show themselves on the face of the story. One is the extravagant amount of tortures alleged to have been inflicted, the narrator having been so eager to accumulate proofs of the constancy of his hero, that he did not stop to consider what a Roman magistrate was likely to order, or what the human frame was capable of enduring. The other is, the familiarity of Sarbelius with the New Testament, which would have been noteworthy in a Christian of long standing in the year 105, but is incredible in the case of a newly-made convert. He is made not only to quote the Gospels several times, but also the book of Psalms and the Epistle to the Romans. We may ascribe the acts to the latter part of the fourth century. They are probably later than Eusebius, who shows no sign of acquaintance with the story. On the other hand, the acts are largely employed in a sermon, printed by Moesinger, by James of Sarug, who died A.D. 522. [JACOBUS (13)].

To this may be added that there is a strong family likeness between the acts of Sarbelius and those of Habibus, and of Samona and Guria, which are also given in Cureton's work. Since the latter martyrs are alleged to have suffered in the Diocletian persecution, the former acts which have the air of coming from the same workshop are at least no earlier. [G. S.]

SARMATIO. In the Epistle of St. Ambrose (lxiii.) to the church of Vercellae, Sarmatio and Barbatianus are denounced as apostate monks, who had fled from their monastery and repudiated the principles of monasticism. They affirmed that there was no merit in fasting or virginity. They had gone to Vercellae, and St. Ambrose warns the Church against their doctrines. [J. Ll. D.]

SATANIANI. [EUPHEMITAE, Vol. II. p. 292.] The name Sataniani is copied by Augustine (*Haer.* 57) from Epiphanius, but without giving any explanation of it. Praedestinatus based his work on Augustine's tract on heresies, and this title gives an amusing illustration of his style of workmanship. He found in Augustine

(*Haer.* 57) the name Sataniani without any explanation of the tenets of the sect, and (*Haer.* 67) the tenets of a sect described without any name. So he combines his information, calls the latter sect Satanniani, and since their tenets as described throw no light on the name, he invents an imaginary Satannius as the founder of the sect. [G. S.]

SATTIUS, African bishop, twentieth in Tit. Conc. Carth. ii. *de pace*, Cyp. *Ep.* 57; sixteenth in Tit. Conc. Carth. iv. *de Basil.* Cyp. *Ep.* 67; thirty-second in Conc. Carth. v. *de Bap.* i. Cyp. *Ep.* 70; bishop of Sicilibba (Procons. Prov.); thirty-ninth suffrage in Conc. vii. *de Bapt.* iii., where the Codex Reginensis reads Sicilibra as Anton. Itin. Other forms in Morcelli are Sicilippa, Sciliba, Sibida. [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (1). (**Σατορνῖνος**, Iren. i. 22; Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 7; *Constt. Apol.* vi. 8. So also Ps.-Tert. 3; Philaster 31; August. *Haer.* 3. but **Σατορνεῖλος** or **Σατορνῖλος**, Hippol. *Ref.* vii. 28; Epiph. *Haer.* 23; Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* i. 3.) In that section of the work of Irenaeus which commences I. 22, he gives a list of heretics, to all appearances derived from the work of Justin Martyr. The first two on this list are the Samaritan heretics, Simon and Menander; and the next, as having derived their doctrines from these, are Saturninus and Basilides; who taught, the former in the Syrian Antioch, the latter in Egypt. Irenaeus proceeds to tell that Saturninus like Menander, ascribes the ultimate origin of things to a Father unknown to all; and taught that this Father made Angels, Archangels, Powers, Authorities; but that the world and the things therein were made by a certain company of seven angels, in whom no doubt we are to recognise the rulers of the seven planetary spheres. He taught that man was the work of the same angels. They had seen a brilliant image (*εἰκών*) descend from the supreme power, and had striven to detain it, but in vain; for it immediately shot back again. So they encouraged each other; "Let us make man after the image and after the likeness" (*κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν*, Gen. i. 25). They made the man but they were too feeble to give him power to stand erect, and he lay on the ground wriggling like a worm (*ὡς σκώληκος σκαρίζοντος*) until the upper power taking compassion on him because he had been made "in its likeness," sent a spark of life which raised the man and made him live. Saturninus taught that after man's death this spark runs back to its kindred, while the rest of man is resolved into the elements whence he was made.

The same myth as to the creation of man is reported by Irenaeus (I. xxx. 5) to have been included in the system commonly known as Ophite; and that there is a relation of literary dependence between the two stories is clear from the common use of the word *σκαρίζω*. But according to the Ophite story it is not the Supreme Power, but Ialdabaoth the chief of the creative company who bestows the breath of life; and these angels say, as in Genesis, "Let us make man after *our* image." We may count Saturninus as the originator of the myth, for the Ophite version has marks of less simplicity and originality. Some of the earliest editors of Irenaeus supplied the "our" in his account of Saturninus, equally against MS. authority and the requirements of the context; and Theodoret or his transcribers have made the same mistake. But the absence of *ἡμετέραν* is attested not only by Epiphanius, who (*Haer.* 23) severely criticises this departure from the Scripture text, but by an earlier authority. In an extract given by Hippolytus (vi. 14) from the *μεγάλη ἀπόφασις*, which purported to be the work of Simon Magus, the words of Genesis are quoted with the same omission, but an entirely different use is made of them. Man is said to have been created not single but two-fold, *κατ' εἰκόνα*, and *καθ' ὁμοίωσιν*. This coincidence is one of the points that ought to be discussed in forming an opinion as to the date of the work quoted by Hippolytus.

Saturninus further taught that the God of the Jews was one of the seven creator angels. He and his company were in constant warfare with Satan and a company of evil angels. So, likewise, there were two distinct species of men, the one good, the other bad, the latter ever aided by the demons in their conflicts with the others. Then the Supreme Father sent a Saviour to destroy the power of the God of the Jews and the other Archons; and to save those who had the spark of life in them; that is to say, the good. This Saviour had no human birth or human body, and was only a man in appearance.

This portion of the teaching ascribed to Saturninus presents the aspect of an inconsistent mixture of different systems. In the case of a conflict between good and evil angels, we should expect that the Supreme, if he interfered, would interfere on the side of the good; yet here the object of the mission of the Saviour is represented as the destruction, not so much of the power of Satan, as of that of the God of the Jews. In the Gnostic systems generally, the origin of evil is traced to the creation of matter, and so the work of redemption is constantly represented as the destruction of the power of the Being or beings who had created the material world. But such systems could very well dispense with the doctrine of evil angels. We may conjecture that Saturninus, whose use of the Old Testament is evidenced by his quotation of Gen. i., derived from the Jewish Scriptures the doctrine of Satan and his angels, and superadded to it a theory suggested by the principle that matter is essentially evil. This principle explains also his docetic teaching concerning the Saviour.

The same principle also explains his Encratism, a rule of life which Saturninus seems to have been the first to introduce among those who called themselves Christians. Some Gnostic teachers justified sexual immorality as but a courageous violation of arbitrary precepts imposed by the God of the Jews. Saturninus on the contrary taught that marriage and generation came from Satan; and many of his followers abstained besides from animal food of all kinds, attracting admiring followers by this severity of life.

It only remains to mention that Saturninus ascribed the Jewish prophecies, some to the creator angels and some to Satan. This is one of several points of coincidence between the reports given by Irenaeus of the teaching of Saturninus and of the Ophites whom he describes (I. xxx.) These do not ascribe any of the prophecies to Satan, but Irenaeus (§ 11) gives the

scheme according to which they distributed the prophecies among the several angels. Saturninus does not appear to have left any writings. His sect is named by Justin Martyr (*Trypho* 35), and by Hegesippus (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22.)] No later haeresiologist appears to know anything about him beyond what he learned from Irenaeus; and Irenaeus himself in all probability gives but second-hand information derived from Justin Martyr. [G. S.]

SATURNINUS (2) (SERNIN), ST., martyr, first bishop and patron of Toulouse. According to his *Acta*, which were published by Surius (Nov. 29), and again by Ruinart after careful revision, in his *Acta Sincera* (p. 128–133), Saturninus came to Toulouse in the consulship of Decius and Gratius (A.D. 251), apparently from Rome (cf. Venant. Fort. *Misc.* ii. 12, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 101). Here his preaching so exasperated the people that they put him to a shocking death by binding him to a bull, which they infuriated by goads. Some years later St. Hilary (third bishop of Toulouse) built a little chapel over his remains for worshippers, but left the coffin undisturbed. Next Silvius (bishop circ. A.D. 364) constructed a beautiful church for its reception, but his death left the task of removing the body to his successor Exuperius. So say the *Acta*, which are highly praised by critics (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 161; Ceillier, ii. 111), and which Ruinart believed were written fifty years after the martyrdom, conjecturing somewhat boldly that the narrative of the translation of the body was a later addition (p. 128). But there were two other traditions current in early times and in the middle ages, one that Saturninus was sent into France by St. Clement at the end of the first century, the other that his mission was from the apostles themselves. The former view is to be found in Gregory of Tours (*De Glor. Mart.* i. 48), though it is inconsistent with the *Hist. Franc.* i. 28, where he adopts the version of the *Acta*, in Rabanus Maurus (*Martyrologium*, Nov. 29) and many writers of the middle ages. Nor is the latter tradition lacking in antiquity, being as old as Venantius Fortunatus, if the *Passio S. Dionysii* is rightly ascribed to him (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 579), and appearing in many other ancient sources (see Ceillier, ii. 111 n.) The recent editor of Ceillier believes the author of the *Acta* was mistaken as to the date, and that the mission in fact should be referred back to apostolic times (*ibid.*)

Saturninus's feast is Nov. 29, though events in connection with the history of his relics are marked on other days. His cult was widely extended, churches being dedicated to him in many places in France, and even in some of the provinces of Spain. Sidonius Apollinaris celebrates his martyrdom in Sapphic stanzas (*Epist.* ix. 16). Venantius Fortunatus has some verses on the same event, the wonder-working virtues of his tomb (*Misc.* ii. 11, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 99), and the beautiful church built towards the close of the sixth century by Launibodes on the spot where he was bound to the bull, and which came to be known as du Taur or du Taureau (ii. 12, col. 100). From Gregory of Tours we gather that portions of his relics were at the monastery of Pauliac (*De Glor. Mart.* i. 48), at Iciac or Issac in the Auvergne (*ibid.* i. 66), and at one time in Burgundy, where they were rescued from a burning church by a man of Tours and consigned to the altar of the church at Neuvy in Touraine (*De Glor. Mart.* i. 31), and finally in Gregory's own oratory at Tours (*De Glor. Conf.* xx.). An unfounded tradition claimed the possession of the body for St. Denys at Paris whither it was said to have been carried in 637, but in fact, according to Adrien Baillet, it was discovered in the martyr's own church at Toulouse in the year 1258 after being lost to view for some centuries (*Vies des Saints*, Nov. 29). There was an early tradition that, before his death, he uttered a prayer that Toulouse might never have a bishop of its own citizens for ever, which Gregory says up to his time had been fulfilled (*Hist. Franc.* i. 28). [S. A. B.]

SATURNINUS (3, 4, 5), African bishops. Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 2, *de pace*, A.D. 252, *Ep.* 57. [E. B. W.]

SATURNINUS (6, 7), African bishops. Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 4, *de Basilide*, A.D. 254, *Ep.* 67. [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (8, 9, 10), African bishops; of the thirty-two sending the synodal epistle of Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. 5, *de Bapt. Haer.* i., A.D. 255 (Cyp. *Ep.* 70). [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (11, 12), Numidian bishops; of the eighteen receiving the Ep. Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. 5, *de Bap.* 1, Cyp. *Ep.* 70. [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (13), Carthaginian confessor, tortured with the *ungulae* in April A.D. 250 before the proconsul. Then banished, or fled to Rome with all his family, Cyp. *Epp.* 21, 22. [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (14), bishop of Avitinae (vv. ll. abitinis, avitinisi, vitinis), 64th in *Sentt. Epp.* Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. His see a colony in Prov. Proc. (not to be confounded with either Avitta, *Momms.* Insc. viii. pp. 100, 148), afterwards famous for its martyrs and its *traditor* bishop Fundanus; in the persecution of Diocletian for its confessor bishop Gaudiosus under Genseric; and for its author bishop Augustalis against the Monothelites (Morcelli). [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (15) (? same as 13), Cyp. *Ep.* 27, a Carthaginian confessor, quoted as an example of one who would give no *libelli*, though imprisoned after torture. Received with AURELIUS exhortatory letters from the confessors MOYSES, &c., at Rome. [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (16) *Sentt. Epp.* 51 in Conc. Carth. sub. Cyp. vii., bishop of Victoriana, of which we seem to have no inscriptions, but which is stated in 2nd Council of Constantinople to be in Byzacene Province, and so is not that mentioned by Augustine as in Mauret. Caesar (Morcelli). [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (17), bishop (and confessor) of Tucca or Thugga Terebinthina in Prov. Byzac. *Mommsen*, viii. p. 77; of Tucca in Numidia, *Morcelli*, but apparently by a transposition of HONORATUS, in which case Tucca in Prov. Proc. should have been assigned to this Saturninus. There was another Tucca in Sitifensis. *Sentt. Epp.* in Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. no. 52. [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (18) (SATURIANUS) **CLAUDIUS**, curator of Aptunga or Autumnae, at the enquiry into the case of Felix, bishop of that place, A.D. 314. (Opt. i. 26; Aug. *Ep.* 88. 4; *c. Cresc.* iii. 81; *Mon. Vet. Don.* pp. 162, 206, ed. Oberthür; pp. 163, 185, ed. Dupin.) [H. W. P.]

SATURNINUS (19), a grave-digger (fossor), a witness at the inquiry, under Zenophilus, A.D. 320, into the conduct of Silvanus, bishop of Cirta, at the time of the persecution, A.D. 303. (*Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 170, ed. Oberthür; p. 170, ed. Dupin; Aug. vol. ix. app. pp. 794–797.) [H. W. P.]

SATURNINUS (20), a deacon, examined at the inquiry under Zenophilus, A.D. 320. (*Mon. Vet. Don.* pp. 178, 179. ed. Oberthür; p. 170, ed. Dupin; Aug. vol. ix. app. p. 798.) [H. W. P.]

SATURNINUS (21), eighth bishop of Arles, between Valentinus and Artemius, was a pillar of Arianism in the west. In the winter of 353 he presided at the council of Arles, which, in the presence of Constantius, condemned Athanasius, and sentenced Paulinus of Treves to deprivation and exile. About this time, however, a more powerful champion of orthodoxy than Paulinus appeared on the scene in the person of Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, and in the west the battle was henceforth between him on the one side, and Saturninus, with Ursacius and Valens, supported by the emperor on the other. In 356 Saturninus presided at the council of Béziers, which decreed the exile of Hilary; and it seems probable, from allusions in Hilary's writings, that he was also at the council of Rimini, in 359, and was one of the legates despatched thence to the emperor at Constantinople (Hilarius, *ad Const. Aug.* ii. 3, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* x. 565). This appears to have been the culminating point of the archbishop's fortune. Hilary, not long after, returned to Gaul, and Saturninus, still unbending in his opposition, was deprived of his see, and even excommunicated, as is thought, at the first council of Paris in 362. According to Sulpicius Severus, he was more than a heretic, being "vir sane pessimus et ingenio malo pravoque; verum etiam praeter haeresis infamiam, multis atque infandis criminibus convictus;" and again "homo impotens et factiosus" (Sulp. Sever. *Hist. Sacr.* ii. 45, 40, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 155, 152). But it must, of course, be remembered that we have only the accounts of his religious adversaries. In addition to the sources abovementioned, see the references scattered through the writings of Hilary in *Patr. Lat.* ix. x.; *Gall. Christ.* i. 523–4; Mansi, iii. 231, 251, 293, 359. [S. A. B.]

SATURNINUS (22), Encratite bishop about A.D. 374. His episcopal rank was recognised on his conversion to the church, together with another bishop named Zoïs, though Basil, who mentions his case in his canonical letter to Amphilochius, lays down in general that such persons were to be rebaptized. [AMPHILOCHIUS.] (Basil. *Epist.* 188; Ceill. iv. 458.) [G. T. S.]

SATURNINUS (23). An imperial general, consul in A.D. 383, a friend of Gregory Nazianzen, who wrote to him in 382 to excuse himself from attending the synod convened by Theodosius for that year (*Ep.* 132). EUDOXIUS (9). [E. V.]

SATURNINUS (24), husband of Castriccia, a leading member of the female cabal against Chrysostom at Constantinople headed by the empress Eudoxia. He was consul in 383. On the revolt of Gainas, the Gothic commander, the terms demanded by the haughty barbarian for laying down his arms were the heads of Saturninus and Aurelian, praefect of the East. The weak Arcadius yielded to the demand, and Saturninus and his companions were given up to Gainas. Through the earnest intercessions of Chrysostom their lives were spared, though not till the sword had been actually brought down upon their necks, and blood had been drawn by it. The captives were kept in Gainas's hands as hostages until his overthrow, when they returned to Constantinople (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 6; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 4; Zosim. v. 18, p. 759; Chrysost. *Homil. cum Saturn. et Aurel.*, &c., vol. iii. pp. 405 ff.) [AURELIAN.] [E. V.]

SATURNINUS (25), bishop of Uzalis, fl. 388, mentioned by St. Augustine as having daily visited the advocate Innocentius at the time of his remarkable cure at Carthage, c. 392. (*Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 366; Tillem. xii. 582, xiii. 124, 166.) [C. H.]

SATURNINUS (26), a Donatist bishop present at the council of Cabarsussum, A.D. 393 (Aug. *En. Ps.* 36, 20.) [H. W. P.]

SATURNINUS (27), a bishop in Palestine, A.D. 400, one of those to whom the synodical letter of Theophilus in condemnation of Origen is addressed (Jerome, *Ep.* 92, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

SATURNINUS, the name of three presbyters mentioned in Augustine's letters; **(28)** the first (*Ep.* 142) lapsed with Eufrates into Donatism, but returned to the church;

(29) Another, bore a letter from Optatus, bishop of Mileum, to Augustine (*Ep.* 202 bis);

(30) The third was present at the proceedings relating to the appointment of ERACLIUS (1) (*Ep.* 213). [H. W. P.]

SATURNINUS (31), bishop of Marcianople, in succession to Dorotheus the Nestorian (Le Quien, *O. C.* i.; Farlati, *Illyr. Sac.* viii.). He was present at the council of Constantinople in A.D. 448, and at the Latrocinium in 449 (Hard. ii. 134, 167). Dorotheus successfully opposed his entrance on the see for a time till expelled by the civil power. (Tillem. xiv. 492, 498, xv. 496, 534.) [G. T. S.]

SATURNINUS (32), deposed priest, was forbidden by Gregory the Great ever to resume the performance of his priestly functions, but was allowed to continue his supervision over the monks in the islands of Gorgona and Capraria. Gregory the Great hearing subsequently that he had presumed to celebrate mass, directed that if it was true he should be excommunicated till his death. (*Epp.* v. 3, 4, 7.) [F. D.]

SATURUS (1), martyr with Perpetua, March 7. He wrote a vision contained in the *Passio Perpetuae*, cap. xi–xiii. His vision describes paradise, and embodies notices of some interesting liturgical practices, as of the Trisagion, the use of papa as a title of bishops, &c. [G. T. S.]

SATURUS (2), a Carthaginian confessor at Rome [MACARIUS (20)] about April or May A.D. 250; *after* Easter, *Ep.* 22. The context implies that he was connected with the clerus; if so, possibly the same Saturus whom about July of the same year Cyprian had with him in his retreat and ordained lector that he might with Optatus (whom he made subdeacon for the same purpose) be a proper envoy to the clergy of Rome, to whom he took *Ep.* 27 on the Lapsed, and *Ep.* 28, to Moyses and nine confessors. In *Ep.* 29 Cyprian, apologising to his own clergy for this private ordination, speaks of him as having been already *proximus clero*, having been more than once appointed to read on Easter-day *communi consilio.* He probably brought back the reply of the Roman clergy, *Ep.* 30, i.e. Novatian's, and that of Moyses (*Ep.* 31). He was then sent on to Carthage to convey copies of these four letters to the clergy there, and provide for their publication. (*Ep.* 32–35.) [E. W. B.]

SATURUS (3). Saturus, Cyprian's acolyte, who conveyed Cornelius' Epistle (59) to Cyprian, A.D. 252. Fell (who avoids identifications) considers him to be the same as (1). But (1) was already at least a lector. [E. W. B.]

SATURUS (4), steward of Hunneric king of the Vandals, and a staunch catholic. Persisting in his refusal to embrace the Arian religion, notwithstanding every kind of threat and the entreaties of his own wife, he was at length dismissed and reduced to poverty, but never overcome. (Victor, Vit. *Persec. Vand.* i. 16; Till. xvi. 536.) [C. H.]

SATYRUS (URANUS), the much loved brother of St. Ambrose, who dwells upon his virtues in his discourse, *De Excessu Satyri* [AMBROSIUS, p. 93]. [J. Ll. D.]

SAUVE, ST. [SALVIUS (4).]

SAVE, legendary eldest daughter of Adam, and wife of Cain, so named in the Book of Jubilees, quoted by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 39, 5). [G. S.]

SAVINELLA, Columba, and Agnella, three African ladies of high rank, of whose almsgiving and good works Gregory the Great had heard. He exhorts them to persevere in their well-doing, and sends them a key containing fragments from the chains of St. Peter. (*Epp.* xii. 7.) [F. D.]

SAVINIANUS, the first bishop of Sens and martyr (*Gall. Chr.* xii. 2); fabled by some Gallic writers to have been one of the seventy, and sent by St. Peter to preach in Gaul; though other writers make him the missionary of the Roman see, placing him in the middle of the third century. Odorannus, a monk of St. Peter Vivus, c. 1028, wrote the history of his translation with that of Potentianus and their martyred companions, printed by Migne (*Pat. Lat.* cxlii. 777). His history is very doubtful. (Tillem. iv. 482, 727; Ceill. xiii. 113.) [C. H.]

SAXULF (SEXULF, SAEXULF), the first abbat of Medeshamstede and the seventh bishop of the Mercian church. Saxulf, according to Bede (*H. E.* iv. 6) was the builder and abbat of the monastery of Medeshamstede in the region of the Gyrvii or fenmen. On this statement the Peterborough historians erected a fabric of legend, traditional history and probable inference, which will not bear critical investigation, although some portions of it need not be entirely rejected. As the Gyrvian country was subject to Mercia, although occasionally under the East Anglian rulers, it is lawful to suppose that Peada and Wulfhere may in succession have patronised the foundation of Medeshamstede, which would be probably dated somewhere between 655 and 664. The Peterborough writers add, from tradition or invention, that Saxulf was a great thane of the neighbourhood, who with the four Northumbrian missionaries laboured for the conversion of Mercia during the short reign of Peada. [PEADA.] (Hugo Candidus, ed. Sparke, p. 23.) They further introduced into the great Anglo-Saxon Chronicle under the year 655 an account of the foundation different from, if not inconsistent with, that of Bede; making Peada and Oswy joint founders, and adding that it was by them committed to the monk Saxulf, who was God's friend, noble and rich. In the account of the reign of Wulfhere the Peterborough Chronicle describes the rich endowment bestowed by that king, on the advice of his brothers, Ethelred and Merwala, and his sisters Kyneburga and Kyneswitha; the sisters and Ethelred were present at the consecration which was performed by archbishop Deusdedit with the assistance of the bishops of London, Rochester, bishop Jeruman of Mercia and Tuda of Lindisfarne. The dedication was to St. Peter, and Wulfhere by word of mouth and by charter gave estates of land. The charter was dated in 664, and was confirmed by pope Vitalian. Under the year 675 is recorded a further endowment by Ethelred, and confirmation by pope Agatho. There is no doubt that the whole of these details are fabricated; but there is nothing impossible in the story assigned to the years 655 and 657 (*Chr. S.*; *M. H. B.* pp. 312–320). The charters, however, on which the story is actually based are forgeries (see Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 984, 990). Probably the forgery was perpetrated in the age of Edgar, when the reviving monastic interest was keenly intent on recovering every estate and privilege that had been lost during the Danish troubles.

In the year 675, or thereabouts, Theodore, having deposed the Mercian bishop Winfrith (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 6), appointed Saxulf to succeed him. The Chronicle mentions, as his successor at Medeshamstede, an abbat named Cuthbald, who must be identical with the person of that name who was abbat at Oundle, when Wilfrid died there, in 709 (Bede, *H. E.* v. 19). It is, however, quite possible that Saxulf retained the government of Medeshamstede in his own hands; for the Black book of Peterborough (MS. Soc. Ant. 60) contains the mention of a gift of king Ethelred to Medeshamstede conferred by placing on the gospels book a sod taken from the land given, and a similar benefaction of Friduric or Friodored, a Mercian Ealdorman, conveyed in the same way; both gifts being made in the presence of Saxulf. All this material is, however ancient, very questionable.

The history of Saxulf's episcopate is less apocryphal. At the time of his appointment the great Mercian diocese was undivided; the

deposition of Winfrith being possibly caused by his unwillingness to divide it, an unwillingness which was felt in Wessex also. The due organisation of the diocesan system was one of Theodore's great acts of policy, and accordingly in the council of Hertford, in 673, a proposition to increase the number of bishops, as the number of the faithful increased, was promulgated. It was waived in that assembly (*Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 120), but in 679, with the assistance of Wulfhere and the Mercian Witan, Theodore broke up the great diocese into five; Worcester, Lichfield, Leicester, Sidnacester and Dorchester being the sees (Flor. Wig. App. *M. H. B.* 622); and Hereford being added probably the next year. Of these the see of Lichfield seems to have been given to Saxulf, and that of Leicester to Cuthwin; although the account of Florence is different, the ancient lists of bishops prove this to have been the case. Cuthwin, however, lived but a short time, and his see, whether at Lichfield or at Leicester, ultimately fell into the hands of Saxulf. Saxulf lived until about 691. On his death Wilfrid of York, who was in exile, undertook the government of a part of his diocese, Headda taking the other; the ancient lists make Wilfrid bishop at Leicester, and Headda at Lichfield (*M. H. B.* pp. 622, 623). Headda subsequently united the two. The statement of the Chronicle that Saxulf died in 705, is disproved both by the statement of Eddius (c. 44), that he was dead in 692, and by the attestation of Headda appended to Mercian charters. [HEDDA.] Of the acts of Saxulf as bishop little is known. It was, however, by him that Putta, the refugee bishop of Rochester, was settled among the people of Herefordshire (*H. E.* iv. 12). Besides Medeshamstede, Saxulf is said to have founded a monastery called Ancarig, afterwards Thorney (*Mon. Angl.* ii. 571, 59; Hearne, Appendix to Sprott, pp. 171, 172; Hugo Candidus, ed. Sparke, p. 6); also by the assistance of Wulfhere, and therefore before he became bishop. This is legendary.

It may be questioned whether any of the charters to which Saxulf's name is appended are genuine. The Malmesbury charters of 681 (K. *C. D.* 22, 23) and the Peterborough grants above referred to are certainly spurious; it is possible that the charter of Osric, Nov. 6, 676, may be genuine (*ib.* No. 12). See Will. Malmesb. G. P. ed. Hamilton, pp. 135, 235, 307, 352; *Mon. Angl.* i. 384; Hugo Candidus, ed. Sparke, pp. 1–23. [S.]

SCALITA (SCIALITA), Nestorian bishop of Rhesina in Mesopotamia, in the time of Georgius the catholicus, about the beginning of the 9th century or earlier. (Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1329.) Among the Syriac manuscripts brought from Amida to Rome and placed in the Vatican (described by Assemani, *B. O.* i. 581, 583, ii. 486) there are the following (in codices i., viii., x.) ascribed to Scalita, *Hymnus de Beata Maria, Homilia II. de S. Mariâ et de Feriâ Tertiâ Ninivitarum seu Rogationum ad primam Sessionem.* [J. G.]

SCAPULA, a proconsul of Africa to whom Tertullian addressed a remonstrance on account of his persecution of the Christians; a remonstrance which Tertullian declares was prompted by no shrinking from martyrdom on the part of the Christians, but solely by love for their enemies, and a desire to save them from the guilt of shedding innocent blood. He recounts the temporal calamities which had overtaken former persecutors of the Christians; he denounces the injustice of punishing men pure in life and always loyal to the emperor; men whose innocence the magistrates fully acknowledge by the unwillingness they evidently show to proceed to extremities, and the exertions they used to induce the accused persons to withdraw their confession. Finally, he represents the alarming scale on which persecution ought in consistency to be carried out. If, as had been done in another province, the Christians of Carthage were to go in a body and present themselves before the proconsul's tribunal, the magistrate would find before him thousands of every age, sex and rank, including many leading persons, and probably relations and intimates of his own friends; and he might well shrink from severities which would decimate the city. The tract addressed to Scapula is later than the emperor Severus, of whom it speaks in the past tense, "Ipse etiam Severus, pater Antonini [Caracallae] Christianorum memor fuit." "Clarissimas feminas et clarissimos viros Severus, sciens hujus sectae esse, non modo non laesit, verum et testimonio exornavit, et populo furenti in nos palam restitit." Tertullian is plainly appealing, by way of precedent, to the tolerance of a dead emperor, and not accusing the proconsul of opposing the wishes of a living one. But though some have thought that the tract was also later than Caracalla, Tertullian's boast that the Christians had not taken part with any of the rivals of Severus,—Cassius, Albinus, or Niger—would not be natural after the dynasty of Severus had been overthrown.

We may with great probability identify with the subject of this article, Scapula Tertullus, who was one of the ordinary consuls of the year 195. The usual interval between consulship and proconsulship was between 15 and 20 years. We thus arrive by another road at the result already obtained, viz. that the proconsulship is to be placed not very long after the death of Severus, which took place Feb. 9, 211. It has been attempted to fix the date with more precision by means of an eclipse of the sun which Tertullian has been thought to refer to in the words, "Sol ille in conventu Uticensi extincto paene lumine adeo portentum fuit ut non potuerit ex ordinario deliquio hoc pati positus in suo hypsomate et domicilio. Habetis astrologos." Ruinart (*Acta Sincera*, p. 119) gives a calculation made by a brother Benedictine fixing for the date of this eclipse April 11, 210. But there are several points in what Ruinart gives as the computed circumstances of this eclipse which suggest a doubt whether the calculation was made by a sufficiently skilled person; and in point of fact Professor Adams has examined the matter sufficiently to be able to say that if any eclipse took place at the date named it must have been a very small one; and that, large or small, it could not have been visible in North Africa. An eclipse which took place in 207 has been suggested, but that, though visible at Utica, was not of sufficient magnitude to answer the description of Tertullian. It may therefore be simplest to assent to Tertullian's own belief, that

the phenomenon which he describes was not an eclipse at all. His reasons for thinking so may not be convincing, nor indeed quite intelligible; but as he refers the proconsul to his own "astrologers," it is likely he knew that the scientific opinion of his day was that there had been no eclipse. There had been sudden darkness at midday, while the annual African assembly was in full session; but whether that darkness had been caused by dust cloud or storm cloud, or otherwise, we have no means of determining. [G. S.]

SCARILA, a man whose queries concerning the Incarnation and the creation of venomous animals caused Fulgentius of Ruspe to write his work *De Incarnatione Filii Dei et de Vilium Animalium Auctore* (cf. t. II., 581; FULGENTIUS (3)). [G. T. S.]

SCHALUL, deacon of Edessa, said to have been instrumental in the conversion of SARBELIUS. [G. S.]

SCHEMATICI, a name for the Monophysites in Joan. Damasc. *Haer.* 83. Some MSS. read Schismatici (see note in Migne, *Patr. Graec.* xciv. 742). [G. T. S.]

SCHOLASTICA, Saint, sister of S. Benedict. All that is known about her is derived from the Dialogues of Gregory the Great (ii. 33, 34, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxvi. 193). According to him, she was dedicated to God from her childhood, and was accustomed to visit her brother once a year, who came to meet her with some of his disciples not far from his monastery, and afterwards return to her cell. She is commemorated on February 10th (*AA. SS.* Feb. ii. 392). [F. D.]

SCHOLASTICUS (1), principal eunuch of Theodosius the emperor. Cyril is said to have bribed him lavishly, and thus secured his influence against the Nestorian and Antiochene schools of thought. (Hefele, *Councils*, t. iii. pp. 81, 112, Clark's trans.; Mansi, t. v. p. 777.) [G. T. S.]

SCHOLASTICUS (2), a governor of Campania, to whom Gregory the Great wrote concerning the election of a bishop of Naples. The people at first chose Florentius, subdeacon of Rome. He declined the office. The pope then ordered Scholasticus to assemble the people of Naples for another election. If they failed in finding a local man they were to send three deputies to Rome to choose one there, an example of popular election of bishops so late as A.D. 592. [FLORENTIUS (44).] (Greg. Mag. *Epist.* iii. 15.) [F. D.]

SCHOLASTICUS (3), defensor, addressed in two letters of Gregory the Great. (*Epp.* viii. 32, xi. 20.) [F. D.]

SCILLITAN MARTYRS. Under Felix (212) we have given an abstract of the acts of these martyrs. When that notice was written we practically knew no more about them than Ruinart did two centuries ago, upon whose statements that abstract was founded Since that time much additional light has been thrown upon their history. The case stood thus. According to Ruinart's theory, which we adopted, the Scillitan Martyrs suffered under Sept. Severus between 198 and 202, about the time when Perpetua and Felicitas were martyred. They suffered under the proconsul Saturninus, who, it was assumed, had been consul about the year 190, and was therefore proconsul in Africa about ten years later, according to the usual rules of promotion in the imperial civil service. Several apparently conclusive proofs confirmed this view. In the MS. used by Baronius the proconsul speaks not only of several emperors as ruling together, but also names Severus and his son Antoninus Caracalla. Now as Caracalla received the title of Augustus only in 198, we had a limit fixed on one side, and on the other side we could not go much beyond the year 200 when Tertullian composed his *Apologeticus*, in which he mentions several bloody executions of the faithful, and we certainly cannot go below the date of his letter to Scapula where he expressly says, c. 3, that "Vigellius Saturninus who first drew the sword upon us lost his eyes." Suspicion however arose some years ago in the mind of M. Léon Renier, an eminent French archaeologist, that the true date of these Acts was much earlier. He noticed that the first line of the existing codices gave the names of the consuls for the year of the martyrdom very variously. The MS. of Baronius gave it as "Existente Claudio Consule;" a fragment published by Mabillon, *Vet. Analect.* t. 4, p. 155. as "Praesidente bis Claudiano Consule." Other codices substituted for *praesidente* or *existente praestante* or *praesente*. He therefore suggested in a letter to Borghesi, that the word *bis* ought to follow a proper name indicating a second consulship, and that the word *consule* ought to be replaced by *consulibus*. Finding moreover in the Fasti the names Praesens II. and Condianus as consuls for 180, he proposed that the first line of our acts should be read, "Praesente bis et Condiano Consulibus." Borghesi, in his reply (*Oeuvres Complètes*, t. viii. p. 615), points out that this hypothesis would necessitate a further change. The words *Dominis nostris imperatoribus Severo et Antonino* must be altered into *imperatoribus Antonino et Commodo*, and further that according to it, in the middle of July 180, that is, five months after the death of Marcus Aurelius, when Commodus had been reigning alone for that period, the African proconsul knew nothing of this fact and supposed the Empire had still two emperors, which is scarcely credible. This was Borghesi's crowning objection, to which Renier could make no reply. Matters were in this state when in 1881 Usener, a Bonn professor, published a hitherto unknown text of these Acts from a MS. in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* of Paris. This MS. dates from the end of the 9th century. It is of great value, because it furnishes the precise date of the episode in question, and quite bears out the hypothesis tentatively put forward by Renier. It explicitly names the two consuls, and these consuls are the very two suggested by Renier, Praesus II. and Condianus. The date in this MS. is the one fixed in all the Martyrologies; XVI. Kal. Aug. or July 17th. This document furthermore clears up the special difficulty urged by Borghesi. There is no mention of Severus or of Caracalla. It speaks of one emperor quite consistently with the facts of the case, since

Commodus on July 17th 180, was sole emperor. The proconsul of Africa is Saturninus. He continues the policy of the previous reign which is not yet modified by the domestic influences which led Commodus to favour the Christians. In 177 persecution had raged at Lyons. It was now the turn of Africa. The first African martyr, Namphamo, henceforth celebrated as the "archimartyr" of Africa, with his companions, Mygdon, Lucitas, and Samae, had suffered perhaps but a few days before. [NAMPHAMO.] (*Mart. Rom.* July 4; August. *Ep. ad Maxim.* Madaur. *opera*, ed. Bened. *Epp.* 16 and 17; Aubé, *Les Chrétiens dans l'Empire Romain*, p. 199; Renier, *Inscript. d'Algérie*, Num. 1030, 1761, &c.) The question now arises, What is the value and character of the Greek text discovered by Usener. Baronius regarded the Latin Acts as veritable transcripts from the proconsular registry purchased by the zeal of the Christians. Ruinart regards them as either transcripts from the official records or notes taken by Christians present in court; upon which two sources of the genuine Acts of the Martyrs Le Blant enlarges and furnishes many interesting illustrations in his supplement to Ruinart, *Les Actes des Martyrs*, p. 6–21, Paris, 1882. Aubé regards the various Latin texts of the Scillitan Acts as emanating from Christian pens, and as probably only translations of Acts written originally in Greek. Usener, on the other hand, looks upon the Greek text discovered by him as merely a translation from a Latin original, as he cannot conceive how the trial in the proconsular court at Carthage could have been conducted in Greek, or how a Greek document could have been composed in such a Latinised city as Carthage; an opinion in which Hilgenfeld concurs (*Zeitsch.* 1881, p. 382). Aubé, viewing the Greek text of Usener as an original document, the source and fountain of all the Latin texts, which are only translations of them, replies to Usener's arguments at great length, pointing out that Greek was largely spoken at Carthage in the latter half of the 2nd century, and urging many critical considerations from a comparison of the Latin and Greek texts which seem to support his view. The reader anxious to investigate this question further must be referred to the treatises of Aubé and Usener as indicated below. To the biblical critic these Acts in both shapes are interesting, as indicating the position held by St. Paul's Epistles in the year 180 in the North African church. The proconsul asked the martyr Speratus what books they kept laid up in their bookcases? To which he replied, Our books, or, as the Latin Version puts it, the four Gospels of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in addition the Epistles of Paul the holy man. The list of names in the Greek version of Usener does not materially differ from that given in the Latin Acts. We may in conclusion mention that the name of the proconsul Vigellius Saturninus, mentioned in our Acts and again by Tertullian in his treatise *Ad Scapulam*, was discovered in 1861 on a monument near Iglitza in Eastern Bulgaria. Renier, in a paper on the inscriptions of Troes published in the *Revue Archéol.* for 1864, t. x. p. 396 (cf. Mommsen, *C. I. L.* iii. n. 6183), quotes this inscription raised in his honour when imperial legate of Moesia Inferior, a post which he may have occupied a year or two after his consulship. According to the then usual rules of promotion he must have been Consul Suffectus about A.D. 170. His full name was Publius Vigellius Raius Plarius Saturninus Atilius Braduanus Aucidius Tertullus. Renier points out that he was connected with the family of Atilius Bradua which furnished Consules Ordinarii in 108 and 160, and with the Gens Plaria, to which belonged the wife of Man. Acilius Glabrio, consul in 152: cf. Mommsen, *Ins. Reg. Neapol.* Num. 1068; Orelli, num. 2228. Agobard asserts that the relics of Speratus, with those of Cyprian, were translated by Charlemagne's orders from Carthage to Lyons (Migne's *Pat. Lat.* civ. 349). The title of the treatise to which this article owes so much is: Aubé, *Etude sur un nouveau texte des Actes des Martyrs Scillitains*, Paris, 1881; cf. Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, t. i. p. 507. [G. T. S.]

SEACHLAN (SEACHNALL), bishop of Armagh and Dunshaughlin. [SECUNDINUS (10).]

SEALBHACH, son of Cualta, abbat of Cork, died A.D. 772. (*Four Mast.* i. 371, A.D. 767.) [J. G.]

SEBARJESUS (1), 9th Nestorian bishop of Bethgarma, in Chaldea, about the end of the 6th century; by his intercession he saved his people from the plague, and he instituted an observance called "The Fast of the Ninevites." (Assem. *B. O.* ii. 427; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1239.) [J. G.]

SEBARJESUS (2), 48th catholicus of Seleucia on the Tigris, was a native of Nuhadra, and made bishop of Harran, or Charran, by Joannes metropolitan of Nisibis; then archbishop of Damascus by the patriarch Timotheus A.D. 778, and catholicus A.D. 832. He died at Dara A.D. 836, famous as promoter and visitor of schools in his dioceses. (Assem. *B. O.* ii. 435; iii. 441, 505; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1130, 1289, 1317.) [J. G.]

SEBASTE, FORTY MARTYRS OF. [FORTY MARTYRS.]

SEBASTIANUS (1), duke of Thebaid, whither Diocletian sent him in the second year of the great persecution to carry out his edicts. (Aug. Ant. Georgii *SS. Col. et Panis. Miraculo*, praef. p. 41.) [G. T. S.]

SEBASTIANUS (2), Jan. 20, military martyr at Rome under Diocletian. He was of Milan, where he commanded the first cohort. He confessed Christ, and was shot (apparently) to death with arrows in the camp. His fame was celebrated in the time of St. Ambrose, *Enarr. in Psal.* 118 Num. 44; Ado (*Martyrolog.*) gives a lengthened notice of him, which tells us that when shot with arrows he was left for dead. A pious woman, Irene, came to seek his body, and found him still alive. She healed him, but he was again arrested and beaten to death with clubs in the Hippodrome. A matron, Lucina, buried him in the Catacombs "juxta vestigia Apostolorum." He is the favourite saint of Italian women. He is regarded as the protector against the plague. His symbol is the arrow. In art he is represented as young, beautiful, without drapery, bound to a tree and pierced by arrows. [G. T. S.]

SEBASTIANUS (3), a presbyter to whom Chrysostom wrote a complimentary letter from Cucusus. (Chrys. *Ep.* 214.) [E. V.]

SEBASTIANUS (4), a hermit in Aquitaine, addressed by Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* xxvi., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. lxi. col. 304–6), and much commended for his piety (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 69). [J. G.]

SEBASTIANUS (5), the head of a monastic house (in some MSS. styled an abbat, in the "indiculus" of Possidius a monk) to whom Augustine wrote a letter, Alypius adding a postscript, in reply to one expressing pain at the misconduct of others. (Aug. *Ep.* 248.) [H. W. P.]

SEBASTIANUS (6), son-in-law of count Boniface the Great, opponent of Genseric and the Vandals. He was put to death by Genseric on refusing to embrace Arianism. [GENSERIC, Vol. II. 635.] (Victor. Vit. *De Wandal. Persecut.*; Ceill. x. 450.) [G. T. S.]

SEBASTIANUS (7), disciple of St. Benedict and author of a life of a certain St. Jerome (Petrus Diac. *De Viris Illust.* cap. iii.; Ceill. xi. 634). [G. T. S.]

SEBASTIANUS (8), deacon of the Roman church. [RUSTICUS (14).]

SEBASTIANUS (9), bishop, addressed in two letters by Gregory the Great in 591 and 595 (i. 28, v. 42). The name of his see is doubtful, as the readings in both letters vary between Sirmiensi and Rhisiniensi. Rhizinium was on the coast of Dalmatia near Cattaro. The first letter relates to the case of ANASTASIUS SINAITA (1), the deposed patriarch of Antioch; in the second Gregory describes his cares and troubles, and commends Sebastianus for declining to be translated to one of the suffragan sees of Anastasius, which the latter after his restoration had asked him to accept. [F. D.]

SEBASTIANUS (10), bishop of unnamed see near Ariminum, to whom in May, A.D. 597, Gregory the Great wrote about the election of a new bishop of Ariminum, in place of Castorius, resigned. (*Epp.* vii. 21.) [F. D.]

SEBBI (SEBBA, SAEBBI) king of the East Saxons. He was the son of Saeward and brother of Sigebert the little, and succeeded to the sovereignty of the East Saxons conjointly with his nephew Sighere about the year 665. During the relapse of his people into paganism in the great plague Sebbi remained faithful to Christianity, and, throughout what little is known of the history of his reign, maintained a high character for devotion. The first years of his long reign, if not the whole of it, were spent under the over-lordship of the kings of Mercia; and Wina the bishop, to whom Wulfhere had sold the see of London, was not likely to sympathise much with a religious prince. Erkenwald, however, who was appointed by Theodore to succeed Wina, and who seems to have re-established Christianity in London, found firm support from Sebbi, and had his co-operation in the foundation of the monastery of Barking: one charter of which, subscribed by Sebbi and his sons, is granted by Oedilred his kinsman (Kemble, *C. D.* 35). Sebbi survived his friend Erkenwald, and possibly also his nephew Sighere. After a reign of thirty years, accordingly, about the year 695, he expressed a strong wish, which his wife had previously prevented him from fulfilling, to resign his throne and become a monk. He was, as Bede repeats the saying of the time, fitter to be a bishop than a king (*H. E.* iv. 11). He applied for the monastic habit to Waldhere, the bishop of London, and obtained it from him, making over to him at the same time all his treasure for distribution among the poor. Freed from earthly cares he prepared for death, and, fearing in his dying hour to say or do anything unworthy of a Christian king, obtained from Waldhere a promise that none but himself and two of his servants should be present at the last. Soon after, he had, as the historian tells us, a vision of consolation: three men in bright apparel approached his bed; one sat down, the other two standing, and told him that his soul should quit the body without pain, and amid a bright shining light, and on the third day following. On the third day at the ninth hour Sebbi died. A miracle attended his entombment: for the stone coffin which was found too short for him became supernaturally lengthened to receive him. He was buried in the church of the doctor of the Gentiles; his tomb was shown in old St. Paul's until its destruction in 1666 (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 11); it was in the north aisle opposite the choir under an arch depicted in Dugdale's *History of the Cathedral*, ed. Ellis, pp. 32, 64); the inscription hung over it dated Sebbi's conversion in 677, and followed Bede in giving him a reign of thirty years. Sebbi had two sons, Sigheard and Swefred, who succeeded him. His name is attached with those of his sons to two charters of Barking Abbey (Kemble. *C. D.* Nos. 35, 38) the former of which, that of Oedilred to abbess Ethelburga, he confirms. He also appears as confirming a forged Peterborough charter (*ib.* No. 40). [S.]

SEBERT (SABERCT, SAEBERHT, SABA, SAEBRIHT, SEBERT, SIBERT), the first Christian king of the East Saxons. He was the son of Sledda, ninth from Woden, and king of the East Saxons, by Ricula, or Rigula, daughter of Eormenric, and sister of Ethelbert king of Kent. No date can be assigned for his accession, or for the acquisition by Ethelbert of supreme power in Essex and in London. Sebert however seems to have been almost entirely dependent on his mighty uncle, and to have accepted Christianity very soon after the conversion of Ethelbert. London, the chief city of the East Saxon territory, must have been entirely under Ethelbert's influence, and he, instead of Sebert, was the founder of the church of St. Paul, to which, shortly before his death, Augustine consecrated Mellitus as bishop. Mellitus, however, had been previously engaged in the evangelisation of the East Saxons, and his history is closely entwined with that of Sebert. Sebert's sons must have been born and grown up before his conversion, for they continued heathen at the time of his death. That event occurred, so far as we can gather from Bede (*H. E.* ii. 3, 5), soon after that of Ethelbert, about the year 616. Sebert appears in history as a pious but insignificant

prince; in legend, however, he is more important, being the traditional founder of Westminster. This legend, which is not more ancient than the eleventh century, but which is incorporated in the famous Westminster charters ascribed to Edgar, but probably fabricated after the Norman Conquest, first takes form in the work of Sulcardus [MELLITUS], who does not seem quite certain whether the Sebert who joined in the foundation was the king, or a citizen of London. The story may be read at large in the Monasticon (i. 265 sq.), and deserves no credit. The ascription, however, of the foundation to the first Christian king and bishop was so natural as to be readily accepted. William of Malmesbury records it as a fact (*G. P.* ii. § 73), and it was subject to little or no criticism by his followers. At Westminster was shewn the tomb of Sebert, and when, in 1308, this sepulchre was opened to allow of the translation of the king's bones, the right hand and arm up to the elbow were found clothed with flesh, and uncorrupted (*Annales Paulini*, p. 140; *Chronicul. S. Pauli*, ed. Simpson, p. 225).

Sebert, according to Bede (*H. E.* ii. 5) had three sons, of whom two appear in the pedigree as Sexred and Saeward; the third, on very insufficient authority, is named Sigebert (Bromton, ed. Twysden, c. 743). [S.]

SEBESIUS, a young friend of Jerome, who had been unfaithful to him, but was brought to see and own his fault by the Orator Magnus at Rome. (Jerome, *Ep.* 70, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

SEBUAEI (Σεβουαῖοι), described by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xi.), as the second heresy of the Samaritans. They celebrated, as he states, the Feast of Pentecost in the autumn, and the Feast of Tabernacles at the time of the Jewish Passover. (Cf. Scaliger in *Isag. Canon*, p. 218, and in *Elencho Trihaeresii*, cap. i.; Serarius, *de Sectis Judaicis*, lib. i. cap. 4; and also Petavius, *Commentary on Epiphanius*, l. c.) [G. T. S.]

SECUNDA, July 30, virgin and martyr, when twelve years old at Tuburbium in North Africa with Maxima and Domitilla, her companions. St. Augustine treats of them in *Ser.* 345, calling them Martyres Tuburbitanae, under which title some have thought Perpetua and her companions were celebrated. (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 82.) [G. T. S.]

SECUNDIANUS (or v. l. SECUNDINUS), eightieth bishop in *Sentt. Epp.* Conc. Carth. vii. *de Bap. Haer.* iii.; called "martyr" in some MSS. Bishop of Thambi ("a Thambis" vv. ll. thanbis, thambeis) or Tambeae in Prov. Byz. (Notit). Names of three other bishops are preserved up till the fifth century, when its martyrs under Hunneric were famous. (See Morcelli.) [E. W. B.]

SECUNDINUS (1), twenty-first bishop in Conc. Carth. vii. *de pace*, Cyp. *Ep.* 57. [E. W. B.]

SECUNDINUS (2), suffr. ii. in Conc. Carth. vii. *de Bap. Haer.* iii., bishop "a Cedias" (vv. ll. accedias, acidius, chezas; so gadiaufala becomes gazaufala). The place is Cedia, now "Argoub el Mekhtalia, cercle de Aïn-Beïda" (Mommsen), and is in Prov. Numid., as Morcelli conjectured. [E. W. B.]

SECUNDINUS (3), twenty-fourth bishop in suffr. Conc. Carth. vii. *de Bap. Haer.* iii.; bishop of Carpis (Colonia Julia Carpis) in Prov. Proc. (1) and (3) seem likely to be identical. Carpis is feminine in inscr. 994, Mommsen, vol. viii. The MSS. of Cyp. have "a Carpos" with vv. ll. carpus, carpis; carpi, Plin.; Carpos, It. Mar. Now el Merissa with a port and large ruins (Momms.). [E. W. B.]

SECUNDINUS (4), a Numidian bishop, perhaps of the age of St. Cyprian, whose martyrdom is mentioned in the Acts of St. Jacobus and Marianus [JACOBUS (51)]. (Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 226, cap. iii.) He may have been the Secundinus who signed the letter concerning the lapsed to the Roman church. (Cypriani *Epist.* 57.) [G. T. S.]

SECUNDINUS (5), an Arian bishop, deposed by St. Ambrose and a synod assembled at Aquileia in the summer of A.D. 381. He was excommunicated in company with another Illyrian bishop, Palladius, and Attalus a priest. The acts of this synod, composed probably by Ambrose, are printed in Mansi, iii. 599; cf. Hefele's *Councils*, Clark's Trans. t. ii. p. 375. [G. T. S.]

SECUNDINUS (6) (SECUNDUS), Donatist bishop of Jacundiana, Jacundiana, or Jucundia, a small town in Numidia (Ant. *Itin.* 71. 5) present at the council of Cabarsussum, A.D. 393; and also at the conference, A.D. 411, at which he declared that he had no Catholic rival in his see (Aug. *En. Ps.* 36. 20; *Carth. Coll.* i. 180). [H. W. P.]

SECUNDINUS (7). [LEPORIUS (1).]

SECUNDINUS (8), parish priest of Germanicia, a place in Numidia, with whom fault was found by some of the Donatists of the place, supported it would seem by a layman residing there, named Pancarius. Augustine wrote to Pancarius expressing his willingness to hear the charges against Secundinus, if brought by Catholics, but declining to do so if they proceeded from heretics (Aug. *Ep.* 251). [H. W. P.]

SECUNDINUS (9), a Manichean, but a listener rather than a member of the sect, who wrote a letter to St. Augustine, blaming him for leaving Manicheism, insinuating that he had done so from motives of fear and of gain, and stating some of its doctrines. He reproaches him for following Jewish rites unworthy of his attention, and urges him to return to the faith which he had quitted (*Sec. ad Aug.* vol. viii. p. 571, ed. Migne). To this letter Augustine replied in a letter which he thought to be the best of his works against Manicheism, denying the motives imputed to him, refuting the doctrines advanced by Secundinus, especially respecting the divinity of our Lord, which Secundinus had denied, or at least depreciated. As to the two opposing principles which, according to him, contended for the soul of man, he recommends him to read his work on Free-Will, which he will find in the possession of Paulinus of Nola, and which shews the nature of temptation by the devil. He defends himself for maintaining Jewish writings and prophecies, deprecates the

heathen fables, and shews that perfection cannot be attained without the help of God (Aug. *Retract.* ii. 10). [H. W. P.]

SECUNDINUS (10) (SEACHLAN, SEACHNALL, SECHNAL, SHAGLINUS), nephew of St. Patrick and bishop of Armagh. His legend is wholly Patrician. He was son of Restitutus Ua Baird and probably Liemania, but other sisters of St. Patrick are named as his mother. He is said to have been sent into Ireland to assist St. Patrick in the year 439 (*Ann. Tig.*), and appears to have been then a bishop. He became closely attached as disciple to St. Patrick, and his chief foundation was at Dunshaughlin, co. Meath: he was also bishop at Armagh. He died A.D. 448 (*Ann. Tig.*) aged seventy-five years, and his feast is Nov. 27. (Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. 259 sq.: Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* vi. 383–384, 437–438.)

He is best known as author of the *Hymnus S. Secundini in laudem S. Patricii*, an alphabetical hymn in the rudest metre. If he was not the author, it was evidently written so as to pass for the work of a contemporary of St. Patrick. It gives in every respect to St. Patrick the character of a faithful apostle of Christ, "cujus ingentis laboris percepturus praemium, cum apostolis regnabit sanctus super Israel." It was first published by Colgan (*Tr. Th.* 211–212, with *Praefatio veteris anonymi*; it has also been given by Ware, *Opusc. S. Patr.* app., 1656; Muratori, *Antiphon. Bench.*, 1713; Villanueva, *Opusc. S. Patr.* app., 1835; Gallandius, *Bibl. Patr.* x.; Todd, *Book of Hymns* i. and Cusack, *S. Patr.*). Todd prints both the preface given by Colgan, and a much fuller one from the *Leabhar Breac.* It was much prized among the ancient Irish, and used as an armour. (Todd, *S. Patr.* 312; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. 294 sq.; Tanner, *Bibl.* 659; *Book of Obits C. C. Dublin*, lxxxv.–vi.; O'Conor, *Proleg.* ii. 71, 80.) [J. G.]

SECUNDINUS (11), a poet, and contemporary of Sidonius Apollinaris, who addresses to him one of his letters (*Ep.* v. 8). Secundinus had apparently stood high in his esteem as a writer of hexameter verse, on minor subjects, such as royal hunting parties and marriages. He had afterwards attempted satire, and sent to Sidonius a composition in hendecasyllabic metre, which Sidonius highly commends, urging him to continue this kind of composition for which there exists ample material. From another letter of Sidonius (*Ep.* ii. 10) it appears that some of his hexameters were inscribed upon the wall of the basilica built at Lyons by Patiens (bishop from about 451 to 491), and he may fairly be supposed to have been one of the considerable number of minor poets who flourished at Lyons in the middle and end of the 5th century. [H. A. W.]

SECUNDINUS (12), bishop of Taormina. Seven letters are addressed by Gregory the Great to him, either alone or conjointly with other bishops (*Epist.* lib. iii. ind. xi. 59; lib. vi. ind. xiv. 36; lib. viii. ind. i. 31; lib. x. ind. iii. 32, 33, 57; lib. xiii. ind. vi. 18, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 657, 826, 934, 1089, 1111, 1275). Of these the most important are the first, directing him to remove a baptistery from a monastery; the third directing him to prevent laymen exercising rights over a monastery; and the fourth relating to the wife of one Leo, who had left her husband on the suspicion of his adultery, and assumed the dress of a nun. On his being proved innocent she had returned to him, and Secundinus had therefore refused to admit her to communion. Gregory disapproves of his action, and directs him to admit her. Secundinus is mentioned as bishop of Taormina in lib. i. ind. ix. 72, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 598, and was therefore consecrated not later than A.D. 591. He subscribes the decrees of the synod held at Rome in July, A.D. 595. (*Appendix ad S. Greg. Epist.* 5, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1338.) [F. D.]

SECUNDINUS (13), abbat of the monastery of St. Martin in Campania. Gregory the Great, after mentioning that many grave charges had been brought against him, says that his own confession, that he had broken his vow of chastity before he became abbat, was sufficient without going further, and directs Peter, the subdeacon, to remove him from his office (*Epp.* iii. 23) in 593. [F. D.]

SECUNDINUS (14), bishop in Greece, whom Gregory the Great in 595 commissioned to investigate the charges against Anastasius, bishop of Corinth, who was ultimately deposed. Gregory praises his behaviour in the matter, and in another letter mentions he had heard through Secundinus of the misconduct of another bishop, Andrew. (*Epp.* v. 52, 57.) [F. D.]

SECUNDINUS (15), a recluse, to whom a long and important letter of Gregory the Great is addressed in 599 (lib. ix. ind. ii. 52, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 982). The text unfortunately is in a bad state, and there is a long interpolation about the treatment of clerics degraded for immorality, which is quite inconsistent with the rules laid down by Gregory in other letters. The pope, after touching on the hermit life of his correspondent, with the temptations to which it was specially liable, discusses the question of the Three Chapters, pointing out that by their condemnation no slight was done to the council of Chalcedon. Then follows the interpolation referred to, after which Gregory replies to a question of Secundinus about the souls of children who die unbaptized before committing actual sin. The letter concludes with some observations on the cult of images (partly quoted in *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, i. 817). Gregory sends with the letter some aloes and other perfumes, to be burnt before the relics of the martyrs, two volumes of his homilies, and two pictures of the Saviour and the Virgin Mary and the apostles Peter and Paul. He is apparently a different person from the Secundus or Secundinus mentioned in lib. vi. ind. xiv. 31, and lib. xiv. ind. vii. 12 (*Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 821, 1314). [F. D.]

SECUNDUS (1), Gnostic of the second century, a disciple of Valentinus, and apparently one of the earliest of that teacher's successors. At least, he is the first of that school of whom Irenaeus gives an account (I. xi. 2). He reports two things as peculiar in the teaching of Secundus; (1) that he divided the primary Ogdoad into two Tetrads, a right-hand and a left-hand one, the one being called light, the other darkness;

(2) that he did not allow the Sophia out of whose passions, according to the Valentinian theory, the material world took its origin to have been one of the 30 primary Aeons. On the theory of an upper and lower Sophia, see SOPHIA, p. 712. [VALENTINUS.] Philaster (*Haer.* 40) is singular in ascribing to Secundus a docetic theory about our Lord's Body; but on comparison with the corresponding sections (11, 12) in Pseudo-Tertullian, there appears reason to think that Philaster transferred to Secundus a portion of what was said about the Valentinians in the immediately preceding section of the older treatise of Hippolytus, which was the common authority of Ps.-Tert. and Philaster. The short notice in Irenaeus seems to be the ultimate source of all authentic information about Secundus; and Augustine appears to have had no more authority for ascribing to the Secundiani special immorality (*Haer.* 12) than 'Praedestinatus' for his story, that they were refuted by Diodorus, bishop of Crete. [G. S.]

SECUNDUS (2), African bishop in Syn. Carth. sub Cyd. iv. *de Basilide*, Cyp. *Ep.* 67. [E. W. B.]

SECUNDUS (3), Arian bishop of Ptolemais in Egypt, one of the original Arian party at Nice. He, with another Egyptian bishop, Theonas, and Arius, alone opposed the imperial command to sign the creed and anathemas of Nice, and suffered exile accordingly. After the death of Constantine he established an Arian church in Egypt by consecrating Pistus as bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 339 (Athanasii *Apol. c. Arian.* 19, 24; Hefele's *Councils*, t. ii. p. 45, Clark's trans.; Gwatkin's *Studies in Arianism*, p. 111). [G. T. S.]

SECUNDUS (4), bishop of Tigisis or Tigisi, a fortified town of Numidia, possessing a valuable spring of water, in the neighbourhood of Lambese and Thamagada, but whose site is not certainly known (Procopius, *Vandal.* ii. 13). The principal facts of the history in which Secundus was concerned will be found in the *General History of Donatism*, Vol. I. pp. 881, 882, but the following particulars may be added. The persecution under Diocletian appears to have reached its height in February 304, and on May 19 of the same year Paulus, bishop of Cirta, committed the act of tradition, which in some measure gave rise to the proceedings in which Secundus became conspicuous. Paulus died not long after this, and some eleven or twelve bishops met at Cirta on March 5, but according to Optatus May 8, A.D. 305, under the presidency of Secundus, as primate of Numidia, to appoint a successor. Although persecution had virtually ceased, the churches were not yet restored, and the assembly met in the house of Urbanus, called by Optatus, Carisus, but by Augustine, Donatus, and there they ordained Silvanus. These facts, related by Optatus, came out in the investigation before Zenophilus, A.D. 320. In a letter to Generosus, A.D. 400, and in his account of this enquiry, contained in his treatise against Cresconius, A.D. 406, Augustine places the date of the outbreak of the persecution in the eighth consulship of Diocletian and the seventh of Maximian, *i.e.* in A.D. 303. But in his breviate of the Carthaginian Conference, A.D. 411, when the whole question was revived, and previous to which he appears to have examined the dates more carefully, he places the outbreak in the ninth consulship of the former emperor and the eighth of the latter, *i.e.* A.D. 304, and shows that the meeting at Cirta must have taken place thirteen months later, viz. on March 5, 305 (Opt. i. 14; Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 29–33; *Serm.* 46. 39; *Ep.* 53. 4; *Brevic. Coll.* 32; vid. Clinton, *Fast. Rom.*). But though the day named by Optatus is probably erroneous, the fact mentioned by him as to the condition of the churches is important, as assisting Augustine to disprove the assertion of the Donatists, that the meeting could not have taken place because it was unsafe at that time for so many as ten or twelve bishops to meet together (*Brevic. Coll.* 32, 33; *Post. Coll.* 18; *c. Gaud.* i. 47; *De Unico Bapt.* 31). Optatus also says that amid the uproar of mutual incrimination Purpurius of Limata taxed Secundus with tradition, because, instead of leaving his post of duty before the inquisition, he remained until he was dismissed in safety, which would not have been the case unless he had purchased his safety by act of surrender. On this a murmur arose in the assembly, and Secundus in alarm accepted a method of escape suggested by his nephew, Secundus the younger, that such questions as this of personal conduct ought to be left to the judgment of the Almighty, a judicious evasion which was received with acclamation by all present (Opt. i. 14; Aug. *Ep.* 43. 6).

At some time before this letters had passed between Mensurius and Secundus, containing on the part of the former strictures on the conduct of some pseudo-martyrs of the time, but acknowledging, as was afterwards urged by the Donatists, his own culpable evasion in respect of the sacred books at the time of the inquiry. On the other side Secundus sought to exculpate himself and justify the conduct of some, who avoided a surrender of their books, by the instance of Rahab, one which applied, as Augustine pointed out, rather to Mensurius than to them, and compared his own conduct to that of Eleazar, described in the book of Maccabees (2 Mac. vi. 18–31; Aug. *Brevic. Coll.* iii. 25; *c. Gaud.* i. 47). But whatever judgment might be formed as to the conduct of Mensurius and Secundus, it was plain, as Augustine remarked, that their intercourse was not interrupted during the lifetime of the former (*c. Petil.* iii. 29; *Brevic. Coll.* 25, 26; *De Unic. Bapt.* 29). But when, on his death, A.D. 311, Caecilian was appointed to succeed him, Secundus was sent for in haste to preside at a meeting of malcontents, seventy in number, to be held at Carthage for the purpose of opposing him; and their factious opposition, illustrated by the brutal insolence of Purpurius of Limata, resulted in the schismatic appointment of Majorinus (Opt. i. 19; Aug. *Parm.* i. 5). From this time no further mention is made of Secundus until the time when the case was brought up afresh at the conference. Besides the original authorities already quoted, the reader will find the history related by Baronius, vol. ii. 303, who maintains the earlier date; by Tillemont, vol. vi. pp. 5–14; by Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* ii. 194–207; and by Ribbek, *Aug. und Don.* pp. 52–57, 69. [H. W. P.]

SECUNDUS (5), the father of CHRYSOSTOM.

SECUNDUS (6) and (7), of Trent, described by Paulus Diaconus as servus Christi, had much influence with queen Theodelinda and her husband Agilulf, to whose son Adaloald he was godfather. He wrote a short history of the Lombards, which was the principal source of the earlier part of the work of Paulus Diaconus. He died in March, A.D. 612. A fragment of his history is given in a note to the preface to Paulus Diaconus in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 25, from which it appears that in June, A.D. 580, he had been fifteen years a monk. He must therefore have lived to an advanced age (Paulus Diac. iii. 29, iv. 27, 40 in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 108, 125, 133). He probably is the same as the abbat Secundus mentioned by Gregory the Great in a letter to queen Theodelinda (lib. xiv. ind. vii. 12, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1314). He had written, probably about the Three Chapters, to Gregory, whose health prevented him from replying. The Secundus, "servus Dei of Ravenna," addressed by Gregory (lib. vi. ind. xiv. 30), is probably a different person, though he was connected with king Agilulf, and was employed by Gregory in 596 to negotiate peace with him. [F. D.]

SEDATUS (1), second in the list of the bishops of Nismes, was present at the council of Agde in 506. He was a friend and correspondent of St. Ruricius. Four of the latter's epistles to him, one of them in verse, are extant (Ruricius, *Epp.* ii. 17, 18, 33, 34; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 99–100, 109–111). Three written by Sedatus survive. They are not included in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, but are to be found in Canisius (*Thesaurus Monument.* i. 360–361, 367, Antwerp. 1725.) For a description of these letters, see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 56–8; Ceillier, x. 608–9. The authors of the *Gallia Christiana* (vi. 428) ascribe to him the authorship of some homilies, which were more probably the production of Sedatus of Béziers. [S. A. B.]

SEDATUS (2), African bishop, on the committee *de Virgg. Subintroductis*, Cyp. *Ep.* 4; Sat. in Syn. Carth. 4 *de Bas. et Mart. Ep.* 67; in Syn. *de Bat.* i. *Ep.* 70; probably the same as Sedatus, bishop of Tuburbo, whether Majus or Minus Mommsen cannot distinguish; Morcelli prefers Majus. Both were in Prov. Procons. and both had bishops. Tuburbo Majus was a colony *Julia Aurelia Commoda* (Tuburbin coloniam, Plin.), and is identifiable with *Kasbat*. Augustine (post *Coll. ad Don.* 22, 38) speaks of the obscurity of the see. Mommsen, Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. *de Bap.* 3, *Sentt.* 18. [E. W. B.]

SEDATUS (3), 5th bishop of Béziers, was at the 3rd council of Toledo in 589, and that of Narbonne in the same year. His diocese was at this period under Gothic domination (*Gall. Christ.* vi. 297). A homily on the Epiphany to be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 765–74, is attributed to him, as well as two sermons printed in the *appendix* to the works of St. Augustine (cxxix. cxxx. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xxxix. 2001–5). For criticisms on these works see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 262–3; Ceillier, xi. 324. [S. A. B.]

SEDNA (SEDONIUS), bishop of Ossory, is noticed by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 572), and identified with the dumb cowherd on Slieve Bloom, who received his speech by the blessing of St. Columba of Terryglass, in the 6th century. He is probably the person to whom is ascribed the *Prophecy of Sedna*, a poem of twenty stanzas or eighty lines, which is in the form of a dialogue between himself and St. Finchu of Brigown. (O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 422; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* ii. 91.) [J. G.]

SEDULIUS (1),[*] a poet of the 5th century, of whose life very few details are known. The only trustworthy information is to be found in his two letters to Macedonius. From them we learn that he devoted his early life, perhaps as a teacher of rhetoric, to heathen literature. Late in life, like Prudentius, he either became converted to Christianity, or, if he had been a Christian before, began to take a serious view of his duties, probably under the influence of Macedonius. Thenceforward he devoted his talents to the service of Christ, living as a priest, apparently in some religious community (cf. i. 7–9), at any rate in close intercourse with a small body of religious friends (Pref.). He gives us a charming account of this group: Macedonius, the father and life of the whole; Ursinus, the reverent priest who has spent his life in the service of the King of Heaven; Laurence, the wise and gentle, who has spent all his money on the poor; Gallicanus, another priest, not learned, but a model of goodness and loyalty to church rule; Ursicinus, combining the wisdom of age with the brightness of youth; the deaconess Syncletica, of noble birth and nobler life, a worthy temple of God, purified by fasting, prayer, and charity, learned and liberal; and lastly Perpetua, the young pure matron, perpetual in fame and purity, no less than in name. Living in this society, he too longed to devote his talent to God, and to strengthen his own spiritual life by exhorting others. He too yearned to attract the heathen by telling them of the wonders of the Gospel, and so wrote the *Carmen Paschale* to invite them to share the Gospel feast. This was dedicated to Macedonius, and afterwards, at his request, whether to make it more widely useful, or whether to secure greater accuracy, was translated into prose (*Opus Paschale*). The works shew a character of much humility (cf. i. ad fin.), of tenderness of heart (v. 96), of warm gratitude (*Carm. Pasch.* Pref.), and of keen susceptibility to criticism (*Opus Pasch.* Pref.).

These are the only certain facts. Even his date is uncertain. He refers to St. Jerome as a well-known student, and his work is praised by a decree of pope Gelasius of A.D. 495 or 496. Further, Syncletica may have been a sister of Eustathius, who lived at the beginning of the 5th century. So that the date of Sedulius must be about A.D. 450. A great deal of information is given about him in later writers, but much of it arises from a confusion with Sedulius the Scotchman. The best authenticated account makes him a native of Rome, who studied philosophy in Italy; then became an *antistes* (i.e. probably a presbyter) and wrote his book in Achaia. The internal evidence as to these details is very slight; the names of his friends

[*] Sometimes called Caelius or Circilius, but there is very slight authority for any praenomen.

are almost entirely Latin; he is in the presence of educated idolaters and takes special pains to argue against sun-worship; but these indications are very vague. Perhaps a careful examination of his interpretation of the Gospels might connect him with some particular school of teaching. His works became popular very soon. They were edited by an editor of Virgil, T. Rufius Asterius (consul A.D. 494)—perhaps in consequence of the importance attached to them by the pope's decree. They are mentioned with praise by Venantius Fortunatus (viii. 1) and Theodulf of Arles; were commented on, perhaps by Remi of Auxerre, in the 9th century, and were frequently quoted and imitated by the writers of the middle ages. Areval quotes sixteen MSS. dating from the 7th to the 16th century; since then more than forty editions have been printed, and special prominence has been given to him by German writers in the last few years.

Works: Carmen Paschale.—In this poem Sedulius does not treat of the whole Gospel story, as Juvencus had done, but simply of the miracles of the Lord. He longs to shew the heathen that Christianity has wonders greater than heathenism, and so invites them to read this poem and share the great paschal gifts of Christ. It may be entitled "A poem in honour of Christ our Passover" (cf. i. 20, 56).

It is preceded by a dedicatory letter to Macedonius, written in rather involved but terse epigrammatic prose. In it he explains (1) that he writes through anxiety to consecrate to God the ability which he had before used on heathen literature, to avoid wrapping his talent in a napkin, and to strengthen himself by exhorting others: (2) that he writes in verse because there is so little Christian poetry, and yet many are attracted to the truth by poetry more than by prose: (3) that he dedicates the poem to Macedonius because he is the life and soul of all their society. He then describes the purpose of the book and its title.

This is followed by a short elegiac invitation to the reader to come to the simple paschal feast which he has prepared.

The poem itself begins with a book which is really introductory to the main subject. In it he calls on the heathen to listen to this true and wondrous theme (1–44), and prays God, whose miracles shew His power, to guide him in his poem (45–86). Then follows a succession of miraculous events from the Old Testament (87–205), which are recapitulated shortly (205–225). The poet then points out the folly of the worship of idols, arguing specially against sun-worship (226-265), and the delight of describing the work of the true God, whose nature is perfect and not to be mutilated as by Arius and Sabellius (266–317). The book ends with a prayer for a place in the heavenly city, even the place of the lowest of the citizens (318–342).

A short prologue, with a prayer to Christ and an account of the four Evangelists, leads to the main subject.

In Book II., after describing the incarnation as God's new act of mercy to undo the work of the Fall (1–34), he describes with clever antithesis the marvel of the pure conception, the birth of the Creator from a virgin mother (35–69), the appearance of the True Shepherd to the shepherds (70–72), the effort of the Jewish king to destroy the King of kings (73–133), the Boy master among the masters of the law (134–138), the Righteous Man baptized (139–174), the Lord tempted by the Devil (175–219), the call of fishers to be fishers of men, of the simple things of the world to confound the wise (220–236): the book ending with a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer (237–300).

Books III.–V. follow the main outline of the miraculous story down to the Ascension.

The poem is thus almost confined to the miracles: the Lord's Prayer is the only other subject dwelt upon at any length. In the earlier part he pieces together in chronological order the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke. Throughout the ministry to the final entry into Jerusalem he follows the order of St. Matthew, with a few insertions from St. John and St. Luke; then he adds a succession of miracles from St. Mark and St. Luke, without attention to their chronology (iv. 59–221), and the chief incidents of St. John's Gospel, and from the entry into Jerusalem to the end, he mainly follows that Gospel.

The treatment is far freer than that of Juvencus, but with much less poetical ornament than that of Nonnus; the tone being more that of a rhetorical preacher than of a poet or historian. The story is illustrated now and then by a few similes; but as a rule the details of the scenes are given slightly, and are followed by frequent comment. At times these comments are dogmatical (e.g. on the Nature of the Trinity, i. 16–20, 281 sqq., ii. 171, the Fatherhood of God, ii. 234, the Priesthood of Christ, iv. 207, &c.). At other times they point out the typical meaning of Holy Scripture, whether of the Old Testament (cf. i. 102–109, 127, 142, 152, iii. 202, iv. 170) or of the New; e.g. the number of the Evangelists and of the Apostles (Prolog. to lib. ii. iii. 172), the number and nature of the gifts of the Magi (ii. 95), the dove (ii. 170), and all the details of the Passion (v. 101, 169, 190, 243, 257, 275, 402). More often still they consist of moral warnings or of explanations of our Lord's Teaching (cf. ii. 106, iii. 321, iv. 16, 163, &c.).

The style is on the whole rhetorical but pleasant, with considerable terseness and power of antithesis; and fairly correct in prosody. It shews considerable acquaintance with classical authors. The reference to Origen (*Opus Pasch.* Pref.), and the play on Elias and ἥλιος (i. 170) imply some knowledge of Greek; of the Latin authors, he shews a knowledge of Terence, Juvenal, and specially Virgil, from whom he frequently borrows lines or parts of lines; possibly too of the poem of Juvencus. There is a growing frequency in the use of leonine rhymes; short syllables are lengthened freely before double letters and before the letter *h* (i. 283); final *o* is shortened in every termination; final *us* of the 4th declension is shortened in the gen. sing. and in the plural; and there are several false quantities (e.g. rĕgulus, iii. 12, tībīcen, iii. 134) and a large number of late unclassical words. Fair specimens of the style will be found in iii. 1–11, v. 202–231. For exact details about the prosody, cf. Huemer, *ubi inf.* The text is printed in Hurter's *Patrum Sel. Opuscula*, Innsbruck, 1876. An analysis of

this poem with a discussion of its sources and theology is given by Leimbach, *über den Christlichen Dichter Sedulius.* (Goslar, 1879.)

2. *Opus Paschale.*—This is a prose translation of the *Carmen.* In the main it follows the *Carmen* faithfully, but at times adds illustrations and fills up gaps. It is preceded by another interesting letter to Macedonius, who had bidden the poet translate his poem, which seems to have offended some readers by its freedom in dealing with Holy Scripture. He justifies himself for translating freely, bespeaks kindly approval from Macedonius, and offers the work to Christ. The work is written in a style involved and turgid, and more difficult to us than the poetry, which was more influenced by classical models. The prose on the other hand is affected both by the inaccuracies of ordinary language, and by the pedantry and exaggerations of rhetoric [cf. *Revue de Philologie,* Jan. 1882]. This work is found in fewer MSS. than the poem. An account of the MSS. and an attempt to estimate their relative worth, with a critical text of lib. v., has been published by E. Ludwig, Heilbrunn, 1880.

3. *Elegia.*—This is an elegiac poem of 110 lines, corresponding in subject to the *Carmen Paschale.* It describes the effect of the Incarnation in contrast to the work of Adam, and Christ as the antitype of the types of the Old Testament. In the types, no names are given, so that the allusions are often obscure. The structure of the poem is very artificial, the first half of the hexameter being always repeated by epanalepsis in the last half of the pentameter. The authenticity of this poem has been doubted, but it is attributed to Sedulius by Bede, the MSS. are in favour of it, and the prosody and subject matter are both akin to those of the *Carmen Paschale.*

4. *Hymn.*—"A solis ortus cardine." The authenticity of this also has been denied, but it is attributed to Sedulius by Bede (de art. metr. 8), and its tone is quite consistent with his authorship. Indeed it may be called a lyrical expression of the *Carmen.* It is a call to praise Christ with a description of the chief facts of His birth, life, and death; all the incidents are mentioned in the *Carmen,* and often with the same epithets and the same antithetical comment (e.g. cf. 41–44, with ii. 150; 61, 62, with iii. 271–290). The form is specially interesting. It is an alphabetical hymn, written in iambic dimeters with four-lined strophes, the first lines of the strophes being alphabetical. It also shews a growing tendency to rhyme, and a careful attempt to avoid any conflict between accent and quantity. Two extracts from the hymn have been widely used in church services, viz. A–G in Lauds for Christmas week; and H, I, L, N, which celebrate the adoration of the magi, the baptism, and the miracle at Cana, on the feast of Epiphany, on which day all these events were anciently commemorated. They will be found in Daniel Thes. i. p. 143, and with a full German commentary in Kayser, pp. 347–383.

5. *Cento Virgilianus* "de Verbi Incarnatione" is sometimes ascribed to Sedulius (e.g. by Bähr), but it is only found in one Corvey MS., and there it only follows the other poems without being ascribed to Sedulius. It is to be found in Martene, *Vett. Scr. Coll.* ix. p. 125.

Full information about MSS. and editions will be found in Areval's Preface, and a useful Introduction in Huemer, *de Sedulii Vita et Scriptis.* Vindobonae, 1878. The most available editions are Bigne's *Bibl. Patrum,* viii.; Gallandi, ix.; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xix. (a reprint of Areval); a text of the poetical works based on a collation of Areval with the Munich MSS. by J. Looshorn, Munich, 1879; and Huemer's edition of the whole Works, Vienna, 1885. [W. L.]

SEDULIUS (2), subscribed the canons of the council held at Rome under pope Gregory II. A.D. 721, as "Sedulius Episcopus Britanniae de genere Scottorum" (Mansi, *Conc.* viii. 109); supposed to have been an Irish bishop in the district of Strathclyde. (Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 219; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils,* ii. pt. i. 7; Herzog, *Real Encyk.* xiv. 194–195.) [J. G.]

SEDULIUS (3), called the younger, to distinguish him from Sedulius the poet of the 4th or 5th century, is known as a commentator upon the Scriptures, but his history is unknown. He is called Scotus, a term equivalent to Hibernus or Irishman, and is identified with the Sedulius who attended the council at Rome in 721 and signed the canons; or with the Sedulius son of Fearadhach who died abbat of Kildare, A.D. 828, or with Sedulius who is mentioned as "Sedulium Scottum clarum habitum" by Hepidannus monk of St. Gall in his *Chronicon,* A.D. 818. His commentaries are not original, but simply compilations from older writers, specially Origen; Migne (Pat. Lat. t. ciii. p. 1–351) gives (A.D. 820) the works of "Sedulius junior natione Scotus" (*Collect. in Pauli Epist.,* col. 9; *Expositio in Evang.,* col. 271; *De rector. Christ.,* col. 291; *Explan. in praef. S. Hieron.* col. 331. Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 109; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 331–332). Ussher *Opp.* iv. 385), on the authority of Joh. Trithemius, mentions his epistles as existing in the 16th century, and frequently quotes him in his *Religion of the Ancient Irish.* Montfaucon, *Palaeograph. Graec.* iii., 7, p. 236, describes a Greek psalter written by him and preserved at the St. Michael's convent in Lorraine; cf. Mai's *Nova Collectio,* t. ix. [J. G. & G. T. S.]

SEGATIUS (Ambr. *Ep.* 87). [FOEGADIUS.]

SEGENIUS (1), SEGENUS, SEGHIN, SEGIANUS, SEGINEUS, SEIGHEN, SEIGINE, SEIGNUS, SIGENIUS (1), fifth abbat of Hy, and connected with several events of great importance to the Scotic church during his abbacy. He was son of Fiachna (Fiachtna or Fiachra) of the race of Conall Gulban, and succeeded Fergna Brit as abbat A.D. 623. Of his own personal acts we have little account beyond his founding a church on Rechra or Rathlin in the year 634 (*Ann. Tig.*; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* vi. 527); and also his being a step in the tradition from St. Columba to his biographer St. Adamnan (*Vit. S. Col.* i. 1, 3; ii. 5), but he evidently headed the Scotic or Columban party in opposition to the Roman or Catholic in the Paschal controversy, and hence it was specially "Segieno abbati, Columbae sancti et caeterorum sanctorum successori" that Cummian addressed his apologetic epistle, giving the reason for his adoption of the Roman calculation, A.D. 634 [CUMMIAN]. A few years later (A.D. 640) he appears to have been included as "Segenus presbyter" among the Irish ecclesiastics (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. c. 19) whom John, while yet but pope

elect, addressed upon this same question (Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 373; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 162; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 506, 540), but this identification is doubted (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 17, col. 2; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 409, 415). An event of still greater importance occurred while he ruled at Iona, when Oswald king of Northumbria applied to the Scotic church for a bishop to minister the word of faith to himself and his people, and after the return of the first and unsuccessful missionary, St. Aidan was raised to the episcopate and sent out to be the first bishop of Lindisfarne [AIDAN]. (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. c. 5.) He held the abbacy twenty-nine years, and died A.D. 652 (*Ann. Tig.*); his feast is Aug. 12, or in Scotland April 7. (Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 16, 26, 373, et al.; Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 482 et al.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 154 sq.) Ware (*Ir. Writ.* i. c. 3) follows Dempster (*Hist. Eccl. Scot.* ii. 572 *) in ascribing to him *Regulae ad Monachos; Epistolae ad diversos; Homiliae de Sanctis.* [J. G.]

SEGENIUS (2), bishop of Armagh, succeeded Thomian A.D. 661, and died A.D. 688 (*Ann. Tig.*). While he was bishop Armagh was burned, A.D. 672 (*Ann. Tig.*). Lanigan (*E. H. Ir.* iii. 35) thinks it probable that he is the "Segenius presbyter" addressed in the paschal letter from Rome (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. c. 19), though Colgan thinks this was another Segenius, abbat of Bangor, co. Down. [SEGENIUS (1).] In *Lib. Armac.* (f. 18 ap. Reeves S. Adamn. 323) there is a curious notice of an interchange of bequests between bishop Aedh and Segene at Armagh. It is probably connected with the Cloc in Aideċta, or "Bell of the bequest" at Armagh. His feast is May 24. [J. G.]

SEGETIUS, bishop. [INNOCENTIUS (3).]

SEGRI. In the visions of HERMAS (*Vis.* IV. ii., 4) he sees a terrible wild beast, whereupon he prays to God who sends "his angel who is over the wild beasts, whose name is Thegri" and shuts (ἐνέφραξε) the beast's mouth. This name Thegri which does not occur elsewhere, has been a puzzle to commentators. In Harnack's edition of Hermas will be found the best explanations they had been able to give. But what has every appearance of being the true solution has lately been given by Mr. Rendel Harris (*Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, iii. 75). He compares the history (Dan. vi. 22) of the angel who "shuts the mouth" of the lions, when Daniel is in the den, the Greek word there being also ἐνέφραξε. In the original, the verb is סְגַר, and it seems almost certain that Hermas had this passage in his mind, and that we must correct Thegri into Segri, and understand "the angel who shuts the mouth of the beasts."

We may infer that Hermas has been rightly connected with Jewish Christianity. We are at least now enabled to add one to the very scanty proofs (see Vol. II. p. 920) of his acquaintance with the Old Testament. It would appear that he read it in Greek; but if he did not read the original himself, he must have mixed with those who did. and have learned from them the name Segri. Whether it was Hermas himself or his transcribers who corrupted the name into Thegri cannot be absolutely determined. The change of the first letter C into Θ is a very conceivable transcriptional alteration, it being assumed of course (what there seems no good cause to doubt) that the original language of Hermas was Greek. But the change, if change there were, must have been made very early; for Thegri seems plainly to have been the original reading of the Latin. It will account for the various readings Tegri and Hegrin, the 'n' of the latter form being also the first letter of the next following word. And it would seem to be this same word Tegri which either St. Jerome or his transcribers corrupted into Tyri (*in Habac.* i. 14). Jerome there charges with folly a certain apocryphal book, which represents reptiles to be made the special charge of an angel named Tyri. [G. S.]

SELENAS (Σεληνᾶς), bishop of the Goths in succession to Ulphilas, whose secretary he had been. Through his mixed descent, from the Goths by his father and from the Phrygians by his mother, he readily spoke both the Gothic and Greek languages, and had accordingly great influence with his people. He belonged to the Psathyrian division of the Arian body. (Soc. v. 23; Soz. vii. 17; Tillem. vi. 631; C. A. A. Scott's *Ulfilas*, p. 149.) [C. H.]

SELEUCIA, a lady of the Cappadocian Caesarea, wife of Rufinus, a man of rank, and a friend of Chrysostom. She placed her country house at his disposal as a place of refuge when he was driven out of Caesarea by the violence of the monks, but she was reluctantly compelled by the menaces of Pharetrius the bishop of that city to frighten him from his shelter, in the dead of the night, by a false alarm of an incursion of the Isaurians. (Chrys. *Ep.* 14.) [E. V.]

SELEUCIANA, famula Dei, addressed by Augustine (*Ep.* 265 al. 108), concerning baptism and the repentance of St. Peter. [C. H.]

SELEUCIANI, heretics. [SELEUCUS (1).]

SELEUCUS (1), enumerated as a Galatian heretic by Philaster, *Haer.* 55. [HERMOGENES, Vol. III. p. 3.] [G. S.]

SELEUCUS (2), (SELEUCIUS), [LEUCIUS, Vol. III. p. 704]. [G. S.]

SELEUCUS (3), Feb. 16, a soldier of Cappadocia and martyr at Caesarea, in the Diocletian persecution, at the same time that Pamphilus and Porphyry suffered. (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* cap. xi.) [G. T. S.]

SELEUCUS (4), a young man of high birth, nephew of Chrysostom's faithful friend Olympias, and grandson of the celebrated general Trajan, who fell with Valens in the defeat at Adrianople. Seleucus is known to us from two letters addressed to him, one in 333 iambic senarii (the number being adopted out of honour to the Trinity), ascribed both to Gregory Nazianzen, and to Amphilochius of Iconium (on the authorship see *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, Vol. I. 106 b; Vol. II. 757 a), and one in prose, of which only fragments exist, of which Amphilochius was the unquestioned author. The poetical epistle has for its

object the formation of the intellectual and religious character of a young man of rank, directing his reading, and warning him against the vicious pleasures and immoral spectacles of the age. Its chief value resides in the list of the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments it presents, on which see Westcott *on the Canon* (pp. 516, 575, ed. 1855). The poem is printed among the works of Gregory Nazianzen (Vol. II. pp. 190–195), and in those of Amphilochius (ed. Combefis, Par. 1644, p. 132 ff.) From the fragments of the other unquestioned letter of Amphilochius, it appears that it contained a warning against the Apollinarian heresy (Amphiloch. *Opera*, *u. s.* pp. 136–138). A portion of this letter is quoted by Photius, cod. 229, p. 827. (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* ix. 627, 746.) [E. V.]

SELEUCUS (5), a bishop of an unnamed see, who, although aged and troubled by a severe cough, had taken a long journey to Cucusus to visit Chrysostom. Chrysostom wrote two letters on his behalf (*Epp.* 37, 98). [E. V.]

SELEUCUS (6), bishop of Amasea and metropolitan (Le Quien, i. 522). He took a leading part in the various proceedings relating to Eutyches, and like Basil of Seleucia was weak and vacillating. At the council of Constantinople in 448 he declared for the two natures in Christ, and voted against Eutyches (Hard. ii. 167). At the Latrocinium in 449 he retracted and voted for him (ii. 86A, 270); and in 451 he subscribed the decrees of Chalcedon (ii. 366). In 458 he received the circular letters of the emperor Leo to the metropolitans (Mansi, vii. 523). Tillemont's notices of him will be found in his vol. xv. [C. H.]

SELRED (1) (Saelraed), king of the East Saxons. He is described in the Pedigrees (*M. H. B.* 629) as the son of Sigebert the Good. He succeeded (*ib.* 637) Offa on his departure to Rome in 709, and his death is recorded in the Chronicle under the year 746 (*ib.* 330). With this agrees the Appendix to Florence of Worcester, which assigns him a reign of 38 years (Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 543, 637). He met his death by violence (*ib.* 637, H. Hunt. *M. H. B.* 728). In the pedigrees, and also by William of Malmesbury (*G. P.* i. § 98), Swithaed succeeds, with whom the pedigree ends. Some good historians, as Sir T. D. Hardy, have supposed that Selred was really king of East Anglia, and only inserted by error in the East Saxon pedigree, but it is as certain as so obscure a matter can be that he is properly referred to Essex, although the Chronicle of Melrose, which contains some original material, calls him king of the East Angles, and gives him as successor the better known king Elfwold. We must, however, depend on the letter of the more ancient authorities, and accept the date given in the Chronicle. Possibly between 708 and 738 Selred may have reigned conjointly with Swebriht [Suefred]. There are no charters in which the name of Selred appears. [S.]

SEMIDALITAE, otherwise Barsanussitae, an obscure Monophysite sect. Joh. Damas. t. i. 107, lib. *de Haeres.* 86; Ceill. xii. 69. [G. T. S.]

SEMIPELAGIANS. [Pelagius (2).]

SEMSES, a monk, and the eldest brother of S. Simeon Stylites. (Asseman. *AA. MM.* ii. 268; Ceill. x. 580.) [G. T. S.]

SENACH, bishop of Clonard, co. Meath, disciple of St. Finnian of Clonard (Colgan, *Acta SS.* ii. c. 7, 395, c. 19, 20), and called by some authors his successor; died A.D. 588. (*Ann. Tig.*; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* iii. 109, adding to Ware's error from *M. Doneg.*; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 229 following Cotton.) [J. G.]

SENAN, bishop and confessor at Iniscathaigh, in the estuary of the Shannon, two miles from Kilrush. His Lives are full of fable, and historically worthless. At Mar. 8 Colgan (*Acta SS.* 512 sq.) gives a metrical *Vita S. Senani Episcopi et confessoris* (ex vetusto codice Kilkenniensi collato cum alio Salmanticensi), followed by a prose *Secunda Vita sive Supplementum Vitae S. Senani, ex Hibernico transumptum*, with Appendix of six chapters. These Lives are republished by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Mar. 8, i. 759–798) with Preface and Appendix containing extracts from Albert le Grand's *Saints of Armorica.* If his life was written by St. Colman, son of Lenin of Cluainuamha, it is now lost, but its substance is said to be contained in Colgan's second life [Colman (6)]; those we have are not older than the 12th century. (For MS. and other authorities see Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. pt. i. 124–6, pt. ii. 886, App.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 543, c. 6, who (*ibid.* 529) also mentions other Lives not used, but probably still at Brussels as noted in *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* iii. 477 sq.; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 210 sq.; O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Ir.* i. p. cccxxix. and *Lect. Ir. MS.* 339.)

St. Senan was son of Ercanus, of the tribe of the Corco-bhaiscin, co. Clare; his mother Comgella, daughter of Ernach, also of Munster. His birth about A.D. 488 is said to have been foretold forty years before by St. Patrick, who announced him as his successor, though not at Armagh. He was educated under Cassidus and Natalis, and appears to have been for some time a soldier. On assuming the religious habit he went on pilgrimage to Rome, Tours, and Menevia, forming with St. David a perpetual bond of friendship. Returning to Ireland he laid foundations at Inniscarra near Cork, where he had fifty Roman monks under him, and at several islands in the Shannon, but his chief church and monastery were on Inis-Cathay, now Scattery Island, where the remains of a round tower mark its ecclesiastical importance. In the metrical life he is called "Senanus archipontifex," and is usually regarded as a bishop, but may have only been abbat (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 542–543; Cotton, *Fast.* i. 431; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* ii. 95). His exact date is unknown, but that commonly accepted is A.D. 544 (Ussher), and he is said to have died in the same year as his friend St. David, which however was later. [David (5).] The Clog Oir or bell sent to him from heaven was used so late as 1834 as a sacred relic on which oaths were taken (O'Hanlon, *Hist. Ir.* iii. c. 6; Anderson, *Scot. Earl. Chr. Times*, 238), and his dedications on the West of Ireland were numerous as those of a favourite saint. The remarkable ruins on Oilen-Tsenach, one of the Magherees lying off the coast of Kerry, were probably of

his foundation; they consist of two ruined churches, and three circular beehive cells surrounded by a cashel wall (see Earl of Dunraven, *Notes Ir. Arch.* by Miss Stokes, i. 37–40, with plates and views). He is believed to have been patron of Llansannan, Denbighshire, Bedwelty, Monmouthshire, and one of the three patrons at Llantrissant in Anglesey (Bacon, *Lib. Regis*, ii. 1051, 1071, 1094), and to have given his name to Sennen, co. Cornwall (Cressy, *Ch. Hist. Brit.* xvi. 9); he is also identified with the Scotch St. KESSOG (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 374) and with the French S. Sané, one of the chief patrons of the diocese of S. Pol de Leon (Boll. *Acta SS.* Mar. i. 777–778). Of the *Amhra Senan* of Dallan Forgaill we have now no trace. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 210; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. ii.; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Ass. Ir.* 4 ser. i. 56, iii. 106 sq., 255 sq. on the island and churches of Inis-Cathay.) [J. G.]

SENARIUS, patrician in the suite and personal friendship of Theoderic the Great in the beginning of the sixth century. He was closely related by blood and friendship to Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, who has addressed eleven of his letters to him (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxiii. 33, 60, et al.). St. Avitus of Vienne (*Ep.* 36) also wrote to him (Migne, t. lix. 252). [J. G.]

SENATOR (1), an officer of state of the highest rank in the Eastern Empire in the time of Theodoret. We have a letter of Theodoret's to him, written apparently about 433, on the subject of the excessive taxation imposed on his city of Cyrrhus, the assessment of which had originally been made twelve years before, when Senator himself was there in an official capacity. At the time of the writing of the letter Senator had been newly raised to the exalted rank of "Patrician," which had been revived by the emperor Constantine, as a personal dignity of the highest grade (Theod. *Ep.* 44). Three years later, in 436, Senator was consul. In 449, Theodoret wrote to him again with reference to the calumnious charges brought against him, against which he begged his assistance (*ib.* Ep. 93). He was present officially among the highest officers of state at the council of Chalcedon in 451. (Labbe, iv. 77.) [E. V.]

SENATOR (2), priest, and probably afterwards bishop of Milan, legate of Leo the Great with the bishops ABUNDIUS and Asterius, and the priest Basilius, to Constantinople, in the summer of A.D. 450. They were bearers of letters, dated July 16th, from Leo to Theodosius, Pulcheria, and the archimandrites of Constantinople (Leo, *Epp.* 69, 70, 71; in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 890, 893, 895; LEO I. vol. iii. 658). They returned to Rome before the following June (*Epp.* 83; in *Patr. Lat.* liv. 919), and Senator and Abundius then proceeded to Milan with letters from the pope to bishop Eusebius. It is almost certain that he is the same as the bishop of Milan of that name, as Ennodius in his series of epigrams on the bishops of Milan (ii. 87), refers to his journey to the East. It praises his eloquence and his skill in interpreting prophecy. He was bishop for three years between Benignus and Theodorus. The exact date is uncertain. Gams (*Scr. Epp.*) makes his episcopate extend from A.D. 472 to A.D. 475, Papebroch (*AA. SS.* Mai. vi. 769) from A.D. 477 to A.D. 480. He is commemorated on May 28 (Tillemont, *M. E.* xv. 607, 627). [F. D.]

SENATOR (3), bishop, to whom Ennodius writes by one Victor, described as "vir magnificus." He complains that whereas Senator had promised to restore one of the slaves that had been carried off by his men from Ennodius' house, he found on his return from Ravenna that the promise had not been fulfilled (Ennodius, *Epp.* iii. 1, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 55). This Senator cannot be the bishop of Milan of that name mentioned by Ennodius in his epigrams (ii. 82), as he died at latest when Ennodius was only eight years old. [F. D.]

SENATOR (4), proper name of Cassiodorius, his full name being Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorius Senator. That it was his proper name, and not a title is shown by the fact, that in his Chronicle he enters his own consulship only by the name Senator, and in books xi. and xii. of the *Variarum* calls himself Senator only. The preceding articles show that the name was not uncommon. A Senator was also consul in A.D. 436. [F. D.]

SENATOR (5), abbat. There is a letter to him from Gregory the Great, dated A.D. 602, which grants various privileges to a hospice at Autun, founded by bishop Syagrius and queen Brunechile, over which he presided (*Epp.* xiii. 8). [F. D.]

SENCHAN (SENCHAI, SEANCHAN, SENCAN) (1) Surnamed Torpeist, Torpestius, or Torpestrius, succeeded Dallan Forgaill as chief bard in Ireland (O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 29, 41). He was contemporary with Guaire Aidhne king of Connaught, who died A.D. 662, and is said to have written a distich upon St. Fursa of Perrone, and, according to Tanner, committed the native laws to writing — "Scriptis commisit leges patrias." (O'Reilly, *Ir. Writ.* xliii.; Tanner, *Bibl.* 662.) [J. G.]

(2), abbat of Emly, co. Tipperary, died A.D. 781 (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 780). He is called both abbat and bishop, and is usually counted among the bishops of Emly (Ware, *Ir. Bps.* Emly; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* i. 84; Gams, *Ser. Ep.* 209). His feast is Dec. 11. [J. G.]

SENECA, LUCIUS ANNAEUS. The chief authorities for the life of this eminent stoic philosopher are, first, his own writings; secondly, the annals of Tacitus, books xii.–xv.; thirdly, the history of Dion Cassius (or rather the abridgment of that history by Xiphilinus), books lix.–lxii. It must be said at once that whereas both from Seneca's own writings and from Tacitus we should gather that Seneca was a man of estimable though faulty character, from Dion on the other hand we should infer that he was altogether hypocritical and base. It has been usual with biographers of Seneca to regard Dion's account as untrustworthy; and the present writer, on the whole, shares this view. The question, however, is not altogether an easy one; we must be content with a fair probability in the answer we accept.

Seneca was born at Corduba (Cordova) in Spain, a year or two after the commencement of our era. He was the second son of M. Annaeus Seneca, a well-known rhetorician, some of whose writings have come down to us. His family was of equestrian rank. He was still a child when his parents came with him to live in Rome. A constant liability to illness, from which he suffered through life, may partly account for his philosophic turn of mind, as well as for that pliability of temper which led him into some great errors. In the reign of Caligula (A.D. 37–41) he was so distinguished as a pleader, that he ran some risk from the jealousy of that emperor, who, however, contented himself with the revenge of disparaging Seneca's style, which he described as "sand without lime," i.e. wanting in continuity and strength of argument; also he called Seneca's speeches mere literary exercises. (Suetonius, *Calig.* 53.) Seneca became quaestor (*ad Helv.* 17), though at what time is not known. In the first year of the reign of Claudius, A.D. 41, he was banished to Corsica, on a charge of criminal intimacy with Julia, one of the daughters of Germanicus, and niece of the reigning emperor. From the words of Suetonius (Claudius 29) it seems a fair conclusion that this accusation was unjust; for though Suetonius does not mention Seneca in that passage, he does mention Julia, and tells us that she was put to death without any proof of crime, and without being permitted to defend herself; and, moreover, that Claudius was persuaded to this and other like decisions by his wives or his favourites, who were actuated purely by passion or self-interest. Messalina was the accuser of Seneca and Julia; it is supposed that she was jealous of Julia. It is evident that Seneca was greatly affected by his banishment, and very uneasy under it. In his letter to his mother Helvia, which apparently was written at the very beginning of it, he does, it is true, express sentiments of the genuine Stoic character. "What matters it," he asks (c. 9), "what soil I tread, so long as I can survey the grand spectacle of the heavens, sun, moon, and stars, and inquire into the causes of their motions?" Again (c. 11), "It is the mind which makes us wealthy; this follows us into exile, and in the midst of the roughest solitudes, when it has obtained enough for the sustenance of the body, abounds in its own blessings and enjoys them. Money has no effect on the mind, any more than the things which are objects of envy to untrained intellects, have an influence on the immortal gods." But these grand sentiments were not maintained to the end. Two or three years afterwards we find him writing to Polybius, the powerful freedman of Claudius, in a tone of misery and despair. He speaks of his mind as "stupified and blunted by long rust," and in the same sentence (the last in the letter) of himself as absorbed in his own misfortunes ("quem sua mala occupatum tenent"), and as having lost his command of his native language in the society of the barbarous people among whom he was placed. But this is not the worst. His letter to Polybius, nominally one of consolation to the latter on the loss of a brother, had for its real aim to obtain through Polybius his own recall from banishment, and the insincere flattery of Claudius which the letter contains is painful to read. Polybius, he says, must in the midst of his grief think of the emperor. He cannot grieve as long as that deity is in sight. While Caesar presides over the world Polybius has lost nothing; Claudius is his solace; his tears will be dried up by the sight of that bright luminary. It is to Claudius that Seneca himself owes his life, for the senate would have put Seneca to death, Claudius persuaded them only to banish him. The "divine hand" whose gentleness and moderation Seneca here celebrates, can hardly be believed to belong to that same person whom, after his death, this same Seneca depicted as a stupid, cruel, and brutal lout. Yet there seems no reason to doubt the genuineness either of the Consolatio ad Polybium, or of the Ludus de Morte Claudii Caesaris. It need not be said which of these treatises exhibits Seneca's real opinion of Claudius.

Seneca's flattery was, after all, unavailing. Polybius himself fell under the displeasure of Messalina and was put to death, and Seneca remained in exile eight years. But Messalina at last fell a victim to her own insane folly and profligacy. Agrippina succeeded her as the wife of Claudius (though his niece), and the new empress had a liking for the banished philosopher. Through her, in A.D. 49, Seneca was recalled from exile, appointed to the praetorship, and made the tutor of the young Domitius (afterwards the emperor Nero, and the son of Agrippina by a former husband). And here we approach an entirely new scene, and the most important one, in the life of Seneca.

Before treating of it, we may observe that he had been married for the first time some years (at least) before his exile; for he alludes in his "Consolatio ad Helviam," to two sons, one who had recently died (c. ii. 5), the other a young child, Marcus, whose playful childish ways are prettily described (c. xvi. 13, 14). Seneca refers to his wife (i.e. his first wife—the celebrated Paullina was his second) in the *De Ira*, iii. 36, 3, and to the boy Marcus again in his 8th epigram, written in his exile.

Seneca then was now no longer a mere pleader, much less an exile under the displeasure of the emperor, but one of the most powerful persons in Rome. And that power was still further and greatly increased, when in the October of A.D. 54 Claudius died (he was poisoned) and Nero became emperor. We do not hear much of Seneca's doings during the five years that elapsed between his recall from Corsica and the accession of Nero; but from that time onward the strongest light which ancient history can supply rests upon him. And if, with all the light we have, the character of Seneca is still a problem, this results, not from our having but little evidence about him, but because evidence on the delicate points which concern him is difficult to weigh, and considerations may often be adduced alike on one side and on the other.

He became, from A.D. 54 to A.D. 62, one of the two leading administrators in the Roman world, his partner in this exalted station being Afranius Burrus, prefect of the praetorian guard. One of his first duties was to restrain the immoderate ambition of Agrippina, who having murdered her husband in order to get

her son made emperor, now acted as though the real power lay in herself alone. She had already planned the death of many persons of note in Rome, when Burrus and Seneca interfered to prevent the bloodshed (Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. 2). One critical moment for her power appears to have been on an occasion when ambassadors from Armenia sought an audience of Nero. Agrippina was on the point of ascending the tribunal and exercising joint authority with her son, when Seneca had the presence of mind to bid the emperor step forward to meet his mother, and under the appearance of filial respect divert her real object. Though Agrippina had been the patroness of Seneca, no one can say that Seneca did not act rightly on these occasions. Nor were the public enactments suggested by him less approved of. The evils that had grown up under the rule of Claudius, the seizure of power by irresponsible favourites, the selling of justice, the quasi-legal attacks on obnoxious individuals, were at once checked; and we read with interest that the senate decreed (among other things) that quaestors on receiving office were not to be obliged to exhibit a show of gladiators. This last enactment is one that seems specially to bear the stamp of Seneca's mind, for he is one of the few classical Roman writers (is there indeed another?) who wrote in reprobation of the gladiatorial spectacles. (See esp. *Ep.* vii. 3, xcv. 33.) Nor is it less to the credit of both Seneca and Burrus (as is remarked by Tacitus), that during the eight years during which they jointly administered the affairs of the empire, no shadow of jealousy arose between them; a rare thing in any age, much more in an age so environed with perils and difficulties as was that of Nero.

Thus far then we have found nothing in Seneca's career as a statesman that is not praiseworthy. But there are points in him on which we cannot look with the same complacency; nay, which must arouse in us deep regret, whatever excuse may in part be made for them. The temptation in those days of flattery to an unworthy emperor, of mean compliances, was to a courtier almost overpowering, and it cannot be denied that Seneca yielded to it. It is difficult not to say that he acted basely towards Claudius, in the points already narrated. And if there were any doubt as to the genuineness of the "Ludus de Morte Claudii," there is at all events none as to the treatise *De Clementiâ*, and the expressions in that treatise are calculated to strike us with the keenest surprise, when they are contrasted with the true history of Nero. The *De Clementiâ* was written, as Seneca tells us (i. 9) when Nero had completed his eighteenth year; when, therefore, he had been at least fourteen months on the throne. Now Nero had been only three months on the throne, when he had committed one of the basest of murders, that of Britannicus (his brother by adoption, i.e. through his own adoption by Claudius); nor was it long after this when he designed to put his mother to death, and with her Rubellius Plautus (under the influence of a panic fear), and was with difficulty dissuaded from doing so by Burrus What must we think then when we find Seneca in this treatise affirming repeatedly and with the utmost force of asseveration, that Nero had never slain anyone; had never spilt a drop of human blood; that he was distinguished from all previous emperors by his innocence, by his clemency? It may be expedient to quote one of the passages in which this assertion is made. "Praestitisti, Caesar, civitatem incruentam, et hoc, quod magno animo gloriatus es, Nullam te toto orbe stillam cruoris humani misisse; eo majus est mirabiliusque, quod nulli unquam citius gladius commissus est." (*De Clementiâ*, i. 11. 2.) "You, Caesar, have preserved the state from all bloodshedding; and your magnanimous boast, That in the whole world you have not spilt a drop of human blood, is by so much the greater and more admirable, in that you were entrusted with the sword at an earlier age than any before you." Now it is true that Seneca in this treatise had clearly a good object, that namely of persuading Nero to a worthy feeling of his imperial duties. But is it not plain that flattery so grossly unfounded must have entirely done away with the effect of the salutary advice with which it was accompanied? And Seneca's actions had too much similarity to his words, even though the discrimination of their real character is not an easy task. He facilitated by means that we cannot but consider unworthy the intrigue of Nero with the courtesan Acte (Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. 13), and this was no unimportant point in the life of Nero, for with it began the alienation from his mother Agrippina which ended in that atrocious act, her murder by her son. It must be noted that the intrigue with Acte took place at the very beginning of Nero's reign, before the murder of Britannicus, and that the murder of Britannicus was even in an indirect manner the result of that intrigue. Seneca, we gather, defended himself for his conduct in the affair of Acte by the argument that, had Nero not been allowed to take his pleasure in this way, he might have broken out into assaults on the honour of high-born Roman ladies. It must be owned that what is narrated of Caligula (Suetonius, *Calig.* 36) shews that the fear was not an unfounded one. But did Seneca, either now or at any later period, attempt to recall Nero to his genuine and honourable wife Octavia? This is a question most important for the character of Seneca, but one which, unfortunately, we are without the means to solve. Could we place trust in the tragedy of "Octavia" (once ascribed to Seneca himself) we might answer it with some confidence in the affirmative. And if that tragedy was, as is probable, composed in the first century A.D. the evidence which it supplies is not to be held worthless. Further, we learn from Suetonius (Nero 35) that some friends of Nero did find fault with his desertion of Octavia, and it may fairly be hoped that Seneca was among them. On the other hand, it must be said that Tacitus gives but slight support to such a supposition, none at all indeed directly, though indirect ground may perhaps be gathered from that historian in the two following ways. The first is, that it is plain from *Annals*, xiv. 52, 53, that the overthrow of Seneca's power (which preceded his death by some three years) was caused mainly by Nero's feeling that his old tutor and moral adviser was exerting his functions in this kind too freely to be pleasing to his quondam pupil and present master. This is a

purely general consideration, but if it be true that Burrus was poisoned by the order of Nero (though this is not wholly certain) then it is impossible not to connect together the death of Burrus and the contemporaneous disgrace of Seneca; and we know from Dion Cassius that Burrus had offended Nero by the strong expression of his opinion in favour of Octavia. It is then a probable inference that Seneca had committed the same honourable offence. Dion Cassius, however, is as strong, it may be said as virulent, against Seneca in relation to the wrongs and calamities of Octavia as he is in all other points; but it is so clear that Dion Cassius took his account from the bitter enemies of Seneca, and he gives so little authority for his assertions (at least in the abridgment of his history by Xiphilinus, which is all of his work that we possess in this part of it) that his statements against Seneca are not entitled to very much weight. On the whole, we may hope that Seneca conducted himself with respect to the miserable history of Nero's sexual relations, not certainly without fault, but still with sincere attempts at rectitude, and that our sympathy for him need not be wholly taken away on this account. The present is not a biography either of Nero or of Octavia; it must be sufficient to remind the reader that the life of Octavia, after her marriage with Nero, lasted about nine years; that it was in the second of these years, or very shortly after he became emperor, that Nero deserted her for Acte (though he had never liked her); that she continued to receive the support and friendship of Agrippina (*Ann.* xiii. 18, 19; xiv. 1) up to the death of the latter; and that her ruin was finally accomplished by the same wicked and beautiful woman who was the prime cause of the death of Agrippina herself, Poppaea Sabina, Nero's second and favourite wife.

We must, however, return to Seneca; and the gravest charge against him has now to be examined, the part which he played in relation to the murder of Agrippina. The mutual relations of Nero and his mother, after the accession of the former to the imperial throne, were those of a growing jealousy and alienation, as indeed from their respective characters was almost certain to be the case. The open attempts of Agrippina to exercise a share in the imperial authority had been frustrated by Seneca himself, and in this he acted rightly, for Nero was the recognised *de facto* sovereign, questionable as the legitimacy of his rule was. After this, the violent and seditious language of Agrippina, though under circumstances of great provocation, may have justified the withdrawal of her military guard and escort. If we could believe that Nero was ever in any positive personal danger from his mother, that she had ever contemplated his removal by assassination or poisoning, our deep condemnation even of Nero would be somewhat lightened, and Seneca's conduct would admit of more excuse than has generally been accorded to it. It may be said, in support of such a supposition, that the woman who had poisoned the late emperor her husband would not hesitate to make away with the present emperor her son, if need were; and those who believe the odious story quoted by Tacitus from Cluvius (*Ann.* xiv. 2), and apparently half believed by Tacitus himself, may argue that there was no wickedness from which Agrippina would have shrunk. But that story wears marks of internal improbability, (for would Agrippina have acted as she is there said to have done in the presence of witnesses?) and was probably the invention of a prurient age; and as to the other point, the tenor of the history shews that Agrippina had an affection for her son which she never had, nor was likely to have, for Claudius. "It is not my son who has sent you," were her words to her murderers; the very violence of her language against him on some occasions was proof that she meditated no secret treachery; and in one most important point, her support of Octavia (*Ann.* xiv. 1), she certainly acted an honourable part. All things considered, can we believe that there was no opportunity for Seneca, during the more than four years' quarrel (an ever-growing quarrel) between Nero and his mother, to say a word for the woman to whom he owed his own advancement, nay more, his deliverance from a most burdensome exile? There is no sign that he ever uttered any such word; and it is to be feared that want of courage was his true reason for such abstinence. Cowardice was emphatically the characteristic of the Roman senate (with a few bright exceptions) at this period; and Seneca, it is to be feared, was liable to the same imputation. The murder of Agrippina was finally carried out for three reasons; first, because Nero was afraid of her; secondly, because he was tired of her reproaches (he found her "praegravis," *Ann.* xiv. 3, and compare Suetonius, *Nero*, 34); and lastly, because Poppaea found her marriage with Nero difficult or impracticable, so long as Agrippina, the resolute champion of Octavia, lived to oppose it. Did we believe of Seneca what was asserted of him by his enemies, that he was privy to the whole plot against Agrippina, our opinion of him must sink very low indeed. He, as well as Burrus, did give an assent to it (*Ann.* xiv. 7); but as far as we know, only at the very last moment, when the scheme for drowning Agrippina had failed, and when it might seem that, as reconciliation was impossible, either Nero or Agrippina must fall. Though even then a man of perfect courage would not have given such assent, yet to avoid it was, we may conclude, difficult, since Burrus gave it as well as Seneca. But Seneca, alone of these two, bore the blame in the popular mind of having composed the letter which Nero afterwards addressed to the senate, in which he declared that Agrippina had made an attempt on his life, and then, finding it unsuccessful, had committed suicide in a fit of terror and remorse. The attempt to drown her was in this letter represented as an accidental shipwreck. If Seneca really composed it, it was the worst act we know of him. On the whole it must be taken that he did compose the letter; though the words of Tacitus, strictly speaking, do not state more than that the popular belief was to this effect. ("Adverso rumore Seneca erat, quod oratione tali confessionem *scripsisset*." *Ann.* xiv. 11.)

The remaining charge against Seneca, during the period of his power, was that of having accumulated wealth by oppressive and extortionate means. The charge was especially emphasised by Suilius, who himself had been an oppressive minister under Claudius, and who, partly at the

instance of Seneca, was banished in the reign of Nero for his old oppression (*Ann.* xiii. 42, 43). There may have been some truth in it, for the wealth of Seneca was no doubt enormous; but it must be said in his favour that he was clearly capable of great personal self-restraint (Tacitus speaks of him in his old age as "parvo victu tenuatum," *Ann.* xv. 63, and in his youth he was a vegetarian, cf. *Ep.* cviii. 13–23); and though fear was no doubt a part motive in his offer to resign all his wealth to the emperor after the death of Burrus (*Ann.* xiv. 54), it does not look as if he clung tenaciously to it, or was unduly fond of it.

It is worth while asking, before we leave this part of the life of Seneca, what reasons are to be assigned for his lamentable failure in the task specially assigned to him, as firstly tutor and then ministerial adviser to Nero? One of the most distinguished of philosophers and of moral writers has an emperor for his pupil; and the result is, that that emperor becomes a prodigy of vice and wickedness. What caused this result? It may be said that the task was a difficult one; but the catastrophe of the issue was stupendous. We are not entitled to be surprised that Seneca did not make a Marcus Aurelius of his pupil; but we might have expected some one better than Nero to have been turned out from the operation. How came such a disaster from conditions so apparently promising? Out of various causes that contributed to the result, perhaps none acted so detrimentally as a certain want of practical directness in Seneca's mind. He loves theorising, but he leaves his theories in the air. His letter of consolation to his mother Helvia upon his own banishment is an eloquent treatise; and the process of writing it no doubt consoled himself; but it is difficult to believe that it can have had the same effect on his mother. What can be more absurd in the way of consolation than to accumulate all the ills a person has ever suffered, and present them in one view with an emphatic statement of the misery that they involved? which is what Seneca does to his mother in the second and third chapters of this treatise. And there is a ludicrous naïveté in the way in which he represents his own banishment (to no more distant place than Corsica) as the worst of all ills that his mother had ever suffered, though he has just reminded her of the death of his own father and her husband, not to speak of the deaths of an uncle and three grandchildren. If Seneca instructed Nero as he consoled his mother, the perversity of the effect produced need not surprise us. Take again the treatise *De Tranquillitate Animi*. Annaeus Serenus, an intimate friend of Seneca, had written to him complaining of his own weakness; he desired to practise the precepts of the Stoic philosophy, and at times did so, living in plain and homely fashion, expressing himself in simple phrases, attending to his own business; but he could not keep consistently to his own resolutions, he was continually hurried away into luxury and ambition. Seneca answers him by telling him that he wants tranquillity, and proceeds to write a treatise on the general subject of tranquillity, out of which he tells Serenus that he must pick out those parts which suit his own case. The treatise is full of able and acute observations, it must be admitted; but Serenus must have been very clear-sighted to find any answer to his own question in it. And in fine, while it would be unjust to say that personal vital morality has no place in Seneca, intellectual morality and theories about duty are so far in excess of the vital feeling as rather to swamp the latter. There is perhaps nothing in which he stands so pointedly in contrast with Christianity as in this; for in Christianity, at any rate the Christianity of the New Testament and the early Fathers, there is hardly a point of pure intellectual theory about duty; every perception of duty is accompanied by the instant practical feeling, "it must be done, or it will be the worse for us." Seneca for the most part surveys duty from a distance. He is aware of his weakness in this respect, and very candidly confesses it in the treatise, *De Vita Beata*, c. 17, 18. "I," he says in effect in those chapters, "am not worthy to speak even as a man who has attained to any good, much less a wise man. I am in a very abyss of faults; when I reprove vices, I reprove my own first of all; when I shall be able, then I will live as I ought to live. Yet, O ye calumniators of all that is good, I will none the less persist in praising that life which I do not indeed live myself, but which I know ought to be lived, and at a vast distance I will creep on in pursuit of it." Sentiments so humble must move us in favour of the man who expresses them, though Seneca did not at all adequately feel the danger there is in mere rhetorical praise of virtue. After all, great as is the difference between Seneca and the New Testament in this respect, Seneca had a real interest in practical active conduct, not enough indeed to kindle a spiritual fire in those devoid of it, but enough to inform and interest others in manifold ways.

But it is necessary to return to his personal life, of which the third, the briefest, and the concluding portion remains to be told. He fell from power after the death of Burrus in A.D. 62. Nero was exhorted by his flatterers to rid himself of an instructor who had possibly been of use to a boy, but was useless to a grown man; and Seneca was alleged to show extraordinary vanity, and even to have carped at the emperor's performances in poetry, chariot-driving, and singing. Seneca perceived that the emperor lent an ear to these accusations, and begged leave to surrender his wealth and retire into private life. This was not permitted, but Seneca, not deceived by Nero's apparently friendly manner, mingled but little henceforth in public matters. He made another unsuccessful attempt to retire at the time when Nero, being in want of money, plundered the temples not only in Italy, but in the provinces of Asia and Achaia (*Ann.* xv. 45); being afraid of being regarded as a participator in such sacrilege. It was reported (whether truly or not we have no means of knowing) that Nero made an attempt to poison him about this time. If so, the attempt failed; but the end of Seneca's eventful life was drawing near. The conspiracy of Piso, in A.D. 65, gave the occasion for it. That plot was disclosed to Nero by a slave of Scevinus, one of the conspirators. It was speedily discovered that Scevinus had had a long and secret interview with Natalis; and Natalis, on being threatened with the rack, informed Nero that

Piso and Seneca were two of the conspirators. The evidence against Seneca, however, was still indirect merely, for Natalis could merely say that he had been sent by Piso to Seneca to complain of Seneca's refusal to admit him to friendly intercourse, and that Seneca replied that frequent conversation between them was inexpedient, but that his safety rested on Piso's safety. Slight as this evidence was, Nero was too eager to get rid of his old tutor to hesitate to avail himself of it. He sent Granius Silvanus, a tribune of the praetorian cohort, to ask Seneca if he acknowledged these utterances. Seneca replied, acknowledging Piso's message, but not his own reply. He had merely refused Piso on the ground of ill-health and desire for rest. "He should have regarded," he said, "such an answer as that attributed to him as flattery of Piso, and Nero must know better than anyone that Seneca was no flatterer, having so often had experience of his freedom of speech." This bold answer at once shewed Nero that Seneca was prepared for the worst. "Was Seneca," he asked the tribune, "preparing for death?" "He shews," said the tribune, "no sign of fear. His words, his countenance are cheerful." Poppaea was sitting by with Tigellinus, the worst of Nero's instruments. "Tell Seneca," said Nero, "that he must put himself to death." And now an incident occurred, in itself slight, but which, if correctly reported, seems to shew that Seneca had really knowledge of the plot. The tribune was himself in the conspiracy, and with such a message he shunned meeting the gaze of Seneca; he conveyed Nero's commands through a centurion. Why? It may have been simply that he shunned, being himself guilty, meeting the gaze of an innocent and injured man. But a more likely explanation is that the tribune not only knew himself to be guilty, but knew that Seneca knew him to be so. And this implies that Seneca knew of the plot, and probably Tacitus thought so too, though he lays stress on the absence of evidence against him. If Seneca knew of it, then, though the evidence produced was inadequate in the extreme, his death cannot be reckoned among the villainies which have made Nero infamous.

We need not, even in this case, blame Seneca severely. It is plain that he was no active conspirator himself. We in our day have learned the evil and uselessness of political assassinations, be the cause of the injured parties as just as it may. But the Romans of the first century A.D. had by no means learned this lesson, and Tacitus himself writes as if he approved of the conspirators in this case (he blames the "ignavia" through which the plot failed). Were the rumour in *Ann.* xv. 65 true, we should condemn Seneca more; but it is too devoid of authority to be more than referred to here.

In the last scene of his life Seneca behaved with courage and equanimity. He was at supper in the company of his wife and two friends: he called for his will, but on this being refused, he turned to his friends and said, "Since I may not requite your kindnesses to me, I can but leave you the picture of my life as your bequest. Remember it, and you will have an honourable reputation both from your own character and from our constant friendship." He restrained their tears with exhortations and reproofs, he embraced his wife, and entreated her not to be too sorrowful, but to console herself with the memory of his virtuous life. She, however, declared herself determined to die with him. Their veins were opened with the same stroke. Seneca, with his aged body and the slow flow of blood, suffered greatly, and to prevent their being mutually affected by the sight of each other's pains, he persuaded his wife to be carried to an adjoining apartment. He himself dictated some reflections to his secretaries, which were afterwards published. Death was long in coming to him; he tried poison in vain; at last he desired himself to be placed in a hot bath. As he entered it, he sprinkled his slaves with the water, crying out, "I make this libation to Jupiter the deliverer." He was quickly overpowered by the vapour. He died in A.D. 65. His wife Paullina did not die; for Nero ordered that her veins should be closed again. It was doubted whether she was, or was not, conscious of the act which restored her life. She lived some years afterwards, but with a deathly pallor of face, revering the memory of her husband.

Seneca, with all his faults, had many elements of goodness in him. Above all, his writings shew him to have been a humane and tender-hearted man. No other classical writer can shew a parallel to such a passage as the following, in which he speaks of the gladiatorial shows, "Man, that sacred thing, is now slain for a sport and a jest to his fellow-man. He, who cannot without crime be trained to inflict and receive wounds, is brought out unarmed and defenceless into the amphitheatre. The spectacle that a man gives by his death is all that we care for. In such a perversity of moral character we need some more than usually strong impulse, to strike aside these inveterate evils." (*Ep.* xcv. 33, 34. "Homo, sacra res, homini jam per lusum et jocum occiditur," &c.). In relation to sexual morality, he speaks in the same epistle with a loftiness of tone seldom found among the ancients: it is, he tells us, "the most grievous injury against a wife for a man to keep a mistress." (*Ep.* xcv. 39.) His practical Roman nature resented the subtleties and puzzles which some logicians of the time regarded as proper training for the intellect (*Ep.* xlviii.), and even the paradoxes of greater philosophers (*Ep.* lxxxviii.). It is of interest to find that he agreed with Bacon in disapproving of preambles to laws, and disagreed with Plato. "A law," he says, "should be short, and should command, but not discuss." (*Ep.* xciv. 38.)

It has been said above that the greatest difference between the general character of his moral precepts and Christian morality lies in the far greater urgency, the commanding force of the latter. St. Paul rebukes vice; Seneca was not strong enough for this; he merely argues against it. Nevertheless the style of the morality of Seneca, and even his religion, are in many respects singularly Christian. He knew that improvement in goodness is effected by small insensible advances, "line upon line, here a little and there a little." "You will find," he says, "that the conversation of wise men benefits you, but you will not find how or when the benefit is effected" (*Ep.* xciv. 41). In more than one

place he uses the phrase that the mind is "transformed" (*transfigurari*) into a better state: "I find, Lucilius," he says, "that I am being not merely corrected, but transformed. I can indeed give no promise or expectation of being free from faults: how should I not have many things in me needing correction? but it is a proof of improvement, that my mind sees faults in itself which hitherto it ignored" (*Ep.* vi. 1, cf. xciv. 48). Then, too, there is in Seneca a greater likeness to that which Christianity terms "faith" than is to be found in any other ancient writer. It is, indeed, not an assured and steady faith; but it is full of enthusiasm. Very remarkable is the passage at the end of the "Consolatio ad Marciam," in which he depicts the son whom Marcia had lost as in heaven, as purified from the stains of this life, as conversing with those who had gone before him and learning the truths of nature; in heaven, where there is no war, nor murder, nor strife, where all minds are laid bare, all hearts are open (*detectas mentes, et aperta praecordia*). Or take the very interesting 68th Epistle, in which he describes (though in different parts and without intentional connexion) the wise man as he is in his true being, before and after death, and man as he is on this earth, feeble and miserable. "When we have assigned," he says in the first passage, "to our wise man a republic worthy of himself, that is the world; then *even when he has left his republic, he is not outside of it.* Nay, rather he has perhaps but left a single corner of it, and is passing into larger and ampler spheres, and is set over the heaven, and feels how lowly was the place in which he was formerly stationed, when he ascended to the curule chair, or the seat of judgment." The heavenly kingdom of Christ cannot but occur to the reader. In contrast with this take the following from the same epistle: "There is no reason why you should give yourself the title of philosopher . . . It is a kind of boastfulness to be too much in retreats, to withdraw from the eyes of men. . . . What is it that you ought to converse with yourself about? that which people are most prone to talk about in respect of others: think badly of yourself. Accustom yourself both to say and to hear truth; and handle your own weakest point the most. . . . I like not praises; I would not you should say of me, Great man, he has despised all things, he has condemned the madnesses of human life, and has fled from them. I have condemned nothing but myself; you need not come to me to learn from me; you are wrong if you hope for any help in this quarter; it is no physician, but a sick man who dwells here." Indeed, there is hardly anything on which Seneca dwells more than the sinfulness of man. Take, as one passage out of many, the following from the *De Irâ*, ii. 27. "If we wish to be equitable judges of every matter, let us first persuade ourselves of this, that none of us is without fault. For it is from this that the greatest indignation arises, when a man says: I have not sinned, I have done nothing; nay, rather thy confession it is which is lacking." So, too, in the treatise, *De Vita Beata*, i. 2, the "worn and frequented road" is stated to be the way of error; in *De Providentiâ*, iii. 3, the benefits of suffering are represented in the striking expression, quoted from Demetrius, "Nihil mihi videtur infelicius eo, cui nihil unquam evenit adversi." "Nothing seems to me more unhappy than the man to whom no adversity has ever happened." (This last recalls the Christian phrase, "Nulla crux, quanta crux.")

These quotations, illustrative of the similarity of Seneca's moral teaching to that of the New Testament, might be extended almost indefinitely. The reader who cares to see more of them may refer to pages 275–288 of bishop Lightfoot's essay, *St. Paul and Seneca*, which forms the second dissertation at the end of his "Epistle to the Philippians." Nevertheless, every one who reads Seneca continuously must feel that his mind is not a Christian mind; Stoic he is essentially as well as nominally; though his stoicism is of a far more flexible and expansive character than some doctrine which has borne that name. There is not a sentence in him that reads as if it were out of place, that does not fit in naturally to his whole system; and though that system has apparent inconsistencies within itself, even those inconsistencies have a natural air, they originate from different sides of the whole complex system. And among the special points in which his teaching is even adverse to Christianity, may be mentioned his distinct and frequent praise of suicide in those cases in which a man judges that his useful career in the world is over, the absence of any tone of awe in speaking of God or "the gods," and his doctrine of recurring cycles of renovation, at the close of each of which this whole system of things will be burnt up, and another order begin.

We have spoken of Seneca as having "faith"; and it emphasises the independent origin of this quality in him, when we find that he exercises it with reference to subjects wholly different from morals. Thus, in his treatise, *Naturales Quaestiones*, vii. 25, he dwells with enthusiasm on those discoveries of science which he anticipates in the future: "there will come a time when the things now hidden will be brought to light by length of days and continued industry. One age does not suffice for the investigation of so great things" . . . and in the 31st chapter of the same book: "How many animals have first come to our knowledge in this present age! and many things unknown to us, shall be known to the coming race. Many things are reserved for future ages, when our memory shall have become dim." And in the same tone is that celebrated passage in his play of "Medea," so often quoted as a prophecy of the discovery of America:

> Venient annis saecula seris,
> Quibus Oceanus vincula rerum
> Laxet et ingens pateat tellus
> Tethysque novos detegat orbes
> Nec sit terris ultima Thule.

"There will come an age, when Time has grown old, in which the ocean will unloose the bands that bind the world, and a mighty land will spread open to our view, and the sea-goddess Tethys shall disclose new spheres, and Thule shall no longer be the furthest known country." Indeed, Seneca had a real love for the splendours and wonders of the physical universe, and he sometimes shews an acuteness in dealing with them which entitles this part of his speculations

to receive more praise than Zeller accords to it. For instance, he is perfectly right as to the nature of comets, which he affirms to be heavenly, and not aerial bodies (*Nat. Quaest.* vii. 22), and to move in orbits; at least, he says that two which appeared in his time did so (*ib.* vii. 23). And he was aware that the moon was the cause of the tides (*De Provid.* i. 4); is there among the ancients any earlier instance of this piece of knowledge?

The great popularity of Seneca as a writer in his own day is attested by Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* x. 1, § 128), who, however, finds some fault with his style. In later times, among the Christian fathers, there gradually grew up a belief that he was almost, if not quite, a Christian. Bishop Lightfoot gives a compendious account of the growth of this belief, which may be quoted. "The earliest of the Latin fathers, Tertullian, writing about a century and a half after the death of Seneca, speaks of this philosopher as 'often our own' (Tertull. *de Anim.* 20). Some two hundred years later St. Jerome, having occasion to quote him, omits the qualifying adverb and calls him broadly 'our own Seneca' (*adv. Jovin.* i. 49). Living midway between these two writers, Lactantius points out several coincidences with the teaching of the gospel in the writings of Seneca, whom, nevertheless, he styles 'the most determined of the Roman Stoics' (*Div. Inst.* i. 5). From the age of St. Jerome, Seneca was commonly regarded as standing on the very threshold of the Christian church, even if he had not actually passed within its portals. In one ecclesiastical council at least, held at Tours in the year 567, his authority is quoted with a deference generally accorded only to fathers of the church. And even to the present day in the marionette plays of his native Spain St. Seneca takes his place by the side of St. Peter and St. Paul in the representations of our Lord's passion." (Bp. Lightfoot on the *Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 268.) The belief in the Christianity of Seneca was largely increased if not caused by that collection of letters, purporting to have been exchanged between him and St. Paul, which was current first, as far as we know, in the time of Jerome (who certainly seems, on the whole, to have believed in their genuineness), and which is extant in our own day. The letters contain nothing worthy of either of their reputed authors, and are now universally (and no doubt justly) held to be spurious. They were, however, very popular in the middle ages. It is worthy of note that the persecution by Nero (which took place after, and by reason of, the fire of Rome, in the year before the death of Seneca) is in the eleventh of these letters represented to have included Jews as well as Christians in its scope. This may be true, but there is no other evidence for it; and Poppaea would as certainly have endeavoured to protect the Jews as she would have been prone to excite Nero against the Christians (by reason of her liking for the Jews). Nor is it easy to think that Josephus would have praised Poppaea as he does (*Ant.* xx. 8, § 11) if the Jews had undergone violent persecution while she was in power at Rome.

There is, of course, no impossibility in the supposition that St. Paul and Seneca met between A.D. 61 and A.D. 65; but there is no evidence for it except the spurious letters; there is nothing in the works of Seneca which requires such a supposition, though they do not absolutely forbid it.

This account of Seneca may be concluded with two remarks. All that we know of him, except what is derived from his own writings, comes from historians who delighted to believe evil of every one. How true this is of Tacitus, the greatest of them, will be apparent from the account which he gives of the Christians. Tacitus certainly could not have *known* that Christianity was an abominable superstition, and Christians deserving of the most extreme punishments; he was quite content to take these things on common rumour. In some of the gravest charges which he records against Seneca, he rests on rumour also. If, then, we unhesitatingly reject what he says against the Christians, we should in fairness look with some doubt upon what he alleges, or half alleges, against Seneca.

Lastly, it is impossible not to be reminded, in reading of Seneca, of our own great countryman, Lord Bacon. Both great philosophers, and even not quite unlike in their philosophic character and enthusiasm (for on the one hand Bacon's observations on human nature are weighty, and Seneca on his side had true enthusiasm for natural science, as has been seen); both placed in high governing positions, and exposed to temptations which they could not wholly resist, and which have done much harm to their subsequent reputation. But Bacon had the advantage of living in a Christian country and in a better age; he had the advantage of light in many points where Seneca was groping; and his name has held a higher position than that of Seneca, and is likely to continue to do so. Nevertheless, Seneca is not quite unworthy of being named by his side.

The best, and a very admirable, account of the whole philosophy of Seneca will be found in Zeller's history of philosophy (towards the close of the first volume of the third part). The relations of Seneca to Christianity have been treated of very amply in the valuable dissertation of bishop Lightfoot (already referred to and quoted from), pp. 268–331 of his commentary on the Philippians; where also there is a discussion as to the genuineness and character of the supposed correspondence with St. Paul. The connexion of Seneca with St. Paul is also treated of in pp. 119–128 of the small volume entitled: *St. Paul at Rome*, by Dean Merivale, who in his *History of the Romans under the Empire*, also has much about Seneca. Other writers who may be referred to are Fleury (*St. Paul et Sénèque*), Aubertin (*Sénèque et St. Paul*), Bähr (*Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, vol. i.), and Ritter (*Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. iv.). Diderot also wrote about Seneca, and Montaigne valued him very highly. A list of Seneca's extant works will be found in the DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY. The works of Seneca were translated into English by Thomas Lodge (London, 1614). A recent edition is by F. Haase. [J. R. M.]

SENECA (HENECAS, Georg. Syncell. or SENTHYAS), the 10th bishop of Jerusalem. His episcopate commenced according to the *Chron.*

Armen. and the *Chronicon* of Jerome in the 8th year of Hadrian, A.D. 125. Eutychius assigns him one year only of office. (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 5; Epiphan. *Haer.* lxvi. 20.) [E. V.]

SENECIO, bishop of Scodra, was appointed coadjutor to Bassus c. A.D. 392 (Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.*; Siricius, *Epp.* 9, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiii. 1178), whom he succeeded, but at which date is not known. He is mentioned c. A.D. 425, by pope Celestinus (*Epp.* 3, in *Patr. Lat.* l. 427). Finally in A.D. 431, he was present at the council of Ephesus, the acts of which he subscribed (Mansi, iv. 1123, 1365; Farlati, *Illyr. Sac.* vii. 305). [F. D.]

SENOCHUS (1), ST., a presbyter, who gained a great reputation for sanctity in the 6th century, near Tours. Owing to his intimacy with Gregory the historian, we have trustworthy information about him. He was born about 536 in a district near Poitiers, called Theiphalia, which had been for many years settled by people of Scythian or Tartar race, to which he belonged himself. He became a Christian, and entered the ranks of the clergy. In some ruined buildings by Tours he built himself a cell, at a spot where an old oratory existed, in which St. Martin, according to tradition, had been wont to pray. St. Euphronius, the then bishop of Tours, consecrated it afresh, and ordained Senoch a deacon. Here with a little company of three he practised for some time the greatest austerities, but aspiring to still higher sanctity he afterwards shut himself up in a solitary cell. In 573 Gregory became bishop of Tours, and received a visit from him. Soon afterwards Senoch went to see his kinsfolk in Poitou, and came back, according to Gregory, so puffed up with spiritual pride, that the bishop had to take him roundly to task. He was brought to reason and consented, at Gregory's persuasion, to forego his absolute solitude, in order that the sick might be healed by his virtues. At about the age of forty he fell ill, and Gregory, summoned to his couch, found him speechless and on the point of death (circ. A.D. 576). His funeral was thronged by a multitude whom he had redeemed from captivity or healed or fed, and miracles were attributed to his dead body. He is commemorated Oct. 24, and his cult, which was established very early, extended into Burgundy (where he was called St. Enoch), Brittany, and the neighbourhood of Poitiers. His name clung to the spot where his cell had been. (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. 7; *Vitae Patrum*, cap. xv.; *De Glor. Conf.* cap. xxxv.; Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. x. 764 sqq.) [S. A. B.]

SENOCHUS (2) (SEDOCUS, SIDOCUS), eleventh bishop of the see of Eause, or Elusa (transferred to Auch in the 9th century), was present at the council held at Rheims under the presidency of Sonnatius, probably in the year 625. In the following year he and his father, Palladius, were driven into exile by Clotaire II., on the charge of being concerned in a Gascon rising (Fredegarius, *Chronicon*, liv.; Mansi, x. 593; *Gall. Christ.* i. 970). [S. A. B.]

SEN-PATRICK. [PATRICIUS (9).]

SENUTI (July 1st in the ancient Coptic Calendar) was the name of an anchorite of the 5th century, whose history was first brought to light by Zoega. It has been investigated of late by E. Revillout in a paper on the Blemmyes contributed to the *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* 1874, Sér. I. t. viii. p. 395, and still more elaborately in a series of articles contributed by him to the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 1883 Nos. 4 and 5. Senuti has strangely faded from the page of history, though he seems to have been a leader of special power amid the distracted controversies attendant upon the third and fourth councils. He was called "the prophet," and invested with supernatural powers. He was born about the middle of the 4th century. His father was a farmer in Egypt, and Senuti fed his sheep in boyhood. But this world's affairs had no charm for him. It was an age when every enthusiast devoted himself to the monastic life. His uncle was a famous anchorite. Senuti was brought to him as a boy to be blessed, when his uncle at once recognised his future greatness. He attached himself to the monastery of Panopolis, near the town of Athrebi in Upper Egypt, where he soon attained the greatest fame for sanctity and orthodoxy. Cyril would not set out for the council of Ephesus till he had secured the company of Senuti and of Victor, archimandrite of Tabenna. Zoega, *Cat. MSS. Coptic Mus. Borg.* p. 29, gives us Cyril's own account of this affair. Cyril travelled in the same ship with Senuti and Victor, while he sent his attendant bishops in another vessel. Senuti's conduct at the council of Ephesus, as described by his disciple and successor, Besa, fully justifies those charges of outrageous violence brought by the Nestorian party against their opponents. Besa describes a strange scene which happened at the opening of the council. A lofty throne had been placed in the centre of the hall, and the four gospels placed thereon. Nestorius entered with pomp, and flinging down the gospels on the floor seated himself on the throne. Senuti, filled with rage, at once jumped into the midst, and snatching up the book hurled it against the breast of Nestorius, accompanying the action with vigorous controversial reproaches. Nestorius demanded who he was, and whence and what brought him to the council, being "neither a bishop, nor an archimandrite, nor a provost, but merely a simple monk." "God sent me to the council," replied the undaunted Senuti, "to confound thee and thy wickedness." Whereupon, amid the plaudits of his adherents, Cyril at once invested him with the rank and robe of an archimandrite, and thus removed the technical objection raised by Nestorius. His career was now marked by miracle. Cyril, by mistake, sailed from Constantinople without him, but the sea was no obstacle to Senuti. He was wafted on a cloud to Egypt. His fame was now everywhere established. Roman commanders waging war against those mysterious but most pertinacious enemies of the Roman State the Blemmyes, sought direction and assistance from him. Thus about the year 450 there was a terrific invasion, and the dux of Upper Egypt, Maximinus, hurried to repel the Blemmyes, but before he would advance he sought the presence of Senuti. He had, however, retired into the desert for a period of

spiritual retreat, charging his followers to let no one know of his hiding-place. Maximinus would, however, admit of no excuse, and was led to the saint, who was very angry on account of the interruption, but yet admitted the plea of urgency. He gave Maximin his blessing and his girdle, which he was to wear whenever he joined battle, if he desired success. Revillout thinks that Senuti was specially hostile to the Blemmyes on this occasion, because they had just liberated his ancient enemy Nestorius from his exile in the Oasis of Ptolemais, and thus brought him back to his own immediate neighbourhood of Panopolis, where Nestorius died. Revillout, contrary to the usual authorities, fixes the date of Nestorius's death, as A.D. 451 [NESTORIUS (3)], and supports the tradition, that Nestorius was summoned by the emperor to the council of Chalcedon, but died before the missive reached him. According to the Coptic MSS. Senuti followed Nestorius with bitter persecution to the last, offering even personal violence to the unfortunate man when he lay dying.

Senuti was now about one hundred years old. He would have been fortunate had he died then. But he lived to be a heretic in the opposite extreme from Nestorius. After the council of Chalcedon he became a Monophysite and a violent partisan of the patriarch Dioscorus of Alexandria. Senuti died under Timotheus Aelurus, aged 118 years. The authorities for his life are Zoega and Revillout in the works mentioned above. [G. T. S.]

SEPTIMINUS, proconsul of Africa, A.D. 403, to whom the council of Carthage, held A.D. 401, addressed a memorial requesting protection against the Circumcellions, and permission to admonish the Donatists; to which he replied by giving permission for this to be done with due respect to the law (*Mon. Vet. Don.* xlv. p. 273, ed. Oberthür; p. 213, ed. Dupin). [H. W. P.]

SEPTIMUS, bishop of Altinum, is addressed in one letter of Leo the Great, and mentioned in another to the bishop of Aquileia, both written early in his pontificate (Leo, *Epp.* 1, 2, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 593, 597). For an abstract of these letters see LEO I. Vol. III. 658, and for a discussion of their date and the genuineness of that to Septimus, Tillemont (*M. E.* xv. 890). He is apparently the same as the Sambatinus mentioned in the Chronicle of Altinum (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, ix. 518). [F. D.]

SERANUS, vicar of Africa during the time of the insurrection of Gildo, about A.D. 393. The violence of the Donatists at this time induced the Catholics to appeal to him to put in force the edict of Valentinian to impose a fine of 10 lbs. of gold on heretics assuming clerical functions (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 21, A.D. 392; Aug. *Petil.* ii. 184). [GILDO (2).] He appears afterwards to have become pro-consul, and when an appeal was made to him by Restitutus to eject Salvius from the property of the see of Membresa he was induced either, as was insinuated, by partiality, or as Augustine thought, more probably by the recent decree of the Council of Bagai to decide against Salvius, with the scornful suggestion that he ought either to return to the community of Primian with a promise of indemnity, or according to the Scripture precept accept cheerfully the lot of persecution (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iv. 58). [H. W. P.]

SERAPHIA, martyr. [SABINA (2).]

SERAPION (1), bishop of Antioch, reckoned eighth in succession, A.D. 190–203 (Clinton), succeeded Maximinus in the eleventh year of Commodus (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 12; *Chronicon*). He was a theologian of considerable literary activity, the author of works of which Eusebius had no certain knowledge, in addition to those enumerated by him. Of these latter an account is given by Jerome (*de Script. Eccl.* c. 41) borrowed from Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 19; vi. 12). They are—(1) a letter to Caricus and Pontius directed against the Cataphrygian or Montanist heresy, containing a copy of a letter of Apollinaris of Hierapolis on the same subject, and substantiated as to the facts by the signatures of several other bishops, including some of Thrace (Eus. *H. E.* v. 19; vi. 12); (2) a treatise addressed to Domninus, who during the persecution of Severus had fallen away to the Jewish "will-worship" (*ibid.* vi. 12); and (3) the most important of all, one directed against the Docetic gospel falsely attributed to St. Peter, addressed to some members of the church of Rhossus on the Gulf of Issus, who were being led away by it from the true faith. Serapion, in the extracts given by Eusebius (*ibid.* vi. 12), recalls the permission to read this apocryphal work given in ignorance of its true character, and expresses his intention of paying the church a speedy visit to strengthen them in the true faith. Dr. Neale calls attention to the important evidence here furnished to "the power yet possessed by individual bishops of settling the canon of scripture" (Neale, *Patriarch. of Antioch*, p. 36). Socrates refers to his writings, as an authority against the Apollinarian heresy (Socr. *H. E.* iii. 7). Jerome mentions sundry letters in harmony with his life and character. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* iii. 168, § 9; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 86; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 702.) [E. V.]

SERAPION (2), Nov. 14, martyr at Alexandria. His martyrdom was described by Dionysius of Alexandria, in his epistle to Fabius of Antioch (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 41). [G. T. S.]

SERAPION (3), a penitent of Alexandria, who fell during the Decian persecution. Dionysius of Alexandria uses his case as an argument against the Novatian schism, to which his correspondent, Fabius of Antioch, was inclined. Serapion had lived a long life without blame, but sacrificed at last. He often begged for admission to the church, but was refused. He was then taken sick, and was three days without speech. At length he awoke to consciousness, and despatched his grandson for a presbyter. He was sick, and unable to come to Serapion, but he sent back a portion of the consecrated Eucharist, telling the boy to moisten it, and drop it into the man's mouth. He lived till he received it, and then died in peace. Dionysius uses this as a divinely-appointed proof against the Novatian view. Reservation of the Sacrament must then have been practised in Alexandria. No argument however for communion in one kind can be drawn from this story, as doubtless the bread had been dipped in

the Eucharistic wine according to Eastern fashion. However, on this point see Bingham's *Antiquities*, lib. xv. cap. v. (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 44.) [G. T. S.]

SERAPION (4), of Corinth, martyr in Egypt, with NICEPORUS (2) under Numerian c. 284. [C. H.]

SERAPION (5), a deacon of Alexandria and a deacon of Mareotis, who subscribed the deposition of Arius at the synod of 320, under the patriarch Alexander (Alex. *Encyc. Ep.* in *Pat. Gr.* xviii. 580, 582). [C. H.]

SERAPION (6), one of the deacons of Mareotis, deposed for Arianism by the patriarch Alexander (Athan. *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 71; Hard. i. 310; Hefele, *Councils*, i. 246; Tillem. vi. 246). Athanasius says he was surnamed Pelycon (Πελύκων). [C. H.]

SERAPION (7), son of Sozon, much praised by Alexander bishop of Thessalonica, to whom he carried a letter from St. Athanasius (Ath. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 66). [C. H.]

SERAPION (8), (Σαραπίων, APRION, SAPRION), bishop of Tentyra (Dendera) in Thebais (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 604; Tillem. vii. 175, 210, 211, viii. 30), mentioned in the Life of Pachomius of Tabenna (§ 20 and notes, Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii. pp. 303, 306, Latin, p. 26* at end of vol., Gr., ed. 1866). It was at his suggestion that Pachomius built his monastery at Tabenna in the southern extremity of the diocese of Tentyra, and that Athanasius ordained Pachomius a priest. He may have been one of the two Egyptian bishops Serapion who signed the decrees of Sardica in or about 343 (Ath. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 50). [C. H.]

SERAPION (9), surnamed SCHOLASTICUS, bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, March 21. He was a friend of Athanasius and St. Anthony of the desert, and occupied a position of some importance in the theological struggles of the 4th century. He is called a Confessor in the time of Arian supremacy under the emperor Constantius. Fabricius (*Bib. Graec.*) and Ceillier suppose him to have ruled the famous catechetical school of Alexandria, on the strength of a notice by Philippus Sidetus (Dodwell, *Diss. Iren.* p. 488) of a Serapion in the list of its presidents. This is however improbable. Philip makes Serapion fifth in succession from Origen, the intervening names being Heraclas, Dionysius, Pierius, Theognistus, and then Serapion, to whom succeeds Peter, the celebrated martyr, and bishop of Alexandria, who ruled that see from A.D. 300 to 311 when he suffered. This would put Serapion's presidency into the 3rd century, which is almost impossible, considering the time, about 370, when he died. The deferential manner he uses towards St. Athanasius who in this case must have been considerably his junior, and the requests for theological instruction he puts forward, are not consistent with his occupation of such a distinguished position. (See on this subject, and the chronology of the famous school of Alexandria, Dodwell's explanatory notes on the extract from Philip, *ut supra.*) Serapion was a great friend of St. Anthony, and seems to have been his companion towards the end of Anthony's life. He received from Anthony an account of his extraordinary visions, which are very similar to those said to have been granted to St. Patrick and Columba (Cusack's *St. Patrick*, and Reeves' *Adamnan's Columba*). Anthony left in his will one of his sheepskin cloaks to Serapion and the other to Athanasius (*Vita S. Anth. in Opp. S. Athan.*, Migne, *P. L.* t. xxvi. col. 971). Serapion was a man of considerable literary activity. St. Jerome, in his *Catal.* num. 99, mentions several of his writings, as his treatise *contra Manichaeos*, his *liber de Psalmorum titulis*, and some epistles. His work against the Manicheans, described by Jerome as "Egregium librum," and noticed by Photius, *Cod.* 85, is extant, and has been several times republished. It will be found in Canisii *Antiq. Lectt.* t. v. par. i. p. 35, and has been fully analysed by Ceill. iv. 333. His treatise on the Psalms is lost. Card. Mai discovered and published two epistles of Serapion, one to a bishop Eudoxius, who had been put to torture; the other a long epistle addressed to the hermits dwelling in the deserts, and extolling in the most extravagant terms their peculiar mode of life. The first will be found in Mai, *Nov. PP. Bib.* v. 362, 366; the second in his *Spicileg. Rom.* iv. 45, 57. Serapion kept up a correspondence with Athanasius, which elicited from the latter an account of the mode of Arius' death, which will be found in Migne's *Pat. Graec.* t. xxv. 686. It was written about A.D. 358. Athanasius addressed to Serapion a series of doctrinal epistles, in which he contends against a form of the Macedonian heresy which troubled Egypt. Its followers admitted the divinity of Christ, but asserted that the Holy Ghost was a creature, and differed only in degree from an angel. Athanasius bestows four epistles on this topic, extending from col. 530–676 in vol. xxvi. of the *Pat. Graec.* The date of his death is not certain. At the council of Seleucia in 359, one Ptolemaeus, an Acacian, is called bishop of Thmuis. He may have been intruded into the see in place of Serapion deposed. Some place Serapion's death as low as 369. If he had been president of the Alexandrian School before Peter, his would have been an instance of intellectual longevity exceeding the celebrated case of Dr. Routh. Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxix. cap. 2) mentions a church at Alexandria called after a Serapion, who may have been identical with the bishop of Thmuis. The church was probably dedicated however to an earlier Serapion, as Epiphanius in that passage is giving a list of the churches distinguished in Alexandria when Arianism sprung up. [G. T. S.]

SERAPION (10), surnamed ARSINOÏTES, presbyter, one of the most eminent fathers of the desert about Arsinoë, superior of many monasteries, and director of ten thousand monks. He was visited by Petronius, who relates how, in harvest time, the brethren all brought him a portion of their earnings and enabled him effectually to extinguish pauperism in the district (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 76; Rufin. *Hist. Monac.* 18, in *Pat. Lat.* xxi.; Tillem. x. 58). It is this Serapion, in the opinion of Papebroch, who occurs in the life of the Libyan anchoret Marcus Atheniensis, whom he buried (cap. i. § 1, ii. § 12, in Boll. *Acta SS.* 29 Mart. iii. 776, and previous comment., new ed.). [C. H.]

SERAPION (11), surnamed SINDONITES from his linen or cotton clothing which he always wore; an Egyptian monk in the time of Palladius. Though uneducated, he knew the scriptures by heart. Some of his sayings are recorded in the *Verba Seniorum* (Rosweyd, *Vit. Pat.* lib. v. libell. vi. § 12, libell. xi. 31), and in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (Coteler. *Gr. Ecc. Monum.* i. 685, 686), there is an account of his visiting the abode of a lewd woman, whom he succeeded in bringing to repentance. His missionary zeal led him to travel, but in more than apostolic poverty, and he even sold his volume of the gospel to relieve a destitute person, a circumstance alluded to by Socrates (iv. 23), who, however, does not give Serapion's name. Once he sold himself as a slave to a theatrical company, and another time to a Manichaean family, with a view to converting them from their ways and errors. He visited Athens, Sparta, and Rome. At Rome he met with Domninus a disciple of Origen (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 83, 84; *Vit. Joan. Eleemos.* cap. 22 in Rosweyd, *V. P.* lib. i.). He died, aged 60, about A.D. 400, not at Rome as stated in the Latin version of the *Lausiac History*, but in the desert, as in Heraclides (*Paradis.* cap. 24), and the Greek of Palladius. The Greeks honoured his memory on May 21, the *Menaea* erroneously calling him ὁ ἀπὸ Σείδονος, belonging to Sidon. He may be the Serapion of Mar. 21 in the Latin martyrologies (*vid. D. C. A.*), though the Roman Martyrology makes this one the bishop of Thmuis. [C. H.]

SERAPION (12), THE GREAT, a solitary in the Nitrian Mount, mentioned with Macarius, Pambonius, Heraclius, and others, who flourished in the reign of Constantius and maintained the Nicene doctrine (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 7; Soz. iii. 13 *fin.*, 14; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* ix. 14). He had been contemporary with Antony (Soz. vi. 30). He was visited by Paula in 386 (Jerom. *Ep.* 108 al. 27, § 14), by the elder Melania in 387, and by Palladius in 390 (*Laus. Hist.* cc. 7, 117). For the chronology see Tillem. vii. 165, viii. 618, 790, xii. 102. [C. H.]

SERAPION (13), a solitary of Scetis visited by Cassian, who gives (*Collat.* v. 10, 11), an incident of his earlier life related by him as a warning to the young. Cassian held his fifth conference with him (*Coll.* v. i.). Gazaeus (*vid.* his notes at these passages) believes that this Serapion is ARSINOÏTES (num. 11), which Tillemont (x. 58) does not allow. [C. H.]

SERAPION (14), a solitary, of Scete, and leader of the Anthropomorphites against the festal epistle of Theophilus, Pat. of Alexandria [THEOPHILUS]. The monks of Scete rejected the orthodox view as to God's nature, with the one exception of Paphnutius, an abbat [PAPHNUTIUS]. Serapion, however, was converted by the efforts of Photinus, an Oriental deacon. Cassian tells us that an abbat Isaac explained to him in connexion with Serapion's conversion that the Anthropomorphite heresy was simply a relic of Paganism. Pious men like Serapion had been so long accustomed to an image that they must form a material notion of God or else their prayers seemed objectless. Cassian, *Collat.* x. 1-6; Ceill. viii. 176 [CASSIANUS]. [G. T. S.]

SERAPION (15), a bishop who had presided by five-and-forty years over the diocese of Ostracina in Egypt, who shewed great kindness to the bishops and ecclesiastics driven out by Atticus's persecution of Chrysostom's adherents. (Pallad. p. 202.) [E. V.]

SERAPION (16), bishop of Heraclea. He was an Egyptian by birth, ordained deacon by Chrysostom (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 4), and selected by him for the important and influential office of archdeacon of the church of Constantinople (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 9). The character drawn of Serapion by contemporary historians is most unfavourable. Presuming on his official power and his influence with his bishop, he treated others with contempt, and exhibited an arrogance in his language and bearing which rendered him intolerable to all who had to deal with him. Impatient of contradiction, his passion broke forth in violent and contumelious language towards those who ventured to thwart his will or failed to shew the subservience he demanded (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 11; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 9). The influence he acquired over Chrysostom was unbounded, and tended continually to widen the breach between the bishop and his clergy, which the stern uncompromising line of action he had originally adopted at Serapion's instance had opened soon after his accession to the episcopate. Socrates records, as a characteristic speech, that on one occasion when Chrysostom was vainly endeavouring to enforce his own strict notions of discipline on his worldly and luxurious clergy, Serapion exclaimed, so as to be heard by them all, "You will never be able to master these men, bishop, unless you drive them all with one rod" (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 4). Chrysostom, blinded to his true character, looked upon Serapion's violence and harshness as proofs of holy zeal, and gave his hearty sanction to the severe disciplinary measures carried out by him as archdeacon. "Separated," writes Gibbon, "from that familiar intercourse which facilitates the knowledge and the despatch of business, he reposed an unsuspecting confidence in his deacon Serapion," who by relieving him of the more distasteful portion of his episcopal duties, made himself essential to him, and in Milman's words, "being both artful and dexterous, ruled him with an inextricable sway, and like all men of address in such stations, while he exercised all the power and secured the solid advantages he left the odium and responsibility on his master" (Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 136.) δι' ὃν [Σαραπίωνα] τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν μῖσος ἐγήγερτο (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 17).

On Chrysostom's leaving Constantinople in the early spring of 401, to regulate the affairs of the church of Asia, he deputed Severian bishop of Gabala to act as his commissary for all episcopal acts during his absence. The real management of the diocese and its clergy was left with Serapion, with instructions to keep him constantly informed of all that was passing. The relations of the two parties, one possessing the name, the other the reality, of power, were not likely to be very amicable. Seeds of mutual dislike were sown, which were destined to bring forth a harvest of evil, both to Serapion and his unsuspecting master. Severian was an ambitious man, devoid of any high sense of honour, and Serapion had soon to report, probably with ex-

aggerations, that he was abusing the confidence reposed in him to undermine Chrysostom's influence with the court and aristocracy, and outdo him, if possible, as a preacher. Chrysostom on hearing this hastened his return to Constantinople, predisposed to believe the worst of one who had proved so unworthy of his trust without over-strict investigation. Serapion greeted him with the astounding intelligence that Severian had denied the Incarnation; Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐνηνθρώπησε. The grounds of this charge were the following: Severian passing by the place where Serapion happened to be sitting, the latter ostentatiously refused to rise to pay the accustomed homage of a deacon to a bishop, with the express intention, as he declared to the clergy about him, of shewing "how much he despised the man" (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 11; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 10). Severian, stung to the quick by this studied insult, indignantly exclaimed, "If Serapion dies a Christian, then Jesus Christ was not incarnate." Whether Serapion heard the whole sentence or not, he found it convenient to remember the latter clause alone. He delated Severian as a denier of the chief article of the Christian faith. His report was confirmed by some of the bystanders, and was readily credited by Chrysostom, who expelled Severian from the city as a blasphemer (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 10; Socr. *H. E.* vi. 11). This is one account of the transaction. A somewhat different one, more favourable to Serapion, is found in a fragment (unwarrantably embodied in the current English translations of Socrates's History) printed as an appendix to Socr. vi. 11. According to this, Serapion's act of disrespect was brought under the cognisance of a synod, which, on Serapion affirming on oath that he had not seen Severian pass, acquitted him of intentional rudeness, while Chrysostom, in the hope of soothing Severian's ruffled feelings, suspended Serapion from his ecclesiastical functions for a short time. Severian, however, insisted on his rival's deposition and excommunication. Chrysostom, annoyed at his pertinacity, quitted the synod, leaving the decision to the assembled bishops, by whom his mild sentence was immediately confirmed. Chrysostom on this broke off all intimacy with Severian, and recommended him to return to his own diocese, which he had neglected too long. For the remainder of this unhappy transaction, another article must be consulted [SEVERIANUS]. It had a very definite influence on the fate of Chrysostom, as well as of Serapion and all his partisans (Socr. Soz. *u. s.*). It must have been soon after these events that Chrysostom rewarded the supposed fidelity of Serapion by raising him to the priesthood. His having done this while Serapion was still unpurged of a serious charge (ὑπὸ ἔγκλημα ὄντα) (which may have been no more than his disrespect to a bishop) was one of the counts of accusation against Chrysostom at the synod of the Oak (Phot. *Cod.* lix. p. 58), to which he himself was cited together with the presbyter Tigrius (Pallad. p. 70; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 17), and where he was charged by John the Monk with having been Chrysostom's instrument in the many sufferings inflicted on him on account of the Origenists (Phot. *Cod.* lix. p. 58). Chrysostom, on his return from his brief expulsion, rewarded Serapion's fidelity, and compensated him for his trials by appointing him to the metropolitan see of Heraclea in Thrace (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 17). On Chrysostom's second and final banishment Serapion took refuge in a convent of Gothic monks, known as the Marsi (Chrys. *Ep.* 14). He was discovered and dragged from his hiding place, and brought before Chrysostom's enemies, when numerous charges were brought against him, which they were unable to substantiate. He was none the less cruelly beaten, and received such ill-usage that his teeth were knocked out, and being deposed from his bishopric, was finally banished to his native land, Egypt, and left at the mercy of the arch-persecutor, the patriarch Theophilus (Pallad. p. 195; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 9). One Eugenius was ordained bishop of Heraclea in his place as the reward of his conspiracy (Pallad. p. 73). [E. V.]

SERAS. [SERRAS.]

SERENA, in the *Martyrologium Romanum Parvum* (August 16th), is commemorated as a saint. She is there described as the wife of Diocletian. An empress of the same name also appears in the spurious *Acta* of St. Susanna (*AA. SS.* Aug. ii. 63). It is demonstrated in *AA. SS.* Aug. iii. 263, that if such a saint really existed, she was certainly not the wife of Diocletian. [F. D.]

SERENIANUS, AELIUS, member of the privy council of A. Severus, mentioned by Lampridius (*Vita Severi*, 67) as "omnium vir sanctissimus," possibly the same person as the praeses of Cappadocia, described by Firmilian in his letter to Cyprian (in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* iii. 1164) as a most cruel persecutor in the local persecution under Maximin. (Tillemont, *M. E.* iii. 264.) [F. D.]

SERENILLA, sister of Desiderius, a learned and eloquent Roman in the end of the 2nd century, and correspondent of Jerome. [DESIDERIUS (2).] She may have been his sister in the spiritual sense (ex conjuge facta soror) as in many similar cases (e.g. RUSTICUS (1)), since Jerome congratulates them both on having together abandoned the world and reached the tranquillity which her name denotes. [W. H. F.]

SERENIUS GRANIANUS. [GRANIANUS.]

SERENUS (1), June 28, two disciples of Origen, who suffered in the persecution of Severus, were called by this name. They suffered with the martyr Plutarch (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 4). [G. T. S.]

SERENUS (2), a monk to whom, jointly with another named Zenas, an epistle was addressed by a certain Justin, by some identified with Justin Martyr. It lays down rules for those living ascetic lives in their own homes. Ceillier thinks it may have been written by one Justin, who was head of a monastery near Jerusalem about the year 610. (Ceill. i. 434.) [JUST. MART. Vol. III. 565.] [G. T. S.]

SERENUS (3), Feb. 23, martyr at Sirmium about the year 307. He was a Greek, a gardener by trade, who settled there and pursued his calling. He reproved a woman for improper behaviour. She complained to her husband,

who was an attendant upon the emperor Maximian, that Serenus had insulted her. He reported this matter to the emperor, who at once despatched him to his home to avenge the matter by legal process. The local president summoned Serenus, who gave such a straightforward account of himself, that the woman's husband withdrew his charge. The president, however, drew from him a confession that he was a Christian, and at once beheaded him. (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 546, Paris, ed.) [G. T. S.]

SERENUS (4), abbat in the Nitrian desert, was of great sanctity and continence, and, when visited by Cassian, A.D. 395, discussed *De animae mobilitate et spiritalibus nequitiis* (*Coll.* vii.), and *De principatibus seu potestatibus* (*Coll.* viii. See Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. xlix. 667 sq.). In the former he treats mostly of the nature of the soul, the rapid movement of the thoughts, the influence of evil spirits upon them, and the duty of fixing the desire on God. In the latter he declares the nature of evil spirits, their fall, subordination, and occupation. His life, but without details, is given in *Vitae Patrum*, c. 50. (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. 844 sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 170 sq.; Fleury, *H. E.* xx. c. 7.) [J. G.]

SERENUS (5), tenth bishop of Marseilles, between Theodorus and Adalongus (circ. A.D. 595–600), is known to us from the letters of Gregory the Great. To his good offices were commended St. Augustine on his mission to England in 596 (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* vi. 52, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 836), and three years later the monks who were despatched to help him (xi. 58, *Patr. Lat.* 1176). Two other letters from Gregory are preserved. Serenus, in an excess of iconoclastic zeal, had entered the churches of Marseilles, and broken and cast forth the images. Gregory, while commending his fervour against idolatry, reproved his violence, pointing out that the use of representations in a church was that the unlearned might read on the walls what they were unable to read in the Scriptures (ix. 105, *Patr. Lat.* 1027). Serenus, however, disregarded the warning, and even affected to believe the letter a forgery, which brought down upon him a severe rebuke and a reiteration of the pope's views (xi. 13, *Patr. Lat.* 1128). This last letter, written on November 1, 600, is the last we know of Serenus; but he is said to have died while returning from a visit to Rome, at a town afterwards destroyed called Biandrate, or Blanderat, near Milan, where he was commemorated Aug. 2, and his tomb celebrated in after-days for its miracles (*Gall. Christ.* i. 639; Ricard, *Évêques de Marseille*, 24, 25; *Vies des Saints de Marseille, S. Serenus*, Bayle). [S. A. B.]

SERENUS (6) (SEVERUS), bishop of Ancona. In A.D. 599, Gregory the Great wrote to him about the complaint of Passivus, bishop of Firmum, against Serenus, deacon of Ancona, who, according to Passivus refused to pay in full money intrusted to him by Fabius, the late bishop of Firmum. In the same year Gregory appointed him visitor of the church of Ausina (Jesi), which had been recovered from the Lombards (*Epp.* ix. 16, 89). [F. D.]

SERENUS (7), patriarch of Aquileia, became patriarch about A.D. 712. (Paulus Diac. *Hist. Lang.* vi. 33.) King Luitprand prevailed on the pope to send him the pallium, which was the first occasion of its being granted to a patriarch of the old Aquileia, after the establishment of the rival lines at Cormons, Cividale, or Udine, and Grado, each claiming to be the rightful patriarchs of Aquileia, and was equivalent to the recognition of the division of the province. On December 1st, A.D. 723, pope Gregory II. wrote to forbid him to infringe the rights of the patriarch of Grado, or to endeavour to exercise jurisdiction beyond the limits of the territory held by the Lombards. (Gregorii II. *Epp.* 15, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxix. 526.) Serenus was alive in A.D. 731, as in the synod held by Gregory III. in the November of that year, a division was definitely made between him and the patriarch of Grado (Joh. *Chron. Grad.* in Pertz, *Script.* vii. 47), but he had died before the end of A.D. 733, as before that date at latest Gregory III. writes to his successor Callistus (Jaffé, *Reg. n.* 1725). [F. D.]

SERFUS, ST. [SERVANUS.]

SERGIA, abbess at Constantinople, and author of a Life of St. Olympias (Niceph. Call. lib. xiii. 24; Tillem. xi. 630). [C. H.]

SERGIOTAE, the disciples of SERGIUS (23), as distinguished from the Baanitae or disciples of Baanos. After the death of these Paulician leaders, a violent strife ensued between the opposite parties of their followers. This lasted some time, with some bloodshed, till the factions were reconciled by the influence of Theodotus the Sergiote (Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 40). [M. B. C.]

SERGIUS (1), addressed in Cyp. *Ep.* vi. See ROGATIANUS (1). [E. W. B.]

SERGIUS (2), Oct. 7, a very celebrated military saint and martyr of the Eastern Church. He must have held a high position, as his acts call him "Amicus Imperatoris." He and Bacchus were regarded as the patron saints of Syria. Sergius suffered at Sergiopolis, or Rasaphe, in Syria, in the early part of 4th century. Their united fame soon became wide-spread. Le Bas and Waddington, *Voy. Archéol.* t. iii. num. 2124, notice a church of Eastern Syria dedicated in their honour in the year 354 as the earliest case of such consecration to saints. In the same volume, num. 1915, they describe a church dedicated in 512 to SS. Sergius, Bacchus, and Leontius, where reasons are offered for regarding Leontius as a martyr under Hadrian, when he was ruling Syria during the last years of Trajan. [LEONTIUS (66).] Theodora, wife of Justinian, presented a jewelled cross to one of the churches of St. Sergius, which the Persians in one of their invasions carried off. Chosroes, king of Persia, returned it to Gregory, patriarch of Antioch, in the year 593. (Cf. Evag. *H. E.* iv. 28, vi. 21, where Chosroes is represented as a convert to the cult of Sergius.) The fame of Sergius and Bacchus spread to France, where Le Blant, *Christ. Latin Inscrip. of France*, t. i. p. 305, notices a church at Chartres dedicated in their honour. (Le Blant, *Actes des Mart.* p. 77 notices the marks of

genuineness borne by his acts as told in *AA. SS. Boll.* cf. *Till.* v. 491. [BACCHUS.]
[G. T. S.]

SERGIUS (3), bishop of Birtha, the modern Bir, or Birejik (Prof. Wright), a fortified post on the Euphrates, which he strengthened with additional works in preparation for an inroad of the Persians, A.D. 506, Anastasius providing the cost from the imperial treasury. (Jos. Stylita (xci.) apud Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* i. 282; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 987.) [E. V.]

SERGIUS (4), bishop of Cyrrhus at the beginning of the reign of Justin, c. 520. He was accused to Justin of having sanctioned the act of some of his clergy, who had placed an image of their former bishop, Theodoret, on a triumphal car and introduced it into the city with great pomp, singing hymns in his honour, as well as of having himself held a festival in honour of Theodoret, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Diodorus of Tarsus, all three suspected of Nestorian sympathies, and of Nestorius himself as a martyr. Justin commissioned Hypatius, "magister militum" of the East, to investigate these charges. They were substantiated, and Sergius was deposed and excommunicated, and so remained till his death. (Labbe, v. 550, 560; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 932; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* xv. 313.) [E. V.]

SERGIUS (5), bishop of Cyrrhus, succeeded his namesake on his deposition by Justin, c. 520, as a Nestorian. He had embraced the opposite heresy of the Monophysites, and when Justinian, in his endeavours to promote the union of the church, brought about a conference between the leaders of the two parties at Constantinople in 533, he took the chief place among the oriental prelates, Hypatius, of Ephesus, being the spokesman on the orthodox side. (Labbe, iv. 1763–1779; Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* ii. 89; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 932.) [E. V.]

SERGIUS (6), bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, mentioned in an edict issued by Justinian, A.D. 541, as having petitioned him in favour of the Samaritans, who, as a punishment for their acts of violence towards Christians, had been forbidden to make wills, and placed under other civil disabilities (Justin. *Novella* 129, tit. 12, c. 1; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 572). [E. V.]

SERGIUS (7), second Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, following Severus, according to the authorities in Assemani (*B. O.* i. 614, ii. 324, 325). The statement that THEOPHANES followed Severus rests on insufficient authority. The original name of Sergius was Beth Chartae; he was a monk of Hola or Arena, and presbyter of Tella or Constantina in Osrhoëne, before his elevation to the episcopate. The date of his consecration is not known with precision. John of Ephesus (Dr. R. Payne Smith's transl. 81) says he succeeded Severus "after a long time had elapsed;" while two different years are given for the death of Severus, 542 according to Severus Aschuminensis, 539 according to Abulfaragius, three centuries later. John of Ephesus says he was sprung from the town of Tella, consecrated by the opponents of Chalcedon, held the dignity three years, and died at Constantinople where he chanced to be. John of Anazarbus is said to have consecrated him, and from the chronology Jacob Baradaeus could have assisted. Antioch was but his titular see, as the Monophysite bishops were not allowed to reside there. He was the first consecrated by that title after the designation of "Jacobite" became current. He was succeeded after an interval by Paul the Black. [C. H.]

SERGIUS (8), bishop of Tarragona, presided as metropolitan over the council of Lerida in A.D. 546, and the first of Barcelona held a few years before. It was to him that JUSTUS (19) of Urgel dedicated his commentary on the Song of Solomon, and he praises Sergius highly in his letter of dedication. (*Esp. Sag.* xxvi. 71; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 145, 686.) [F. D.]

SERGIUS (9), 4th Jacobite bishop of Edessa, was an Armenian, and with his brother Joannes, attacked the writings of Petrus Callinicus, but was reproved by Julian the patriarch; flourished A.D. 591. (Assem. *B. O.* ii. 333; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1432.) [J. G.]

SERGIUS (10), defensor, addressed in five letters of Gregory the Great. The first, after sharply reproving him for his negligence, directs him with Vitalianus, bishop of Sipontum, to cause the daughter of the deceased Tullianus, formerly magister militiae, who after taking the veil, had assumed lay attire, to re-enter her nunnery, and to be kept there in strict custody till Gregory sent further orders. The next refers to the rights of the mother-in-law of PANTALEON. The third is the circular forbidding clergy to have women living with them. The last relates to the affairs of the churches of Callipolis and Hydruntum (*Epp.* viii. 7, 8; ix. 46, 60, 100, 101, 102). [F. D.]

SERGIUS (11), patriarch of Constantinople, was consecrated on Easter Eve, A.D. 610. He had been deacon of the cathedral and had the care of the poor belonging to it (*Chron. Pasch.*). Six months afterwards he crowned the new emperor Heraclius, whose marriage with his niece Martina he vainly tried to prevent four years later. Heraclius admitted he had done his duty as a priest and a friend, but took the responsibility on himself. Certain liturgical innovations introduced by Sergius are noticed in the *Chron. Pasch.* (*sub ann.* 615, 624). In April, A.D. 619, he procured a pragmatic sanction from the emperor (Nov. ii. 4), forbidding any one to be ordained at Constantinople except to take the place of one of the clergy who had died. It was to Sergius and the patrician Bonus that Heraclius committed the government of Constantinople when he started on his eastern expedition in A.D. 622.

The event that marked the patriarchate of Sergius was the origin of the Monothelite heresy. The emperor at the beginning of his eastern campaigns encountered in Armenia one Paulus, a Severian bishop, and had an argument with him, in which mention was made of One Operation in Christ. In writing with reference to Paulus to Arcadius, the metropolitan of Cyprus, Heraclius forbade the use of the term Two Operations. Some four years later the emperor mentioned his interview with Paulus in the

presence of CYRUS (4), then bishop of Phasis, who professed that he was ignorant, whether One or Two Operations should be ascribed to Christ. By the emperor's direction he then wrote to Sergius, inquiring which doctrine was correct, and whether any of the fathers had spoken of One Operation. Sergius, after consulting a synod (Mansi, x. 586), sent him the forgery ascribed to MENNAS, which contained many patristic testimonies in support of One Will and Operation, asserted that no council had decided the question, but said that if it could be proved that any father recognised by the church had used the term Two Operations, he ought to be followed, for not only the doctrines of the fathers should be accepted but their very words should be used. In A.D. 629 Heraclius when at Edessa, desired Sergius to send him the patristic testimony in favour of One Will and Operation contained in the alleged work of Mennas, and the next year Cyrus was translated to the patriarchate of Alexandria. In one of the articles of the compromise agreed on between him and the Monophysites there was attributed to Christ One Theandric Operation. SOPHRONIUS, afterwards patriarch of Jerusalem, then came forward in support of the doctrine of Two Operations, and went to Constantinople with letters from Cyrus to Sergius, who called upon him to cite passages from the fathers distinctly speaking of Two Operations. This, according to Sergius, he was unable to do. Sergius then wrote to Cyrus, forbidding in future the use of either of the expressions One Operation or Two Operations. This account is based on the letters of Sergius to Cyrus and Honorius, read at the sixth general council (Mansi, xi. 525, 529). The account of Theophanes is quite different. According to him (274, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cviii. 677) the heretical bishop encountered by Heraclius was the Jacobite Athanasius, the date was A.D. 630, the place Hierapolis, near Edessa; and the emperor wrote himself to Sergius, who summoned Cyrus to consult with him, but his authority is obviously inferior to that of Sergius, and the sixth council fixes the date of the letter of Cyrus to Sergius as late in A.D. 625, or early in A.D. 626 (Mansi, xi. 360), that is several years before Theophanes' date of the origin of the controversy.

In A.D. 634 Sergius wrote to pope HONORIUS (15), q.v., for a full account of the letter of Sergius, and the memorable replies of Honorius.

The ECTHESIS, q.v., issued by Heraclius was drawn up by Sergius, after whose death Heraclius disclaimed all responsibility for it. It was confirmed by a synod (Mansi, x. 1000) assembled under Sergius, late in A.D. 638, shortly before his death, which took place in the December of that year (Theophanes; Nicephorus, the *Acta* of the Lateran and the sixth general councils *passim* in Mansi, x, xi.; *AA. SS.*, Aug. i. 77*; *Or. Christ.* i. 227; Pagi's notes to Baronius A.D. 626, 627, 633, 639; the articles above referred to). [F. D.]

SERGIUS (12), the name of the two Monophysite priests, contemporaries of John of Ephesus, and persecuted at the same time with him at Constantinople. Their sufferings are related by John, whose friends the Sergii were, one of them having been his Syncellus, the other his disciple. While John was imprisoned in the penitentiary of the hospital of Eubulus the two priests were seized, and as they would not yield, they were publicly scourged and then imprisoned in a "diaconate," or hospital attended by deacons and laymen, where they were kept forty days. The Syncellus was finally sent to the monastery of Beth-Rabula, where he met with kind treatment, the monks there "having no love for the council of Chalcedon, nor even proclaiming it in their worship" (John of Ephesus, *Eccl. Hist.* p. 110, tr. by Dr. R. Payne Smith). [C. H.]

SERGIUS (13), sub-deacon, addressed by pope Honorius (Honorius, *Ep.* 9 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 478). [F. D.]

SERGIUS (14), bishop of Joppa, c. 633, who after the retreat of the Persians, relying on the authority of the emperor Heraclius, seized on the vicariate of the see of Jerusalem, *τοποτηρησίαν τοῦ θρόνου*, and assumed the right of ordaining bishops and presbyters of monothelite tendencies, who attached themselves to the heterodox Paul, patriarch of Constantinople. Pope Theodore, on the complaint of Stephen of Dor, annulled these uncanonical ordinations, and appointed Stephen vicar [STEPHANUS OF DOR] (Labbe, vi. 109; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 628, cf. 282). [E. V.]

SERGIUS (15), bishop of Constantia, in Cyprus, in the middle of the 7th century, who addressed a synodal letter in the name of the orthodox bishops of the East, to pope Theodore, in 643, against the rising heresy of the Monothelites, anathematizing the Ecthesis, and appealing against its being placarded at Constantinople as a rule of faith, and accepting Leo's definition that the energy of Christ was displayed in each form, divine and human, not separately, but in communion with the other *ἐνεργεῖν ἑκατέρᾳ μορφῇ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας*. The orthodoxy of the document was acknowledged by Theodore, who appointed him vicar of the churches in the East, and it was read in the Lateran council, A.D. 649 (Labbe, vi. 122). According to Le Quien, Sergius afterwards made shipwreck of the faith. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1049; Baron. *Annal.* 643; Ceillier, *Aut. Eccles.* xii. 925; Fabr. xii. 236.) [E. V.]

SERGIUS (16), bishop of Rome after Conon from December, A.D. 687, to September, A.D. 701. The manner of his election, and the exarch's unavailing opposition to it, are spoken of under PASCHALIS (antipope). The most memorable event with which his name is associated was the holding at Constantinople of the Concilium Quinisextum, which was repudiated by him, though accepted in the East as ecumenical, and which proved an important step towards the final schism between the Eastern and Western Churches. In addition to the long standing rivalry between the sees of Rome and Constantinople, and the general resistance of the popes to attempted imperial domination, the monothelitic controversy had lately been the cause of serious discord, and even of interrupted communion. See especially under MARTINUS (3), and EUGENIUS (1). Pope Agatho had, however, triumphed with regard to this dispute in procuring the entire condemnation of the Monothelite heresy at the 3rd

Constantinopolitan council (the 6th ecumenical), A.D. 680, which had terminated peacefully in accordance with his desires. But, after its close, the emperor Justinian II. conceived the idea of convening a supplementary one, on the ground that neither it, nor the previous fifth ecumenical, had passed any canons of discipline, having been wholly occupied with doctrinal definitions. Accordingly, such a council met (691–2), known as Concilium Quinisextum, as being supplementary to the fifth and sixth, and also as Trullanum, or Concilium in Trullo, from the place in which it sat, viz. a hall in the imperial palace called Trullus. It passed 102 canons, intended to form a complete synodical code of discipline, most of them being either re-enactments of older canons, or designed only to give legal sanction to receive church usages. A few, however, were distinctly intended to assert, and thus give ecumenical authority to, Eastern views and usages which were at variance with those of Rome, as well as to confirm the rank and jurisdiction of the see of Constantinople, which had been asserted previously, but which the popes had never allowed. Six of the canons were thus open to objection at Rome. Canon ii., concerning church laws to be considered valid, sanctioned 85 apostolical canons, whereas the Roman Church had accepted only the first 50, and, after enumerating as authoritative a number of councils, some of which had not been accepted at Rome, and omitting mention of many Western councils and of all decretals of the popes, prohibited all other canons as not genuine. Canon xiii. forbade married persons, if ordained deacons or priests, to put away or refuse intercourse with their wives, referring expressly to the Roman requirement to the contrary as not primitive. This was in accordance with the 5th of the Apostolical canons, viz. "Let not a bishop, presbyter, or deacon, put away his wife under pretence of religion; but, if he put her away, let him be excommunicated; and, if he persist, let him be deposed." The canon of the council in Trullo fell short, indeed, of the apostolic canon, in that bishops were not included in it; and, further, canon xii. forbade bishops to remain in the married state; which was, according to Bellarmine (*de cler.* 1, 10) the origin of the present usage of the Greek Church, which has a married priesthood but a celibate episcopate. Still, in allowing the state of marriage to priests and deacons, the council in Trullo distinctly contravened ordinances of popes, and general Western usage. Canon xxxvi. confirmed Canon iii. of the first council of Constantinople (381), and canon xxviii. of the council of Chalcedon (451), which had given second rank after Rome, and patriarchal jurisdiction over the Thracian, Pontic, and Arian dioceses, to the see of Constantinople; and Canon xxxviii. repeated word for word Canon xvii. of Chalcedon, which had given the right of appeal to any one wronged by the metropolitan of his province to the exarch of the diocese, or to the holy throne of Constantinople; and had further ordered that, in case of any city newly erected by royal authority, the ecclesiastical should follow the political order. These canons, thus confirmed, had never received the assent of the Roman bishops, who had ever resisted the claim of Constantinople to spiritual pre-eminence on the mere ground of its being the imperial city. Canon lv., referring expressly to the custom at Rome of fasting on all Saturdays during Lent, required the observance of Can. Apostol. lxvii., which forbade fasting on any Saturday except Easter Eve. Canon lxvii. required abstinence from blood, in any way partaken as food; whereas Acts xv. 29 had long been generally interpreted in the West as laying no such permanent obligation on Christians. Lastly, Canon lxxxii. prohibited, for the time to come, representations of our Lord in sacred pictures under the form of a Lamb.

The pope's legates who were present at the council signed all the canons, having been, it would seem, blind to the drift of some of them, or not bold enough to make a stand. Anastasius says of them (*Lib. Pontif.*), "decepti subscripserant." Their subscription, however, did not compromise the pope himself; for it does not appear that they had been specially deputed to represent him in the council, or to have received any instructions from him. They were probably his ordinary representatives (apocrisiarii) for general purposes in Constantinople, who of their own accord took part in the synod. So strenuously maintains Marca (*lib.* 5 *de concord. c.* 18). See Pagi (*critic. ad ann.* 692, ix. &c.). Present, however, also, and assentient, was Basilius, the metropolitan of Crete, as representing in some sense the Roman Church. For among the extant signatures is found, "Basilius episcopus Gortyniorum metropolis Christo amabilis Cretae insulae, et locum tenens totius synodi sanctae ecclesiae Romanae definiens subscripsi." But that his assent, thus expressed, was not considered to carry with the pope's own, appears from a place being left immediately after the emperor's name for the pope's signature:—"*Locus sanctissimi papae Romani.*" The canons were accordingly sent to him for his confirmation, and were at once by him rejected and disallowed. Thereupon Justinian II., acting in the spirit of former emperors, but overrating his own powers, took measures to enforce compliance. He sent Zacharias, the chief of his bodyguard (*protospatharium*) to Rome with orders to bring Sergius to Constantinople; but the military from Ravenna and from other parts of Italy mustered in the pope's defence, and drove Zacharias, with contumely and ill-usage, from Rome. (Paul. diac. *de gest. Longobard.* vi. 11; Bed. *de sex aetat.*) Anastasius (*Lib. Pontif.*) gives a graphic account of what took place at Rome. He describes Zacharias as "immanem protospatharium," referring, we may suppose, to the huge size of the lifeguardsman, with an intended contrast between his imposing appearance and his contemptible performance. Alarmed, we are told, by the multitudes that were approaching Rome, he implored Sergius to have the gates of the city closed, and took refuge, terrified and trembling, in the bedroom of the pope, whom he begged with tears to have pity on him so that his life might be spared. The army, having entered the city, proceeded to the Lateran palace, where both the pope and his suppliant were, and, finding the doors barred, threatened to break them open. Thereupon the big guardsman hid himself in the pope's bed, having quite lost his senses through excess of

terror:—"ita ut mente excideret, et perderet sensum." Sergius, having comforted him and bidden him have no fear, went out and addressed the military and populace, whom he succeeded in pacifying; but they still kept guard round the palace, and were not satisfied till they had driven Zacharias with insults out of Rome. If the emperor had any thoughts of avenging this insult, and continuing his design of coercing Sergius, such projects were cut short by his own temporary deposition and exile soon afterwards, A.D. 695. Before his restoration Sergius was dead.

The episcopate of Sergius is of interest to us in connexion with the church in Britain. Caedwalla, king of the West Saxons, having in 685, after exile, gained possession of his kingdom, resigned it after two years, and in 688 resorted to Rome for baptism (Bed. *H. E.* v. 7). He had, after his recovery of his kingdom, invaded the Isle of Wight with the view of rooting out heathenism with the sword, having vowed to give a fourth part of the land and the prey to the Lord; and this fourth part he accordingly bestowed on St. Wilfrid, who proceeded to evangelize the remaining inhabitants of the island. (Bed. iv. 16.) It may have been remorse for his cruelty, together with the ghostly counsels of St. Wilfrid, that led him to abdicate in the prime of life, being little more than thirty years of age, and seek in Rome itself the absolution of baptism, which he had so far deferred. Bede thus describes his motives:—"Cum genti suae duobus annis strenuissime praeesset, relicto imperio propter Dominum regnumque perpetuum, venit Romam, hoc sibi gloriae singularis desiderans adipisci, ut ad limina beatorum apostolorum fonte baptismatis ablueretur, in quo solo didicerat generi humano patere vitae caelestis introitum: semel etiam sperans quia mox baptizatus, carne solutus ad aeterna gaudia jam mundus transiret." He attained his desire, with respect both to the baptism he sought, and to death after it before new sins had stained him. He was baptized by Sergius, receiving from him the name of Peter, on Easter Eve A.D. 689; and, while still clothed in his white baptismal robes, expired, and was buried in St. Peter's Church. Sergius placed an epitaph over his tomb, consisting of twenty-four elegiac verses, with the following notice, "Hic depositus est Caedual, qui et Petrus, rex Saxonum, sub die duodecimo Kalendarum Maiarum, indictione secunda; qui vixit annos plus minus triginta, imperante domno Justiniano piissimo Augusto, anno ejus consulatus quarto, pontificante apostolico viro domno Sergio papa anno secundo." (Bed. *ib.*) His abdication and resort to Rome are interesting as being the first example of a practice which was followed afterwards by his successor Ine, and others.

Bede informs us also that Willibrord, the English missionary in Frisia, and the founder of the see of Utrecht, twice visited Rome in the time of Sergius, and on his second visit received consecration from him. Having begun to preach in Frisia under the protection of king Pippin A.D. 692, he had in the same year gone of his own accord to Rome, not only for the pope's licence and blessing, but also (and, as it seems, more especially) for procuring from him relics of apostles and martyrs for deposition in the newly founded churches;—"ut dum in gente cui praedicaret destructis idolis ecclesias institueret, haberet in promptu reliquias sanctorum quas ibi introduceret." Having obtained his desire, he returned to his work. Afterwards, A.D. 696, Pippin sent him again to Rome, in order to be ordained Archbishop of the Frisians, Sergius being still pope. He was ordained on his birthday in the church of St. Caecilia, receiving the new name of Clemens. (Bed. *H. E.* v. 10, 11; cf. Alcuin. *in vit. S. Wilbrord*, *c.* 7, 8.)

Two letters relating to the English Church are given by William of Malmesbury (*Gest. Pont.* pp. 52–55, *ed.* Hamilton) as written by Sergius on the appointment of Berhtwald to the see of Canterbury, A.D. 692. One is to the kings Ethelred, Aldfrith, and Ealdulf;—the other to all the bishops of Britain;—exhorting to reception of, and obedience to, the new primate. Both are of doubtful authenticity. As to another letter, given also by Malmesbury (*Gest. Reg.* i. 3.), from Sergius to Ceolfrith, abbot of Jarrow and Wearmouth, desiring Bede, "religiosum famulum Dei venerabilis monasterii tui," to be sent to Rome, it is doubtful whether the original referred by name to Bede. (See under BEDA.)

Bede (*De Sex Aetat.*), Paulus Diaconus (l. 5, c. 14), Sigebert (*in Chron.*), and the *Liber Pontif.* (*in Vit. Serg.*), speak of a synod held at Aquileia in the time of Sergius, and after the usurpation of the empire by Aspimar, which was induced by the admonitions of Sergius to accept the fifth ecumenical council, though at first adverse to it. It will be seen in other articles (e.g. VIGILIUS, PELAGIUS) that the bishops of Istria and Venetia had long refused to accept that council, and had been out of communion with Rome in consequence. Even Gregory the Great had failed to bring them round. It thus appears to have been reserved for pope Sergius, about a century and a half after the fifth council, to induce those Italian churches to accept it. Their reluctance to do so was but a survival of the general attitude of the Western Church at the time of the council, and of the contemporary pope Vigilius himself, till he sacrificed consistency by yielding to the emperor's will.

Sergius is said in the *Lib. Pontif.* to have done much in the way of renovating and ornamenting various churches in Rome. Among other things he is said to have discovered in the *sacrarium* of St. Peter an old silver casket containing portions of the true cross adorned with gems, which he transferred to the Lateran Church, where it was afterwards adored. He is said also to have first ordered the singing of the Agnus Dei during the consecration of the host. He died in September A.D. 701, and was buried, according to Anastasius, on the 8th day of the month, in St. Peter's, in the 14th year of his episcopate. He is commemorated in the *Roman Martyrology* on Sept. 9. [J. B—Y.]

SERGIUS (17), archbishop of Ravenna, became archbishop between A.D. 742, when his predecessor John was living (Anastasius, *Lib. Pont.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 1054) and A.D.

752. He was a layman of noble family, and married. After his consecration in Rome, his clergy separated from him and refused to communicate with him. A more serious quarrel was with pope Stephen, who, on his journey to France, deprived Sergius of the monastery of Galliata, and granted it to Anscausus, bishop of Forlimpopoli for life, and on his return to Rome summoned him before him, and detained him for three years, on the charge of having been uncanonically elected. Sergius replied that at his consecration the pope had made no objection, though he had stated he was a layman and married. Apparently Sergius had given offence by asserting the independence of Ravenna. (*Cod. Car.* 52 in *Patr. Lat.* xcviii. 284.) The pope's intention to depose him was frustrated by his death, and his successor Paul I. released him on his promising to let him take what he pleased from the treasures of the church of Ravenna. When the pope accordingly came to Ravenna, one party of the clergy was for murdering him, but milder counsels prevailed, and they merely hid what they could of the treasure. Paul also, in A.D. 759, restored him the monastery of Galliata (Paulus, *Epp.* ii. in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxix. 1189). The above account is based on Agnellus (*Lib. Pont.* in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 377); but he writes as a champion of the rights of Ravenna, and with a strong prejudice against Rome. Sergius was represented at the Lateran Synod, held in April A.D. 769 (Mansi, xii. 713), but died soon afterwards. (Anastasius, *Lib. Pont.* 276, 282, in *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 1155, 1157.) [F. D.]

SERGIUS (18), sacellarius, afterwards secundicerius[a] and nomenclator of the Roman church, son of the primicerius Christopher, and with him, leader of the counter-revolution against pope CONSTANTINE II. in A.D. 768. On Constantine being made pope in July, 767, Christopher and his sons took sanctuary at St. Peter's, which they left on Constantine's promising to allow them to live in their own houses till the following Easter, and then enter a monastery. Christopher and Sergius were accordingly allowed to leave Rome, ostensibly for a monastery near Spoleto. They, however, went to king Desiderius, and asked his assistance. Sent back by him to Reate, they collected a force in the neighbourhood, with which Sergius and Waldipert, a Lombard priest, marched on Rome. A gate was opened to them by their friends, and Constantine, his brother Passivus, and bishop Theodore were taken prisoners. At the instigation of Waldipert, one Philippus was chosen pope, but was immediately deposed, and by the influence of Christopher, Stephen was elected. Then followed a series of atrocities—Passivus, Theodore, the tribune Gracilis, and Constantine himself were seized and their eyes put out, and the tongues of Theodore and Gracilis torn out. The Lombard, Waldipert, on a charge of conspiracy against Christopher, was treated in the same way. Christopher and Sergius were now the most powerful men in Rome. The latter was promoted to the office of secundicerius and nomenclator, and sent on a mission to king Pippin, who had died before his arrival, but he was well received by his sons, Charles and Carloman. Christopher and Sergius, as heads of the Frankish party, and the personal friends of Carloman, became obnoxious to Desiderius. Another cause of discord was their pressing him for the restoration of certain church property. The pope, too, was tired of being a puppet in their hands, and the chamberlain, Paul Afiarta, who was in the pay of Desiderius, inflamed him against them. Desiderius marched on Rome, ostensibly to pray at St. Peter's. Christopher and Sergius, collecting a great number of peasantry from the Campagna, Tuscany and Perugia, prepared for resistance, and closed the gates. After an interview at St. Peter's with Desiderius, the pope returned to the Vatican. Christopher and Sergius, justly suspecting that Paul was endeavouring to turn the people against them, with their armed mob and Dodo, a missus of Carloman, who was then in Rome, and his Franks, broke down the doors of the palace, and forced their way into the pope's presence in the chapel of St. Theodore, demanding the surrender of Paul and his accomplices. They gave way at the pope's rebuke; and the next day at a second interview, Desiderius and Stephen came to an agreement at St. Peter's, the former yielding the matters in dispute, and the latter surrendering Christopher and Sergius. Accordingly he sent two bishops to the gate by the Aelian Bridge, where Christopher and Sergius were posted, offering them the option of entering a monastery, or coming to him at St. Peter's. The last they refused, fearing the Lombards, and prepared to stand their ground, and prevent the return of the pope; but the hearts of their adherents failed them, and their forces melted away. Even their kinsman Gratiosus went over to the pope. Christopher and Sergius, seeing they were betrayed, went at nightfall to St. Peter's, and were seized by the Lombards on the steps of the basilica, and brought before the pope. To save them, as he said, he ordered them to be made monks, and left them in the basilica, while he returned to Rome, intending to bring them away by night. Paul, however, with the approval of Desiderius, and a band of Lombards, dragged them out of St. Peter's, hurried them to the gate of the city, and there tore out their eyes, Christopher being thrust into the monastery of St. Agatha, where he died three days afterwards, and Sergius into that of St. Andrew on the Coelian, from which he was removed to the vaults of the Lateran.[b] Eight days before the death of Stephen (Jan. 24th, 772), by orders of Paul and the pope's brother, Sergius was handed over to Tunisso and Leonatius, a priest and tribune of Anagni, who took him out of prison, stabbed and strangled him on the road leading to St. Maria Maggiore, and buried his still breathing body by the wayside. After the accession of Hadrian, his murderers were detected and punished, and Christopher and Sergius honourably buried at St. Peter's. (*Lib. Pont. Vitae Steph. III. et Hadr.*; *Cod. Car.* 50 in Jaffé *Mon. Ger.* iv. 168; Gregorovius iv. 3, 4; Mansi, xii. 703.) [F. D.]

[a] Of the seven notaries of the Roman church the first and second were styled Primicerius, and Secundicerius, the fourth Sacellarius or treasurer.

[b] Jaffé (*Reg.* 201) places these events in the summer of 771. Gregorovius (p. 369 n.) in 769.

SERGIUS (19), son of Dryinus, the great Paulician reformer in the 9th century (Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 32; Phot. *c. Man.* i. 21). He was born at the village of Ania, near the Galatian town of Tavia. Probably his father belonged to the Catholic church, though the account of Photius would suggest that Sergius sprang from a family connected with the sect. While still a young man, he was attracted and won over to the Paulician doctrine through the impression produced on him by conversation with a woman belonging to the sect. At her advice he diligently studied the writings of St. Paul, though with a mind pre-occupied with the theories of the Gnostic dualism. Apprehending Christianity under these forms, Sergius started in his career of an apostolic reformer, taking the name of Tychicus in the Paulician fashion to designate his adhesion to the principles and doctrines of St. Paul. His missionary labours extended over a period of thirty-four years, during which he penetrated almost every portion of Asia Minor, successfully promoting the spread of the reformed Paulicianism. He seems to have led an irreproachable life, winning the praise of even his bitterest opponents. During his itinerant ministry, in imitation of St. Paul, Sergius maintained himself by his own hands, working as a carpenter. His early labours synchronized with the reign of the tolerant Greek emperor Nicephorus, who was born at Seleucia in Pisidia, and refused to persecute the growing Paulician communities of his native districts. At last, in the reign of the rigid Leo the Armenian, he fled before imperial persecution, and sought shelter with his fellow-sufferers in the parts of Armenia subject to the Saracens. Sergius, with his usual gentleness of character, dissuaded the Paulicians from retaliatory measures against their Roman neighbours, though with little success. Some years later, in 835, while felling wood for his carpenter's work in one of the mountain forests near Argasus, he was murdered by an orthodox fanatic, Tzanio of Nicopolis. The "Epistles of Sergius" are repeatedly quoted by Petrus Siculus and Photius in their histories, where they refer to them as acknowledged authoritative writings among the Paulicians (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 346; Gibbon, vol. i. 46, ch. 54). [M. B. C.]

SERNIN, ST. [SATURNINUS (2).]

SERPENTINI. So Philaster translates the name Ophitae. [G. S.]

SERRAS (SERAS, SARAS), at first a presbyter in Libya, where he was one of the leaders of the Arians (Hieron. *Dial. adv. Lucif.* § 20), and subsequently ordained a bishop by Secundus, who had been deposed from the see of Ptolemais for Arianism (Athan. *De Synod.* § 12). In 356 Serras and Secundus desired to advance Aëtius (then serving as a deacon at Alexandria) to the episcopate, but Aëtius declined to be ordained by them on the ground of their having held communion with the Homoousians (Philostorg. iii. 19). In 358 the emperor Constantius, at the instigation of Basil of Ancyra, banished Serras together with Theophilus bishop of Castabala and Aëtius (*ib.* v. 4). In 359 Serras, as bishop of Paraetonium in Libya, subscribed at the council of Seleucia (Epiph. *Haer.* lxxiii. 20). In 360 he was deposed along with Heliodorus and other supporters of Aëtius at the synod of Constantinople (Philost. vii. 6; Hefele's *Councils*, ii. 274). In 362, as it probably was, Serras joined Eunomius and others at Constantinople in ordaining Aëtius a bishop (Philost. vii. 6). For the chronology see Tillem. vi. 247, 410, 435, 469, 488, 490, 508. [C. H.]

SERRANUS, addressed by Sidonius Apollinaris (*Ep.* 13). [R. J. K.]

SERVANDUS (1), deacon and abbat of the monastery of St. Sebastian in Campania, was a disciple of St. Benedict (Gregorius, *Dial.* ii. 35). [F. D.]

SERVANDUS (2), deacon of Faesulae, who with the priest Agrippinus petitioned Gregory the Great, A.D. 600, to aid in repairing their church, which they alleged to be in ruins (*Epp.* x. 44). [F. D.]

SERVANUS (SAIR, SARE, SERB, SERF, SERFFE, SERFUS, SERUAN, SERVAN, SERWANE), popular saint in Scotland, bishop and confessor. His legends are so unhistorical as to give no basis for chronology regarding himself or his contemporaries, but the more general tradition would attach him to the 5th or 6th century rather than to the close of the 7th. Dr. Grub (*E. H. Scot.* i. 29 n.) suggests the likelihood of there having been two bishops of the same name in the 5th and 6th centuries, whose acts have been mixed up together, while Dr. Skene (*Celt. Scot.* ii. 31, 184) prefers a late date, and condemns the device of the *Brev. Aberd.* in making two saints, one in the time of Palladius, and another contemporary with St. Adamnan: still more improbable is Dempster's placing (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 574*) a Servanus in A.D. 440, and a Serfus in A.D. 293, contrary even to his own quoted authority. The oldest authority is the tract *On the Mothers of the Saints of Ireland*, by Aengus the Culdee (quoted by Reeves, *Culdees* 124, from the *Book of Lecan*, p. 43 bb), which calls him Serb, son of Alma, daughter of the king of Cruithne, his father being Proc, king of Canaan of Egypt, and his abode at Cuilennros, between the Ochil hills and sea of Guidi (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 445). Embodying or built on this is the *Vita S. Servani* (printed by Skene, *Chron.* 412–20) full of absurd fables. According to this, Malachias or Servanus is son, miraculously born, of Obeth king of Canaan, and his wife Alpia daughter of the king of Arabia. After abdicating the throne, he becomes successively bishop of Canaan, patriarch of Jerusalem, honoured visitor at Constantinople, and pope at Rome. He then comes to Scotland, finds abbat Edheunanus, or Adamnanus, at Inchkeith, and receives from him "terram Fif, et a monte Britannorum usque ad montem qui dicitur Okhéll," and from Brude son of Dargart king of Scotia land at Culross for a church and cemetery. He does many wonderful works, dies at Dunning, and is buried at Culross. This is the Life on which, in the 15th century, Wyntoun (*Chron.* v. c. 12) has framed his notice of St. Serf and his miracles.

Different in many respects from this are the Lections in the *Brev. Aberd.* (*Prop. SS. p. aest.* ff. xv.–xv.), more local in their character, but as full of miracles, connecting him with Palladius, and also referring to the other legend. The Palladian view of St. Servanus is also given by Fordun (*Scot. Chr.* iii. c. 9), who quotes, as his

authority, from the *Vita Kentegerni imperfecta*, auctore ignoto (published in Bp. Forbes's *Lives of SS. Nin. and Kent.* 243 sq.). But though Jocelyn used this fragment, he has dropped all allusion to Palladius (in his *Vita Kentegerni*, auctore Jocelino monacho Furnesensi), introduces him as living at Culross, Perthshire, where he receives the new-born Kentigern, baptizes, names, and educates him [KENTIGERN]. Jocelyn, however, does not remove him from the Palladian period, as, at the time of Kentigern's flight from Culross, Servanus is infirm with age, "seniles artus baculo regente" (c. 8), and returns to Culross to await in a good old age the day of his call; there his relics are said to have been in the beginning of the 16th century (*Mart. Aberd.* Kal. Jul.). To this Boethius (*Scot. Hist.* lib. vii. f. 128, ed. 1574; Bellenden's *Boece*, l. vii. c. 18, ed. 1821, i. p. 286) adds that Palladius made him bishop, and sent him to the Orkney Isles that he might instruct the rude people there in Christian piety. This addition all the later Scotch annalists have accepted.

St. Serf's connection with Lochleven and the monastery on the island in its waters is important for chronology, as in the monastic charters now incorporated in the *Registrum Prioratus S. Andreae* (pp. 113–118) it is said that Brude son of Dergard gave to St. Servanus and the Keledei hermits dwelling there the Isle of Lochlevine; Dr. Skene (*Celt. Scot.* ii. 258 sq.) identifies this Brude with the Brude son of Derile, a contemporary of St. Adamnan, and thus brings Brude, Servanus, and Adamnan together in establishing the hermits at Lochleven about the close of the 7th century, but unfortunately for the theory the same charters might synchronize Servanus and Macbeth in the 11th century. Skene supposes that his legend points to the same tide of Roman influence as is traceable in that of St. Boniface and belongs to the same period. Ussher (*Brit. Eccl. Ant.* Ind. Chron.) places his death in the year 540, but it must remain doubtful. Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 574*) says he wrote *Epistolae ad Orcadianos* and *Epistolae ad Ecclesias Scoticas*. His baculus was used for swearing upon, and is mentioned by Wyntoun (*Cron.* i. 120) and in *Brev. Aberd.* (*p. aest.* f. xvi.). His feast varies between April 20 and July 1. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 445–447; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 212 sq.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. pass.; Grub, *E. H. Scot.* i. pass.; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* iii. 382 sq. on the Culdees and their remains on Lochleven; Reeves, *Culdees*, pass.; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 105; Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Jul. i. 50–53.) [J. G.]

SERVATIUS (1) I, ST., tenth bishop of Tongres, was present at the great council of Sardica, the date of which is now fixed in 343 or 344 (Mansi, iii. 1 sqq.; Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. iii. 210–211; ATHANASIUS). The *Acta* of the council of Cologne, supposed to have been held in 346, represent Servatius as speaking from personal knowledge, derived from the proximity of their sees, to the heresy of Euphratas. But the gravest suspicion rests upon this council. He may well be the Servatius, who, in company with a Maximus, was sent by Magnentius, the murderer of Constans, on a mission to Constantius in 350 (*Apol. ad Imp. Const.* i. 300; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 205), and there is no doubt that he was at the council of Rimini in 359, where he displayed much constancy in the orthodox cause, but was misled, with others, by the device of Ursacius and Valens, (Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* ii. 44; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xx. 153–4). Nothing further is known of him unless, as some have contended, he is the Servatius or Aravatius of Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 5, and *De Glor. Conf.* lxxii., as to which see SERVATIUS II. His day of commemoration is May 13 (Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. iii. 209 sqq.). The late lives of him are worthless. [S. A. B.]

SERVATIUS (2) II. (ARAVATIUS, ARVATIUS), **ST.**, fifteenth in the list of the bishops of Tongres. Gregory of Tours, speaking of the invasion of Gaul by Attila and the Huns (A.D. 450), says that when the rumour of their approach arose there was at Tongres a bishop of exceeding sanctity, Aravatius (or Servatius), who with vigils, fasts and tears besought God that the calamity might be averted. His supplications being unheard, he formed the design of making a pilgrimage to Rome and beseeching the intercession of Peter himself. Here, after long fasting and prayer, it was revealed to him that the invasion was not to be averted, but that he himself would be taken away from the evil to come. Returning to Tongres he set his house in order, and, bidding farewell to clergy and people, set out for Maestricht, where he died, and was buried near the city wall (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 5). In the *De Glor. Conf.* lxxii. it is stated that the snow never lay on his tomb, and that in course of time bishop Monulfus (A.D. 550) built a large church in his honour, whither his body was transferred with great pomp, and where it still worked numerous miracles.

The history of the early bishops of Tongres is very obscure, and in particular there has been a vast deal of discussion as to whether the Servatius, who is the subject of this article, is identical or not with the Servatius of the councils of Sardica (A.D. 343 or 344) and Rimini (A.D. 359) treated of above as Servatius I. It seems probable that the *Gallia Christiana* (iii. 813), Ruinart (*not.* ad Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 5; *De Glor. Conf.* lxxii.), and Rettberg (*Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 205) are right in considering the two as distinct, a view which is supported by the fact that most of the MSS. read Aravatius in the passages above quoted from Gregory of Tours (Ruinart, *ibid.*). Henschenius and the others who identify them are compelled to believe that Gregory was mistaken, and refer the journey to Rome, either to the Vandal invasion of 406, which would still make Servatius of an impossible age, or to a Hunnish devastation of 383 (*Acta SS.* Mai. vii. p. xviii. sqq.). The later Bollandists however appear to doubt of their predecessors' conclusions (Aug. iv. 40). Servatius is usually credited with the transference of the see to Maestricht, whence it was afterwards moved again to Liège. He is commemorated May 13 (Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai iii. 209). [S. A. B.]

SERVILIO, the preceptor of ENNODIUS (Ennodius, *Epp.* v. 14, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 94). [F. D.]

SERVILIUS, a monk, said by Evodius to have appeared to him after his death, in a dream (Aug. *Ep.* 158 al. 258, 9, 11). [H. W. P.]

SERVUS (1) (SERVUS DEI), bishop of a place in Africa, called by St. Augustine, in the same chapter, Thubursica and Thubursicabur. There were two places in Numidia called respectively, by Ptolemy, Thuburnica and Thubursicca (Ptol. iv. 3. 39). Of these, Thuburnica is mentioned in a decree of an African council, A.D. 407 (Bruns, *Cod. Eccl. Afr.* 100, 1. 186; see Clinton, F. R.), as also its bishop Maurentius, probably the same as he whose name appears in *Carth. Coll.* i. 143, A.D. 411. Another bishop of Thubursicus, in Numidia, Januarius, is mentioned in the same (i. 201), but Morcelli suggests, from an inscription, that the word Thubursicubur, as given by Augustine, represents two words, viz. Tibursica, or Thubursica, of the Burenses, a different place from either of the two others just mentioned, but whose site is not known. Servus Dei, who appears in the record of the conference, was probably the same as Servus who, some time before this, when returning to his home, which had been seized by the Circumcellions, was attacked by them, and narrowly escaped with his life. The shock of this event caused the death of his father, a presbyter, a few days after (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 47). A Donatist bishop of Thubursica, named Cyprian, had been convicted of gross immorality about A.D. 406, but the rival bishop of Tubursicabur at the time of the conference was Donatus (*Carth. Coll.* 1. 121; Aug. *Petil.* iii. 39; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 318). [H. W. P.]

SERVUS (2), sub-deacon and martyr with Liberatus at Carthage in the Vandal persecution. [LIBERATUS (3).] [G. T. S.]

SESIN (SEZINUS), Breton saint, whose life is compiled by Albert le Grand (*Les Vies des SS. Bret. Armor.*) from ancient breviaries, &c., of Leon and Cornwall for Sept. 19, and quoted from at length, with notes, by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 477), and the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 6 Mar. i. 428), but the details are doubtful. Colgan seeks to identify him with Iserninus the companion of St. Patrick, but merely as a guess. According to the legend, he was of Ulster birth, A.D. 402; his father Ernest, and mother Wingella. Early in youth he retired to an island for pious exercises, and in A.D. 435 visited Rome, where he became acquainted with St. Patrick, who was then a bishop, and accompanied its apostle back to Ireland with the papal blessing and gifts. After the performance of many miracles, he set out with seventy disciples, and, reaching the diocese of Leon in France, built his monastery at Guic-Sezni, where he died in A.D. 529 at the ripe age of one hundred and twenty-seven years. He was buried beneath the altar in his own church at Guic-Sezni, and his feasts are March 6th and September 19th. Lobineau (*Hist. Bret.* i. No. ccxv. p. 76) can find only his name and patronage. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 173–176; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 87.) [J. G.]

SETHITES. [See OPHITES, p. 87.]

SEVEN BROTHERS. [FELICITAS (1).]

SEVEN MARTYRS OF ANCYRA, female victims of the persecution of Diocletian about the year 304. They were unmarried, about seventy years old, and notable for their piety and good works. As soon as the persecution was finally determined upon, Theotecnus, a magician, a philosopher, and pervert from Christianity, was despatched as governor to Galatia, to root out Christianity. Among the earliest victims were these seven virgins, whose names were Tecusa, Alexandra, Faina, Claudia, Euphrasia, Matrona, Julitta. Having summoned them before him Theotecnus called upon them to offer incense, and upon their refusal condemned them to the public brothel, from which they escaped scatheless on account of their age, and by the ingenuity of Tecusa their leader. He then ordered them to officiate as priestesses of Diana and Minerva in washing their statues according to the annual custom of Ancyra. They were accordingly carried naked in a procession through the streets to a neighbouring lake, where garlands and white garments were offered them in which they should fulfil his commands. Upon their refusal Theotecnus ordered them to be drowned in the lake, and heavy stones to be tied round their necks lest their bodies should be recovered and buried by their fellow-Christians. Legends in abundance now connect themselves with the story. In Ancyra was a tavern-keeper named Theodotus, a very earnest and devout Christian, who had been active in encouraging the martyrs to endure. To him, as the story goes, Tecusa appeared the same night in which they died, calling upon him to rescue their bodies, and warning him at the same time to avoid a traitor among the friends. The next night, in company with her own nephew Polychronus, he went out to the lake, which he found guarded by soldiers to prevent such an attempt. The darkness, too, was so great as to render it hopeless. Supernatural aid, however, was at hand. Two saints appeared with a lighted lamp to guide them, while St. Sosandrus, a martyr famous in those parts, appeared as a tall armed man and affrighted the guards. At the same time a storm of wind drove the water of the lake so to one side as to leave the bodies exposed, whereupon they were seized and brought to Ancyra by Theodotus and his companions, and buried near the church of the Patriarchs in that town. The governor hearing of the rescue, arrested Polychronus, who confessed under torture the names of those who had carried it, and thus fulfilled the warning of the vision. Acting upon the information thus gained, the bodies were disinterred and burned, and Theodotus, after witnessing a good confession and suffering excruciating tortures, was finally beheaded. He is commemorated by the Greeks on the 7th of June. The seven virgins of Ancyra are commemorated in the Greek, the Roman and Egyptian Martyrologies on May 18. The acts of the seven virgins and of St. Theodotus are recorded in Greek in a Vatican manuscript which professes to have been written by an eye-witness named Nilus. They were translated into Latin by the Jesuit priest Daniel Papebrochius. They are found in Greek and Latin in the Boll. *Acta SS.* May 18; cf. also Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 336; Ceillier, iii. 15. The church of the

Patriarchs, mentioned frequently in these acts, was probably one dedicated to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whose festival the Greeks observe on Dec. 13. [G. T. S.]

SEVERA (1), called Marina in the *Chron. Pasch.*, first wife of VALENTINIANUS I., and mother of GRATIANUS (5), q. v. and also JUSTINA (5). [F. D.]

SEVERA (2), a lady addressed by Chrysostom (*Ep.* 229) in his exile at Cucusus, A.D. 404. [C. H.]

SEVERIANA, daughter of Sidonius Apollinaris, who (*Ep.* 12) was about to take her into the country for the restoration of her health. [R. J. K.]

SEVERIANS [SEVERUS (3) and (27)].

SEVERIANUS (1), confessor of Carthage as STATIUS, Cyp. *Ep.* 21. [E. W. B.]

SEVERIANUS (2), bishop of Gabala on the northern seaboard of Syria, c. A.D. 400, Chrysostom's episcopal commissary during his Asiatic visitation in A.D. 401, and afterwards one of his most determined enemies, and a leader of the cabal against him. Severian was an ambitious man, and having a natural gift of eloquence, and a fair amount of theological and scriptural learning, he was anxious to display his powers in a wider field than a small provincial city. He is described by Gennadius (*Ill. Eccl. Script.* c. 21) as "in Divinis Scripturis eruditus, et in Homiliis declamator admirabilis." The success of his neighbour Antiochus bishop of Ptolemais, who had acquired great celebrity as a preacher at Constantinople, led Severianus to resolve to try his fortune also in the imperial city. Having carefully prepared a large stock of sermons he turned his back on his diocese and repaired to Constantinople, where he was kindly received by Chrysostom, who often selected him to address the people on important occasions. In spite of a rough provincial accent, he obtained considerable popularity, not only with the people in general, but with the emperor and empress, who often appointed him to preach (Gennad. *u. s.*). When in the spring of A.D. 401 Chrysostom left Constantinople for the visitation of Asia Minor, he deputed his official authority to Severian as commissary, all real power being vested in his archdeacon Serapion, who was instructed to watch Severian narrowly and acquaint Chrysostom with all that passed in his absence. Severian abused the opportunity of Chrysostom's absence to undermine his influence with the emperor and empress and the court, and to render him increasingly distasteful to the worldly and luxurious clergy of Constantinople, whom his severity had already greatly alienated. His conduct was reported in the darkest colours to Chrysostom by his jealous and artful rival in popular favour, Serapion. The insult offered to Severian by Serapion, the outburst of temper which followed, the mutilated words eagerly reported to Chrysostom, and vouched for by those who wished to curry favour with their bishop, and the ill-judged haste with which Chrysostom, without waiting to enquire fully into the truth of the charge, compelled Severian to leave for his own diocese, are to be found in a previous article [SERAPION (16)]. But whether, according to the more highly coloured account, Severian was actually expelled as a blasphemer (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 10; Socr. *H. E.* vi. 11), or, as we find in the alternative passage in Socrates (*Append. ad lib.* vi.), Chrysostom contented himself with the suspension of intercourse, and the advice that he should return to his own diocese, from which he had been absent so long—a recommendation which, at the synod of the Oak, Chrysostom was charged with having incited the "deacons" of the church to carry out by force (Phot. *Cod.* lix. p. 55)—Severian had barely crossed the Bosphorus when court influence procured his recall. The imperious Eudoxia, annoyed at the loss of a favourite preacher, compelled Chrysostom to allow his return. But though he yielded so far, he steadily refused to re-admit the offender to his former friendly intercourse. The influence Severian had acquired by his flattery and his eloquence over the empress's mind led her to resort to a most extraordinary measure to bring about at least the appearance of amity. Taking her infant son, the future emperor Theodosius, in her arms, she carried him into the church of the Apostles, where Chrysostom was seated, and, casting him in his lap, conjured him with solemn imprecations to be reconciled with Severian. Chrysostom consented; but in the words of Socrates the seeming reconciliation only cloaked a secret ill-feeling which Severian, at any rate, was watching his opportunity to indulge. Nothing was wanting, however, on either side to convince the public of the reality of the reconciliation. Chrysostom, at least, was thoroughly honest in his protestations that all angry feeling was laid aside; and exhorted his congregation who had been much offended by the conduct of Severian towards their reverend spiritual father, to submit as loyal subjects and good Christians to the wishes of those in authority, forget all past dissensions, and receive their offending brother with a full heart and open arms (*Homil. de recipiend. Severian.* tom. iii. p. 422, ed. Migne). The request was acceded to with applause. Severian next day delivered a short rhetorical eulogy on the blessings of peace—a studied composition, as devoid of naturalness as the event proved it to be of honesty (*Sermo ipsius Severiani de pace, ibid.* p. 493).

The hollowness of the reconciliation was soon proved. Severian came forward with Antiochus of Ptolemais and Acacius of Beroea as the chief leaders of the cabal against Chrysostom. Their own neglect of their sacred duties as "hireling shepherds," calling themselves what they were not, and being really what they had no mind to be called, already the theme of the satirical ballads of the theatres, inspired them with envy of the true pastor, with whom the comparison was so disadvantageous; and having no other way of ridding themselves of him, these base intriguers, under the inspiration of the empress and the powerful female influence of the court, formed a plot for Chrysostom's humiliation, which ultimately proved only too successful (Pallad. *Dial.* pp. 35, 48, 72). At the assembly of the Oak, Severian took a leading part, acting at the same time as accuser, witness, and judge (Pallad. p. 72, Phot. *Cod.* 59, p. 53). On his deposition, Severian mounted the pulpit and publicly expressed his approbation of the act,

which he said Chrysostom had well merited for his haughtiness alone. This was an unpardonable sin, for which, as Holy Scripture declared, even God made no allowance. The people were already in a very excited state at the loss of their revered bishop; this "barefaced attempt to justify injustice" only rendered them more furious, and they were only prevented from taking summary measures against his persecutors by his speedy recall (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 16; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 19). On Chrysostom's triumphant return Severian and his brother intriguers consulted their safety by flight (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 17; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 19; Pallad. *Dial.* p. 16). We find Severian and the other intriguers at Constantinople seconding the new designs for the destruction of Chrysostom set on foot by Eudoxia and the court party, and securing his condemnation. Having obtained an audience of the emperor, Severian joined with his brother caballers in urging the immediate removal of Chrysostom, who had no longer any legal right to occupy the palace, as the only security for the pacification of the city (Pallad. *Dial.* pp. 79, 88; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 22). Severian's malice did not cease with the expulsion of his enemy. He was one of the concocters of the letters of accusation addressed to pope Innocent sent by Paternus (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 25). He is charged by Palladius with using his influence to obtain an order for the removal of the aged invalid from Cucusus, where the climate had not proved so fatal as the malice of his enemies desired, to the more bleak and inaccessible town of Pityus (*ibid.* 97). Severian had previously been one of the uncanonical consecrators of Porphyrius as bishop of Antioch (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 24). The time of his death is uncertain. It may be placed under Theodosius II. between A.D. 408 and A.D. 430.

Severianus was a copious author. Very few of his works have been preserved to us. Some of the homilies printed in Chrysostom's works have been attributed to him with more or less probability. The following are regarded as his on satisfactory grounds: (1) *De Creatione Mundi*, orationes sex, Chrys. ed. Savil. tom. vii. p. 587 ff. Combefis, *Auctarium*, Paris, 1672, tom. iii. p. 211. (2) *De Nativitate Christi* (quoted as his by Theodoret, *Dial.* ii.), ed. Savil. tom. vii. p. 307. (3) *De Sigillis Librorum*, *ibid.* p. 134 (also quoted by Theodoret, *Dial.* iii. p. 169). (4) *De Serpente Aeneo*, *ibid.* tom. v. p. 44 (quoted as his by John of Damascus, *de Imag. Orat.* and other ancient writers). (5) *De Nativitate*, *ibid.* tom. v. p. 134. We may mention also a homily, *De Morte Innocentium*, Chrysolog. No. 152, and *de Cruce homilia*, published by Combefis with some homilies of Chrysostom's, Paris, 1656. Du Pin attributes to Severian, from internal evidence, a large number of the homilies which pass under Chrysostom's name. He mentions in the sixth volume of Savile's edition, Nos. 4, 12–15, 17–21, 25, 34, 37–42, 44, 57–59, 61–63; and Nos. 102, 105, 133, and 144 in the fifth volume. Combefis (*Auctar.* iii. p. 291) cites a number of passages from various Greek catenae, but leaves it uncertain whether some of them do not rather belong to Severus, the Eutychian patriarch of Antioch. Severus is quoted together with Antiochus by the monks of Constantinople as theological authorities against Nestorius (Labbe, *Concil.* iii. 416). Severianus is said to have composed a large number of commentaries on Holy Scripture, the whole of which are lost with the exception of fragments contained in the *Catenae*. Commentaries on Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy are quoted by Fr. Zephyrus in his *Catena in Pent.* Colon. 1572. A commentary on Job is quoted in the Catena of Paulus Comitolus; a commentary on the Galatians is mentioned by Gennadius as having been read by him, and a fragment is given by Oecumenius in his commentary on that epistle. Oecumenius also quotes his commentary on the Romans, 1 Cor., and 2 Thess.; and Anastasius Sinaita (Ὁδηγός, c. 16) that on the Colossians. There is, however, some doubt whether these belong to him or to Severus of Antioch. Gennadius speaks of having read with pleasure a treatise of Severian's on *Baptism* and on the *Epiphany*. A work *contra Novatum* is quoted by Gelasius, *de duabus Christi Naturis*; and one *contra Judaeos* by Cosmas Indicopleustes, vii. 292. According to Mabillon (*Mus. Ital.* i. pp. 13, 124) eighty-eight homilies bearing Severian's name exist in MS. in the Ambrosian library, and others in the Coislinian. (Fabr. *Bibl. Graec.* ix. 267; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 375; Dupin, *Hist. Eccl.*) [E. V.]

SEVERIANUS (3), Count of Ancyra, to whom Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis, paid a visit. He gives an account of him and his wife, Bosphoria, in his *Historia Lausiaca*, cap. 114, where he describes their almsgiving to hospitals, monasteries, and churches about A.D. 413. Cf. Ceillier, vii. 486. [G. T. S.]

SEVERIANUS (4), confessor in Africa with Novatus and POSSIDIUS under Genseric, Coss Aëtio II. et Sigisvulto (Prosper, *Chron.* in *Pat Lat.* li. 597), *i.e.* A.D. 437 (Clinton, *F. R.* i. 620) [C. H.]

SEVERIANUS (5), bishop of Scythopolis, attended the council of Chalcedon in 451. (Labbe, iv. 788.) The following year, on his return from the council, he was brutally murdered, together with his attendants, by the partisans of Theodosius, the fanatical Eutychian intruder into the see of Jerusalem. The emperor Marcian, in his eighth letter, speaks of his murder as πάρεργον τῆς Θεοδοσίου μανίας (*ibid.* 851) and mentions it again in his ninth and fifteenth letters (*ibid.* 858, 879). His name occurs in the Roman martyrology on Feb. 22. (Theoph. p. 92; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 688; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xv. 735.) [E. V.]

SEVERIANUS (6), bishop of Arethusa in Syria Secunda, at the beginning of the 6th century. In common with most of the ecclesiastics of Syria Secunda, then suffering under the sanguinary tyranny of Peter the intruding metropolitan of Apamea, the follower and zealous partisan of Severus the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, Severianus refused to receive the synodical letters of that prelate, and in conjunction with Cosmas, bishop of Epiphania, he dispatched an instrument of deposition by the hands of Aurelian, archdeacon of Epiphania, who, in the garb of a female petitioner, surreptitiously placed the document in the hands of Severus himself. The emperor Anastasius, whose sympathies were with the Monophysites, learning this, ordered that Severianus and Cosmas

should be deposed and banished. But on learning that through the popularity of these bishops his orders could not be carried out without bloodshed, he revoked them, and Severianus and Cosmas remained undisturbed. (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 34.) Severianus signed the petition of his metropolitan, Paul of Apamea, to Justinian at the council under Mennas, A.D. 536, condemning the errors of Severus, Peter and Zoaras. (Labbe, v. 105.) [E. V.]

SEVERIANUS (7), the father of Leander and Isidore of Seville. [LEANDER (2), ISIDORUS (13).] [F. D.]

SEVERINA and ROMULA, ladies of Constantinople, probably sisters, to whom Chrysostom writes from Cucusus. (Chrys. *Ep.* 219.) [E. V.]

SEVERINUS (1), bishop of Cologne, who succeeded Euphratas A.D. 346, and is very highly spoken of by St. Gregory of Tours (*De Mir. S. Mart.* i. c. 4, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 918), according to whom he was favoured with a special intimation of St. Martin's death, *c.* 397. But the facts of his life are uncertain, as there is a confusion between him and a contemporary of the same name at Bordeaux, if as some suppose they be not one and the same person. The difficulty of regarding them as one lies in the fact, that Gregory mentions both as separate persons. Surius (*Vit. SS.* x. 360 sq.) gives a Life of St. Severin by an anonymous author, but it is not of much value; the Bollandists (*AA. SS.* Oct. x. 56) reproduce it with annotations, and it is plainly based upon Gregory's statements of the two Severini blended together. In this Life he became bishop of Cologne after Euphratas, defended his see against heresy and disaster, until, after the notice of St. Martin's death, he was summoned by a vision in his old age to proceed to Bordeaux, where St. Amand welcomed him, and at death (c. A.D. 403) buried him. The second part of the Life gives an account of the translation to Cologne at a much later date. His feast is Oct. 23 (Boll. *AA. SS.* Oct. x. 50 sq., discussing the intricacies, in the Comment. praev. and notes: Tillemont, *H. E.* x. 234 sq., 358 sq. *Gall. Christ.* iii. 623; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 177–8). [J. G.]

SEVERINUS (2), fourth bishop of Bordeaux, has his tradition mixed up with that of his contemporary bishop at Cologne [SEVERINUS (1)]. In the *brevis Vita* given by the Boll. (*AA. SS.* Oct. x. 65–66) as extracted from Gregory of Tours (*Lib. de Glor. Conf.* c. 45; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 862) he came "ex partibus Orientis" to Bordeaux when Amandus was bishop, who ceded to the stranger the episcopal seat, until after a few years Severinus died, and the see reverted to Amandus about the beginning of the 5th century. He is patron of Bordeaux as St. Seurin, and his feast is Oct. 23. But the account of his relations to Amandus and the see of Bordeaux is very improbable, yet Tillemont (*H. E.* x. 236 sq. 358) thinks there may be a portion of truth in it. (See Boll. *AA. SS.* Oct. x. 66; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 789.) The Life written by Fortunatus (Greg. Tur. *De Glor. Conf.* c. 45) is lost. [J. G.]

SEVERINUS (3), a kinsman of St. Augustine, who belonged to the Donatist party, and to whom, in reply to a letter from him expressing a desire to return to the church, Augustine wrote *c.* 400, urging him to do so (Aug. *Ep.* 52 al. 170). [H. W. P.]

SEVERINUS (4), Jan. 8, monk and apostle of Noricum (Austria) in the fifth century. He was assisted by EUGIPPIUS (1) who afterwards presided over a monastery dedicated to his memory, and there wrote his life about A.D. 511, for the use of a deacon named Paschasius. Severinus is described in his Life as coming from the East to preach in Pannonia and Noricum, about the time of Attila's death, followed as it was by contests among his sons, which wrought havoc and destruction among the inhabitants of these provinces. He lived a life of the sternest asceticism, inhabiting a small cell where a man could barely stand erect. There he gained the character of a prophet and a worker of miracles. His Life is filled, chapter after chapter, with narratives of the wonders wrought and the predictions uttered by him. He seems to have been gifted with some kind of second-sight, similar to that which Adamnan's Life of St. Columba claims for the Celtic saint of the following century. (Cf. cap. vii. for an instance of this.) The narrative of Eugippius is important as illustrating the social life of the outlying provinces of the empire when the foundations of the modern European system were just beginning to be laid. Thus Chap. VI. tells of the influence he exercised in introducing the payment of tithes. Poverty was widespread, owing to the ravages of the barbarians, and there was no system of relief for the poor who were perishing under his eyes. So Severinus urged upon the rich and well-to-do the payment of a tenth for the relief of their brethren and the redemption of captives, a practice as we learn from St. Patrick's *Epistle to Coroticus*, common among the Romans of Gaul in that age [PATRICIUS (10)]. The rich neglected the duty and refused to hearken to the exhortations of Severinus with a selfishness which we find exactly paralleled in the denunciations of Salvianus addressed to the Christians of Gaul. A famine soon followed, and Severinus pointed to it as a manifest judgment of God upon their misconduct. (Cf. TITHES in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.* p. 1965.) Severinus was a most devoted missionary, without any ambitious desires for himself. He was offered a bishopric, but refused it, preferring the life of a simple monk. Yet he was reverenced, by Roman and barbarian alike, so much so, that Odoacer sought him out and desired his blessing when about to invade Italy. "The lowness of the door would not admit the lofty stature of Odoacer. He was obliged to stoop, but in that humble attitude the saint could discern the symptoms of his future greatness, and, addressing him in a prophetic tone, 'Pursue,' said he, 'your design; proceed to Italy; you will soon cast away this coarse garment of skins, and your wealth will be adequate to your liberality of mind.'" (Gibbon, cap. xxxvi.) Severinus died A.D. 482, near Vienna. His body, six years afterwards was carried into Italy, and deposited in the villa of Lucullus, on the bay of Naples, then converted into a monastery. His Life will be found in

AA. SS. Boll. (Jan. 1, 483) and in Pez, *Scriptt. Res Austr. I.* 62; cf. Till. *Mém.* t. xvi. p. 178-181. The new edition of Herzog's *Encyclop.* has a very exhaustive article upon him. Potthast *s. v.* gives a full list of MSS., authorities, etc.

[G. T. S.]

SEVERINUS (5), bishop of Miria, had taken with him the ornaments of that church to Squillace. After his death the clergy of Miria petitioned Gregory the Great for their restoration (*Epp.* v. 9). The position of Miria is unknown. Another reading adopted by Gams (*Ser. Ep.*), but not by Jaffé (*Reg. Pont.*), gives Aleria, the well-known town in Corsica.

[F. D.]

SEVERINUS (6), bishop of Rome, elected shortly after the death of pope Honorius (12 Oct. A.D. 638), but not ordained till more than a year and a half afterwards, on 28 May, A.D. 640. He died at the beginning of August in the same year, after a reign of only two months and a few days. He was a Roman, and his father's name Abienus (Anastasius). The delay of his ordination was owing to the refusal of the emperor Heraclius to confirm his election, except on condition of his accepting the *Ecthesis*, issued before the death of Honorius, but too late for him to express an opinion upon it. [See JOANNES (349) IV.] The document had been sent from Constantinople to Isacius the exarch of Ravenna, with orders to him to require its acceptance by the new pope. This appears from a letter of Cyrus of Alexandria to Sergius of Constantinople, read at the third session of the first Lateran council, which was held under pope Martin, A.D. 649. In it are the words, "Ectheseos venerabilis nostrae fidei a piissimo et a Deo conservando domino nostro magnoque Principe pro pia fide nostra ad Isacium excellentissimum Patricium et Exarcham Italiae destinatae, quam debet profiteri communis frater noster Severinus sanctissimus Deo adjuvante, qui ordinatur Romae." But Severinus at once rejected it. So assures us pope Martin, who, after the reading of the letter above quoted in the Lateran council, said: "Ceciderunt a spe sua. Nec enim suscepta est omnino aut admissa secundum vanam eorum spem; magis autem condemnata est et anathematizata ab Apostolica auctoritate huc transmissa pessimae et praesumptae novitatis eorum Ecthesis." Messengers (apocrisiarii), then sent from Rome to Constantinople, were informed, on their arrival there, that confirmation of the election could not be granted unless they promised to persuade the new pope to accept the *Ecthesis*. Hence, it would appear, the long delay. At length they are said to have obtained the emperor's confirmation of the election by promising insincerely to lay the document before Severinus, and to ask him to sign it, if he approved of it, undertaking at the same time not to dissuade him from doing so. Our authority for this assertion is the contemporary abbat, St. Maximus, in a letter to the abbat Thalassius (Anastas. *in Collectan.*) Severinus, however, after his ordination, certainly did not comply with the emperor's required condition: for not only have we the assertion of pope Martin, above quoted, that the *Ecthesis*, when sent to Rome, was condemned by apostolical authority, but also the evidence of the profession of faith afterwards made by popes on their election (*Lib. diurn. Roman. Pontif.*, c. 3, *tit.* 6), in which the words occur, "Profitemur etiam cuncta Decreta Pontificum Apostolicae Sedis, id est sanctae recordationis Severini, Joannis, &c. . . . custodire; qui adversus novas quaestiones in Urbe Regia exortas, et pro propria doctrina cuncta zizaniorum scandala amputasse noscuntur, profitentes, juxta duarum naturarum motum, ita et duas naturales operationes, et quaecunque damnaverunt sub anathemate damnamus." *Decreta* of Severinus and other popes being here spoken of, it may be inferred that he held a Roman synod during his short tenure of office, in which the heresy involved in the *Ecthesis* was condemned; since only synodical decrees of popes were thus at that time designated.

During the vacancy of the see Anastasius informs us (*Vit. Severin.*) that Mauritius, the *Chartularius* (keeper of the records) of Rome, in concert with others, *Judices* of the city, made an attack on the Lateran palace, where the pope elect was in possession, with the view of plundering it. They got, we are told, the co-operation of the army at Rome, whose pay was in arrears, by suggesting that pope Honorius had accumulated large treasures in the Lateran, which were of no use where they were, and might be utilised with advantage. Having, after a siege of three days, gained entrance into the palace, they sent word to Isacius, the Exarch, who at once came to Rome, banished from the city the leading clergy, and took possession of the treasures, which he plundered, sending a part of them to the emperor Heraclius; and it was not, it is added, till after the ordination of Severinus that he returned to Ravenna. Though it is not intimated by Anastasius that this action was taken with the view of intimidating Severinus into acceptance of the *Ecthesis*, yet Isacius at least, acting in the interests of the emperor, may be supposed, with probability, to have had such a design in view. At any rate the state of things with regard to the *Ecthesis* afforded the opportunity for the attack and plundering of the Lateran.

We learn from Bede that the Scottish bishops and clergy, who were still at variance with the Roman communion in England on the Easter question, addressed a letter on the subject to Severinus, who died before it reached Rome. It was answered by his successor, John IV., while still only pope elect. (Bed. *H. E.* ii. 19.)

[J. B—Y.]

SEVERUS (1), L. SEPTIMIUS, emperor, was born at Leptis in Tripoli in April A.D. 146. His family were of equestrian rank, and two of his uncles had been consuls. His early life was spent at Rome in a mixture of study and dissipation. There his talents appear to have attracted the attention of M. Aurelius, who conferred various offices upon him. In one capacity or another he held office in nearly all the western provinces—Baetica, Sardinia, proconsular Africa, Tarraconensis, Lugdunensis, Pannonia, and Sicily. In A.D. 193 he was in command of Pannonia and Illyricum. When the news arrived of the murder of Pertinax, and the sale of the empire to Didius Julianus, it aroused great indignation in the

minds of the Pannonian army, and Severus, taking advantage of this feeling, got himself saluted emperor by them at Carnuntum in the month of April or May.

He immediately marched on Rome. Julian's preparations for defence proved unavailing; he was abandoned by the praetorians themselves, and put to death by order of the senate on the 1st or 2nd of June. Severus, after disbanding the mutinous praetorians, and raising a new force in their place, paying the last honours to Pertinax, attending to the corn supply of Rome, and transacting various other business, left Rome, after a stay of thirty days—having secured his rear by a treaty with Clodius Albinus, the governor of Britain, on whom he conferred the dignity of Caesar—to take the field against his most formidable rival, Pescennius Niger, who had assumed the purple at Antioch a few days before himself. All the East, including Egypt, had acknowledged him, and he was also master of the city of Byzantium. Severus, however, forced the passage of the Hellespont, routed Aemilianus, Niger's lieutenant, at Cyzicus, defeated Niger in person at Nicaea, forced the passes of Mount Taurus, and finally won a decisive victory at Issus on the field where Alexander had defeated Darius. Niger fled to Antioch, was captured in one of the suburbs and beheaded. Severus proceeded to punish severely the persons and cities who had taken his rival's part. Among others, Neapolis (Nablous), the ancient Shechem, was deprived of the franchise, which, however, was restored some years afterwards (*Vita Severi*, 9, 14). The fall of Niger took place in A.D. 194, and the next two years were spent by Severus in wars in Osrhoene, Adiabene, and Arabia. In the beginning of A.D. 196, he had the pleasure of hearing of the fall of Byzantium, the last refuge of Niger's partisans, which had held out bravely for nearly three years. He was recalled from the East by the outbreak of a new civil war. Albinus, whom after the fall of Niger he had ceased to treat as Caesar, had assumed the title of emperor, and had crossed into Gaul. After various indecisive actions, the rivals met on February 19, A.D. 197, in the plain of Trevoux near Lyons. After a protracted and sanguinary battle, Albinus was defeated and slain. Severus, on his return to Rome, put great numbers of the real or supposed partisans of Albinus to death, among whom were twenty-nine senators. He then marched again to the East against the Parthians, who had overrun Mesopotamia. The following year he marched down the Euphrates and took Seleucia and Ctesiphon, which, however, he did not attempt to hold permanently. In A.D. 199 he was, like Trajan, repulsed before the little town of Atra. The next two years were spent in Syria, where search was made for the relics of Niger's party. Some obscure notices are found of a rising of Jews and Samaritans about this period (*Vita Severi*, 16; S. Hier. *Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xxvii. 635). From Syria he proceeded into Egypt, where he ascended the Nile and visited Memphis and the pyramids, the labyrinth and Memnon. In A.D. 203 he returned to Rome, where he remained till A.D. 208. The most notable event of this period was the fall of the cruel and arrogant Plautian, who had attained an absolute ascendency over the emperor's mind. He had been made praetorian prefect and his daughter Plautilla had been married to the emperor's eldest son. Not satisfied with the position he had attained, and also fearing the hatred of Caracalla, he plotted to kill the emperor and his sons. His designs were disclosed by the centurion to whom he had entrusted their execution; he was summoned to the palace, and slain there (January A.D. 204). This, at least, is the account of Herodian; according to Dion, the plot was a fiction got up by Caracalla in order to remove his father-in-law. In the autumn of the same year the secular games were celebrated with great magnificence for the last time. In A.D. 208 Severus set out for Britain, where he marched through Caledonia to the extreme north of the island, cutting down the forests and making roads. Though he met with no opposition from the natives, the army suffered greatly from the hardships they underwent, and after making peace he returned to the Roman part of the territory. He added a new rampart to the wall built by Hadrian from the Tyne to the Solway. His last years were embittered by the quarrels of his sons, and the plots of the eldest against his own life, and he felt the vanity of all his successes. He had been all things, he said, and it profited him nothing. He died at York on February 4th, A.D. 211. A little before his death he asked for the urn to be brought in which his ashes were to be placed, and taking it in his hands said, "Thou shalt contain one whom the world did not contain." Of all the emperors from Augustus to Diocletian, Severus was probably the man of greatest power. Hated and feared by the senate, who felt notwithstanding that he was indispensable, he relied on the support of the army, and spared no pains to secure their attachment. Crafty, ambitious, and unscrupulous, he allowed no considerations of humanity to stand in his way. Yet he did not delight in cruelty for its own sake, and any weakness on his part would not only have been fatal to himself, but would have plunged the Roman world again in the anarchy from which he had rescued it. Under his rule disorder and brigandage throughout the empire were put down with a firm hand. The only weak point in his character was his belief in astrology and magic, in which he was himself an adept.

In the earlier part of his reign, Severus was favourable to the Christians. He believed that he had been cured of an illness by oil administered by a Christian named Proculus [CARACALLA], whom till his death he maintained in the palace; and the nurse and some of the playmates of Caracalla were Christians. No Christians took a prominent part on the side of Niger or Albinus, and it is even probable that the defenders of Byzantium ill-treated the Christians there during the siege. The number of councils held in the early years of Severus on the question of the time of observing Easter, proves that the church was then unmolested. The first change for the worse appears to have been on the occasion of the emperor's entry into Rome, in A.D. 197, after the defeat of Albinus. The Christians excited the fury of the mob by refusing to join in the demonstrations of rejoicing, an act, which they considered inconsistent with their religion. But Severus was so far from yielding to the mob, that he used his influence to protect

men and women of rank who were Christians against their fury (*Ad Scap.* 4).

But these troubles were only the forerunners of the storm. In A.D. 202 the emperor issued an edict by which future conversions to Judaism or Christianity were forbidden (*Vita Severi*, 17). His motives for this step are unknown. Probably Severus, a stern statesman of the old Roman school, foresaw the peril to which the national religion and the constitution of the state were exposed by the active propaganda carried on by the Christians, and though he was personally friendly to some among them, yet he thought it was time to check the further progress of the *religio illicita*. The prohibition against Jewish proselytism may have been caused by the obscure disturbances in Palestine already mentioned, and it seems to have been soon relaxed, if indeed it ever was enforced. At least this is a natural inference from the fact, that one Domninus abandoned Christianity for Judaism during the persecution (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 12).

Though the terms of the edict applied only to new converts, and though it appears that accordingly the catechumens were the greatest sufferers, yet there were numerous victims among those who had long embraced Christianity. The pronounced disapproval of the emperor naturally tended to intensify the persecutions in provinces where they had already commenced, and to spread them to others where hitherto the Christians had been secure. In the eastern part of the empire it was in Egypt that the Christians suffered most, which may have been caused by the fact, that the emperor had visited it immediately after the promulgation of his edict. So terrible was the outbreak that Judas, a Christian writer, interpreting the prophecies of Daniel, made the seventy weeks expire with the tenth year of Severus, and considered the advent of Antichrist was at hand. Laetus the prefect, and his successor Aquila, shewed themselves merciless enemies of the Christians, who were dragged from all parts of Egypt to their tribunal at Alexandria. Among the most notable of the martyrs was Leonidas the father of the famous Origen, who was only prevented by a stratagem of his mother's from sharing his father's fate. The property of Leonidas being confiscated to the imperial treasury, his family was reduced to poverty. Yet, notwithstanding the persecution, Origen was allowed to open a school, where many in consequence of his teaching became Christians and suffered martyrdom. The most famous of them was Potamiaena, the story of whose martyrdom resembles the well-known legend of St. Dorothy. Their names are given by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 4, 5). By a strange inconsistency, which also appears in the accounts of the African persecution, Origen was allowed to visit them in prison, and to be present at their trial, and even to accompany them on their way to execution, apparently without being molested by the government, though he was several times in great danger from the violence of the mob.

In Africa the persecution began with a violation of the cemeteries, and a bad harvest that followed increased the rage of the people against the Christians[a] (*Ad Scap.* 3). In the spring of A.D. 203, under Hilarianus the procurator, who had assumed the government on the death of the proconsul, suffered that famous group of martyrs among whom St. Perpetua is the most conspicuous. Yet here again we find the same inconsistency as at Alexandria. Deacons were allowed to visit the imprisoned Christians unmolested, to alleviate their sufferings, and even to procure their removal to a better part of the prison. In A.D. 205 or 206, under the milder government of Julius Asper, the persecution seems to have abated, after raging for three years (*De Pallio*, 2). So perilous was the position of the Christians that many sought refuge in flight, while others tried to escape by bribing the Roman officials, and in some cases the Christian community as a whole seems to have done so. These subterfuges were regarded with scorn and abhorrence by the more enthusiastic Christians, but no trace is to be found of the Libellatici so notorious in later persecutions, who procured by a payment a certificate that they had complied with the requirements of the law. This abatement seems to have continued till near the close of the reign, but in A.D. 210 and 211 the persecution broke out again in its sharpest form under the proconsul Scapula, when it also extended to Mauritania. There, however, the sword was the instrument of execution, whilst the cruel Scapula burnt his victims alive or flung them to the wild beasts of the amphitheatre.

Of the persecutions in other parts of the empire, we have only a few isolated notices. The aged Irenaeus and his companions suffered at Lyons in the reign of Severus, but no details of their martyrdom are preserved, and even the date is uncertain. In Syria, Asclepiades, who was afterwards bishop of Antioch, was a confessor (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 11). It was probably in this reign[b] that the cruel persecution in Cappadocia to which Tertullian (*Ad Scap.* 3) alludes, took place. The governor, Herminianus, was enraged against the Christians, because his wife had been converted. It may have been on this occasion that Alexander, who was bishop of a Cappadocian see, and who was afterwards bishop of Jerusalem, was imprisoned in A.D. 204 (Eus. *Chron.*). The fact that he was again in prison in A.D. 211 (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 11) shews that the persecution, at any rate to some extent, still continued in the East, and Tertullian's letter to Scapula proves that it continued in Africa after the death of Severus. It however ceased soon afterwards (Sulp. Sev. ii. 32, in *Patr. Lat.* xx. 147) and it must have finally ended in A.D. 212, when Caracalla, after his brother's death, issued a general amnesty (Dion, lxxvii. 3). Cruel as it was, and severer than any previous persecution, it had not the systematic character of those of Decius and Diocletian. With the exception of Irenaeus, none of the bishops or prominent mem-

[a] Till lately the Scillitan Martyrdoms were assigned to the reign of Severus, and consequently those of Namphamo the protomartyr of Africa (St. Aug., *Epp.* 16 17) and his companions, which immediately preceded those of the Scillitans, but the *Acta* recently published by Usener (*vid.* App. to *Index Schol.* Bonn, 1881) and Aubé (*Étude sur un nouveau texte des Actes des Martyrs Scillitaines*) fix the date of the Scillitan Martyrdoms as July A.D. 180. See also Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Part II., vol. i. 507.

[b] The change in the date of the Scillitan Martyrdoms renders this doubtful. See Lightfoot, *Ap. F.* II. i. 523.

bers of the church seem to have been executed; many, like Tertullian and Origen, who might have been thought certain victims, were unmolested, and the resolution with which the martyrs bore their sufferings was the cause of many conversions. (The authorities are, for general history, the epitome of Dion Cassius, lxxiii. 14–lxxvi.; Herodian, ii. 9–iii.; the lives of Severus, Pescennius, and Albinus in the Augustan History; Tillemont, *Emp.* iii.; Gibbon, c. 5, 6; for the persecutions in general, Eus. *H. E.* vi. 1–12; Tillemont, *M. E.* iii.; Görres, in *Jahrbücher für Protest. Theol.* 1878, 273; for that in Africa in particular, Tertullian, *Apologeticus; ad Martyres; ad Nationes; ad Scapulam; de Fuga; de Corona Militis*; Aubé, *Revue Historique*, xi. 241.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (2), AURELIUS ALEXANDER, emperor, was born at Arca Caesarea, in Syria, on October 1st, A.D. 205 (Lampridius) or A.D. 208 (Herodian). For an account of his family see ELAGABALUS. Like him he was made in childhood a priest of the Sun at Emesa, and when his cousin became emperor he and his mother Julia Mamaea accompanied him to Rome. Mamaea took the utmost pains to educate her son, and to preserve him uncontaminated by the monstrous excesses of his cousin. After having been created Caesar by the emperor in A.D. 221, on the 1st February in the following year (Clinton) he became emperor on the death of Elagabalus and his mother Soaemis at the hands of the indignant soldiery. Being then at the most not yet seventeen the administration of affairs rested with his mother and grandmother Julia Mamaea and Julia Maesa, the latter of whom, down to her death, which took place about A.D. 225, enjoyed the greater share of power. Under them the chief minister or rather regent was the famous jurist Ulpian, whose appointment appears to have been due to Maesa's influence, though Mamaea afterwards acquiesced in it (Lamp. 50). He was assisted by a council of not less than seventy members, of whom from sixteen to twenty, who were eminent jurists, formed a sort of inner cabinet (compare Herodian, vi. i. with Lamp. 15). To separate committees of this council was referred the business of the different departments of the state.

The first step of the new administration was to reverse the acts of Elagabalus. The images of the gods which he had collected at Rome from all parts of the empire were restored to their former shrines. The creatures of Elagabalus were removed from the offices they had obtained by disgraceful means. The senate, the knights, the tribes, and the army were purged of the infamous persons with whom they had been filled by the late emperor. Not only was the palace cleared of the vile associates of Elagabalus and the ministers of his vices, but the imperial establishment was reduced as low as possible.

The praetorians and the army in general did not easily acquiesce in these reforms. Probably in order to check their mutinous spirit their prefects Flavianus and Chrestus were removed and put to death, and Ulpian was made sole prefect in their stead. One example will shew the temper of the praetorians. From some trifling cause a riot broke out between them and the people, which lasted for three days. The soldiers, getting the worst of it, set fire to the city and thus checked their assailants. They could not endure the firm rule of Ulpian. Several times he had to take refuge in the palace, and was saved with difficulty by the emperor from their fury. At last, probably in A.D. 228, he was killed by the soldiers in the presence of Alexander and his mother, who felt themselves so much at the mercy of the army that it was only by a stratagem they were able to punish the ringleader.

Throughout the empire the same insubordinate spirit prevailed. The troops in Mesopotamia mutinied and killed their commander Flavius Heracleon. The historian Dion by his firm rule in Pannonia had excited the hatred of the pretorians to such a degree, that Alexander was driven to the humiliating expedient of requesting him not to come to Rome during his consulship.

This spirit of mutiny was the more dangerous as the reign of Alexander witnessed the restoration of the Persian power. The Persians under Artaxerxes revolted against the Parthians. In three great battles, in one of which the Parthian king Artabanus fell, he completely broke their power, and by the most extraordinary revival recorded in history re-established the kingdom of Darius in A.D. 226. As heir of the ancient monarchy he claimed to be entitled to all the Asiatic provinces of Rome. Such pretensions naturally produced a war. At the end of A.D. 231 or the beginning of A.D. 232 the emperor, accompanied by his mother, left Rome to take the field against the Persians. He was detained for some time at Antioch by the seditious state of the army. One legion, following the example of Julius Caesar, he reduced to obedience by addressing the soldiers as Quirites and disbanding it. The accounts of the war are irreconcilable. According to Lampridius and the speech of Alexander, he reports, he vanquished Artaxerxes with heavy loss and conquered Mesopotamia. The account of Herodian, who gives a more detailed narrative, is totally different. According to him the plan of campaign was an invasion by three combined armies, the first marching on Media through Armenia, the second invading the country near the mouths of the Euphrates and Tigris, while the centre, under the emperor in person, was to support the other two, and all three were to unite at an appointed rendezvous. The execution, however, was unequal to the conception. The northern army indeed advanced into Media and gained considerable advantages, but on its retreat in winter through the Armenian mountains it suffered terribly from the cold. Neglecting its movements Artaxerxes concentrated his forces against the southern army, surrounded it and destroyed it, though the soldiers fought bravely, and though the Persian loss was as great as that of the Romans. This disaster was due to the inactivity of the central army, which should have advanced in support, but the emperor, either from illness, cowardice, or yielding to his mother's fears, had halted on the road. Thus covered with disgrace he returned to Antioch with the remnant of his troops. The Persians had however suffered so much that they kept quiet for three or four years, and thus allowed Alexander to return to Europe, where he was summoned by news of the movements of the Germans on the Rhine and Danube. After a

triumph at Rome on September 25th, A.D. 233 (Clinton), he proceeded to the Rhine frontier, where he was slain in his tent near Mayence, at the beginning of A.D. 235 (Clinton), by the mutinous soldiery, his mother perishing along with him. Whether his successor Maximin had any hand in his death, and whether he had previously been saluted emperor, is uncertain.

Thus perished the most virtuous of the emperors (except Antoninus and M. Aurelius) who had occupied the throne. Apparently his only faults were an excessive deference to his mother, and a certain want of energy. In his private habits he was frugal, temperate, and chaste. He was fond of reading, preferring Greek to Latin authors. His favourite works were the "Republic" of Plato and the "De Officiis" and "De Republica" of Cicero. He was also fond of Virgil and Horace. He was acquainted with geometry, was able to paint, and could sing and play on various instruments. Though he attended the temples regularly and visited the Capitol every seventh day, and though he rebuilt and adorned the shrines of various deities, yet, by a curious anticipation of Comtism, the objects of his peculiar veneration were not the gods of the various popular religions, but deified heroes and men. The private chapel in which he performed his devotions every morning contained no images of gods, but statues of canonised men. There were found the best of his predecessors, Alexander the Great, who might be called his patron saint, Orpheus, Apollonius of Tyana, Abraham, and Christ. In a smaller chapel were images of Achilles, Virgil, whom the emperor used to call the Plato of poets, Cicero, and other great men. From his mother's intercourse with Origen (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 21) he would naturally have better means of learning the doctrines and practices of Christianity than any of his predecessors. It is said indeed that he contemplated erecting a temple to Christ and placing Him among the gods. At any rate, though he did not give Christianity the status of a *religio licita*, yet the Christians during his reign enjoyed a *de facto* toleration. In the famous suit between the guild of cooks and the Christians for the possession of a piece of land, which according to tradition is the site of S. Maria in Trastevere, he decided in favour of the latter on the broad ground, that it was better that God should be worshipped there under whatever form than that it should be given to the cooks. This decision implies a certain recognition of the right of the Christians as such to hold property, which is also implied by the life of Callistus. [CALLISTUS, Vol. I. 391.] Consistently with this, it is in the reign of Alexander that edifices set apart for Christian worship begin to appear—at any rate in some parts of the empire (compare the letter of Firmilian to Cyprian (in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* iii. 1163) with Origen, *homily* 28 *on St. Matthew*, (quoted in *contra Celsum*, viii. 755, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xi. 1539)). A form of the golden rule of Christian morality (Do not do to another, what you would not have done to yourself) was so admired by the emperor that he caused it to be inscribed on the palace and other buildings.[a]

[a] This may have been derived, not from a Christian source, but from the similar precept in the book of Tobit (iv. 15), "Do that to no man which thou hatest."

A curious anecdote of Lampridius (44) shews at once the emperor's acquaintance with Christian usages and the antiquity of the practice of publishing to the congregation the names of those who sought ordination. In imitation of this custom the emperor caused the names of persons he was about to appoint to be published beforehand to the people, who were exhorted if they had any charge against them to come forward and prove it.

Strange to say, in later tradition the emperor, whom all the authorities who wrote near his time represent as a friend, nay almost a convert, to Christianity, whose chapel contained an image of Christ, and whose household was filled with Christians (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 28), appears as a cruel persecutor. It is said that pope Callistus with many companions, St. Caecilia and her comrades, pope Urban I., and many others suffered in his reign and that he personally took part in their martyrdom. On the other hand, no father of the third, fourth, or fifth centuries knows anything of such a persecution, but they all on the contrary agree in representing the reign of Alexander as a period of peace. Firmilian, in the above passage testifies that before the persecution of Maximin the church had enjoyed a long peace. In like manner Sulpicius Severus (ii. 32 in *Patr. Lat.* xx. 447) includes the reign of Alexander in the long peace that lasted from the reign of Septimius Severus to that of Decius, broken only by the persecution of Maximin. Against this mass of testimony can be set only the evidence of late authors such as Bede, Ado, and Usuard and unauthentic Acts of Martyrs. The most famous of the alleged martyrs of this reign, St. Caecilia and her companions, are placed by other accounts in the reigns of M. Aurelius or Diocletian. [CAECILIA (1).] All these martyrs are given up by Tillemont with the exception of Callistus. His chief ground for considering him a martyr is that in the *depositio Martyrum*, written in A.D. 354 (in *Patr. Lat.* cxxvii. 123), a Callistus is mentioned as martyred on October 14th, the day on which the pope is commemorated. Lipsius, however (*Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe*, 177, 8), acutely conjectures that this notice does not refer to the martyrdom, but to the confession of Callistus before Fuscianus mentioned by Hippolytus [CALLISTUS, Vol. I. p. 390], as up to the Decian persecution the word martyr was still used in the wider sense. We may therefore conclude that all these accounts of persecutions and martyrdoms, which are so inconsistent with what is known of the character of the emperor, and which are passed over in silence by all the authors who lived for more than two centuries afterwards, are fictions of a later date. (Dion Cassius, lxxx.; Herodian, vi.; Lampridius; Tillemont, *Emp.* iii. 157, *M. E.* iii. 250, 258; Müller, *Studien zur Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit*; Muche, *de Imp. Alex. Sev.*: Görres, *Zeitsch. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1877.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (3) and SEVERIANS. Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 29) having quoted the account given by Irenaeus of Tatian and the Encratites, proceeds to say that some little time after Tatian, these heretics had for their leader one Severus, from whom they obtained the name Severians. He says that they used the law, the prophets,

and the gospels, but put their own interpretations on the sacred writings; and that they blasphemed Paul the apostle, and rejected both his Epistles and the book of the Acts of the Apostles. This description would lead us to think of these Severians as an Ebionite sect.

A sect of Severians is described by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 45) which except the feature of Encratism has little in common with the sect described by Eusebius. Epiphanius evidently had not found this sect described in any previous treatise on heresies, for he is uncertain in what place in his list it ought to come. Nor does he describe the sect from personal knowledge, for he concludes his account with an expression of doubt whether any remains of the sect were still surviving in his day. His description, whencesoever derived, indicates a heresy of the Ophite family. It taught the existence of a good God dwelling in the highest heaven, but that the material Creation was not His work but that of certain Principalities and Powers. The devil, it was said, was the son of the great Archon, to whom some gave the name of Ialdabaoth, others of Sabaoth. They said that woman was made by Satan; and that those who married did the work of Satan. Indeed they taught that only half of man, from the navel upwards, was God's work; his lower parts had been made by the devil. This theoretical justification of abstinence from marriage they had in common with other Gnostic sects (Iren. I. xxiv. 2). But they justified their abstinence from wine by a myth, of which we do not read elsewhere, that the vine had sprung from carnal intercourse between the serpent and the earth; and they pretended to discover in the form of the plant and of its fruit, traces of its serpent origin. Though the sect described by Epiphanius has affinities with those called Ophites, they plainly held the serpent in no honour, but regarded it as a type of the evil principle.

It may reasonably be doubted whether there really was an Encratite teacher named Severus, or whether sects did not merely get the Latin name of Severians from the austerity of their rule of life. [G. S.]

SEVERUS (4), Oct. 22, priest of Heraclea, and martyr with St. Philip, bishop of that city, under a magistrate named Justinus. His sufferings are narrated in acts of Philip in Ruinart's *Acta Sincera* [PHILIPPUS (3)]. [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (5), FLAVIUS VALERIUS, chosen Caesar at Nicomedia in 305 by Diocletian; died as Augustus in April 307. Clinton's *Fasti*, A.D. 305–307. [*Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.*] [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (6), a correspondent of Lactantius, to whom he addressed two books of his epistles. Jerome mentions among ecclesiastical writers one Aquilius Severus, a Spaniard, and a member of the same family [LACTANTIUS, Vol. III. p. 615]. (Ceillier, ii. 507, iv. 347.) [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (7), ST., bishop of Ravenna. The one certain fact about him is that he attended and subscribed the decrees of the council of Sardica, A.D. 343 or 344. (Hilar. *Frag.* ii. 14, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* x. 643.) See also Agnellus, *Lib. Pont.* in *Patr. Lat.* cvi. 491, *Script. Rer. Lang.* 283, and *AA. SS.* Feb. i. 79). [F. D.]

SEVERUS (8), a tribune of the city of Eleutheropolis in Palestine. He was a Luciferian and is mentioned in the *Libellus Precum* of Faustinus and Marcellinus. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiii. 82.) [FAUSTINUS (33).] [MARCELLINUS (3).] [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (9), a chorepiscopus and witness to the subscription of Eustathius appended to the confession drawn up by St. Basil to satisfy Theodotus of Nicopolis. (Basil. *Epist.* 125.) [BASILIUS, Vol. I. p. 292.] [EUSTATHIUS (4).] [THEODOTUS.] [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (10), a blind butcher of Milan, whose restoration to sight St. Ambrose declares to have been effected by touching the relics of St. Gervasius. See GERVASIUS (1), Vol. II. p. 666, where this case is discussed. [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (11), a bishop of Southern Italy, to whom one of St. Ambrose's letters (lix.) was written [AMBROSIUS, Vol. I. p. 91]. He may probably be identified with St. Severus, bishop of Naples. [J. Ll. D.]

SEVERUS (12) SANCTUS (ENDELECHIUS). Perhaps identical with the rhetorician mentioned in the subscription of the cod. Flor. of Apuleius, as teaching at Rome in the year A.D. 395. He is the author of a Christian idyl, in Asclepiad metre, upon the subject of a great cattle-plague; possibly that mentioned by St. Ambrose (*comm. in Luc.* x. 10). This plague occurred about A.D. 376, which fact, together with the date assigned for Endelechius's teaching, and the possibility that he was the correspondent of St. Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* 28, 6), would fix the date of the poem to the end of the 4th or beginning of the 5th century. The poem itself, which is entitled "de mortibus boum," is written with some taste and a good deal of vigour. It represents certain herdsmen—apparently Aquitanians—discussing their fortunes in the general affliction. One of them asserts that his herds have been protected by the sign of the Cross, and by his own belief in Christ. The others resolve to adopt a religion which, according to his account, is at once profitable and easy. The poem has been often edited: first by Pithoeus, Paris, 1586. It is to be found in Wernsdorf, *Poetae Lat. min.* ii.; Migne, xix. (Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 290; Ebert, *Gesch. der Chr.-Lat. Lit.*; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, x. 626, 2nd ed.; Teuffel, vol. ii.) [ENDELECHIUS.] [H. A. W.]

SEVERUS (13), presbyter of Constantinople, who in 403 accompanied GERMANUS (32), and the rest of Chrysostom's deputation to the synod of the oak (Pallad. *Dial.* c. 2 in *Pat. Gr.* xlvii. 9). [C. H.]

SEVERUS (14), bishop in Bruttium or Calabria, addressed by pope Innocent I. (Innocentii *Epist.* 38, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 605.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (15), bishop of Sitifa, whose niece was carried off by barbarians, A.D. 409, but restored (Aug. *Ep.* 111. 7). [H. W. P.]

SEVERUS (16), addressed by St. Nilus (lib. iii. ep. 199), in reference to Chrysostom's exile and sufferings. [C. H.]

SEVERUS (17), a presbyter, a friend of Chrysostom who writes remonstrating on his silence. (Chrys. *Ep.* 101.) [E. V.]

SEVERUS (18), SULPICIUS (as to the different modes of writing the name, see Ceillier viii. 110 note and *Hist. Litt.* ii. 95), ecclesiastical historian in Gaul in the latter half of the 4th and beginning of the 5th centuries, belonged to a noble family of Aquitaine, and, being rather younger than his friend St. Paulinus, of Nola, was born after the year 353. He adopted advocacy as his profession and married a woman of consular rank and wealth, who however did not long survive the marriage. About 392, while yet in the flower of his age, caressed and praised by all, and attaining eminence in his profession (Paulinus, *Ep.* v., Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxi. 169–170), he braved the anger of his father and the flouts of worldly acquaintances (*ibid.* i. col. 154), to retire from the world. Thenceforth in the company of a few disciples and servants he led a life of ascetic seclusion and literary activity, varied by occasional visits to his friend and master St. Martin of Tours (Paulinus, *Ep.* xvii.), and chequered, as we gather from Paulinus, by some troubles and serious illness (*Epp.* i., xvii.). The place of his abode is not quite certain, but was probably Primuliacum, a village between Toulouse and Carcassonne, where he built two churches (ibid. *Ep.* xxxii.) It was probably an estate of his wife or mother-in-law, his father apparently having disinherited him (cf. *Epist. ad Bassulam*). According to Gennadius he was a priest, but this has been questioned, and his tone towards the bishops and clergy, against whom he never misses an opportunity of inveighing as vain, luxurious, self-seeking, factious foes of Christianity and envious persecutors of his hero St. Martin, lends countenance to the doubt (*Hist. Sacr.* ii. 32; *Vita S. Martini*, 27; *Dialogi* 1, 2, 9, 21, 24, 26). Later authors have believed him a monk, some of Marmoûtiers, Martin's foundation at Tours, others of Marseilles, whither he may have been driven by the Vandal invasion. That he had taken monastic vows seems probable from the 1st cap. of the 1st Dialogue (cf. also ii. 8). The same Gennadius asserts that in his old age he was deceived into Pelagianism, but recognising the fault of loquacity he remained mute till his death, in order by penitential silence to correct the sin he had committed by much speaking. Others upon the ground of a passage in St. Jerome (Hieronym. *in Ezech.* cap. xxxvi., Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xx. 85) have accused him of Millennarianism. There is no doubt that at the Roman council held by pope Gelasius in A.D. 494 the *Dialogi*, under the name of *opuscula Postumiani et Galli*, were placed among the *libri apocryphi* (Mansi, viii. 151). The charge rested on *Dial.* ii. 14, where a strange theory as to the imminent appearance among men of Nero and Antichrist is put into the mouth of St. Martin. The chapter has been expunged in many of the Italian MSS. (Halm. *Sulpic. Sev. Praefatio*). The date of his death is unknown, and various years have been suggested between 406 and 429. Though he was never canonized, the belief to that effect having probably arisen from a confusion between him and St. Sulpicius I., bishop of Bourges (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 968–9), he was commemorated from immemorial antiquity at Tours (Ceillier, viii. 110). The principal authorities for his life are the short biography of Gennadius (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* xix. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 1071), the letters of his friend Paulinus of Nola, with whom between the years 394 and 403 there was a constant interchange of gifts and letters, though only one letter of Sulpicius, and that probably a forgery, survives (*Epp.* i., v., xi., xvii., xxii.-xxiv., xxvii.–xxxii., Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxi., 153–330; Ceillier, vii., 55 sqq.), allusions in his own writings, especially in the *Vita S. Martini*, the *Epistolae*, and the *Dialogi*, and a panegyric by Paulinus of Périgueux (*De Vita S. Martini* lib. v. *Pat. Lat.* lxi. 1052). He is often referred to by Gregory of Tours, who himself wrote four books on the Miracles of St. Martin (see *Mirac. S. Martini*, I., 1), and many other ancient authors. These passages are collected in *Pat. Lat.* xx. 88 sqq. Among modern accounts of him may be mentioned the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 95 sqq.; Ceillier, viii. 110 sqq.; Herbert, *Oeuvres, Traduction, Pref.* p. 5; and particularly the exhaustive notice of Jacob Bernays, *Die Chronik des Sulp. Sev.*, Berlin, 1861.

His works consist of the *Historia Sacra* or *Chronica*, a Life of St. Martin of Tours, three letters, and three Dialogues. The first of these, written about 403, was, as he informs us in the preface, an attempt to give a concise history of the world with dates from the Creation down to his own times, the consulship of Stilicho in 400. The sources he draws from are the Septuagint, the ancient Latin version of the Scriptures, the Chronicles of Eusebius, and the *Historici Ethnici*, as he calls the non-Christian authors (Herbert, *Notice*, p. 7). The first book and a portion of the second (caps. 1–27) are occupied with universal history down to the birth of Christ (see Ceillier, viii. 115; *Hist. Litt.* ii. 106–8; Herbert, *Notice*, p. 6–7 and Bernays, pp. 29 ff. for a discussion of the chronology and distinctive points of this portion). Then, omitting the period covered by the Gospel narrative and Acts of the Apostles, he adds some details to Josephus' narrative of the siege of Jerusalem, recounts persecutions of the Christians under nine emperors, and describes the Invention of the Cross by St. Helena, as he had heard it from Paulinus (see *Ep.* xxxi., *Pat. Lat.* lxi. 325 sqq.). His account of the Arian controversy (lib. ii. 35–45) is inaccurate, and of little value as a contribution to its history, but a more important portion of the work is the narrative contained in chapters 46–51 (supplemented by *Dial.* iii. 11–13) of the Priscillianist heresy, which had arisen in his own time, and with the details of which he was familiar.

The *Vita S. Martini*, the earliest in point of time of his writings, is very important as containing, with the Dialogues and three letters, practically everything that is authentic about, perhaps, the most popular saint of Western Christendom; the poem of Paulinus of Périgueux (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxi. 1009 sqq.) and the life by Venantius Fortunatus (*ibid.* lxxxviii.

363 sqq.), deriving all the worth they possess from Sulpicius' narrative [MARTIN (1)]. He tells us that having long heard of the sanctity and miracles of Martin he undertook a journey to Tours to see him, and during his visit addressed to him all the questions he could, and got all the information he was able from eyewitnesses and those who knew (cap. 25). This visit, which probably took place about 394, was followed by many others. It was published during Martin's lifetime.

In the *Dialogi*, written about 405, the interlocutors are his friend Postumianus, who has just returned from a three years' stay in the East, Gallus, a disciple of St. Martin now dead, and Sulpicius himself. Twenty-two chapters of the first contain interesting pictures of the controversy at Alexandria between Theophilus, the archbishop, and the monks concerning the works of Origen, St. Jerome at his church in Bethlehem, and the monks and hermits of the Thebaid. His experiences concluded, Postumianus asks about St. Martin, and bears witness to the enormous popularity of the Life, which was known to almost every country of the world. Paulinus had introduced it at Rome, where the whole city had fought for it, and the booksellers were exultant. All Carthage was reading it, the Alexandrians knew its contents almost better than the author, and it had penetrated into Egypt, Nitria and the Thebaid.[a] All were clamouring for those further wonders which Sulpicius knew, but had omitted from the Life (Cap. 23, cf. *Vita, Prologus*). The remainder of the Dialogues is almost entirely occupied with a recital of these additional miracles of Martin, put into the mouth of his disciple Gallus, the audience in the third dialogue being swelled by some monks, clergy, and one or two laymen (cap. 1).

The Epistles to his mother-in-law, Bassula, Eusebius and Aurelius are also on the subject of St. Martin, the first giving the story of his death and burial. Seven more letters have been published under Sulpicius' name. Several of them have been generally suspected (Ceillier, 119–120), but they are all pronounced spurious by Halm (*Pref.* xi.–xiii.) though he prints them. Gennadius says he wrote many letters to his sister, exhorting to contempt of the world, two to Paulinus, and more to other people (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* xix.) It was perhaps this sentence which suggested the forgeries, if forgeries they are, two of them purporting to be addressed to his sister Claudia and one to Paulinus. Lastly, the life of St. Paulinus of Nola has been wrongly attributed to him by Honorius of Autun (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* ii. 19, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 92).

As to editions, the *Vita S. Martini*, as it was the first written, so it was the first printed, by Aldus Manutius in 1501, and again in the following year. The *Historia Sacra*, or *Chronica*, was first published at Basle in 1556. The collected works appear to have been printed at Basle in 1565 for the first time. The editions are very numerous, but the most noteworthy are those of Giselinus at Antwerp in 1574, of Sigonius at Bononia in 1581, of Drusius at Arnheim in 1607, of Hornius at Leyden in 1647, and the much superior one of Père Jérôme de Prato at Verona in 1741 and 1754. Galland reproduced this last in tom. viii. with the addition of the seven doubtful letters, and this version has been adopted in Migne's *Patrologia Latina* (xx. 95 sqq.) But the best edition is that of C. Halm (*Sulpicii Severi Libri qui supersunt*, Vindob. 1866), the preface to which gives some notes on the various MSS. See also Ceillier, viii. 122 sqq., *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 104 sqq., 742–3, and Bernays, *ibid.* pp. 71–2. His works have been several times translated into French, among others by M. Herbert (*Oeuvres de Sulp. Sev. Traduction nouvelle*, Paris, 1847).

Apart from the unique history of St. Martin, which, however, is the worst of his writings from a literary point of view, Sulpicius' chief title to fame rests on the beauty and purity of his style ('eloquia tua tam facunda quam casta,' Paulinus, *Ep.* xi. *Patr. Lat.* col. 197). He has successfully avoided that pitfall of his countrymen, the "ubertas gallici nitorque sermonis" of which Jerome speaks (*Epist.* cxxv. *ad Rusticum*, *Patr. Lat.* xxii. 1072), and it is not too much to say that in respect of style he is pre-eminent, if not unique, among ecclesiastical authors, and well merits his appellation of the 'Christian Sallust.' He seems to have taken this historian as his model, but his writings bear traces of familiarity with Virgil, Livy, Tacitus, and most of the classical authors. Perhaps, like other copies, his work is somewhat lacking in vigour. Nor is it entirely free from the affectations and bad taste of his time. The polish of the style moreover often contrasts strangely with the credulity and superstition of the narrative, which in the case of Martin's Miracles, had evidently excited scepticism even among the Christians in Sulpicius' own time (see *Dial.* iii. 6). For a discussion of the whole question of the supernatural in this connection see MARTIN (1), and for an estimate of Sulpicius' works see Ceillier, viii. 121–2.

[S. A. B.]

SEVERUS (19), bishop of Mileum or Mileus, a native of the same place as Augustine, and a fellow student, but probably older than he; also a member of the same monastic community with him and also Alypius and Evodius, and a friend of Augustine throughout his life. He became bishop of Mileum about the beginning of the 5th century, succeeding Honorius. Early in his episcopate, probably in A.D. 401, it became necessary for Augustine, together with Alypius and Samsucius, to explain their own conduct in the matter of Timotheus, and to call on Severus to accept their explanation (Aug. *Ep.* 62, 63), but this temporary misunderstanding by no means interrupted the friendship between him and Augustine, nor does it seem to have caused any ill-will on his part towards Timotheus (August. *En. Ps.* 95. 1; *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xxi. cap. 4). In a letter of somewhat later date, perhaps A.D. 406, addressed to Novatus, Augustine mentions with regret how seldom he was able to see his old friend, who wrote but seldom, and then chiefly on business, not from want of good will but from necessity (Aug. *Ep.* 84). Severus was also on friendly terms with Paulinus of Nola,

[a] This statement is curiously confirmed by the extraordinary number of the existing MSS. of the *Vita*, see Halm (*Sulp. Sev. Praefatio*, p. viii.)

with whom he exchanged letters and friendly messages (*ibid.* 31. 9, and 32. 1); and when Augustine wrote to Olympius, the bearer of the letter, a presbyter of Mileum, was desired by Severus, who joined in the request contained in it, to call at Hippo on his way, and to convey to him their joint salutations (*Ep.* 97.) [OLYMPIUS (10).] About A.D. 409 Severus wrote to Augustine a letter, conveyed by Quodvultdeus and Gaudentius, expressing the great delight which he took in his writings, and the benefit which he derived from them as leading him to greater love of God, and begging him to write to him in return (*Ep.* 109). To this Augustine with his monks replied, sending the letter by Timotheus, and in it disclaimed his friend's eulogies, and insisting that he himself is a debtor to him. He entreats him however to bear in mind his many pressing occupations, which leave him, as he says, little more than a few drops of time. He hopes that he will visit him, in which case he will see the truth of this statement, and that he will discourage others from writing to him (*Ep.* 110). An anonymous letter, of unknown date, supposed, formerly, but without good reason, to have come from St. Jerome, mentions to Augustine the writer's disappointment at not finding him at the place, Legis or Leges, where he expected to do so, but expressing his pleasure at finding his dear friend (partem animae) Severus (*Ep.* 270). He appears to have gone to Carthage, to attend the conference there, A.D. 411, but to have been obliged by infirmity to retire before the business had begun (*Carth. Coll.* i. 215). He appears however to have joined in the address to Innocentius concerning Pelagianism, A.D. 416 (Aug. *Ep.* 175, 176). He died probably about A.D. 426, for in his account of the appointment of Eraclius, his own successor, Augustine mentions what had taken place at Mileum after the death of Severus, then a recent event. Before his death he had nominated a successor, but made known the nomination to the clergy only and not to the laity, whose minds were much disturbed by the omission: and Augustine was obliged to make a journey to Mileum to settle the question, which he was able to do without change as to the nominee of Severus (*ibid.* 213). He appears to have been an amiable and pious man and a good preacher, but perhaps wanting in judgment. [H. W. P.]

SEVERUS (20), a blind deacon at Hippo, whose charity towards his mother and sister is praised by Augustine (*Serm.* 156 § 5 in *Pat. Lat.* xxxix. 1576; Tillem. xiii. 853). [C. H.]

SEVERUS (21), ST., Aug. 8 (cf. *D. C. A.*), a priest at Vienne, contemporary with St. Germanus of Auxerre, mentioned by Ado archbishop of Vienne (*Chron.* in *Pat. Lat.* cxxiii. 103). Ado calls him a native of India who quitted his country to preach the faith in various parts. Coming to Vienne he converted many pagans, destroyed an idol temple, and erected a church before the city gate. Germanus passed through Vienne on his way to Italy as the church was near its completion, and promised that he would attend the dedication. The day for this ceremony arrived, and just as the service was about to commence the corpse of Germanus on its way from Italy was borne in. Tillemont (xv. 23), mentions an inscription, but of no early authority, to the effect that Severus died in 430. [C. H.]

SEVERUS (22), bishop of Minorca, is known only by his encyclical letter referred to in the book *de Miraculis S. Stephani*, i. 2, composed by order of EVODIUS (3) of Uzalis, first published by Baronius (*Ann.* A.D. 418), and reprinted in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 731, and again in the Appendix—*de S. Stephani reliquiis*—to St. Augustine's *de Civitate Dei*, xli. 821. OROSIUS had brought some of the recently discovered relics of the saint to Minorca, and deposited them in the church at Magona (Port Mahon), where there were a large number of Jews, one of whom, the Rabbi Theodorus, was *defensor civitatis*. The arrival of the relics caused great religious excitement among the Christians, which led to constant arguments between them and Jews. A day was fixed for a conference, so as to allow time for the return of Theodorus from Majorca, and in the meantime the Jews placed in their synagogue stones and weapons to defend themselves, while Severus with a great number of the Christians of Jammona, the other town in the island, where he resided, proceeded to Magona. On his arrival he summoned the Jews to meet him at the church, and on their declining, on the ground that it was the Sabbath, and they would be polluted by entering it, he proposed meeting them at the synagogue. Again being met with a refusal, he demanded why they had collected arms in the synagogue, and on their denial marched thither at the head of the Christians. On the way stones were thrown at the procession by some persons, the Christians retaliated, and, though no one was hurt, the synagogue was set on fire, and nothing left but the bare walls. These events were followed by the conversion of a great number of the Jews, including Theodorus himself, and also including some who had fled the country but afterwards returned. In all about 540 were baptized, but it may be doubted whether in all cases the conversions were sincere or were caused by fear of violence. On the site of the destroyed synagogue the Jews erected a church. These events took place in the last week of January, A.D. 418. (Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (1) 406.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (23), thirteenth bishop of Trèves, and a man of singular sanctity, was disciple of St. Lupus of Troyes, and accompanied St. Germanus in his second missionary visit to Britain, A.D. 447. To this work Severus was invited when preaching to the tribes of Germania Prima: the same account of him is given by Bede (*H. E.* i. c. 21), and in the Lives of St. Lupus [LUPUS (2)] (Boll. *A. SS.* Jul. vii. 75, 81, 83, 93), and St. Germanus [GERMANUS (8)] (*Ib.* Jul. vii. 227; Surius, *Vit. SS.* vii. 421, 422). He died A.D. 455, and his feast is Oct. 15 (*Ib.* Oct. vii. 31–4; Fleury, *H. E.* xxvii. 7, xxix. 43; *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 378). [J. G.]

SEVERUS (24), LIBIUS, emperor at Rome from A.D. 461–465. He died in Rome Aug. 15, 465. Some of his coins will be found in Eckhel, t. viii. p. 196, and some of his laws in Novell. v. i. p. 37, and ii. p. 38. Clinton's *Fasti*; DICT. GR. AND ROM. BIOG. [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (25), a bishop to whom pope Simplicius writes in November, A.D. 475, on the case of Gaudentius, bishop of Aufinium. [GAUDENTIUS (16)]. Gaudentius having been deprived of the power of ordaining, Severus was if necessary, to ordain in his stead. (Simplicii *Epp.* 3 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 37.) [F. D]

SEVERUS (26), ST., abbat, patron of Agde. His *Acta*, which were first published by Mabillon, and are also to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. v. 159, were apparently written by a monk of Agde, probably more than two centuries after his death (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 50, 682). They are of little value. Severus's day is Aug. 25, but he does not appear in the ancient martyrologies (Boll. *ibid.* p. 156). [S. A. B.]

SEVERUS (27), patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 512–519; a Monophysite, intruded into the see by Anastasius on the deposition of Flavian. Severus may be regarded as the true scientific head of the previously headless party of the Acephali, sharing with Philoxenus (Xenaias) the origination of the Jacobite form of Monophysitism, so long prevalent in Egypt, and still maintained by the Copts. The memory of Severus is still solemnly honoured in all the Jacobite communions, by whom he is regarded as only second to Cyril and Dioscorus (Neale, *Patr. of Alexandria*, ii. 28), and styled, *par excellence*, "the patriarch." His name is commemorated in several of the Jacobite liturgies with those of Dioscorus, Philoxenus, etc. (Renaudot, *Liturg.* 230, 260, 291, 481, 505.) It is unfortunate for a just estimate of Severus's character and work that we know him and his actions almost exclusively through the distorted medium of the testimony of his theological opponents, many of whose disparaging statements, dictated by a polemical rancour which, it must be confessed, his own violence and party bitterness did little to disarm, may be safely regarded as the exaggerations of those who desired to believe all that was ill of one whom they found to be so able and so powerful an antagonist. We learn from Evagrius (*H. E.* iii. 33) that Severus was a native of Sozopolis in Pisidia ("de Severo gloriatum Sozopolis," *Offic. Syr. Jacobit.*). By birth and education he was a heathen. He devoted himself to legal studies, and practised as an advocate at Berytus. In the memorial presented to Mennas by the monks of Jerusalem and Syria, he is accused of having practised magical arts. To escape the odium he had thus incurred, he is charged by the same suspicious authority with having feigned conversion to Christianity, being baptized in the martyry of Leontius at Tripolis (Evagr. *l. c.*; Labbe, v. 40, 120).

He had scarcely been admitted into the orthodox communion when he openly united himself to the Acephali, repudiating not only his own baptism and his baptizer, but the Catholic church itself as infected with Nestorianism, and denouncing the "holy houses of God as lodging places of heresy and impiety." (Labbe, *u. s.*) On embracing Monophysite doctrines, he assumed the monastic life in a monastery apparently belonging to that sect between Gaza and its port Majuma. Here he met with Peter the Iberian, a zealous Eutychian, who had been ordained bishop of Gaza by Theodosius, the fanatical Monophysite monk, during the time of his usurpation of the see of Jerusalem, and who had subsequently been one of the ordaining prelates of Timothy Aelurus, and had been banished together with him (Evagr. *l. c.*). About this time Severus seems to have joined a Eutychian brotherhood near Eleutheropolis under the Archimandrite Mamas [MAMAS (2)], by whom he was still further confirmed in his Monophysite opinions. (Liberat. *Brev.* c. xix.; Labbe, v. 762; Evagr. *l. c.*) These were of the most extreme character. He rejected the "Henoticon" of Zeno, to which he applied various contumelious epithets, such as κενωτικόν, "the annulling edict," and διαιρετικόν, "the disuniting edict" (Labbe, v. 121), and anathematized Peter Mongus, the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, for accepting it. We next hear of Severus in an Egyptian monastery, of which one Nephalius was abbat [NEPHALIUS], who, having been formerly a Monophysite, had embraced the orthodox faith as formulated at Chalcedon. Severus engaged in a controversy with Nephalius, with the view of bringing him back to his former opinions. His arguments may have proved too subtle for Nephalius to refute, or their frank heresy may have shocked his former sympathizer, who with his monks expelled Severus and his partizans from their monastery. (Evagr. *l. c.* cf. iii. 22.) Severus is charged with having stirred up a fierce religious war among the excitable population of Alexandria, resulting in bloodshed and conflagrations. (Labbe, v. 121.) To escape the punishment of his turbulence, Severus fled to Constantinople, supported by a band of 200 Monophysite monks. (Labbe, iv. 1419.) He appeared in the capacity of an "apocrisiarius," though whom he represented is somewhat doubtful. Liberatus's language, however, indicates that he was deputed by Peter Mongus (Labbe, v. 762), which is accepted by the cautious Tillemont. (*Mém. Ecclés.* xvi. 684.) On being reproached with having previously anathematized Peter, Severus is said to have replied that it was true he had anathematized *a* Peter; but this was not Peter Mongus, but Peter of Apamea. (Liberat. *l. c.*) Anastasius, who had succeeded the author of the Henoticon in 491, was a declared favourer of the Eutychians. By him Severus was received with honour. His advent, however, was an unhappy one for the peace of Constantinople. The streets of the city were the scene of a sanguinary tumult stirred up by rival bands of monks, orthodox and Monophysite, chanting in their respective churches the opposing forms of the "Trisagion," to which sacred formula the obnoxious clause added by Peter the Fuller, "who wast crucified for us," imparted a heretical colour. There was a wild and fierce fray, resulting in the humiliation of Anastasius, the temporary triumph of the patriarch Macedonius, and the depression of the Monophysite cause. (Theophan. p. 132.) This took place A.D. 511. For the deposition of Macedonius, and subsequently of Flavian, patriarch of Antioch, the articles devoted to those two names may be consulted. [MACEDONIUS; FLAVIANUS.] Severus was eagerly despatched by Anastasius to occupy the vacant throne of Antioch A.D. 511. He was ordained, or, in the words of his adversaries, "received the shadow of ordination" (Labbe, v. 40), and enthroned on the same day in his patriarchal

city. (Labbe, iv. 1414; Theod. Lect. ii. 31, p. 563, 567; Theophan. p. 134.) The attempt of Timotheus to substitute Severus's name for that of Flavian in the Constantinopolitan diptychs was frustrated by the people. (Theoph. p. 135.) If the statement of the *Synodicon* is to be credited (Labbe, iv. 1414) that Anastasius had made him swear that he would never speak or act against the council of Chalcedon, Severus speedily showed how little store he set by the sanctity of an oath compared with the triumph of his theological dogmas, since on the very day of his enthronement he solemnly pronounced in his church an anathema on Chalcedon, and accepted the "Henoticon" which he had previously repudiated. He also caused the name of Peter Mongus to be inscribed in the diptychs; declared himself in communion with the Eutychian prelates, Timotheus of Constantinople and John Niciota of Alexandria; and received into communion Peter of Iberia and the other leading members of the Acephali. (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 33; Labbe, iv. 1414, v. 121, 762; Theod. Lect. *l. c.*) Eutychianism seemed now triumphant throughout the Christian world. Proud of his patriarchal dignity, and strong in the emperor's protection, Severus despatched his enthronistic and synodal letters to his brother prelates, announcing his elevation and demanding communion. In these he anathematized Chalcedon, and all who maintained the two natures. These letters met with a very varied reception. Many rejected them altogether. Among these were the metropolitans, Julian of Bostra and Epiphanius of Tyre, who presented a prolix memorial to the council under Mennas, A.D. 536, detailing his impieties and cruelties (Labbe, v. 194, 202), Theodorus of Antaradus, and the bishops of Tripolis and of Arce. (Labbe, v. 196.) Those of Eutychian proclivities received the letters gladly while they were accepted by not a few through fear of the consequences of refusal. These apprehensions were not unfounded. A fierce and sanguinary persecution of the adherents of the orthodox faith was set on foot in the patriarchate. In this Severus had Peter of Apamea as his zealous associate. In conjunction with him, Severus is charged with having planted in ambush a body of Jewish mercenaries, who fell upon a body of pilgrims to the mandra of St. Simeon, of whom they butchered 250, leaving their unburied corpses by the roadside, burned over their heads the monasteries in which the fugitives had taken refuge, and slaughtered their monastic inmates. (Evagr. iii. 33; Labbe, iv. 1462; v. 157, 194–202.) Not a few of the bishops and clergy of the patriarchate fled from their charge, among whom Evagrius particularizes Julian of Bostra, Peter of Damascus, and Severus's former instructor in Eutychian doctrine, the abbat Mamas. Others were deposed and banished. (Theophanes, p. 107.) The monasteries of Palestine, and Jerusalem itself remained steadfast to the orthodox faith, for which Elias, patriarch of Jerusalem, suffered deposition. (Evagr. *l. c.*) Two of Severus's own suffragans, Cosmas of Epiphania and Severian of Arethusa, had the hardihood to draw up a sentence of deposition against their patriarch, which they caused to be placed in his hands by the archdeacon Aurelian, disguised as a female, under colour of presenting a petition. (Evagr. iii. 34.) Anastasius commanded the deposition of the two remonstrants and of the others who refused communion with Severus; but, on learning that this edict could not be carried out without risk of riot and bloodshed, he allowed them to remain undisturbed. (Evagr. *l. c.*) John, appointed patriarch of Jerusalem in room of Elias, who, as the price of his elevation, had promised communion with Severus and acceptance of the Monophysite doctrines, when once firmly established turned round under the influence of St. Sabbas, and undeterred by the threats of fine and imprisonment, refused to communicate with him (Theophan. p. 136). But notwithstanding these defections, Monophysitism was everywhere in the ascendant in the East, and Severus was deservedly regarded as its chief champion and "a horn of salvation to the orthodox." (Severus of Ashmunain apud Neale, *Patr. Alex.* ii. 27.) Synodal letters were interchanged between John Niciota and Severus; the earliest examples of that intercommunication between the Jacobite sees of Alexandria and Antioch, which has been kept up to the present day. (Neale, *l. c.*) The triumph of Severus was however short. His sanguinary tyranny over the patriarchate of Antioch did not survive his imperial patron. Anastasius was succeeded in 518 by the rude Dacian peasant-soldier Justin, who at once declared for the orthodox faith. The Monophysite prelates were everywhere deposed to make room for orthodox successors. Severus was one of the first to fall. His deposition was hastened, it is said, by the urgency of the orthodox but dangerously powerful Scythian officer, Vitalian, who had been the object of attack in some of Severus's harangues. Irenaeus, the count of the East, was commissioned to arrest him and have his tongue cut out as a punishment for his blasphemies. Severus, however, managed to evade this edict, and after having been detained in Antioch for a while under the strictest surveillance he effected his escape, and in September 518, embarking at Seleucia, the port of Antioch, by night, set sail for Alexandria, whither Julian of Halicarnassus had preceded him. (Liberat. *Brev. l. c.*; Theophan. 141; Evagr. *H. E.* iv. 4.) Paul was ordained in his room. His adherents seceded from the church, and Severus and his doctrines were anathematized in various councils. At Alexandria the reception of Severus by his fellow religionists was enthusiastic. He was gladly welcomed by the patriarch Timotheus, and generally hailed as the champion of the orthodox faith against the corruptions of Nestorianism. His learning and argumentative power established his authority as "os omnium doctorum," and the day of his entrance into Egypt was long celebrated as a Jacobite festival. (Neale, *u. s.* p. 30.) Alexandria speedily became the common home of Monophysites of every shade of opinion, who formed too powerful a body for the emperor to molest. The refugees were no sooner delivered from the apprehension of open persecution than fierce controversies arose among themselves on various subtle questions connected with Christ's nature and His human body. A vehement dispute arose between Severus and his fellow-exile, Julian of Halicarnassus, as to the corruptibility of our Lord's human body before His resurrection. The latter held that Christ's body was not only not

subject to corruption, but that it was also free from the transient character of ordinary human bodies, and elevated above the wear and tear and consequent necessity for reparation by food and sleep incident to them. Julius and his followers were therefore styled "Aphthartodocetae" and "Phantasiastae," as it was asserted that they made Christ's body a mere appearance, not a reality. Severus, and his adherents, who maintained the opposite view, received from their opponents the opprobrious epithets of "Phthartolatrae" or "Corrupticolae," and "Ktistolatrae." The controversy was a warm and protracted one, and no settlement was arrived at. The Jacobites, however, claim the victory for Severus, whom they commemorate with special honour for having "confounded the phantasiastic dreams of Julian." (Renaudot, p. 129.) After spending some years in Egypt in perpetual literary and polemical activity, Severus found himself unexpectedly summoned to Constantinople by Justin's successor, Justinian. Though himself an orthodox Christian, his empress Theodora warmly favoured the Eutychian party. The emperor himself had become utterly weary of the turmoil and confusion caused by the long continued theological discussions. Severus, he was told, was the master of the Monophysite party. If unity was to be regained it could only be by his influence. Letters passed between the emperor and empress, which Nicephorus speaks of as extant in his time (Nic. Callist. *H. E.* lib. xvii. c. 8). At this period, A.D. 535, Anthimus had been recently appointed to the see of Constantinople by Theodora's influence. He was a concealed Eutychian, who on his accession at once threw off the orthodox mask, and joined heartily with Severus and his associates, Peter of Apamea and Zoaras, in their endeavours to annul the Chalcedonian decrees and cause Monophysitism to be recognised as the orthodox faith. According to the memorial of the eastern monks, presented at the council under Mennas, this introduction of zealous and turbulent Monophysites threw the city into great religious disorder. The newcomers were active in propagating their tenets, establishing private conventicles of their co-religionists, baptizing privately and even in public, and leading large numbers to embrace their pernicious heresy. (Labbe, v. 124.) The further progress of this audacious attempt to establish Monophysitism in the imperial city is fully narrated in other articles, and need not be repeated here. (JUSTINIANUS I. *D. C. B.* iii. 545 B, 546 A; ANTHIMUS, AGAPETUS.) The result was that, at the instance of pope Agapetus, who happened to visit Constantinople on political business at this time, the Monophysites Anthimus and Timotheus were deposed, and Severus was again subjected to an anathema. The orthodox Mennas succeeded to Anthimus's vacated seat. (Liberat. *Breviar.* c. xxi.; Labbe, v. 774.) The new patriarch summoned a local synod, *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα*, in the months of May and June A.D. 536, to deal with the Monophysite question, and to consider the charges brought against Severus and his associates. The "Acta" of this council include a number of memorials presented by oriental prelates clergy and monks directed against the Monophysite leaders, in which Severus is accused of acts of the utmost impiety, blasphemy, violence and cruelty. (Labbe, v. 101–251.) Their condemnation was a foregone conclusion. Severus and his two companions were all pronounced to have wilfully chosen the "sin unto death," and therefore the previous sentences against them were confirmed, and they were cast out "as wolves" from the true fold, and anathematized. (Labbe, v. 253–255.) The sentence was ratified by Justinian (*ib.* 265). [MENNAS.] The writings of Severus were proscribed, and any one possessing them who failed to commit them to the flames was sentenced to lose his right hand. (Evagr. *H. E.* iv. 11; Novell. Justinian. no. 42; Matt. Blastar. p. 59.) Severus on this returned to Egypt, which he seems never again to have left. The date and place of his death are uncertain. It is fixed variously in A.D. 538, 539, and 542. Bar-Hebraeus (ed. Abbeloos. i. 212) says that he died at Alexandria in February, A.D. 543. According to John of Ephesus, he died in the Egyptian desert, to which he had retired on his return to Egypt. (ed. Payne Smith, i. 78.) Assemâni states that he had adopted a monastic disguise, and places his death Feb. 28, A.D. 539. (*Dissert. de Monophys.*)

Severus was a very copious writer. The catalogue of his writings occupies no fewer than eleven folio pages in Assemani's great work on the Monophysites, pp. 191–201, but of all his works we possess little more than fragments. An account of them, so far as they can be identified, is given by Cave (*Hist. Lit.* vol. i. p. 499 ff.) and Fabricius (*Bibl. Graec.* lib. v. c. 36, vol. x. p. 614 ff., ed. Harless). A very large number exist only in Syriac, for which may be consulted the catalogue of the Syriac MSS. by Professor Wright in the British Museum. The Greek works mentioned by Cave and Fabricius may be thus classified. (I.) *Works on the Holy Scriptures.* Commentaries on Job, Matthew, Luke, and John, are erroneously ascribed to Severus on the ground of very frequent quotations in the *Catenae*. These however are probably passages from his sermons or other works. A commentary on the Psalms is mentioned by Bar-Hebraeus or Abul Pharagius (Cave, *u. s.* p. 501), and a work on St. Luke is quoted in one of the Coislin MS. (Montf. *Bibl. Coislin*, p. 54). Cave also mentions "Answers to questions on Holy Scripture" proposed by the chamberlain Eupraxius, which however is doubtless only one of his innumerable letters (cf. Wright's *Catal.* p. 944, col. 2, No. xii.) One of these is probably cited by Anastasius Sinaita (*Quaest.* 152, p. 612), viz. "How the three days sepulture and the resurrection of Christ are to be understood?" The fragment of an attempt to harmonize the accounts of the Resurrection given by the Evangelists published by Montfaucon from one of the Coislin MSS. and ascribed to Severus (*Bibl. Coislin*, pp. 68–75) had previously appeared among the printed works of Gregory Nyssen (ed. Paris, 1615, 1638), but it has been more correctly assigned by Combefis (*Auctar. Nov.* 1648) to Hesychius of Jerusalem. (II.) *Sermons and Homilies.* As many as 160 of these are enumerated in the various Catenae. Montfaucon gives a list of the quotations given in the *Catenae* (*u. s.* p. 53, 61). Some of these sermons are described as λόγοι ἐπιθρόνιοι, or ἐπιθρονιαστικοί, *Homiliae Cathedrales*, so called, because they were delivered from the patri-

archal throne. They were delivered in the Church of St. Ignatius by Severus, who "took occasion from time to time to turn aside from his main text, and commemorate as a man of like spirit, the apostolic martyr whose reliques reposed in the building" (Lightfoot, *S. Ignatius* i. 48). The wide popularity of these epithroniastic orations is shewn by the fact that two Syriac versions of them, to the number of 125, are extant, the earlier by Paul of Callinicus (?), the later by Jacob of Edessa, A.D. 701 (Wright's *Catalogue of Syr. MSS.* pp. 534, 546). This later version (*MSS. Addit. Brit. Mus.* 12,159, is divided into three books, containing respectively Hom. 1–50, 57–89, 90–125 (Lightfoot, *u. s.* i. pp. 25, 48, 180, ii. 419). A fragment from one of these is given by Joannes Damascenus (ed. Le Quien, vol. i. p. 504). Another fragment of a homily on St. Euphemia, in which the writer anathematizes Chalcedon, the Tome of Leo, and all who deny the two natures and the two operations, is given in the Acts of the Lateran Council, A.D. 649 (Labbe, vi. 316). Fragments of sermons on Isaiah are mentioned by Cave (*l. c.*), "ap. Cl. Galeum." Of these, Cave remarks, "Dictio ejus splendida; modus interpretandi anagogicus." A large number of Severus's sermons exist in other Syriac MSS. besides those already specified. (III.) *Polemical.* As might be expected, it was in polemics that Severus manifested his chief activity. Among the polemical works cited or named, are: (1) Φιλαλήθης directed against John of Caesarea. In this Severus is said by Anastasius (*Hodegus*, c. 6) to have undertaken to destroy the alleged authority of the fathers in favour of the doctrine of the two natures, by repudiating as forgeries all such passages as he could not explain away, and only accepting those which he was able to interpret in favour of his own views. This work is stated to have been held in the highest esteem by the Monophysites, who placed it even above the Gospel of St. John, refusing to accept any statement of the fathers unless confirmed by Severus. Severus was also the author of an *Apologia* or "Defence" of the Φιλαλήθης (Wright, *Cat.* 1323, col. 1). (2.) *A Treatise addressed to Nephalius and Simplicius* in defence of the Monophysite doctrines. This is also quoted by Anastasius Sinaita, and in Syriac MSS. (Wright, *u. s.* 1323, col. 1). (3.) *Against Joannes Grammaticus* of Caesarea, in three books, written at Alexandria after his deposition, in reply to a book published by this John in defence of the council of Chalcedon, and directed against Timotheus. This is mentioned by Anastasius (*l. c.*), and is cited in the Acts of the Lateran Council (Labbe, vi. 308). There is also a Syriac translation (Wright, *u. s.* 1323, col. 1). (4.) *Against the Codicils of Alexander*, in several books. (5.) *Against the "Testamentum" of Lampetius*, a presbyter of the Euchites; written while still a presbyter to refute the errors of that sect (Phot. *cod.* 52). (6.) *A treatise* on Ἅγιος ὁ Θεός. (7.) Ὑπακοὴ εἰς τοὺς μάρτυρας. (8.) *Against Julian of Halicarnassus*, from which there is a short citation in Photius (*cod.* 225). For Syriac translations of these see Wright, *u. s.* 554, 555, 1323. (9.) *Against Felicissimus*, in four books at least. (10.) *A dialogue against Anastasius.* (IV.) *Epistolary.* Cave remarks, "epistolae Severi pene infinitae; synodicae, enthronisticae, familiares." Montfaucon (*u. s.* pp. 55–58) furnishes a long list of letters quoted or referred to in the Coislinian MSS. Fabricius also (*u. s.* pp. 346–348) gives the names of between fifty and sixty different persons to whom it is known Severus wrote. Quotations from letters to Eleusius, Oecumenius, and Sergius Grammaticus are found in the Acts of the Lateran Council (Labbe, vi. 316), and of those to Paulus Haereticus, Anthimus and Theodosius in the Acts of the Third Council of Constantinople, (*ib.* 834, 835). Large collections of translations of the letters of Severus into Syriac exist among the Nitrian MSS. in the British Museum (see Wright's *Catalogue*, pp. 558–569). One volume (*MSS. Add.* 17,200) contains the correspondence of Severus and Julian of Halicarnassus on the Corruptibility of the Body of Christ, translated by Paul of Callinicus (Wright's *Cat.* p. 554); another that of Severus and Sergius Grammaticus on the two natures (Wright, *u. s.* 557). Cave attributes to Severus a treatise on the Ritual of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper as observed in the Syrian churches, translated into Latin from the Syriac by Guido Fabricius Boderianus (Antwerp, 1572), and erroneously assigned by him, contrary to the evidence of the Codex itself (Fabr. *u. s.* 348, 9), to Severus patriarch of Alexandria: "qui nullus unquam fuit" (Renaudot, *Liturg.* ii. 330). The active genius of this remarkable man displayed itself also in sacred poetry. Among the Syriac MSS. of the British Museum (*MSS. Add.* 17,134, 18,816) is a collection of his Hymns, two hundred and ninety-five in number, translated from the original Greek, among them being one (fol. 48a) in honour of his great predecessor on the patriarchal throne, Ignatius (Lightfoot, *u. s.* i. 91, 185). "As the teaching of Ignatius seemed to favour Monophysite doctrine, he is frequently quoted by Severus" (*ib.* 169). The translator, according to Assemani (*B. O.* ii. 47), was Paul of Callinicus, who translated the Homilies and several other works of Severus at Edessa; but Wright has shewn (*Catal.* 330, 336) that the translator of the hymns was not this Paul but his contemporary, Paul bishop of Edessa, while residing in Cyprus.

One of the Jacobite Liturgies bears the name of Severus, exchanged in some codices for that of Timotheus of Alexandria. The invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements, Renaudot remarks is continuous with the words of institution, "uno tenore dicitur," which he says is no doubtful mark of antiquity (Renaudot, *Liturg.* p. 330).

The great object of Severus was to unite the Monophysites into one compact body, with a definitely formulated Creed. In this he may be pronounced to have been successful. For notwithstanding the numerous sects and parties into which the Monophysites were divided and subdivided, he was, in Dorner's words, "strictly speaking, the scientific leader of the most compact portion of the party," and was regarded as such both by the Monophysites themselves and their opponents. He was the chief object of attack in the long waged and fierce contest with the orthodox party, by whom he is always designated as the author and ringleader of the detestable heresy they were seeking to crush. Severus's opinions, however, were far from being consistent, and no little difficulty appears to have

been experienced by his opponents in arriving at a clear and definite view of them. That he contradicted himself is constantly asserted by them. This was to some extent forced upon him by the conciliatory position he aimed at occupying. With the view of embracing as many as he could of varying theological colour, he followed the traditional formulas of the Church as closely as possible, while he affixed his own sense upon them (Dorner, *Pers. of Christ*, div. ii. vol. i. p. 136, Clark's translation). His conception of the Incarnation was, that all the human qualities remained in Christ unchanged in their nature or essence, but that they were amalgamated with the totality of the hypostasis; that they had no longer a separate existence, and having no longer any kind of centre or focus of their own no longer constituted a distinct monad. "On the contrary, the foci had become one. The monads were conjoined; the substratum in which the qualities of both natures inhered no longer had an independent subsistence (μονάδες ἰδιοσύστατοι), but formed a synthesis, and all the *idiomata* or attributes subsisted in this composite hypostasis." "Through the humanification of God (ἀνδρωθέντος θεοῦ), there arose a theandric nature (φύσις θεανδρική) and hypostasis, which put forth a new and theandric activity (θεανδρική ἐνέργεια) (Dorner, *u. s.* p. 138). With regard to the weaknesses and sufferings incident to Christ, he asserted that the divine Logos appropriated the qualities and sufferings of human nature, according as His work demanded it of Him, and of His own free will either left the body subject to its physical laws and assumed human sufferings, or on the other hand displayed His divine energy and allowed His human body to share in it. With respect to the question of the will of Christ, Severus held "that the divine and human wills were one, not merely in virtue of the identity of their aim, but also in virtue of the identity of the willing principle." He was indisposed to admit the existence of any difference relatively to the soul between the human and the divine in the matter either of wisdom or knowledge. The words "not as I will, but as Thou wilt," indicating a struggle between the two wills of Christ, Severus explained away as being merely a word of instruction for us. "The Logos could neither have feared death nor have appropriated to itself the natural human unwillingness to die, but freely permitted the flesh to undergo the sufferings of which it was physically susceptible; so that here also no act can be said to be either solely human or solely divine, but all are alike divine and human" (Dorner, *u. s.* p. 140). For a more complete statement of Severus's opinions, the great work of Dorner may be consulted, and the article "*Monophysiten*," in Herzog's *Encyclopaedia*.

(Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 33, iv. 4, 10; Theodorus Lector, ii. 31; Theophanes, *Chronogr.* pp. 132, 134, 135, 137, 141, 146; Bar-Hebraeus, ed. Abbeloos, i. 188, 190, 194, 212; John of Ephesus, ed. Payne Smith, pp. 78, 82; Liberatus, *Breviarum*, c. 19; Labbe, *Concilia*, iv. 1461; v. 105a. 263; Joann. Malal. lib. xvii., ii. 132, 133; Assemâni, *Bibl. Orient.* i.; 494, 570; ff. ii.; 54 ff.; Idem, *dissert. de Monophys.*; Ceillier, *Auteurs Eccl.* xvi. 192 ff.; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xvi. 682–720; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 730; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 499; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* (ed. Harless) viii. 679, 684, 695; x. 249, 569 614 (a list of Severus's works); Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coislin.* pp. 53, 68–75, passim; Ang. Mai, *Script. Vet. Nov. Collect.* vii. 136 ff.; 277–281; 283 ff.; 285–290; ix. 725 ff.; x. 408; Galland, *Bibl. Pat.* xii. 708–715; 719–750; Walch. *Ketzerhist.* viii. 520 ff.; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, div. ii. vol. i. pp. 133–141; Wright, Catalogue of Syriac MSS. in the British Museum, pp. 1322–1324.) [E. V.]

SEVERUS (28), a rhetorician of Constantinople, in cent. vi., to whom Ferrandus, deacon of Carthage, and disciple of Fulgentius, addressed a letter against the Sabellian, Arian, Nestorian and Eutychian heresies. [FULGENTIUS (3) FERRANDUS.] Ceillier, xi. 91. [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (29), bishop of Avranches. The time when he flourished is uncertain, but probably in the 6th century. (An anonymous Life and accounts of three translations are given in Boll. *AA. SS.* 1 Feb. vii. 187 sq.; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 468.) [J. G.]

SEVERUS (30), priest, mentioned by Gregory of Tours (*De Glor. Conf.* c. 50) as having built churches in two towns, twenty miles distant, and taken service in both every Sunday (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 376). [J. G.]

SEVERUS (31), patriarch of Aquileia, succeeded Elias about A.D. 586. Like his predecessors, he was a strenuous champion of the Three Chapters. Soon after his consecration the exarch Smaragdus seized him in his basilica at Grado, where the bishops of Aquileia had taken refuge [PAULINUS (14)], and carried him off to Ravenna with three other bishops—Severus of Trieste, John of Parenzo, and Vindemius of Ceneda. There he was imprisoned a whole year, and subjected to personal ill-treatment till he consented with his three above-mentioned suffragans, and two others, to communicate with John, the archbishop of Ravenna. He was then allowed to return to Grado, but the people refused to communicate with him till he had acknowledged his fault in communicating with those who condemned the Three Chapters, and had been received by a synod of ten bishops at Marano, in or about A.D. 589. (Paulus Diac. *Hist. Lang.* iii. 26.)

Gregory the Great, at the end of A.D. 590 or beginning of A.D. 591, wrote to Severus expressing his regret at his relapse into schism, and summoning him by the emperor's orders to Rome, with his followers, in order that a synod might be held to decide the question at issue (*Epp.* i. ind. ix. 17 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 461). Thereupon three separate appeals were presented to the emperor Maurice—the first by Severus alone; the second by him jointly with the bishops of Istria and the insular part of the province, which were still held by the Romans; the third by the bishops of the continental part which was in the hands of the Lombards. Only the third letter is extant. In it the bishops urge the injustice of the pope, from whose communion they had separated, being judge in his own cause. They profess their willingness, when peace is restored, to attend and accept the decisions of a free council at Constantinople, and point out that the clergy and people of the suf-

fragans of Aquileia are so zealous for the Three Chapters that, if the patriarch is compelled to submit by force, when future vacancies occur among his suffragans, the new bishops will be compelled to seek consecration from the bishops of Gaul, and the province of Aquileia will thus be broken up. (Mansi, x. 463.) Maurice accordingly wrote to the pope directing him to leave Severus and his suffragans alone for the present. Gregory submitted; but his letter, a year later, to the archbishop of Ravenna rebuking him for suggesting that alms should be sent to Grado, which had been burnt, shows how deeply he was annoyed (*Epp.* ii. ind. x. 46, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 585). Severus maintained his position all through Gregory's life, though Firminus of Trieste and others returned to communion with Rome. [FIRMINUS (8)]. Severus died in A.D. 606 or 607 (Paulus Diac. iv. 33), after an episcopate of twenty-one years and a month. He bequeathed all his property to his cathedral at Grado. (*Chr. Patr. Grad.* in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 394.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (32), bishop of Ficulum (Cervia) between Ariminum and Ravenna, was appointed by Gregory the Great visitor of the former church in A.D. 591, and of the latter in A.D. 595, *sede vacante* (*Epp.* i. 57; v. 25, 26). [F. D.]

SEVERUS (33), priest of a church in the valley of Interocrina, near Tudertum, according to Gregory the Great (*Dial.* i. 12), was summoned, while pruning his vineyard, to the deathbed of one of his flock. Delaying a little to finish his work he found the man dead on his arrival. Being greatly grieved thereat, he was weeping and bitterly reproaching himself, when the dead man came to life again, his restoration being granted to the tears of Severus. He is commemorated on February 15 (*AA. SS.* Feb. ii. 826). [F. D.]

SEVERUS (34), scholasticus, or councillor to the exarch Romanus, addressed by Gregory the Great A.D. 595 (*Epp.* v. 36). [F. D.]

SEVERUS of Ancona. [SERENUS (6).]

SEVERUS (35), bishop of Malaga, towards the end of the 6th century, was the friend of LICINIANUS of Carthagena, and joint author with him of the letter to Epiphanius. He also wrote a treatise against the apostate VINCENTIUS of Saragossa, and another, *de Virginitate*, entitled *Annulus*, and dedicated to his sister, neither of which is extant. In his time Malaga was in the hands of the emperor, and his name, therefore, does not appear among the attendants at any of the councils then held in Gothic Spain. He died in the reign of the emperor Maurice, *i.e.* before A.D. 602. (Isidorus, *de Vir. Ill.* 43; *Esp. Sag.* xii. 303.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (36), vir magnificus, commended in A.D. 600, by Gregory the Great to Leo, bishop of Catana (*Epp.* xi. 9). [F. D.]

SEVERUS (37), surnamed Sabocht, Jacobite bishop of Kennesrin in Syria, flourished about A.D. 630, and was noted for his philosophical, mathematical, and ecclesiastical studies. (Greg. Barhebr. *Chron.* i. 275: Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1509.) [J. G.]

SEVERUS (38), bishop of Barcelona, was represented by a priest at the fourth council of Toledo, A.D. 633 (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 317), and died soon afterwards, as his successor attended the fifth council in A.D. 636. (*Esp. Sag.* xxix. 51, 130, vii. 317; Gams, *Kircheng. von Spanien*, i. 305.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (39), surnamed Bar-Maske, 9th Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, and contemporary there with Macarius the Monothelite, who had usurped the episcopate of the orthodox, was consecrated by John, Jacobite bishop of Tarsus, A.D. 668, and died A.D. 680. He had a lengthened contention with the Mesopotamian bishops who opposed his attempt to arrogate to Antioch all the ordinations or consecrations in the patriarchate, as the custom was in the patriarchate of Alexandria. The dispute lasted for four years, both sides appealing to authorities and to councils, and resorting to excommunications. At his death peace was restored by John, the maphrian of the East. (Greg. Barhebr. *Chron.* i. 281 sq.; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1363.) [J. G.]

SEVERUS (40), 4th Jacobite bishop of Samosata, was opposed to the patriarch Cyriacus, but the latter in visiting Samosata to enforce his canons of reformation, A.D. 797, broke into the church and excommunicated the bishop. Severus afterwards submitted and was restored. (Greg. Barhebr. *Chron.* i. 334; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1463.) [J. G.]

SEWARD, king. [SAEWARD.]

SEXBURGA (1), queen of the West Saxons. This famous lady was the wife of Coinwalch, king of the West Saxons, and probably the second wife, married after he had repudiated the sister of Penda (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 7). On the death of Coinwalch, which the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle places in 672, the West Saxon dominion was, according to Bede, divided among the "subreguli" of the nation, a state of anarchy resulting, which lasted for ten years (*H. E.* iv. 12). The Chronicle names as rulers between 672 and 685, when Caedwalla got possession of the whole kingdom, first queen Sexburga, who reigned for a year (*M. H. B.* p. 318), then Escwine in 674, and Kentwine 676 (*ib.* 320). Florence of Worcester, however, cites the *dicta regis Alfredi* for the interposition of a king Cenfus, the father of Escwine, between the latter and Sexburga (*M. H. B.* 641), remarking, however, that he was omitted by the Chronicle. Ethelwerd (*M. H. B.*) omits Cenfus, and gives one year to Sexburga and two to Escwine (cf. Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 533; H. Hunt. *ib.* 717, 718). William of Malmesbury (*G. R.* i. § 32), who had special regard for Coinwalch, owing to the fact that the monasteries of Glastonbury and Malmesbury dated from his reign, describes Sexburga in glowing language, for which it is doubtful whether he can have had any authority; saying that Coinwalch left the government to her, that she undertook the task with spirit, levied armies, controlled her subjects, kept her enemies in awe, and behaved quite as well as a king could have done; her tenure of power was short, for she died after a year's reign. Matthew Paris, improving on this story, says that she was

deposed by the magnates of the kingdom, who objected to the rule of a woman, and banished (ed. Luard, i. 296). There seems to be no real authority for this statement, which is, in fact, contradictory to that of William of Malmesbury. Neither writer, however, appeals to any tradition of the events, and possibly both may have reflected the ideas of the age of the empress Matilda. There is no need to suppose that in the 7th century government by a queen would have been impossible in either England or France. [S.]

SEXBURGA (2), queen of Kent and abbess of Ely (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 8, iv. 19), was the eldest daughter of Anna, king of the East Angles, and wife of Earconbert, king of Kent. She was thus sister of Ethelburga, and half-sister of Saethryd, abbesses of Brie, and sister of S. Etheldreda, abbess of Ely, and Wihtburga, a nun of the same monastery (Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 636, *Liber Eliensis*, i. c. 2, ed. Stewart, p. 15). By Earconbert, who reigned from 640 to 664, and to whom, according to the Ely tradition, she was married at the beginning of his reign (*AA. SS.* Boll. Jul. ii. 348), Sexburga was mother of Egbert and Hlothere, afterwards kings of Kent, and of Earcongota and Eormenhilda, the wife of Wulfhere (Elmham, ed. Hardwick, p. 176; *Liber Eliensis*, p. 51; Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 636). After the death of Earconbert Sexburga founded the monastery of Minster, in the Isle of Sheppey, for nuns, probably intending it as her own resting place. Florence says that she founded it for her husband, who was, however, buried at St. Augustine's (Thorn, c. 1769). She is said to have received the veil from archbishop Theodore (*Hist. Eliens.* lib. i. c. 36). After some time spent at Sheppey, Sexburga removed to Ely, where her sister Etheldreda presided as abbess; and where her grand-daughter Werburga also took refuge after the death of her father Wulfhere in 675 (*Lib. Eliens.* i. c. 18). As Eormenhilda succeeded Sexburga at Minster, her removal to Ely must have taken place soon after Wulfhere's death. The *Liber Eliensis* contains the farewell speech made to the nuns when Sexburga left Minster, and an account of her reception at Ely. On the death of Etheldreda Sexburga succeeded her as abbess. This was, according to the accepted date, in 679 (Flor. Wig. *ad ann. Lib. Eliens.* p. 58). Sixteen years after the death of Etheldreda Sexburga was still alive, and presided at the translation of her sister, which is thus referred to the year 695 (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 19). Although in Bede's Martyrology eleven years are said to have elapsed, the number sixteen is given in both the Ecclesiastical History and the Chronicon. The historian tells us that she sent to Grantacaestir for a stone for the sarcophagus required, and that her messengers found a marble coffin with its covering ready to receive the body of St. Etheldreda, which was found incorrupt. Sexburga must have been advanced in years, and probably did not live long after the translation. The date of her death is unknown. The Bollandists adopt Alford's conclusion, that it occurred about 699; the day of her anniversary was July 6. She was buried at Ely, where her daughter Eormenhild succeeded her as abbess, making over Sheppey to her own daughter Werburga, who in turn succeeded her at Ely also. The life of Sexburga seems to have been written in the vernacular as well as in Latin, at the time of the revival of early hagiography in the eleventh century; and a fragment of the Anglo-Saxon Life is in the Lambeth MS. 427. The Latin biography (*MS. Cotton*, Caligula, A. 8) contains, according to Sir Thomas Hardy, little or nothing of importance that is not taken from Bede and from the English fragment. The life given in the Acta Sanctorum is by Capgrave, and contains nothing of value.

(See *AA. SS.* Boll. Jul. ii. 346–350; Hardy, *Catal. Mat.* i. 360–262.) [S.]

SEXRAED (SEXRED), king of the East Saxons. Sexraed, with his brother Saeward and a third brother, to whom Bromton, the 15th century compiler, gives the name of Sigebert (ap. Twysden, c. 743), succeeded their father Sebert in the kingdom of Essex about the year 616. They were still heathen, and very ignorant, even of the external signs of Christian worship. They applied to Mellitus, who was still bishop of London, for the white bread which they had seen him give to their father in the Eucharist. Mellitus told them that if they would be baptized as their father had been they might be partakers of the bread. They refused, as having no need of washing, but wanting refreshment. Offended at his refusal, they ordered him to leave their kingdom. Mellitus, accompanied by Justus, who was suffering from a like relapse of the Kentish men consequent on Ethelbert's death, fled to Gaul; the kings remained heathen, and the East Saxons relapsed or remained unconverted. The young kings all perished shortly after, in an invasion of the West Saxon territory. Henry of Huntingdon (*M. H. B.* 716) dates this event in 626, and makes Kynegils and Cwichelm the West Saxon rulers at the time. Sigebert the Little, the next East Saxon king, is said to have been the son of Saeward. (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 5.) [S.]

SEXTILIANUS, an African bishop, who, as deputy for Primosus of Carthage, in the fifth general council, Collat. 5, produced the authority of St. Augustine's letters for the practice of anathematizing the dead (Mansi, t. ix. p. 260–263). [G. T. S.]

SEXTUS, author of a treatise on the Resurrection. Eusebius who mentions it in that part of his history which treats of the beginning of the 3rd century (v. 27) owns that he has no certain knowledge of the time when this writer lived. [G. S.]

SIACRIUS (SYAGRIUS), seventh bishop of Nice, said to have been nephew of Charlemagne. When that monarch subdued the Cimellienses and Nicienses (but the expedition is doubtful), he gave them Siacrius as teacher, who built a monastery and instructed the people, not without miracles. In the fifth year of pope Adrian I. (A.D. 777) he became bishop of Nice, but the time of his decease is unknown (Boll. *AA. SS.* v. 257 sq.; (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, vi. 463; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 1274). [J. G.]

SIADHAL, Irish saint. [SEDULIUS.]

SIBYLLINE ORACLES, THE (Χρησμοὶ Σιβυλλιακοί). Before examining the collection of writings now bearing this title, it will be necessary to inquire into the origin and history of the name Sibyl in classical times.

1. The true derivation of the word Σίβυλλα is probably that given by Lactantius (*Div. Instit.* i. 6), on the authority of Varro; namely, from σιός = θεός, and βυλή = βουλή. "Omnes feminae vates," he says, "Sibyllae sunt a veteribus nuncupatae, vel ab unius Delphidis nomine, vel a consiliis Deorum denuntiandis; σιοὺς enim deos, non θεούς, et consilium non βουλὴν sed βυλὴν appellabant Aeolico genere sermonis. Itaque Sibyllam dictam esse quasi θεοβουλήν." The Doric form σιὸς for θεὸς is found in Thuc. v. 77, and in Aristophanes; while βόλλα for βουλή occurs in a Lesbian inscription in Böckh's *Corp. Inscript.* The further change of ο to υ in Aeolic, as in στύμα, μύγις, for στόμα, μόγις, etc., is a familiar one. At the same time this etymology is not altogether free from objections. It would make the first part of the word Doric, the second Aeolic; and proof seems wanting of the existence of βύλλα as a separate word. But though disputed on this and other grounds, as by Salmasius (in a note on the above passage) and Perizonius (on Aelian, *Var. Hist.* xii. 35), it has more to recommend it than any of the derivations proposed in its stead. Maass (*De Sibyllarum Indicibus*, 1879, p. 16) endeavours to prove an eastern origin of the word, connecting it with Saba, or Sabaea; and Bang (*Voluspá und die Sibyllinischen Orakel*, tr. by Poestion, 1880, p. 40) still more fancifully connects it with the Volva and Voluspá of the old Norse Sagas.

2. The term Σίβυλλαι appears to have been attached to a class of prophetic women, as Βάκιδες was to prophetic men. Verses from a Boeotian Βάκις are cited by Herodotus (viii. 12, 77, 96), and two others bearing the same title are mentioned by Aelian (*loc. cit.*). Hence Aristotle (*Problemata*, § xxx. *Prob.* 1) speaks of Σίβυλλαι καὶ Βάκιδες as generic terms. The writer of the article DIVINATIO in the *Dict. of Antiqq.* thinks that the Βάκιδες and Σίβυλλαι were distinguished from the μάντεις, or seers, by the fact of their professing to derive their knowledge from sacred books, χρησμοί, which they consulted. But the description given by Pausanias of the Boeotian Βάκις as uttering his oracular sayings when "inspired by the Nymphs" (μανέντι ἐκ Νυμφῶν, iv. 27), and "possessed by the Nymphs" (κατάσχετον ἄνδρα ἐκ Νυμφῶν, x. 12), seems rather to harmonize with Virgil's description of the Cumaean Sibyl, Deiphobe (*Aen.* iii. 443):—

> Insanam vatem adspicies, quae rupe sub ima
> Fata canit foliisque notas et carmina mandat.

The number of such Sibyls, as is natural, is variously stated by various writers. Aristophanes (*Pax*, 1095, 1116) and Plato (*Phaedr.* xxii.) employ the word Σίβυλλα in the singular number only. But until it can be shown that they do not use it generically, but only as a proper name, we cannot assent to Alexandre's inference, that in Greece, or at least at Athens, down to the time of Alexander the Great, one Sibyl only was recognized. Tacitus (*Ann.* vi. 12) was uncertain whether there were one or more: "una seu plures fuere." Pausanias and Aelian, in the passages above cited, specify four. Varro, as quoted by Lactantius, gives a list of ten; of whom the most famous was Herophile, the Sibyl of Erythrae in Ionia. To enter into further details on this part of the subject would be trenching on the province of the *Dict. of Mythology*; and therefore, after a short notice of the Libri Sibyllini of Roman history, we will pass to the collection now extant.

3. The story of the appearance of a Sibyl to king Tarquin, with the offer of certain prophetic books for him to purchase; of his refusal; of her return with a diminished number, but still at the same price; of his declining the purchase a second time; of her return once more with a number still further diminished; of the king's becoming disturbed by her persistence, and, finally, hastening to secure what still remained; is one of the most familiar in Roman history. But it has to be related in vague outlines, such as the above; for when we strive to grasp the details they elude us on all sides. Which of the Tarquins was it? Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Antiqq.* iv. 62) implies Superbus. Lactantius (*loc. citat.*), avowedly on the authority of Varro, says it was Priscus. In like manner, there is a divergence as to the name of the Sibyl, and the number of the books. The common account is, that three remained out of nine. But Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xiii. 13) gives it as one out of three. Whichever it was, the remnant of the prophetic writings was carefully preserved in a *sacrarium* (Aul. Gell. *Noct. Attic.* i. 19) in a vault beneath the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, under the charge, first of two men (duumviri), afterwards of ten, and finally of fifteen (the "lecti viri" of Virg. *Aen.* vi. 73). The existence of such a deposit, down to the burning of the Capitol in B.C. 83, admits of no reasonable doubt. One fragment of seventy lines from this collection has been preserved by Phlegon, in his treatise περὶ θαυμασίων. It is a response given in B.C. 124, when the oracular books were consulted on the birth of an hermaphrodite; and, like all the rest, is in Greek hexameters. A list of the various occasions on which any record of the consultation of them has been preserved, has been drawn up by Alexandre (*Excursus*, iii. p. 198); and he is able to trace upwards of sixty such, previous to the destruction of the capitol in B.C. 83.

In this conflagration the old Sibylline books appear to have perished. When the rebuilding of the capitol was undertaken by Sulla, he made it part of his care to replace them, as far as was possible, by collecting from all quarters such lines or passages as might be found treasured up. As a freedman of Sulla's is said to have traced the name Sulla to Sibylla (Charis. *Instit. Gramm.* i. p. 110, quoted by Maass, *ubi sup.* p. 32), perhaps the great dictator had a special interest in the subject. At any rate, a commission of three persons was charged to visit the principal cities of Italy, Greece, Sicily, and Libya, and collect such scattered relics as might be found. Samos and the Asiatic Erythrae would seem to have been the most profitable fields for their quest. As a result of their labours, about a thousand lines (accordiug to Fenestella, a writer of the age of Augustus) were brought back to Rome; the comparative smallness of the number indicating perhaps that no more had stood the test of investigation. By the year

B.C. 75 the new collection appears to have been stored up in the same custody as before. And it is only natural to surmise that the increased attention which for seven or eight years had thus been drawn to the Sibylline verses, may have quickened the interest of Lentulus and others like him in predictions supposed to affect them, and helped to foment the disorders in store for the twentieth year after the burning of the capitol (Voss. *Tractatus de Sibyllinis*, p. 20). It is also reasonable to conjecture, as Alexandre does (*Exc.* iii. p. 177), that this search for Sibylline oracles may have stimulated the inventive faculty of Egyptian Jews and others; and, on the principle of the supply answering to the demand, have prompted the composition of such verses as were in request.

What remains to be told concerning this second recension at Rome may be despatched in few words. Augustus, finding that the writing of the leaves had faded from age (ἐξίτηλα ὑπὸ τοῦ χρόνου γεγονότα, Dion Cass. liv. 17), or rather, we may suppose, from damp, as it was but some sixty years since they had been deposited in their new resting-place, caused official copies to be made of them. A few years later, on assuming the title of Pontifex Maximus, in B.C. 12, he had a fresh scrutiny held of the floating prophecies which claimed a Sibylline or quasi-Sibylline character; and, after burning more than 2000 manuscripts thus called in, he transferred the collection, supplemented by such verses or poems as had stood the test, to a new depository at the foot of the statue of the Palatine Apollo. (Suet. ii. 31; Tac. *Ann.* vi. 12.) Here they remained in comparative obscurity. In the reign of Tiberius, Asinius Gallus proposed to consult them about an inundation of the Tiber, but the emperor forbade it (Tac. *Ann.* i. 76). In Nero's reign, as Alexandre points out, they are recorded to have been consulted once; and a few times under the Gordians and Gallienus. Aurelian, and still later Julian (Ammian. Marcell. xxiii.), tried to revive the honour once paid to them, but in vain. Finally, in the reign of Honorius, the books were publicly burnt by the order of Stilicho, at some period between A.D. 404 and 408.

4. Long before this final disappearance of the collection at Rome, there had been growing up, from an origin almost equally obscure, a series of so-called Sibylline oracles, resembling the earlier ones in outward form, but in subject and purpose very different. These, or at least such portions of them as have come down to us, it is now our task to examine. When it is mentioned that we possess more than four thousand lines in Greek hexameter verse, or about as much as the first six books of the Iliad would amount to, it will be seen that, in mere quantity alone, a not inconsiderable legacy has been bequeathed us. One important section of these writings, and that the oldest of them, probably had its origin in the Jewish quarter of Alexandria, in the time of Judas Maccabaeus, or a little later. The reciprocal influence of Greek and Judaic thought, quickened into fresh activity by the translation of the Septuagint, is very marked in the Alexandrian literature of this period, and several instances are given by Ewald (*Hist. of Israel*, Eng. tr. v. p. 255) of the way in which the rising Hellenists strove to compete with their Greek models. One such composition in particular, in which the Messianic hopes of the Jews found utterance, the apocryphal *Book of Enoch*, is referred by Ewald to the time we are considering (*Abhandlung*, *infr. cit.* p. 23); and between it and the oldest of the extant Sibylline writings he traces many points of resemblance.

While the earliest portion of the series we now possess thus originated as far back as the reign of Ptolemaeus Physcon, or even, as others think, in the preceding reign of Philometor (B.C. 181–146), the latest did not appear till after the death of Odenathus (A.D. 267). There is thus an interval of more than four centuries between the limits of composition. Indeed, if we accept the opinion of Ewald that the xivth Book is as late as the reign of Justinian, we extend this interval by three centuries more. The range being so wide, it is only reasonable to expect that there should be differences of opinion as to the date of the several poems of which the collection consists. The following is a digest of the chronological order in which Alexandre would arrange them:—

(1.) Bk. III. 97–294, 489–828; *circa* B.C. 168; author an Alexandrian Jew.
(2.) Bk. IV. *c.* A.D. 79; author a Judaizing Christian, or perhaps a Therapeute of Alexandria.
(3.) The Prooemium; about the same time, and from the same school as the preceding.
(4.) Bk. VIII. 217–429; ditto.
(5.) Bk. III. 295–488; age of the Antonines; Jewish authorship.
(6.) Bk. V.; about same period; author an Alexandrian Jew.
(7.) Bk. VIII. 1–429; same period, or a little later, under Antoninus Pius (A.D. 138–161).
(8.) Bk. VI.; reign of Alexander Severus (c. 234); author a Judaizing Christian.
(9.) Bk. VII.; ditto.
(10.) Bks. I. II.; perhaps the third century, but doubtful, being much altered and interpolated of Christian origin.
(11.) Bk. VIII. 430–480, 481–501; middle or end of third century; of Christian origin.
(12.) Bks. XI.–XIV.; *c.* A.D. 267; author an Alexandrian Jew.
(13.) The Anonymous Preface and Bk. III. 1–96; reign of Justinian; author, an unknown monk.

Other critics dissent from this arrangement. Ewald and Friedlieb would make the Prooemium contemporary with the oldest portions of the Third Book; the latter referring it to B.C. 170–160. Both dissent from Alexandre's opinion as to the Christian origin of the Fourth Book. Ewald regards Bk. iii. 295–488 as of equal age with the sections immediately preceding and following it. He agrees with Alexandre as to the date of the Eleventh Book, which Friedlieb (*Einleitung*, p. lxxi.) would place as early as the end of Trajan's reign (A.D. 115–118); while Dechent (*infr. cit.* p. 486) goes so far as to make the author to have lived not long after the death of Virgil (B.C. 19).

Such are a few of the chief points in dispute. A bare outline of the reasons in support of each view must suffice.

To begin with the *Prooemium*. This really consists of two fragments, of 35 and 49 lines each respectively. They are linked together, in Alexandre's édition, by another short fragment of three lines; all being taken from the *ad Autolycum Libri* of Theophilus (A.D. 180).

Friedlieb prints them as detached fragments. Alexandre's opinion that they are of Christian origin rests mainly on the lines (5, 6):—

> "Παντοτρόφον κτίστην, ὅστις γλυκὺ Πνεῦμ' ἐν ἅπασι
> κάτθετο, χἠγητῆρα βροτῶν πάντων ἐποίησεν."

and on the passage at the end, in which occur such expressions as *ζωὴν κληρονομοῦσι*, *Παραδείσου*, and *δαινύμενοι γλυκὺν ἄρτον ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος*. The Johannine tone of vv. 5, 6 is no doubt noticeable; but Badt (*De Orac. Sibyll.* p. 12) thinks that it need be no more than a product of Alexandrian thought, and maintains its ante-Christian origin. In like manner the resemblance of *ζωὴν κληρονομοῦσι* to St. Matth. xix. 29, and of *ἄρτον ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ* to Rev. ii. 17, while at first sight suggestive of Christian authorship, are not of themselves sufficient to establish it.

The age of iii. 295–488 is vigorously disputed between Ewald and Alexandre. Ewald would assign it to the latter part of the reign of Ptolemaeus Physcon, or about B.C. 124; Alexandre to the age of the Antonines. The mention of the conquest of Babylon (ver. 384), and the death of a great conqueror, whose successors should fall before the posterity of those whom he had sought to destroy (ver. 393, sqq.) are points in favour of the former hypothesis. For the reference seems more naturally to be to the conquests of Macedonia than of Rome; to Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors, rather than to Hadrian (*Abhandlung*, p. 14). On the other hand, the frequent mention of Rome in this section of the poem; the different tone used in speaking of it, when compared with the allusions in the other sections; and the difficulty of adequately interpreting such passages as (464 sqq.):—

> "Ἰταλίη, σοὶ δ' οὔτις Ἄρης ἀλλότριος ἥξει,
> ἀλλ' ἐμφύλιον αἷμα πολύστονον, κ.τ.λ."

of the dissensions of the Gracchi, or of the civil wars of Marius and Sulla, foreseen by one writing in B.C. 124, lend weight to the arguments in favour of a later date.

The date of the Fourth Book will be discussed presently, when an outline of its contents is given. The ground on which Friedlieb (*Einleitung*, p. lxiii.) rests for assigning the Eleventh Book (in his reckoning, the Ninth) to an earlier period than the three concluding ones, namely, to the end of Trajan's reign or the beginning of Hadrian's, is a little precarious. He argues that the author of the lines (159, sq.):—

> "Ἄρξει γὰρ γενεὴ τούτου μετόπισθεν ἁπάντων,
> ἄχρις ἐπ' Εὐφράτου Τίγριος ποταμῶν ἀνὰ μέσσον,"

must have lived before Hadrian relinquished the conquests made by his predecessor east of the Euphrates. But, while this might be conclusive, if the question of date were limited to a single decade, it can scarcely apply, if there is reason for thinking that the author lived when the conquests of Septimius Severus, in 198, had again brought Mesopotamia under Roman dominion. The bold hypothesis of Dechent that the author wrote soon after the death of Virgil in B.C. 19, rests mainly on the assumption that the passage xi. 163 sqq., while imitated, as all admit, from iii. 419 sqq., refers, not to Homer, as that manifestly does, but to Virgil; and that, to give effect to the author's design in introducing it, it was necessary that no long interval should have elapsed since Virgil wrote his description of the Battle of Actium.

Dechent argues strongly against the classification of the eleventh Book with the three which follow. But the literary history of these four Books is unfavourable to such a view. Their very existence was unknown to any of the older editors. They were first discovered by Angelo Mai, and published by him—the xivth Book in 1817, from a MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan; and again Bks. xi.–xiv. in 1828, from a MS. in the Vatican. The numbers by which they are uniformly denoted in the MSS. seem to indicate that the original collection was in ten books; these being a later and inferior addition. The intrinsic merits of Bk. xi., apart from the question of its date, are not in fact thought more highly of by Dr. Dechent himself than by other critics.

5. The chief interest will naturally attach, in the first place, to those sections of the poems which are confessedly the most ancient, and, in the next place, to the earliest ones of Christian origin. As our space does not admit of an analysis of all the books, we will give an epitome of two only; the Third (or, at least, such parts of it as are admitted by all alike to be among the most ancient), and the Fourth. The Christian origin of the Fourth, as was said above, has indeed been disputed; but the comparative certainty of its date (A.D. 79 or 80), and other circumstances, would render it, even apart from that claim to consideration, one of the most interesting and important.

Bk. iii. (97 sqq.) begins abruptly with the destruction of the Tower of Babel by the agency of the winds,—an aftergrowth on the narrative in Genesis. The peopling of the earth is then described (105 sqq.), and in due course the reign of Cronos, and the birth of his offspring. The rebellion of the Titans and the imprisonment of Cronos (147 sqq.) were the beginning of their woes to mortals. Then rose in succession the great kingdoms of the earth: Egypt, Persia, Media, Aethiopia, Assyria, Macedonia, Egypt a second time, and Rome (162). At this point the Sibyl breaks off in her retrospect, and taking her stand in imagination near the beginnings of time, sees the history of the future unfolding itself before her gaze. In this way she foretells the rise of various kingdoms, the Jewish, Macedonian, and Roman (167–193). After pausing to recount the judgments of God in the world, especially as affecting the Jews (196–212), she proceeds to her chief topic, the praise of the Jewish nation (218 sqq.), and the great events of their story. Their departure from Egypt, the giving of the Law, the Assyrian captivity, are passed in review (248–268); and their deliverance foretold. The section closes with the rise of the heaven-sent king (Cyrus) who was to restore them, and with the work of rebuilding the temple.

In iii. 489–828, the Sibyl begins with the divine prompting that urged her to resume her task. Then follow the prophetic burdens of Phoenicia, Crete, Thrace, Gog and Magog (the Getae and Massagetae?) and other nations. Most dreadful of all will be the devastation of Greece and other countries by Rome (520 sqq.)

Hence should the Gentiles learn to desist from idolatry. One race of men would arise, who would fulfil the duty of worshipping the true God (573 sqq.). When the seventh king of a Grecian dynasty should reign in Egypt, there would come a mighty invader from Asia (Antiochus Epiphanes), swooping like an eagle upon the land (611 sqq.). Then in sooth would it be time for the pious to betake themselves to supplication; for terrible things were coming upon the earth (633 sqq.) But in due time there should arise a king sent from God, under whom the chosen people should flourish again. He should take vengeance on his enemies, and all that opposed him should be destroyed (675 sqq.) The prosperity of the Jewish race is then set forth at length (714 sqq.), with a passing admonition to the Gentiles not to hinder the Jews living in their midst from going forth to succour their countrymen at home (in the wars of the Maccabees? 732–735). The signs that were to herald the consummation of all things are then foretold (795–807); and the prophetess ends with declaring that she herself is neither the Erythraean Sibyl of the east, nor the Cumaean Sibyl of the west (808–817), but a daughter-in-law of Noah (if lines 818–820 are genuine), shut up with him in the ark

From the abruptness of the beginning at iii. 97, it is not unlikely that the fragments now put together to form the Prooemium may have constituted the real beginning of this book.

In Bk. iv. the Sibyl takes at the outset a tone not unlike that of St. Paul when addressing the men of Athens on Mars' Hill. The nature of the one true God was such that He could not be like the mute images of marble fashioned by the hand of man (1–17). As prophesying by His inspiration, the Sibyl (so naming herself, as in iii. 814) claimed attention to her words (18–23). Happiness was the portion of the good; of those who were careful to pray before eating and drinking, who avoided the sight of heathen temples, and endured persecution in their observance of the moral law of God (24–39). Their righteousness would be vindicated at the last. But before the coming of that closing age, see what things must happen upon the earth (40–48). Then, in rapid succession, the rise of various nations, Assyrians, Medes, Greeks, and others, is touched upon, along with their wars, the Trojan war being noticed among the rest (49–114). Last of all, the Romans would invade Syria, and Jerusalem itself should be destroyed (115–127). Cyprus should feel the shock of earthquakes, and many cities of Italy perish in an eruption (of Vesuvius) 130–134. Other visitations should follow, a warning to men to repent of their evil ways. Let them "wash their bodies wholly in flowing rivers, and lifting up their hands to heaven, ask pardon for their former deeds" (160–162). If they would not, they should perish in a universal conflagration; the advent of which would be foretold by many signs and tokens (170–177). Then should the just rise again to a new life, and the wicked be shut up in Gehenna (178–185). Happy those who should attain to this new and better life (186–191).

In this abstract, prominence has been given to the two passages (24–39; 160–162), on which the argument for the Christian authorship of the Fourth Book mainly rests. The latter of them, in particular, is thought by Alexandre to point conclusively to Christian baptism. But the vagueness of the language will not fail to be remarked; and Friedlieb (*Einleit.* p. xlii.) denies that anything expressly Christian can be found in the book. The precept *ἐν ποταμοῖς λούσασθε ὅλον δέμας ἀενάοισι* is considered by him to signify no more than Isaiah's "Wash you, make you clean" (i. 16). The author may possibly have been one of the Essenes, as is suggested by the writer of an article in the *Edinb. Rev.* (*infra cit.* p. 55). But against this view must be set, as Dechent points out, the acquaintance with Greek literature and history, not likely to betoken an Essene; and, on the other hand, the absence of any special commendation of the Essenian virtues of asceticism and virginity. While admitting that the question is a hard one to solve, Dechent inclines to the assumption of a Jewish-Christian authorship. In any case, the exactness with which the date can be fixed (Badt, *infra cit.*, p. 13), and the certainty that we are thus reading what was penned before the Fourth Gospel or the Apocalypse had seen the light, make it an interesting and valuable relic. As we compare it, moreover, with the still older Bk. iii., we may gain a deeper insight into the origin of Sibylline verse. Like the *De Civitate* of St. Augustine, each of these poems had its birth beneath the shadow of a great visitation. The earlier Sibyllist might well feel moved to prophesy of the end of all things, when the hosts of Epiphanes were invading his country, and their commander was boasting that he would for ever exterminate both the Judeans and their God (Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, v. pp. 299, 310). And in like manner, one who had witnessed, in the space of a single decade, the fall of Jerusalem and the overwhelming of Herculaneum and Pompeii, might well feel the prophetic fire burn within him, till at the last his words found utterance.

As the interest of these two books exceeds that of the rest, for the reasons just mentioned, so the first of them (the oldest portion of Bk. iii.) is conspicuous by its purely literary merit. There is a real Homeric vigour in many of the lines; and the difference between the earlier and later versification is palpable even in the opening lines of the two sections. Compare, for instance, the run of

> "'Ἀλλ' ὁπόταν μεγάλοιο Θεοῦ τελέωνται ἀπειλαί,
> ἅς ποτ' ἐπηπείλησε βροτοῖς, κ.τ.λ." (iii. 97 sq.)

with the limping rhythm of

> "Οὐράνι' ὑψιβρεμέτα μάκαρ, ὃς ἔχεις τὸ Χερουβὶμ
> ἱδρυμένον, λίτομαι, παναληθέα, φημίξασαν
> παῦσον βαιόν με. κ.τ.λ." (iii. 1, sqq.)

and the inferiority of the latter is obvious. In connection with this imitation of Homer, it is curious to observe that Homer is charged in two places (iii. 419 sqq., xi. 163 sqq.), with borrowing from the Sibyl:—

> "Καί τις ψευδογράφος πρέσβυς βροτὸς ἔσσεται αὖθις,
> . . . . γράψει τὰ κατ' Ἴλιον, οὐ μὲν ἀληθῶς,
> ἀλλὰ σοφῶς, ἔπεσι γὰρ ἐμοῖς, μέτρων τε κρατήσει."

The true explanation may probably be found in the similar charge brought in Suidas against Phocylides. In fact, the history of the Ποίημα

νουθετικὸν itself is no bad commentary on that of the Sibylline Oracles.

6. A very few points only can be noticed in the remaining books. The Fifth, which Ewald places next in order of time, but which Alexandre refers to the age of Antoninus Pius, professes to be the utterance of an Egyptian Sibyl, sister of Isis (*Ἴσιδος ἡ γνώστη*, ver. 53). The first 52 lines give a series of Roman emperors, the first letters of their names being indicated by the numbers corresponding to those letters; and as the rest of the book is occupied with Egyptian affairs, this portion should probably be detached from it. One passage would seem to denote that the author was conversant with Christianity (255 sqq.):—

> "Εἷς δέ τις ἔσσεται αὖθις ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἔξοχος ἀνήρ,
> ὃς παλάμας ἥπλωσεν ἐπὶ ξύλου πολυκάρπου
> Ἑβραίων ὁ ἄριστος, ὃς ἠέλιόν ποτε στῆσε."

But the strange blending of Gibeon with Calvary leaves all in uncertainty. Very different is the remarkable line near the end of Bk. vi.:—

> "Ὦ ξύλον, ὦ μακαριστόν, ἐφ' ᾧ Θεὸς ἐξετανύσθη."

The most memorable passage of all is perhaps that in the Eighth Book (217–250), in acrostichal verse, the initial letters of which form the words ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ. This peculiar form of composition would alone make it noticeable, being the only passage of that kind in the whole series. And this fact is the more striking, when we remember that the Sibylline verses of Rome are all said to have been of this description; Cicero (*De Divin.* ii. § 112) making this artificiality of construction an argument to prove that the lines never could have been uttered in the heat of sudden inspiration. But of far greater moment than any peculiarity of external form is the enduring impression this passage has produced upon the mind of Christendom. A translation of it is found in the *De Civitate* of Augustine, and its echo is heard in the famous sequence of Thomas of Celano:—

> "Dies irae, dies illa,
> Solvet saeclum in favilla,
> Teste David cum Sibylla."

7. For many topics of interest, on which these poems might be cited as an authority, a mere reference must suffice. Their ethical teaching is throughout good. (Cf. iii. 584 sqq.) The corruption of manners among the clergy in the 3rd century may be studied in ii. 264 sqq. Indications of ritual are few and simple (v. 266; viii. 497 sqq.) Baptism is alluded to in viii. 271, *ὕδατι φωτίζων διὰ πρεσβυτέρων ἅμα χειρῶν*, and perhaps in the disputed line iv. 160. If the genuineness of vii. 87 were not suspected, it would be a witness for baptism by sprinkling: *ἀλλὰ λαβὼν κεφαλὴν τοῦδ' ἄνερος, ὕδατι ῥαίνας εὔξαι τρίς*. Allusions to the Holy Eucharist are uncertain, the nearest approach to them being in viii. 403, 408. Citations from the canonical Scriptures are frequent in the books of later origin; Bk. i. especially being full of references to the Old Testament, not always correctly made. In the older portions, the Apocalypse appears most frequently referred to. On this subject see Alexandre's *Excursus*, vi. pp. 554–6.

The peculiarities of metre and syntax, as well as the late forms of words, to be found in these poems, are very numerous. A collection of them has been made by Alexandre in his *Excursus* vii., and the more prominent ones are also noticed by Friedlieb at the end of his account of each book, in his *Einleitung*. The following are a few specimens, noted independently in reading:—

κρῖταί (iii. 781), *τῠχη* (viii. 202), *Λᾱτίνων* (xiv. 244, 280), *Λατῖνων* (viii. 131), *δεδιότες* (viii. 183), *ῥᾱπίσματα* (viii. 288), *πρῶτŏν* (xiv. 248). Late forms of words are: *βοληθείς* (xiv. 75), *θάνεται* (xiv. 91), *φολίσι* (xiv. 326), *Θύμβριδος* = Tibridis (viii. 64), *ἐκπορθηθήσῃ* (viii. 128), *ἀνάσταμα* (viii. 268), *μαστιζόμενοι* (viii. 281). As peculiarities of construction, we find (1) the opt. for fut. indic. (iii. 521, viii. 273, etc.); fut. ind. after *ἵνα* (viii. 293), *ὁπόταν* (xiv. 69), *ἐπὰν* (xiv. 317), *ὅταν* (xiv. 348); subj. aft. *ἥνικα* (xiv. 293), *ὅτε* (viii. 50); the particles *τέ*, *καί*, otiose, as also the pronouns *μίν* and *οἵ* (iii. 735, iii. 1, xiv. 232, etc.)

The frequent paronomasiae, or plays on words, should also be noticed, as *Ἔσται καὶ Σάμος ἄμμος, ἐσεῖται Δῆλος ἄδηλος, καὶ Ῥώμη ῥύμη* (iii. 364). Many proverbial sayings are introduced; some, perhaps, which cannot now be recognized as such, besides familiar ones like

> Μὴ κίνει Καμάριναν, ἀκίνητος γὰρ ἀμείνων (iii. 736).
> Ὀψὲ θεοῦ μῦλοι ἀλέουσι τὸ λεπτὸν ἄλευρον (viii. 14).
> Ὄλβιος ὃς τέθνηκε καὶ ὄλβιος ὅστις ἄτεκνος (xiv. 307).

8. *Bibliography.*—The first edition of the Sibyllina was that of Xystus Betuleius (Birken). Basil. 1545, in 8vo, without any Latin version The metrical Latin version, still retained in a corrected form, was by Castalio (Châteillon), and appeared in 1546. The text and Latin version appeared together in the next edition of 1555, also published at Basle. A fourth edition, by Joannes Opsopoeus (Koch), was published in Paris in 1599; and a fifth at Amsterdam in 1687–8, under the superintendence of Servatius Gallaeus (Gallé), in 2 vols. 4to. These were all superseded by the exhaustive edition of C. Alexandre, of which the first volume, in two parts, appeared in 1841 and 1853, at Paris, in 8vo., and the second, containing a copious Latin commentary in the form of *Excursus*, followed in 1856. These were condensed into one volume by the same editor in 1869, Paris, 8vo. The only other edition that need be specified is that by Dr. J. H. Friedlieb, of Breslau, published at Leipzig in 1852, 8vo. Besides a valuable introduction, this has a translation of the Greek into German hexameters. An exhaustive list of works bearing on the Sibylline literature will be found at the end of Alexandre's second volume (1856), with a continuation at the end of his smaller edition.

Authorities.—Many of these have been already specified in the course of the article. For the classical oracles, Klausen's *Aeneas und die Penaten*, 1839, tom. i. p. 245 sqq., and Sir G. C. Lewis's *Credibility of the Early Roman History*, 1855, vol. i. p. 514 sqq., are worth consulting. For the extant collection, nearly all the materials that can be desired have been amassed by Alexandre, in his laborious volumes. The patience with which he has collected everything bearing on his subject is only equalled by his candour, and his courtesy towards opponents. His con-

clusions may not always be regarded as sound; and here the edition of Friedlieb, mentioned above, and the *Abhandlung über Entstehung Inhalt und Werth der Sibyllischen Bücher*, of Heinrich Ewald, Götting. 4to, 1858, may be studied as a useful corrective. Dr. Badt, of Breslau, published an edition of Bk. iv. in 1878, with some ingenious emendations; and his notes to this, as well as his earlier *Dissertatio inauguralis*, Breslau, 1869, on the Jewish element in the Sibylline poems, are valuable. A good list of German works on the subject is given by Badt, at the beginning of his *Dissertatio*, including Friedlieb's *Commentatio de Codicibus Sibyll. manuscriptis*, Breslau, 1847, and Volkmann's *De Oraculis Sibyllinis Dissertatio*, Lipsiae, 1853. In the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch.* Gotha, 1878, 481–509, is an essay by Dr. Dechent, embodying the result of more lengthy investigations, on the *Charakter und Geschichte der altchrist. Sibyllenschriften*, in which some fresh theories are ably supported. One or two of these, as to the early authorship of Book xi., and the Jewish-Christian origin of Book iv., have been briefly noticed above. His general conclusion is, that all the Sibylline writings which have come from Christian sources, are to be traced to writers in whom heretical or heterodox influences were predominant. For English readers, no better résumé of the entire subject could be found, than an article which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1877. [J. H. L.]

SIBYLLISTAE. So Celsus nicknamed the Christians who attached weight to the prophecies of the Sibyl (Orig. *adv. Cels.* v. 61). [G. S.]

SIDERIUS, bishop of Palaebisca, in Egypt. From the epistles of Synesius, Num. 67, we learn that Athanasius sanctioned his consecration, though it was performed contrary to the canons by one bishop (Philo) alone, and not by three. It was irregular also from the Egyptian point of view, as not having been performed at Alexandria. Athanasius condoned the defects on account of the Arian troubles, and afterwards procured his translation to the metropolitical see of Ptolemais (cf. Bingham's *Antiq.* lib. ii. cap. xi. sec. 4, 5). [G. T. S.]

SIDONIUS (1), Roman confessor (note the Punic name), A.D. 250. See MOSES, MAXIMUS (20), and CELERINUS. [E. W. B.]

SIDONIUS (2) APOLLINARIS, SAINT (CAIUS SOLLIUS APOLLINARIS SIDONIUS). The name appears thus, but without APOLLINARIS in the dedication to him by Claudianus Mamertus of his book on the Soul, and without CAIUS in his own title to the poem addressed by Sidonius to Magnus Felix. One MS. adds MODESTUS, but as it seems without good authority (*Carm.* ix.; Germain, *Sid. Apoll.* p. 180). His grandfather Apollinaris had been praefectus praetorio of Gaul under the rival emperor Constantine, A.D. 408 (Zos. vi. 4; Olympiodorus, ap. Phot. *Bibl.* p. 57, ed. Bekker), and was the first of the family who became a Christian. In an epitaph written by his grandson for his tomb near Lyons he speaks of him in the highest terms, especially on this account. He also tells us that his great grandfather held a high official situation (Sid. *Ep.* iii. 12. i. 3). His father, of whose name no special mention is made, was a tribune, and also a notary or secretary, under Honorius, thus combining a military with a civil office, and under Valentinian III. became praefectus praetorio of Aquitania I. A.D. 449 (Sid. *Ep.* iii. 1. v. 9, viii. 6). This date is fixed by that of the consulship of Asterius, at whose inauguration at Arles C. Sollius, the subject of this article, was present, at a time in his life when he was entering youth (adolescens nuper ex puero), *i.e.* probably about 17 or 18 years old (see Cic. *pro Arch.* 3, Gell. x. 28). In a letter of later life he mentions his pleasure at a speech made by Nicetius on this occasion (*Ep.* viii. 6).

First period, 431-471.—His mother's name is not known, but he was born Nov. 5, A.D. 431 or 432, probably at Lyons (*Carm.* xx. 1). He appears to have been educated at the same place, then famous as a seat of education, in the same school as his cousin Avitus, and his friends Aquilinus and Probus. Among his teachers were Eusebius in philosophy, Hoenus, and perhaps Victor, in poetry. He appears also frequently to have consulted Claudianus Mamertus at Vienne (Vol. III. 791), of whose multifarious ability, acuteness, patience, and kindness towards those who consulted him, and also his devout respect for his brother, the bishop of that see, he speaks with the warmest affection (*Ep.* iii. 1. iv. 1. 3. v. 9; *Carm.* i. 25. ix. 314, 334). From the title "frater," with which he more than once addressed a friend named Volusianus, he has been thought to have had a brother of that name, but as it seems without good reason (*Ep.* iv. 18; vii. 17). Soon after he reached the age of 20, he married Papianilla, only daughter of Flavius Eparchius Avitus, a native of Auvergne, who had held the office of praefectus praetorio, of which the seat was at Arles from A.D. 439 to 443, and who ten years later assisted in persuading Theodoric, king of the Visigoths, the seat of whose government was at Toulouse, to join the Romans under Aetius, and enable them to inflict on Attila and the Huns that great defeat on the plains of Châlons, in which Theodoric himself was slain, but which retarded for a time the decline of Roman power in Gaul, A.D. 451. After the battle, Avitus, who was not only a soldier and a diplomatist, but also a lover of nature and of literature, retired to his own house and patrimonial estate at Avitacum, Aydac or Aydat, near the city, probably Augustonemetum, which answers to the modern Clermont (*Carm.* vii. 230, 316, 339, 460, etc.). Besides Papianilla, Avitus had two sons, Ecdicius, whom Gibbon suggests, but without giving any reason, to have been only his stepson (vol. iv. p. 287, ed. Smith), and Agricola, with whom, after his marriage, Sidonius lived on the most friendly and affectionate terms, and with each of whom he exchanged letters. The marriage appears to have been blessed with a son, Apollinaris, and two daughters, Roscia, who was brought up by her aunts and grandmother, and Severiana. That there was another son, twin with Apollinaris, and named Heliodorus, and another daughter, named Alchima, has been thought by some writers, but does not seem probable (*Ep.* iv. 10, v. 16; Greg. Tur. iii. 2; Tillemont, xvi. note, p. 748; Germain, p. 6). A letter of later date is extant, addressed to his son Apollinaris, then almost sixteen years old, commending

him for his blameless behaviour, and warning him against the bad example and vicious society of some profligate scamps at Lyons, where he was studying (*Ep.* iii. 13). There is also a letter to Agricola, in which tender feeling is mixed with some quiet humour, and in which he excuses himself from joining him on a fishing excursion on account of the alarming illness of his daughter Severiana, on whose behalf, as well as his own, he begs his prayers. He speaks also of his general distrust of doctors, one alone, named Justus, being excepted, and expresses his firm trust in Christ as his best support (*Ep.* ii. 12). In a letter to the same, probably of the date 454 or thereabouts, he describes minutely the person and mode of life of king Theodoric II., successor to his brother Thorismund, whom he had murdered, particulars gathered in a visit to the court of Toulouse in company with Avitus, who having been called, as Sidonius says, like Cincinnatus, from his country retreat, to take the command of the Roman army (magister militum) by Maximus, checked the incursions of the Saxon pirates, and the threatened invasion of the Alemanni, and was engaged in negotiating with the Visigoth king an alliance with the Romans, when on the death of Maximus, at the demand, according to Sidonius, of Theodoric, as a condition of his alliance, or perhaps at his suggestion and with his support, Avitus was raised to the imperial dignity, and proclaimed emperor, first at Toulouse and afterwards at Ugernum (Beaucaire), A.D. 455, and was followed to Rome by his son-in-law, who pronounced a panegyric on him in a poem of 602 hexameter lines with an introduction of thirty-six elegiacs on Jan. 1, 456 (*Carm.* vii. 369–404; 510–572). By way of reward for this panegyric on his father-in-law, Sidonius received the honour of a brazen statue in the Basilica of Trajan, in a space between the two libraries. The opinion of the writers of Gallia Christiana, that this statue is of later date, appears to be erroneous (*Ep.* ix. 16; *Carm.* viii.). The reign of Avitus came to an end in 456, and after an ineffectual attempt in Gaul to set up Marcellinus, in which Sidonius took part, and a man named Poeonius assumed the office of praefect (*Ep.* i. 11), Majorian became emperor, and having crossed the Alps, defeated the Burgundian invaders, and after a stout resistance captured the city of Lyons. He imposed hard conditions and heavy taxes on the citizens, but was induced to remit them by the compliment of a florid panegyric in 603 hexameters, pronounced by Sidonius, and by some elegiac verses addressed both to himself and to his principal secretary Peter, a man fond of literature and ambitious of literary renown, whom Sidonius calls his Maecenas. We are indebted to this panegyric and to the previous one on Avitus for many details of historical events not recorded elsewhere. This took place in March 459. He obtained not only the desired remission, but also, perhaps somewhat later, the office of Count of the palace for himself (*Ep.* i. 11; *Carm.* iii, iv, v, xiii). Coupling the statement of Idatius as to a peace concluded between Majorian and Theodoric, A.D. 459, with some lines in the epitaph on Sidonius, we may perhaps infer that he was employed in negotiating it. Idat. *Chr.* v. 17; Epitaph in Sid. ap. Sirmon. *Vit. Sid.* Two years later, A.D. 460, when the emperor was holding his court at Arles, and had gathered round him, besides Sidonius, the most eminent literary men of Gaul, Domnulus, Lampridius, and Severianus, Sidonius distinguished himself, as he tells us in a letter, twenty years later, to his friend Tonantius Ferreolus, both by an improvised poem in praise of a book by secretary Peter, delivered at a dinner given by a citizen of Arles, and also at the emperor's table by his skilful and ready wit in clearing himself of a charge insinuated against him of being the author of a scurrilous attack by name on many well-known persons including Poeonius, already mentioned. The story is too long for insertion here, but is told by him in a lively manner and with much humour, especially as regards the way in which in an improvised epigram he turned the tables on Poeonius, who had suggested the charge against him. The prose letter is better than the verses, but both bear witness to his good temper, prudence and ready facility of composition (*Ep.* i. 11, ix. 13). From 461 to 465, during which period Severus, the puppet of Ricimer, occupied the imperial throne, Sidonius appears to have passed the time in retirement from public business, but fulfilling his part as a great landed proprietor, at Avitacum, into possession of which he came in right of his wife, on the death of Avitus, and which he describes at great length, and with much enthusiasm, in a letter written in the style of Pliny to his friend Domitius. His description of the house and grounds is very pleasing and picturesque, its trees and underwood, its lake, its fountains, its cascade, the sounds of the various persons and creatures inhabiting the neighbourhood, nightingales, swallows, geese, swans, frogs, cicadae, the bells of the cattle, the strains of the shepherds' and cowherds' pipes, the ball-court in which he played with Ecdicius when he stayed with him, and the whole closed with a pressing invitation to his friend to pay him a visit in the autumn (*Ep.* ii. 2). Living the life of a country gentleman in a country in whose beauty he delighted (see *Ep.* iv. 21), he was fond of field-sports, hunting and fishing, and not forgetting his literary taste, wrote verses on his fish-pond, and on fish caught in it, of which he sent some as a present to a friend, probably Ecdicius (*Carm.* xix. xxi.). It was on one of his journeys to this residence, but at an earlier period, and before he had quitted Lyons altogether, that not far from that city he detected, and in the high Roman fashion of a patrician, punished summarily some robbers who were violating the tomb of his grandfather, Apollinaris, perhaps A.D. 452. He describes the exploit in a letter to his nephew Secundus, and includes an epitaph in hendecasyllables on Apollinaris written on the following evening (*Ep.* iii. 12).

Several letters to friends belong to this period, among which may specially be mentioned one to Eriphius, a citizen of Lyons, perhaps A.D. 461, describing a church gathering which took place in commemoration of St. Justus at Lyons on Sept. 2, the procession before daybreak, the large congregation of both sexes, the psalms sung antiphonally by monks and clerks, the Eucharistic celebration, the great heat caused by the crowd and the number of lights, cooled after a time by the autumnal morning. The

principal citizens then met by agreement at the tomb of Afranius Syagrius, who had been consul A.D. 381. Pleasant conversation took place in which no one talked politics, till by general consent the company divided itself according to age and taste, for active or sedentary amusements, ball play, chess or draughts. Sidonius describes his own vigorous activity and that of Philimatius, father of Philimatia, wife of Eriphius, now an elderly man, his frequent falls, and presently his retirement from the game in pain and disorder, his own consequent cessation in order to assist Philimatius, and at last an elegiac quatrain improvised on the jack-towel used to wipe off his perspiration. The whole proceedings were brought to an end by a summons to the reception at the episcopal palace (*Ep.* v. 17). Another pleasant gossiping letter to Donidius, an Auvergnat friend, describes a visit made to his friends Tonantius Ferreolus, formerly praefectus praetorio of Gaul, and his kinsman, and Apollinaris his relative, at their houses, Prusianum (Bresis), and Voruangus (Beringueri), not far distant from each other on the banks of the Gardon near Nimes (*Ep.* ii. 9). He also probably visited his friend Consentius, himself a poet, at Narbonne, whose hospitality, and the praises of the city, and of his friends whom he met there, Magnus Felix, Lampidius, Marinus, Marcellinus, and others, and also the defence of the city during its recent siege, he celebrates in a poem of 512 hendecasyllabic verses (quingenti hendecasyllabi) (*Carm.* xxii. xxiii.; *Ep.* vii. 12). It may have been also during the same journey that he visited Faustus, bishop of Riez, who had succeeded Maximus in that see, as he had also done before in the abbey of Lerins, heard him preach, and was introduced by him to his mother, whom he describes as a Rebecca or a Hannah. This visit, made during very hot weather and his other obligations to Faustus, especially for his careful protection of his brother in his youth, he celebrates in a poem of thanks (eucharisticum), sent probably after no great interval of time (pridem) (*Carm.* xvi.).

When Anthemius became emperor, A.D. 467, he sent for Sidonius to Rome, on business which the people of Auvergne deputed him to manage on their behalf. Under the favour of Christ, as he says in a letter to Eutropius, whom he begged to accompany him, but with what success does not appear, he undertook the mission, of which his expenses, under a recent regulation, were provided by the imperial treasury. His friends crowded round him at his departure from foggy Lyons, and in letters to Heronius and Candidianus he describes pleasantly his easy and rapid ascent of the Alps, and no less easy descent by a path cut through the snow, his journey by the rivers Ticino, Po, Adda and Adige to Cremona and Ravenna, of which city he describes the situation, its fogs, bad drainage and mosquitos, and its social degradation, also the pestilential region, as he calls it, of Tuscany, which brought on an aguish fever, which, however, disappeared as he reached the outskirts of the apostolic city. The preparations for the marriage of Ricimer with Euphemia, the daughter of Anthemius, were in progress at the time of his arrival, and the wedding took place shortly afterwards. At Rome he took up his residence at the house of Paulus, a man of praefectorian rank, and possessing literary and scientific ability and attainments, and who was able to assist him by canvassing some of the senators in favour of his application, especially Gennadius Avienus and Caecina Basilius, who exhorted him, as a likely way of promoting his own interests, to celebrate the inauguration of Anthemius the new Consul by a poem. Sidonius consented, and the result was a panegyric in 548 hexameters, with a preface of thirty elegiacs, on Anthemius, his warlike achievements and literary attainments, and including some felicitations on his daughter's marriage. This complimentary address was rewarded with a gift of the high office of praefect of the senate and of the city of Rome, of which he speaks in a tone of gratified ambition in a letter to Philimatius. The office thus conferred on him, which he hoped by the help of Christ to fulfil, was not merely titular. Part of his duty as praefect of the city was to superintend the supply of corn for the food of the citizens, and while preparations for the war with Genseric and the Vandals were going on, Sidonius was in great fear lest this supply should be cut off by the Vandal fleet, A.D. 468, and that he himself should thus incur the displeasure of the Roman people, and be hissed in the theatre. But his apprehensions were relieved by the opportune arrival at Ostia of five ships laden with corn and honey, cargoes which the *praefectus annonae*, a zealous and diligent man, would soon cause to be distributed among the people. In the midst of his successes at Rome the interests of his friends in Auvergne were probably not forgotten, as some words used by Sidonius seem to shew. He remained at Rome until 469, and during that time was compelled to be a spectator of the trial and condemnation of Arvandus, prefect of Gaul, which he describes in a letter to Vincentius. Arvandus, whom he could not help calling his friend, was a man of no steady principle of character, vain and frivolous, and Sidonius wondered not that he had fallen, but that he had stood so long as he did. His debts, his arrogance, and above all his treasonable correspondence with Euric, the king of the Visigoths, who had become so in 466 or 467 by the murder of his elder brother Theodoric, correspondence revealed by his secretary, made an appeal to Rome inevitable, and it was conducted by the most eminent men of the province, Tonantius Ferreolus, Thaumastus and Petronius. Of every instance of his folly and ostentatious affectation of candour in respect of the treasonable letters Sidonius was not a witness, for he was absent, no doubt purposely, from the senate on the day on which he appeared there, but he did not desert his friend in distress, for he engaged the most eminent lawyer of the day, Auxanius, to defend him. His own perverse infatuation, however, led necessarily to his condemnation, at first to death, a sentence which was probably commuted to one of confiscation and banishment (*Ep.* i. 3. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10; *Carm.* i. ii.). He was followed, perhaps in the same office, certainly in one of great authority, by Seronatus, a brutal, corrupt, tyrannical, treacherous man, the Catiline of his age, as Sidonius calls him, in league with Euric against the Romans, and whose conviction and condemnation to death, obtained with great

difficulty, was one of the last acts of justice performed by the expiring empire (*Ep.* ii. 1, v. 13, vii. 7), "quem convictum vix res publica praesumpsit occidere." On leaving Rome Sidonius retired to Gaul, and resided partly at Lyons and partly at Avitacum. Towards the end of the year or the beginning of the next, the province of Lugdunensis I. was surrendered by Anthemius to the Burgundians as the price of their assistance against the Visigoths (Tillemont, *Emp.* vi. p. 357). Against these barbarians, whom, however, he describes as less ferocious than other German races, Sidonius pours forth his complaints, describing their perverse ways, revolting and odious to those over whom they domineered, but of their ruler (tetrarches) Chilperic II., and of his wife Agrippina, he speaks more favourably. (*Ep.* v. 7; *Carm.* xii.) But he describes with much admiration the marriage ceremonies of a Burgundian chief, Sigismer, and regrets the absence of a friend to whom he wrote on the subject (*Ep.* iv. 20). About this time a new church was erected at Lyons through the exertions of Patiens, the bishop, for whom Sidonius entertained the most affectionate reverence. He was present at the dedication, which he describes in hendecasyllables, and for which the poets Constantius and Secundinus had written inscriptions in hexameters, placed near the altar of the church (*Ep.* ii. 10). So also at the request of Perpetuus, bishop of Tours, he wrote an elegiac inscription for the church of St. Martin, of that city, which Perpetuus had enlarged. (*Ep.* iv. 18.) Always fond of writing verses, and having obtained a wide reputation as a writer of complimentary poems, he frequently employed his pen in this way, and some of his compositions of this kind probably belong to this period, *e.g.* 1. An inscription of twelve elegiacs for a silver bowl, to be presented by his friend Evodius to Ragnahilda, the wife of Euric, a gift plainly of a propitiatory character, to be presented at a time when her husband's friendship was particularly desirable. It was composed at his friend's request, who was then on his way to Toulouse, at the command of Euric, during a halt on one of his journeys from Lyons to Avitacum (*Ep.* iv. 8). 2. A poem of 133 hexameters, with a preface of twenty-two elegiacs, on the marriage of Ruricius and Iberia, daughter of Ommatius (*Carm.* x. xi. 52). 3. One of 222 turgid and jejune hexameters, with a preface of thirty hendecasyllables on the marriage of Polemius and Araneola (Ărānĕŏla) (*Carm.* xiv. xv.). Polemius appears to have studied, or at any rate dabbled in, philosophy, especially that of Plato, and the poet expresses the fond hope that his union with Araneola may bear fruit in a young Plato (v. 191). 4. Among poems of this kind is one apologising for absence of an expected Epithalamium on account of the presence of the Burgundians, whose great stature and their gross and barbarous habits he describes with all the contemptuous disgust of a highly civilised patrician (*Ep.* v. 5; *Carm.* xii.). About this time he appears to have visited Bordeaux, and writes to his friend Trygetius, urging him to come thither, and meet their mutual friends Leontius, Paulinus, perhaps a member of the same family as Paulinus of Nola, Rusticus and others, and endeavouring to attract him both by this prospect, and also by one of a luxurious voyage on the river, and of dainties of various kinds, cockles, oysters, and fish (*Ep.* viii. 12; *Carm.* xxii. 117). It was, perhaps, also on this occasion that he wrote his poem on the town of Burgus, itself connected with the harbour of Bordeaux (*Carm.* xxii.) It must have been before the time when the Visigoths openly attacked Auvergne, and while the Roman Empire still retained its hold on some portion of S.E. Gaul, that Sidonius sent forth his poems collected in a volume, addressed to his various friends, and circulated among them in succession, beginning with the house of Domitius, and ending at Narbonne. They are preceded by an address in verse by way of introduction, *propempticon* or *envoi* (*Carm.* xxiv.). About the time when Lyons was transferred to the Burgundians, Sidonius left it and took up his residence permanently at Avitacum, which the friendship of Ommatius made particularly agreeable to him (*Carm.* xvii.).

Second period, 471–475. — Surrounded by dangers from threatened invasions, and enemies not only political but religious, for Euric was a zealous supporter of Arian doctrine, and persecuted the Catholics with great severity, the people of Clermont, when Eparchius their bishop died, A.D. 471, united in a clamorous demand that Sidonius should become their bishop. He was not in holy orders, but, as we have seen, had shown himself to be without ostentation a devout Christian, though somewhat flexible and elastic as a politician. His ability was beyond question, as a man of letters he stood in the foremost rank of his time, he held a high place, probably the highest, among the landed proprietors of his province whose interests he was firm and patriotic in upholding, and had taken an active part on more than one occasion on behalf of its inhabitants, in which also he had been ably and zealously supported by his friends, of whom both in military and in civil affairs, Ecdicius held the chief place in the district. (Greg. Tur. ii. 21). Fully aware of his own deficiencies he accepted unwillingly the office thrust upon him, deploring his unfitness to pray for the people committed to his charge, and dreading its responsibility he begs his friends, among them Fonteius, bishop of Vaison, Euphronius, bishop of Autun, Leontius, bishop of Arles, and Lupus, bishop of Troyes, who wrote to congratulate him on his appointment, to pray for him that his sins may be forgiven, and that in approaching to the altar he may not pollute it with strange fire (*Ep.* v. 3, vi. 1, 3, 7, vii. 8, 9, ix. 2). His feeling in this matter appears to be thoroughly genuine, for it brought on an illness (*Ep.* v. 3), and the notion of Ampère, of Guizot, and of Ozanam, that he accepted the office because all hope of advancement in any other line was cut off by the collapse of the empire, appears to be without solid foundation. (Ampère, *Litt. de la France*, vol. ii. p. 230; Baret, *Sid. Ap.* p. 29.) In the same spirit he declines on the ground of conscious incompetence to accede to the request of Euphronius to write something for him (*Ep.* ix. 2), and at a later time to a similar one from Arbogastes, afterwards probably bishop of Chartres, referring him to bishops nearer and more competent than himself, as Lupus of

Troyes, or Auspicius of Toul (*Ep.* iv. 17). From this time he gave up writing verses of a light kind, as an occupation ill-suited both to his time of life and the gravity of his office, and declined to resume it even at the request of his friends (*Ep.* ix. 12). But he did not refuse at their request to criticise compositions nor to write hymns in honour of martyrs, among which was, according to the writers of *Histoire littéraire*, one in honour of St. Saturninus of Toulouse, and another on St. Anianus, both of which are lost (*Ep.* viii. 4, ix. 16). As regards his wife Papianilla, though there is no doubt of his undiminished affection for her, it is probable, as is assumed by Sirmond, Tillemont, the Abbé Chaix, and others, that like Paulinus, Reticius and others, he lived with her on terms not of connubial but of fraternal intimacy, but no evidence of this appears from his own writings. That they continued to live together is plain from the story told of them by Gregory of Tours, that having parted with his plate in order to give to the poor, she like the wife of Paulinus found fault with him for so doing (Greg. Tur. ii. 22). He also speaks with the greatest affection of their young daughter, Roscia, who was being brought up carefully by her grandmother and aunts at Lyons (*Ep.* v. 16). He became abstemious in his diet, observing alternate days as fasts, yet not wanting in hospitality (*Ep.* vii. 14). In describing the mode of life of his friend Maximus who like himself had been forced into the office of a priest, perhaps bishop of Toulouse, he may be supposed to describe in some measure his own (*Ep.* iv. 24). He became a diligent student of Scripture, though disclaiming earnestly any ability as a commentator, and also of ecclesiastical writers, as Augustine, Jerome, Origen, and others (*Ep.* viii. 4, ix. 2).

Among his acts about this time may be reckoned an endeavour through Pragmatius (bishop of Bourges, as Tillemont conjectures, or according to Chaix, of Autun), perhaps the same man as the one mentioned in *Ep.* v. 10, to bring about a reconciliation between a presbyter Agrippinus and a widow named Eutropia, whose son had married his daughter, in a matter of inheritance in which Sidonius thought that he had behaved ill towards her (*Ep.* vi. 2; Tillemont, xvi. p. 227, 238).

It was probably before he became a bishop that in a journey to Toulouse he was able to perform an act of great service to an old friend. Turpio, a man of Tribunitian rank, had borrowed a sum of money from Maximus Palatinus, also a friend of Sidonius, and the only security that he gave for it was his bond to pay interest at 12 per cent. For ten years no interest had been paid, and Turpio, now extremely ill, besought Sidonius to obtain for him more delay. Sidonius dined and slept at the house of Maximus, and noticed a great change in his dress and appearance, and found that he had adopted a monastic or at least a clerical mode of life. Next morning, as he was departing, he laid the case before his friend, urging him to grant his request on the ground not only of kindness but of prudence, for if Turpio died his heirs would be entitled by law to a year's immunity. Maximus, as a friend, and particularly as a clerical person, granted the request, postponed the payment of the debt for a year, and remitted all the interest. In his letter to Turnus, son of Turpio, in which he relates the whole transaction, Sidonius urges him on his own behalf and on that of his co-heirs to express the utmost gratitude to Maximus, and to use his best endeavours to pay off the principal of the debt (*Ep.* iv. 24).

From the time of his acceptance of the bishopric in 471 until A.D. 474, when Auvergne was first attacked formally by the Visigoth, its is not easy to fix accurately all the dates of events or of letters, but the following are probably included within that period.

From the time of his accession to the throne of Toulouse in 466, Euric lost no opportunity of strengthening himself and increasing his own dominions by aggression upon the Roman. In 470, in compliance with the treacherous suggestions by Arvandus, and in contravention of the existing treaty under Riothamus, he attacked and defeated a Breton force in alliance with Rome, and probably intended to act against him, but shortly after received a check from the Romans under Paulus, which with the unwelcome support of the Burgundians served to maintain their supremacy for a time in Berry (*Ep.* i. 7, vii. 6; Greg. Turon. ii. 18). With Riothamus Sidonius appears to have been on friendly terms, and exerted his influence with him to obtain redress for an Arvernian, whose slaves had been carried off by some of his disorderly Bretons (*Ep.* iii. 9).

Not long after his acceptance of the episcopate, the archiepiscopal see of Bourges became vacant on the death probably of Eulalius or Eulodius, and the people agreed to request Sidonius to undertake the duty of appointing a successor. Before accepting this office he consulted Euphronius, bishop of Autun, who had been concerned together with Patiens, bishop of Lyons, in appointing John, an archdeacon, to be bishop of Chalons, A.D. 469, and also Agroecius, bishop of Sens, whom he pressed to attend if possible and preside as metropolitan, though from the disturbed state of the country other bishops would be unable to attend. There were many candidates, of whom the principal were Eucherius, Pannychius, and Simplicius, all of them laymen, but of whom the last was distinctly the favourite, and the first two were disqualified by having married a second time. So numerous, however, were they as to fill two benches in the cathedral, and while all were opposed to each other, many obtruded themselves, and some even offered money for the office, putting it up, as it were, to auction, for the highest bidder. Amidst this confusion and difficulty, the only safe course to be taken was that which the people chose, with some little objection on the part of some presbyters, viz., to commit the selection to a single person. Accordingly Sidonius delivered an address in the presence of the archbishop of Sens, in which he describes with modesty and good judgment his great difficulty in making choice of a fit person. Many were fit, but only one could be chosen. Some disliked a monk, some a man of learning, some a strict man, and others, one who was lax and easy. If he were to choose a military man, a cry would be raised against himself because he had been engaged in secular affairs and might be thought to despise the poor

in Christ. But after weighing carefully the whole question he had resolved to name Simplicius, as having a sacerdotal origin, being the son of Eulodius, probably the last bishop, and also son-in-law of Palladius who, unless the conjecture of Tillemont be correct, preceded Eulalius. He then describes his character and merits, among which one was that he had built a church at a time when he was young, his family were increasing, and his means restricted. If any asked him how he came to know all this, he replies that he had known the people of Bourges before he had made acquaintance with the town, had conversed with many and heard their opinions, and therefore in the name of the Trinity he pronounced Simplicius to be the metropolitan of the province, and chief priest of the city. At the request of Perpetuus, bishop of Tours, he sends him the discourse which he had composed or at least dictated to a copyist in two watches of a summer night, without ornament, or grace of oratory, but which answered the purpose for which it was intended. (*Ep.* iv. 25, vii. 5, 8, 9.) At some time shortly after he became a bishop, Mamertus Claudianus, already mentioned, sent him his treatise in three books on the condition of the soul (de statu animae) of whose receipt Sidonius took no notice until Mamertus wrote to him to complain of his silence and of his retention of his book. This appeal drew forth a reply, in which Sidonius, who had lent the book to Nymphidius, pours forth an overflowing torrent in eulogy both upon the treatise and also on a hymn which he had lent at the same time, which Gennadius says was the one so well known by its opening words, "Pange lingua," commonly attributed to Venantius Fortunatus (Vol. III. p. 791; *Ep.* iv. 2, 3, v. 2; Chaix, ii. 55). In the following year 473, or early in 474, Claudian died, to the great grief of his two friends, and of the diocese of Vienne. His death was deplored deeply by Sidonius, who, in a letter to his nephew Petreius, describes his character and abilities, and his affectionate deference to his brother the bishop, and also the valuable assistance rendered by him to his flock. He adds also a funeral elegy to his memory in hendecasyllabic verse, which he says in that letter he wrote at the grave when he visited Vienne late in the summer of 474 (*Ep.* iv. 11. v. 6).

The following letters between the dates mentioned above may be mentioned as illustrating in one way or another the character of the writer. (1) To Ambrosius, a bishop, perhaps of Sens, about a young man who had led a dissolute life, but mended his ways by marriage, over which he expresses his pleasure, but recommends behaviour in the use of it in accordance with the opinion much in favour at this time, and with which his own conduct in this respect most probably agreed (*Ep.* ix. 6). (2) To a friend named Aper, a man of property in Auvergne, whom he entreats to return to his patrimonial estate, extolling the beauties of the country, the attractions of the town, and representing the advantage to himself of a speedy return (*Ep.* iv. 21). (3) To Aprunculus, bishop of Langres, about a clerical person, named Injuriosus, whom he was willing to release from his obligation to the church of Clermont, and whose services he wished his friend to enjoy, on condition that he treated him with kindness (*Ep.* ix. 10). (4) To Auspicius, bishop of Toul, recommending to his notice the bearer of his letter, Peter, a man of Tribunitian rank (*Ep.* vii. 10). (5) To Censorius, bishop, probably of Auxerre, about a "Levite" who had taken refuge in his diocese from the threatened attacks of the Visigoths, and who, he begs, may be relieved from the payment due from him as a stranger on the produce of a small piece of church land, which he occupied, so that he might return home with a grateful heart (*Ep.* vi. 10). (6) To Eleutherius, bishop of Tournay, recommending a Jew to him for protection (*Ep.* vi. 11). (7) To Fonteius, bishop of Vaison, expressing his thanks for his kind reception of Vindicius, a deacon of Auvergne, and also his kindness and protection afforded to his intimate friends, Apollinaris, his kinsman, and Simplicius, suspected by Chilperic II., the Burgundian tetrarch, who, bearing the Roman title of *magister militum*, was jealous of Roman influence, and suspected them of a plot for transferring Vaison to the Roman emperor (*Ep.* v. 6, vii. 4). (8) In a letter to Graecus, bishop of Marseilles, he relates the story of Amantius, a native of Auvergne, and employed as a reader in the service of the church, born of parents of good character and moderate means. He went to Marseilles to seek his fortune, and by his industry and good conduct obtained the favour of Eustachius, the bishop, predecessor of Graecus, of the count and of many citizens. Having gained the affections of a young lady of equal rank at least with his own, and possessing a good fortune, he married her without precaution on the part of her mother, who appears to have been a widow, to secure her own property. But as soon as this was accomplished, the gay deceiver (praestigiator invictus), having averted by a timely present the suspicions of his mother-in-law, laid hands on as much property as he could, and beat a retreat to Auvergne. She threatened him with an action for damages, but having obtained from Sidonius, on grounds which must have been fictitious, a letter of recommendation to Graecus, he returned to Marseilles in hope of pacifying her anger. Notwithstanding what had taken place, the affair was somehow made up, and Sidonius, who treats the whole rather as a comedy than a moral offence, did not withdraw his favour from Amantius, whom he employed frequently as his letter-carrier to Graecus (*Ep.* vii. 2, 7, 11; ix. 4). (9) To Leontius, bishop of Arles, recommending the bearer of the letter, who had some business to transact there in reference to a will (*Ep.* vi. 3). (10) To Lupus, bishop of Troyes, with whom he carried on frequent correspondence, about a man named Gallus, who had left his wife and removed to Auvergne, and to whom Lupus sent a letter exhorting him to return to her. The success of this letter is related by Sidonius (*Ep.* vi. 9). (11) To Nonnechius, or Nunechius, bishop of Nantes, recommending to him a converted Jew named Promotus (*Ep.* viii. 13). (12) To Philagrius, a friend, on metaphysical subjects (*Ep.* vii. 11). (13) To Pragmatius, bishop, perhaps of Autun, though Tillemont thinks of Bourges, requesting him to reconcile two persons who were at variance, Agrippinus, a priest, whose daughter had married the son of Eutropia, a widow devoted to a holy life. The son was

now dead, and also their child, and Agrippinus, who was plainly endeavouring to secure a pecuniary benefit for his daughter, persecuted his mother-in-law in an ungenerous manner, though she was well disposed to a reconciliation, which Sidonius had endeavoured vainly, as an old friend of Eutropia, to bring about, and for which, he says with some surprise, there was more inclination on the female than on the male side of the quarrel (*Ep.* vi. 2). (14) To Principius, bishop of Soissons, there are two letters, one acknowledging the receipt of a letter, and regretting deeply that he is separated so far from him by distance, the other describing the pleasure which he had received from a visit paid to him by Antiolius, a bishop, though of what see is unknown, who had been a member of the monastic community of Lerins, and a friend of Lupus, bishop of Troyes, and Maximus of Riez, predecessor of Faustus. Antiolius had visited Principius, and also his brother Remigius, and delighted Sidonius with his account of them, on which Sidonius indites a rhetorical panegyric, in the midst of which a letter was brought to him from Principius by Megethius, by whom in reply he sends his respects (obsequia), requesting him to favour him with letters as frequently as he can, at all events with his prayers, and deploring the distance which separates them (*Ep.* viii. 14, ix. 8). (15) To Proculus, a friend whose son had left his home and taken refuge in Auvergne, and whom he implores him to receive again with lenity, especially as he had himself rebuked him severely and brought him to repentance (*Ep.* iv. 23). (16) To Remigius, bishop of Rheims, brother of Principius, relating how a native of Auvergne having gone to Rheims, obtained clandestinely from his secretary or bookseller a collection of his discourses, and presented them to him, though he was willing to purchase them. Sidonius immediately had them all copied out, and in his letter to Remigius expresses his admiration of them, especially their style, on which he pronounces an inflated panegyric, and hints that if he neglects to favour him with more of his compositions, he shall watch the sales of travellers and plunder his bookshelves with the connivance and assistance of the numerous admirers who have read his works in Auvergne (*Ep.* ix. 7). (17) To Apollinaris, at the time when the siege was impending, approving of his determination to postpone a meditated pilgrimage to the tomb of the martyr, perhaps St. Julian, and mentioning a complaint by the bearer of the letter against a servant of his, named Genesius. (*Ep.* iv. 6).

In the course of the year A.D. 473, or early in 474, the province of Berry became a prey to the Visigoth king, who took advantage of the weakness of the Roman empire after the death of Anthemius to extend his dominion towards the Rhone and the Loire, and Auvergne was now the only province remaining to the Romans west of the Rhone, and this also was in constant danger of invasion. No formal attack, however, took place until the autumn of 474. In June of that year Julius Nepos, nephew of Marcellinus mentioned above, became emperor, and held that office until August 475 (Jornandes, *Get.* 45). A friend of Sidonius, Castalius Innocentius Audax, was appointed by him to the office of *praefectus urbi* early in his reign, an appointment on which Sidonius wrote to congratulate him, adding some judicious compliments to the new emperor (*Ep.* viii. 7). In this letter no mention is made of any alarm of invasion, and late in the summer of the same year, when the fear of siege had for the present subsided at Clermont, Sidonius took the journey to Vienne already mentioned, in which he paid a visit of condolence to his friend Thaumastus, who had lately become a widower, but who had exerted himself to refute the suspicion raised against Apollinaris and Simplicius respecting the city of Vaison (*Ep.* v. 6; vii. 4). He seems on this journey, either first or last, to have visited Lyons, and there to have met with the quaestor Licinianus, who bore with him from the emperor Nepos at Ravenna a formal appointment of Ecdicius to the dignity of a patrician. Of this he writes with great pleasure to Papianilla, as the payment of a debt long due, promised by Anthemius, and now fulfilled by Nepos, and looks forward to higher honours still to be conferred upon her brother. He concludes his letter with salutations from their daughter Roscia, who was being brought up with tender care by her aunts and grandmother (*Ep.* v. 16). At some time in this year, as it seems, Avitus, brother-in-law of Sidonius, endowed the see of Clermont with a farm called Cuticiacum (Cunhiae), not far from the city, and in the letter mentioning this Sidonius speaks also of the threatened invasion and of his confidence in Avitus in case of negotiation (*Ep.* iii. 1). Meanwhile, as the autumn advanced, the danger became nearer, the Visigoths entered the territory of Auvergne, and communication with distant places became more difficult. For the purpose of conveying letters, Sidonius employed a Jew named Gozolas (Gedaliah?), of whom he expresses the hope that he may become a Christian (*Ep.* iii. 4, iv. 5), and in writing to Graecus, Amantius (*Ep.* vi. 11). In preparations to resist the enemy Sidonius exerted himself not so much as a bishop as a leader of the people, and was greatly assisted by his brother-in-law Ecdicius, who, on one occasion, with a handful of cavalry attacked and defeated a large force of the enemy. They retired at the end of 474 or beginning of 475, but not so completely as to remove either the apprehension of future attack or the necessity for watch and ward to be kept on the walls during the snowy days and dark nights of winter (*Ep.* iii. 7). Among the vexations incidental to the state of affairs, one appears in a letter to Calminius, a friend serving, but whether under compulsion is not quite clear, in the ranks of the enemy; but in this he speaks of the prospects, if not of peace, yet at least of a truce (*Ep.* v. 12). The blockade had not been maintained so strictly as entirely to prevent communication from without, for in a letter to Faustus, bishop of Riez, he speaks of a monk named Riochatus, who was also a bishop and a Briton by birth, the bearer of some books of his, who on his way to Bretagne, if not to Britain, came to Clermont, and being prevented from further progress by the siege was entertained hospitably there for more than two months. During his stay he had made known some scattered portions of his freight, but took his departure hastily, and was suspected by some of the people who were travelling of having

carried off not literary but pecuniary treasure. Sidonius accordingly mounted his horse, rode off in pursuit, and overtook him on the following day. He saluted him with a mixture of severity and cordiality, but with the greatest show of respect took from him the book which he had concealed, and which he devoured, he says, with eagerness, and from which he caused large extracts to be made. He then proceeds to give his opinion concerning them, in which he compares his friend to the captor of a foreign woman suggested in the book of Deuteronomy. Like him he has taken captive heathen Philosophy, whom he has deprived of her superfluous ornaments and joined in marriage with himself (Deut. xxi. 10, 13). On this theme he proceeds in his usual eulogistic style to enlarge in detail, and to show how the doctrines of the various schools have been made, by his friend, with due regard to Christian doctrine, subservient to his own purpose, and he foretells with confidence the future fame of the book, which, however, unfortunately has not been preserved (*Ep.* ix. 9). That the enemy had departed by this time is evident both from this story and from a letter to Eutropius, bishop of Orange, recommending the bearer to his notice (*Ep.* vi. 6). The siege was now over, and immediate danger from the enemy removed, but the troubles from without were succeeded by other troubles not less perplexing. Ecdicius had left Clermont and taken up his abode for the present among the Burgundians, and much strife and dissension prevailed in Clermont. In this state of affairs Sidonius entreated his friend Constantius, a priest of Lyons, to visit him and use his influence with the people in restoring peace. He obeyed the call, notwithstanding the winter season, the difficulties of travelling, the length of the journey, and his own feeble health, was received with the utmost respect and cordiality, and his mission was crowned with success (*Ep.* iii. 2). Ecdicius also was entreated by his brother-in-law to return, and not to trust to the uncertain favour of kings, a remark which seems to refer to the Burgundian tetrarchs, whose favour he was enjoying. The loose narrative of Jornandes seems to show that he returned for a time, but there is no evidence of this from Sidonius (Jornandes, *Get.* 45, Sid. *Ep.* iii. 3). Besides the trouble already mentioned, the siege and its attendant devastations had caused much distress among the inhabitants of Clermont, which however Patiens, bishop of Lyons, of whose munificent liberality Sidonius had been a witness in the region bordering on the Rhône, contributed largely to relieve. In his letter to him of thanks and encomium, Sidonius compares him to Triptolemus and also to Joseph (*Ep.* vi. 12). In this work of relief Ecdicius appears to have joined very heartily, but the account given of his share in it by Gregory of Tours appears to be much exaggerated (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* ii. 24; Ecdicius, Vol. II. 33). A truce, not destined to be of long duration, appears to have been arranged in the early part of A.D. 475, perhaps through the agency of Epiphanius, bishop of Pavia, who appears to have gone alone to Toulouse, but who may have conferred on his way with Licinianus, of whom Sidonius, who does not mention Epiphanius, speaks in high terms, and also with others (Baronius, *Ann.* 474, xvi.–xx.). He mentions a treaty, perhaps this one, in a letter to Julianus, a bishop in the province either of Bourges or Narbonne (*Ep.* ix. 5; Tillemont, xvi. p. 249), and uses his interest with Hypatius to induce him to consent to the sale of the remainder of a property called Eborolacum (Ebreuil) to Donidius, of which he already possessed the moiety. He also wrote to Theoplastus, a bishop, perhaps of Geneva, to assist Donidius in some matter, perhaps the same as the one just mentioned, on which he had applied to him (*Ep.* iii. 5, vi. 5). In the midst of this temporary cessation of hostilities a report became current that Euric had again made a movement of aggression and invaded the Roman territory of Auvergne, and Sidonius thought it to be his duty to summon his people to join in acts of fasting and prayer to be conducted in the same way as the Rogations instituted, or rather revived and re-organised, some years previously by Mamertus, bishop of Vienne, and of which, in a letter to him, he recounts the history. In the same letter he begs for the prayers of the bishop and of his flock on behalf of the people of Auvergne, and as a claim upon their attention, mentions the transfer to Vienne at some previous time of the remains of Ferreolus and the head of Julian, both of them martyrs and natives of Auvergne. He also wrote to his friend Aper, entreating him as a citizen of Clermont to leave his warm baths at Aquae Calidae, and come to Clermont to take part in the solemn service (*Ep.* v. 14, vii. 1, Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* ii. 11 *de Mirac.* ii. 1, 2; ROGATION DAYS, *Dict. Chr. Ant.* Vol. II. p. 1809; Baronius, *Ann.* 475, xii.–xxi.; Tillemont, vol. xvi. p. 247, 248). No actual invasion of Auvergne appears to have taken place, but in the meantime negotiations were being carried on in which the bishops Basilius, of Aix, Faustus, of Riez, Graecus, of Marseilles, and Leontius, of Arles, were among the acting counsellors, and of which the ultimate result was the surrender of Auvergne to the Visigoths.

It was probably at this time, after his repulse from Clermont and while negotiations were going on, that Euric, who was not only a determined enemy of Rome but a zealous partisan of the Arian heresy, and whose hostility in this direction Sidonius says that he feared more than his attacks on Roman fortifications, deprived of their sees and in many cases put to death or banished many bishops in the regions subject to his dominion, whose places he would allow no successors to fill, and thus the number of the clergy was in danger of being diminished. Churches were overthrown, and their sites overrun by animals. Christian discipline was destroyed, and in a letter to Basilius, probably archbishop of Aix in Provence, one of the negotiators above mentioned, Sidonius implores him, as placed in a region which was the passage ground of political negotiators, to exert himself to obtain permission for the exercise of episcopal ordination (*Ep.* vii. 6). Assuming this to be the true date of this letter, which seems to be corroborated by a letter to Felix (*Ep.* iv. 10), and in some degree by the narrative of Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Fr.* ii. 25), it was perhaps at this time, while Sidonius was master of his own movements, that he accepted a request made to him by Elaphius, a country

gentleman of Rouergue (Ruteni), in which region Euric was predominant, to consecrate a baptistery, of which he remarks that his friend had built a church at a time when few would have dared to repair an old one. Though the season was unfavourable for travelling, and the road dangerous from Alpine precipices, he consented cheerfully to go, but warned his friend that he must bring a long train of attendants (*Ep.* iv. 5). Probably also at this time he visited the church of Chantelle (Cantillensem) about twenty-six miles south-west of Moulins, at the request of a friend named Germanicus, on whose bodily vigour at the age of sixty he enlarges with pleasure in a letter to another friend, Vectius, whose own person and habits he describes with no less pleasure and admiration in one to his nephew Secundus (*Ep.* iv. 9, 13).

The news of the surrender of Auvergne, proclaiming as it did the utter prostration of Roman influence, was a heavy blow to Sidonius, and he wrote to Graecus to complain bitterly of what had taken place, recounting the unswerving loyalty of the Arvernians, their exertion on behalf of the state in the matter of Seronatus, and their sufferings during the siege; and inveighing with vehement severity against the selfish policy by which, for the sake of securing for a time but for future slavery the districts in which the negotiators were interested, the faithful province of Auvergne was to be handed over for punishment to the enemy. If this is to be the case, the friends to whom they have been betrayed ought at least to be prepared to receive them as exiled refugees. The letter is a manly and patriotic remonstrance, free from artificial pedantry, in a style which exhibits the character of the writer in its genuine colours, and in the honesty of its scornful indignation rises into real eloquence (*Ep.* vii. 7; GRAECUS, Vol. II. p. 720). But the remonstrance was fruitless, and Auvergne passed from the Roman to the Visigoth dominion. It was placed under a governor named Victorius, with the title of Count, who appears at first to have behaved with real or affected moderation (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* ii. 20; Sid. *Ep.* vii. 17; Chaix, ii. 290).

Third Period, A.D. 475–489. — Sidonius was soon banished for a time to a fort named Livia, probably Capendu, about ten miles from Carcassonne, on the road to Narbonne (*Ep.* viii. 3; ix. 3; Vaissette, *Hist. de Languedoc*, V. vol. i. p. 501). Some of the inconveniences which he suffered there are described by him in letters to Faustus, bishop of Riez, and to Leo, a native of Narbonne and of Roman origin, but filling a high office under Euric. They consisted chiefly in the annoyance caused by his neighbours, two quarrelsome drunken old Gothic women (*Ep.* viii. 3). Leo was a friend to Sidonius, who at his request wrote a life of Apollonius of Tyana, and on whom in a letter to Leo he pronounces, not a critical description of the man and his works, but an indiscriminating panegyric (*ib.*). Through Leo's influence he obtained release from his confinement, which was not of long duration, but his return to Clermont was delayed by an enforced sojourn at Bordeaux, whither he went in order to obtain from Euric authority for recovering the inheritance belonging to him in right of his mother-in-law. But two months were allowed by Euric to pass before he would grant him an interview, nor have we any information as to the result, but his visit drew forth a letter in verse from Lampridius, a professor of literature there, but who was absent at the time, urging him to write some verses, a request with which, though not in the mood for writing, and somewhat in the condition, as he says, of a dying swan, he nevertheless complied, and sent his friend a poem in hendecasyllables, describing the various signs of the power of Euric, to be seen at Bordeaux, perhaps hoping that through Lampridius, and also through Leo, this little stroke of indirect flattery for the king might be of service to him in attaining his object (*Ep.* viii. 3. 9). On his return to Clermont, though not under close restraint, his movements beyond his diocese were controlled by the governor, whose leave he says that he was obliged to obtain, when he wished to take a journey to visit his friend Felix (*Ep.* iv. 10). But in general he seems to have been well satisfied with his treatment, unless indeed some part of the praise which he bestows on his custodian, be due to the inveterate spirit of eulogy, for Victorius ostentatiously promoted church building in Clermont, and undertook the charge of the funeral of Abraham, a monk of Eastern origin, who having been imprisoned for five years in Persia, had latterly been abbat of the monastery of St. Cyricus, near Clermont. Victorinus visited him on his death-bed. His life is related by Gregory of Tours, and Sidonius wrote, A.D. 477, a somewhat turgid epitaph on him in elegiacs, at the request of a friend named Volusianus, said to be his brother, whom Baronius calls a bishop, perhaps the successor of Perpetuus at Tours. Sidonius recommended that a monk named Auxanius should be chosen to succeed Abraham, but that as his health was weak and his temper easy, Volusianus should take the lead in the government of the monastery. According to Gregory of Tours, the conduct of Victorius became at a later time oppressive and tyrannical. He was forced to take flight and seek refuge at Rome, whither he persuaded Apollinaris, son of Sidonius, to accompany him. Showing there similar insolence as he had shown in Auvergne, he was stoned to death by the populace. Apollinaris was taken with him, and kept for a time in confinement at Milan, but was enabled to make his escape and return home, where, so far as we can judge, he seems to have been received kindly. (*Ep.* vii. 17; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* ii. 20, 21, 26; *de Mirac.* i. 45; *Vit. Patr.* c. iii.; Baronius, ann. 480, xiv.–xviii.; Chaix, ii. 289–292; Ruricius, *Ep.* ii. 25.)

Sidonius had already, at the request of Magnus Felix, published the twenty-four poems which, as well as two letters in prose to Leontius and Polemius, appear in a collected form. This was probably about A.D. 468 (*Carm.* ix. 8; Germain, p. 38). At a time much later than this, which there are no definite data to fix, but which may probably be placed at about 477 or 478, the time at which he would have reached the age of forty-six or forty-seven, the commencement of "seniority," according to Gellius, Censorinus, and others (Censorinus, *de die Nat.* xii.; Gell. x. 28), his friend, Constantius of Lyons, urged him to publish his letters, a request to which he acceded. The reason for assigning this date is that in the first book he

speaks of himself as advancing in years, and in one of the fifth book, published somewhat later, which is addressed to Aquilinus, as knocking at the threshold of old age. Born A.D. 432, he would be fifty years old in 482, an age which the words just quoted would sufficiently describe (*Ep.* i. 1, 11, v. 9). Of the first book as it now stands, all the letters belong to the earlier period of his public life. It was not long after this that he published six more books, as he implies in the last letter of the seventh book addressed to the same Constantius (*Ep.* iv. 10, vii. 18). Of the letters in these five books most of those which possess special interest have been noticed already, but a few remain to be mentioned. (1) To Placidus, a citizen of Grenoble, unknown as it seems to himself personally, but who had read and admired his works both in verse and in prose, i.e., the first volume of his letters (*Ep.* iii. 14). (2) To Chariobaudes, an abbat, thanking him for his sympathy in his trouble, and sending him by his messengers a warm cowl to wear during night Services (*Ep.* vii. 16). (3, 4) A friendly correspondence between Sidonius and Ruricius, afterwards, but not at that time, bishop of Limoges, on whose marriage with Iberia Sidonius had written a poem in former days. Sidonius had lent to Leontius, bishop of Arles, a book, one of his own composition, which Ruricius, who had great admiration for its author, wished to see, and which by direction of Sidonius he had obtained from him. But he was so much pleased with it that he ventured without leave to have it copied, a pious fraud for which upon confession of the deed he asked Sidonius to grant him absolution, which was willingly and gracefully accorded (Ruric, *Ep.* i. 8; Sid. *Ep.* iv. 16). In another letter to the same, Sidonius speaks of having sent by the bearer a copy made by his scribe of the volume of the Heptateuch, i.e., the Pentateuch, together with the books of Joshua and of Judges+Ruth, regarded as one book, which he had himself examined and ascertained its correctness; also one of the Prophets, written during his own absence, and also that of the promised corrector, but with great care, and freed from superfluous additions. For this work the scribe, in his opinion, deserves his master's best thanks (*Ep.* v. 15). (5) To Sapaudus, a professor of rhetoric, at Vienne, to whom he pays an adroit compliment by expressing the admiration with which Pragmatius regarded him, himself an eminent orator. He speaks of Sapaudus and Pragmatius as the two most distinguished scholars of the day (*Ep.* v. 10). (6) To Pastor, a citizen of Clermont, chosen by his fellow citizens to represent them at a provincial council at Arles, probably in the time of Majorian, but who failed to appear on the day appointed. Sidonius commends his modesty if that had been the cause of his absence, and makes some good remarks on canvassing, but warning him that if he stays away again his absence will be imputed to idleness (*Ep.* v. 20). (7) To Leo, the minister of Euric, who had exhorted him, now that he had published his letters, i.e., the first book of them, to take up the composition of history, but Sidonius excuses himself from the task on various accounts, his disinclination to work, his dislike of travelling, his want of practice in reading old books, and his clerical condition, in which the utterance of strict truth, which that condition imposes on him, is likely to be inconvenient and dangerous (*Ep.* iv. 22). Having published seven books of letters, he was urged by his friend Petronius to ransack his stores and publish another book, a request with which he complied by publishing an eighth book, and at the request of Firminus a ninth and last, which he says that he completed after a visitation of his diocese during a winter so severe that he was obliged to break the frozen ink which he had to use in writing. By this time he says that he had completed three Olympiads in his office of bishop, a calculation which would bring the date of this work to A.D. 483 (*Ep.* viii. 1, ix. 1, 12).

Of the letters contained in the eighth book the following, which have not been mentioned before, may be mentioned here: (1) To Consentius, probably the son of Consentius to whom the poem on Narbonne was addressed A.D. 465. He expresses a great desire to see again his house and estate called Octaviana, its chapel, library, baths, and other arrangements, praises the verses which his friend sends him from time to time, and speaks of himself as being now a better critic than poet, for he has given up verse-making and devotes himself to graver studies, to which also he exhorts his friend to pay attention, and especially to be liberal in alms-giving, for what is given to the church is laid up in store for himself. The date of this letter may probably be put at about A.D. 485 (*Ep.* viii. 4). (2) To a friend named Fortunalis, a Spaniard, whose firmness in difficulties he extols, and whose fame he predicts will be universal (*Ep.* viii. 5). (3) A long letter to Nammatius, a friend employed in naval affairs by Euric, and now stationed at the island of Oleron, where he found much amusement in hunting, in which also he implies that his son Apollinaris, who was more fond of hunting than of study, took great delight. He speaks of the great pleasure which he had received from the praise bestowed on his published works by Nicetius, whom as a young man he remembers making a speech on the day when his own father presided at the inauguration of the consul Asterius at Lyons. Also of the attacks of the Saxon pirates on the coast, their nautical skill, and their cruelty, and his anxiety for him on this account. He sends him the copies of Varro and the Chronicle of Eusebius, for which he had asked. The letter is written in a cheerful tone, with scarcely any reference to his own condition. Nammatius may have been the same person as he to whom with Ceraunia, his wife, some letters are addressed by Ruricius (Sid. *Ep.* viii. 6; Ruric. *Ep.* ii. 1–5). (4) A long letter to Lupus, professor of rhetoric at Perigueux, mentioning the murder by his slaves of Lampridius, to whom at Bordeaux he had sent a poem, which he now transcribes, with much praise of his literary abilities, but regret that he should have been deluded into the folly and impiety of consulting African diviners. He expresses great regard for the man and deep sorrow for his loss (*Ep.* viii. 11). (5) To Prosper, bishop of Auxerre, undertaking at his request to write a panegyric on Anianus, bishop of Orleans, but declining to complete the history of the war with Attila, which he had begun (*Ep.* viii. 15). (6) To Constantius,

committing to him the care of publishing the volume which he had undertaken to compile at the request of Petronius. He apologises for the old-fashioned and rough style of the language, but justifies it as founded on ancient and good authority (*Ep.* viii. 16).

To the eight volumes already published, he added at the request of Firminus a ninth, a step justified, he says, by the precedent of Pliny, the younger. He asks him to let him know what criticisms are passed on the former volumes, and if he finds any letters that are worth publishing he will write them on the margin of the eighth volume, for his son Apollinaris is not to be trusted in literary matters (*Ep.* ix. 1). Mention may be made of the following: (1) To Faustus, bishop of Riez, written from his prison at Livia. He thinks it expedient in the present state of affairs not to write too often, for nothing can be more inconsistent than a cheerful style and a mind depressed. He speaks with admiration of his friend's ascetic life, and of the pleasure and advantage which in former days he had derived from his sermons, both extemporaneous and such as were carefully prepared, which he had applauded vehemently, when they were preached in the church at Lyons. Begs him to pray for him, and hopes that he will, if necessary, find fault with him (*Ep.* ix. 3). (2) To Graecus, plainly of an earlier date than the one about the surrender, speaking of him in terms of the highest respect and affection, and bidding him not to take too much to heart the pain caused by the death (necessitas) of some of his clergy, because they who would follow Christ must drink of His cup (*Ep.* ix. 4). (3) To Lupus, bishop of Troyes, now in his 50th year of episcopate, to apologise for sending him a volume, probably of his letters, which he was not to keep for himself, but to transmit it to some one else. Lupus had written to complain of this neglect, as it seemed to be, on his part, for which Sidonius entreats him earnestly to pardon him, and to attribute it not to want of friendship, but to doubt as to its being likely to please him (*Ep.* ix. 11). (4) To Oresius, who seems to have been either a Spaniard or familiar with Spain. He asked Sidonius for some verses, but he replies not only that he gave up verse-making when he became a bishop 3 Olympiads ago, but that he is now out of practice; but that if he can find any letters previous to that time containing verses, he will send them to him (*Ep.* ix. 12). (5) To Tonantius, son of Tonantius Ferreolus mentioned in ii. 9, who also asked him for some verses in Asclepiadean metre suitable for recitation at a dinner-party. With this request he complies, though with an apology for his want of practice. We may suppose that in this case the claim of old friendship was strong enough to overcome the objection mentioned just now, but he exhorts his young friend to fill up the vacant moments at an entertainment with religious stories rather than verses, or with questions provoking discussion after the manner of Apuleius, the Plato of Madaura (of which Macrobius gives some instances, *Sat.* vii. 3, 24). He adds the story of what passed at the table of Majorian 20 years ago, already mentioned above (*Ep.* ix. 13). (6) To Burgundio, probably a young Burgundian, one of the garrison of Clermont during the siege, who as well as himself is ill and in bed, for which he expresses his regret, but is glad to hear that he is better and preparing to get up. He mentions with praise a speech lately delivered by him, but would prefer to commend it in his absence rather than directly. Burgundio had asked him what was meant by "recurring" verses, a question which he answers by giving instances

1. Roma tibi subito motibus ibit amor
Sole medere pede, ede perede melos.

in which the lines may be read backwards by inverting the letters of each word.

2. Praecipiti modo quod decurrit tramite flumen
Tempore consumptum tam cito deficiet.

in which the words of an elegiac distich being read backwards, express the same sense as when read forwards, but in a different order of words. He then exhorts his young friend to take up some great subject, in treating which he has no doubt that he will surpass himself, but while some will praise his eloquence, some his intellectual power, all will praise his modesty. It is a great thing when one who is only just past boyhood has obtained so much praise for literary excellence, that so many should be found to praise him on moral grounds (*Ep.* ix. 14). (7) To Gelasius, sending him some senarian iambics in reply to an appeal to him for some verses, but complaining that he was too fond of hendecasyllabics. (8) To Firminus, on completion of his collection, of which the previous eight books were dedicated to Constantius, accomplished after visiting his parishes during the winter, having ransacked his shelves and cupboards for letters to include in it. As the iambic poem sent to Gelasius had given him much pleasure, he now sends to Firminus a concluding one in Sapphic metre, in which, now that old age is at hand, he expresses his intention of devoting himself to sacred subjects and of writing a hymn in praise of Saturninus, bishop of Toulouse (*Ep.* ix. 16). The date of this is probably 483 (see No. 4) or 484.

In none of these letters does he speak of opposition or personal ill-treatment: on the contrary, the tone of his later letters is cheerful, and he appears from the last of them to have met with no hindrance except from weather in fulfilling his episcopal duties. But Gregory of Tours relates that, in the later years of his life, he was much annoyed by two priests, probably of Arian opinions, whose names he does not mention, but which are said by Chaix, though without citing any authority, to have been Honorius and Hermanchius. These men, Gregory says, succeeded in preventing him from exercising his episcopal functions, and even in reducing him to extreme poverty; but after the death of the one called Honorius, who died from a disease resembling that which caused the death of Arius, he was restored to his office, but being attacked by fever he desired that he might be carried into the church of St. Mary, and there, after speaking some words of love to his people, and pointing out Aprunculus, bishop of Langres, as fit to be his successor, he died, though not, as it appears, in the church, August A.D. 489. Upon his death the other priest, Hermanchius, seized on the property of the see, but at a banquet, to which he invited the principal citizens, a dream was related by the butler representing him as called

to account for his behaviour, and he soon afterwards died in a manner resembling the death of Simon Magus (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* ii. 23; Tillemont, xvi. 273–277; Chaix, ii. 366, 371). He was buried in the chapel of St. Saturninus, in the centre of the city of Clermont, by the side of his predecessor Eparchius, and an epitaph in hendecasyllabic verse by an unknown author was placed near his tomb with the date, "XII. Kal. Sept. Zenone imperatore." This has disappeared, but a copy of it has been preserved in a MS. of the Abbey of Cluny. The church of Saturninus is said by Savaron to have existed as late as the 10th century, after which it was destroyed, but the relics of Sidonius were transferred to the basilica of St. Genesius, which also has been destroyed, and thus the remains of Sidonius have probably been dispersed, but his memory is venerated at Clermont as that of a saint, and commemorated formerly on Aug. 23, the day of his death, but in later times on July 11, the day of the translation of his remains.

Sidonius may be said to present himself to us in four capacities: As 1. a country gentleman. 2. a politician. 3. a literary man. 4. a bishop. A gentleman of easy fortune living in the country, he entered eagerly into its employments and active amusements, but was also keenly sensible of the more refined and tranquil pleasures, derived from natural objects. Possessing and exerting without scruple a lordly influence over his own dependants and people of inferior rank in the province, he sometimes exercised it in a high-handed and peremptory manner, but usually with kindness and consideration. Affectionate and constant to his friends, he loved both to give and to receive from them hospitality, and some of his most agreeable letters are those which describe social gatherings in which he took part. His conduct as a politician was doubtless much influenced by his literary character. In the age of imperial decadence, the weakness of rulers and men in authority seems to have sought compensation in the fulness of panegyric, of which a copious stream was ever ready to flow from the facile pen of Sidonius. His eulogies were poured forth without stint or discrimination, alike on Avitus, Majorian, and Anthemius, and even Nepos did not fail to obtain a small share. He has compliments at fitting seasons, direct or indirect, for Euric and his wife. A poet laureate by nature, he must be regarded as a pliant politician, but though in this respect he cannot be ranked very high, he never forgot his duty as a patriotic citizen. Faithful to his countrymen, whether by birth as of Lyons, or of adoption as in Auvergne, he never failed to plead their cause, to uphold their interests, to denounce their oppressors, and to stand by them against injustice or hostile invasion, nor need we wonder that his memory should be revered by them as that of a saint. Invested against his will, and without previous preparation, with the office of a bishop, he laboured hard to repair the deficiencies under which he felt himself to labour. He neglected no duty, shrank from no personal trouble or responsibility, and in times of extreme difficulty shewed not only courage, but prudence and discretion. His character, no less than his abilities, commanded the respect and cordial affection of the best men of his time, both near at hand, and those who were more distant, as Basilius, Felix, Graecus, Lupus, Patiens, Principius, Remigius, as well as Leo and Arbogastes, and many others; and though, as we have seen, he did not shrink from remonstrating gravely and even bitterly with some of them, especially Graecus, he does not appear to have forfeited their esteem and affection. A man of kindly disposition, though like most, if not all proprietors of his time, a slave-owner, he treated his own slaves with kindness and took pains to induce others to shew similar conduct. He was friendly to Jews, employed them, and recommended them to the good offices of his friends.

Literary character.—But though he shewed himself to be a sincere and devout Christian, both before and after his elevation to the episcopate, it is as a man of letters that he will always be best known in modern times, for as it has been observed, his writings are the best furnished storehouse that we possess of information as to the domestic life, the manners and habits of public men, and in some points the public events of his period. Though not a voluminous writer, he has left behind him 147 separate letters, besides two included in poems, and 24 poems besides verses included in the letters. Besides these he is said to have written some epigrams, a panegyric on St. Anianus, a hymn on St. Saturninus, and a work called *Contestatiunculae*, and also according to Gennadius, other smaller works containing sound doctrine (Gennadius, *de Scr. Eccl.* 92). Gifted with a fatal facility of composition, and yielding readily both to the fascination which it exerts on the mind of its possessor and to the importunity of friends eager to enjoy its fruits, his longer poems are remarkable more for adroit handling of unpoetical material, than for poetry in its true sense, and must be said to deserve to a great extent the contemptuous sentence passed on them by Gibbon. Yet some of the shorter compositions, especially those in hendecasyllabic metre, are more successful, and touch with a light and discerning hand the scenes and characters which they describe. But of his letters we may speak with less sparing praise, for though their style is often turgid and pedantic, defaced by an artificial phraseology, frequently tainted with the heresy of self-invented words, and abounding in passages of great obscurity, they often describe in a very lively and picturesque manner the persons, objects, and transactions recorded in them. An inveterate panegyrist both in politics and in literature, he is more given to bless than to blame, to extol than to criticise, and sometimes wearies his reader by accumulation of indiscriminate praise gathered from various sources often incongruous, and seldom well selected, a fault incidental perhaps to an amiable man living in dangerous times, and during the decay of literature; yet sometimes, as in the case of Graecus, he shews that he knows how to blame as well as to applaud, and to lay on, when the occasion called it forth, a heavy weight of just and honest condemnation, expressed in nervous and for the most part simple language. Indisposed by habit of mind to searching criticism or solid investigation, he is inclined to regard the outward forms of language more than the substance clothed in them, to shew acquaintance more with the names of writers than the contents of their works, and with the metres employed by his poetic models in their compo-

sitions, than with their thoughts. Hating barbarians in general and their ways with all his heart, and jealous for the purity of the Latin tongue, a purity however framed on a standard lower than that of the best age, his style nevertheless exhibits in a remarkable manner the transition through which the language was passing, especially in the change from the synthetic to the analytic principle in grammatical formation (see Hallam, *Lit. Hist.* i. 1). A copious list of illustrations of these changes, too numerous to be noticed here, will be found in the edition of his works by M. Baret, Paris 1879, and may be consulted with great advantage by students. We may notice in passing his disposition to play on words, *e. g.* the name of a place "Apta" (*Ep.* ix. 9), "telas" and "tela" (*Carm.* xv. 148), and the pun on Tacitus already mentioned (*Ep.* iv. 22.) We have already had occasion to notice his facility of composition and his reputation for this among his contemporaries. Gregory of Tours gives an instance either of this or of retentive memory on the occasion of a festival of the church, at which the Office book having been removed or mislaid he was able either to compose at the moment or to recite from memory all that was required for the purpose of the Service (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* ii. 22). The machinery of his poems is almost entirely mythological, so much so that what Ampère says of them is not far from the truth, viz. that if one-tenth of his writings be deducted, the remainder would leave us in doubt whether he were a Christian or not. As regards his poems this estimate is probably correct, but there is abundant evidence of Christian thought in his letters, even before his episcopate, to shew the truth and sincerity of his Christian faith, though even in these he now and then turns aside into the mythological channel (Ampère, *Hist. de la Litt.* ii. 216). Petrarch says of him that he cannot forgive his presumption in speaking disrespectfully of Cicero, but this opinion seems to be founded on a single passage in which he uses an epithet applying not to the writings of Cicero, but to his person. (*Ep.* v. 5. Petrarch, *Op. Ep. praef.* p. 569.) Accounts of his life and writings are given by Baronius under the years already referred to; Cave (*Hist. Lit.* vol. i. p. 453); in *Gallia Christiana*, vol. ii. 231-234; in *Histoire Littéraire de France*, vol. ii. 550-573; Ceillier, vol. x. p. 579-599; Tillemont (vol. xvi. p. 195-284); M. Guizot, *Hist. de la Civilisation en France*, vol. i.; F. Ozanam, *Hist. of Civilisation in the 5th cent.* tr. London 1868, pp. 267, 273. But the fullest account that we have of him is the one by the abbé Chaix, curé of the church of St. Genesius at Clermont, *Sidoine Apollinaire et son siècle*, 2 vols. Clermont 1866. M. Chaix has omitted nothing which can illustrate his subject, of which he has treated for the most part with great fairness, and has translated many passages, both of the letters and the poems. Dr. Michael Fertig has published some very valuable academical essays on his life and times, including also some translations, in three parts, of which two were published at Würzburg in 1845, 1846, and the third at Passau 1848. Mr. Hodgkin has given an excellent account of him, and translated well some of his letters in his *Conquerors of Italy*, book iii. vol. ii. He gives an unfavourable opinion as to his honesty of purpose, for he says, "it is difficult to resist the conviction that he was playing a part," p. 311. There is also a good article on him in *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, vol. iii. p. 817.

The latest edition up to the present time (1886) is by M. Eugène Baret, Paris, 1879. It has an extremely valuable Introduction, containing remarks on the times and state of society, and lists of grammatical forms, words and phrases used by Sidonius, illustrating the transition state of the Latin language, and some peculiar to himself; also an attempt to settle the chronology of the letters, a task of great difficulty, the result of which would be more satisfactory, if the numeration of the letters themselves as given in the body of the work corresponded with that of the list in the Introduction, which is frequently not the case. There are also a good many misprints and the index is meagre. [H. W. P.]

SIDONIUS (3) II., thirty-third bishop of Mainz, about the middle of the 6th century, was one of those prelates who, as representatives of Roman culture amid the storms of the Frankish invasion, compelled the respect of the conquerors, and exerted a beneficent influence for the conquered (Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 571). Mainz had suffered terribly, and from the eulogies of Venantius Fortunatus we learn the part Sidonius took in repairing the ravages of these wars. He rebuilt ruined churches, restored public edifices, and liberally relieved the numerous prisoners and exiles (*Misc.* ix. 9, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxviii. 308-9). In particular, with the aid of a Frankish princess, Berthoara, daughter of Theodebert I., he erected a baptistery (ibid. ii. 15, col. 105), a church in honour of St. George the Martyr (ii. 16, col. 107) and works at the junction of the Main and Rhine, to confine the streams (ix. 9). See also *Gall. Christ.* v. 436 and Rettberg, i. 290, 570. [S. A. B.]

SIDONIUS (4), eighteenth bishop of Constance, succeeded Ernfridus A.D. 748, whom he had also succeeded as monk and abbat of Augia Dives (Reichenau). When abbat Othmar of St. Gall was being oppressed by the counts Warin and Ruodhard, Sidonius joined them in the condemnation and banishment of Othmar [OTHMARUS] (Hepidanus, *Ann. Alem.* A.D. 746, 758). He then administered the affairs of the abbey with his bishopric, distributing its churches and endowments, and enriching the friends of Warin and Ruodhard. He died in the monastery of Augia, c. A.D. 759 (Ratpertus, *De Cas. Mon. S. Gall.* i. c. 2; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxxvi. 1060-1; Herman. Contract. *Chron.* Saec. viii. A.D. 746, 759; *Gall. Christ.* v. 895; Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 759, c. 8, 10 with Pagi's critical notes). [J. G.]

SIGANTIUS. [GIGANTIUS.]

SIGBALD, the fourth abbat of a monastery or cell dependent upon Lindisfarne, which has found a metrical chronicler in Ethelwulf. To this cell Sigbald was a generous benefactor, building a chapel dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, and giving to it, among other things, a jewelled chalice of gold.

Mr. T. Arnold, who has edited this poem in the Appendix to the Works of Symeon of Durham, considers that the cell was at Crayke, near York, an ancient possession of St. Cuthbert. I

cannot agree with him. If Crayke had been intended, the abbat would never have sent an altar to the borders of Scotland to be consecrated, when York with its archbishop was only twelve miles distant. The messenger is said also to have returned by sea, a fact which by no means agrees with the position of Crayke. A sea-voyage would not be an easy route to or from Crayke. Probably the cell mentioned is not Crayke, but some other place in the northern part of the present county of Northumberland, where there was more than one "urbs," alluded to by Ethelwulf, who was, it is to be observed, a monk of Lindisfarne.

Sigbald is, possibly, the 'Sibald abbas' whose death is said by Symeon (*H. R.*) to have occurred in A.D. 771. [J. R.]

SIGE. In the system of Valentinus, as expounded by Irenaeus (i. 1), the origin of things was traced to two eternal co-existent principles, a male and a female. The male was called Bythus or Proarche, or Propator, &c.; the female had the names ENNOEA, CHARIS and SIGE. The whole Aeonology of Valentinus was based on a theory of syzygies, or pairs of Aeons, each Aeon being provided with a consort; and the supposed need of the co-operation of a male and female principle for the generation of new ones, was common to Valentinus and some earlier Gnostic systems. But it was a disputed point in these systems whether the First Principle of all was thus twofold as has been described. There were those, both in earlier systems, and even among the Valentinians who held, that the origin of things was to be traced to a single Principle, which some described as bisexual or hermaphrodite; others said was above all sex. And among the Valentinians who counted thirty Aeons, there were those who counted Bythus and Sige, as the first pair: while others who asserted the Single Principle excluded Bythus from the number, and made out the number of thirty without reckoning him. Thus Irenaeus says of the Valentinians (I. ii. 4. p. 10), *Τὸν γὰρ Πατέρα ποτὲ μὲν μετὰ συζυγίας τῆς Σιγῆς, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ ὑπέραρρεν καὶ ὑπέρθηλυ εἶναι θέλουσι.* And (I. xi. 5, p. 56) *Οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἄζυγον λέγουσι, μήτε ἄρρενα, μήτε θήλειαν, μήτε ὅλως ὄντα τι. Ἄλλοι δὲ ἀρρενόθηλυν αὐτὸν λέγουσιν εἶναι, ἑρμαφροδίτου φύσιν αὐτῷ περιάπτοντες. Σιγὴν δὲ πάλιν ἄλλοι συνευνέτιν αὐτῷ προσάπτουσιν, ἵνα γένηται πρώτη συζυγία.* And so Hippolytus (*Ref.* vi. 29) *οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν, ἵν᾽ ᾖ παντάπασι καθαρὸν τὸ δόγμα τοῦ Οὐαλεντίνου πυθαγορικὸν, ἄθηλυ καὶ ἄζυγον καὶ μόνον, τὸν πατέρα νομίζουσιν εἶναι· οἱ δέ ἀδύνατον νομίζοντες δύνασθαι ἐξ ἄρρενος μόνου γένεσιν ὅλως τῶν γεγενημένων γένεσθαι τινὸς, καὶ τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων, ἵνα γένηται πατήρ, σιγὴν ἐξ ἀνάγκης συναριθμοῦσι τὴν σύζυγον.* Hippolytus supposes Valentinus to have derived his system from that of Simon; and in that as expounded in the *μεγάλη ἀπόφασις*, from which he gives extracts, the origin of things is derived from six roots, divided into three pairs; but all these roots spring from a single independent Principle, which is without consort. The name Sige occurs in the description which Hippolytus (vi. 18) quotes from the *Apophasis*, how from the supreme Principle there arise the male and female off-shoots *νοῦς* and *ἐπίνοια*. The name Sige is there given not to either of the off-shoots but to the supreme Principle itself: however, in the description, these off-shoots appear less as distinct entities than as different aspects of the same Being.

Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* vi. 17) makes Sige the daughter of Bythus and by him the mother of Logos, a fable which he classes with the incests which heathen mythology attributed to Jupiter. Irenaeus (II. xii. p. 129) ridicules the absurdity of the later form of Valentinian theory, in which Sige and Logos are represented as coexistent Aeons in the same Pleroma. "Ubi est Sige" he says, "non erit Logos; et ubi Logos non utique Sige." He goes on (ii. 14) to trace the invention of Sige to the heathen poets, quoting Antiphates, who in his Theogony makes Chaos the offspring of Night and Silence. Probably this passage of Irenaeus suggested to Hippolytus his phrase (vi. 22), *τῆς ὑμνουμένης ἐκείνης παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησι Σιγῆς.*

Sige has been the subject of more discussion than any other of the Valentinian Aeons, because a phrase in the received text of the Ignatian Epistle to the Magnesians (8) (*λόγος ἀΐδιος οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών*) had seemed to prove that this letter was later than Valentinus, and therefore could not be the genuine work of the martyr Ignatius. This argument is dealt with at great length by Pearson, *Vindiciae Ignatianae* (II. cc. 3–7); and by Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* sect. iii. cap. 1. But the discovery, since the time of these writers, of new authorities for the text of Ignatius, has given a solution of the difficulty of which they were not aware; namely, that the words *ἀΐδιος οὐκ* must be struck out, as not genuine. The passage then becomes an argument for the early date of the Epistles, since a writer, of later date than Valentinus, would have avoided the use of language to which that writer had given a heretical complexion. See Lightfoot's Ignatius, i. 371–4, ii. 126. [G. S.]

SIGEBED, bishop. [SIGGA.]

SIGEBERT (1) I., King of the Austrasian Franks (561–75), was one of the sons of Clotaire I. by Ingundis (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 1). Scarcely had the four brothers buried their father at Soissons, the only act in which they ever united, when Chilperic the youngest began the civil wars which henceforth desolated France. Seizing the royal treasure deposited at Braine, near Soissons, and purchasing by its means the support of the Franks, he occupied Paris. His three half-brothers, however, leagued together and compelled him to make a fair division, probably upon lines settled by Clotaire before his death (Richter, *Annalen* 65). To Sigebert fell the kingdom which had belonged to Theodoricus I., i.e. the country occupied by the Ripuarian Franks and a part of Champagne, with Rheims for his capital, which division was now beginning to be known as Austrasia (Greg. Tur. iv. 21, 22; *Hist. Epitom.* lv.; Marius Aventic. ann. 560. For the details of this partition see Bonnell, *Anfänge des Karolingischen Hauses, Beilage*, p. 206 ff.; Richter, 65–6; Fauriel, *Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 169 sqq.). The year following his accession, Sigebert's kingdom, owing to its eastern position, had to bear the brunt of an invasion by a body of Avars or Huns, which had become detached from the mass of the nation, and, perhaps with the connivance of the

Eastern emperor, made its way to the Rhine. On their first appearance they were defeated and driven back, but renewing the attack later, probably in 565 or 566, they put to flight Sigebert's army, took him prisoner, and had to be bought off (Greg. Tur. iv. 23, 29; Paulus Diac. ii. 10; Mascou, xiv. 4, 5; Richter, 66–67; Fauriel, ii. 164 seqq.). It may be that the embassy which Sigebert sent to Justin II. at Constantinople about 566 was connected with this barbarian inroad, though possibly it had reference to Italian affairs (Greg. Tur. iv. 39; Richter, 68). In 567 Charibert I. died, and the division of his kingdom proved another source of discord. (For the chronology see Richter, p. 68 n.). To Sigebert fell, as far as can be gathered from later events (see Greg. Tur. ix. 20), a third share of the city of Paris, the coast of Provence with Avignon, the former possessions of Theodoricus I. in Aquitaine, the northern part of Brie, Beauce, Touraine and Poitou (Richter, 68; Bonnell, *ibid.*; Fauriel, ii. 175–7). About this time Sigebert married the famous Brunechilde (Brunehaut), a daughter of Athanagild the Visigothic king, in Spain, she having first renounced Arianism, and made profession of orthodoxy. (Greg. Tur. iv. 27; Venant. Fort. vi. 2, 3, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 204–9. For the character and accomplishments of this queen, who in later life became almost supreme in France, see Greg. Tur. *ibid.*; Venant. Fort. *ibid.*; Fauriel, ii. 166 sqq.) Sigebert's motive was disgust at the unworthy marriages of his brothers (Greg. Tur. iv. 27). The remainder of the reign was taken up with miserable civil wars between the brothers, in which Chilperic strove to possess himself of parts of Sigebert's dominion, while the weak Guntram vacillated between the two. The occasion of these wars was no doubt in part the desire of Brunechilde to avenge the murder of her sister Galsuintha (cf. the letter of St. Germanus of Paris in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 77; Ceillier, xi. 307); but the main cause seems to have lain in the fact that Chilperic the youngest obtained, both at the first division after their father's death, and at the second, when Charibert died, a less share than those of his half-brothers (see Bonnell, *ibid.* 206), and urged on by his wife, the able and unscrupulous Fredegund, was ever wading through seas of blood in his efforts to right himself. Sigebert's territory of Tours and Poitiers, with their respective districts, was his principal object of attack. Two years running (A.D. 574–5) his armies overran those ill-fated countries (Greg. Tur. iv. 46, 48). On the second occasion Gregory, after depicting the churches burnt and plundered, clergy killed, monasteries in ruins, and nuns outraged, uses these memorable words—"fuitque illo in tempore pejor in ecclesiis gemitus quam tempore persecutionis Diocletiani" (iv. 48. See too his outburst of indignation in cap. 49). To meet these attempts Sigebert recruited his forces with pagan Germans from beyond the Rhine (iv. 50, 51), and finally in 575, with the assistance of Guntram carried his arms to Paris and Rouen, and while Chilperic was shut up in Tournay, was raised by his subjects on the shield and declared king in his place. At the very moment, however, of his elevation he was struck down by assassins, probably emissaries of Fredegund. (Greg. Tur. iv. 52; Marius Avent. *Chronicon*; Venant. Fort. *Miscell.* ix. 2, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 298 sqq.). The crime saved Chilperic He issued from his retreat, and, whether out of generosity or policy, had his brother's body buried at Lambres, whence it was afterwards transported to the church of Saint Médard at Soissons, which Sigebert himself had built (Greg. Tur. *ibid.*). He left a son of five years, Childebert II.

Sigebert was much the best of the sons of Clotaire. In happier circumstances he might have been a humane and enlightened king, but his misfortune was to reign at perhaps the darkest period of French history. His clemency towards Chilperic's son Theodebert, who had invaded his territory (Greg. Tur. iv. 23), his motives in seeking Brunechilde's hand in marriage, as described by Gregory (iv. 27), and his intrepid attempts to restrain his barbarian Trans-Rhenish allies from plundering (iv. 30), throw light upon his character. He was true to the orthodoxy of his race (iv. 27), and it was he who recalled St. Nicetius of Trèves from exile and appointed Gregory to Tours. [S. A. B.]

SIGEBERT (2) II., eldest of the sons of Theodoricus II., was but eleven years old at his father's death in 613 (cf. Fredegarius, *Chronicon*, xxi.). His great-grandmother Brunechilde strove to place him on his father's throne (*ibid.* xxxix.), but the hatred of the Austrasian and Burgundian nobles for their ambitious queen led them to prefer the dominion of the Neustrian king Clotaire II. After a few months of vain effort, deserted and betrayed by his late father's subjects, he fell into Clotaire's hands, and was put to death (*ibid.* xl.-xlii.). [S. A. B.]

SIGEBERT (3) III. ST., king of Austrasia (A.D. 632–656), was the eldest son of Dagobert I. At five years of age his father raised him to the throne of Austrasia under the tutelage of Cunibertus, archbishop of Cologne, and with Adalgiselus for Mayor of the Palace (Fredegarius, *Chronicon*, lxxv.). In the following year he solemnly confirmed him in this dignity, Neustria and Burgundy being at the same time assigned to the newly-born Clovis II., and exacted an oath from the Austrasian bishops and nobles to observe this disposition of the realm after his own death (Fredegarius lxxvi.). Dagobert died in 638 (*ibid.* lxxix.). The history of the Merovingian kings now came to be little else than the history of the Mayors of the Palace. On Dagobert's death, Pippin I. or the elder, the founder of the Carlovingian family, repaired to Metz and virtually assumed the government. He died, however, the following year (Fredegar. lxxxv.); and the next three years of the reign were occupied with a struggle between his son Grimoald and one Otto, who had been Sigebert's tutor, for the Mayordom, in which the former proved the victor. [GRIMOALDUS (1).] The only external event of importance in Sigebert's reign was a campaign against the Thuringians in 640, in which that nation won a victory over the Franks on the Unstrut, and achieved virtual independence (Fredegarius, lxxxvii.), a result that probably hastened Otto's fall. The most important matter, from an ecclesiastical point of view, was the prohibition, probably at the instance of Grimoald (see

Gérard, *Hist. des Francs d'Austrasie*, i. 359), issued to the bishops of his realm against the holding or taking part in any council without the king's consent (see Sigebert's letter to Desiderius, bishop of Cahors, in Migne *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1175). It was probably part of Grimoald's policy of strengthening the central authority The clergy, however, found in Sigebert a munificent patron, and he was duly rewarded by canonization. Encouraged apparently by Grimoald, whose family, both before and after him, owed much to the church, he is said to have founded twelve monasteries, a great number of churches, and some hospitals for the poor. Migne assigns to him four *diplomata* (*Patrologia Latina*, lxxxvii. 319 sqq.), but the third is said to be spurious (Ceillier, xi. 733 n.). The first is a charter of the monastery of Cougnon (Casagonguidinense) dated in 644, the second for those of Stavelo and Malmédy in the Ardennes, in 651, and the fourth confers certain tithes on the church of Spires about 653. He also founded the monastery of St. Martin at Metz, where he was himself buried.

The main authority for Sigebert's life is the Chronicle of Fredegarius, but his biography was written by Sigebert of Gemblours about four centuries after his death, possibly upon the occasion of the first translation of his remains in 1063. This work which is of course only valuable so far as it is derived from earlier sources, may be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 303, seqq., and Boll. *Acta SS.*, Feb. 1, 227. (An abbreviated life by the same author is found in *Patr. Lat.* clx. 725 sqq.) His relics were translated several times (Boll. *ibid.* p. 236 sqq.) His day is Feb. 1, on which he is commemorated at Metz (*ibid.* p. 206, sqq.). [S. A. B.]

SIGEBERT (4), king of the East Angles, brother and successor of Earpwald. The pedigrees do not place him as the son of Redwald, who certainly drove him into exile, from which it may be inferred that he was only a stepson (Will. Malmesb. *G. R.* I. § 97; Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 636). He was however the brother of Earpwald, whom he succeeded, after a three years' interregnum or relapse, about the year 631. During the reign of Earpwald Sigebert had lived in exile in Gaul, where he had been baptized and become a scholar. On his accession he determined to devote himself to the conversion of his people, in which he was assisted by bishop Felix, whom archbishop Honorius dispatched as an apostle into East Anglia (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 15), and by Fursey, who came on the same errand from Ireland. Sigebert laboured likewise for the education of his people, instituted a school such as he had seen in France, the legendary precursor of the University of Cambridge, for which also he procured teachers from Canterbury. After a few years he made over his kingdom to his kinsman Egric, and took the tonsure; but, on war being declared by Penda against the East Angles, he left his monastery at the prayers of his people, and, going to battle armed only with a rod, was slain, together with Egric and his army. (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 18, 19.) According to the Ely tradition, the monastery into which Sigebert retired was at Bedrichsworth, now Bury St. Edmund's. That in which abbat Fursey was settled was at Cnobsheresburg, or Burgh Castle (*Lib. Eliens.* i. 1; Bede, *H. E.* iii. 19). The date of Sigebert's death is probably about 637. He is said by Pits (*ad ann.* 650) to have corresponded with Desiderius, bishop of Cahors, by letters which were preserved at St. Gallen. (See Smith's note on Bede, *H. E.* iii. 18; and *Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 190.) [S.]

SIGEBERT (5), surnamed Parvus (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 22), was king of the East Saxons during the obscurest part of their always obscure history. He is made in the pedigrees (*M. H. B.* 629) the son of Saeward, one of the three sons of Sebert, the first Christian king of Essex, who continued heathen and survived their father only a short time. If Sigebert succeeded his father, he must have reigned from about 617 (cf. Bede, *H. E.* ii. 5) or 626 (H. Hunt. *M. H. B.* 716) onwards; but the date of his death is unknown. His cousin Sigebert the Good being found on the East Saxon throne as soon as any new light is shed on the state of the nation, Sigebert the Little must have finished his reign before 653. It is probable that the West Saxon dominion, advanced by Cynegils and Cwichelm, and afterwards the aggressive kingdom of Mercia under Penda, kept the East Saxon kings in the same dependent relation in which Sebert had stood to Ethelbert. Sigebert the Little was succeeded by Sigebert the Good, who represented another branch of the family. Sigebert the Good was followed by his brother Suithelm, on whose death the family of Saeward recovered the throne in the persons of Sebbi, a brother, and Sighere, a son, of Sigebert the Little. (*M. H. B.* 629, 637.) [S.]

SIGEBERT (6), surnamed the Good, king of the East Saxons. He was the son of Sigebald, son of Seleferth son of Saexa, the brother of Sebert, the first Christian king of the East Saxons (*M. H. B.* 629, 637), and succeeded on the throne his kinsman Sigebert the Little, about the middle of the 7th century. At the time of his accession his people were still heathen, having not yet recovered from the relapse which followed the death of Sebert. The date is undetermined, but Sigebert must have ascended the throne some years before the death of Penda, king of Mercia, and possibly by the support of Oswy, king of Northumbria, the leader of the tribes which were Christianised and opposed to Penda. According to Bede, Sigebert received Christianity by the persuasion of Oswy, and was baptized by Finan, the Northumbrian bishop, at a station on the Roman wall called "Ad Murum" (*H. E.* iii. 22). This was in or about the year 653. Oswy, at Sigebert's request, sent with him Cedd, the brother of Chad, to attempt the conversion of his subjects; and Cedd, having returned to Lindisfarne with a report of his success, was consecrated by Finan as bishop for the East Saxons. It is very questionable whether Cedd, or Sigebert either, obtained any hold on London; Ythancaestir and Tilaburg, two villages in Essex, are mentioned as the centres of the bishop's work, and London, as we learn from the adventures of bishop Wina, Cedd's successor, was in Mercian hands a few years later. Sigebert's acts are otherwise unrecorded, and he seems to have perished in a family quarrel

One of his kinsmen, having contracted an unlawful marriage, was excommunicated by Cedd. Sigebert neglected to obey the sentence, and actually went to banquet with the guilty man. As he was leaving the house Cedd met him, and, on his dismounting from his horse, leaped from his own horse and upbraided him. Sigebert begged for forgiveness; Cedd replied with a prophecy that he should die in the house where he had sinned. The guilty kinsman, aided by his brother, and possibly exasperated by the king's humble attitude towards Cedd, afterwards murdered the king, alleging as a reason his leniency towards his enemies and his too great readiness to forgive. The date of this event is uncertain, but from the way in which Bede tells the story, although he says that no short time intervened between the conversion and the murder, it most probably occurred before the battle of Winwaed and the death of Penda. The editors of the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, however, adopt the year 660 as most probable. Sigebert was succeeded by Suidhelm, or Swithelm. [SWITHELM.] [S.]

SIGEBERT (7), king of the West Saxons. He was son of Sigeric (*M. H. B.* 641) who is described by Florence of Worcester as a "subregulus," and has an unascertained place in the pedigree of the West Saxon kings (ib. p. 633). On the death of Cuthred, probably in 755 (Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* 662; *Chr. S. M. H. B.* 330), Sigebert ascended the throne which he held for one year. His unrighteous doings provoked his people against him, and in the next year the Witan of Wessex, with Cynewulf at their head, deposed him. (Chr. S. *M. H. B.* 330.) There must have been either a strong party in favour of Sigebert, or some redeeming circumstances in the case, as Hampshire, the best province of the West Saxon dominion, was left as provision for him, and he was allowed to retain it until, having murdered Cumbra, the last ealdorman who adhered to him, he was driven into the forest of Andred by Cynewulf, and was killed by a swineherd at Privet's-flood. The date of this event is not given, but when Cynewulf had reigned thirty-one years, in 786, Cynehard, the brother of Sigebert, avenged his death and seized the throne. The history of Sigebert is of importance as illustrating the constitutional power of the Witan to remove a bad ruler, a power which however is scarcely ever exerted except when it is directed by some competitor for royalty. Cumbra, whose murder was avenged by the swineherd, is found as praefectus regis in a questionable charter of Cuthred (K. *C. D.* 93). [S.]

SIGERAED (1), the last king of the East Saxons. He was the son of Sigeric, and must have succeeded him when in 797 or 799 he went to Rome (*Chr. Sax. M. H. B.* 340). In him the pedigree of the East Saxon kings comes to an end, and, if he were the last of his race, he must have survived until the year 824, when his kingdom fell, together with those of Kent and Sussex, into the hands of Egbert, king of the West Saxons (Flor. Wig. App. M. *H. B.* 637). It is probable that the attestation of a Rochester charter of Kenulf in 811 (K. *C. D.* No. 198), 'Ego Sigired rex' belongs to this Sigeraed, whether he is identical with No. 2 or not. [S.]

SIGERAED (2) (SIGERED, SIGIRAED), king of Kent. Two grants of Sigiraed, king of half Kent to Eardulf, bishop of Rochester, appear in the Textus Roffensis (Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 110, 114), one of them with a date 762. He does not occur in the pedigree of the Kentish kings. One charter is marked by Kemble as doubtful or spurious; but the signer may be the Sigeraed who is said to have been the last king of the East Saxons, and whose date may require readjustment. The attestation of a Sigired is attached to a charter of Egbert of Kent in 778 (K. *C. D.* 132). The Sigeraed who attests the charter of 811 (K. *C. D.* 198) is most probably the East Saxon king. A Sigired dux attests in 814 (K. *C. D.* No. 207), in 816 (*ib.* 209, 210), and in 822 (*ib.* 216); and in 823, two of the name attest a charter of Ceolwulf (*ib.* n. 217), one as *subregulus*, who may be the East Saxon king, and one as *dux*, who continues to appear in charters some years later. It is probable that the East Saxon kings, either as descended from an early divisional dynasty, or as viceroys under Mercian authority, claimed some portion of Kent during the 7th and 8th centuries; but there are no coins of the dynasty either in Essex or Kent; the Mercian kings seem to have maintained a steady hold on London, and there is nothing after the beginning of the 8th century in either kingdom that deserves the name of history. See KENT, EAST SAXONS, kings of. [S.]

SIGERIC (1), king of the Goths, seized on the throne on the murder of Ataulf, at Barcelona in A.D. 415. He was brother of Sarus, the enemy of Alaric and Ataulf, who had been put to death by the latter. In revenge he murdered the children of Ataulf by his first wife, tearing them from the embrace of bishop Sigesarius, and compelled Placidia to walk twelve miles before his horse, with the rest of the prisoners. He is said to have been inclined, notwithstanding this insult to the emperor's sister, to make peace with the Romans, but he was murdered after a reign of seven days. (Orosius, viii. 43; Olympiodorus, Bonn edition 459; Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen*, v. 65.) [F. D.]

SIGERIC (2), the eldest son of St. Sigismund, fifth king of the Burgundians, by Amelberga, daughter of Theodoric the Ostrogoth, was, like his father, converted from Arianism by Avitus, archbishop of Vienne, who preached a homily on the occasion (Avitus, *Titulus Homiliae*, viii.; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 294). He fell a victim to the jealousy of his stepmother, who, by falsely accusing him of treasonable designs, induced Sigismund to have him put to death (Marius Avent. *Chronicon*, Symmacho et Boet. Coss., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 796; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iii. 5). [S. A. B.]

SIGERIC (3) (SIRIC), king of the East Saxons. He is placed in the pedigree (M. *H. B.* 629) as son of Swithaed or Swithred, who was king of the East Saxons in 758, and is said in the Chronicle to have gone to Rome in the year 797, for which probably we should substitute 799 (M. *H. B.* 340). Sigeraed, the last king named in the pedigree, appears to have been his son. [S.]

SIGERIUS, presbyter, disciple of Marcellus of Ancyra (Epiph. *Haer.* lxxii. 11). [G. S.]

SIGESARIUS, a bishop of the Goths, an Arian, who baptized the emperor Attalus (Soz. ix. 9) in 409 (Gibbon, *D. & F.* vol. iv. p. 99, ed. Smith). [C. H.]

SIGEWARD, king. [SAEWARD.]

SIGFRID, bishop. [SIGGA.]

SIGFRID (1), a priest, who is mentioned by Beda in his life of Cuthbert as one of his authorities. Sigfrid was educated and trained in his religious profession by Boisil, abbat of Melrose, and was there in A.D. 651, when the youthful Cuthbert first entered that monastery. When Beda was writing Cuthbert's life, Sigfrid was an honoured inmate of Jarrow, although very old, and in the extremity of weakness and decay (*Vita S. Cuth.* c. 6). This was in the beginning of the eighth century. We must not, therefore, confound this Sigfrid with his namesake, abbat of Jarrow and Wearmouth, who died in A.D. 688. [J. R.]

SIGFRID (2), coadjutor abbat of Wearmouth, A.D. 686–88, of whom Beda has given us one of his life-like pictures. Easterwine, his immediate predecessor, died of the plague, and when Benedict-Biscop, the abbat, returned from one of his many journeys to Italy, he found that the monks and Ceolfrid had appointed Sigfrid in the room of Easterwine. Beda describes him as a person of sufficient learning in the Scriptures, as a lover of abstinence and godly living, but afflicted with an incurable wasting away of the lungs. Sigfrid was only in deacon's orders. We are induced therefore to think that the ravages of the plague had limited the choice to a small number, when it fell upon a young man labouring under a mortal disease. Soon after his return Benedict himself was smitten with a creeping palsy, so that the hand of death was laid at the same time upon the two abbats. They were placed in different rooms, and an earnest desire seized them to see each other once more in this world, and to hear once more the sound of each other's voice. Sigfrid was carried into Benedict's room, and was laid by his side on his bed. Although their heads were resting on the same pillow, they were so weak that it was only by the brethren drawing their faces together that they were able to give each other the kiss of charity. They then joined the monks in appointing Ceolfrid to succeed them. Sigfrid lingered for two months after this touching scene, dying on the 22nd of August, 688. (Beda, *Hist. Abb. Wirem.* etc.) [J. R.]

SIGGA (1), a deacon of John of Beverley, bishop of York (A.D. 705–18), who is said to have witnessed in the church of St. Michael at York a spiritual manifestation vouchsafed to his master. His face became wrinkled in consequence until John restored it to its former condition. (*Vita S. Joh.* ed. Folcard in *Historians of York*, i. 258.) (Leland, *Collect.* t. iii. p. 154, in Hearne, t. iv. p. 100; *Mon. Angl.* ii. 128.) [J. R.]

SIGGA (2) (SIGFRITH), the fourth bishop of Selsey (M. *H. B.* 618). His full name was Sigfrid, as given by the continuator of Bede (*ib.* 288), who states that he was consecrated by archbishop Tatwin as soon as he received his pall, in the year 733. He appears at the council of Clovesho in 747 as "Sicga Australium Saxonum episcopus" (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 360, 362). His name appears among the attestations of the privilege of Ethelbald of 742 (*ib.* 342), but the attestations themselves are conjectural or fabricated; and he may be the person described as 'Sigibed episcopus' in another act of Ethelbald (Kemble, *C. D.* n. 90). He is named in one of the very suspicious Selsey charters, but without date; and nothing is known of the termination of his episcopate. The career of Aluberht, his successor, is a blank, and Osa, the next bishop of Selsey, appears first in genuine charters in 772. [S.]

SIGHARD (SIGEHEARD, SIGIHEARD), king of the East Saxons. He was the son of Sebbi, and about the year 695 succeeded his father conjointly with his brother Suefred. He is mentioned as having been present at the miracle which took place when his father was put in his coffin (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 11). [SEBBI.] It is possible that he shared the kingdom not only with Suefred but with his cousin Offa, the son of Sighere, or with Sighere himself. [OFFA.] Nothing is known of his history or end, but he must have ceased to reign some time before the year 709 in which Offa, who succeeded him on the throne, made his pilgrimage to Rome. Sighard's name is attached to the charter of Oedilraed to the abbess Ethelburga (Kemble, *C. D.* 35; *Mon. Angl.* i. 439), together with those of his father and brother; each of the three has the title of king, so the names may have been added after the execution of the grant, supposing it to be genuine. They are attached in a similar way to the charter of Erkenwald to the same abbess (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 38; *Mon. Angl.* i. 438). [S.]

SIGHERI (SIGHERE), king of the East Saxons. He was the son of Sigebert the Little, and in conjunction with his uncle Sebbi acquired the sovereignty over the East Saxons, under the supreme influence of Wulfhere, king of the Mercians about the year 665 (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 30; *Mon. Hist. Brit.* pp. 629, 637). The beginning of their reign coincided in time with the prevalence of the great plague, one result of which seems to have been the relapse of the nation, or a part of it, into paganism. Sighere unfortunately placed himself at the head of the relapsed, and began the restoration of the idolatrous temples in his dominions. Sebbi continued faithful, and Wulfhere also interfered. By the mission of the Mercian bishop Jaruman into Essex, he recovered Sighere and his adherents to the faith. Cedd was now dead, and Wina the West Saxon bishop, to whom Wulfhere sold the bishopric of London, does not seem to have taken much pains with the country people. The conversion of the nation was left to be accomplished by Erkenwald who, before his appointment to the bishopric, had laboured in both Essex and Surrey. Sighere and Sebbi were still reigning when Theodore, in or about the year 675 (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 6), appointed Erkenwald bishop; and Sebbi was king for thirty years, dying a monk about the year 695. How long Sighere lived is unknown; but as his son Offa was a young man in 709 [OFFA], he may have survived his uncle, and shared the kingdom with Sighard and Suefred

the sons of Sebbi. His name, however, is not attached to the charter granted by Oedilred to Barking, as are those of Sebbi and his sons. In a forged charter of Peterborough (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 40), the kingdom of Kent is spoken of as having fallen under the sway of Sighere. This is possibly a relic of a tradition which seems to be found in Kentish charters also, that the East Saxon kings, perhaps as agents of Mercia, exercised some authority in the remoter kingdom, but see SUEFRED. [S.]

SIGISBERT, monk with St. Columbanus at Luxueil. He went into banishment with his master, and founded the monastery of Disentis (Disentinense monasterium) at the head of the western source of the Rhine in Rhaetia. (Mabillon, *Ann.* i. 310, 504.) [J. G.]

SIGISMER, son-in-law of the emperor Theodosius II. An account of his entry into Lyons (or some other town where Sidonius then was) on the occasion of his espousing the daughter of the king of the Visigoths, is given by Sidonius (*Ep.* 20). [R. J. K.]

SIGISMUNDUS, ST., May 1, martyr, fifth king of the Burgundians (A.D. 516–524), was brought up under the influence of Avitus, the orthodox archbishop of Vienne, who succeeded in winning him, with two of his children, from the Arianism of his nation and family (Avitus, *Epist.* 27, 29, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 243, 246; Agobardus, *adv. Leg. Gund.* xiii. *Patr. Lat.* civ. 124), and sought to lead his inclinations towards the Roman empire (see Mascou, *Annotation* ii., where the passages are collected, and Fauriel, *Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 100). He married Ostrogotha, the daughter of Theodoric, the Ostrogothic king of Italy (Jornandes in Bouquet ii. 28), the betrothal being probably arranged when St. Epiphanius, the bishop of Pavia, undertook his mission to the Burgundian court at Lyons, in 494, to ransom the Lombard captives, carried off by Gundobald and his brother (see Ennodius, *Vita Epiphanii*, cap. xii. Boll. Jan. ii. 374; Mascou, xi. 6). While his father was still living, Sigismund was invested with regal dignity, and held his court at Geneva (Avitus, *Epp.* 29, 30; *Greg. Tur. Epitom.* xxxiv.). In 515 he founded, or, according to some (see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 89, 91), refounded the monastery of St. Maurice, at Agaunum, where tradition placed the martyrdom of the Legio Thebaea (Marius Avent. *Chronicon*, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 796). In the following year he succeeded his father (Marius, *ibid.*), and in 517 convened a council, under the presidency of Avitus, at a place called Epaunum, the site of which is uncertain, but is supposed to be the present Iene on the Rhone (EPAON, *Dict. Antiq.*; *Hist. Litt.* iii. 9). If the extent of his dominion may be inferred from the sees of the bishops present, Burgundy included at that time, besides the later duchy and county of the name, Dauphiny and Savoy, the city and dominion of Lyons and the Valais, besides a part of the present Switzerland (Mascou, xi. 10, 31). For the councils of Agaunum and Lyons, also held in Sigismund's reign, see Mansi, viii. 531–8, 567, sqq., and *Hist. Litt.* iii. 89 sqq. 93. He is said to have exiled the bishops who were present at the latter, for condemning incest in one of his officers (cf. *Vita S. Apollinaris*, Bouquet, iii. 404). About 517 Sigismund seems to have published at Lyons the enlightened code or redaction known as the *Loi Gombette* [GUNDOBALD]. The fair prospect of his reign, however, was marred by crime. After the death of his first wife, who bore him one son, Sigericus, he had married Fredegaria, apparently a servant, who, jealous for her own offspring, succeeded in stirring up false suspicions of the loyalty of her stepson, and induced Sigismund to put him to death in the year 522 (Marius, *ibid.*; Greg. Tur. iii. 5). Bitter remorse ensued, which drove him to make public profession of repentance, and to retire to St. Maurice, where, while practising all the austerities of a monk, he lavished endowments and established an unceasing service of psalmody (Greg. Tur. iii. 5). The crime, and the long seclusion which followed, alienated the powerful Theodoric, and diminished the loyalty of his own people at a time when he was called on to meet the aggression of the Franks. It was in 523 that three of the four sons of Clovis, namely, Clodomir, Clotaire, and Childebert, stirred up by their mother, the widowed Clotilda, invaded Burgundy. Sigismund was defeated and fled to St. Maurice, where he was betrayed by his own subjects to Clodomir, and carried prisoner in the garb of a monk to Orleans. Shortly afterwards, with his wife and two children, he was murdered at the neighbouring village of Coulmiers, by being cast alive, as was said, into a well (Marius, *ibid.*; Greg. Tur. iii. 6). His brother, Godemar, succeeded him as the sixth and last king of the Burgundians. The bodies of the murdered family were, some years later, transported to St. Maurice (*Vita S. Sigism.* Bouquet, iii. 404), and Sigismund, despite his crime, is numbered amongst the saints and martyrs. His cult commenced at a very early date, being recognised by Gregory of Tours, and his name appears in the Martyrologies of Rabanus Maurus, Ado and Usuard on May 1 (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. i. 85).

Sigismund was a well-intentioned, but weak man. It would seem that he surrendered himself too much to the influence of Roman ideas and habits for the king of a barbarian people, neighboured on one side by the powerful Ostrogothic monarchy, and on others by the fiercely aggressive Franks. His partizanship moreover for the orthodox faith, while it harmed him with his subjects, was not thorough-going enough to win the clergy from their leaning towards the Franks (see Fauriel, ii. 100, sqq.).

For the history of his relics, which were in after days transported in part to Prague, see Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. i. 88–91. Popular belief ascribes to him a miraculous efficacy in the cure of fevers (Greg. Tur. *De Glor. Mart.* i. 75; the mass is given in *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1134).

The letters addressed in his name to the pope and emperor were the work of Avitus (*Patr. Lat.* lix. 243, sqq.; Ceillier, x. 560, sqq.) [S. A. B.]

SIGUALDUS, patriarch of Aquileia, is mentioned as patriarch in the deed of foundation of two monasteries in May, A.D. 762. (Cappelletti, viii. 80.) In October, A.D. 772, he grants privileges to a nunnery at Brescia (*Bullarium Casinense*, ii. 16). He was therefore patriarch between these two periods, but the dates of his elevation and death are uncertain. He probably died in A.D. 776, and was the patriarch visited on

his death-bed by Charles the Great. (The Monk of St. Gall. *Gesta Kar.* ii. 27, in Pertz, *Script.* ii. 760.) [F. D.]

SIGULFUS, abbat of Ferrières and priest. He was a native of Britain, and accompanied Alcuin to the continent: he continued in close friendship with Alcuin and succeeded him at Ferrières, c. A.D. 800 (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 14, 301, 480). The questions which he put to Alcuin are stated by the latter (*Interr. et Resp. in Genes.* Pref. in Migne, t. c. 516) as his only motive for writing the exegetical notes on Genesis. Alcuin thought him much too fond of studying Virgil, especially as he was found encouraging others to do the same in secret (*Vit. Anon. S. Albini*, c. x.) His special name from Alcuin was Sigulfus Vetulus, but this may not mark his age. He provided the anonymous author with material for his Life of Alcuin (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. c. 25–100; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xii. 166–7). [J. G.]

SIGWINE, an abbat of an unknown cell of Lindisfarne. See ETHELWULF. Sigwine occurs in the *Liber Vitae* of Durham in the list of abbats (p. 8). [J. R.]

SILANUS (SILVANUS), a deacon of the church of Panormus, mentioned in the reply of Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybaeum, as the bearer of Leo's letter to him, inquiring what was the right time of celebrating Easter in the year 444 (Leo, *Epp.* 3; in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 606). [F. D.]

SILAS (SHILA), a Nestorian, succeeded BABAEUS, whose archdeacon he had been, as catholicus of Seleucia, A.D. 503 or 505. He was married, according to the rule instituted by his predecessor, and had children; and is described as a self-indulgent covetous man, ruled by his wife. He is said to have gone so far as to seize the costly altar vestments and bestow them on his daughter; and to have excommunicated one Maris, who rebuked him for this sacrilege. The only fact recorded of him that bespeaks any sense of the duties of his high office is that, according to Maris, a Nestorian writer, he endeavoured to convert to his creed some "heretics" (i.e. Monophysites), who in his time were driven into Persia by the persecution of the emperor Justin. He endeavoured to arrange that his son-in-law, Elisha, a physician, should be his successor. In consequence of this attempt, a schism followed on his death (520 or 523). A rival candidate, Narses, was set up, supported by Jozachus bishop of Ahwaz (or "the Huzites"), a prelate powerful in the favour of Cavades, which he had gained by curing that king and his daughter from an illness. Both claimants, however, were encountered by an opposing party, which included three persons of special importance; the chief metropolitan, Jacob of Gandosapor (Elamitis), whose office it was to consecrate the catholicus; the chief bishop of the Seleucian province, Samuel of Cascara, on whom devolved the charge of the church during the vacancy; and the chief of the clergy, Paulus, archdeacon of Seleucia (see Assem. iv. 643 & ff.). Narses was consecrated notwithstanding, in the principal church of Seleucia, but by the metropolitan next in rank, Giavar of Nisibis. Elisha also obtained consecration, but (by a double irregularity) at the hands of David, metropolitan of Maru, and in the church of Nisibis. Elisha then proceeded to exercise the functions of the office he claimed, but was everywhere opposed by Narses, so that rival bishops were consecrated for every see that fell vacant. For twelve (or fifteen) years, the contest distracted the Nestorian communion. The goodwill of Beröes, the physician of Cavades, procured for Elisha the support of the king, and finally enabled him to overpower Narses and throw him into prison, where he died (535 or 538). A synod was then held, by which both consecrations were condemned and Elisha was deposed, and Paulus was raised to the catholicate [PAULUS (44)]. Of Elisha's end, nothing is recorded. The list of his works given by Ebedjesu (*Catal.*), including commentaries on Job and on certain of St. Paul's Epistles, shews him to have been a man of some learning. (Gregory Barh., *Chron. Eccl.* ii. 81; Assem. ii. 409; iii. 614 (from Amrus and Mares); Le Quien, ii. 1115, 1182, 1192.) [J. Gw.]

SILBONE, a military martyr at Babylon in Egypt, with PAPHNUTIUS and PANESNIU in the persecution of Diocletian (Georgii *SS. Coluthi et Panesniu Miracula*, p. 322). [G. T. S.]

SILCO, the first Christian king of Nubia. He expelled the Blemmyes from the neighbourhood of Philae, and erected an inscription, which still exists, commemorating his victory. It has been often copied and commented on by Niebuhr, Franz, Letronne, and Revillout, in his memoir on the Blemmyes read before the French Academy. (Cf. *Mém. de l'Acad. des Insc.*, Prim. Sér., *Sujets d'Erudition*, t. viii. part ii. p. 431, Paris, 1874.) It will also be found in Dean Payne Smith's translation of John of Ephesus, p. 345. Silco lived about the beginning of the seventh century. [G. T. S.]

SILLAN (SILVANUS, SIOLLAN), a name belonging to saints of the Irish kalendars, many of whom are simply commemorated as abbat, bishop, deacon, or without designation. [J. G.]

SILVANIA (SILVIA, SALVIA), a sister of Rufinus the minister of Theodosius the Great. She is famous in monastic history for her studies. She perused the commentators on the Bible (Stephen, Gregory, Pierius, Basil) to the amount of three millions of lines. At the age of threescore she could boast that she had never washed any part of her person save the tips of her fingers when she communicated, a boast which comes in connection with an amusing story of how she reproved a deacon JOVINUS (9), afterwards bishop of Ascalon, who was sailing with her to Egypt, for the care he bestowed on his body after a severe attack of sea-sickness. (Rosweyd, *Vitae Patrum*, p. 779, 977 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 1210, lxxiv. 328; Gibbon, cap. xxix. note[32]; Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 143.) On the chronology see Tillem. xi. 417, 419, 505, 639, xii. 311. [G. T. S.]

SILVANUS (1), a patripassian mentioned by Gennadius (*Dogm. Eccles.* c. 4) with PRAXEAS. [C. H.]

SILVANUS (2), bishop of Gaza, a martyr in the persecution of Maximin, c. 305. According to the Greek menology, he had served as a soldier before he took holy orders, and was very successful in the conversion of pagans. He was still a presbyter at the outbreak of the persecution, from the very beginning of which he endured many varied sufferings with the greatest fortitude. Finally, he with thirty-nine others, was condemned to the copper mines of Phaeno, in Palestine, their feet having been previously crippled by cauterizing the sinews. Not long before his martyrdom, which was one of the last in Palestine, he obtained the episcopate. Eusebius speaks with high admiration of his christian endurance, saying that he was "reserved to the last to set the seal, as it were, to the conflict in Palestine." (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13.) He suffered death by decapitation, according to the Roman martyrology, on May 4, 308. (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 7, 13; Theoph. p. 9; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 605.) [E. V.]

SILVANUS (3), bishop of Emesa, a martyr in Diocletian's persecution. In extreme old age, τὴν ἡλικίαν ὑπεργήρως, after a forty years' episcopate he was thrown to the wild beasts. (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13, ix. 6; Theophan. p. 9.) The Greek menology (Feb. 6) incorrectly places the martyrdom of Silvanus under Numerian, and states that his deacon Lucas, and his reader Mocius, suffered at the same time, being encouraged to persevere in their testimony as they were led to the beasts by Julian (No. 78), a physician of Emesa, who paid for his rashness with his life. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 837.) [E. V.]

SILVANUS (4), bishop of Cirta, was a subdeacon under Paulus, bishop of that see, during the persecution under Diocletian, and, as well as he, became guilty of "tradition." Yet, having been chosen, it was said, by the dregs of the populace (harenarii) and contrary to the express wish of the Christian people, who desired to have a townsman, and one not tainted with the infamy of tradition, he was ordained by Secundus of Tigisis, as the successor of Paulus, at the meeting which took place at Cirta in March A.D. 305. The scene of mutual incrimination which took place on this occasion has been described above (Vol. I. 882). He became afterwards one of the ordainers of Majorinus, and received a share of the bribe provided by Lucilla. [LUCILLA.] These facts were elicited at the inquiry under Zenophilus, A.D. 320, at which it was proved, by ample evidence, not only that Silvanus had been guilty of the charge brought against him, but with others had appropriated plate and ornaments from the heathen temple of Serapis; and after he became a bishop received as a bribe for ordaining Victor, a fuller by trade, to be a presbyter, money which ought to have been given to the poor. After the enquiry he was banished for refusing to communicate with Ursacius and Zenophilus, at the time of the mission of Macarius, A.D. 348 (Aug. *Petil.* i. 23, iii. 69, 70; *De Gest. Emer.* 5; *c. Cresc.* iii. 32, 33, 34, iv. 66; *De Unico Bapt.* 30, 31; Aug. *Ep.* 53. 4 *Mon. Vet. D.* pp. 178, 180, 182, ed. Oberthür; pp. 167–171, ed. Dupin). [NUNDINARIUS; SECUNDUS (2).] [H. W. P.]

SILVANUS (5), a comedian, who while a young man under twenty obtained admission to the coenobium of Pachomius at Tabenna in Thebais. At first he was submissive to the rules, but after a time he indulged his old histrionic humours to such a degree that Pachomius sentenced him to expulsion. Upon his humble submission and the intercession of Petronius, one of the most virtuous of the brethren, Silvanus received a longer trial and became an eminent example of genuine repentance. But he lived only eight years from that time, dying in the lifetime of Pachomius, who died May 9, 348 (Boll. *Acta SS. Graec.* 14 Mai. pp. 36, 37; Tillem. vii. 216, 688). [C. H.]

SILVANUS (6), bishop of Tarsus and metropolitan, one of the most excellent of the Semiarians belonging to the body described by Athanasius as "brothers who mean what we mean, and differ only about the terms." (Ath. *de Synod.* 41.) He succeeded Antonius in the reign of Constantius. He was one of the 22 Oriental bishops who at the council of Sirmium, in 351, joined in the deposition of Photinus. (Hilar. *Synod*, p. 129; *fragm.* i. p. 48.) On the deposition and banishment of Cyril from Jerusalem, early in 358, Silvanus gave him a hospitable reception at Tarsus, in spite of the remonstrances of Acacius. (Theod. *H. E.* ii. 22.) The same year he took part in the Semiarian council of Ancyra (Labbe, ii. 790), as he did in that of Seleucia, in 359, at which he proved himself a vociferous advocate (μέγα ἀνέκραγε) for the acceptance of the Lucianic dedication creed of Antioch (Socr. *H. E.* ii. 39), the mere mention of which drove the Acacian party from the place of assembly by way of protest. On the conclusion of the council, Sylvanus was one of the ten bishops deputed to convey the report of the proceedings to Constantius (Theod. *H. E.* ii. 27). Acacian policy triumphed, and Silvanus, with other Semiarian leaders, was deposed by the Homoeans, in the council held at Constantinople in 360, the nominal ground in his case being that he had translated Theophilus, bishop of Eleutheropolis, to Castabala (Soz. *H. E.* iv. 24). On the accession of Julian, amongst other exiled bishops, Silvanus was restored to his see. He was among the Semiarian leaders who were the first of the rival Church parties to memorialize Julian on his arrival at Antioch after his elevation to the imperial dignity, requesting him to expel the Anomoeans, and call a general council to restore peace to the Church, and declaring their acceptance of the Nicene faith. (Socr. *H. E.* iii. 25.) In 366 he was one of the deputies to Liberius, together with Eustathius of Sebaste and Theophilus of Castabala. [THEOPHILUS (8).] He returned with the letters of communion of Liberius and the Roman Synod (Basil. *Ep.* 67 [50]). His death is placed by Tillemont in 373. (*Mém. Eccles.* tom. vi. p. 592; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 872). [E. V.]

SILVANUS (7), a bishop of the Audians among the Goths in Moesia, and one of the last bishops under whom that sect flourished (Epiph. Haer. 70; C. A. A. Scott's *Ulfilas*, p. 76). He died before A.D. 377. (Tillem. vi. 694.) [C. H.]

SILVANUS (8), bishop of Omboe, in Thebais, mentioned in the paschal epistle of Theophilus, A.D. 402, as having been succeeded by Verres

(Jerom. *Ep.* xcviii. 26, ed. Vall.; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 606). [C. H.]

SILVANUS (9), a presbyter of the beginning of the fifth century, who sent to Jerome, then at Bethlehem, in the year 405, the books of Pachomius and other ascetic writers. He had found that there were many men of Latin speech living in the Egyptian monasteries who were at a great disadvantage from not having these works in their own tongue. He therefore sent them to Jerome, who undertook their translation into Latin. (*Regulae S. Pachomii* in Jerome, vol. ii. 53 ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

SILVANUS (10), a bishop, driven out in the persecutions after Chrysostom's banishment, who took refuge in the Troad and supported himself by fishing. (Pallad. p. 197.) [E. V.]

SILVANUS (11), bishop of Summa or Zumma, a place of unknown site in Numidia, joined with Aurelius and other Catholic bishops in letters to Marcellinus respecting the arrangements for the conference, at which he was present (Aug. *Ep.* 128, 129; *de Gest. Em.* 5; *Carth. Coll.* i. 99). [FELIX (157).] He was also present at the council of Mileum against Pelagianism, A.D. 416 (Aug. *Ep.* 176. 182). Some years after this, perhaps A.D. 423, as primate of Numidia, he was requested by Augustine to come to Hippo to ordain, as bishop of Fussala, a presbyter who understood the Punic language, but at the last moment the intended bishop declined the office, and in order that the journey of Silvanus might not be fruitless, a young reader, named Anthony, was appointed (*Ep.* 209. 3). He also joined in a remonstrance to the Donatists, passed at a council held after the conference at Cirta, exhorting them to return to the church (*Ep.* 141). [H. W. P.]

SILVANUS (12), solitary of Sinai. He was a native of Palestine. He retired at first to Sceti, and thence to Mount Sinai. "He founded at Geraris near the great torrent a very extensive establishment for holy men, over which the excellent Zachariah subsequently presided." (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 32). Cotelerius, in his *Monument.* t. i. p. 678, has a number of curious stories about him, among which is the following. He trained his followers to industrial pursuits. On one occasion a wandering ascetic came, and seeing all the brethren working very diligently he said to them, "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, Mary chose the better part." Silvanus overhearing this remark said at once, "Give a book to the brother and lead him to an empty cell." When the ninth hour came, the stranger looked out expecting some one to call him to eat, but no one came. At last, wearied and hungry, he set out to look for Silvanus. Addressing him, he said, "Father, the brethren have not eaten to-day." "Oh, yes," replied the abbat, "they have eaten." "And why," said the other, "did you not send for me?" "Because," responded Silvanus, "thou art a spiritual man, and dost not require food, but we are carnal and wish to eat, and therefore are compelled to work. Thou, however, hast chosen the better part and continuest in study the whole day, nor art willing to consume carnal food." The stranger confessed his fault and was forgiven, Silvanus playfully saying, "Martha is evidently necessary to Mary." Cotelerius tells stories too of his prolonged trances. On one occasion he awoke very sad, because he had been in the eternal world and had seen many monks going to hell and many secular persons to heaven, *l. c.* p. 679. [G. T. S.]

SILVANUS, deacon. [SILANUS.]

SILVANUS (13), a man of rank to whom Theodoret wrote a consolatory letter on the death of his wife. (Theod. *Ep.* 15.) [E. V.]

SILVANUS (14), first known bishop of Calahorra. Our information about him is derived from two letters of Ascanius, bishop of Tarragona, and the bishops of his province to pope Hilary, and the reply of the latter dated Dec. 30, A.D. 465 (in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 14). From the first letter it appears that Silvanus had seven or eight years before consecrated a bishop without any request from the places comprised in his see or the approval of Ascanius. The other bishops of the province were satisfied with admonishing him, and received the new bishop as one of themselves; but the see in question having again become vacant Silvanus had lately repeated the act, with the aggravation that the priest consecrated belonged to the diocese of another bishop, and the other bishop at the instance of the bishops of Saragossa having refused to join, Silvanus had performed the consecration alone. In the second letter the bishops express their surprise at the pope's delay in answering. His reply was remarkably favourable, in consequence probably of letters from people of rank and property at Calahorra, Tarazona and neighbouring towns, which alleged in excuse for Silvanus that his were not the only irregularities, bishops having been consecrated for other cities without the previous approval of the metropolitan. The pope in consideration of the troubled state of the times granted an amnesty for the past, while enjoining strict observance of the canons for the future. As the first letter was written some time before Hilary's reply, Silvanus probably became bishop about A.D. 455. (*Esp. Sag.* xxxiii. 128; Gams, *Kirchg. von Sp.* ii. (1) 430.) [F. D.]

SILVANUS (15), a presbyter of Rome, who having been in company with Misenus and Vitalis, the legates of pope Felix III., at Constantinople in 483, afterwards testified to their holding communion with heretics there (Evag. *H. E.* iii. 21; Tillem. xvi. 341, 352). [FELIX (3), p. 483.] [C. H.]

SILVENEUS (SYLUENEUS), monk at Kilrule (St. Andrews, Fifeshire); received the relics of St. Regulus on their arrival in Scotland about A.D. 369. He wrote *In omnes Psalmos* and *Meditationes*, and is venerated July 4. (Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 584; Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 204, 447.) [REGULUS.] [J. G.]

SILVERIUS, bishop of Rome after Agapetus, during the reign of Justinian I. Agapetus having died at Constantinople, when on the point of returning to Italy (on the 22nd of April according to Anastasius) in the year 536, we are informed by Liberatus (*Breviarium*) that,

on the news of his death reaching Rome, Silverius, a subdeacon, and a son of pope Hormisdas, was elected and ordained. The exact date of his ordination is uncertain, though there is no doubt of its having been in the same year, 536. According to Anastasius (*Lib. Pontif. in Vit. Silverii*) the election of Silverius was not a free one on the part of the Roman church, but forced upon it by the Gothic king Theodatus, who at that time had possession of the city; and this not without simony on the part of Silverius. He says: "Hic levatus est a tyranno Theodato sine deliberatione decreti. Qui Theodatus, corruptus pecuniae dato, talem timorem induxit clero ut qui non consentirent in ejus ordinatione gladio punirentur. Sacerdotes quidam non subscripserunt in eum secundum morem antiquum, neque decretum confirmaverunt ante ordinationem." But he adds that after his ordination, thus effected by force and intimidation, the presbyters assented to it for the sake of the unity of the church. Though Liberatus, in his succinct account, makes no mention of these irregular proceedings, there seems no sufficient reason for concluding, with Baronius, the report of them to have been invented by way of justifying the subsequent deposition of Silverius. The Gothic king would be likely to use his power for securing the election of his own nominee, whose loyalty to himself he might hope to count on, threatened as he was at the time by the imperial army under Belisarius: nor is there anything in the general character of ecclesiastics of the period, or in what is known of that of Silverius himself, to render a simoniacal transaction in itself improbable. Baronius defends him against the charge on the strength of a supposed letter of his to Vigilius after the intrusion of the latter into the see, in which he accuses him of simony, which it is argued he could not well have done, had he been guilty of it himself. But the genuineness of this letter is more than doubtful; and even had he written it, his accusation of another would not have proved his own innocence. Still the charge rests only on the evidence, not always trustworthy, the *Lib. Pontif.*

In whatever way obtained, Silverius did not long enjoy his dignity. Belisarius, having previously got possession of Naples, entered Rome in the name of Justinian on the 10th of December, A.D. 536. In the meanwhile, Theodatus had been deposed by his subjects, had fled from Rome and been assassinated, and the Gothic general Vitiges had been elected in his room, and commenced a siege of Rome, now in the possession of Belisarius, in the March of the year 537.

Belisarius, after entering Rome, is said in the *Hist. Miscell.* (*lib.* 16 in Muratori, tom. i. p. 106, 107) to have been reproved and subjected to penance by Silverius on account of his cruel treatment of the Neapolitans after his siege of their city; which treatment Anastasius describes thus: "Ductus furore, interfecit Gotthos et omnes cives Neapolitanos, et misit praedam, ut nec ecclesiis parceret praedando, ita ut uxoribus praesentibus maritos earum gladio interficeret, et captivos filios et uxores nobilium exterminaret, nullis parcens, nec sacerdotibus nec servis Dei, nec virginibus sanctimonialibus." But, on the other hand, Procopius (*Bell. Goth.* lib. i.) commends the peculiar humanity of Belisarius after the capture of Naples; saying how he had proclaimed in the streets and churches, so as to check the rapacity of his soldiers, "The gold and silver are the just rewards of your valour: but spare the inhabitants; they are Christians, they are suppliants, they are your fellow-subjects. Restore the children to their parents, the wives to their husbands; and shew them by your generosity of what friends they have obstinately deprived themselves." If this testimony of the contemporary historian is to be believed rather than the other very contrary tradition, the story of Silverius having reproved him and made him do penance is discredited: nor was Belisarius likely, in the flush of victory, to have so submitted to a pope whom he soon afterwards (as will be seen) treated with so high a hand in obedience to the orders of the empress Theodora, whose designs to procure the election of Vigilius he had already, according to Liberatus, been made aware of before leaving Naples. Still it is possible that he may at first have treated the reigning pope with deference, till worked upon by his wife Antonina, whose ascendancy over him was notorious. It is she who appears to have been the leading spirit in the subsequent proceedings.

Vigilius was one of the deacons of pope Agapetus who had been with him in Constantinople, and had, on that pope's death there, been sent for by the empress Theodora, and promised the popedom through the agency of Belisarius on condition of his disallowing, after his elevation, the council of Chalcedon, and supporting the party of the Monophysites whom that notorious lady favoured. (See art. on VIGILIUS.) On his arrival in Italy he found Belisarius at Naples,[a] to whom he communicated the commands of Theodora, and is further said to have secured his good offices by a bribe (Liberatus, *Breviar.*). Belisarius having gained possession of Rome, and Vigilius having followed him there, measures were taken without delay to carry out the wishes of the empress. In the first place, attempts seem to have been made to win over Silverius, who was already in possession of the popedom, to her party. According to Anastasius, she sent a letter to him through Vigilius, imploring him to come to her without delay, or at any rate to recal to his see Anthimus, the Monophysite patriarch of Constantinople, who had been deposed in favour of Mennas under the influence of Agapetus: and Liberatus speaks of Belisarius and his wife having privately tried to persuade him to do the bidding of the empress by disallowing the council of Chalcedon, and writing a letter of communion to the Monophysite bishops in the East. On his refusal to comply, orders are said to have been received from the empress that some pretext must be sought for justifying his deposition, or at any rate for sending him forthwith to Constantinople, Vigilius being significantly mentioned as "one very dear to us, who has promised to us to recal the patriarch Anthimus." Anastasius, who tells us this, says also that Belisarius himself, though

[a] Liberatus says at Ravenna, which is probably a mistake for Naples, of which Belisarius is known to have got possession before proceeding to Rome, whereas Ravenna was not recovered till afterwards.

prepared to obey the empress, repudiated responsibility for the death of Silverius, if that were intended to be compassed: "Sed is qui interest in nece Silverii papae ipse reddet rationem de factis suis domino Jesu Christo." Nor did he, it is added, at first believe the accusations which were forthwith brought against the pope, though, through fear, he at length yielded to the persistence of many witnesses. The fact seems to have been that Belisarius was an unwilling agent in what he knew to be a nefarious transaction through fear of Theodora, and the influence of her confidante Antonina, the wife of Belisarius, who in this, as in other cases, managed her uxorious husband. The accusations against Silverius were to the effect, that he had been in communication with the Goths who were besieging Rome, and had written a letter to Vitiges to this effect: "Veni ad portam quae vocatur Asinaria juxta Lateranas, et civitatem tibi trado, et Belisarium patricium." Such a letter was produced, said to have been forged by one "Marcus Scholasticus," and one "Julianus Praetorianus." Belisarius occupied a palace on the Pincian, and thither the pope appears to have been thrice summoned to meet these charges. After the first interview he betook himself to the basilica of the martyr St. Sabina. Thence he was again summoned through Photis, the son of Antonina, who assured him of security by an oath. Though dissuaded by his friends, he again went to the Pincian palace, and was that day allowed to return to his church. Summoned a third time by Belisarius, he went once more, though after hesitation from suspicion of intended mischief. He entered the palace alone according to Liberatus, accompanied by Vigilius according to the less trustworthy account of Anastasius, and was thenceforth, says Liberatus, seen by his friends no more. Anastasius gives the following account of what took place. Antonina was sitting on a bed, with Belisarius sitting at her feet. 'Say, lord pope Silverius,' said she as he entered the room, 'What have we done to thee and to the Romans, that thou shouldest wish to betray us into the hands of the Goths?' While she was yet speaking, one John, "subdiaconus regionarius," came in, and took off the pope's *pallium*, led him into a chamber, stripped him of his robes, dressed him as a monk, and concealed him. One Sixtus, another "subdiaconus regionarius," having caught sight of him thus habited, went out and announced to the clergy that the lord pope was deposed and made a monk; on hearing which they all fled. He was banished, in the first instance, to Patara, a city of Syria, Vigilius being forthwith elected and ordained in his stead by order of Belisarius. Anastasius passes over this first banishment to Patara, speaking only of the second and final one; but Liberatus gives an account of it, and Procopius alludes to it, saying that Silverius was sent "in Graeciam." Liberatus further informs us that the bishop of Patara, after his arrival there, went to represent the matter to Justinian himself, and to protest against the deposition of the bishop of so great a see, "multos esse dicens in hoc mundo reges, et non esse unum, sicut ille papa est, super ecclesiam mundi totius." The emperor, who, though he prided himself on his management of ecclesiastical affairs, was really very often the tool of others who managed him (and especially of the intriguing and imperious Theodora, whom he had raised from a life of the lowest degradation to an equal share in his own imperial dignity), seems to have been ignorant of the facts. On hearing of them he asserted himself, ordering Silverius to be recalled to Rome, and investigation made of the genuineness of the letters which had been the ground of his condemnation. Should they be found to have been really written by him, he was to be banished from Rome, though retaining his rank as bishop; should the charge against him be disproved, he was to be restored to his see. This seems to be the meaning of Liberatus: "ut, si probaretur ab ipso fuisse scriptas, in quacunque civitate episcopus degeret; si autem falsae fuissent probatae, restitueretur sedi suae." The emperor's order so far prevailed that Silverius did go back to Rome, although Pelagius (the deacon—afterwards pope—whom pope Agapetus had appointed as his apocrisiarius at Constantinople, but whom Theodora seems to have won over to her side) had been sent post haste to prevent his return. But the empress carried the day after all, having succeeded somehow in keeping her husband quiet. For, on the arrival of Silverius at Rome (as we are informed by Liberatus), Vigilius represented to Belisarius that he could not do what was required of him unless the deposed pope were delivered into his hands. He was thereupon given up to two dependents of Vigilius, under whose custody he was sent to the island of Palmaria in the Tyrrhene sea (or Pontia, according to *Martyrol. Rom.* and Anastasius),[b] where he died from famine (defecit inedia) according to Liberatus; with whose account accords that of Anastasius: "et sustentavit eum (*i.e.* Vigilius) cum pane tribulationis ab aqua angustiae. Qui deficiens mortuus est, confessor factus." So also *Martyrologium Roman.*, "multis aerumnis confectus defecit." Procopius (*Hist. Arcan.*), on the other hand, speaks of one Eugenius, a servant of Antonina, as having been her instrument in bringing about his death, the expression used seeming to imply a death by violence. Allemann (note on *Hist. Arcan.*) argues that the account of Procopius, who was living at Rome at the time, and likely to be well acquainted with the facts, is to be received rather than the other; and attributes the implication of Vigilius to prejudice on the part of Liberatus. For Liberatus, he says, was a Carthaginian, and the Africans were incensed against Vigilius on account of his confirmation of the fifth council. There seems to be no reason why there should not be truth in both accounts. Silverius may have been sent to Palmaria (or Pontia) under the charge of the agents of Vigilius, and his end there may have been hastened by Eugenius, commissioned by Antonina.

The death of Silverius was on the 20th of June (xii Kal. Jul. *al.* Jun. *Anastas.*), most probably A.D. 538, *i.e.* in the year following that of

[b] Palmaria, Pontia, and Pandataria are three small islands over against the coast of Latium, to which people whom it was desired to get quickly rid of appear to have been sent under the emperors. Julia, daughter of Augustus, was for some time secluded in Pandataria (Tac. *Annal.* i. 53); and Nero, the son of Germanicus, was sent by Tiberius to Pontia, and, like Silverius, is said to have died of hunger there (Sueton. *in Tiber.* c. 54).

his deposition;—which certainly took place in the year 537, though Baronius assigns it to 538, erroneously supposing the siege of Rome by Vigites to have begun in the latter year. Baronius is most probably further in error in concluding the death of Silverius to have been in the year 540, on the strength of a letter said to have been addressed by him to Vigilius, which is dated viii. Kal. Jul. A.D. 539. But this letter has such signs of spuriousness that no conclusion can be drawn from it (see Pagi in Baron. A.D. 540, num. i.). The earlier date is probable from the very fact that Theodora, whose design to compass his death Belisarius is said, as above seen, to have suspected from the first, would be naturally anxious to get him out of the way as soon as possible. As long as he lived the position of Vigilius would be insecure, and Justinian might still be moved to interfere.

At the end of the life of Silverius Anastasius adds: "Et cessavit episcopatus dies sex." Binius and Baronius, taking this vacancy to have been after the death of Silverius (since he remained the lawful pope canonically notwithstanding his deposition), suppose Vigilius to have resigned his assumed position, and to have been properly elected after the time alleged. But there is not the least historical ground for this idea. According to Liberatus, Vigilius was proposed by Belisarius to the assembled clergy of Rome shortly after the deposition of Silverius ("et alia die Belisarius convocatis presbyteris," &c.), and, though some hesitated and others refused to concur, was thereupon ordained: and there is no record of any subsequent election or ordination. Hence we may suppose that the Roman church, under intimidation, accepted the new pope on his ordination by order of Belisarius, and that by the vacancy of six days was meant originally the interval between the deposition of Silverius and that event. It is true that Anastasius, who makes no mention of the ordination of Vigilius at the time when Liberatus informs us it took place, speaks of the vacancy after recording the death of Silverius; perhaps owing to the same feeling that influenced Binius and Baronius,—viz. unwillingness to recognise any vacancy of the see during the life of its lawful occupant. But very irregular things might easily be both done and condoned in the circumstances of the time. Such depositions of bishops, and ordinations of others in their room, under imperial dictation, were common enough elsewhere; and never indeed was there a time in which the dignity of the great Roman see suffered so much as this; a time when such things as have been related could be done through the machinations of two women such as Theodora and Antonina. Imperial domination from Constantinople proved in fact no good exchange for the more immediate authority of the Gothic kings of Italy, who, though themselves Arians, had generally treated the Catholic Church with respect and fairness. The eminent dignity of the Roman see, viewed as representing St. Peter's primacy, had indeed by this time been successfully asserted; but the Eastern emperors, accustomed to subservience, expected even popes to bend to their will as the ecclesiastics of the East had done; and Justinian especially, who was unhappily a theologian as well as a despot, was not the man to tolerate independence. At the same time the intrigues of his corrupt court rendered the domination exercised in his name all the more degrading. It was not till the time of Gregory the Great, when the imperial power was on the wane, and when a truly great man was in possession of the Roman see, that it began to rise to the great position of influence which it afterwards occupied in the world.

Silverius was buried in the island where he died. Sick persons were said to have been cured by resort to his tomb; and his sufferings for the faith at the hands of the Monophysite party have procured him a place in the Roman martyrology as a saint and martyr, his day being June 20.

Two epistles are attributed to Silverius. One, which has been already mentioned, purports to have been addressed by him to Vigilius, anathematising him for his usurpation, and to have been signed also by four other bishops. Its whole style, the improbability that, situated as he was, he would have been able to send such a letter with the concurrence of other bishops, and the Consuls named in it as contemporary, are sufficient proofs of its spuriousness. Though Baronius accepts it, it is decidedly rejected by Pagi. The other letter, addressed to a bishop Amator, giving an account of his trial and sufferings, is universally rejected by Baronius and Binius as well as others. So also one from the same Amator to himself, to which the letter last mentioned purports to be a reply. The authorities for his life, as above given, are, in addition to Anastasius, the contemporary writers, Liberatus (*Breviarium*) and Procopius (*de bell. Goth.*) and *Anecdota* or *Historia Arcana*). [J. B—Y.]

SILVESTER(1), bishop of Rome after Miltiades, from Jan. 31, A.D. 314, to Dec. 31, A.D. 335, during 21 years and 11 months. Though his time was an important one in church history, we have few genuine records of any personal action of his own. There is, on the other hand, a great store of legend about him to make up for the deficiency. The well-attested facts claim notice first.

It was in the first year of his episcopate that Constantine the Great, moved by the persistent appeals of the African Donatists, summoned the first council of Arles for reconsidering the decision against them of the synod held at Rome by his order in the year 313. [MILTIADES, DONATISM.] The presidency of the Roman synod had been committed by the emperor to the pope Miltiades, assisted by assessors from Gaul nominated by the emperor for the purpose. With the subsequent council of Arles Silvester evidently had nothing to do, beyond being represented at it by two presbyters, Claudianus and Vitus, and two deacons, Eugenius and Cyriacus, whose names appear in his behalf in the fifth place among the signatures. Whoever presided, the general conduct of the council seems to have been committed by the emperor to Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse; as may be gathered from a letter to him from Constantine preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* x. 5). In this letter the emperor complains with considerable bitterness of the provoking conduct of the Donatists in refusing to acquiesce in the ruling of the Roman synod, which he had hoped would have settled the dispute. That synod had by

them been accused of prejudice, and of hastiness of procedure; and so Christians were still disgracefully at variance, and exposing the faith to the derision of its adversaries. In the hope therefore of getting the dispute settled by means of a fuller council, he has, he says, commanded a large number of bishops from various parts to meet at Arles, and he bids Chrestus repair thither within the specified time, with two presbyters chosen by himself, who, together with three servants, are to be provided with a conveyance at the public cost. Further, the name of Chrestus heads the signatures appended to the alleged acts of the council, though in the names at the head of a letter (to be afterwards spoken of) said to have been addressed to Silvester after its close, that of Marinus bishop of Arles comes first.[a] Certainly Silvester did not preside, nor did any representative in his place. Constantine, in making arrangements for the council, evidently takes no account of him, though the dispute to be settled was one that had arisen in Western Africa, where the popes had already claimed authority, which was in later times conceded to them. He does not even mention him in his letter to Chrestus. Indeed the fact of the council being convened to review the decisions of a previous one over which a pope had presided shews that the see of Rome was not considered by him to have any special prerogative of authority. Constantine acted in this case after his usual manner. While scrupulous in committing the settlement of ecclesiastical causes to ecclesiastics only, he still convened synods for the purpose by his own mere authority, summoned such bishops as he chose to them, and felt himself under no obligation to consult or give precedence to the bishop of Rome. Nor is there any recorded protest in his day on the part of the church against his mode of procedure.[b]

There is indeed one document—the letter above alluded to as addressed by the bishops of the Arles council to Silvester—which, if genuine and unadulterated, would exalt the status of the Roman bishop above what other evidence shews to have been at that time recognized. It is found in the commonly received acts of the council, and runs as follows:

"To the most beloved pope Silvester, Marinus (bishop of Arles, as aforesaid), Agraecius, &c. (here follow thirty-two names), eternal salvation in the Lord. United in the bond of charity, and in the unity of our mother the Catholic church, having been convened by the will of the most pious emperor in the city of Arles, we thence salute thee, most glorious pope, with due reverence. We have endured men, troublesome and pernicious to our law and tradition, and of unbridled mind, whom both the present authority of our God and the tradition and rule of faith have rejected. Wherefore, by the judgment of God and of mother church, who knows and approves her own, they have been either condemned or repulsed. And would, most beloved brother, that you had deemed it of sufficient importance to be present at so great a spectacle. If you had, we truly believe that the sentence against them would have been more severe; and, had you judged together with us, our assembly would have exulted with greater joy. But, as you could by no means leave those parts where both the apostles daily sit, and their blood without intermission testifies the glory of God,—we have notwithstanding thought it right, most dear brother, not only to treat of those things for the consideration of which we had been invited, but also to take counsel among ourselves with respect to divers matters, the provinces from which we come being divers. We have therefore thought fit, in the presence of the Holy Spirit and his angels, to promulge certain resolutions for present quiet. And we have thought it fit also that they should be especially made known *to all* through you, *who hold the greater dioceses*. What we have resolved on we subjoin in the writing of our mediocrity." A summary of the canons agreed on follows. Now, though this letter does not imply either that the bishop of Rome had taken any part in convening the council, or that his approval of its decrees was necessary, yet he is addressed in it with very marked deference, and a kind of apology is made by the writers for having done all they had done without him. Further, the phrase in it, *qui majores dioeceses tenes*, with the consequent desire expressed that the pope should promulgate the decrees, has been used by Schelstrate and others in proof of the pope's then acknowledged patriarchal jurisdiction over all the great dioceses (*i.e.* exarchates) of the Western Empire. For the word διοίκησις denoted the jurisdiction of a patriarch, larger than that of metropolitans, after the church in her ecclesiastical arrangements had followed the civil division of the empire into dioceses under exarchs which was introduced by Constantine. The word for a diocese in the modern sense was properly παροικία. It is, however, highly improbable that the word *diocese* would have been used ecclesiastically in this sense so early as A.D. 314, even if the civil division of the empire into dioceses had been by that time established. Hence Bingham contends (*Ant.* ix. i. 12, and ii. 2) that if the passage, "by all acknowledged to be a very corrupt one," be accepted, διοίκησις must be taken in the sense generally at that time expressed by παροικία: and he adduces instances of the word being used in this sense in canons of Carthaginian councils. It may be considered more probable that the whole epistle (on the ground not only of this passage but also of the general anachronism of its tone) is a forgery from beginning to end, concocted with the view of magnifying the Roman see. Acts of councils that have been handed down to us as genuine are not always trustworthy. Many, in whole or in part, are now generally discredited on grounds of internal evidence. For instance, as will be seen below, an alleged synodical letter from the council of Nicaea to the same Silvester, seeking his confirmation, and his reply to it, are both now rejected by the learned. The synodical letter from Arles may well be conceived to have been

[a] The latter probably, as was likely to be the case, had the formal presidency.

[b] Constantine's attitude towards the church was in accordance with his speech to the bishops mentioned by Eusebius (*V. C.* iv. 24): "ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν εἴσω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθιστάμενος ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἴην." On which speech Eusebius remarks, 'Ακόλουθα δ' οὖν τῷ λόγῳ διανοούμενος, τοὺς ἀρχομένους ἅπαντας ἐπεσκόπει, προὔτρεπέ τε, ὅση περ ἂν ἡ δύναμις, τὸν εὐσεβῆ μεταδιώκειν βίον."

forged with a like motive. In it there is this among other reasons for suspicion,—that (as is pointed out in the *Art.* on MARINUS) the pope is requested, as holding the greater dioceses, to communicate the decrees *to all*, whereas the bishops of Sardica, seventy years later, in their letter to pope Julius (well attested, since preserved by St. Hilary), only "thought it right that their brethren in Italy, Sardinia, and Sicily should learn their decrees through him."

Of the canons said to have been passed at Arles, the first only has any direct reference to the bishop of Rome. It decrees that Easter should henceforth be kept everywhere on the same day, and that the bishop of Rome should, according to custom, make known the day by letters addressed to all the churches. It is worthy of remark that in the synodal letter of the subsequent council of Nice (A.D. 325), at which general uniformity with regard to Easter was provided for, there is no mention of the bishop of Rome as the authority for declaring the proper day. In the following century the custom, said to have been established by "the Fathers," was for the patriarch of Alexandria to ascertain and notify it. Pope Leo, *e.g.* (440–461) learnt it from him on the ground of ancient custom:—"Statuerunt ergo *sancti patres* occasionem hujus erroris (viz. with regard to the Easter cycle) auferre, omnem hanc curam Alexandrino episcopo delegantes, quoniam apud Aegyptios hujus supputationis antiquitus tradita videbatur peritia" (Leo I. *ad Marcianum imp.* ep. 94, *al.* 121). Cf. ep. 109, *al.* 138, *ad episcopos Galliarum et Hispaniarum*, in which Leo notifies to those bishops the proper day for Easter, having, he says, himself learnt it from the emperor Marcianus, whom he had requested to ascertain it from those "qui habent hujus supputationis peritiam." See also Bingham, B. xx. ch. iv. sect. ix.

To the more memorable council of Nice in 325 Silvester was invited, but, declining to attend in person on the ground of his age, he sent two presbyters, Vitus and Vincentius, as his representatives (Euseb. *V. C.* iii. 7; Socr. *H. E.* i. 14; Sozom. *H. E.* i. 17; Theodoret. *H. E.* i. 6). The view that they presided over the council in his name, or that (as Baronius maintains) Osius of Cordova did so, is without foundation. In the subscriptions to the decrees of the council the name of Osius appears first, but simply as bishop of Cordova, not as in any way representing Rome; after which come those of Vitus and Vincentius, who sign "pro venerabili viro papa et episcopo nostro, sancto Sylvestro, ita credentes sicut scriptum est." The earliest, and indeed the only authority for the view of Osius having presided in the pope's name is that of Gelasius of Cyzicus at the end of the 5th century, who says only that Osius from Spain, "qui Silvestri episcopi maximae Romae locum obtinebat," together with the Roman presbyters Bito and Vincentius, was present (Gelas. *Hist. Concil. Nic.* l. ii. c. 5, in Labbe, vol. ii. p. 162). Equally groundless is the allegation first made by the sixth oecumenical council (680), that Silvester in concert with the emperor summoned the Nicene fathers.[a] The gradual growth of this idea appears in the pontifical annals. The catalogue of popes called the Felician (A.D. 530) says only that the synod was held with his consent (cum consensu ejus); some later MSS. improve this phrase into "cum praecepto ejus." It is evident from all authentic documents that the synod of Nice, as that of Arles, was convened by the sole authority of the emperor, and that no peculiarly prominent position was accorded to the pope with respect to either. The fifth and sixth of the Nicene canons are well known as illustrating generally his recognized position at that time. The fifth provides for the final determination of appeals from excommunicated persons by provincial synods. No further appeal to the see of Rome, such as was afterwards conceded by the Westerns at Sardica A.D. 343 [JULIUS (5)], was as yet thought of. The sixth confirms to the bishop of Alexandria his customary authority over the churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, and similar authority to the bishop of Antioch, on the ground that "this is also customary to the bishop of Rome." The inference evidently is that the bishop of Rome was not then regarded as possessing jurisdiction of a different or higher kind than that of other patriarchs, and that such as he had above other bishops was considered to rest on custom rather than divine authority. An alleged synodical letter to Silvester, seeking his confirmation, and his reply to it (Labbe, vol. ii. p. 79), are both generally acknowledged to be spurious.

Spurious also are the accounts of three Roman synods said to have been held under Silvester. The first of these (alleged to have been summoned, A.D. 315, at the desire of Helena and Constantine, for a disputation with the Jews, see Labbe, vol. i. p. 1521) is referred to (apparently on the authority of the fabulous *Acts of S. Sylvester*, which will be mentioned below) by pope Hadrian, in a letter to Charlemagne (Hadr. *Ep.* 3. *ad Car. M.*). The second (Labbé, vol. i. p. 1575), assigned to the year 324, before the council of Nice, in which Arius is said to have been condemned, and several canons passed, is mentioned in the Felician catalogue, and its supposed acts are contained in the pseudo-Isidorian collection. In the third (Labbe, vol. ii. p. 417), assigned to the year 325, the Nicene decrees, already passed, are said to have been confirmed in the presence of Constantine, who certainly could not have been in Rome at the time spoken of. On these pretended councils see Hefele (*Conciliengeschichte*, i. 419, &c.).

But the most memorable of the fables about Silvester is that relating to the baptism of Constantine by him, and the celebrated "Donation." It is, though variously related, in the main as follows:—The emperor, having before his conversion authorized cruel persecution of the Christians, to escape which pope Silvester had hidden himself in Mount Soracte, was smitten with leprosy by divine judgment. He was advised by certain soothsayers whom he consulted (according to some versions of the story, by physicians, or by the priests of the Capitol) to use a bath of infants' blood for cure. A

[a] The statement occurs in the address of the council to the emperor: "Arius divisor atque partitor Trinitatis insurgebat: et continuo Constantinus semper Augustus et Silvester laudabilis magnam atque insignem in Nicaea synodum congregabant." (Hardouin. iii. p. 1417.)

great multitude of infants was accordingly collected for slaughter; but the emperor was so moved by their cries and those of their afflicted mothers that he was seized with remorse, and desisted from his purpose. Being in this state of mind, he was visited in visions of the night by SS. Peter and Paul, and directed by them to seek and recall Silvester, who would show him a pool by immersion in which he would be healed. Thereupon he recalled the pope from exile, was instructed by him in the faith, cured of his leprosy, and baptized. Moved by gratitude, he not only destroyed the heathen temples, and built and endowed numerous churches, but also made over to the pope and his successors the temporal dominion of Rome, of the greatest part of Italy, and of other provinces, thinking it unfit that the place where the monarch of the whole church and the vicar of Christ resided should be subject to earthly sway. (See *Lib. Pontif. in Vit. Sylvestri*, and the Lections *in Fest. S. Sylvestri* in the Breviaries of the various uses.) The earliest known authority for the whole story appears to be the *Acta Sylvestri*, with respect to which more will be said below. There is apparent reference to the earlier part of it in the account given by Gregory of Tours of the baptism of Clovis: "Procedit novus Constantinus ad lavacrum, deleturus leprae veteris morbum, sordentesque maculas gestorum antiquorum recenti latice deleturus." (Greg. Turon. *Hist.* l. ii. c. 31.) Such is the alleged origin of the "Donation of Constantine," which, having with the "False Decretals" assumed definite form probably in the 8th century, long continued to be accepted and referred to as the foundation of the pope's temporal sovereignty. It began to be questioned as early as the beginning of the 12th century, but was not universally rejected till the 16th. Gibbon (c. xlix.) gives a good summary, with references, of the history and exposure of the forgery. There seems to have been a foundation of fact for it so far as this: that Constantine, at Rome especially, though elsewhere also, was liberal in founding churches and in granting immunities and endowments to the clergy (Euseb. *V. C.* iii. 25–40; iv. 28, 39, 58–60; Sozom. i. 8, v. 5; Theodor. iv. 4); and it is not improbable that the subsequent possession of the Lateran palace by the popes was due to him.

The part of the story that attributes his conversion and baptism to Silvester is as undoubtedly legendary as the rest. It seems not unlikely to have been originally due to a desire on the part of unbelievers to throw discredit on Constantine's profession of Christianity. For we find an early form of it in the statement of the heathen historian Zosimus, that after the execution by his order of his son Crispus his nephew Licinius and others (that of his wife Fausta, though probable, is by some doubted), he sought lustration from the priests, and was informed by them that they had no means of expiating crimes like his; but that a Spaniard with an Egyptian name was afterwards introduced to him, who told him that the Christian doctrine assured forgiveness of all manner of sin, and that he was thus first led to embrace Christianity. (Zosim. ii. 29.) Sozomen (i. 5) refutes a similar pagan story, to the effect that having applied to and been repulsed by Sopater the philosopher, he fell in with certain Christian bishops, who promised him purification from all his sins after repentance and baptism. By the Spaniard with an Egyptian name Osius of Cordova has been supposed to be meant, who is accordingly added by more modern relators of the story to the two apostles seen in vision, as having also directed him to Silvester. So Tillemont and also Baronius and Binius, who further attribute his leprosy and remorse to the unhappy events in his life alluded to by Zosimus, and not merely (as is intimated in the *Lib. Pontif.* and alleged in the Breviaries) to his previous persecution of Christians. It is possible that something did actually occur to give foundation for the story at that period of the life of Constantine (during his visit to Rome A.D. 326), when he may well have passed through a season of peculiar remorse, and been drawn more than before towards the Christian doctrines of Atonement, and washing away of sin. But it is undoubted both that his profession and patronage of Christianity were anterior to the time spoken of, and also that he was not actually baptized till long afterwards, at the close of his life. There is abundant testimony that he did not seek baptism, or even imposition of hands as a catechumen, till in a suburb of Nicomedia, as death drew near, he received both for the first time from Eusebius, the Arian bishop of that see. (Euseb. *V. C.* iv. 61, 62; Theodoret. i. 32; Sozom. ii. 34; Socrat. i. 39; Photius, *cod.* 127; Ambrose, *Serm. de obit. Theodos.*; Jerom. *Chron. an.* 2353; Sozom. iv. 18; *Council of Rimini.*) In spite of this concurrent evidence Baronius warmly supports the fable of his previous baptism by Silvester. Emmanuel Schelstrate (*antiq. illustr. pt.* 2, *dissert.* 3, *c.* 6) supposes him to have been baptized a second time by Eusebius as a convert to Arianism. But this is only an unsupported expedient for reconciling the legend with the fact. After all, it seems not unlikely that the legend in its earliest form did not really imply actual baptism by Silvester, but only some sort of lustration for the cure of his alleged leprosy. The original Acts of Silvester, as referred to by pope Hadrian in his letters (as to which see below), do not seem of necessity to have implied baptism, though suggesting the idea of it,—and it is worth noticing that the lections of the York Breviary (see *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesie Eboracensis*, published by Surtees Soc. 1880) do not, like those of the Roman and Sarum uses, allege actual baptism but only the emperor's immersion in a fountain (*fontem*), which had been blessed by the pope, out of which he arose cleansed from his leprosy, and confessing that he had seen Christ.

The "Acta S. Sylvestri," alluded to above, which seem to have furnished the materials for most of the legends—including the banishment to Soracte, the leprosy of Constantine, his lustration by Silvester, and his Donation—are mentioned and approved as genuine in the *decretum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, commonly attributed to pope Gelasius (492–496), but probably of a later date. They are quoted in the 8th century by pope Hadrian in a letter to Charlemagne, where the donation is alluded to, and in another to the empress Irene and her son Constantine on the occasion of the 2nd Nicene

council, where the pope's purpose is to support the image-worship which that council was assembled to restore. He tells how St. Peter and St. Paul had appeared in a dream to Constantine the Great, and directed him to Silvester, then in banishment on mount Soracte, who would shew him a pool (*piscina*), after three immersions in which he would be cured of his leprosy: how he had asked Silvester who Peter and Paul were, and whether he had any pictures of them; and how Silvester had produced portraits, which the emperor recognised as agreeing with his dream. The original "Acts" have not been preserved. The extant editions of them, given in Latin by Surius (*Acta SS.* Decembr. p. 368), and in Greek by Combeficius (*Act.* p. 258), purport to be only compilations from an earlier document.

For references to the original document, see Acts of the 2nd Nicene Council, containing the letters of pope Hadrian above referred to.

Silvester died on the 31st of December, A.D. 335, and was buried in the cemetery of St. Priscilla. He is commemorated on the above-mentioned day in the Roman martyrology as a saint, and as having baptized Constantine and confirmed the Nicene council: also in the Greek menology on the 1st of January, as a worker of many miracles, and the converter, healer, and baptizer of Constantine. [J. B—y.]

SILVESTER (2), bishop and companion of St. Palladius, has his tradition collected by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 570–571), but it is very obscure. He was buried at Donard, co. Wicklow, where a church was dedicated to him and Solonius his associate (Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 368–369; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 282–283). He has a Scotch and Irish tradition. [J. G.]

SILVIA, the mother of Gregory the Great. She retired, probably after the death of her husband, GORDIANUS (7), to a place afterwards called Cella Nova, near the gate of St. Paul. Gregory afterwards caused her portrait, with that of his father, to be placed in the atrium of a monastery, probably that of St. Andrew ad Clivum Scauri. They existed in the time of John the Deacon (c. 870), and are minutely described by him (Joannes Diaconus, *Vita Gregorii*, i. 1, 9, iv. 83; in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxv. 63, 66, 229). His description is given under GORDIANUS (7). She is commemorated as a saint on November 3rd. [F. D.]

SILVINA. [SALVINA.]

SILVIUS, companion of St. Regulus, and brother of Nathabeus (Skene, *Chron.* 187; Fordun, *Scot. Chron.* ii. c. 47, ed. Skene, i. 76–77; ii. 71); is probably the original of Dempster's (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 588) "Silvius Bonus natione Scotus" who flourished about A.D. 410; he was orator and poet, held in much esteem by the emperor Maximus, and is said to have written *Maximi Caesaris Laus*, *Invectivae in Ausonium*, *De bellis Aremoricis*, *Poemata diversi generis*, *Epistolae ad diversos.* [J. G.]

SIMEON (1), second bishop of Jerusalem, succeeding James, the brother of our Lord. According to the statement of Hegesippus, preserved by Eusebius, the correctness of which there is no reason to question, Simeon was the son of Clopas "mentioned in Holy Scripture" (Joh. xix. 25), the brother of Joseph, and therefore, legally, the uncle of our Lord, while Simeon himself—*ὁ ἐκ τοῦ θείου τοῦ Κυρίου*—was, legally, his cousin, *ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ Κυρίου*, and of the royal line of David (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 11, 32; iv. 22). The language of Hegesippus (*H. E.* iv. 82) evidently distinguishes between the relationship of James and Simeon to our Lord. Dr. Mill, however, follows Burton (*Eccl. Hist.* i. 290) in regarding Simeon as a brother of James and also of Jude, though perhaps by another mother (Mill, *Pantheistic Principles*, pp. 234, 253). Such an interpretation of Hegesippus' language is very unnatural, and is at variance with the statement of Epiphanius that Simeon was the cousin, "*ἀνεψιός*," of James the Just (Epiphan. *Haer.* lxxvii. c. 14, p. 1046; cf. Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 262). There is nothing to lead us to suppose that Simeon was of the number of the Twelve Apostles. The sameness of name however has led, contrary to all probability, to his identification with "Simon Zelotes," or the "Cananite." This is asserted in the work "*de Duodecim Apostolis*," falsely ascribed to St. Hippolytus (*Opera*, part ii. p. 30, ed. Fabric.), and by Sophronius (?), who, however, strangely confounds him with Jude—*Σίμων ὁ Κανανίτης, ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, ὁ καὶ Ἰούδας* (Hieron. *Op.* ii. p. 958), and by Isidore of Seville (*de Vit. et Obit. Sanct.* c. 81), (see Mill, *u. s.* p. 238, Lightfoot, *u. s.* p. 246). This extraordinary double identification also meets us in a list of the Twelve Apostles found at the end of a codex of the Four Gospels (Bibl. Reg. 1007), given by Coteler (*Patres Apost.* tom. i. p. 274, note 6), and in Pseudo-Dorotheus (*ibid.* p. 385, note 16). This last-named author makes a still greater confusion by identifying Simeon the cousin of our Lord, and the second bishop of Jerusalem with his father Cleopas (cf. Liv. xxiv. 18), and regarding him as a different person from Simon the Apostle—*Κλεώπας ὁ καὶ Συμεὼν, ἀνεψιὸς τοῦ Κυρίου γενόμενος καὶ δεύτερος ἐπίσκοπος Ἱεροσολύμων* (*ibid.*). Whether he was the same with Simon the brother of Christ (Matt. xiii. 55, Mark vi. 3) depends upon the view taken of the real nature of the relationship thus designated. Eusebius concludes from his reputed age at the time of his martyrdom, 120 years, and from Mary the wife of his father Cleopas being mentioned in the Gospels, that Simeon was one of those who saw and heard Christ (*H. E.* iii. 32). Bishop Lightfoot regards his age as "an exaggeration," and suggests that his being "a son of Cleopas mentioned in the Evangelical records," leads us to place his death earlier than the generally received date. Renan ingeniously evades the chronological difficulty by the hypothesis of a second Simeon, the great-grandson of Cleopas, who occupied the throne of Jerusalem after Judas the successor to Simeon the son of Cleopas, and suffered martyrdom towards the end of the reign of Trajan (*Les Evangiles*, p. 466, note 3, pp. 496, 540). This later Simeon is a creation of Renan's fertile brain, who may be safely discarded from our consideration.

According to Hegesippus, Simeon was unanimously chosen to fill the vacant see of Jerusalem on the violent death of James the Just. A tradition preserved by Epiphanius (*l. c.*) tells us that Simeon was an eye-witness of his kinsman's

martyrdom, standing afar off and remonstrating with his murderers. There is an element of legend (λόγος κατέχει) which may be safely rejected in the statement of Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 11), that the choice of Simeon as James's successor was made by the surviving apostles and disciples of Christ, and his kinsmen, assembling for that purpose after the fall of Jerusalem. But as Burton appositely remarks, although "if any of the apostles were at this time in Judea they possibly had a share in making this appointment, there is reason to think that for some years they had been engaged in distant countries, and Simeon was probably chosen by the elders of the Church of Jerusalem" (*Lectures on Eccl. Hist.* vol. i. p. 290). Renan accepts Eusebius's postponement of Simeon's election till after the fall of Jerusalem. On the eve of so tremendous a catastrophe there would, he thinks, have been no hurry to appoint a successor to St. James (*Antechr.* iv. p. 22). The date usually assigned for the martyrdom of James is A.D. 62 or 63. This seems fixed by the account of Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 9. 1). Whether the appointment of Simeon immediately succeeded, or was not made till the retirement of the Christian Jews to Pella cannot be determined. The former seems rather the more probable. His retreat at Pella would save him from the inquisition after descendants of the royal line of David, made by Vespasian, according to Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 12), as well as the later enquiry instituted by Domitian (*ib.* 19, 20). He must have returned with the members of his church to Jerusalem when allowed to do so by the Roman authorities. Of his episcopate we know absolutely nothing. His martyrdom took place some time in the reign of Trajan, ἐπὶ Τραϊανοῦ (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 32), but its exact date is uncertain. By a misinterpretation of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius which seemed to assign it together with the martyrdom of Ignatius, to the 9th or 10th year of Trajan, Simeon's death has been assigned to A.D. 107 or 108. Lloyd and Dodwell put it as late as A.D. 110, Burton as early as A.D. 104. Bishop Lightfoot has clearly traced the origin of this error—"the dates being left loose were liable to be assigned to any of the neighbouring years by later scribes and redactors"—and has shown good reason for placing the event earlier in Trajan's reign (Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, i. 21, 58–60; ii. 442–450). The facts as narrated by Hegesippus are these. When in his 121st year Simeon was accused by certain Jewish sectaries on a double charge, first that he was of the line of David, and therefore a possible claimant of the throne of his royal ancestor, and secondly that he was a Christian. The accusation was laid before Atticus who was then pro-consul. Hegesippus relates that Simeon was subjected to torture for many days in succession, and that he bore his sufferings with a firmness which astonished all the beholders, especially Atticus himself, who marvelled at such endurance in one of so advanced an age. As the closing act of the tragedy he was ordered to be crucified (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 32). The compiler of the *Chronicon Paschale* erroneously describes the heretical accusers of Simeon as Cerinthians and Nicolaitans (*Chron. Pasch.* p. 471, ed. Bonn.). There can be no doubt that in common with the persecutors of James the Just, they were members of one or other of the seven sects, αἱ ἑπτὰ αἱρέσεις, mentioned more than once by Hegesippus (Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23, iv. 22). These sects were mainly Jewish. Hegesippus goes on to say that after Simeon's death his accusers were apprehended on one of the charges brought against him as being members of the royal house. He adds that the death of Simeon, the last of the generation who were eye-witnesses and hearers of Christ, was the signal for the birth of heresies polluting the hitherto original purity of the church, which a certain Thebuthis [THEBUTHIS] had already begun to corrupt secretly through jealousy at not being made a bishop (Euseb. *H. E. ll. cc.*). Simeon is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on Feb. 18, and in the Greek on Ap. 27. There appears no sufficient probability for Dean Spence's opinion that Simeon was the author of the recently published *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, which he thinks was written by him during his residence at Pella for the instruction of converts from among the neighbouring heathen. (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 11, 12, 32, iv. 22; Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* i. pp. 212 sq.; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* ii. 186–188; Burton, *Lect. on Eccl. Hist.* i. 290, 341, 357, ii. 14, 17; Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, i. 15, 21 sq., 39, 58, 60, 66; ii. 443–449.) [E. V.]

SIMEON (2), surnamed Bar-Saboë (filius tinctoris), 9th catholicus of Seleucia and Ctesiphon on the Tigris, and martyr, succeeded Papas A.D. 326, having probably been his assistant. According to Sozomen (*E. H.* ii. cc. 9, 10), the Magi and Jews excited Sapor against the Christians, and one of the first to be cast into prison was the catholicus. With a number of other Christians, himself being the last, he suffered martyrdom on Good Friday, probably A.D. 344, but the date is uncertain. His feast is April 17th. (Assem. *B. O.* ii. 399, iii. 612, *Acta Mart. Or.* i. 229; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1107; Ruinart, *Act. Mart.* 584 sq.) [J. G.]

SIMEON (3), bishop of Beth-Arsam in Persia, A.D. 510–525. He converted three leaders among the Magi, who were beheaded ten days after their baptism. He signed Zeno's Henoticon, but opposed Nestorianism. The only writings of his extant are a liturgy composed for the Persian church, sometimes attributed to Philoxenus (Renaudot, *Liturg.* t. ii. p. 301); and two letters, one without any address, concerning Barsaumas, bishop of Nisibis, and Nestorianism, the other directed to Simeon, abbat of Gabula, concerning the Homerite martyrs, requesting him to interest the Jewish patriarch at Tiberias in their sufferings. An analysis of this letter will be found under ELESBAAN in t. ii. p. 73. [HOMERITE CH. AND MART.] (Asseman. *Bib. Orient.* i. 341–379; Wright's *Cat. Syr. MSS.* pp. 1045, 1057, 1105; Ceill. x. 643.) [G. T. S.]

SIMEON (4), bishop of Bostra in Arabia Auranitis, c. 560. The opening paragraph of a letter to him from Anastasius patriarch of Antioch, on the Sabbath, defending image worship by analogy, was brought forward by Constantine, bishop of Constantia, at the 4th Session of the Second Nicene Council A.D. 787 (Labbe, vii. 248, 759). [E. V.]

SIMEON (5), bishop of Edessa, in the middle of the 7th century. According to the

Chronicon of Dionysius, he died A.D. 650, and was buried in the church of St. Zoaras the martyr, at Amida. (Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* ii. 103.) [E. V.]

SIMEON (6), bishop of Edessa, succeeded Timotheus A.D. 761. He had previously been an ascetic at Beth Cheduna. Having been chosen bishop he refused to accept the office, but was violently dragged before George, the patriarch, and forcibly ordained. On the third day he fled to a monastery near Edessa, and eventually took refuge in a mountain near Samosata, where he finished his days in showing hospitality to wayfarers. (Dionys. *Chron.* apud Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* ii. 111.) [E. V.]

SIMEON (7), (Alcuinus, *Epp.* 64, 65, 72. [EANBALD II., p. 13, *a*.] [J. G.]

SIMEON (8) and Maris, presbyters and monks in the diocese of Apamea, who took a lively interest in Chrysostom's Phoenician mission. Chrysostom writes to them, though personal strangers, begging them to endeavour to find some suitable men to aid John the presbyter in his missionary work (Chrys. *Ep.* 55). Tillemont identifies Simeon with the disciple of Marcian, the abbat of a large monastery at Nicertes in Apamea. (Theod. *Vit. Patr.* c. 3; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. xi. p. 304.) [E. V.]

SIMEON (9), one of the original leaders of the Messalian or Euchite party (Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 11). [EUCHITES.] [G. T. S.]

SIMEON (10), called PRISCUS, a solitary commemorated by Theodoret, whose mother had received his benediction, and acquainted her son with the marvellous story of his life and miraculous powers. His first place of retirement was a cave in the mountain side, whence he was driven by the crowds who were attracted by the fame of his miracles. He then established himself on Mount Amanus. This retreat he had to leave for the same cause, repairing with a number of disciples to Mount Sinai, where he built two establishments for his followers, whom he instructed in the religious and ascetic life till his decease. Theodoret relates several of the miracles ascribed to him. (Theod. *Hist. Relig.* c. vi.) [E. V.]

SIMEON (11), an Italian monk and a friend of Cassian when in Egypt. Being able to support himself only by transcribing Latin manuscripts, knowing no other art and being unacquainted with Greek, the ordinary language of Egypt, he was by a charitable device of one of the fathers, furnished with employment in his own line, when out of work (Cassian. *Inst.* v. 39). Tillemont (xiv. 164) suggests that he might have been the solitary Simon, a saying of whom is recorded by Poemen (Coteler. *Mon. Gr. Eccl.* i. 615). [C. H.]

SIMEON (12), STYLITES, A.D. 388–460, Jan. 5, *Mart. Rom.* Sept. 1. Bas. *Men.* He was the first of a succession of pillar saints, somewhat like the enclosed anchorites of the early Celtic Church, except that the latter were enclosed in a cell at the level of the earth, the former were enclosed in a box or paling at a height varying from ten to sixty feet. In fact Symeon was himself, according to Theodoret, originally an enclosed anchorite, and only raised his cell to avoid the honours paid to him (cf. Reeves on church of St. Doulough, p. 8–11, with Evagr. *H. E.* i. 21). The fashion however rapidly spread even to the sects separated from the Church, as we learn from Joannes Moschus, *Prat. Spirit.* cxxix.; cf. Ceill. xi. 701, that the Monophysites of 6th century had pillar saints as well as the orthodox. Sometimes both parties had opposition Stylites in the same district. The common idea about the pillar saints, that they stood balancing themselves at such a dizzy elevation without any support is quite mistaken. Evagrius tells us Simeon's pillar was only three feet in circumference at the top, which would barely afford standing ground. Asseman has depicted Simeon's column in his life of the saint with a railing or kind of wooden pulpit at the summit. Some such structure must have stood there, not only to prevent his fall, but also to enable him to write those epistles he sent broadcast to emperors, bishops and councils on all pressing questions. Simeon was born at Sisan, a village on the borders of Cilicia and Syria. At an early period of his life, apparently when about sixteen, he with his brother embraced the monastic life, and joined a monastery, where he created a disturbance by the excessive character of his austerities, some of them indeed, as described by Theodoret, of a very disgusting character. He dug a trench in the garden, and buried himself in it up to his head during a whole summer. He passed forty days in a dark cave. He tied a girdle round him garnished with sharp goads and pricks, which drew blood. These practices naturally seemed to his brethren a reproach against their own easier life. They therefore, after bearing with him for nine years, desired his expulsion, whereupon he made his way to another monastery, ruled by an abbat named Maris, where he simply asked for a cell where he might pass Lent by himself. A monk named Bassus built up the door of his cell, having previously placed there six loaves and a vessel full of water. At the end of Lent Bassus opened the cell and found him on his knees, the food and water being all untouched. He established himself about the year 413 in a cell near Antioch, where his austerities speedily attracted a number of followers, who formed a society called the Mandra. From 413–423 Simeon spent his time in an enclosed cell. In 423 he built a low pillar, which he gradually raised, till in A.D. 430 he attained the height of forty cubits, where, with his neck manacled by an iron collar, he spent the last thirty years of his life engaged in perpetual adorations, save when he condescended to bestow his advice about mundane matters. His extraordinary life made a great impression; large numbers of Arabians, Armenians, and other pagans were converted by him, while the emperors and bishops and pilgrims from the most distant lands, even Spain and Britain, consulted him most reverently. A contemporary biographer tells us that he was once seized with an illness which lasted nine months and threatened his dissolution. The emperor Theodosius wrote a letter to him, and sent three bishops to pray him to descend for a time from his post, and offered the

services of his own physician to heal him. Simeon received the bishops with every mark of honour, but replied to the emperor in a letter in which he gave him and his sisters some very plain advice about the conduct of their government. He refused however to quit his column, saying to the bishops "God knows what was my intention when embracing this state of life. He will not permit me, as I hope, to need human remedies. He has himself the power to cure me when He will." He passed the whole of the following Lent without food, and on the thirty-eighth day found the ulcer in the foot from which he was suffering, perfectly healed. Evagrius tells a story which all other biographers have omitted, and which shows that he was the first of the pillar saints and that his practice was an innovation. "When Simeon, that angel upon earth, that citizen in the flesh of the Heavenly Jerusalem, had devised his strange and hitherto unknown walk, the inhabitants of the holy desert (presumably the Nitrian) sent a person to him, charged with an injunction to render a reason of this singular custom, why abandoning the beaten path which the saints had trodden, he is pursuing another altogether unknown to mankind; and further, that he should come and travel the road of the elect fathers. They, at the same time, gave orders that, if he should manifest a perfect readiness to come down, liberty should be given him to follow out the course he had chosen, inasmuch as his compliance would be sufficient proof that he was persevering under Divine guidance, but that he should be dragged down by force in case he should manifest repugnance or be swayed by self-will, and refuse to be guided implicitly by the injunction. When the person thus deputed came and announced the command of the Fathers, and Simeon, in obedience to the injunction, immediately put one foot forward, the messenger declared him free to fulfil his own course, saying "Be stout and play the man; the post which thou hast chosen is from God." Simeon was the object of deepest reverence all through life. The news of his approaching death caused therefore great excitement. Great crowds assembled in July 459 round his pillar to receive his last words. On August 29th he was seized with a mortal illness, and he died Sept. 2nd, 459. His body was transported with great pomp to Antioch, attended by a train of bishops and clergy, and guarded by the troops under Ardabyrius commander of the forces of the East. The emperor Leo wished to bring it to Constantinople, and sent letters to the bishop of Antioch demanding it. The people of Antioch piteously reminded the emperor, "Forasmuch as our city is without walls, for we have been visited in wrath by their fall, we brought hither the sacred body to be our wall and bulwark"; and consequently were permitted to retain the coveted relics, which however did not avail to protect the city against capture by the Persians. [CHOSROES I. of Persia, Vol. I. p. 483.] Simeon wrote many epistles on current ecclesiastical matters. The subjects of the following are known: (1) Evagrius, *Hist.* lib. i. cap. 13, mentions an epistle addressed by him to the emperor Theodosius against restoring to the Jews the synagogues of which they had been deprived. It effectually incited the emperor to intolerant courses. He withdrew the concession, and dismissed the official who had advised it. (2) Evagrius, ii. 10, mentions an epistle addressed to Leo, on behalf of the council of Chalcedon, and against the ordination of Timotheus Aelurus. (3) Evagrius (l. c.) gives extracts from another epistle addressed to Basil of Antioch on the same topic. (4) An epistle to the empress Eudocia on the same (Niceph. xv. 13), by which she was converted from Eutychian error. (5) Eulogius of Alexandria mentions his profession of the Catholic faith, which Cave conjectures to have been identical with Epist. 2, ut supra, cf. *Phot. Biblioth.* cod. 230. Besides these, there is extant a Latin version of a sermon, *de Morte assidue cogitanda*, which in the Biblioth. Patr. is usually ascribed to our Simeon. Lambecius, on the authority of a MS. in the imperial library at Vienna, ascribes it to Simeon of Mesopotamia, cf. Lambec. *Comment. de Biblioth.* Caesaraea, vol. 8, lib. v. col. 198 D. ed. Kollar. Evagrius (i. 13) describes the appearance of Simeon's relics in his time, and also (cap. 14) a visit he paid to the monastery and pillar of Simeon. The pillar was then enclosed in a church, which no woman was ever allowed to enter, and where supernatural manifestations were often seen, including a large brilliant star shooting along a balustrade, and also a resemblance of the saint's face flitting about here and there, with a long beard, and wearing a tiara as in life. These manifestations, like the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, were only vouchsafed on the saint's commemoration day. The peasants of the neighbourhood used to dance round the pillar, and compass it about with their beasts of burden to ensure good luck. The statements of Evagrius have been of late fully verified. Count de Vogüé in his *Syrie Centrale*, t. i. p. 141–154, Paris, 1865–77, gives a very full account of the present state of the church described by Evagrius, and has shown its minute accuracy. He has identified the remains of the very pillar occupied by the saint. The plates 139–150 give full details of the buildings. In them he discovered one of the three examples of painted mural decorations found in the monuments of Central Syria, cf. plate 151. It is the only one which he found in the interior of buildings. The form of the ornaments and the choice of colours are derived from ancient art, as is also the system of architecture. The colours used are red, green, black and white. The ruins, as De Vogüé tells us, are still called Kalat 'Sem'an (the House of Simon). The ruins of the convent in which he was received after he was expelled from his first abode may still exist in the village still called Deir Sem'am (Convent of Simon) at the foot of the hill on which the church is situated (cf. De Vogüé, p. 125, plates 108–114). The ruins testify to the popularity of the saint's convent as a place of pilgrimage soon after his death. Thus in the village there still exist the remains of a public guest-house, with an inscription testifying that it was finished on July 2nd 479. Outside the village are the ruins of a triumphal arch over the road which led up to the church of St. Simeon. De Vogüé assigns the close of the 5th or the beginning of the 6th century as the date of the erection of the church and arch. With the accounts of De Vogüé and Evagrius may be com-

pared the statements of Joannes Phocas, a monk of Crete, who visited and described the monastery and pillar in A.D. 1185, printed in Leo. Allat. Συμμίκτοις. The title of Phocas' work is *Compendiaria descriptio castrorum et urbium ab urbe Antiochia usque Hierosolymam.* Authorities—Theodoret, *Philotheus*, c. 26; Evagr. l. c.; Theodor. Lect. *H. E.* i. 12, ii. 42; *AA. SS.* Boll. Jan. t. i. p. 264, where three lives are given; Till. *Mém.* xv. 347; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 438; Fab. *Biblioth. Graeca*, x. 522; Allat. *De Symeon. Scriptt.*; Asseman. *AA. MM.* ii. p. 227–346, on this last page he depicts his pillar, which may be compared with De Vogüé's narrative. His narrative is based on an account given by a contemporary of the saint called Cosmas, and a homily in his praise by Saint James of Sarug in Mesopotamia about the end of the 5th cent. [JACOBUS (13)]; Ceillier, iii. 353. [G. T. S.]

SIMEON (13) STYLITES, called JUNIOR or MAUMASTORITES, May 24, Bas. *Men.*, possibly Sep. 3. *Mart. Rom.*; born at Antioch A.D. 521, his father was originally of Edessa. His mother was one Martha of Antioch. He entered a monastery while very young, where a certain John the Stylite was the presiding spirit. Evagrius the historian was personally acquainted with him. Nicephorus of Antioch wrote a prolix life of him, which will be found in *AA. SS.* Boll. 24 Maii, t. v. p. 298. It is full of miracles, visions, and legends, and follows largely the same lines as the life of the Elder Simeon. Evagrius (*H. E.* vi. 23) tells us that "Simeon far surpassed all his contemporaries in virtue, and endured the discipline of a life on the top of a column from his earliest years, since he even cast his teeth in that situation." He was credited with the gift of prophecy, and Evagrius (l. c. and v. 21) gives several instances of his wonderful power. He was sustained by the branches of a shrub which grew upon the mountain near Theopolis, where his monastery was situated. He died A.D. 596. The life of Simeon by Nicephorus and his extant writings will be found in Migne's *Pat. Graeca*, t. lxxxvi. col. 2965–3220. Some of his devotional compositions are mentioned by Allatius, *de Sym. Scriptt.* p. 21 as extant in MS. His ascetic sermons are also noted by Assem. *Bib. Orient.* ii. 510, as extant in an Arabic version at Rome. A letter, stirring up the emperor Justin Junior to punish the Samaritans who had assaulted the Christians, is given at length in the Fifth Action of the Second Nicene Council. His life was also written by an archbishop Arcadius of Cyprus. It is cited by St. John of Damascus in his *Orat.* 3 *de Imagin.* in *Pat. Gr.* xciv. 1393. The life of Simeon's mother Martha is given by the Bollandist, *l. c.* p. 403–431 out of a Greek MS. of Florence. In it we find an epistle of Simeon to Thomas the Guardian of the True Cross at Jerusalem. (Fabric. *Bib. Graec.* x. 325, 524, xi. 299; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 508; Ceillier, xi. 674.) [G. T. S.]

SIMEON (14) STYLITES, called TERTIUS, Jul. 26, Bas. *Men.* presbyter and archimandrite. He is reverenced by both the Greek and Coptic churches, and must therefore have lived in the 5th century, before the complete breach happened between the orthodox and Jacobite parties. Some have identified him with the Simeon Stylites of Aegae in Cilicia, mentioned by Joannes Moschus (*Prat. Spirit.* c. 57) as having been killed by lightning. (*AA. SS.* Boll. Jul. t. vi. p. 310; Allat. *de Sym. Scriptt.* p. 22; Fab. *Bibl. Graec.* x. 525.) [G. T. S.]

SIMEON (15), one of the Acoemetae monks of Constantinople, sent by his archimandrite Cyril to Rome in 484, where he charged the papal envoys Misenus and Vitalis with holding communion with the heretics at Constantinople and avoiding the orthodox there (Evag. *H. E.* iii. 21; Tillem. xvi. 352). [C. H.]

SIMEON (16) called SALUS, a hermit of Emesa, in the 6th century, mentioned by Evagrius (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 34), falsely suspected of incontinency, because of his giving bread to a mendicant, a woman of bad character. He was known by the epithet salus ("foolish," Syriac), because in his wish to degrade himself in the eyes of men he counterfeited idiocy. His life is narrated by Leontius, bishop of Neapolis in Cyprus, who is mentioned at the second council of Nicaea. (*Conc. Nic.* ii. A.D. 787, Act. iv.) He is commemorated by the Roman Church on July 1, by the Greek July 21. [I. G. S.]

SIMEON (17), surnamed, or perhaps christened, TITUS after his Paulician conversion. About the year 684, Simeon, then an officer of the household of Constantine Pogonatus, was sent by the emperor into the districts of Armenia, where the Paulician sect was spreading, with orders to have the ringleaders stoned to death, and their adherents brought over to the church. With the aid of Trypho, a local chieftain, he took captive Constantine Silvanus and all his followers at Cibossa, near Colonia. After the violent death of Constantine Silvanus, Simeon assisted the bishops in their efforts to reclaim the sectaries. Their Christian fortitude and sincerity produced a profound impression upon him. He returned to the imperial court at Constantinople, but after a stay of three years could no longer conceal or deny his convictions. He secretly repaired to Cibossa in 687. There Constantine's remaining followers were still to be found, and Simeon, who now took the apostolic name Titus, was placed at the head of the sect. The Paulician apostate Justus, who had been the first to take part in the stoning of Constantine Silvanus, accused Simeon before the bishop of Colonia. The result was an investigation, by order of Justinian II., in 690. Simeon and many others died at the stake (Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 25–27; Phot. *c. Man.* i. 17, 18; Gibbon, c. 54; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 342). [M. B. C.]

SIMON (1) MAGUS has been the subject of so many legends, and of so much speculation, that it is important to discriminate carefully what is told of him by the different primary authorities.

The Simon of the Acts of the Apostles.—At the bottom of all the stories concerning Simon lies what is related Acts viii. 9–24. According to this account, Simon was a magician who exercised sorcery in Samaria, and with such success that the people universally accepted his claim to be "some great one," and declared him to be "that power of God which is called great." We are further told that Simon was so impressed by the miracles wrought by Philip, that

he himself asked, and obtained, admission to Christian baptism; but that he subsequently betrayed the superficial character of his conversion by offering money to Peter with the view of obtaining the power of conferring the gift of the Holy Ghost. All subsequent accounts of Simon retain the two features, that he possessed magical power, and that he came personally into collision with Peter. The Acts say nothing as to Simon's having been a teacher of heretical doctrine; nor do they tell whether or not Simon broke off all connection with the Christian society after his exposure by Peter.

The Simon of Justin Martyr.—When Justin Martyr wrote his *Apology*, the sect of Simonians appears to have been formidable, for he speaks four times of their founder, Simon (*Apol.* i. 26. 56; ii. 15; *Dial.* 20); and we need not doubt that he identified him with the Simon of the Acts. He states that he was a Samaritan, adding that his birthplace was a village called Gitta; he describes him as a formidable magician, and tells that he came to Rome in the days of Claudius Caesar, and made such an impression by his magical powers, that he was honoured as a god, a statue being erected to him on the Tiber, between the two bridges, bearing the inscription, "Simoni deo Sancto." Now, in the year 1574, there was dug up in the place indicated by Justin, viz. the island in the Tiber, a marble fragment, apparently the base of a statue, bearing the inscription, "Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio," with the name of the dedicator (see Gruter, *Inscrip. Antiq.* i. p. 95, n. 5). Hence critics have generally been of opinion that Justin made a mistake in imagining that a statue really dedicated to a Sabine deity (Ovid. *Fasti*, vi. 214) had been erected in honour of the heretic Simon. And though some (*e.g.* Burton *Bampton Lectures*, n. 42) have thought it incredible that Justin could have committed so gross a blunder, yet the coincidence is too remarkable to admit of any other satisfactory explanation. If the Simonians in Rome pointed out the statue to Justin as proof of the honour in which their founder had been held, it does the Saint no great dishonour to believe that, having never heard of Semo Sancus, he had not the means of exposing the Simonian misconception; in which he was the more ready to acquiesce, because he believed that Simon had been able to exhibit magical wonders, such as would deceive the Roman people into accepting his pretensions.

Justin Martyr, in his *Apology*, further states that almost all the Samaritans, and some even of other nations, worshipped Simon, and acknowledged him as "the first God" ("above all principality, power, and dominion," *Dial.* 120), and that they held that a woman named Helena, who went about with him, and who had formerly been a prostitute, was his "first conception" (ἔννοια πρώτη). In connection with Simon, Justin speaks of another Samaritan heretic, MENANDER.

Justin states, in the same place, that he had published a treatise against heresies. Now in the part of the work of Irenaeus against heresies which deals with Simon and Menander, the coincidences with Justin are too numerous and striking to leave any room for doubt that Irenaeus is here using the work of Justin as his authority; and therefore the section on Simon (Irenaeus, i. 23) may be regarded as but a fuller account than that given in the *Apology* of Justin's tradition concerning Simon. We need not doubt that it was Justin who set the example followed by later heresiologists of placing the two Samaritan heretics, Simon and Menander, at the head of their list. From Irenaeus we get the following additional particulars: Simon's claim for himself, was to be the highest power, that is to say, the Father who is over all; he taught that he was the same who among the Jews appeared as Son, in Samaria descended as Father, in other nations had walked as the Holy Spirit. He was content to be called by whatever name men chose to assign to him. Helen was a prostitute whom he had redeemed at Tyre, and led about with him, saying that she was the first conception of his mind, the mother of all, by whom he had in the beginning conceived the making of angels and archangels. Knowing thus his will, she had leaped away from him, descended to the lower regions, and generated angels and powers by whom this world was made. But this "Ennoea" was detained in these lower regions by her offspring, and not suffered to return to the Father of whom they were ignorant. Thus she suffered all manner of contumely, so far as to be included in a human body, and to pass by transmigration from one female body to another. She was, for example, the Helen for whose sake the Trojan war was fought; and afterwards fell lower and lower, until at last she was found in a brothel. She was the lost sheep. In order to redeem her, the Supreme Power descended to the lower world; he passed through the regions ruled by the principalities and powers and angels, in each region making himself like to those who dwelt there; and so among men he seemed to be man, though not really so, and seemed to suffer though he really did not. His object was to bring to men the knowledge of himself, and so to give them salvation from the sway of those powers who, through their mutual jealousies, had misgoverned the world. See the article HELENA, Vol. II. p. 880.

Now it is to be noted, that in what is here told of Simon there is a large portion common to almost all the forms of Gnostic myths, together with something special to this form. Common to nearly all the forms is the place in the work of creation assigned to the female principle, the conception of the Deity; the ignorance of the rulers of this lower world with regard to the Supreme Power; the descent of the female into the lower regions, and her inability to return (see SOPHIA). In fact, the very name Sophia is given to this Helen in the report of Pseudo-Tertullian (compare also Clem. *Recog.* ii. 12; *Hom.* ii. 26). Common to many myths is also the descent of the Redeemer from the upper regions, his deception of the rulers of the regions he passed through, by assuming their forms (see CAULACAU, OPHITES), and the Docetic theory of the Saviour's Passion. What is special to the Simonian tale, is the identification of Simon himself with the Supreme, and of his consort Helena with the female principle; together with the doctrine of transmigration of souls, which was necessary to give these identifications a chance of acceptance, it not being

credible that the male and female Supreme principles should only make their first appearance in the world at a late stage in its history.

Now if Simon had been really the inventor of the Gnostic myths, it is not credible that they should pass into so many systems which did not care to retain any memory of his name. On the other hand, if this mythology had been in Simon's time already current, it is intelligible that he might make use of it in order to justify to his disciples his relations with a fallen woman. She had but repeated the experience of the Gnostic Sophia—had fallen and been entangled among baser natures; and he had played the part of the Redeemer, and set her free. It seems probable, therefore, that the Simon described by Justin was not, as he supposed, the father of Gnosticism, but had found at the time of his teaching a Gnostic system already developed. It follows, then, that Justin's Simon could not be identical with the contemporary of the Apostles; and the name Simon is so common a one, that the supposition of two Simons presents no difficulty. It must be remembered that the Simon of the Acts is a century older than Justin; and so it is likely to have been a later personage concerning whose birthplace, and whose relations with the other sex, traditions were still fresh in Justin's time. It may be added, that Justin's Simon appears to have carried his doctrine of transmigration of souls to the point of pretending that it was he himself who had appeared as Jesus of Nazareth. Such a pretension would be scarcely intelligible unless this Simon had been born after our Lord's death. We come, then, to the conclusion, that the Simon described by Justin was his elder only by a generation; that he was a Gnostic teacher who had gained some followers at Samaria; and that Justin rashly identified him with the magician told of in the Acts of the Apostles. Mention has been made (Vol. II. p. 880) of Baur's somewhat forced conjecture (*Christliche Gnosis*, p. 308) that Justin may possibly have made another confusion, and in his representation of the honour in which the Samaritans generally held Simon, may have been misled by the cult there paid to the Phoenician sun and moon deities: the name Simon having a common root with שֶׁמֶשׁ; and σελήνη appearing in the Clementine *Recognitions* instead of Helena as the name of Simon's consort. But certain it is, that Justin (*Dial.* 120) claims credit for his own independence in rejecting the pretensions of Simon, Samaritan though he was.

Irenaeus further states that Simon taught, that the Jewish prophecies were inspired by the creator angels; therefore, those who had hope in him and in Helen need not attend to them, but freely do what they would; for that men should be saved according to his grace, and not according to just works. For actions were just not by any intrinsic quality of their own, but by the accident of their being ordered by these creator angels, who had merely wished to enslave those who heard them. But he promised that the world should be dissolved, and that those who were his own should be redeemed. And, accordingly, his priests, Irenaeus tells us, led lascivious lives, used magic and incantations, made philtres, had familiar spirits by whose aid they were able to trouble with dreams those whom they would. They had images of Simon and Helen, in the forms respectively of Jupiter and Minerva.

It remains to enquire, whether there is anything else in the early notices of Simon which may reasonably be believed to have been derived from Justin. The Clementine writings will be considered separately. The section on Simon in the *Refutation of all Heresies*, by Hippolytus, divides itself into two parts; the larger portion is founded on a work ascribed to Simon called the μεγάλη ἀπόφασις, which we do not hear of through any other source than Hippolytus. This work must receive a separate discussion. But the article on Simon concludes with a section, the greater part of which is in such verbal agreement with Irenaeus as would lead us to conclude that Hippolytus was simply transcribing Irenaeus, if it were not for variations and additions which can be explained on the supposition, that Hippolytus is drawing directly from the source used by Irenaeus, viz. the anti-heretical treatise of Justin. In connection with this section must be considered the treatment of Simon in the lost earlier treatise of Hippolytus, which may be conjecturally gathered from the use made of it by Pseudo-Tertullian, Philaster, and Epiphanius (see Vol. III. p. 93). The section in the first of these authorities adds nothing to the account of Irenaeus except that, as already mentioned, it gives the name Sapientia to the being whom Simon descended to redeem. Between Philaster and Epiphanius there are several verbal coincidences which afford proof that they are drawing from a common source. These are to be found in the description given by both of the passion and jealousies that Helen excited among the creator angels: in what is told by both of Helen's expectation of a deliverer. "Expectabat virtutem aliam, id est Magi ipsius Simonis praesentiam (Phil.), αὕτη δὲ προσεδόκα τὴν ἐμὴν παρουσίαν (Epiph.); and in their common report that the Trojan wooden horse typified the ignorance of the nations "per allegoriam asserit quod illa machina ignorantia erat universarum gentium" (Phil.), τὸν παρ' Ὁμήρου δούριον ἵππον ἔλεγε ὁ γόης ὅτι ἄγνοιά ἐστιν τῶν ἐθνῶν (Epiph.).

When this common matter is compared with the section in the *Refutation*, the hypothesis is fully confirmed that Hippolytus was the source from which Epiphanius and Philaster drew. Hippolytus speaks at length of the use made by Simon of the heathen poets, of the story of Helen and her torch, and the Trojan horse; and he finds in the Trojan war, excited by the beauty of Helen, a representation of the conflict raised among the creator angels by the descent among them of Sophia. Hippolytus gives a fuller account than Irenaeus of the immoral teaching of the Simonians. According to the representation of Epiphanius, we find in the system of Simon almost every feature, and even the terminology of the common Gnostic mythology, reproduced so exactly as even to suggest a doubt whether Epiphanius or his authority has not mixed up with his account of the Simonians some things belonging to other sects. With respect to one thing not found in the system of Simon, we take the opportunity of making a remark omitted in the article OPHITES, viz. that the Egyptian "Book of the Dead" teaches us to

recognize as a feature peculiar to Egyptian Gnosticism, the instruction of the disciple in formulae to be used by the soul after death, in order to obtain a passage from the rulers of the different regions which it must traverse. To return to Epiphanius, notice must be taken of a remarkable feature in his account, viz. that he twice reports the doctrine of Simon in the first person. Simon is introduced, saying, "For each heaven I was transfigured into the form of the dwellers in that heaven, that I might escape the notice of the angelic powers, and might descend on the Ennoea, who is also called Prounikos and Holy Spirit, by whom I created the angels, and the angels created the world and men." And again, "This is she who is now with me: for her sake I descended, and she expected my appearing." The first person is so inartificially introduced by Epiphanius that we may conclude he is transcribing his authority; and that the first person was similarly used in the lost work of Hippolytus. It seems likely that Hippolytus found this feature in *his* authority, the work of Justin; for if at the time of writing the earlier treatise he had already direct knowledge of the μεγάλη ἀπόφασις, it is not likely that he would have been so completely silent as to the various points so largely reported in the *Refutation of all Heresies*. It would follow then, that Justin drew his account of Simon from a book purporting to be written by that heretic; and if we are justified in inferring from Epiphanius that this book made use of St. Paul's Epistles, we have an additional reason for believing that Justin's Simon was later than the Simon of the Acts.

There is one thing common to Philaster and Epiphanius which appears not to have been taken from Hippolytus. They both speak of the death of Simon; but their mention of it is separate from the part which contains their common matter, and in their account there are no verbal coincidences. Both, however, show themselves acquainted with the story which came to be the received account of Simon's death, viz. that to give the emperor a crowning proof of his magical skill, he had attempted to fly through the air, but that through the efficacy of the Apostle's prayers the demons who bore him were compelled to let him go, whereupon he perished miserably. Philaster says "Fleeing the blessed Apostle Peter from Jerusalem, he came to Rome, and there contended with the blessed Apostle before Nero; and being conquered by the prayer of the blessed Apostle, and smitten by an angel, he deservedly died in such a way as that the falsehood of his magic might be evidently manifest to all men." There is nothing of this in Pseudo-Tertullian, who, however, like Philaster, has the word "meruit"; but in Pseudo-Tertullian, and doubtless in their common source, this word is used in speaking of the sentence pronounced by Peter in the Acts of the Apostles. Epiphanius has ἐν μέσῃ τῇ τῶν Ῥωμαίων πόλει ὁ τάλας καταπεσὼν τέθνηκε. But this story is unknown to Hippolytus, who gives quite a different account of the death of Simon. His relation is, that after the scene recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, Simon travelled to Rome and there encountered the Apostles, and that when he was deceiving many by his magic arts he was especially resisted by Peter. And when he was near being thoroughly exposed, he bid his disciples dig a trench and bury him, promising that he would rise again on the third day. They did as he bad them; but he never rose. We may conclude that the story known to Philaster and Epiphanius, though, of course, earlier than the end of the fourth century when they wrote, is of later origin than the beginning of the third century when Hippolytus wrote. That Hippolytus did not find his own account in Justin may be concluded from the place it occupies in his narrative, where it comes in a kind of appendix to what is borrowed from Justin; and also from the fact, that this form of the story is unknown to all other writers.

The Simon of the Clementines.—In the articles, CLEMENTINE LITERATURE and PREACHING OF PETER, an account has been given of the literature which made its appearance in the second century, professing to give a report of discourses delivered by the Apostle Peter. Some of these discourses had for their object the confutation of heathenism; others were directed against heresy; and naturally the heretic, into whose mouth the erroneous teaching was put which the author desired to combat, was he who was known to have come into collision with the Apostle, Simon Magus. The Clementines agree with Justin in identifying Simon of Gitta with the Simon of the Acts; and there is every reason to believe that Justin was the authority which the Clementine writers followed. Justin has evidently direct knowledge of the Simonians, and regards them as formidable heretics; but in the Clementines the special doctrines which Justin has taught us to recognize as Simonian have no prominence; and the introduction of Simon is clearly no more than a literary contrivance for bringing in the theological discussions in which the author himself takes an interest. When a real character is introduced into a historical romance, though the language put into his mouth may be pure fiction, the previous history attributed to him is likely to have a foundation in fact. Thus, though we have no right to connect with the historical Simon the doctrinal teaching of the Clementines, the notices of his personal history deserve attention. Some merely repeat what we had in Justin's extant writings; but the statement that Simon's father's name was Antonius, and his mother's Rachel, probably gives us an additional point of the Justinian tradition. It is less easy to say whether the account given of Simon's earlier history and of his relations with Dositheus is to be regarded as derived from Justin, or as mere Clementine invention. That account has been reported and discussed at length in the article DOSITHEUS, Vol. I. p. 902, and need not be repeated here. But the story contains one feature which, though not noticed in the extant Justin, must be pronounced a genuine characteristic of Simonianism; viz. the title, the Standing one (ὁ ἑστώς), which Simon claimed for himself when identifying himself with the Supreme. The Simonian use of this title is confirmed both by Hippolytus and by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii. 11, p. 456). This epithet had been used by Philo in speaking of the stability and immutability of God (*De nomin. mutat.* p. 1054), and is similarly employed also by Clem. Alex.

(*Strom.* i. 24, p. 414, vii. 10, p. 866). Two or three other touches found in the same place (*Hom.* ii. 22) possibly give a genuine representation of the teaching of this Samaritan heretic. On the other hand, there appears to be nothing historical in the Clementine enumeration of the various ways in which Simon displayed his magical power. The fact seems to be that Justin describes the Gnostic teacher as a magician merely because he identified him with the Simon of the Acts, and that the Clementine forger, finding the character of a magician already fixed on his leading personage, exercised his imagination in devising stories appropriate to that character.

One concluding remark must be made concerning these Clementine writings, viz. that the circuits of Peter, which they describe, are exclusively made through Eastern cities. Peter follows Simon with the purpose of exposing him from Caesarea to Tyre, Tripolis, Laodicea; and the climax of his success is reached at Antioch in Syria, where the story comes to an end. There are, no doubt, a very few places where mention is made of Simon's intention to go to Rome, and of Peter's resolve to pursue him thither: but all these notices are quite separable from the context, and might be struck out without injury to the story. In fact the Clementine writings underwent many recastings, and the form in which they have come to us is that in which in the third century they were presented for acceptance at Rome. There is every appearance that the original "circuits of Peter" knew nothing of his exposure of the magician at Rome; and that the references to the Roman visit were only interpolated when the tale was dressed up for Roman use in the form of the *Recognitions of Clement.*

The Simon of the "Apophasis." We return now to consider the work ascribed to Simon called ἡ μεγάλη ἀπόφασις, from which Hippolytus has given considerable extracts (*Ref.* vi. 9–18).

The use of the New Testament in the work cited clearly proves that it is not as early as the Simon of the Acts. The author undertakes to give an interpretation of the Pauline phrase, "that we should not be condemned with the world" (1 Cor. xi. 32). But it does not follow that the author may not have been Simon of Gitta. Proof has already been produced from Epiphanius that writings under the name of this heretic were current; and in the passage cited (*Haer.* xxi. 3) Epiphanius complains of Simon's forced applications of Pauline language, specifying in particular his use of the passage (Eph. vi. 14) which speaks of the Christian armour. St. Jerome also professes acquaintance with the writings of Simon, which would seem to have been voluminous. In his commentary on Matt. xxiv. he says, "Simon Samaritanus . . . haec quoque inter caetera in suis voluminibus scripta dimittens: Ego sum sermo Dei, ego sum speciosus, ego paracletus, ego omnipotens, ego omnia Dei." The language of this extract seems to indicate acquaintance with St. John's Gospel. Simon is also recognized as a writer in the Clementine *Recognitions*, ii. 38, where Simon is asked, "probare potes, an ex aliis aliquibus quas omnes ignoramus, an ex graecis auctoribus, an ex tuis scripturis propriis?" But when we recognize that Simon of Gitta was a second-century heretic, we find no reason why he may not have been acquainted with New Testament books; and as writings under his name were current, we cannot say that the *Apophasis* may not have been one of them, even though no authority but Hippolytus has mentioned its name.

The book, however, described by Hippolytus is of a different character from what Justin's account would have led us to expect. The mythological element which predominates in Justin's account of Simonianism is almost entirely absent from the extant portions of the *Apophasis*, which, if we were to judge by these extracts, aimed at a philosophic character, and professed to give a theory of Cosmogony. The only phrase that connects these extracts with Simonianism, as otherwise known, is the epithet, the "Standing One," applied to the Supreme; which in the extracts takes the form ἑστὼς, στὰς, στησόμενος, which may be compared with "who art and wast and art to come" in the Revelation of St. John. It is, however, intelligible that an outsider, reading a work of Simon's, would care very little to master his obscure philosophic speculations, and would be likely, passing these over, to fasten on the mythology of the book; and therefore we are not entitled to pronounce the *Apophasis* to be not Simon's on account of its difference in character from what Justin would have led us to expect. The Gnostic system, however, which it discloses, instead of being like Justin's Simonianism of the ordinary Ophite type, is, as Hippolytus has noticed, more closely allied to Valentinianism, of which it has the air of being an earlier stage. Like Valentinianism it deals in syzygies, referring the origin of things to the union of male and female principles of which it enumerates three pairs, forming "six roots." These are, as he in one place lays down, heaven and earth, sun and moon, air and water. Above these is the Supreme Principle, having no consort, but itself bisexual; and this principle is fire, concerning which he takes pains to explain that we must distinguish τὸ φανερὸν τοῦ πυρὸς and τὸ κρυπτόν; the former being that which is cognizable by sense, the latter being the hidden principle from which the sensible qualities flow. The six roots otherwise considered are called, νοῦς and ἐπίνοια, φωνὴ and ὄνομα, λογισμός and ἐνθύμησις. Nous has a leading place in all the Gnostic systems; ἐπίνοια comes here in the place of what, not only in other Gnostic systems, but in Justin's account of Simon's, is called ἔννοια. Simon then forces many texts of Scripture to bear witness to his theory. Thus he finds his six roots in the six days of creation: the three days before the sun and moon are the two first roots, Heaven and earth, together with the Supreme Principle: Isaiah's "Hear, O heaven, and give ear, O earth," is an address to the same two "roots." Testimony is elicited in the same way from Homer. It is not worth while to enter into further details.

Our information about second-century Gnosticism, is too scanty to give us a right to reject the Simonian authorship of the *Apophasis*, merely because the document is unlike other reports of Simon's teaching; but the present writer has already called attention (OPHITES, p. 84 *sq.*, *Hermathena*, ii. 389) to the strange

resemblances between documents which Hippolytus produces as emanating from quite different sects; the coincidences being such as to establish decisively a literary connection between the documents; and to prove either that some of these writers borrowed from others, or else that Hippolytus was imposed on by spurious wares, all manufactured in the same workshop. In particular, there is not only a strong family likeness between Simon's general method of dealing with the Scriptures and with heathen poets, and those employed in the other documents preserved in the *Regulations*, but there are also many coincidences in details. On a careful examination of them, I find that in several instances a fair case can be made out for the priority of the Simonian document. Thus the Sethite writer (*Ref.* v. 20, p. 143) speaks of the three days before the sun and moon; but this mention is quite gratuitous: Simon, on the contrary, having started the theory that the six days in Genesis i. are the six "roots," is forced to explain why there should be three days before the third and fourth roots, sun and moon. In like manner, the use made of Is. i. 2, in the system of Justinus (v. 26, p. 157), and of 1 Cor. xi. 32, in the Peratic system (v. 12, p. 125), seems somewhat more forced than in the Simonian system. We are told by Irenaeus of the use made of Homer by Simon, and by Epiphanius of his strained interpretations of Scripture. We may, therefore, accept as characteristic of genuine Simonianism that strange method of exegesis, common to several of the Gnostic systems as quoted by Hippolytus, which can discover its doctrines in the most unlikely texts of Scripture, and which finds confirmatory proofs in Homer and other poets. On the whole, though the matter is by no means free from doubt, I find it possible to believe that Hippolytus, in his extracts from the *Apophasis*, has preserved for us genuine specimens of Simonian teaching. In this way it would be possible to explain other coincidences between the systems described by Hippolytus: for Simon's place in the history of Gnosticism is early, and his writings and his methods would probably be followed by his successors.

The Simon of the legends.—By the time that the "Circuits of Peter" had been dressed up for Roman use in the form, having Clement for the narrator of the story, the soil had been prepared for a plentiful crop of legends. The "Circuits" gave the idea that the encounter of Simon with Peter, recorded in the Acts, had been followed by a series of conflicts in other cities. Justin Martyr's supposed discovery of a statue of Simon at Rome was accepted as proof that the impostor had visited that city. There, also, then a conflict must have taken place, though Justin Martyr had made no mention of it; and Simon's character as a magician made it fitting that the story of the encounter should contain specimens of the impostor's lying wonders defeated by the higher miraculous powers at the Apostle's command. Justin Martyr had assumed that the visit of Simon to Rome took place soon after what is told of him in the Acts of the Apostles; that is to say, in the reign of the emperor Claudius. Those who accepted that date naturally made Peter Simon's sole antagonist, he being the Apostle whom the Acts recorded as having rebuked the magician; so, for example, Eusebius tells the story (*H. E.* ii. 14). But at Rome the legend of Simon had to be fitted in with a tradition, probably a true one, that both Peter and Paul had visited the city in the reign of Nero. Thus it was natural to put down the date of Simon's conflict to that emperor's reign; and equally naturally, although the principal part in the conflict continued to be ascribed to Peter, the Apostle Paul was represented as his assistant in the combat. The story had taken this shape as early as the beginning of the third century. In the passage already quoted from Hippolytus (*Ref.* vi. 20), Simon is said when at Rome to have been in conflict with the Apostles (plural number), but to have been mightily resisted by Peter when deceiving many with his sorceries. The extant Greek Acts of Peter and Paul give details of the conflict and represent both Apostles as having taken part in it.

Some of the legends of the conflict with Simon have been given in the articles LINUS and MARCELLUS (11). Simon and Peter are each required to raise a dead body to life. Simon, by his magical power, makes the head of the corpse appear to move, and is supposed to have been successful; but when he goes away from the neighbourhood of the body, it remains lifeless. Peter, on the other hand, by his prayers effects a real resurrection. Simon and Peter are challenged each to divine what the other is planning. Peter, taking the emperor into the secret, prepares blessed bread; but the magician cannot guess what the Apostle has been doing. Simon raises hell-hounds, who rush upon Peter; but on presentation of the bread, prepared in anticipation of the attack, the beasts vanish. Another story of hell-hounds has been reported in the article MARCELLUS. But Simon still retains the emperor's confidence by means of an exhibition of his power to rise from the dead. He pretends to permit his head to be cut off, but through his magic, he has power to deceive the eyes of the spectators; so the executioner, who imagines he decapitates him, really only cuts off the head of a ram. So Simon is able to walk in, on the third day, alive and triumphant. Finally, recognizing that Peter is too strong for him, he determines to quit the scene with glory, and announces to the emperor his intention of flying up to heaven. According to the most popular version of the story, a wooden tower is erected for his ascent in the Campus Martius, and in the sight of the emperor and people he is seen going up in a fiery chariot. But on the adjuration of Peter the two demons who were bearing him were compelled to drop him, and he perished miserably;—on the spot, according to some accounts, a few days after, according to others. We may connect with this story what is told by Suetonius, vi. 12 (see also Dio Chrysost. *Orat.* xxi. 9), that Nero did cause a wooden theatre to be erected in the Campus Martius, and that there one who tried to play the part of Icarus fell so near the emperor as to spatter him with his blood. It has been already said that this version of the death of Simon was known to Epiphanius and Philaster towards the end of the fourth century; a somewhat earlier witness is Cyril of Jerusalem, who tells the story at length (*Catech.* vi. 15), and ascribes the fall of Simon to the joint prayers

of Peter and Paul. The earliest writer to mention the tale is Arnobius (*adv. Gent.* ii. 12), at the beginning of the fourth century. And the fact that the story was unknown to Hippolytus proves that it was not invented till the third century was pretty far advanced. We may gather from the great variety of forms in which the death of Simon was told, a confirmation of what has been already stated, that the earliest form of the story of Peter and Simon did not carry the conflict beyond Antioch. If it had given details of the conflict at Rome, these would have fixed the tradition for later writers.

The Simon of modern criticism.—The Clementine writings were produced in Rome, early in the third century, by members of the Elkesaite sect, which was then endeavouring to establish itself there. One of the characteristics of these heretics was hostility to Paul, whom they refused to recognize as an apostle. Baur has the merit of directing attention to the manifestations of this characteristic in the Clementines; and in particular he pointed out that in the disputations between Simon and Peter, some of the claims which Simon is represented as making (such as that of having seen our Lord, though not in his lifetime, yet subsequently in vision), were really the claims of Paul; and that Peter's refutation of Simon is in some places to be understood as intended as a polemic against Paul. The passages in question are found only in the Clementine *Homilies*, which the investigation in the article CLEMENTINE LITERATURE leads us to regard as one of the latest forms which these forgeries assumed. In the Clementine *Recognitions*, there is abundance of anti-Paulinism; but the idea does not appear to have occurred to the writer to dress up Paul under the mask of Simon. However, the idea started by Baur was improved by his followers until it came to assume the shape that, wherever in ancient documents we find mention made of Simon Magus, we are to understand Paul to be meant. To begin with the Acts of the Apostles, we are asked to believe that the Simon of whom we read in chap. viii. was no real character, but only a presentation of Paul. Simon claimed to be the power of God which is called Great; but Paul not only calls his gospel the power of God (Rom. i. 16, 1 Cor. i. 18), but claims that the power of Christ rested in himself (2 Cor. xii. 9), and that he lived by the power of God (2 Cor. xiii. 4). In the narrative (Acts viii.) the power of bestowing the Holy Ghost, which Philip does not appear to have exercised, is clearly represented as the special prerogative of the Apostles. When therefore Simon offered money in order to obtain the power of conferring the Holy Ghost, this was in other words to offer money in order to obtain the rank of apostle. We are therefore to detect that we have here a covert account of the refusal of the elder Apostles to admit Paul's claim to rank with them, backed though it was by a gift of money for the poor saints in Jerusalem. Peter tells him that he has no lot in the matter; that is to say, that he has no part in the lot of Apostleship (see Acts i. 17, 25) that he is still in the "gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity"; that is to say, full of bitter hatred against Peter (Gal. ii. 11) and not observant of the Mosaic Law. We are not to be surprised that St. Luke, Paulinist though he was, should insert in his history this libel on his master. He knew the story to be current among the Jewish disciples, and he wished to take the sting out of it, by telling it in such a way as to lead his readers to imagine that Simon was actually a real person, distinct from Paul. And so, having begun to speak of Paul in the beginning of chap. viii., he interpolates the episode of Philip's adventures, and does not return to speak of Paul until his reader's attention has been drawn off, so as not to be likely to recognize Paul under the mask of Simon.

It is not necessary to spend much time in pulling to pieces speculations exhibiting so much ingenuity, but so wanting in common sense. If, by way of nickname, a public character is called by a name not his own, common sense tells us that that must be a name to which discreditable associations are already known to attach. If a revolutionary agitator is called Catiline, that is because the name of Catiline is already known as associated with reckless and treasonable designs. It would be silly of any one to conclude from the modern use of the nickname that there never had been such a person as Catiline, and that the traditional story about him must be so interpreted as best to describe the modern character. Further, we can understand that obscure third-century heretics, not choosing to incur the odium of assailing directly one held in veneration through the rest of the Christian world, should resort to disguise. But Paul's opponents, in his lifetime, had no temptation to resort to oblique attacks: they could say what they pleased against Paul of Tarsus, and not run the risk of being unintelligible by speaking of Simon of Gitta.

Lipsius, whose account of his predecessors' speculations we have abridged from his article "Simon," in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*, exercises his own ingenuity in dealing with the legendary history of Simon. The ingenuity which discovers Paul in the Simon of the Acts has, of course, a much easier task in finding him in the Simon of the legends. But since the history, as it has come down to us, leaves much to be desired, if we are to suppose it was constructed with the view of serving as a libel on Paul, we must modify the legends so as best to adapt them to this object, and we must then believe that we have recovered the original form of the legend. Thus, the *Homilies* represent the final disputation between Peter and Simon to have taken place at Laodicea; but we must believe that the original form laid the scene at Antioch, where took place the collision between Peter and Paul recorded (Gal. ii.). The Clementines, as we now have them, represent Simon as going voluntarily to Rome; but the original must surely have represented him as carried off as a prisoner by the Roman authorities, and so on. It is needless to examine minutely speculations which are vitiated by the faulty method of investigation. The chronological order is—the historical personage comes first; then the legends which arise about him; then the use that is made of his name. The proper order of investigation is, therefore, first to ascertain what is historical about Simon before discussing his legends. Now it cannot reasonably be

doubted that Simon of Gitta is an historical personage. The heretical sect which claimed him for its founder was regarded by Justin Martyr as most formidable, though possibly its local influence may have given it undue importance in Justin's eyes. He speaks of it as predominant in Samaria, and as not unknown elsewhere; that is to say, probably, he had met members of the sect at Rome. The existence of the sect is testified by Hegesippus (Eus. iv. 22) and by Celsus (Orig. *adv. Cels.* v. 62), who states that some of them were called Heleniani. It is also mentioned by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vii. 17), who states that a branch of them was called Entychitae. The sect had become almost extinct in Origen's time, who doubts (*adv. Cels.* i. 57) whether there were then thirty Simonians in the world; but we need not doubt of its existence in Justin's time, or of the fact that they claimed Simon of Gitta as their founder. That writings in his name were in circulation, we have already quoted the testimony of the Clementine Recognitions and of Epiphanius, as confirming that of Hippolytus. The Simon of the Acts is also a real person. If we read Acts viii., which relates the preaching of Philip, in connection with chap. xxi., which tells of several days spent by Luke in Philip's house, we have the simple explanation of the insertion of the former chapter, that Luke was glad to include in his history a narrative of the early preaching of the Gospel communicated to him by an eye-witness. We need not ascribe to Luke any more recondite motive for relating the incident, than that he believed that it had occurred. There is no evidence that this Samaritan magician had obtained elsewhere any great notoriety; and there is every reason to think that any later writer who speaks of him derived his knowledge from the Acts of the Apostles. We have already said that we believe Justin to have been mistaken in identifying Simon of the Acts with Simon of Gitta, whom we take to have been a second-century Gnostic teacher; but this identification is followed in the Clementines. In any case, we see that the whole manufacture of the latter story is later than Simon of Gitta, if not, as we believe, later than Justin Martyr. The anti-Paulinists, therefore, who dressed Paul in the disguise of Simon, are more than a century later than any opponents Paul had in his lifetime, who, if they wished to fix a nickname on the Apostle, were not likely to go to the book of the Acts of the Apostles to look for one. [G. S.]

SIMON (2), a friend of Isidore of Pelusium [PAULUS (62)]. [C. H.]

SIMON (3), THE SYRIAN, Jacobite patriarch of Alexandria A.D. 689–700. He was nominated by the Emir Abdel-Aziz, when the Copts were distracted between the rival claims of two abbats, John and Victor. He received an embassy from India, asking for a bishop and priests. His memory is celebrated by the Ethiopians and Copts on July 24. (Le Quien, ii. xvii. 453; Renaudot, 179–189; *AA. SS.* Boll. Jun. v. 76; Neale, ii. 83–90.) [G. T. S.]

SIMONIANI. Under this name the followers of Simon Magus are described in the *Apost. Constit.* vi. 16, cf. Epiph. *adv. Haer.* Num. xxi. The Nestorians were, by imperial decree, designated by this opprobrious name after the exile of Nestorius [NESTORIANS]. [G. T. S.]

SIMPLICIA (1), the widow of Alypius, governor of Cappadocia. On her husband's premature death, being left in delicate health, with a family of children and troublesome legal business connected with her estates, which would entail long and wearisome journeys, Gregory Nazianzen wrote his urgent letter on her behalf to Jacobus, her husband's successor as governor. (Greg. Naz. *Epp.* 146, 147.) [E. V.]

SIMPLICIA (2), a wealthy lady of Cappadocia, very lavish in her gifts to the church, but suspected of unsoundness in the faith. One of her domestic slaves, who acted as her steward, having been forcibly consecrated bishop by Basil and Gregory, at the request of a congregation that had been for a long time destitute of episcopal superintendence, against his own will, and without asking or obtaining his mistress's consent, she not unnaturally became very indignant at this invasion of her rights, and wrote a violent letter to Basil, upbraiding him with what he had done, and threatening him with the vengeance of her eunuchs. Basil, in his reply, manifests the haughtiest disdain of her threats, and adopts a tone of bitter invective, which may have silenced the lady, but cannot have convinced her of the equity of his acts. (Basil, *Ep.* 115 [87].) Simplicia acquiesced in the loss of her slave as long as Basil lived. On his death she renewed her claim, loading Basil's memory with praises, but requiring that this ordination should be annulled, stating that the man was unworthy of the episcopal office, and threatening to carry the matter before the secular courts if her demand were not obeyed. Gregory Nazianzen shews, by his reply, that he felt the weakness of his case and the essential justice of Simplicia's claim. He requests that she will not deprive the Church of a bishop, but sanction by her free will the ordination which had been made against her will. Any charges against the man should be made before the properly constituted tribunal, and investigated in open court in her presence. The claim that her servant should give an account of his stewardship he allows to be reasonable, if only it were urged in a kindly spirit. Her gifts, which he hints were rather the fruit of ostentation than of piety, purchased for her no right to lord it over others. Her perseverance in her present line of conduct would only strengthen the suspicion felt of her heterodoxy. (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 38.) [E. V.]

SIMPLICIANUS, ST., bishop of Milan next after St. Ambrose, better known by what we hear of his influence over others more famous than himself, than by any writings of his own He must have been born early in the 4th century, perhaps at Rome, but was certainly a resident there between A.D. 350 and 360, during which time he became instrumental in the conversion of Victorinus (Aug. *Conf.* viii. 2). [VICTORINUS.] At some time, later perhaps than this, he became intimate with St. Ambrose, whose father in the Christian faith he is called by Augustine, *i.e.* perhaps in intercourse with him at Rome, or after his removal to Milan. About A.D. 374, the year in which his friend was so suddenly raised to the episcopate, he appears to have taken

up his residence at Milan, but there is no solid ground for the statement of Baronius, that he was sent thither by pope Damasus, in order to guide the new bishop in his new and unexpected office (Baronius, Ann. 375, xxii.; Tillemont, vol. x. p. 398). It is certain, however, that he was held in deep reverence by St. Ambrose, who speaks of his continual study of holy Scripture, and who was often consulted by him (Aug. *Conf.* viii. 2; Ambr. *Ep.* 37. 2, 65. 1). Four letters addressed to him by St. Ambrose are extant. 1. A reply to one from Simplicianus, expressing his pleasure received from a discourse of his to the people on the writings of St. Paul, and his wish that he would continue the subject. He adds his own partial fulfilment of that wish, by showing from Scripture, especially from the writings of St. Paul, that the Christian alone enjoys true liberty (Ambr. *Ep.* 37). 2. Continuing the same subject he shows that he also, whether man or woman, alone possesses true wealth (*ibid.* 38). 3. In reply to some questions put by Simplicianus, as to the explanation of certain passages of Scripture, especially the pouring out of blood into basons and on the altar, Ex. xxiv. 6 (*Ep.* 61). 4. In reply to his enquiry how it was that Moses, holding the place which he did, consulted his brother Aaron so much, with special reference to Lev. x. 16 (*Ep.* 67).

It was while Augustine was residing near Milan, A.D. 386, that he became acquainted with Simplicianus, who related to him the history of the conversion of Victorinus, a narrative which, coming as it did at so critical a point in the condition of his mind, awakened in him an eager desire to follow his example (exarsi ad imitandum) (*Conf.* viii. 5), and the friendship thus formed was preserved by Augustine throughout his life. How it came to pass that Simplicianus was appointed to the see of Milan, A.D. 397, is related by Paulinus in his life of St. Ambrose (c. 46), and may be seen above (Vol. I. p. 97). He appears to have died A.D. 400, and was succeeded by Venerius. It was to him, no doubt, that the letter of Vigilius, bishop of Trent, was addressed concerning the acts of the martyrs Alexander, Martyrius, and Sisinnius, whose relics in compliance with his request, were sent at the same time, though Gennadius by his expression, *ad Simplicianum quendam*, seems to throw some doubt upon this (Baronius, ann. 401. ii.; Paulin, *Vit. S. Ambr.* c. 52). As well as pope Siricius he was consulted by the 3rd Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, on the subject of admission to the priesthood of persons baptized in infancy by Donatists (*Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 263, ed. Oberthür, p. 208, ed. Dupin; Bruns, *Conc.* i. 133; Baronius, ann. 397. xlvi.). His name is also mentioned with great respect by the first council of Toledo, A.D. 400, and his consent, as well as that of Siricius, was required to the restoration to communion and admission to holy orders of excommunicated Priscillianists (Baronius, ann. 405, xlv. liv.). A modest and humble man, his influence over others, which was very great, was shewn more in drawing forth their thoughts than in recording his own, and thus it was his enquiries which gave occasion both to the letters of St. Ambrose already mentioned, and to the treatises of Augustus addressed to him in the early days of his episcopate, viz. the two books of answers to various questions (de diversis quaestionibus). i. *a.* concerning passages in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Rom. vii. 7, 25). *b.* On election and reprobation as shewn in the cases of Jacob and Esau. ii. Questions arising out of the books of Samuel and Kings; *a.* the evil spirit in Saul. *b.* God's "repentance" respecting him. *c.* The appearance of Samuel to Saul at En-dor, a subject which he mentions also in the reply to the questions of Dulcitius. *d.* The proper attitude in prayer. *e.* The complaint of Elijah for the death of the widow's son at Sarepta. *f.* The mission of the lying spirit from God to the prophets of Ahab (1 Kings xxii. 21–23). These books were sent to Simplicianus by Augustine, with a letter expressing the utmost kindness and respect, and are described by him in his *Retractations*, but with the omission of the last of the questions. He also refers to them in his books on predestination and the perseverance of saints, and he mentions him with great respect in the "City of God" (Aug. *Ep.* 37; *Retract.* ii. 1; *De Praed.* 8; *De Dono Persev.* 52; *Civ. D.* x. 29). Simplicianus died at Milan, and was buried on Aug. 15, but the calendars both of Rome and Milan postpone his commemoration to the following day. His remains were transferred by S. Carlo Borromeo in 1582, from their original place of interment in a church bearing his name to another in the same church (Tillemont, x. 401; Ceillier, iv. 325, vi. 7, ix. 6, 78, 249–254; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* vol. i. p. 299). [H. W. P.]

SIMPLICIOLA, virgin. [QUINTILIANUS (3).]

SIMPLICIUS (1), governor of Tarsus, under whom St. Boniface is said to have suffered on May 14. Boniface was steward to Aglae, a Roman lady, with whom he lived in unlawful intercourse. She was converted to the faith, renounced sin, induced Boniface to follow her example, and sent him to the East to secure some relics of the martyrs in the Diocletian persecution which was then raging. Simplicius put him to death at Tarsus (*AA. SS.* Boll. Mai. iii. 280; Ceill. ii. 477). [G. T. S.]

SIMPLICIUS (2), ST., sixth bishop of Autun. Though a saint of some repute in Gaul, and finding mention as well in the ancient as in the more recent Latin martyrologies, his life and even the date of his episcopate are very obscure. On the one hand his name appears in the records of the council of Cologne in 346 (Mansi, ii., 1771) and that of Sardica in the following year. On the other he appears in the lives of the bishops Amator and Germanus of Auxerre, as their contemporary, which would bring him down to about 418 (Stephanus, *Vita S. Amatoris*, Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. i. 58; Constantius, *Vita S. Germani Autiss.*, Boll. ibid. Jul. vii. 202). Looking to the suspicion that attaches to the council of Cologne, and the fact that no see is appended to Simplicius' name at that of Sardica, we are safer in following the undoubtedly high authority of Constantius' narrative, and adopting the later date (cf. *Gall. Christ.* iv. 334; Boll. *Acta SS.* Jun. iv. 812). Gregory of Tours preserves the traditions of him current in his time, according to which he was of noble birth and great wealth. Like many other Gallic bishops, he was a layman when elevated to the episcopate. Nor did he separate from his wife, though they lived to-

gether as brother and sister, a miracle closing the mouths of murmuring sceptics. Another miracle crushes the worship of Berecyntian Cybele, who was still carried round at Autun to give fertility to the crops and vineyards. (*De Glor. Conf.* lxxvi., lxxvii.) His day is June 24. For his cult see Boll. Jun. iv. 812. [S. A. B.]

SIMPLICIUS (3), of Emona, originally a grammarian, and then the friend of Maximin, the cruel minister of Valentinian, was vicar of Rome in A.D. 374. He rivalled his master in cruelty. Ammian gives a long list of the persons executed by him. He was put to death by Gratian's orders in Illyricum, probably in A.D. 376 Ammianus, xxviii. i. 45-57). A rescript of Valentinian I. addressed to him, is referred to in the rescript of Gratian and Valentinian II. given in the *Appendix to the Theodosian Code* (ed. Ritter), and in Baronius, A.D. 381. By it those who held unlawful religious assemblies and deposed bishops were banished 100 miles from Rome. The occasion of the rescript probably was the disturbances arising from the contested election between pope Damasus and Ursinus. [F. D.]

SIMPLICIUS (4). A tribune to whom Gregory Nyssen dedicated his short treatise, *De Fide* (*Greg. Nyss.*, tom. iii. p. 38). [E. V.]

SIMPLICIUS (5), ST., seventeenth archbishop of Vienne, at the close of the 4th and beginning of the 5th centuries, was involved in a long struggle against the pretensions of the see of Arles to metropolitan jurisdiction over his province. The council of Turin, held about 397, or a little later, in its second canon, suggested a modus vivendi, under which it seems for some years peace was kept, the two prelates exercising metropolitan jurisdiction in their respective provinces (Mansi, iii. 861; Ceillier, vii. 738), but the bishops of Arles again obtained the ascendant, and in 417 pope Zosimus, in a letter addressed to the bishops of the province of Vienne and Narbonensis Secunda rebukes Simplicius for what he describes as shameless usurpations of the rights of Arles (*Epist.* v., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 665). The keenness of the controversy may be judged from the existence of a forged letter of the same pope, purporting to revoke his words and restore matters to the footing they were on after the council of Turin (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. 1, 354). Simplicius is commemorated Feb. 3. His name is not found in the older martyrologies, but Gregory of Tours has a quotation from a Paulinus, perhaps of Nola, in which Simplicius, with other bishops, is held up as an example of sanctity and faith (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 13; for his cult see Boll. *ibid.*) [S. A. B.]

SIMPLICIUS (6), a friend of St. Augustine, remarkable for his memory. He knew the writings of Virgil by heart so well that Augustine thought he could repeat them backwards (Aug. *de An.* iv. 9). [H. W. P.]

SIMPLICIUS (7), bishop of Rome after Hilarius, from 22 Feb. A.D. 468 (according to the conclusion of Pagi, *in Baron. ad ann.* 467, iv.), to March, A.D. 483.

According to *Lib. Pontif.* he was a native of Tibur, the son of one Castinus. He witnessed, during his episcopate, the memorable event of the fall of the Western empire, and the accession (A.D. 476) of Odoacer as king of Italy. But this change, however politically important, does not seem to have affected at the time the pope or the Church at Rome. The later emperors, Anthemius, Nepos, Augustulus, who reigned during the earlier years of Simplicius' popedom, being merely nominees of the Eastern emperor, had little power or influence; and Odoacer, himself an Arian, did not interfere with church affairs.

The reigning emperors of the East were, first Leo I., the Thracian, called also *The Great*, and after him Zeno, his son-in-law, who succeeded him A.D. 474, but whose reign was interrupted from 475 to 477, by the usurpation of Basiliscus. The contemporary bishop of Constantinople was Acacius (471–489). The most memorable incidents of the pontificate of Simplicius were his negociations, and eventual breach, with this prelate, and with the emperor Zeno who supported him, — leading up to the long schism between the churches of the East and West, which ensued in the time of the following pope, Felix III. (II.). The questions on which difference arose were, as will be seen, in connecfion partly with the rival claims of the sees of Rome and Constantinople, and partly with the Monophysite or Eutychian heresy, which continued to cause discord in the church long after its condemnation by the council of Chalcedon in 451.

The first occasion of difference with respect to the rival claims of the two sees was the promulgation of an edict by the emperor Leo I., at the instance of Acacius, confirming the 28th canon of the council of Chalcedon. This canon, said to have been passed unanimously by all present except the legates of pope Leo, not only confirmed the 3rd canon of Constantinople, which had given to the bishop of new Rome (i.e. Constantinople) a primacy of honour (i.e. honorary rank) next after the bishop of old Rome, but further gave him authority to ordain the metropolitans of the Pontic, Asian, and Thracian dioceses, thus investing him with the powers as well as the rank of a Patriarch, second only to the pope of Rome. Pope Leo had subsequently objected to this canon, to which he never gave his assent. He rested his objection to it on its being, as he said, an infringement of the canons of Nice, and entrenching on the rights of other patriarchs. A main ground of his objection to it probably was that it expressed a desire on the part of the bishops of Constantinople, which had become the real seat of empire, to rival, with the view perhaps of eventually superseding, the old primacy of Rome. At Rome the position maintained was that the authority of a see rested on its ecclesiastical origin, and that of Rome especially on its having been the see of St. Peter. The view at Constantinople, where there was no apostle to fall back on, was, that the temporal pre-eminence of a city was a sufficient ground for ecclesiastical ascendancy. Hence the long struggle between the two sees. The remark may here be allowed in passing, that—whatever may be thought of the assumed basis, or the legitimacy of papal claims—it was surely well for the church at large that the patriarchs of Constantinople, dependent as they were on Caesar, did not eventually succeed in their attempted rivalry of Rome.

Acacius, in inducing the emperor to confirm the 28th canon of Chalcedon by a special edict, had for his purpose to make it plain to the world that the eminence and authority thereby assigned to his see were still maintained, and had not been conceded to the remonstrances of pope Leo. And the language used by the emperor in his edict—styling the church of Constantinople "the Mother of his Piety, and of all Christians, and of the orthodox faith"—confirms the supposition, that an idea was even entertained of the new seat of empire superseding the old one in ecclesiastical prerogative as well as temporal rank. If so, it was both natural and fit that Simplicius should take alarm. Accordingly he sent Probus, bishop of Canusium in Apulia, as his legate to Constantinople to remonstrate against the edict; but with what success we are not informed. We know of the legation only from mention of it in a letter of pope Gelasius, as follows: "Eaque nihilominus etiam sub sanctae memoriae Papa Simplicio legatum sedis apostolicae sanctae memoriae Probum Canusinae urbis episcopum, Leone Principe tunc petente, praesentem docuisse nullatenus posse tentari, neque his prorsus praebuisse consensum. *Atque ideo non civitatis cujuslibet respiciant qualitatem, sed modum dispensationis ecclesiasticae paterna traditione firmatum convenienter observent.*" (Gelas. *ep. ad Dardan. episc.*).

With regard to the doctrinal controversies of the day,—in connexion also with which, as has been said, differences between Rome and Constantinople eventually arose,—Simplicius appears to have been in accord with the emperor Leo, and for some time with Zeno, as well as with Acacius. The great patriarchal sees were, during the first years of his reign, occupied by orthodox prelates, who had the imperial support. Alexandria had been held by Timothy Salophacialus since the Eutychian usurper, Timothy Aelurus, had been deposed and banished by the emperor Leo, A.D. 460. At Antioch Julianus, an orthodox patriarch, who had been elected on the expulsion of the usurper Peter Fallo by Leo I., A.D. 471, was still in possession of the see. At Ephesus the Eutychian patriarch Paulus had been deposed. But the usurpation of the empire by Basiliscus, A.D. 475, introduced immediate discord and disturbance. He declared at once for Eutychianism, and, as a first step, recalled Timothy Aelurus to the see of Alexandria. Having taken possession of it, and driven Salophacialus to flight, Aelurus, in the same year, 475, repaired to Constantinople, where crowds of the populace received him in triumph, crying before him, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Acacius, however, and the clergy generally, refused him entry into their churches, so that he was compelled to celebrate the divine mysteries in private houses. His purpose in visiting the imperial city was to bring about, through the new emperor, the general triumph of his party, and with this view to procure the calling of a new general council for reconsidering and reversing the decisions of Chalcedon. This he had previously urged on Leo I., when, on the accession of that emperor, A.D. 457, he had been first ordained by his party bishop of Alexandria; and for some time Leo seems to have been inclined to call a council, though in the end, having been strongly dissuaded by pope Leo, he had relinquished the idea, and (as aforesaid) deposed Aelurus.

In this state of things certain clergy and monks of Constantinople sent a messenger with letters to represent it to Simplicius at Rome. Simplicius without delay wrote to Basiliscus and to Acacius. In his letter to the former, after complimentary language to the usurper himself, he expresses his horror at the doings of Aelurus, of which he had been informed by the monks and clergy, and his surprise that they had been possible under the emperor's piety. With more policy than sincerity, he addresses Basiliscus as one universally known to be devoted to God and orthodoxy, as endowed with the virtues of his predecessors Leo and Marcian, and, like them, well disposed to Catholic truth. He hopes — nay, he does not doubt—that the new emperor will follow their faith, as he has succeeded to their empire; he reminds him that the stability of his power will depend on his propitiating the Giver of it by support of the truth, and that it is the duty of princes to restrain those whom the church has condemned. He further refers him to the letters of pope Leo, defining clearly the true faith, which would be found in the imperial archives, but of which, for the emperor's easier consideration of them, he has sent copies to Acacius. As to Timothy Aelurus, he speaks of him, in no measured language, as an impious parricide, a bloody robber, and far more detestable than Cain: and he requests that the poison of that deadly head should be removed from the abodes of men to waste its virulence in solitude.[a] The opportunity is not lost, in the course of the letter, of insinuating to the new emperor the peculiar spiritual authority of the Roman see. These words occur, "The truths which have flowed pure from the fountain of the Scriptures cannot be disturbed by any arguments of cloudy subtilty. For there remains one and the same rule of apostolical doctrine in the successors of him to whom the Lord enjoined the care of the whole sheepfold — to whom he promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against him, and that what by him should be bound on earth should not be loosed in heaven." And the pope conjures the emperor in the voice of St. Peter, the unworthy minister of whose see he is, not to allow the enemies of the ancient faith to go on with impunity. It is observable that in the letter to Acacius, sent at the same time, Simplicius does not thus assert the paramount authority of St. Peter's see, feeling, perhaps, that such assertion would incense rather than awe the patriarch. But, in urging him to use his influence with the emperor, he requests him to add force to his appeal by speaking in the pope's name as well as his own:—"Ergo cum praedictis presbyteris ac monachis opportune pietati ejus nostro quoque nomine supplica, et legationem hanc pro nobis quoque clementiae ejus insinua." He further especially urges Acacius to prevent, if possible, the assembling of a council for reviewing the deci-

[a] The charge of parricide against Aelurus has reference to his supposed implication in the murder of Proterius, whose see he had usurped at Alexandria in 470.

sions of Chalcedon, which he understood to be contemplated. This subject he did not touch on in his letter to the emperor, for fear, we may suppose, of suggesting to him what he might not be himself intending. He wrote also to the monks and others who had informed him of the state of things, sending them copies of his letters to Basiliscus and Acacius. In his letter to them he alludes to the fact, that Acacius himself had not written to him; but intimates no displeasure on this head. He says, "We do not think his silence to be blamed, since, knowing the faith of that most excellent priest, we hold it for certain that it is not his own fault that he has been silent." The silence of the patriarch might perhaps be partly due to his unwillingness to commit himself to any step which might seem like an appeal to Rome. It was certainly not due at that time to indifference; for we find him afterwards making a resolute stand against Aelurus and the emperor, when the latter continued to back up the Eutychian cause. Simplicius seized also the opportunity of an embassy from Odoacer to Constantinople to despatch a second shorter letter to Acacius to the same effect as the former one.

Meanwhile Basiliscus at Constantinople allowed Aelurus to convene a synod, at which the expelled Eutychian bishops were ordered restitution to their sees, and all previous proceedings against Aelurus himself were declared null and void. After this the emperor issued an Encyclic letter, addressed to Aelurus, in which, while accepting with all honour the councils of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus, he utterly repudiated and condemned that of Chalcedon; required all, under pain of deposition, exile, and other punishments, to agree to this condemnation; and ordered all copies of pope Leo's letters and of the Acts of Chalcedon, wherever found, to be burnt. The document is given in full by Evagrius (l. 3, c. 4.). Acacius refused to sign it. But in the compliant East elsewhere it was accepted generally. At Ephesus, whither Aelurus went, 600 bishops of Asia are said to have signed it; and at a synod held there Acacius and all other bishops who should refuse assent were declared to be deposed, and, in contravention of the 28th canon of Chalcedon, Ephesus, Heraclea, and Cæsarea were exempted from the jurisdiction of Constantinople. There also Paulus, who had been deposed by Acacius, was reinstated in the see.[b] At Antioch also, Peter Fullo, the Eutychian bishop who had been deposed, was restored to the see in the room of Julian. Meanwhile, at Constantinople, Acacius, supported by the clergy and monks, was resolute in his resistance, and with success. He induced Daniel Stylites (one of the pillar-saints of the day) to descend from his pillar, and aid in rousing the populace; and Basiliscus had to leave the city for safety. The disaffection of the people, thus at length excited on religious grounds, was taken advantage of by Zeno, who in 477 marched on Constantinople to recover his throne. Basiliscus at this juncture implored the protection of Acacius and Daniel, retracted his Encyclic, and professed orthodoxy. But it was of no avail. Zeno without further difficulty became again the emperor of the East.

During all these troubles under Basiliscus Simplicius seems to have had no opportunity of exercising any influence; but, as soon as he heard of the restitution of Zeno, being informed of it first by certain clergy and monks of Constantinople—the same, probably, as had previously been before Acacius in telling him of the state of things,—he wrote at once to the emperor. After language of compliment and congratulation (which would have come with a better grace if he had not written previously in somewhat similar strain to the usurper Basiliscus), the main drift of his letter is to exhort the emperor to follow the steps of his predecessors Marcian and Leo, seeing that the side they had taken in religious matters was now evidently shown to have the support of Heaven; to allow no tampering with the decisions of Chalcedon; to drive all Eutychian bishops from the sees which they had usurped; and especially to send Aelurus from human society into solitude. To Acacius also he wrote (having this time received a letter from him after that of the monks and clergy), desiring him to back up his own appeal to the emperor, and especially urging the necessity of getting Aelurus irrevocably banished into solitude. A second letter from Acacius informed the pope of the death of Timothy Aelurus, of the unsuccessful attempt of Peter Mongus to get possession of the see, of his subsequent flight, and of the peaceable restoration of Timothy Salophacialus. This Peter Mongus (Μογγός, *the Stammerer*) was a deacon of Alexandria, who had been banished with Aelurus in 470, and had rejoined him then in 475. He will appear as a prominent figure in subsequent proceedings. To this letter from Acacius the pope replied, expressing joy for the good news, but at the same time warning him to keep an eye on the restored Alexandrian patriarch, who had once before failed in the constancy of a faithful prelate in allowing the name of Dioscorus (the patriarch deposed after the council of Chalcedon) to be recited at the altar. Soon afterwards, however, having received a letter from Salophacialus, expressing penitence for his former weakness, Simplicius wrote again to Acacius to assure him on this head, but to inform him further that, according to the information given by Salophacialus, Mongus was still lurking at Alexandria, and to urge his immediate banishment. He wrote twice to this effect to Acacius, and twice also to the emperor himself. It does not appear, however, that Zeno was thus moved to take any step against Peter Mongus, whom we find still at Alexandria, when a few years later (as will be seen) Acacius, instead of repudiating him, took him up. It

[b] The unanimity of the Asian bishops may easily be accounted for by their objection to the canon of Chalcedon which had given to the bishop of Constantinople patriarchal jurisdiction over them. A main purpose of the synod held at Ephesus under Aelurus was to restore to the see of Ephesus its ancient patriarchal independence; and this would be likely to be welcome there. It may be observed here that the peculiar zeal of Acacius at this juncture in support of the council of Chalcedon may have been intensified by similar considerations on the other side of the question. He certainly did not show afterwards any great unwillingness to fraternise with the Eutychians, when other motives came in. Various motives as well as pure zeal for truth or error, have to be taken into account for a right understanding of the history of controversies.

may be that the emperor and his advisers were already disposed to the conciliatory policy towards the Eutychians which they afterwards maintained in spite of indignant protests from the pope. Still, so far, the correspondence between Rome and Constantinople had been amicable with respect to affairs at Alexandria.

At Antioch too we find Simplicius complaining of the Eutychian leaders having been allowed to remain, and attributing the troubles that occurred there to this cause. Peter Fullo had been deposed there, synods condemning him having been held apparently both at Rome and at Constantinople; but he had not been banished. And, with respect to this see, there were about this time some further threatening symptoms of want of concert between Simplicius and Acacius, though causing no open breach between them at the time. The sequence of events there at this time is not known to us with full certainty, the accounts of the historians being somewhat discordant. According to the generally accepted view it was as follows. After the restoration of Zeno to the empire, Peter Fullo (as aforesaid) was deposed, and John Codonatus (who had been previously ordained by Fullo as bishop of Apamea) for a short time took possession of the see, but was deposed after a tenure of about three months by a synod at Antioch, and Stephen (called Stephen the elder) was elected and ordained. After a short episcopate, the duration of which is uncertain, he was murdered at the altar by a Eutychian mob, being pricked to death with pointed reeds, and his body thrown into the Orontes. Zeno thereupon sent to Antioch and caused the culprits to be executed; and then, in concert with Acacius, took measures for filling up the see. According to ancient custom, confirmed by the canons of both Nice and Constantinople, the new patriarch should have been elected and ordained by those of his own province. But, with the view of avoiding contest and tumult, the election was held at Constantinople, and the ordination performed there by Acacius. The choice fell on another Stephen, called Stephen the younger, to whom there was no objection on the ground of orthodoxy. This irregular proceeding—especially on the part of the Constantinopolitan patriarch—might well have excited the serious displeasure of the pope. But both Zeno and Acacius having written to him to explain how what they had done had been done only under the pressure of necessity, he expressed himself as satisfied, and let it pass; but only on the understanding, and the assurance of the emperor's promise, that it would never be done again, or made into a precedent. His letter to the emperor to this effect bears the date of A.D. 479.

In the year 482 the death of the younger Stephen left the see of Antioch again vacant. Calandio succeeded him, who appears evidently to have been the nominee of the authorities at Constantinople; for John Codonatus, above spoken of, is said on good authority to have been in the first place re-appointed at Antioch. Whether or not this Calandio was elected and ordained, under the emperor's direction, canonically in his own province, or, like Stephen, at Constantinople, is uncertain. [See *Art.* on CALANDIO.] The letter of Simplicius to Acacius written after the event (*Ep.* xvi. *apud* Labbe) favours the former supposition. For it contains no complaint of the proceedings having been uncanonical, but only of the news of the election having reached Simplicius from the electing synod, and not from Acacius, and of the latter not having informed him of what was going on at Antioch. This complaint, however, implies some dissatisfaction on the part of Simplicius with the conduct of Acacius, and is significant of already cooled relations between them. Still the pope accepted Calandio as a lawfully appointed patriarch.[a]

The death of Timothy Salophacialus at Alexandria, in the same year with the election of Calandio (482), gave rise to much more serious differences between Constantinople and Rome. Strained relations now resulted in decided conflict, ending in an open schism, which lasted thirty-five years, between Eastern and Western Christendom.

John Talaias was elected canonically by a synod of the orthodox at Alexandria in the room of Salophacialus. Simplicius received a notification of the election from the synod, and was on the point of replying, and expressing his assent, when he was startled by receiving a letter from the emperor Zeno which accused Talaias of being guilty of perjury, and therefore unfit to be promoted, and further intimated that, in the emperor's opinion, Peter Mongus (the Eutychian friend of the deceased Aelurus, and the temporary usurper of his see after his death, who has been spoken of above) was the most proper person to succeed Salophacialus. Simplicius at once addressed Acacius (who had not written himself, having his reasons for letting the emperor be the pope's informant), expressing sorrow and surprise at not having been informed of the matter by Acacius himself, whom he supposes, or affects to suppose, zealous for orthodoxy; he protests against the promotion of a notorious and excommunicated heretic like Mongus; and he implores Acacius to do all he can to prevent it. The letter written at the same time to Zeno himself has not been preserved. That to Acacius is dated "Idibus Juliis, Severino consule," i.e. 15 July A.D.

[a] The sequence of events that has been given is the one generally received, and appears on the whole most probable. But the statements of some of the historians are inconsistent with it. Pagi (in Baron., *ad ann.*, 479 II. and 482 III.) maintains the view that it was the younger, not the elder, Stephen, who was murdered at Antioch, and that it was Calandio, and he only, who was uncanonically ordained at Constantinople. Taking this view, which rests on what Theophanes and other historians say, he supposes the letters of Simplicius to Zeno and Acacius (*Epp.* xiv. xv. Labbe)—in which the uncanonical ordination of a bishop of Antioch, not mentioned by name, at Constantinople is condoned—to have reference to Calandio, and not to the younger Stephen. But, in order to make his view tenable, he has to alter the date of the first of these letters, which in the extant text of it denotes A.D. 479, *i.e.* three years earlier than the ordination of Calandio. He supposes transcribers of the epistle to have changed the date. But there seems to be no sufficient ground for this supposition: and, further, the letter of Simplicius to Acacius which was undoubtedly written on the occasion of the ordination of Calandio, since his name is mentioned in it (*Ep.* xvi.), appears, from its purport, to have been written on a different occasion from that of the other two.

482. Hearing nothing from Acacius, though there had been ample opportunity for him to send a letter, he wrote to him again in the November of the same year, but still got no reply. So much appears from the extant letters of Simplicius (*Epp.* xvii. xviii. Labbe). We learn from other sources what had been going on meanwhile, and what afterwards occurred.

It appears that John Talaias was on more than one ground unacceptable at Constantinople. He had been sent there previously from Alexandria in the time of the patriarch Salophacialus, and is said to have sworn to the emperor before his departure that he would never accept the see of Alexandria. Hence the charge of perjury made against him.[d] Further, he was known to be a friend of Illus, the emperor's *Magister Officiorum*, who had been his patron, but who at the time when the see of Alexandria became vacant was in disfavour, and had been sent away to Antioch. Further, whereas Talaias had sent in due form a synodical letter, announcing his election to the pope, he had not done so to Acacius. He had only sent a messenger with a letter to Illus, whom he supposed to be still in the imperial city, charging him to make his election known to Acacius and the emperor, and to deliver letters to them which he enclosed. The messenger, on his arrival at Constantinople, finding that Illus was no longer there, had departed to seek him at Antioch, without delivering the letters intended for Acacius and the emperor. And thus Acacius first heard of the election of John Talaias without having received any notification of it from the elected prelate himself. A charge also of complicity with heresy was brought against Talaias, on the ground that it was said to have been under his advice that Timothy Salophacialus had once (as has been above stated) inserted the name of Dioscorus in the diptychs (Liberatus c. 17). But the other circumstances were sufficient to cause his election to be unwelcome at Constantinople. He had previously been distasteful to the emperor as a probable candidate for the see of Alexandria (perhaps owing to his intimacy even then with Illus, who proved himself justly open to suspicion of disallegiance by afterwards joining the usurper Leontinus against Zeno); and his conduct now implied that, while he sought the support of Rome, and of Illus also, he was not anxious to court the favour of the emperor and Acacius. But the selection of the notorious Mongus, in whose condemnation both Zeno and Acacius had once concurred, was a startling step. It is said to have been the scheme of Acacius, who recommended it to the emperor. Acacius had already (as has appeared) failed to satisfy the more ardent zeal of pope Simplicius in conniving at the immunity from banishment of the Eutychian leaders; and this final step may have been only in pursuance of a policy of conciliation that he had been for some time entertaining, while at the same time he thought it might secure the allegiance to Constantinople of the large party at Alexandria which was in distinct opposition to that of John Talaias. He himself does not seem to have had very decided views, or cared very keenly about doctrine for its own sake, though he ever declared himself entirely orthodox. His justification of the elevation of Mongus was that the latter was now prepared to profess orthodoxy, and that, being popular at Alexandria, he was likely to be able to reconcile the misbelievers. Liberatus (*Breviar.*) relates as follows:—Acacius, moved as has been said, and on the grounds above alleged, induced the emperor to take up the cause of Mongus against Talaias: messengers from Mongus himself came to Constantinople, expressing, in his name, a desire of unity in the faith: they were presented by Acacius to the emperor, who was easily persuaded to write to the civil authorities at Alexandria, ordering them to expel John Talaias, and retain Peter Mongus (who appears to have already been elected by his party) in the see; but on condition only that the latter should accept the profession of faith sent him by the emperor, and send synodical letters to Acacius, Simplicius, and the other archbishops. So ready was Acacius to accept Mongus that he caused his name to be recited in the Diptychs on the strength of his mere promise of compliance, without waiting till he had carried it into effect. The profession of faith on this occasion sent, with the view of promoting union, is known as the *Henoticon* of Zeno. It is given in full by Evagrius Scholasticus (l. 3. c. 14), and by Liberatus (*Brev.* c. 17), and will be found in Baronius (*ad ann.* 482, xxvi.). It is addressed in Zeno's name to the clergy monks and laity of Alexandria and the rest of Egypt, and invites all to join themselves to the Catholic Church on the basis of a common acceptance of the creed of Nice and Constantinople, which is declared to be incumbent upon all and a sufficient definition of the faith. It approves the council of Ephesus, adding a definition of the faith as against Nestorianism, and further pronounces an anathema against Nestorius, and also against Eutyches, both of whom, it is said, had contravened the faith. But it avoids any acceptance of the council of Chalcedon, which had condemned the Monophysite doctrine which had been taught by Eutyches, referring to it only in these slighting terms, which imply derogation of it, though not rejection:—"Whoever thinks or has thought differently, either now, or at any other time, *or in the Council of Chalcedon*, we anathematize him; but most of all Nestorius, Eutyches, and the favourers of their doctrines." It is to be observed that it contains no similar anathema of, nor even an allusion to, Dioscorus of Alexandria, who ought in consistency to have been condemned as well as Eutyches. But the sole purpose of the document, which is not quite consistent with itself, was to induce the Egyptian Monophysites to join the orthodox communion, by offering them only such a profession as they might

[d] So alleged Zeno and Acacius. Evagrius (*H.E. lib.* 3, c. 12), giving Zacharias *Rhetor* as his authority, represents his oath to the emperor to have been only that he would not canvass for the see. Evagrius's account of the matter is, that at the instigation of certain persons in Alexandria, he had gone to Constantinople to request that he should be allowed to nominate a successor to the see when it should become vacant, and that the emperor, detecting in him a desire to get it for himself, had made him swear that he would not himself seek it. But he is not thus acquitted of perjury; for Evagrius (on the authority of the same Zacharias) alleges further that he obtained the see by simony.

possibly be willing to accept, with an appearance of their accepting orthodoxy. Peter Mongus accepted and signed this *Henoticon*, and got it accepted generally by his party in Egypt. He appears himself to have done even more than this; for in two letters to Acacius and to pope Simplicius (given by Evagrius, l. 3, c. 13) he declares his acceptance of the council of Chalcedon itself. But it is further said by Leontius (*de sect. act.* 5), that he afterwards anathematized the council of Chalcedon, when he found many of his followers—who came to be called *Acephali* because they formed a party without a recognised head—deserting him on the ground of his uncertain utterance.

The above account of the drift and purpose of the *Henoticon*, and of the action of Mongus with respect to it, has seemed relevant to a life of Simplicius, being required in order to account for and justify his and his successors' condemnation of the *Henoticon* itself, and their unflinching repudiation of Peter Mongus, and of all who had been in communion with him. The *Henoticon*, though in itself not unorthodox, was regarded as a compromise with a condemned heresy, which the popes, according to their principles, felt bound to have no dealings with; and, as to Peter Mongus, not only his tergiversation, but also the mere fact of his having been an excommunicated person when elevated to the see of Alexandria in place of the patriarch lawfully elected by the orthodox community, afforded a sufficient justification of the utter repudiation of him and his abettors on the part of Simplicius and his successors. It does not of necessity follow that the irreconcileable attitude of the successors of Simplicius towards the Eastern churches after the death of Mongus was equally justifiable.

Liberatus (c. 18) further informs us that, driven from Alexandria, John Talaias repaired to his friend Illus at Antioch, by whom he was recommended to apply to Calandio, the patriarch there. The latter took up his cause, and gave him synodical letters to Simplicius, to whom he advised him to appeal for support. These letters were in the first place sent, with a request that Simplicius would write to Acacius. He at once did so; but Acacius vouchsafed no reply, beyond simply saying that he could not recognise Talaias, having received Peter Mongus into communion on the basis of the emperor's *Henoticon*. Simplicius then wrote to Acacius again, representing that he ought not to have received Peter into communion without the concurrence of the Apostolic See; that a man who had been condemned by a common decree could not be freed from the ban except by a common council; and that it would be necessary for him first to accept unreservedly the council of Chalcedon and the *tome* of pope Leo. Simplicius received no reply to this second letter. He died not long after writing it, in the beginning of March, A.D. 483, according to Anastasius. John Talaias himself arrived at Rome after the pope's decease, and thus had to present his personal appeal to Felix, the successor of Simplicius. (See FELIX III.)

Baronius and Binius make much of this appeal of John Talaias to the see of Rome, as implying a recognition of the pope's supremacy over the church at large. But all that appears in this and other similar cases is that prelates, when aggrieved in the East, sought the protection and support of the great Roman see, which was acknowledged as the first in rank, and had the widest influence. It is true that popes had long asserted claims to be the supreme shepherds, as representing St. Peter, of the whole Catholic sheepfold: but it is not true that such claims were ever acknowledged in the East; and even in the West they received, in some quarters, but tardy acknowledgment. It has been observed above, that, though Simplicius is found asserting a claim of this kind when he could do so with effect, he refrains from such assertion in his letters to Acacius, with whom he knew, it may be supposed, that it would only provoke resentment.

Besides the letters of Simplicius above referred to, there are three others attributed to him. One (not dated) is to Zeno, bishop of Seville in Spain, and metropolitan of Bætica, constituting him vicar of the Roman see (*Ep.* i. *ap.* Labbe). Another (dated 30 May, A.D. 482) is to John, bishop of the metropolitan see of Ravenna, reproving him severely for having ordained one Gregory to the see of Modena against his will. Such ordinations by force appear to have been not uncommon. In this case Simplicius directs that Gregory shall undertake the charge to which he had been unwillingly ordained, but exempts him from the jurisdiction of Ravenna; and he threatens John with suspension from the power of ordination, if again guilty of a similar offence (*Ep.* ii.). The third letter (dated 19 November, A.D. 475) has reference to one Gaudentius, bishop of Aufidum in Italy, and is addressed to three neighbouring bishops, Florentius, Equitius, and Severus. This Gaudentius had ordained clergy in some way uncanonically, and had appropriated to himself for three years the whole of the revenues of his church, instead of reserving three-fourths of them, according to canonical rule, for the poor, for church fabrics, and for the clergy. He is deprived of the power of ordaining in future, Severus (one of the bishops addressed) being empowered to hold ordinations in his stead; he is required to restore the revenues which he had misappropriated, and one Onager, a presbyter, is entrusted henceforth with the charge of them.

Simplicius is said in the *Lib. Pontif.* to have dedicated and enriched with gifts many churches at Rome, to have provided for clergy taking their turns week by week in attendances at the churches of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Lawrence, for confessions and baptisms, and to have been buried in the Basilica of St. Peter. He is commemorated as pope and confessor on the 2nd of March in the Roman Calendar. [J. B—Y.]

SIMPLICIUS (8), ST., fifteenth archbishop of Bourges, is known to us from an interesting account of his election, which took place A.D. 472, by Sidonius Apollinaris. The vacancy had brought forward so many candidates that two benches would not suffice to seat them. Every sort of intrigue was being employed in the various interests, till at last the perplexed people, with whom the choice lay, summoned Sidonius, recently made bishop of Clermont, to Bourges, and confided the selection to him, having bound

themselves by oath to abide by it. Sidonius called to his aid Agroecius, archbishop of Sens, and Euphronius, bishop of Autun, and finally, in a discourse pronounced in the church, preserved in a letter to St. Perpetuus of Tours, after stating the principles on which a bishop should be chosen, gave his decision for Simplicius, whose friend he seems to have been (see *Epist.* iii. 11, Ceillier, x. 386). Of a family which had won distinction both in the church and the law-courts, Simplicius, according to the same authority, combined the activity of youth with the prudence of age, displayed both genius and talent in letters, was charitable, a good citizen, and had already built a church. Not even the Arians could find anything to say against him. The choice, however, was in violation of the canons, as Simplicius was a layman. He was also married and the father of a family. Whether his episcopate fulfilled the high promises made in his name we do not know, as there are no records of it. He is, however, commemorated as a saint, March 1. He was buried in the church he had built, and which afterwards was known as S. Austregisili in Castro. (Sidon. Apoll. *Epist.* vii. 5, 8; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 8; Boll. *Acta SS.* Mart. i. 34–8; Ceillier, x. 380–1.) [S. A. B.]

SIMPLICIUS (9), saint, third abbat of M. Cassino, after Constantius, c. 560–570, was one of Gregory the Great's authorities for his account of S. Benedict (*Dial.* ii. 1 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxvi. 126). He is said to have been the first to cause the rule of S. Benedict to be read by all monks. Nine verses of his are preserved, inviting one who desires to become a monk to study the rule. He is commemorated on October 22nd (*AA. SS.* Oct. ix. 589). [F. D.]

SIMPLICIUS (10) in A.D. 600, informed Gregory the Great of the wants of the hospice for old men at Mount Sinai, and also of the troubles of the priest Palladius there (*Epp.* xi. 1, 2). [F. D.]

SIMPLICIUS (11), bishop of Paris. In A.D. 601, Gregory the Great wrote to him and other Gallic bishops, commending to them the monks who were going to St. Augustine with LAURENTIUS (25) and MELLITUS (*Epp.* xi. 58). [F. D.]

SINACH, bishop of Clogher, date unknown, but probably about the close of the 8th century. (Ware, *Ir. Bps.* Clogher; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* iii. 72.) [J. G.]

SINDEREDUS, bishop of Toledo, succeeded GUNDERIC (4) before A.D. 710. Isidorus Pacensis gives an inconsistent account of him; after praising him for his sanctity, he says that Sindered at the instigation of WITTIZA, with a zeal not according to knowledge, persecuted continually aged and honourable members of the church of Toledo, and that on the Arab invasion like a hireling, he deserted his flock and fled to Rome. His signature appears among those at the council there in A.D. 721. (Mansi, xii. 265; *Esp. Sag.* v. 302; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (2) 242.) [F. D.]

SINELLUS (1) bishop of Clogher, co. Tyrone, about A.D. 550, as successor to Tighernach. (Ware, *Ir. Bps.* Clogher; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* iii. 71; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 210.)

SINELLUS (2) bishop of Movilla, co. Down, died A.D. 603 (*Ann. Tig.*); his feast is Oct. 1, where *M. Doneg.* calls him priest. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 650, c. 8; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 152, 380.) [J. G.]

SINICIUS, second bishop of Rheims and Soissons, was disciple and successor of Sixtus, c. A.D. 300. In the *Acta* of Sixtus and Sinicius (Boll. *A. SS.* Sept. i. 125, with commentarius praevius, pp. 118–25), he is said to have come from Rome, when a presbyter, with Sixtus, and was consecrated by him as bishop for the Suessiones: at Sixtus' death he succeeded him also at Rheims [SIXTUS (1)] (Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 205, and note 31, ed. 1732; Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* i. c. 3; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxxxv. 32, 105; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 646; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 2, 334). [J. G.]

SIPHORI (al. lec. SYMPHORI), the earlier name of those heretics called in Gennadius's time BONOSIANI (Gennad. *Eccles. Dogm.* c. 52). Why they were so called is not known (Tillem. x. 242). [C. H.]

SIRICA (1), abbess of the nunnery of SS. Gavinus and Luxorius at Cagliari, had assumed to make a will, which was supported on the ground that she had never worn the attire of a nun. Gregory the Great, notwithstanding, decided that she had no testamentary power (*Epp.* ix. 7). [F. D.]

SIRICA (2), wife of GAUDIOSUS (5).

SIRICIUS, bishop of Rome after Damasus from the latter part of December, A.D. 384, or the earlier part of January, A.D. 385, to Nov. 26 (?) A.D. 398. With regard to the date of his accession, there is no doubt that Damasus, his predecessor, died in December, on or before the 10th day of the month, according to *Martyrol. Hieron.* "iv. Id. Dec. Romae depositio S. Damasi episcopi"; and that the year was 384 appears from Prosper Aquitanus, *Chron.*, "Ricemere et Clearcho coss. Romanae ecclesiae post Damasum Siricius praefuit annis xv."; a statement confirmed by what Jerome says of himself (*Ad Rufin.* and *Ep.* 99), viz., that, having come to Rome in 382, he left it in the August of the year which followed that of the death of Damasus after a stay of nearly three years. The only question is whether Siricius was consecrated before the end of the same year or early in the following one. Prosper Aquit., in the passage given above, implies that it was in the same year; and this supposition would account for the duration of 15 years assigned by him to his episcopate, which duration is given also in the epitaph on his tomb (cited by Baronius, *ad ann.* 398, i.); "Ter quinos populum qui rexit ad annos amore." For, if the years of his accession and of his death were reckoned in, there would be fifteen wholly or in part included. On the other hand the *Liber Pontificalis* speaks of a vacancy of 31 (*al.* 36) days after the death of Damasus, thus throwing the accession of Siricius into January, 385.

On this question of date, which is of no historical importance, see Pagi, *Baron. ad ann.* 385, V.

During the violent conflicts which had attended the election of Damasus as successor to Felix II. Siricius had supported Damasus against his rival Ursinus, and after the death

of the former is said to have been elected by the general consent of the Roman people to succeed him, though Ursinus had again come forward. He had been previously presbyter of a church in Rome called that of "the Pastor." His election was confirmed (with allusion to the unanimity of the electors and to the rejection of Ursinus) by the boy emperor, Valentinian II., who then reigned in Italy under the direction of his mother Justina, in a letter to the praefect Pinianus, dated vii. Kal. Mart. (Feb. 23).

Siricius followed the example of Damasus in maintaining the authority of the Roman see. When the praefecture of East Illyricum had been assigned (A.D. 379) to the Eastern division of the empire, Damasus had insisted on its being still subject to the spiritual authority of Rome, and had constituted Acholius bishop of Thessalonica and after him Anysius (who succeeded Acholius A.D. 383), his own vicars for the maintenance of such authority. Siricius, on his accession, renewed this vicariate jurisdiction to Anysius (Innoc. *Epp.* i. xiii.).

Further, one of his earliest acts was his issue of the first of the Papal Decretals that has any claim to genuineness, though he speaks in it of earlier *Decreta* sent to the provinces by pope Liberius. It is dated, "iii. Id. Febr., Arcadio et Bautone vv. cc. (i.e., *viris clarissimis*), coss."—denoting Feb. 11, A.D. 385. Its genuineness is undisputed. Pagi says of it (*in* Baron. *ad ann.* 585, V. *et sq.*), "Neque ea in dubium revocanda, cum sola in Dionysii Exigui Collectione reperiatur, ex eaque desumpta sit quaecunque Cresconius ex Siricii decretis citat." It is plainly referred to by pope Innocent I. (*Ep.* vi. *ad* Exsuperium). Quesnel includes it without hesitation in his *Cod. Rom. cum Leone edit.*, c. 29. Its occasion was a letter from Himerius, bishop of Tarragona in Spain, addressed to Damasus, but received by Siricius, in which the pope's advice was asked on certain matters of discipline, and with regard to certain abuses prevalent in the Spanish church. Siricius, having taken counsel in a Roman synod, issued this decretal in reply, to be communicated by Himerius to all the bishops of Spain, and also to those of neighbouring provinces with a view to universal observance. The opportunity was taken of asserting in very decided terms the authority of the Roman See: "We bear the burdens of all who are heavy laden; nay, rather the blessed apostle Peter bears them in us, who, as we trust, in all things protects and guards us, the heirs of his administration." Again, "To all the questions which thou hast referred to the Roman Church as being the head of thy body, we have given, as I think, sufficient answers;" and in conclusion, "Although it is not allowable for any of the priests of the Lord to be ignorant of the statutes of the apostolic See or of the venerable definitions of the canons, yet it may be more useful, and in regard to the antiquity of thy priesthood more glorious for thyself, if those things which have been written generally, but specially addressed to thee, be made known to all our brethren everywhere through the solicitude of thy unanimity, ... that they may remain inviolate, and no way be left open for any excuses in time to come." Among the rules thus promulgated for universal observance, the following are the most important. 1. Arians returning to the Church are not to be rebaptized, but reconciled only by invocation of the Septiform Spirit, and imposition of episcopal hands. This is declared to be the rule of the whole East and West, and is required to be followed under pain of separation from Roman communion. 2. Adults are to be baptized (unless in danger of death) at Easter and Pentecost only. This rule, not hitherto universally observed, is henceforth to be followed by all under pain of divulsion from "the solidity of the apostolical rock on which Christ has built the Universal Church." 3. Apostates to heathenism, reconciled sinners who have returned to their former lives, monks or nuns guilty of fornication, are to continue during life in penitence, and be reconciled only at the point of death. But, while monks and nuns thus sinning are to be incarcerated during life, other persons who, as aforesaid, have, through human weakness, relapsed into sin, may after penance and reconciliation attend, though not partake of, the Eucharist, i.e. occupy the position of *consistentes*. 4. No man may marry a virgin who has been betrothed to another, since violation of the sacerdotal benediction on betrothal is of the nature of sacrilege. 5. Priests and deacons are prohibited from all sexual intercourse, whether with wives married before ordination or with others. Siricius approaches this subject with great earnestness, grounding the prohibition on the necessity of those who minister daily about holy things keeping themselves continually pure, and quoting the text, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." It appears from what he says that it was at that time usual in Spain for the clergy to have wives and live with them, and that many were found to defend the practice on the ground of the allowance of marriage to the Levitical priesthood. To such as had erred through ignorance in this regard Siricius allows condonation of the past on condition of future continence, though forbidding their promotion to any higher clerical order: but such as defend the practice are to know themselves to be degraded from their office, and forbidden ever again to officiate, "by the authority of the Apostolic See." This utterance is important as being the earliest known decisive enforcement of clerical celibacy by the Roman See. A feeling against marriage as inconsistent with the highest sanctity, and hence against the marriage of the clergy, had long been extensively prevalent. The council of Illiberis in Spain (313) had, though apparently without much practical result, ordered all the clergy "to abstain from wives and the begetting of children." The councils of Ancyra and Neocaesarea (314?) had been less exacting, the former allowing deacons to marry if they had obtained the bishop's leave before ordination, the latter ordering only the deposition of presbyters who should marry after ordination. The great synod of Nice (325), moved, it is recorded, by the protest of Paphnutius the confessor, had refrained from requiring married clergy to separate from their wives (Socrat. *H. E.* I. ii.; Sozom. i. 23, etc.). Thus what the oecumenical council had refused to require Siricius now declared to be of general obligation, in virtue of the authority of the apostolic see. It is to be observed, however, that the

rule, as laid down by him, affected only the higher clerical orders, not including subdeacons, to whom it was extended by Leo I. (c. A.D. 442. See *Epp.* xiv. 4; cxlvii. 3). Its extension to them we find afterwards required by pope Gregory the Great in Sicily, where up to his time it had not been so extended (Greg. *Epp.*, *Lib.* I. *Indict.* ix., *Ep.* 42). 5. No one who has been twice married, or has married a widow, or has been subjected to penance, is to be ordained to any clerical order; and any cleric in minor orders, who has married as aforesaid, is to be reduced to lay communion. 6. Monks, if worthy, may be ordained: but not without the probation in the successive orders of the ministry, required in all cases. All candidates, after passing through the orders of lector, acolyte, and subdeacon, must be deacons for five years before they can be ordained priests, and then priests for ten years before they can be made bishops. In the enunciation of this rule the lawfulness of marriage for all under the order of deacon is distinctly recognized: for one of the qualifications for the offices of acolyte and subdeacon is that the candidate should be "content with one wife, whom he has espoused as a virgin with the benediction of a priest." But it is added that "continence" must precede advancement to the diaconate.

The zeal of Siricius against heresy appears in the first place from his correspondence with the usurper Maximus, who in 383 had obtained the imperial authority in Gaul. To him the pope wrote, exhorting him to support the Catholic faith, and complaining of the recent ordination of one Agricius, who seems to have been suspected of heresy. Maximus, in his extant reply, declares his desire to maintain the true faith, undertakes to refer the case of Agricius to a synod of clergy, and takes credit for measures already taken against the Manicheans in Gaul, the atrocity of whose principles, as avowed by themselves at their trial, he speaks of as being such as he blushes to mention.[a] He doubtless alludes to the Priscillianists, who were often called Manicheans, and some of whom, Priscillian himself included, had been summoned to a synod at Bordeaux in 384, and been beheaded under this same Maximus, after a subsequent synod at Trèves A.D. 385. [See MAXIMUS, Emperor.] The pope's zeal against the Manicheans at Rome is intimated by the statement, that there "he found Manicheans, whom he sent into exile, and provided that they should not communicate with the faithful, since it was not lawful to vex the Lord's body with a polluted mouth" (*Lib. Pontif. in Vita Siricii*). The reference here seems to be to the alleged habit of the Manicheans to make a show of conformity by frequenting Catholic communion.[b] It is added that even converts from them were to be sent into monasteries, and not be admitted to communion till at the point of death. A law of Theodosius inflicting civil disfranchisement on Manicheans may probably have been promulgated at the instance of Siricius: "Manichaeis, sub perpetua justae infamiae nota, testandi et vivendi jure Romano omnes protinus eripimus facultatem, neque eos aut relinquendae aut capiendae alicujus haereditatis habere sinimus potestatem, etc." (*Cod. Theodos.* xvi. 1, 7). But, on the other hand, that the violent action of the emperor Maximus against the Priscillianists was disapproved by Siricius appears from canon vi. of the synod of Turin, held A.D. 401: "Those Gallican bishops who renounced communion with Felix of Trèves shall be received into the communion of the synod, in accordance with the letter of Ambrose of blessed memory, and of the Pope" (Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, § 113). This Felix of Trèves had been appointed bishop of that see by the synod held there (as aforesaid) for the condemnation of the Priscillianists. Martin of Tours, disapproving of the violent proceedings, had renounced communion with him and his supporters; and it appears from the above canon of the Turin Synod that other Gallican bishops had done the same, and that pope Siricius, with Ambrose of Milan, had approved by letter.

Another class of heretics afterwards fell under the condemnation of Siricius. Jovinian, notorious through St. Jerome's vehement writings against him, having been expelled from Milan, had come to Rome and obtained a following there. This teacher (called by Neander the Protestant of his time) was inspired by a reactionary feeling against the ascetic principles then prevalent, especially so far as they involved the view of higher sanctity, and higher reward, being attainable through counsels of perfection. He held that all the regenerate (meaning the inwardly regenerate, not merely the baptized) were alike in a state of grace, from which they could not fall; that virginity, marriage, and widowhood, were states of equal merit; that it was immaterial whether a person abstained from food or partook of it with thanksgiving; and that there would be no difference of reward hereafter. In connection with his denial of any peculiar merit in virginity, he maintained further that the mother of our Lord, though she conceived Christ as a virgin, brought Him forth in the natural way, her womb being opened at His birth (Hieron. *in Jovin.*; Ambrose, *Ep.* 7, given by Labbe, vol. ii. p. 1222; Augustin. *Haeres.* 82). His teaching at Rome came under the notice of two eminent laymen, Pammachius and Victorinus, who represented it to pope Siricius. He thereupon assembled a synod of clergy, at which Jovinian was excommunicated, together with his abettors, Auxentius, Genialis, Germinator, Felix, Frontinus, Martianus, Januarius, and Ingenius. These departed to Milan, whither Siricius also sent three presbyters with a letter addressed to the Milanese clergy, informing them of what had been done at Rome, and expressing confidence that they would pay regard to it. The letter is full of strong invective against Jovinian and his colleagues,—"dogs such as never before had barked against the Church's mysteries,"—but it contains no arguments. Siricius, on his part, disclaims any dis-

[a] See Article on MANICHEANS for a view of the principles which may have called a blush into the cheek of Maximus.

[b] See Article on GELASIUS, where there is notice of that pope's prohibition of communicating in one kind only, supposed to have reference to the practice of the Manicheans, who were in the habit of communicating with the orthodox, but, according to their principles, which forbade the use of wine, abstaining from the cup.

paragement of marriage, "at which (he says) we assist with the veil," though he "venerates with greater honour virgins devoted to God, who are the fruit of marriages." [e]

The synodical reply from Milan to this letter is preserved among the epistles of St. Ambrose (*Ep.* xlii. *edit. Benedict.*), who presided at the Milanese synod. In it he and his colleagues thank Siricius for his vigilance, concur with him in his strictures on the views of Jovinian, supply the arguments which the pope's letter had been wanting in, and finally declare that they had condemned those whom the pope condemned, according to his judgment. The introductory words of this epistle have been adduced in proof of the view then held of the pope's supreme authority. They are: "We recognize in the letter of your holiness the watchfulness of a good shepherd, diligently keeping the door committed to thee, and with pious solicitude guarding the sheepfold of Christ, worthy of being heard and followed by the sheep of the Lord." But this language, though expressing recognition of the bishop of Rome as the representative of St. Peter among the apostles, cannot be pressed as implying that he was the one doorkeeper of the whole church, or an infallible authority in definitions of faith. On the contrary the bishops at Milan proceed to endorse his judgment, not as a matter of course or as being bound to do so, but on the merits of the case, setting forth their reasons. These proceedings appear to have been in the year 390.

About the same time, or soon after, the Meletian schism at Antioch came under the notice of Siricius. Its origin and history (for fuller account of which see articles on FLAVIANUS, MELETIUS, PAULINUS, EVAGRIUS) may be briefly stated thus:—About the year 330 or 331 (the exact date is uncertain), Eustathius, the orthodox bishop of Antioch, had been deposed and banished through the intrigues of the Arian party, and another intruded into the see. The general community of Antioch, the orthodox as well as the Arian, had accepted the interloper; all except the more strictly orthodox, who remained loyal to their banished bishop, and were consequently called Eustathians. They continued apart after the death of Eustathius, refusing to acknowledge the successive Arian occupants of the see. In the year 360 it became vacant by the translation of Eudoxius to Constantinople, and then all except the Eustathians agreed in the election of Meletius, who was himself entirely orthodox. He proved more rigidly so than some of his supporters had anticipated; for after his election he excommunicated the Arians. Thereupon the emperor Constantius banished him, and placed an Arian, Euzoius, in his room. Thus the Arians of Antioch had at length their own bishop to themselves; but the Catholics were still divided. Those who had concurred in the election of Meletius adhered to him still; but the Eustathians refused to acknowledge him because of his having been elected by the mixed party which included Arians. And so the Catholics were split into two parties; that of the "Meletians" and that of the "Eustathians." During this state of things, Lucifer of Cagliari, after fruitless attempts to heal the schism, unhappily perpetuated it by ordaining Paulinus, the leader of the Eustathians, as their bishop. The church at large was divided as to the claims of the rival bishops. Pope Damasus and the Westerns generally acknowledged Paulinus; so did Athanasius, with the bishops of Egypt, as well as those of Arabia and Cyprus. The rest of the Easterns, including Basil of Caesarea, supported Meletius, whose popularity in the East is sufficiently evidenced by his appointment as president of the council of Constantinople, called the 2nd oecumenical, A.D. 381. It was evidently nothing to the Constantinopolitan Fathers that he was disowned at the time by Rome. His death in the year of the convention of the council (381), and while it was still sitting, afforded a favourable opportunity for making peace by the general acceptance of Paulinus, especially as he and Meletius were said to have agreed together, with the consent of their respective adherents, that the survivor should be the sole bishop. Gregory Nazianzen, too, who succeeded Meletius in the presidency of the council, recommended the acceptance of this arrangement. But party feeling proved too strong for his counsels to prevail; and a successor to Meletius was, with the sanction of the council, ordained in the person of Flavianus. Nor did even the death of Paulinus in 388 bring about a union, for he had, unhappily before his death, if reports be true, and without the concurrence of other bishops, ordained a successor to himself in the person of Evagrius.[d] Thus there were still two rival bishops, each of them orthodox, and each claiming to be the legitimate occupant of the see;—Flavianus representing the Meletians, and Evagrius representing the irreconcilable Eustathians.

The attitude of Siricius at this new juncture is not certainly known. He certainly may be supposed to have previously supported Paulinus and the Eustathians, as Damasus before him had done; but the case of Evagrius was different, his appointment being alleged to have been uncanonical; and there is no distinct evidence that Siricius declared himself in his favour, though it seems from a letter of St. Ambrose, to be noticed presently, that he was reckoned on as likely to support him. Theodoret, indeed,

[e] This mention of "the veil" is the third allusion that has come before us in the letters of Siricius to the religious ceremonies then held necessary for sanctifying Christian marriage. It was the yellow bridal veil, which the priest blessed. "Marriage," says St. Ambrose, "ought to be sanctified *velamine sacerdotali et benedictione*" (*Ep.* xix. *edit. Benedict.*). It appears further from one of the passages above quoted that priestly benediction accompanied the betrothal as well as the actual marriage.

[d] So distinctly says Theodoret (v. 23). Baronius discredits the statement as being contrary to those of Socrates (v. 15) and Sozomen (vii. 15), who speak only of the election of Evagrius after the death of Paulinus. But he acknowledges, on the testimony of St. Ambrose, that the appointment of Evagrius must have been in some way uncanonical. It is to be observed that Socrates and Sozomen, throughout their account of things, show a decided bias on the side of the Eustathians, whom Rome favoured, so that they would be likely to suppress anything that was not fully proved to the disadvantage of the party; and also that Socrates is inaccurate in speaking of Damasus as the contemporary pope. On the other hand, Theodoret throughout his narrative favours Flavianus

states that even after the ordination of Evagrius, the Romans ceased not to act hostilely against Flavianus. But this is not conclusive, since he says the same of the bishops of Egypt, who, according to Ambrose (*Ep.* lvi. *ad Theoph. edit. Benedict.*) stood neutral. So did Ambrose himself, speaking of each of the claimants relying more on the invalidity of his rival's ordination than the validity of his own (*ib.*).

At length, probably towards the end of the year 391, the emperor Theodosius was induced to convene a council at Capua, to which the two rivals were summoned; but there is no record of Siricius having taken any part in it, though he may have been represented by deputies, as was customary with the popes in the case of councils held elsewhere than at Rome. Ambrose, however, rather than he, appears to have taken the lead in the whole proceedings. He certainly was present at Capua, as appears from his subsequent letter (*Ep.* 9, *al.* 56, *al.* 78) to Theophilus of Alexandria, in which are the words, "quando omnes convenimus"; and he may be supposed with probability to have presided at the council, of which, and of what followed afterwards, he gives an account in the aforesaid letter to Theophilus. From this account it appears that Flavianus had refused to come, and that Evagrius, who had been present, had failed to establish his case. "Non habet quod urgeat Evagrius; et habet quod metuat Flavianus, ideoque refugit examen":—"Solus exlex Flavianus non venit, quando omnes convenimus." Under these circumstances the council contented itself with decreeing continuance of communion with the orthodox of both parties, and referring settlement of the claims of the rival bishops to Theophilus, with the bishops of Egypt as his assessors, on the ground that Egypt had been so far neutral in the dispute. Flavianus however declined submitting his case to the proposed tribunal, and again appealed to the emperor. Ambrose, being informed of this by Theophilus, expresses deep regret that, after all the labours of the clergy with a view to peace, recourse should be had once more to judgments of this world, and desires Theophilus to renew his summons to Flavianus, and adjudge the case in his absence, should he still refuse to appear. He further desires him to communicate the result to the bishop of Rome, in the hope of his confirmation of the sentence. "For (says he) we presume that you will pass such a judgment as cannot displease him." This is the intimation referred to above, which seems to shew that Siricius was known or supposed to be opposed to Flavianus, and which so far confirms what Theodoret implies. Baronius adduces this suggested seeking of the pope's confirmation as proving that no decision would have been held valid without it. But all that appears is that it was hoped that the authority of the Roman see might add such additional weight to that of Alexandria as to induce Flavianus to give up his appeal to the emperor; and now that the decision was likely to be against Flavianus, that the support of Rome might be expected. Flavianus, however, seems to have been as little disposed to submit to Rome as to any other ecclesiastical authority with regard to his claim to the see of Antioch. For it is probably to this juncture that Theodoret refers when he says that Flavianus addressed the emperor to this effect:—"Were I accused on the ground of faith or morals, I would submit to the sentence of the judges assigned me; but if they contest my right to my see, I will neither plead before them, nor oppose those who aspire to its dignity. I will myself resign it, that you may give it to whom you will." Theodoret adds that the emperor was so well pleased with the magnanimity and wisdom of Flavianus that he bade him return to his country, and feed the flock committed to him. And thus things remained, the schism at Antioch continuing till after the death of Evagrius, when St. Chrysostom, whom Flavianus himself had ordained priest, intervened as peacemaker. On the occasion of his own consecration to the see of Constantinople (A.D. 398), he induced Theophilus to be reconciled to Flavianus, and to join with him in sending an embassy to Rome to procure his recognition by Siricius. The application was successful; and thus at length Flavianus, notwithstanding his previous defiance of high ecclesiastical authorities, and his recourse to Caesar, was acknowledged by the whole church as the lawful bishop of Antioch. (Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 23; Socrat. *H. E.* v. 15; Sozom. *H. E.* vii. 15; viii. 3.)

At the council of Capua, spoken of above, opportunity was taken of bringing accusations of crime and heresy against Bonosus, bishop of Sardica, after whom was called the sect of the Bonosiani. Though he is said by Marius Mercator to have been condemned by pope Damasus, he was still in possession of his see. He was of the same school of thought with Jovinian, spoken of above, the prominent charge against him being that, with Helvidius (against whom also Jerome wrote), he denied the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord. The synod of Capua (which in this, as in the main case before it, appears to have acted, under the influence of St. Ambrose, equitably and without prejudice) committed the hearing of the charge against him to Anysius metropolitan of Thessalonica with the bishops of Macedon. There is a letter addressed to these bishops, preserved among the epistles of St. Ambrose (though the way in which his action in the matter is referred to shews that it was not his), which may have been from pope Siricius. It appears from it that the bishops had condemned the views of Bonosus, but had shrunk from passing sentence on him without the sanction of the writer of this letter, to whom they had therefore applied for his judgment. He replies that, though he agrees with them in condemning the impious views of Bonosus, he cannot act in the matter, since it was to them, and not to himself, that the synod had referred the case. Holstein (in *Collect. Roman.*) attributes this letter to Siricius, whose it most probably was, since the bishop of Rome was the most likely authority to be referred to by Anysius, who (as has been seen above) had been constituted by Siricius as his vicar in East Illyricum. If so, this is an unusual instance of forbearance in a bishop of Rome to assert the authority of his see. (Ambrose, *Epp.*—*Ep.* v. in *edit. Roman.*; appended to *Ep.* lvi. in *edit. Benedict.*)

The relations of Siricius to his great contemporary St. Jerome remain to be noticed, though there is nothing very definite to be said about

them. It was some six months after the death of Damasus, whose highly valued secretary he had been, that Jerome left Rome for ever. There was a strong feeling against him in Rome at the time, aroused by his unsparing denunciation of the vices of the clergy, and his propagation of ascetic views and practices. The recent death of the girl Blesilla, which was attributed to excessive fasting, had intensified this feeling. Scandal was also rife (to which, however, no credit is due) with respect to his spiritual intercourse with devout ladies, and especially with Paula, the mother of Blesilla, who gave some umbrage to the suspicion by joining him after his departure from Rome. In his bitterly expressed letter to Asilla, in which, after leaving the city, he inveighed against his opponents and calumniators, he makes no mention of the new pope; but it may be concluded, if only from his silence, that he had lost the countenance which he had enjoyed under Damasus. One expression in the letter suggests the idea, that he had been a little disappointed at not being made pope himself, and that coolness between him and Siricius may have arisen from this cause. For, speaking of former times, when Damasus had been his "mouthpiece," he says that by almost universal opinion he had himself been thought worthy of the episcopate. Siricius and he were indeed at one in their advocacy of virginity against Jovinian, and in their general orthodoxy; but there seems to have been no intercourse between them. And, even in the course of the controversy against Jovinian, Siricius appears to have joined others at Rome in disapproving of Jerome's alleged disparagement of matrimony: for the latter, writing to his friend Pammachius who had been attacked for supporting his position on the subject, expresses himself thus: "Audio totius in te urbis studia concitata; audio Pontificis et populi voluntatem pari mente congruere. Minus est tenere sacerdotium quam mereri." The concluding sarcasm is significant enough of Jerome's feeling towards the pontiff, though his reverence for the Roman See restrained him, in this and in other instances, from his accustomed vituperation of opponents. Further, Rufinus, the once close friend of Jerome, having quarrelled with him in Palestine on the subject of Origenism, but having been temporarily reconciled, in the year 395 left Jerusalem for Rome. Here he was favourably received by Siricius, who continued to support him, and gave him a commendatory letter on his departure, after the quarrel had broken out afresh, and with increased violence, between him and Jerome. The latter, however, on this occasion, as before, refrained from all strong language against the pope, attributing his action in the matter (here again with a tinge of sarcasm) to amiable simplicity.[*]

Siricius' neglect of Jerome and his patronage of Rufinus are grounds on which Baronius disparages this pope, going so far as to say that his days were shortened by divine judgment (Baron. *ad ann.* 397; xxxii.). A further ground of complaint (*ad ann.* 394; xl.) is his supposed unworthy treatment of another ascetic saint, Paulinus of Nola. He, when, having abandoned his wealth in order to retire from the world, he passed through Rome (A.D. 395) on his way to Nola, alleges himself to have been so badly treated by the Roman clergy that he had been obliged to leave the city in haste and proceed on his journey: and in his letter on the subject he especially blames the pope:—"Sed plenius indicare poterunt conservi nostri, pueri tui, quantum nobis gratiae Dominicae detrimentum faciat *Urbici Papae superba discretio*." (Paulin. *ad* Sulpic. Severum; *Ep.* i.; *in nov. edit.* v.) For such reasons Baronius has excluded Siricius from the Roman Martyrology. Pagi (*in Baron. ad ann.* 398, I.) defends the sainted pope against the animadversions of Baronius.

Siricius died in the year 398. ("Honorio IV. et Eutychiano coss." So Prosp. Aq. in *Chron.*, speaking of the accession of his successor Anastasius.) The day of his death or burial is given in *Martyrol. Hieron.*, and also by Bede, as Nov. 26 (vi. Kal. Decemb. Romae sanctorum Sirici et Saturnini). This is the probable date, so accepted by Pagi, the Bollandists, and Bower, though according to *Lib. Pontif.* his burial was on Feb. 19, and according to some Martyrologies on Feb. 22, (Sepultus v. Kalend. Martii." *Lib. Pontif.* "In quibusdam vero martyrologiis, a Florentinio in notis ad martyrologium sancti Hieronymi ad diem xxvi. Novemb. memoratis, ejus depositio inscribitur ad viii. Kalend. Martii." Pagi.) As was observed at the beginning of this article, the 15 years given in his epitaph and by Prosper as the duration of his episcopate may be due to its first and last years, 384 and 398, being reckoned in. It would be really 13 years 11 months and some days, if the dates above accepted as probable be correct. Thus also the statement of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who gives it as 15 years 11 months and 25 days, may be accounted for by supposing a confusion between the two modes of reckoning it.

Besides the epitaph on his tomb already referred to, Baronius cites a further inscription (referring to *Antiq. Inscr. in Appen. pag.* 1171 n. 16) commemorating his reparation of the memorials of martyrs:

"Siricius pia nunc persolvit munera sancti
Gratia quo major sit bona martyribus
Omnipotens Deus hunc conservet tempore multo
Moenia sanctorum qui nova restituit."

According to *Lib. Pontif.*, he was buried in the cemetery of Priscilla on the *Via Salaria.*

Besides the extant letters that have been mentioned above, there are two others attributed to Siricius: one addressed to all bishops about admission to Holy Orders, the other to the bishops of Africa, purporting to communicate the decrees of a synod of 80 bishops which

[*] Jerome, in his "Epistola ad Principiam, sive Marcellae viduae epitaphium," thus alludes to the countenance given at Rome to Rufinus,—"Ita ut sacerdotes quoque, et nonnullos monachorum, maximeque saeculi homines, in assensum traheret, ac simplicitati illuderet episcopi, qui de suo ingenio caeteros aestimabat." (*Ep.* xvi. *in vet. ed.*; xcvi. *in ed. Benedict.*; cxxvii. in later editions.) Elsewhere he thus refers to the commendatory letter which had been given by Siricius to Rufinus, which letter the latter appears to have appealed to when condemned by pope Anastasius, the successor of Siricius.—"Siricii jam in Domino dormientis profers epistolam, et viventis Anastasii dicta contemnis" (*Contra Rufin. lib.* iii., c. 21). Again, "Tale quid et contra Papam Anastasium disputas, ut quia Siricii episcopi habes epistolam iste contra te scribere non potuerit" (*ib.* c. 24).

had been held at Rome, which decrees are said to be enunciations of ancient apostolical constitutions.

They are to the following effect: (1) No consecration (of a bishop) shall take place without the consent of the apostolic see, i.e. the primate. (2) As has been already ordered in the fourth canon of Nicaea, no single bishop shall take upon himself to consecrate another. (3) No one may be made a cleric who, after baptism, has served in war. (4) No cleric (of the lower orders) may marry a widow. (5) No one may be made a cleric who, as a layman, has married a widow. (6) No one may ordain one belonging to another church. (7) A deposed cleric may not be admitted into another church. (8) Those who come over from the Novatians and Montenses shall be received back by imposition of hands only, because they rebaptize. (The intention of this decree, as it stands, is obscure. Hefele takes it to mean that clergy (who are all along referred to) returning to the Church from sects which rebaptize their converts are to be readmitted only as laymen so returning were, not to restitution of orders). (9) Finally we advise (or exhort, *suademus*) that priests and Levites (i.e. deacons) should not live with their wives. These nine decrees are commended to universal observance under pain of "exclusion from our communion, and subjection to the pains of Géhenna." The synodal letter containing them is found among the acts of a council said to have been held at Tela in Africa at the beginning of the 5th century (c. 418, according to Hefele), as having been adopted by the council; and it is quoted by Ferrandus of Carthage (*Breviatio Canonum Ecclesiast.*) in the same century. Its genuineness is questioned by Papebrocius (*in Propylaeo Maii*, 60), by Quesnel (*Dissertatio* 5 in S. Leon.), by Blondel (*Censura in decretal. Epist.*), and Bower (*History of the Popes*). Pagi (*ad* Baron.) defends it against the objections of Papebrocius; Hefele also (*Conciliengeschichte*) accepts it as sufficiently authenticated, and open to no well-grounded suspicion. One ground of suspicion is that the council itself, the acts of which are our authority for the letter, cannot have been held, as alleged, at Tela, which was a town in Proconsular Africa, whereas all the bishops said to have attended were of another province, that of Byzacena. But this objection may be met by supposing Telense to have been erroneously written for Teleptense, which reading is actually found in some codices,—Telepte being the metropolis of the Byzacene province. Then, the mild word *suademus* in decree (9) has been thought inconsistent with the peremptory requirement of Siricius on the same subject in his decretal. But the word may be used in the sense of exhorting to observe a previous injunction which there had been a difficulty in enforcing generally. It obviously in itself affords no valid ground for rejecting the document, if otherwise trustworthy. It is to be observed that in the subsequent letters of Innocent I. to Victricius of Rouen and Exuperius of Toulouse (see art. on INNOCENTIUS), in which the injunction is repeated (with definite allusion in the latter letter to the decretal of Siricius), arguments are added in support of it, as if there was still a difficulty in getting it observed. Then decree (1), requiring the consent of the apostolic See to *all* consecrations, is not beyond what a Roman synod might have enjoined, the appended "i.e. the primate" being considered. Hefele suggests that the latter expression may have been added when the decrees, passed in the first place for the regions under the more immediate jurisdiction of Rome, were sent to Africa, where the title primate was in use. In the corresponding injunction by Innocent I. to Victricius (*Ep. ad* Victricium) the word used is "metropolitan," to suit the case of Gaul. Lastly, the fact that pope Innocent I. (*Ep. ad Victricium*) uses the same language as is found in this synodal letter is no good argument against its genuineness: for it may only be an instance of a pope adopting and repeating the synodical utterance of one of his predecessors. Indeed Innocent expressly says that the rules he sends are no new ones, but of old standing.

In the *Lib. Pontif.* Siricius is said to have ordered "ut nullus presbyter missas celebraret per omnem hebdomadam nisi consecratum episcopi loci designati susciperet declaratum quod nominatur *fermentum*." For a similar statement about Miltiades see art. on that pope; and for the meaning of *fermentum* and the custom alluded to, see art. on INNOCENT I. (note on his ep. to Decentius). [J. B—Y.]

SIRMIUM, STONEMASONS OF. The history of the martyrdom of the five stonemasons of Sirmium has of late occupied much attention. Their names were Symphorianus (*al.* Symphronianus, Simpronianus), Simplicius, Nicostratus, Claudius and Castorius; their memory is celebrated in the martyrologies on Nov. 8. Their acts have been known for centuries, being found in substance in Ado's martyrology, but it is only of late that their relation to the history of the Diocletian period has been recognised. Their story is briefly thus. They were stonemasons belonging to Pannonia; four of them were Christians, one of them alone, Simplicius, was a pagan. They were engaged in the imperial quarries, and distinguished themselves by their genius and ability, which surpassed all others. They even attracted the notice of Diocletian himself by the beauty of their carving. Simplicius was converted by his four companions, and baptized secretly by a bishop, Cyril of Antioch, who had been three years a slave in the quarries and had suffered many stripes for the faith. The pagans were jealous of the skill of the Christians, and accused them before Diocletian, who, however, continued to protect them. At last the emperor ordered them to make a variety of figures and statues, and among others, a statue of Aesculapius. The masons made all the others, but refused to carve an image of Aesculapius. The pagans took advantage of this refusal and procured an order for their execution. They were enclosed in lead coffins and flung into the Save. Their acts then proceed to narrate the martyrdom of the saints called the Quatuor Coronati, whose liturgical history has been told at length in the *Dictionary of Christ. Antiq.* t. i. p. 461. Diocletian came to Rome with his ardour for the worship of Aesculapius intensified by the refusal of his favourite masons to carve an image for him. He ordered all the troops to sacrifice to

Aesculapius, when four soldiers, Carpophorus, Severus, Severianus and Victorinus, refused to comply. They were flogged to death, and their bodies buried by pope Melchiades and St. Sebastian on the Via Lavicana at the third milestone from the city. These acts are very valuable as illustrations of the great persecution; yet they are full of difficulties which have exercised the ingenuity of many modern critics. The principal difficulty is this. The martyrdom of the masons evidently took place during the great persecution, and after the retirement of Diocletian into private life. Thus Cyril, the bishop of Antioch, to whose existence Eusebius testifies (*H. E.* vii. 32) was three years a prisoner at the mines when one of the masons was baptized. This would fix the date of their martyrdom and of the whole transaction about 306 at earliest. Now Diocletian never visited Rome as emperor after that date. His last visit to Rome was in December, 303. How then could the martyrdom of the Quatuor Coronati have followed on that of the stonemasons at Sirmium? But there is no necessary connexion between the two. The story of the masons is complete in itself. The story of the Quatuor Coronati was simply a later addition. In Ado's *Martyrol.* the death of the Quatuor Coronati is placed two years subsequent to that of the Sirmium martyrs. The whole story will be found translated in Mason's *Diocletian Persecution*, p. 259. Attention was first called to the Acts, as illustrating the Diocletian period, by Wattenbach in the *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad.* Bd. x. (1853) S. 118–126. They have been since discussed in Büdinger, *Untersuch. zur röm. Kaisergesch.* ii. 262, iii. 321–338, with elaborate archaeological and chronological commentaries, cf. also Petschenig's critical edition of the text in the *Sitzungsber. Wien. Akad.* t. xcvii. p. 761; Duncker's discussion of the Chronology in *Rhenischen Museum* for 1876, p. 440; De Rossi's *Bullet. Arch. Crist.* for 1879; Brieger's *Zeitsch. für Kirchengesch.* 1881–1882, p. 466. The organisation of the imperial quarries has been discussed by Borghesi and Henzen, *Annali*, 1843, p. 333; De Rossi, *Bullet.* 1868; Hirschfeld, *Untersuch.* p. 78; cf. *Rev. Archéol.* 1882, p. 294, for an abundant list of authorities on this topic. [G. T. S.]

SISEBERT, bishop of Toledo, succeeded JULIANUS, who died in March A.D. 690, and is perhaps the same person as Sisebert who signs as abbat the decrees of the 13th, 14th, and 15th councils of Toledo in A.D. 683, 684, 688. He was detected in a plot to deprive king EGICA not only of his crown but his life, and also to murder certain other persons, probably members of the royal family (one of them Liuvagotho was probably the queen of ERVIG and mother of Cixilo the queen of Egica), and was deposed at the opening of the 16th council of Toledo, in May A.D. 693, FELIX (152) being translated from Seville in his stead [EGICA (2)]. His deposition was confirmed by the ninth canon of the council, by which he was also excommunicated, and he was sentenced to banishment for life, and all his property was forfeited. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 576, 681; *Esp. Sag.* v. 297; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (2) 221). [F. D.]

SISEBUT, king of Spain, succeeded GUNDEMAR in the autumn of A.D. 612. He put down a revolt among the Asturians and the Ruccones, and also conquered part of the Basques, who had been tributary to the Franks. But his greatest successes were against the Byzantines. Their possessions in Spain consisted of two distinct portions—a small piece in what is now Algarve, including Ossonoba, and a much larger strip along the coast, from near Cadiz to Cartagena, of varying extent inland. He conquered the whole, or nearly the whole, of the larger territory, including Malaga and Asidonia, the bishops of which appear for the first time at a Gothic council at that of Seville in A.D. 618. From the obscure correspondence of Sisebut with the patrician Caesarius, probably the Byzantine governor, a peace seems to have been made, probably about A.D. 616. These successes were mostly obtained by Sisebut's generals Rechila and SUINTHILA, afterwards king, but he won two victories over the Byzantines in person. It appears also that he employed a fleet to reduce the maritime cities.

ISIDORUS (12) wrote at his request and dedicated to him his *De Natura Rerum*, in which, and in the *de Reg. Goth.* he praises him for his ability, his eloquence, his learning, and his clemency. As an instance of the last, he states that Sisebut ransomed at his own expense many of the prisoners who formed the booty of his victorious army. Besides the correspondence already alluded to, there exist four other letters of Sisebut, the first to Caecilius bishop of Mentesa, rebuking him for retiring to a monastery and neglecting his duties, the second to EUSEBIUS (85), q. v., the third to one Theudila who had become a monk, and the fourth to queen THEODELINDA and her son Adaloald is a polemic against Arianism. Sisebut also wrote the Life of DESIDERIUS (9) of Vienne, the victim of Brunichilde and Theodoric. These writings breathe the fiery zeal which early in his reign showed itself by his converting by force great numbers of the Jews (Isidorus, *Chron.* and *de Reg. Goth.*). A remarkable fact is the disapproval expressed of this policy by Isidore, the most influential churchman of the time. (*Ubi supra*, and fourth council of Toledo, canon 57.) Many Jews took refuge in Gaul, but many more outwardly became Christians, while remaining Jews at heart. The legislation against these "new Christians," again and again renewed whenever the clergy obtained the preponderating power in the State, is a dark stain on the history of Gothic Spain, and the discontent of so large and powerful a class was one of the main causes of the success of the Mahometan invaders a century later. Two laws of Sisebut renewed Reccared's prohibition of the purchase of Christian slaves by Jews. Those who had subsequently come into their possession by legitimate means (e. g. by inheritance) were to be sold or manumitted before a date named in the law. (*Liber Judicum*, xii. (2), 13 and 14).

Sisebut died early in A.D. 621. The cause of his death was unknown, some attributing it to illness, others to an overdose, and others to poison. He was succeeded by his young son Reccared II., who died shortly afterwards. (Isidorus, *de Reg. Goth.* and *Chron.*; Fredegar. *Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 624; Sisebut's letters

in *Esp. Sag.* vii. 309; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii., (2) 77; Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen*, v. 177. An inscription containing his name in Hübner, *Insc. Hisp. Chr.* 171; coins in Heiss, 103.) [F. D.]

SISENAND, king of Spain, A.D. 631–636, obtaining the crown by a successful rebellion against SUINTHILA, q.v. Hardly anything is known of his short reign, except that it represented a reaction of ecclesiastics and magnates against the independent attitude of his predecessor. The *Chronicon Albeldense* in *Esp. Sag.* xiii. 448, sums up his reign and character with the words "patiens fuit et regulis Catholicis orthodoxus extitit." The only important event of his reign was the fourth council of Toledo in A.D. 633, for an account of which see ISIDORUS (12) of Seville, Vol. III. 306. Seventy-five canons were passed at it, a summary of which is given in *Dict. Chr. Antiq.* ii. 1968. It should be added that by canon fifty-seven, while the synod expressed its disapproval of forcible conversions of Jews for the future, it declared that those who had been forcibly converted by king Sisebut must remain Christians, and proceeded to legislate with great severity against those who secretly practised the rites of their former religion. Their children were torn from them and brought up in monasteries or in the houses of Christians, and intercourse with those of their race who had remained Jews was forbidden. The converts who violated the last canon were to be given as slaves to Christians, while the Jews who did so were to be publicly flogged. Backsliding converts were also declared incapable of giving evidence. Jews were likewise forbidden to intermarry with Christians, were disqualified for office, and the prohibition of their holding slaves was repeated. Clergy and laity alike were forbidden from screening Jews against these enactments (canons 58–66). Grätz (*Die Westg. Gesetzgebung in Betreff der Juden*, 33) further identifies Sisenand with the author of the four laws in the *Liber Judicum* (xii. (2), 5–8) forbidding (converted) Jews to observe the passover, to marry any relation within the seventh degree or with Jewish rites, to practise circumcision, or to distinguish between clean and unclean meats. The *Acta* of the fourth council of Toledo in Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 261; Fredegarius, *Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 651; Isidorus Pacensis; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (2), 81, 90; Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen* v. 187.) [F. D.]

SISINNIUS: *vid.* also SYS-.

SISINNIUS (1), one of the twelve disciples of Manes, and his immediate successor as leader of the Manichean sect. According to the *Acta Archelai*, he embraced the Catholic faith after the disputation at Caschar. All other authorities, however, are agreed that he retained his Manichean views, and became the successor of Manes. Flügel's *Mani*, p. 316, cf. pp. 14, 27, 29, 42, 97. Sisinnius wrote several epistles expository of Manichean doctrines, which Flügel describes pp. 103, 374, 375, see also Petr. Sic., *Hist. Manich.* p. 30; Toll. *Insig.* p. 144. Beausobre, *Hist. du Manich.* i. 17. [MANES, Vol. III. p. 793.] [G. T. S.]

SISINNIUS (2), a martyr at Antinoe in the Diocletian persecution, with Coluthus a priest and physician, and a great number of others whose names are given in the Acts of SS. Apater and Irai in Hyvernat's Coptic *Actes des Martyrs de l'Egypte*. Rome, 1886. [G. T. S.]

SISINNIUS (3), May 29, the apostle of the Tyrol and mart., with Alexander and Martyricus, at Anaunia, near Trent. Sisinnius was a Greek, from Cappadocia, and was ordained deacon by Vigilius, bishop of Trent. He was sent by him as a missionary to the neighbouring pagans, who were as yet devoted to the worship of Saturn. They were murdered by a pagan mob, at a festival celebrated by them in honour of that god at the end of May, A.D. 379. The details of the acts are interesting, as showing how tenaciously the rural population held to paganism. Ruinart in *Acta Sincera* gives two epistles written by Vigilius, the one to Simplicianus of Milan, the other to St. Chrysostom, narrating their sufferings. (Ceill. vi. 267.) [G. T. S.]

SISINNIUS (4), a correspondent of St. Ambrose (*Ep.* lxxxiii.). [J. Ll. D.]

SISINNIUS (5) (SYSINNIUS), a deacon who in 398 or 399 visited Jerome at Bethlehem after passing through the islands of the Adriatic. In one of these he found among the works of Augustine a letter to Jerome, but without Augustine's name. Of this he brought a copy to Jerome, whom it had not previously reached. (Jerome, *Ep.* 102, 105; Aug. *Ep.* 68, 72; *Art.* HIERONYMUS, Vol. III. p. 44, section on *Augustine*.) [W. H. F.]

SISINNIUS (6), a monk of Aquitaine, sent on a mission to Palestine and Egypt in the year 406. He had presents for the monks of Nitria, but his chief business was with Jerome at Bethlehem. To him he brought (1) The books of Vigilantius sent by Desiderius and Riparius to be answered by Jerome; (2) Letters from the monks Minervius and Alexander, asking for an explanation of St. Paul's words: "We shall all sleep but we shall not all be changed;" (3) Many similar questions from Christians of both sexes in Aquitaine; (4) Presents from Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse. He arrived in the autumn of 406, and Jerome, expecting him to remain till over the Epiphany, put off writing his answers in the most important points. But suddenly tidings arrived that the monks of Nitria were in great distress, the Nile not having risen. Sisinnius thought it his duty to depart, and Jerome had to finish his work as quickly as possible. The commentary on Zachariah, which he had promised to Exuperius, was finished in haste; the reply to Minervius and Alexander had to be written rapidly, without any attention to style, and the treatise against Vigilantius was the work of a single night before the departure of Sisinnius. (Desiderius, Riparius, Vigilantius, Exuperius. Jerome *Ep.* 109, 119; Jer. *adv. Vigilantium*, 17; Jer. *Prefaces* to Bks. i. ii. viii. of *Comm. to Zach.*) [W. H. F.]

SISINNIUS (7), a bishop of the Novatians at Constantinople, a contemporary of Chrysostom. He received his education from the philosopher Maximus, having the future emperor Julian as his fellow pupil. He was reader of the church under Agelius, who named him as

his successor. This choice not being agreeable to the Novatian laity who desired Marcian, Agelius yielded to them, with the proviso that Sisinnius should be Marcian's successor, which was carried into effect on Marcian's death in November, A.D. 395 (Socr. *H. E.* v. 21, vi. 1; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 1). On Theodosius summoning a meeting of the bishops of all parties in the church, A.D. 383, in the hope of securing unanimity by mutual discussion of the points of difference, Sisinnius, while still a reader, being consulted by his bishop, Agelius, to whom the orthodox bishop of Constantinople, Nectarius, had had recourse in the perplexity caused by the intimation of the emperor's intention, was the author of the advice that an appeal should be made on the disputed points to the testimonies of the ancient fathers recognised by all, and that each of the dissentients should be judged by the agreement of his doctrines with those there found (Socr. *H. E.* v. 10; Soz. *H. E.* vii. 12). At a later period he warmly controverted Chrysostom's impassioned language as to the efficacy of repentance and the restoration of penitents to the communion of the church, against which he published a treatise (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 21). Chrysostom taking umbrage at this, and at his claim to exercise episcopal functions in Constantinople, threatened to stop his preaching; on which Sisinnius jocosely told him he would be much obliged to him for sparing him so much trouble, and thus disarmed his anger (*ibid.* 22). Sisinnius enjoyed a great reputation for witty repartees, several of which are collected by Socrates (*l. c.*), but they do not give a very high idea of his powers. He is described as having been man of great eloquence, enhanced by the dignity of his countenance and person, the gracefulness of his action, and the tones of his voice. He had a considerable reputation for learning, being very familiar with philosophical writings, as well as with expositions of the Scriptures, and was well skilled in dialectics. His power for argument was such that the heretical writer Eunomius, himself famous for his dialectic skill, shrank from entering the lists with him (Socr. *u. s.*). He is stated to have been a copious author, but he was more successful as a speaker than as a writer. Socrates, who had a high opinion of him, criticises his composition as being too flowery and poetical. In addition to the treatise against Chrysostom, *de Poenitentia*, he, together with Theodotus of Antioch, composed a synodic letter against the Thessalians, in the name of the Novatian bishops who had assembled at Constantinople for his consecration, addressed to Berinianus, Amphilochius, and other bishops of Pamphylia (Photius, *Cod.* lii. col. 40; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 290). Though a bishop of a schismatic body, he was treated with much esteem and regard by the orthodox bishops, especially by Atticus, and was the honoured friend of the leading members of the aristocracy of Constantinople. He was as far as possible from an ascetic, keeping a sumptuous table, though not exceeding the bounds of moderation himself, dressing always in white, and visiting the bath twice a day. To one who asked why, as a bishop, he did so, he replied, "Because I have not time to bathe thrice" (Socr.; Soz. *u. s.*). He is recorded to have seen a vision declaring the eminent virtue of Eutropius, the young deacon tortured to death in Chrysostom's cause (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 24). Sisinnius died the same year as Chrysostom, A.D. 407, and was succeeded by Chrysanthus (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 6; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 290).

[E. V.]

SISINNIUS (8), patriarch of Constantinople. On the death of Atticus there was much dispute as to his successor, one party favouring the priest Philippus, another the priest Proclus, while all the laity were strongly in favour of Sisinnius, a priest of the suburb of Elaea, and who was beloved for his charity and uprightness. He was consecrated on February 28, A.D. 426, and died on the 24th of December in the following year. The only recorded act of his short episcopate was the consecration of Proclus as bishop of Cyzicus, whom the Cyzicenes refused to receive, alleging that the privilege of nominating their bishops had been granted only to Atticus personally and not to the patriarchs in general. Sisinnius was bitterly attacked by his disappointed rival Philippus in his *Historia Christiana.* (Socrates, vii. 26–28; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 215.) [F. D.]

SISINNIUS (9), bishop of Rome, elected after a vacancy of about three months, as successor to John VII., who died 17 Oct. A.D. 707. Being at the time of his appointment so afflicted with gout as to be unable to feed himself, he died after holding the see for only twenty days, and was buried in St. Peter's on the 7th of February, A.D. 708. Anastasius says of him that, notwithstanding his bodily infirmities, he was firm in character, that he had a care for the inhabitants of Rome, and had ordered the preparation of lime for restoring the walls of the city before his sudden death. The ordination of one bishop for the island of Corsica is his only recorded act. (Anastas., in *Lib. Pontif.*)

[J. B—Y.]

SISOË, solitary of Egypt. There were two of this name; one of Petra, the other from the Thebaid. One of them lived on Sinai from A.D. 356–428. Cotelerius bestows much space on abbat Sisoe in his *Monumenta*, t. i. 662–678. (Cf. Till. *Mém.* xii. 453–463.) [G. T. S.]

SIXTUS (1), first bishop of Rheims and Soissons, is said in the *Acta* of St. Sixtus and St. Sinicius, to have been consecrated and sent from Rome in the time of Diocletian to teach the Gospel to the Suessiones and Remi, c. A.D. 287 (Boll. *A. SS.* Sept. i. 118 sq.). Flodoardus (*Hist. Eccl. Rem.* i. c. 3; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxxxv. 32, 105) says he was an envoy of St. Peter the Apostle, but he probably belongs to the close of the third century (*Gall. Christ.* ix. 334; Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 205, and note 31, ed. 1732). [J. G.]

SIXTUS (2) I., so called in the Liberian Catalogue, by Optatus (l. 2), by Augustine (*Ep.* liii.); but Xystus, Xistus, or Xestus, in *Catal. Felic.*, Irenaeus (*adv. Haer.* iii. 3), Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 4, 5, and *Chron.*), Epiphanius (*Haer.* 97, 6)—one of the early bishops of Rome, called the 6th after the apostles, and the successor of Alexander. As is the case with the other bishops of this early period, his exact date cannot be fixed with certainty, the ancient lists differing in their chronology. All, however, assign him an episcopate of about ten years, more or less, and

place him in the reign of Hadrian. According to *Catal. Liber.* he was bishop from A.D. 117 to A.D. 126; according to Eusebius (*H. E.*) from A.D. 119 to A.D. 128; according to his *Chronicle* from A.D. 114 to A.D. 124. Lipsius (*Chronol. der röm. Bischof.*) gives A.D. 124 and A.D. 126 as the earliest and latest dates assignable for his death. The Felician Catalogue and the Martyrologies represent him as a martyr, and he is commemorated among the apostles and martyrs, after Linus, Cletus, Clemens, in the canon of the mass. But Telesphorus being the first bishop of Rome designated a martyr by Irenaeus, the claim to the title of Sixtus and other early bishops of Rome, to the great majority of whom it has been since assigned, is doubtful. He is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology as a saint and martyr under Antoninus Pius (*acc.* 138) on the 6th of April.[a] Two undoubtedly spurious epistles, referring principally to the doctrine of the Trinity, to the accusation of bishops, and to the supremacy of the apostolic see, have been assigned to this pope. On the Proverbs ascribed to this pope see XYSTUS. [J. B—Y.]

SIXTUS II., pope. [XYSTUS.]

SIXTUS (3), III., bishop of Rome after Coelestinus, from A.D. 432 to A.D. 441, and the immediate predecessor of Leo the great. Two notable heresies were afloat in his day,—Pelagianism and Nestorianism. The former, repudiated from the first at Carthage, had at last, after hesitation if not approval of it, been condemned at Rome also by pope Zosimus A.D. 418. The latter had been condemned by the council of Ephesus, with the concurrence of pope Caelestine A.D. 431. Sixtus, before his accession to the popedom, had taken part in both controversies. It appears from letters addressed to him by St. Augustine, when he was still a Roman presbyter under Zosimus, that the Pelagians had claimed him as being, with the pope, on their side; but that, when the pope was at length induced to condemn the heresy, he also had written to the African church expressing his concurrence with a vigour of language that fully satisfied St. Augustine. "Deinde cum litteris Apostolicae sedis de illorum damnatione ad Africam missis tuae quoque litterae ad venerabilem senem Aurelium consecutae sunt, quae tametsi breves erant, tuum tamen vigorem adversus eorum errorem satis indicabant." Augustine further rejoices to have heard how Sixtus had been foremost in anathematising Pelagianism in a large assembly at Rome: "primo te priorem anathema eis in populo frequentissimo pronunciasse eadem fama non tacuit." (Augustin. *Epp.* 191, *al.* 104, and 194, *al.* 105). It appears also as if Sixtus had, before his accession, intervened in the Nestorian conflict; for, in his letter to John of Antioch (*Ep.* ii.), he speaks of having himself once admonished Nestorius; and this must have been before the final condemnation of Nestorius, and hence before the accession of Sixtus:—"Credo ad dilectionem tuam rerum cursus et ordo pervenerit, qualiter ei voluimus nostra admonitione succurrere: retinuimus in praeceps euntem, qui erat blasphemiarum pondere in profunda mergendus." To such action of Sixtus Gennadius probably alludes, when he says (c. 54); "Similiter etiam Sixtus, successor Caelestini, pro eadem re et ad ipsum Nestorium et ad Orientis episcopos adversus errorem ejus succidendum sententias direxit." It appears from the above instances that Sixtus had been a man of mark and influence at Rome before he became pope.

Notwithstanding his early opposition, thus evinced, to the heresy of the Nestorians, it seems that by them, as well as by the Pelagians, Sixtus was claimed as once having favoured them; and he was reported to have taken in ill part the condemnation of Nestorius. This imputation was made to rest on a letter that had been circulated as written by one Philip, a Roman presbyter, referred to in an epistle from Cyril of Alexandria to Acacius of Mytilene (*Cyr. Ep.* 29; *et in Act. Concil. Ephes.*). But Cyril in his letter declares the imputation to have been entirely groundless. It, as well as the other with respect to Pelagianism, may have arisen from his having evinced a conciliatory spirit, and a reluctance to condemn too hastily. Such a spirit, rejoicing in concord, appears in the letters written by him as pope, with respect to the differences that continued after the condemnation of Nestorius, while at the same time he then fully endorsed the condemnation, and spoke strongly against the heresiarch, whom he had once in vain endeavoured to reclaim. The differences that arose were between Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch. The latter, before the council of Ephesus, though not holding with Nestorius, had objected to the 12 *capitula* which Cyril had issued against him. He and his suffragans having been unavoidably delayed on their journey to Ephesus, Cyril had refused to wait for them, and in their absence condemned Nestorius. John, with his followers, on their arrival at Ephesus, had held a separate council, and the result in the end was that the members of the two assemblies stood mutually excommunicated. The emperor Theodosius intervened to bring about a reconciliation, calling on John to anathematize Nestorius, and on Cyril to withdraw his *capitula*. John complied, Cyril refused; but at length, friendly advances having been made by John, the two patriarchs came to terms and were reconciled.

There are two extant epistles of Sixtus III., written on this happy occasion to Cyril and to John, expressing his great joy; from one of which it further appears that he had written often to Maximian, the successor of Nestorius at Constantinople, on the subject previously. When he thus wrote to the reconciled partriarchs, a synod had been held at Rome on the occasion of his birthday, at which the joyful news of the reconciliation had been made known, and he was expecting the speedy arrival of a deputation of clergy from John of Antioch. These two letters are given by Baronius (A.D. 433, xii. and xvii.); from a Vatican MS., which he speaks of as corrupt but trustworthy. See also Labbe, *Concil. Eph.* vol. iii. pp. 1689, 1699. The letter to John is quoted by Vincentius Lerinensis (*adv. Haer.*).

Two previous letters also of Sixtus, conceived in a similar spirit, are given by Cotelerius from

[a] There is an evident error here, in itself raising suspicion of his martyrdom at all, since, according to all early accounts of him, his death was at least ten years before the accession of Antoninus.

MSS. in the *Biblioth. Reg.* (Coteler. *Monum. Graec. Eccles.*, vol. i. p. 42). One was to Cyril; the other was apparently an encyclic to him and the Easterns generally, sent by two bishops from the East, Hermogenes and Lampetius, who had been present at the pope's ordination. Their immediate purpose was to announce, as was usual, his accession to his see, and to declare his communion with the Eastern Churches. But in both, while he fully concurs in the condemnation of Nestorius by the council of Ephesus, he refers with regret to the dissent of John of Antioch and his adherents, whose reception into communion he desires and recommends, if they should come to a better mind, as he hopes they will do. "Sicut enim persistentes prioribus non potuerant in nostra esse communione, sic volumus eos propter unitatem et pacem ecclesiarum satisfacientes ut diximus suscipi."

Sixtus was no less vigilant than preceding popes in maintaining the jurisdiction of the Roman see over Illyricum, and that of the bishop of Thessalonica as the pope's vicar over the rest of the bishops there. Four letters of his on this subject were read in the Roman council held with reference to it under Boniface II., A.D. 531. (See Labbe, vol. v., *Concil. Rom. III. sub Bonifac. II.*) Two of these letters were written in 435, the other in 537. In the last, which is addressed to all the bishops of Illyricum, he enjoins them to submit themselves to Anastasius of Thessalonica, as being constituted, as his predecessor had been, vicar of the apostolic see, with authority to summon synods and adjudicate on all cases, except such as it might be necessary to refer to Rome. He bids them further pay no regard to the decrees of "the oriental synod," except those on faith, which had his own approval: "Nec his vos, fratres carissimi, constitutis quae praeter nostra praecepta orientalis synodus decernere voluit credatis teneri; praeter id quidem quod de fide nobis consentientibus judicavit." He probably refers to the council of Constantinople, which in its third canon had given a primacy of honour after old Rome to Constantinople. On the strength of this canon the patriarchs of Constantinople had already assumed jurisdiction over the Thracian dioceses, though it was not till the council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451; can. xxviii.), that the express power of ordaining metropolitans in Illyricum was formally given to them in spite of the protest of pope Leo's legates.

It has been seen above that Sixtus, while still a presbyter, had, eventually at least, concurred decidedly in the condemnation of Pelagianism. Towards the end of his life he showed that he was in the same mind with regard to it. For we are told by Prosper (*chron.*), that in the year 439 Julianus, the eminent Pelagian, who had been deposed from the see of Oeulanum in Campania, essayed, by profession of penitence, to creep again into the communion of the Church, but that Sixtus, under the advice of his deacon Leo, "allowed no opening to his pestiferous attempts." The Leo here spoken of was the successor of Sixtus in the see of Rome, Leo the Great, who thus appears to have been his archdeacon and adviser. It is observable that an acolyte Leo, who may have been the same person, is mentioned in the epistles of St. Augustine above referred to as the bearer of the letter written by Sixtus, while he was still a presbyter, to Aurelius of Carthage.

It is stated in the *Liber Pontificalis* that in the second year of his episcopate, Sixtus was accused of crime by one Bassus;—that the emperor Valentinian ordered a council to be assembled, at which the pope was declared innocent by 56 bishops, and Bassus excommunicated,—but with the allowance to him of the viaticum at the hour of death;—that Valentinian, with his mother Placidia, thereupon proscribed Bassus, and confiscated his property;—and that Sixtus, on the death of Bassus within three months, honourably interred him in his family burial place at St. Peter's. Acts of the council supposed to have been held at Rome on this occasion are extant, but are undoubtedly spurious. So also is a letter attributed to Sixtus (*Ep.* iii. *ap.* Labbe), purporting to be addressed to the eastern bishops, giving them an account of what had taken place. According to the Acts the crime alleged against him was the violation of a consecrated virgin; and it is therein represented that the emperor before the assembled council, acknowledging the principle that the pope could be judged by no one, called on him to pronounce judgment in his own case. Spurious also, and of no historical value, are the Acts of a council said to have been held at Rome under Sixtus for the purgation of an accused bishop of Jerusalem, Polychronius.

Three works issued under the name of Sixtus (*De Divitiis*, *De Malis Doctoribus &c.*, and *De Castitate*), appear to have been of Pelagian origin (see Baron. *ad ann.* 440, vi.). The party may have put them out in his name on the strength of the old report of his having once favoured it.

Sixtus died A.D. 440, and was buried (according to Anastasius, *Lib. Pontif.*), "ad S. Laurentium via Tiburtini." The day of his death is variously estimated and uncertain. He is commemorated as a confessor on 28 March:—"Romae S. Sixti tertii, papae et confessoris." (*Martyrol. Roman.*) Why he should be called a confessor is not obvious from anything recorded of him. The title may be supposed to rest on the spurious letter to the bishops of the East above mentioned, wherein he is made to complain of persecution.

In the *Lib. Pontif.* extraordinary activity in building, endowing, and decorating churches is attributed to Sixtus, and to the emperor Valentinian under his instigation. He is said to have built the Basilica of St. Maria Maggiore on the Esquiline (called *Ad Praesepe*),[a] and of

[a] Probably Sixtus only rebuilt the church of St. Mary, which had stood on the Esquiline before his time. Its original erection is elsewhere attributed to pope Liberius (*acc.* 352), and in the notice of its construction by Sixtus in the *Lib. Pontif.* the expression is used, "quae ab antiquis Liberii cognominabatur." The legend of St. Liberius in the Breviaries contains the following account:—John, a Roman patrician, being childless, desired to give his wealth to the blessed Virgin: he and his wife, having prayed for guidance, were admonished in a dream to build a church on a spot which they would find covered with snow: in the morning, though it was in the heat of August, they found a part of the Esquiline so covered: Liberius had experienced in the same night a similar dream: consequently a church was built by the patrician, under the pope's auspices, where the snow had fallen, and was called the church of "St. Maria ad Nives."

St. Laurence, and to have furnished both with great store of precious implements and ornamentations. Pope Hadrian, in one of his epistles to Charlemagne, written in support of image-worship (*Ep.* 3, c. 19), alludes to the former, saying, "Magis autem successor Caelestini Sixtus Papa fecit Basilicam S. Dei Genetricis Mariae, cognomento Majorem, quae et ad Praesepe dicitur: simili modo et ipse in metallis aureis quamquam in diversis historiis, sacris decoravit imaginibus." Baronius gives from an ancient record (*Antiq. inscript. in Append. pag.* 1170, *num.* 7), the following inscription, formerly existing in the church, but in his time perished;—

"Virgo Maria tibi Xystus nova tecta dicavit
Digna salutifero munera ventre tuo.
Tu genetrix ignara viri, te denique foeta,
Visceribus salvis edita nostra salus.
Ecce tui testes uteri sibi praemia portant,
Sub pedibusque jacent passio cuique sua,
Ferrum flamma ferae fluvius saevumque venenum:
Tot tamen has mortes una corona manet."

A structure of gold having twelve doors, with images of the Saviour and of the twelve apostles, adorned with gems, said in the *Lib. Pontif.* to have been placed by Valentinian at the request of Sixtus over the shrine of St. Peter in the Vatican, is also alluded to in the same letter of pope Hadrian. Among other decorative works of Sixtus is mentioned a structure over the font of the Lateran, consisting of porphyry columns with marble chapters, on which he inscribed verses. The verses, interesting as expressing the teaching of Sixtus on the efficacy of baptism, are thus given by Baronius,

"Gens sacranda prolis hic semine nascitur almo,
Quam faecundatis Spiritus edit aquis.
Virgineo foetu genetrix Ecclesia natos,
Quos spirante Deo concipit, amne parit.
Coelorum regnum sperate hoc fonte renati:
Non recipit felix vita semel genitos.
Fons hic est vitae, et qui totum diluit orbem,
Sumens de Christi vulnere principium.
Mergere peccator, sacro purgande fluento:
Quem veterem accipiet proferet unda novum.
Insons esse volens isto mundare lavacro,
Seu patrio premeris crimine seu proprio.
Nulla renascentum est distantia, quos facit unum
Unus fons, unus Spiritus, una fides.
Nec numerus quemquam scelerum nec forma suorum
Terreat: hoc natus flumine sanctus eris."

The columns, &c., are said in the *Lib. Pontif.* to have been collected by Constantine the Great, to whom the original building of the Lateran Baptistery is attributed, but left unused by him. Two porphyry columns at the entrance, and eight forming a colonnade round the interior, still adorn the Baptistery, as they were placed there by Sixtus. The verses appear to have been renovated at some later date. "Schon Sixtus III. liess diese Säulen errichten. Aussen auf ihren antiken in spätrömischer Weise profilirten Gebälk stehen 8 auch schon von Sixtus III. angebrachte, die Wirkung des Sakraments dichterisch preisende, Distichen (jetzt in neuer Schrift)." [*Rom und Mittel-Italien, von* Dr. Th. Csell-Fels. Hildburghausen 1871, p. 296.]

Sixtus is further said in the *Lib. Pontif.* to have placed a column (*platoniam*) in the cemetery of S. Callistus, inscribed with the names of bishops and martyrs buried there. [J. B—Y.]

SIXTUS (4), martyr, whose relics were sent by Gregory the Great to St. Augustine at his request (*Epp.* xi. 64). There is nothing to show whether he was one of the popes of that name, or a third person. [F. D.]

SMARAGDUS (1), exarch of Ravenna, c. 584–588 and again c. 602–610. The exact date of his appointment is unknown, but in A.D. 584 or 5 he concluded a three years' truce with the Lombards (Paulus Diac. iii. 18). We learn the date by a reference in the letter in A.D. 585 of Pelagius II. to the Istrian bishops. (Jaffé, *Reg.* 686.) He persecuted ELIAS, the schismatic patriarch of Aquileia, till he was checked by the emperor Maurice (*Lib. Episc.* in Mansi, x. 463). For his treatment of his successor SEVERUS, and his three suffragans, see that article. He was recalled probably in A.D. 588, and certainly before the middle of A.D. 590, as ROMANUS had then been exarch for some time. Smaragdus was reappointed about A.D. 602 (Paulus Diac. iv. 25). Unsuccessful in the war with the Lombards, after losing Cremona, Mantua and some smaller places, in November A.D. 603 he obtained a truce till April A.D. 605 (Gregorius, *Epp.* xiv. 12) by surrendering the king's daughter and her husband and children, who had been taken prisoners, and in the following November the truce was renewed for one, and then for three years. In June A.D. 603 Gregory the Great wrote to him (*Epp.* xiii. ind. vi. 33) to commend him for his zeal in endeavouring to terminate the schism, and to ask him to protect FIRMINUS (8) of Trieste against the machinations of SEVERUS. After the death of SEVERUS, Smaragdus compelled the bishops of Istria to elect Candidianus as patriarch in his stead, having his seat at Grado. (*Ep. Joannis* in Baronius xi. 77). The date of his recall is uncertain, but it was probably about A.D. 610 or 611. (Ersch and Gruber, *Encyc.* xxxix. 313, &c.). [F. D.]

SMARAGDUS (2), 4th abbat of St. Michael (Saint-Mihiel) in the diocese of Verdun, author and grammarian. Considering the extent of his works and the comparative lateness of his epoch, very little is known of him. He was probably born about 760, but his earliest appearance in history is in the dedication of his *Via Regia*. From the fact that Charles the Great, to whom it was addressed, appears to have been already crowned king of the Lombards, but not yet emperor, the date of its publication may be assigned to the close of the 8th century. It may have been in reward for the compliment, that, some time before 805, he became abbat of Saint-Mihiel, a monastery founded about the commencement of the 8th century, and originally known as Castellion from the mountain on which it was built, and Marsoupe, or Massoupe, from a stream having its rise in the neighbourhood. (For its history, see *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 1270 seqq., and for its legendary origin the *Chronicon Monast. S. Michaelis* in Mabillon, *Vetera Analecta*, Paris, 1723, p. 350 seqq., and Hauréau, *Singularités Historiques*, p. 100). Here he doubtless took charge of the monastery school. In 809 the church in France was agitated with the '*Filioque*' controversy, and Charles resolved to send a deputation to pope Leo III. on the subject [LEO III.]. The emperor's letter to the

pope, which marshals the arguments from the Scriptures and the fathers in favour of the addition, was composed by Smaragdus, who accompanied the mission, and reduced to writing the conference between the pope and the delegates (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcviii. 923 seqq.; cii. 971 seqq.). From the charters of Louis the Pious in favour of his monastery (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cii. 975–80), it appears that he enjoyed equal favour after Charles's death, though, with the exception of a mission to Moyen-Moûtier, to compose differences which had arisen between the abbat and his monks, in 814, and an attendance at the council of Aix-la-Chapelle in 817, he appears to have passed the remainder of his life in his monastery. This he moved from its hill-site to a more convenient place on the banks of the Meuse in 819, where it became a famous Benedictine abbey, and gave its name to a town that grew up around it. The exact year of Smaragdus's death is unknown, but the day is marked on Oct. 29 in the necrology of the monastery. He was buried in the cemetery of the old foundation, where a few monks still remained to perform the office. His epitaph, which qualifies him as 'Theologus,' survives (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 441).

Works.—His published works occupy nearly a thousand columns in Migne's *Patrologia Latina* (cii. 13–976). The first in order, though not the earliest, is the *Collectiones in Epistolas et Evangelia* (13 seqq.), consisting of commentaries drawn from the works of the Fathers upon the Epistles and Gospels for the year. Among the Fathers whom he enumerates in his preface, as the sources of his commentary, is one Figulus, who is not otherwise known to us. At the end of the volume are published some *notanda* by Dom Pitra to these *Collationes* (1111 seqq.). The Collationes are followed by the *Diadema Monachorum* (593 seqq.), a treatise of 100 chapters on the whole duty of the monk, the virtues to be aimed at and the vices to be avoided, a work of little originality or interest. The *Commentaria in Regulam S. Benedicti* (689 seqq.) are preceded by a metrical preface eulogizing the Rule. The work was undertaken to settle the meaning of certain passages in the Rule which differing commentators had rendered uncertain. It has been erroneously printed among the works of Rabanus Maurus. The *Via Regia* (931 seqq.) was probably the first, and is the most interesting, of his works. Part of the dedicatory letter being missing, there has been some discussion whether the prince to whom it was addressed is Charles or his son, Louis the Pious, but internal evidence leaves little doubt it was the former (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 441 seqq.; Ceillier, xii. 255). It consists of thirty-two chapters, each having for its subject some excellence which the good prince will seek to attain or some fault which he will avoid. Hauréau considers it one of the best writings of the 9th century, and in illustration of its originality, quotes the chapter on slavery, in which, after exhorting the king to forbid slavery throughout his realm, Smaragdus has the following remarkable words for the time, "Conditione enim aequaliter creati sumus, sed aliis alii culpa subacti" (cap. xxx., coll. 968; Hauréau, *ibid.* p. 115). For the various editions of these works, see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 441 seqq. Smaragdus also wrote a Commentary, or Gloss, on the *De octo partibus Orationis* of Donatus. This has never been published, but from the preface, printed by Mabillon in his *Vetera Analecta* (p. 357) it appears that it was composed at the instance of his companions, to whom he taught grammar, and that he had drawn his examples, not from Cicero, Virgil, and other Pagans, as his predecessors, but from the Scriptures. Honorius of Autun, who wrote in the 12th century, says "Grammaticam Majorem Donatum exponendo explicuit" (*De Script. Eccles.* iv. 6, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* clxxii. 230), and Hauréau, who has apparently read the work, points to the numerous existing MS. copies of the 9th and 10th centuries as attesting its early popularity. It displays a profound knowledge of the Latin language, but its philology, as might be expected, is defective (ibid. p. 103 seqq.).

[S. A. B.]

SNEDBRANUS, bishop of Kildare, died A.D. 787. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 786; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* ii. 224.) [J. G.]

SOBIAI. [ELKESAITES, Vol. II. p. 96 a.]

SOCRATES (1), bishop of Laodicea in Syria Prima, the predecessor of EUSEBIUS (48) (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32). [C. H.]

SOCRATES (2), one of the most interesting and valuable historians of the early Christian age, was born at Constantinople, and, as is generally supposed, about the beginning of the reign of Theodosius the younger, A.D. 408. He tells us himself that he was educated in the city of his birth under Helladius and Ammonius, two heathen grammarians, who had been compelled to flee from Alexandria in order to escape the displeasure of the emperor. They had been guilty of many acts of cruel retaliation upon the Christians there, who had risen for the overthrow of their idols and temples (*Hist.* v. 16). When the education of Socrates as a boy was completed he studied rhetoric, assisted Troilus the rhetorician and sophist, and entered the legal profession. From this last circumstance he received the name of Scholasticus, the title for a lawyer. His life was spent at Constantinople, and he himself assigns this as the reason why, in his history, he occupies himself so much with the affairs of that city. "No wonder," he says, "that I write more fully of the famous acts done in this city (Constantinople), partly because I beheld most of them with my own eyes, partly because they are more famous and thought more worthy of remembrance than many other acts" (*Hist.* v. 23). In these words we see the true spirit of the historian, and the anxiety to be correct in his narratives that distinguished their author. How sincere in this respect the desire of Socrates was, is shown by his use of similar expressions in the beginning of the 6th book of his history, when he tells us that he had a greater liking for the history of his own than of bygone times, because he had himself either seen it or learned it from eyewitnesses. A certain Theodorus, of whom nothing appears to be known, encouraged him to take up his pen as a historian of the Church. His object was to enter upon this field at the point at which it had been left by Eusebius, and to continue the

history to his own day. His work is divided into seven books, beginning with the time when Constantine was proclaimed emperor, A.D. 306, and extending to A.D. 439, a period of 133, or, as he himself calls it, in round numbers, 140 years. Love of history and admiration of Eusebius seem to have combined with the exhortations of Theodorus in leading him to devote himself to his task. In addition to this, however, it is worthy of notice that, especially in his first two books, Rufinus appears to have exercised considerable influence over him. But at that point, the writings of Athanasius and the letters of other celebrated men coming into his hands, he discovered that Rufinus had been misinformed on many points, and had misled him. His own statement accordingly seems to imply that he wrote his first two books over again, that he might have the satisfaction of knowing that he had set forth the history "in a most absolute and perfect manner" (*Hist.* ii. 1).

Of the style which Socrates thought it proper to adopt we have a most interesting account from his own pen; and, as it throws light not merely on his style, but on his whole spirit and method as a historian, it may be well to quote it. Addressing Theodorus he says, "But I would have you know, before you read my books, that I have not curiously addicted myself unto a lofty style, neither unto a glorious show of gay sentences; for so peradventure, in running after words and phrases, I might have missed of my matter and failed of my purpose and intent. . . . Again, such a penning profiteth very little the vulgar and ignorant sort of people, who desire not so much the fine and elegant sort of phrase, as the furtherance of their knowledge and the truth of the history. Wherefore, lest that our story should halt of both sides, and displease the learned, in that it doth not rival the artificial skill and profound knowledge of ancient writers, the unlearned, in that their capacity cannot comprehend the substance of the matter by reason of the painted rhetoric and picked sentences, I have tied myself unto such a mean as that, though the handling be simple, yet the effect is soon found and quickly understood" (*Hist.* vi. preface).

Such, then, was the object which Socrates had in view, and such the manner in which he proposed to accomplish it. His matter was to be chiefly the affairs of the Church, but not to the complete exclusion of "battles and bloody wars," for he thought that even in these there was something worthy to be recorded. He believed that the narrative of such events would help to relieve the weariness which might overcome his readers if he dwelt only on the consideration of the bishops' affairs, and their practices everywhere one against another. Above all, he had observed that the weal of Church and State were so closely bound up together that the two were either out of joint at the same time, or that the misery of the one followed closely the misery of the other (*Hist.* v. preface). It was the troubles of the Church, too, that he desired chiefly to record. His idea was that, when peace prevailed, there was no matter for a historiographer; and there is a sadness in the unconsciously satirical judgment pronounced by him on the times which he had reviewed when, at the end of his history, he says, "There would have been no matter for my pen if such as set their minds on sedition and discord had been at peace and unity among themselves" (*Hist.* vii. 47).

One important qualification which Socrates possessed for the task which he undertook consisted in his being a layman. This in no degree hindered his capability of forming a correct judgment on the theological controversies recorded by him, for it was around these that the main interest of lay as well as clerical Christians centred in his days, and they were thoroughly understood by all educated Christian men. At the same time his lay position and training unquestionably helped to raise him above the bitter animosities and the persecuting spirit of his age; showed him what an amount of hairsplitting there was in not a few of the disputes which then filled the world with dismay, and not unfrequently with bloodshed; and taught him that recognition of good in those from whom he differed, which forms one of the most pleasing characteristics of his history. His impartiality of spirit, indeed, has exposed him to that charge of heresy which has been brought against moderate men in every age of the Church. He saw, and ventured to own, that there was some good in the Novatians, and especially in several of their bishops. A fault of this kind ecclesiastical orthodoxy seldom pardons, and he has been accordingly often charged with Novatianism. Good grounds for the charge hardly seem to exist. His history shows little, if any, reason why we should doubt his orthodoxy, and his recognition of good qualities in his opponents ought to be ascribed to the impartiality of his spirit rather than the unsoundness of his faith. Tillemont's censure may thus be accepted as praise: "Socrates was a lawyer, and very ignorant of the spirit and discipline of the Church. Hence it comes to pass that he commends equally either Catholics or heretics when they did things which seemed to him to be commendable." (Quoted in Jortin's *Eccles. Hist.* ii. 120.) His greatest weakness was one from which even the most enlightened men of his age were not free, the giving too easy credence to miraculous stories. These he was always ready to receive, and there are many scattered throughout his pages quite as improbable and foolish as those found in the most superstitious writers of his time.

Along with all this, however, Socrates often displays a singular propriety of judgment, while the occasional reflections and digressions in which he indulges constitute one of the most interesting and instructive parts of his history. Thus his defence of the study by Christians of the writers of heathenism may to this day be read with profit, and it may be doubted if much more can even now be added to the argument (*Hist.* iii. 14). His chapter, too, on ceremonies, on their place in the Christian system, on the ground of their obligation, and on their relation to the true word of the gospel shows an enlargement and enlightenment of mind worthy of our highest admiration (*Hist.* v. 21). More than fourteen centuries have passed away since the words were written, and yet there is perhaps hardly a church on earth, there are only individual Christians scattered here and there throughout the world that practically understand or appreciate them. His whole his-

tory also shows how keen an eye he had for the mischief done by heated ecclesiastics, and for the unworthy motives by which they are frequently swayed. There is keen irony, *e.g.* in his description of the spirit that brought many of them to the council of Chalcedon summoned for the deposition of Chrysostom, "But above all other men they came thither apace which for divers quarrels owed John a displeasure" (*Hist.* vi. 14).

There are many points for which the student will find the History of Socrates valuable. Among these the following may be noted. It contains a large number of original documents, such as decrees of councils and letters of emperors and bishops. It gives many important details with regard to the councils of Nicaea, Chalcedon, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Ephesus, &c.; with regard to the emperors of the time treated of; with regard to the most distinguished bishops, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzum, Ambrose, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Cyril, &c.; with regard to the Egyptian monks and their miracles; with regard to Ulphilas, bishop of the Goths, and the famous Hypatia. It embraces also some important statements on the independence of Rome claimed by the Eastern Church, and the encroachments of the Roman see upon the latter; on the beginnings of the secular power of the Roman church; and on the introduction of some of those disciplinary arrangements by which Rome has most of all enslaved her members. The progress of the Gospel too amongst the Goths, Saracens and Persians is largely treated of; much is said of the persecutions of the Jews, and valuable chapters will be found on the progress of the Eastern controversy.

An interesting edition of the History of Socrates along with the histories of other early writers was published by R. Stephens at Paris, A.D. 1544. This was followed by an edition in Latin as well as Greek by Christophorsonus and Suffridus Petrus at Col. Allob., A.D. 1612. Another Greek and Latin edition, with notes, by Valesius, was published at Paris in 1668, and this edition was repeated at Cambridge in 1720, and in Migne's *Patrol. Graec.* (t. lxvii.) in 1859. In 1853 appeared the Greek and Latin edition of R. Hussey, Oxf.. 3 vols. 8vo. There is a French translation by Ludovicus Cyaneus, Paris, 1568, a German translation by Caspar Hedio, 1645; and a translation into English, from which the extracts in this article are for the most part taken, by Meredith Hanmer, Professor of Divinity. This last was published in London by Field, A.D. 1619. [W. M.]

SOCRATITAE, given by Epiphanius (*Ancor.* 13), and after him by Joannes Damascenus (*Haer.* 26) as the name of a Gnostic sect. In the corresponding passage of the *Panarion* (*Haer.* xxvi. 3), this name does not occur. [G. S.]

SOLENNIS (SOLEMNIS, SOLEMPNIUS, SOLENNIUS, SOLEMPIUS), fourteenth bishop of Chartres, succeeded Palladius after A.D. 480, but the historical points in his life it is difficult to fix in the diffuse unhistorical *Acta*. He was made bishop of Chartres by command of Clovis I., and was associated with Remigius in Clovis' baptism, A.D. 496. He seems to have died in the beginning of the following century, after naming Adventinus his successor. His feast is Sept. 25. (There is a Life in Surius, *Vit. SS.* ix. 268 sq.; two Lives in Boll. *AA. SS.* Sept. vii. 62 sq., with *Historia Translationis reliquiarum* and *Miracula*, all being preceded by *Comment. Praev.* in 2 sections; see also *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vii. 607; *Gall. Christ.* viii. 1095.) [J. G.]

SOLOMON. [SALOMON.]

SOLIASSUS, one of Felicissimus' excommunicated partisans, a banished confessor; Cyp. *Ep.* 42 (see AUGENDUS); called in MSS. Budinarius (*conj.* Burdonarius, mule-owner; Butinarius, "a maker of Butinae, bottles." Goldhorn refers to Salmas. *ad Script. Hist. Aug.* (Lugd. 1671) ii. p. 578, who interprets a maker of *Acetabula*, small measures. See also DUCANGE. The name Soliassus seems not to be found in inscriptions. [E. W. B.]

SOLUS (SOLA), **ST.**, hermit, an Englishman by birth, followed St. Boniface to Germany and was ordained by him during the reign of Pippin. He retired to a hermitage in the pinewoods between the hills and the Altmuhl, at the place which after him was called Solenhofen, between Nuremberg and Augsburg. His fame reached the ears of Charles the Great, who granted him the site of his hermitage. This, with the land the country people gave him, he made over to the monastery of Fulda, of which it became a cell. He died about A.D. 790 on December 3rd, on which day he is commemorated. His life was written in the next century by Ermanric, abbat of Elwangen, who professes to have received his information from an aged servant of Solus. (Mabillon, *AA. SS. Ord. Ben.* iii. 2. 429). [F. D.]

SOLUTOR, Nov. 20, martyr with Octavius and Adventor. They are regarded as the patrons of Turin, and are supposed to have belonged to the Thebaean Legion. They are praised by Maximus of Turin in cent. v. Baronius testifies that their manuscript acts were preserved at Turin. (*Mart.* Usuard.; Ceill. x. 322.) [G. T. S.]

SONNATIUS, 21st archbishop of Rheims (circ. A.D. 594–631), was deacon and archdeacon under his predecessor, who intrusted him with a mission to Childebert II., to obtain restitution of some of the lands of the see, and confirmation of his will. As archbishop, he presided over more than forty bishops at the council of Rheims, which is usually fixed in 625, and the canons of which we owe to Flodoard. He increased the possessions of the see by purchase and exchange; and by his will, the provisions of which are also given by Flodoard, he made gifts to various churches, especially that of St. Remigius, where he directed that he should be buried (Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 4, 5; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 18; Ceillier, xii. 914). There have been published under Sonnatius' name some *Statuta Synodalia* (see Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 443) comprising rules of ecclesiastical discipline and practice. But Flodoard knows nothing of them, and internal evidence points to a later date for their composition (cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 538–41; Ceillier, xi. 693). In the 12th century supposed miracles at his tomb attested the sanctity of Sonnatius, and his relics were removed to the cathedral in 1204, where, however, they were afterwards burnt. He is

numbered among the Beati, his day being Oct. 20 (Boll. *Acta SS.* viii. 899–903). [S. A. B.]

SOPATER, governor of Armenia at the time of Chrysostom's banishment. Chrysostom says of him that he presided over the province like a father, being the common refuge of the poor and distressed, and that he exhibited more than fatherly kindness towards himself (Chrys. *Epp.* 64, 14). He had a son residing at Constantinople to prosecute his studies, whom Chrysostom commends to the kind offices of a bishop named Cyriacus, requesting him to introduce the young man to the magistrates and his own friends, and enable him thus through the son to repay his debt to the father. (Chrys. *Ep.* 64.) [E. V.]

SOPHIA (1) (or ACHAMOTH, Ἀχαμώθ) is a mythological person in the Ophitic and Valentinian Gnosticism. The name (Σοφία) was borrowed from the Old Testament. In the Proverbs of Solomon (c. viii.) Wisdom (the noun is feminine) is described as God's Counsellor and Workmistress (Master-workman, R.V.), who dwelt beside Him before the Creation of the world and sported continually before Him. In accordance with this description, the Jewish Alexandrine religious philosophy was much occupied with speculations about the Divine *Sophia*, as the revelation of God's inward thought, and assigned to her not only the formation and ordering of the natural universe (comp. Clem. Hom. xvi. 12), but also the communication of all insight and knowledge to mankind. The oldest, the Syrian Gnosis, which sought by an allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament to ground its phantasies on holy scripture, readily appropriated these notions, and took special delight in referring to the *Sophia* the formation of the lower world and the production of its rulers the Archontes; but along with this they also ascribed to her the preservation and propagation of the spiritual seed. In accordance with the description given in the Book of Proverbs, a dwelling-place was assigned to the Sophia, and her relation to the upper world defined as well as to the seven planetary powers which were placed under her. The seven planetary spheres or heavens were for the ancients the highest regions of the created universe. They were thought of as seven circles rising one above another, and dominated by the seven star spirits (called Archontes). These constituted the (Gnostic) Hebdomad. Above the highest of them, and over-vaulting it, was the Ogdoad, the sphere of immutability, which was nigh to the spiritual world, as Clemens Alexandrinus says (Strom. iv. 25, 161; comp. vi. 16, 138 sqq.). Now we read in Prov. ix. 1: ἡ σοφία ᾠκοδόμησεν ἑαυτῇ οἶκον καὶ ὑπήρεισε στύλους ἑπτά. These seven pillars being interpreted of the planetary heavens, the habitation of the Sophia herself was placed above the Hebdomad in the Ogdoad (*Excerpt. ex Theodot.* 8, 47). It is said further of the same divine wisdom (Prov. viii. 2): ἐπὶ τῶν ὑψηλῶν ἄκρων ἐστίν, ἀνὰ μέσον δὲ τῶν τρίβων ἕστηκεν, παρὰ γὰρ πύλαις δυναστῶν παρεδρεύει, ἐν δὲ εἰσόδοις ὑμνεῖται. This meant, according to the Gnostic interpretation, that the Sophia has her dwelling-place "on the heights" above the created universe, in the place of the midst, between the upper and lower world, between the Pleroma and the ἐκτισμένα. She sits at "the gates of the mighty," *i.e.* at the approaches to the realms of the seven Archontes, and at the "entrances" to the upper realm of light her praise is sung. The Sophia is therefore the highest ruler over the visible universe, and at the same time the mediatrix between the upper and the lower realms. She shapes this mundane universe after the heavenly prototypes, and forms the seven star-circles with their Archontes under whose dominion are placed, according to the astrological conceptions of antiquity, the fates of all earthly things, and more especially of man. She is "the mother" or "the mother of the living" (Epiph. *Haer.* 26, 10). As coming from above, she is herself of pneumatic essence, the μήτηρ φωτεινή (Epiph. 40, 2) or the ἄνω δύναμις (*Epiph.* 39, 2), from which all pneumatic souls draw their origin. This view was in the Ophitic system combined with another. In striving to reconcile the doctrine of the pneumatic nature of the Sophia with the dwelling-place assigned her, according to the Proverbs, in the kingdom of the midst, and so outside the upper realm of light, men came to the assumption of a descent of Sophia from her heavenly home, the Pleroma, into the void (κένωμα) beneath it, and were led on to inquire into the causes of this her humiliation. The first thought which suggested itself was that of a seizure or robbery of light, or of an outburst and diffusion of light-dew into the κένωμα, occasioned by a vivifying movement in the upper world. But inasmuch as the light brought down into the darkness of this lower world was thought of and described as involved in suffering, the inference was a natural one that this suffering must be regarded as a merited punishment. This inference was further aided by the Platonic notion of a spiritual fall. Alienated through their own fault from their heavenly home, souls have sunk down into this lower world without utterly losing the remembrance of their former state, and filled with longing for their lost inheritance, these fallen souls are still striving upwards. In this way the Mythus of the fall of Sophia came to be regarded as having a typical significance. The fate of the "mother" was regarded as the prototype of what is repeated in the history of all individual souls, which, being of a heavenly pneumatic origin, have fallen from the upper world of light their home, and come under the sway of evil powers, from whom they must endure a long series of sufferings till a return into the upper world be once more vouchsafed them. But whereas, according to the Platonic philosophy, fallen souls still retain a remembrance of their lost home, this notion was preserved in another form in Christian circles. It was consequently taught that the souls of the Pneumatici, having lost the remembrance of their heavenly derivation, required to become once more partakers of Gnosis, or knowledge of their own pneumatic essence, in order to make a return to the realm of light. In the impartation of this Gnosis consists, according to the doctrine common to all Gnostics, the redemption brought and vouchsafed by Christ to pneumatic souls. But the various fortunes of such souls were wont to be contemplated in those of this mythical personage Sophia, and so it was taught that the Sophia also needed the redemption wrought by Christ,

by whom she is delivered from her ἄγνοια and her πάθη, and will, at the end of the world's development, be again brought back to her long lost home, the Upper Pleroma, into which this mother will find an entrance along with all pneumatic souls her children, and there, in the heavenly bridal chamber, celebrate the marriage feast of eternity.

The Sophia-mythus has in the various Gnostic systems undergone great variety of treatment. In those described by Irenaeus, the cosmogonies of Syrian Paganism have a preponderating influence. In them, the great Mother-principle of the universe appears as the first woman, the Holy Spirit (rûḥâ d'qudshâ) moving over the waters, and is also called the mother of all living. Under her are the four material elements—water, darkness, abyss, and chaos. With her, combine themselves the two supreme masculine lights, the first and the second man, the Father and the Son, the latter being also designated as the Father's ἔννοια. From their union proceeds the third imperishable light, the third man, Christ. But unable to support the abounding fulness of this light, the mother in giving birth to Christ, suffers a portion of this light to overflow on the left side. While, then, Christ as δεξιός (He of the right hand) mounts upward with his mother into the imperishable Aeon, that other light which has overflowed on the left hand, sinks down into the lower world, and there produces matter. And this is the Sophia, called also Ἀριστερά (she of the left hand), Προύνεικος and the man-woman. There is here, as yet, no thought of a fall, properly so called, as in the Valentinian system. The power which has thus overflowed leftwards, makes a voluntary descent into the lower waters, confiding in its possession of the spark of true light. It is, moreover, evident that though mythologically distinguished from the *humectatio luminis* (ἰκμὰς φωτός), the Sophia is yet, really nothing else but the light-spark coming from above, entering this lower material world, and becoming here the source of all formation, and of both the higher and the lower life. She swims over the waters, and sets their hitherto immoveable mass in motion, driving them into the abyss, and taking to herself a bodily form from the ὕλη. She compasses about, and is laden with material every kind of weight and substance, so that, but for the essential spark of light, she would be sunk and lost in the material. Bound to the body which she has assumed and weighed down thereby, she seeks in vain to make her escape from the lower waters, and hasten upwards to rejoin her heavenly mother. Not succeeding in this endeavour, she seeks to preserve, at least, her light-spark from being injured by the lower elements, raises herself by its power to the realm of the upper region, and these spreading out herself she forms out of her own bodily part, the dividing wall of the visible firmament, but still retains the *aquatilis corporis typus*. Finally seized with a longing for the higher light, she finds, at length, in herself, the power to raise herself even above the heaven of her own forming, and to fully lay aside her corporeity. The body thus abandoned is called "Woman from Woman." The narrative proceeds to tell of the formation of the seven Archontes by Sophia herself, of the creation of man, which "the mother" (i.e. not the first woman, but the Sophia) uses as a mean to deprive the Archontes of their share of light, of the perpetual conflict on his mother's part with the self-exalting efforts of the Archontes, and of her continuous striving to recover again and again the light-spark hidden in human nature, till, at length, Christ comes to her assistance and in answer to her prayers, proceeds to draw all the sparks of light to Himself, unites Himself with the Sophia as the bridegroom with the bride, descends on Jesus who has been prepared, as a pure vessel for His reception, by Sophia, and leaves him again before the crucifixion, ascending with Sophia into the world or Aeon which will never pass away. (Irenaeus, i. 30; Epiph. 37, 3, sqq.; Theodoret, h. f. i. 14).

In this system the original cosmogonic significance of the Sophia still stands in the foreground. The antithesis of Christus and Sophia, as He of the right (ὁ δεξιός) and She of the Left (ἡ ἀριστερά), as male and female, is but a repetition of the first Cosmogonic Antithesis in another form. The Sophia herself is but a reflex of the "Mother of all living" and is therefore also called "Mother." She is the formatrix of heaven and earth, for as much as mere matter can only receive form through the light which, coming down from above has interpenetrated the dark waters of the ὕλη; but she is also at the same time the spiritual principle of life in creation, or, as the world-soul the representative of all that is truly pneumatic in this lower world: her fates and experiences represent typically those of the pneumatic soul which has sunk down into chaos. The name given her, Προύνικος or Προύνεικος, is probably meant to indicate her attempts to entice away again from the lower Cosmic Powers the seed of Divine light (cf. Möller, *Geschichte der Kosmologie*, p. 270 sqq.) In the account given by Epiphanius (*Haer*. 37, 6) the allusion to enticements to sexual intercourse which is involved in this name, becomes more prominent. Epiphanius mentions the name Προύνικος as used not only by the Ophites, but also by various other kindred sects—the Simonians (*Haer*. 21, 2,) the Nicolaitans (*Haer*. 25, 3 sq.), and a branch of the Valentinians (*Haer*. 31, 5 sqq.) Nigh related to this is the notion widely diffused among Gnostic sects of the impure μήτρα from whence the whole world is supposed to have issued. As according to the Italian Valentinians the Soter opens the μήτρα of the lower Sophia, (the Ἐνθύμησις), and so occasions the formation of the universe (Iren. I. 3, 4,) so on the other hand the μήτρα itself is personified. So Epiphanius reports (*Haer*. 25, 5) the following cosmogony as that of a branch of the Nicolaitans. "In the beginning were Darkness, Chaos, and Water (σκότος, καὶ βυθὸς καὶ ὕδωρ), but the Spirit indwelling in the midst of them, divided them one from another. From the intermingling of Darkness with Spirit proceeds the μήτρα which again is kindled with fresh desire after the Spirit; she gives birth first to four, and then to other four (read τέσσαρες instead of δεκατέσσαρες) aeons, and so produces a right and a left, light and darkness. Last of all comes forth an αἰσχρὸς αἰών, who has intercourse with the μήτρα, the offspring whereof are Gods, Angels, Daemons, and

Spirits." The Sethians (ap. Pseud-Origen. *Philosophum.* v. 19, p. 144 sq.) teach in like manner that from the first concurrence (συνδρομή) of the three primeval principles arose heaven and earth as a μεγάλη τις ἰδέα σφραγῖδος. These have the form of a μήτρα with the ὀμφαλος in the midst. The pregnant μήτρα therefore contains within itself all kinds of animal forms in the reflex of heaven and earth and all substances found in the middle region. This μήτρα also encounters us in the great 'Απόφασις ascribed to Simon where it is also called Paradise and Edem as being the locality of man's formation. It is obvious that all these cosmogonic theories have their source or archetype *not* in the Σοφία of the Old Testament but in the Thalatth or Moledet of Syrian paganism, the life-mother of whom Berossus has so much to relate, or in the world-egg out of which when cloven asunder heaven and earth and all things proceed. (Lipsius, *Gnosticismus*, p. 119 sqq.) The name of this Berossian Thalatth meets us again among the Peratae of the Philosophumena (v. 14, p. 128), and is sometimes mistakenly identified with that of the sea—θάλασσα. It seems doubtful whether the name 'Αχαμώθ is originally derived from the Hebrew חָכְמָה, Σοφία in Aramaic Ḥachmūth ܚܟܡܘܬܐ or whether it signifies 'She that brings forth'—'Mother.' (Hahn, *Bardesanes Gnosticus*, p. 64 sqq.). The Syriac form Ḥachmūth is testified for us as used by Bardesanes (Ephraim, *hymn* 55), the Greek form 'Αχαμώθ is found only among the Valentinians: the name however probably belongs to the oldest Syrian Gnosis. A similar part to that of the μήτρα is played by Edem consort of Elohim in the Gnostic book Baruch (*Philosoph.* v. 26, p. 150 sqq.), who there appears as a two-shaped being formed above as a woman and from the middle downwards as a serpent.

Among the four and twenty Angels which she bears to Elohim, and which form the world out of her members, the second female angelic form is called 'Αχαμώς ['Αχαμώθ]. Like to this legend of the Philosophumena concerning the Baruch-Gnosis is that which is related by Epiphanius of an Ophite Party that they fabled that a Serpent from the Upper World had had carnal intercourse with the Earth as with a woman (*Haer.* 45: 1 cf. 2).

Very nigh related to the doctrines of the Gnostics in Irenaeus are the views of the so-called Barbeliotae (Iren. I. 29). The name Barbelo, which according to the most probable interpretation is a designation of the upper Tetrad [BARBELO], has originally nothing to do with the Sophia. This latter Being called also *Spiritus Sanctus* and *Prunikos* is the offspring of the first angel who stands at the side of the Monogenes. Sophia seeing that all the rest have each its σύζυγος within the Pleroma, desires also to find such a consort for herself; and not finding one in the upper world she looks down into the lower regions and being still unsatisfied there she descends at length against the will of the Father into the deep. Here she forms the Demiurge (the Πρώταρχων), a composite of ignorance and self-exaltation. This Being, by virtue of pneumatic powers stolen from his mother, proceeds to form the lower world. The mother, on the other hand, flees away into the upper regions and makes her dwelling there in the Ogdoad.

We meet this Sophia also among the Ophians whose "Diagram" is described by Celsus and Origen, as well as among various Gnostic (Ophite) parties mentioned by Epiphanius. She is there called Sophia or Prunikos, the upper mother and upper power, and sits enthroned above the Hebdomad (the seven Planetary Heaven) in the Ogdoad (Origen, *c. Cels.* vi. 31, 34, 35, 38; Epiphan. *Haer.* 25, 3 sqq. 26, 1, 10. 39, 2; 40, 2). She is also occasionally called Παρθένος (Orig. *c. Cels.* vi. 31), and again is elsewhere identified with the Barbelo or Barbero (Epiph. *Haer.* 25, 3; 26, 1, 10).

Cosmogonic myths play their part also in the doctrine of Bardesanes. The *locus foedus* whereon the gods (or Aeons) measured and founded Paradise (Ephraim, *Hymn* 55) is the same as the impure μήτρα, which Ephraim is ashamed even to name (cf. also *Hymn* 14). The creation of the world is brought to pass through the son of the living one and the Rūḥā d' Qudshā, the Holy Spirit, with whom Ḥachmūth is identical, but in combination with "creatures," i.e. subordinate beings which co-operate with them (*Hymn* 3). It is not expressly so said, and yet at the same time is the most probable assumption, that as was the case with the father and mother so also their offspring the son of the Living One, and the Rūḥā d' Qudshā or Ḥachmūth, are to be regarded as a Syzygy. This last (the Ḥachmūth) brings forth the two daughters, the "Shame of the Dry Land" ܒܗܬܬܐ ܕܝܒܫܐ i.e. the μήτρα, and the "Image of the Waters" ܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܡܝܐ i.e. the *Aquatilis Corporis typus*, which is mentioned in connection with the Ophitic Sophia (*Hymn* 55). Beside which, in a passage evidently referring to Bardesanes, air, fire, water, and darkness are mentioned as aeons (Īthyē: *Hymn* 41). These are probably the "Creatures" to which in association with the Son and the Rūḥā d' Qūdshā, Bardesanes is said to have assigned the creation of the world. Though much still remains dark as to the doctrine of Bardesanes we cannot nevertheless have any right (with Hort—"BARDESANES—") to set simply aside the statements of Ephraim, who remains the oldest Syrian source for our knowledge of the doctrine of this Syrian Gnostic, and deserves therefore our chief attentions. Bardesanes, according to Ephraim, is able also to tell of the wife or maiden who having sunk down from the Upper Paradise offers up prayers in her dereliction for help from above, and on being heard returns to the joys of the Upper Paradise (Ephraim, *Hymn* 55).

These statements of Ephraim are further supplemented by the ACTS OF THOMAS in which various hymns have been preserved which are either compositions of Bardesanes himself, or at any rate are productions of his school. (Lipsius, *Apocryphe Apostolgeschichten*, I. pp. 292–321.) In the Syriac text of the Acts published by Dr. Wright (*Apocryphal Acts of Apostles*, pp. 238–245) we find the beautiful *Hymn of the Soul*, which has been sent down from her heavenly home to fetch the pearl guarded by the serpent, but has forgotten here below her heavenly mission till she is reminded of it by a letter from

"the father, the mother, and the brother," performs her task, receives back again her glorious dress, and returns to her old home. Of the other hymns which are preserved in the Greek version more faithfully than in the Syriac text which has undergone Catholic revision, the first deserving of notice is the *Ode to the Sophia* (ap. Bonnet, *Supplementum Codicis apocryphi*, I. p. 8) which describes the marriage of the "maiden" with her heavenly bridegroom and her introduction into the Upper Realm of Light. This "maiden," called "daughter of light," is not as the Catholic reviser supposes the Church, but Ḥachmūth (Sophia) over whose head the "king," i.e. the father of the living ones, sits enthroned; her bridegroom is, according to the most probable interpretation, the son of the living one, i.e. Christ. With her the living Ones i.e. pneumatic souls enter into the Pleroma and receive the glorious light of the living Father and praise along with "the living spirit" the "father of truth" and the "mother of wisdom." The Sophia is also invoked in the first prayer of consecration (Bonnet, p. 20 sq.). She is there called the "merciful mother," the "consort of the masculine one," "revelant of the perfect mysteries," "Mother of the Seven Houses," "who finds rest in the eighth house," i.e. in the Ogdoad. In the second Prayer of Consecration (Bonnet, p. 36) she is also designated, the "perfect Mercy" and "Consort of the Masculine One," but is also called "Holy Spirit" (Rūḥā d' Qudshā) "Revelant of the Mysteries of the whole Magnitude," "hidden Mother," "She who knows the Mysteries of the Elect," and "she who partakes in the conflicts of the noble Agonistes" (i.e. of Christ, cf. *exc. ex Theod.* 58 ὁ μέγας ἀγωνιστὴς Ἰησοῦς). There is further a direct reminiscence of the doctrine of Bardesanes when she is invoked as the Holy Dove which has given birth to the two twins (i.e. the two daughters of the Rūḥā d' Qudshā ap. Ephraim, *hymn* 55).

This Mythus of the Soul and her descent into this lower world, with her various sufferings and changing fortunes until her final deliverance, recurs in the Simonian system under the form of the All-Mother who issues as its first thought from the Ἑστώς or highest power of God. She generally bears the name Ἔννοια, but is also called Wisdom (Sophia), Ruler, Holy Spirit, Prunikos, Barbelo. Having sunk down from the highest heavens into the lowest regions, she creates angels and archangels, and these again create and rule the material universe. Restrained and held down by the power of this lower world, she is hindered from returning to the kingdom of the Father. According to one representation she suffers all manner of insult from the angels and archangels bound and forced again and again into fresh earthly bodies, and compelled for centuries to wander in ever new corporeal forms. According to another account she is in herself incapable of suffering, but is sent into this lower world and undergoes perpetual transformation in order to excite by her beauty the angels and powers, to impel them to engage in perpetual strife, and so gradually to deprive them of their store of heavenly light. The Ἑστώς himself at length comes down from the highest heaven in a phantasmal body in order to deliver the suffering Ἔννοια, and redeem the souls held in captivity by imparting gnosis to them. The most frequent designation of the Simonian Ἔννοια is "the lost" or "the wandering sheep." The Greek divinities Zeus and Athena were interpreted to signify Ἑστώς and his Ἔννοια, and in like manner the Tyrian sun-god (Herakles-Melkart) and the moon-goddess (Selene-Astarte). So also the Homeric Helena, as the cause of quarrel between Greeks and Trojans, was regarded as a type of the Ἔννοια. The story which the fathers of the church handed down of the intercourse of Simon Magus with his concubine Helena, had probably its origin in this allegorical interpretation. (Iren. i. 23; Tertull. *de Anima*, 34; Epiphan. *Haer.* 21; Pseudo-Tertull. *Haer.* 1; Philaster, *Haer.* 29; Philos. vi. 19, 20, p. 174 sqq.; *Recogn.* Clem. ii. 12; *Hom.* ii. 25; and thereupon Lipsius, *Quellenkritik des Epiphan.* p. 74 sqq.) In the Simonian *Apophasis* the great δύναμις (also called Νοῦς) and the great ἐπίνοια which gives birth to all things form a syzygy, from which proceeds the man-woman Being, who is called Ἑστώς (*Philos.* vi. 18, p. 172). Elsewhere νοῦς and ἐπίνοια are called the upper-most of the three Simonian Syzygies, to which the Ἑστώς forms the Hebdomad: but on the other hand, νοῦς and ἐπίνοια are identified with heaven and earth. (*Philos.* vi. 12 sqq., p. 165 sqq.)

The most significant development of this Sophia-Mythus is found in the Valentinian system (VALENTINUS). The descent of the Sophia from the Pleroma is ascribed after Plato's manner to a fall, and as the final cause of this fall a state of suffering is indicated which has penetrated into the Pleroma itself. Sophia or Μήτηρ is in the doctrine of Valentinus the last, i.e. the thirtieth Aeon in the Pleroma, from which having fallen out, she now in remembrance of the better world which she has thus forsaken, gives birth to the Christus "with a shadow" (μετὰ σκιᾶς τινος). While Christus returns to the Pleroma, Sophia forms the Demiurge and this whole lower world out of the σκιά, a right and a left principle. (Iren. *Haer.* i. 11, 1.) For her redemption comes down to Sophia either Christus himself (Iren. i. 15, 3), or the Soter (Iren. i. 11, 1, cf. *exc. ex Theod.* 23; 41), as the common product of the Aeons, in order to bring her back to the Pleroma and unite her again with her σύζυγος. The motive for the Sophia's fall was defined according to the Anatolian school to have lain therein, that by her desire to know what lay beyond the limits of the knowable she had brought herself into a state of ignorance and formlessness. Her suffering extends to the whole Pleroma. But whereas this is confirmed thereby in fresh strength, the Sophia is separated from it and gives birth outside it (by means of her ἔννοια, her recollections of the higher world), to the Christus who at once ascends into the Pleroma, and after this she produces an οὐσία ἄμορφος, the image of her suffering, out of which the Demiurge and the lower world come into existence; last of all looking upwards in her helpless condition, and imploring light, she finally gives birth to the σπέρματα τῆς ἐκκλησίας, the pneumatic souls. In the work of redemption the Soter comes down accompanied by the masculine angels who are to be the future σύζυγοι of the

(feminine) souls of the Pneumatici, and introduces the Sophia along with these Pneumatici into the heavenly bridal chamber (*exc. ex Theod.* 29–42; Iren. i. 2, 3). The same view, essentially meets us in the accounts of Marcus (Iren. i. 18, 4; cf. 15, 3; 16, 1, 2; 17, 1), and in the Epitomators of the Syntagma of Hippolytus (Pseudo-Tertull. *Haer.* 12; Philaster, *Haer.* 38).

The Italic school distinguished on the other hand a two-fold Σοφία, the ἄνω Σοφία and the κάτω Σοφία or Achamoth. According to the doctrine of Ptolemaeus and that of his disciples, the former of these separates herself from her σύζυγος, the θελητὸς through her audacious longing after immediate Communion with the Father of all, falls into a condition of suffering, and would completely melt away in this inordinate desire, unless the Ὅρος had purified her from her suffering and established her again in the Pleroma. Her ἐνθύμησις, on the other hand, the desire which has obtained the mastery over her and the consequent suffering becomes an ἄμορφος καὶ ἀνείδεος οὐσία, which is also called an ἔκτρωμα, is separated from her and is assigned a place beyond the limits of the Pleroma. From her dwelling-place above the Hebdomad, in the place of the Midst, she is also called Ogdoad (Ὀγδοάς), and further entitled Μήτηρ, Σοφία also, and ἡ Ἱερουσαλήμ, Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, and (ἀρσενικῶς) Κύριος. In these names some partial reminiscences of the old Ophitic Gnosis are retained. The Achamoth first receives (by means of Christus and Πνεῦμα ἅγιον the Pair of Aeons within the Pleroma whose emanation is most recent), the μόρφωσις κατ' οὐσίαν. Left alone in her suffering she has become endued with penitent mind (ἐπιστροφή). Now descends the son as the common fruit of the Pleroma, gives her the μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν, and forms out of her various affections the Demiurge and the various constituents of this lower world. By his appointment the Achamoth produces the pneumatic seed (the ἐκκλησία). The end of the world's history is here also (as above) the introduction of the lower Sophia with all her pneumatic offspring into the Pleroma, and this intimately connected with the second descent of the Soter and his transient union with the psychical Christus; then follows the marriage-union of the Achamoth with the Soter and of the pneumatic souls with the angels. (Iren. i. 1–7; *exc. ex Theod.* 43–65.) The same form of doctrine meets us also in Secundus, who is said to have been the first to have made the distinction of an upper and a lower Sophia (Iren. i. 11, 2), and in the account which the Philosophumena give us of a system which most probably referred to the school of Heracleon, and which also speaks of a double Sophia (*Philos.* vi. 29–35). The name Ἱερουσαλήμ also for the ἔξω Σοφία meets us here (*Philos.* vi. 32, p. 191; 34, p. 193). It finds its interpretation in the fragments of Heracleon (*ap.* Origen. *in Joann. tom.* x. 19). The name Achamoth, on the other hand, is wanting both in Pseud-Origenes and in Heracleon. One school among the Marcosii seems also to have taught a two-fold Sophia. (Iren. i. 16, 3; cf. 21, 5.)

A special and richly coloured development is given to the mythical form of the Sophia of the Gnostic Book *Pistis Sophia* (edd. Schwartze and Petermann, 1851). The two first books of this writing to which the name *Pistis Sophia* properly belongs, treat for the greater part (pp. 42–181) of the Fall, the Repentance, and the Redemption of the Sophia. She has by the ordinance of higher powers obtained an insight into the dwelling-place appropriated to her in the spiritual world, namely, the θησαυρὸς *lucis* which lies beyond the XIIIth Aeon. By her endeavours to direct thither her upward flight, she draws upon herself the enmity of the Αὐθάδης, Archon of the XIIIth Aeon, and of the Archons of the XII. Aeons under him; by these she is enticed down into the depths of chaos, and is there tormented in the greatest possible variety of ways, in order that so she may incur the loss of her light-nature. In her utmost need she addresses thirteen penitent prayers (μετάνοιαι) to the Upper Light. Step by step she is led upwards by Christus into the higher regions, though she still remains obnoxious to the assaults of the Archontes, and is, after offering her XIIIth Μετάνοια, more vehemently attacked than ever, till at length Christus leads her down into an intermediate place below the XIIIth Aeon, where she remains till the consummation of the world, and sends up grateful hymns of praise and thanksgiving. The earthly work of redemption having been at length accomplished, the Sophia returns to her original celestial home [PISTIS-SOPHIA]. The peculiar feature in this representation consists in the further development of the philosophical ideas which find general expression in the Sophia-Mythus. Sophia is here not merely, as with Valentinus, the representative of the longing which the finite spirit feels for the knowledge of the infinite, but at the same time a type or pattern of faith, of repentance, and of hope (cf. Köstlin, *das gnostische System des Buches Pistis Sophia* in Baur und Zeller's theol. Jahrbücher, 1854, p. 189). After her restoration she announces to her companions the twofold truth that, while every attempt to overstep the divinely ordained limits, has for its consequence suffering and punishment, so, on the other hand, the divine compassion is ever ready to vouchsafe pardon to the penitent.

We have a further reminiscence of the Sophia of the older Gnostic systems in what is said in the book Pistis-Sophia of the Light-Maiden (παρθένος *lucis*), who is there clearly distinguished from the Sophia herself, and appears as the archetype of Astraea, the Constellation Virgo (Köstlin, l.c. p. 57 sq.). The station which she holds is in the place of the midst, above the habitation assigned to the Sophia in the XIIIth Aeon. She is the judge of (departed) souls, either opening for them or closing against them the portals of the light-realm (pp. 194–295, ed. Schwartze). Under her stand yet seven other light-maidens with similar functions, who impart to pious souls their final consecrations (p. 291 sq. 327 sq. 334). From the place of the παρθένος *lucis* comes the sun-dragon, which is daily borne along by four light-powers in the shape of white horses, and so makes his circuit round the earth (p. 183, cf. p. 18,309).

This light-maiden (παρθένος τοῦ φωτός) encounters us also among the Manichaeans as exciting the impure desires of the Daemons, and thereby setting free the light which has hitherto been held down by the power of darkness. (*Dis-*

putat. Archelai et Manetis, c. 8, n. 11; Theodoret., h. f. I. 26; Anathemat. Manich. ap. Cotelier on the *Recogn.* Clement IV., 27 *et passim*; to which add Thilo, *Acta Thomae*, p. 128 sqq.; Baur, *Manichäische Religionssystem*, p. 219 sqq.) On the other hand, the place of the Gnostic Sophia is among Manichaeans taken by the "Mother of Life" (μήτηρ τῆς ζωῆς and μήτηρ τῶν ὅλων), and by the World-Soul (ψυχὴ ἁπάντων), which on occasions is distinguished from the Life-Mother, and is regarded as diffused through all living creatures, whose deliverance from the realm of darkness constitutes the whole of the world's history. (Titus Bostrenus, *adv. Manich.* I., 29, 36, ed. Lagarde, p. 17 sqq. 23; Alexander Lycopolit. c. 3; Epiphan. *Haer.* 66, 24; *Acta disputat. Archelai et Manetis*, c. 7 sq. et passim; cf. Baur, l. c. p. 51 sqq. 64, 209; Flügel, *Mani*, p. 201 sq. 210, 233.) Their return to the world of light is described in the famous *Canticum Amatorium* (ap. Augustin. c. Faust. xv. 5 sqq.). [R. A. L.]

SOPHIA (2), martyr [FIDES (1).] (Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, pt. ii. vol. i. p. 490, ed. 1885.) [C. H.]

SOPHIA (3), sister of LUCIANUS (10). (Cyp. *Ep.* 21.) [E. W. B.]

SOPHIA (4), empress, wife of JUSTINUS II., was niece of the empress THEODORA (Victor Tun. *Chron.*). She became empress on her husband's accession in November A.D. 565, and exercised great influence during his reign, especially the latter part of it. It was by her advice that Justin selected Tiberius as his successor. It was said that her motive was affection for Tiberius, and the hope of marrying him after Justin's death, and thus continuing empress; but, if so, she was disappointed, as he was already secretly married to Anastasia. He, however, built a palace for her residence, and ordered her to be honoured as the emperor's mother. The story that from jealousy, she then endeavoured to make Justinianus, the grand-nephew of Justinian, emperor instead of Tiberius, comes only from a Latin source (Greg. Tur. v. 31), but that she had Justinus, the other grand-nephew of Justinian, put to death at Alexandria rests on the testimony of Joannes Biclarensis, who was then at Constantinople. Sophia lived till 601, as at Easter that year she joined the empress Constantina in giving the emperor Maurice a crown. It is probably true that she advised the recall of NARSES from Italy, but that she added the famous insult of sending a distaff seems an embellishment (Isidorus, *Chron.*; Fredegarius). Sophia in the third year of her reign caused all the bonds and pledges at Constantinople to be brought to her, and paid off all the sums secured, an act which naturally gained her great popularity (Theophanes, *Chron.*; Corippus, *de Laud. Justini*). [F. D.]

SOPHIANI (Σοφιανοί), heretics in the list of Sophronius, between the Sethiani and the Ophitae. (Hard. iii. 1292 A.) The name probably originated as a corruption of Ophiani. [C. H.]

SOPHIAS, of Beneventum, Jan. 24, confounded with St. Cadocus. [CADOC.] (Cf. *AA. SS.* Boll. Jan. ii. 602–606.) [G. T. S.]

SOPHRONAS, an Alexandrian, who accused St. Cyril of tyranny, and prejudiced the mind of the emperor Theodosius against him in the course of the year 430. He was assisted by three others, Queremon, Victor and Flavian, and incited by Nestorius. They are described by their opponents as condemned criminals. (Cyril. *Ep.* 10 al. 8; Ceill. viii. 258.) [G. T. S.]

SOPHRONIA (SOPHRONIUM), the second of the noble Roman ladies (Marcella being the first) who made vows of virginity and poverty. She was the instructress of Paula and Eustochium and is highly praised by Jerome (*Ep.* 127 ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

SOPHRONIUS (1). Cyp. *Ep.* 42. See AUGENDUS. One of Felicissimus' excommunicated partisans. [E. W. B.]

SOPHRONIUS (2), bishop of Pompeiopolis, in Paphlagonia, and one of the semi-Arian leaders at the synod of Seleucia, A.D. 359. He was deposed for avarice by the Acacian party at a subsequent synod of Constantinople (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 42; Sozom. *H. E.* iv. 24). [G. T. S.]

SOPHRONIUS (3), a disciple of Eustathius of Sebaste, received with his companion Basilius by Basil had into his house on the recommendation of Eustathius in A.D. 372, or 373. Sophronius repaid Basil's hospitality and confidence by a clandestine departure and the spreading of base and unfounded charges against him, which Basil begs Eustathius will check, otherwise there will be an end of their friendship (Basil, *Ep.* 119, [307].) [E. V.]

SOPHRONIUS (4), a native of the Cappadocian Caesarea, an early friend of Gregory Nazianzen and of his brother Caesarius (ὁ σὸς Καισάριος, Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 18) and of Basil, whose fellow student he was at the University of Athens. (Basil, *Ep.* 272 [330].) Sophronius devoted himself to an official life, rising from one position to another (ἀεὶ προϊὼν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔμπροσθεν, Greg. Naz.) until he reached the high rank of "Praefectus Urbis" (*Cod. Theod.* vi. p. 385). He was a secretary, in 365, and earned his advance to the praefectship by his promptitude in conveying intelligence of the usurpation of the imperial dignity at Constantinople by Procopius, Sept. 28, 365, to the emperor Valens who was then staying at Sophronius' birthplace, Caesarea, and thus enabling him without delay to prepare for an effective resistance (Ammian. Marcellin. lib. xxv. c. 9). Sophronius is chiefly known to us from letters of his former intimates, Basil and Gregory, soliciting his good services for themselves or others. On the death of Caesarius, the brother of the latter, in A.D. 368, leaving his property to the poor, the administration of it devolving on Gregory, both Gregory and Basil appealed to Sophronius to protect them from the harpies who were threatening by the claims they made on the estate, to leave but little for charity, hardly enough, indeed, to afford his old friend honourable interment (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 18; Basil, *Ep.* 32 [84].) Gregory also wrote to Sophronius on behalf of his nephew Nicobulus, (*Ep.* 107) of Eudoxius, the son of a rhetorician of the same name, his father's equal in eloquence (*Ep.* 108) of his friend Amazonius (*Ep.* 109), and of a young man named Amphilochius.

charged with some malversation of money (*Ep.* 110). After Gregory's return from Constantinople to Arianzus, he writes in A.D. 382 to his old friend complaining that the pleasures of his retirement will hardly compensate for the loss of his society (*Ep.* 59), and again in the same year, on the summoning of the fresh council, imploring him to use his influence to heal the dissensions of the church which arose more out of private pique than from zeal for the truth (*Ep.* 60). Basil's letters include one painting in vivid colours the alarm and distress caused by the proposed division of Cappadocia in A.D. 371, and the loss of dignity which his native city of Caesarea would suffer, and begging Sophronius to use his influence to prevent the measure (Basil, *Ep.* 76 [331]), and another lamenting the loss of Therasius as governor in A.D. 372. (*Ep.* 96, [352].) In others he commends to his kind consideration Eusebius, the victim of an unfounded charge (*Ep.* 177, [334]), and Eumathius who had fallen into great trouble, whose petition he begs he will forward to the emperor. (*Ep.* 180, [333].) It is evident that these requests generally met with a favourable reception and that Sophronius felt pleasure in gratifying his old friend's wishes. (*Ep.* 192, [329].) But towards the close of his life a cloud came over their intercourse. Sophronius had listened too readily to unfounded slanders charging Basil with opposing his wishes in some transaction, and preferring the friendship of a wealthy man named Hymetius to his own. These calumnies Basil indignantly denies, assuring Sophronius that there was no one whose friendship he esteemed more highly, both on account of his personal kindnesses and the benefits he has conferred on his country. (*Ep.* 272, [330].) [E. V.]

SOPHRONIUS (5), possibly the same as the preceding, a supporter of St. Basil against Eunomius [EUNOMIUS (3)] Photius (*Biblioth. Rom.* 5), celebrates his book in defence of St. Basil for its perspicuity, brevity and acumen. Fabricius (*Bib. Graeca*, t. ix. p. 158, ed. Harles), identifies him with SOPHRONIUS (7). [G. T. S.]

SOPHRONIUS (6), a monk at Rome, whose discreditable proceedings there are described by Jerome in 384 (*Ep.* 22, § 28). [C. H.]

SOPHRONIUS (7), a learned Greek friend of Jerome, who was with him in the years 391–2, and finds a place in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers. He had, while still young, composed a book on the glories of Bethlehem, and, just before the catalogue was written, a book on the destruction of the Serapeum, and had translated into Greek Jerome's letter to Eustertrium on virginity, his life of Hilarion, and his Latin version of the Psalms and Prophets. These last may be said to owe their existence to him, for Jerome records that it was at his instance that he undertook them. Sophronius had, in dispute with a Jew, quoted some passages in the Psalms, but was met by the reply that the passages were read differently in Hebrew. He therefore urged Jerome to give a version direct from the Hebrew. Jerome yielded, though knowing that the alterations from the received version would cause him some obloquy. The importance of these alterations led Sophronius to translate the versions into Greek. They were well received, and were read in many of the Eastern churches instead of the Septuagint. The translations have not come down to us; but a Greek version of the catalogue of ecclesiastical writers bears the name of Sophronius. It is not quite accurate, but appears to have been the version used by Photius. The presence of his name on this book probably gave rise to its insertion in some MSS. between the names of Jerome, who, however, does not appear to have adopted it. (Jerome *De Vir. Ill.* 134; Jer. *Cont. Ruf.* ii. 24.) For the questions relating to Sophronius, see Ceillier vi. 278, and Vallarsi's preface to Jerome *De Vir. Ill.*) [W. H. F.]

SOPHRONIUS (8), a deacon of Constantinople, a prisoner in the Thebaid for Chrysostom's sake. (Pallad. p. 196.) [E. V.]

SOPHRONIUS (9), a monk, and correspondent of St. Nilus, of Mount Sinai (St. Nili, *Epist.* 34, ed. Allat. [NILUS.] (Ceill. viii. 216.) [G. T. S.]

SOPHRONIUS (10), bishop of Tella or Constantina in Osrhoene, first cousin of Ibas, bishop of Edessa. He was present at the synod of Antioch which investigated the case of Athanasius of Perrha, in 445 (Labbe, iv. 728). At the "Robbers' Synod" of Ephesus in 449 (Evagr. *H. E.* 10), he was accused of practising sorcery and magical arts, on the testimony of a boy whom he had initiated in hydromancy, and of collecting astrological books. He had a son named Habil who was charged with introducing a Jew into the episcopal palace, and eating with him, and admitting him into the sanctuary during the celebration of the holy office. The popular indignation caused by this impiety created a disturbance, which ended in the massacre of a large number of persons who had taken refuge in a church by the pagan governor Florus (Martin, *Actes du Brigandage d'Éphèse*, p. 90–93). Sophronius was also accused of Nestorian doctrine. He was not, however, deposed, but on the motion of Thalassius, bishop of Caesarea, his case was reserved for the hearing of the orthodox metropolitan of Edessa, to be appointed in the place of Ibas (*ibid.* p. 94). No further steps appear to have been taken in the matter, and at the council of Chalcedon he took his seat as bishop of Constantia. (Labbe, iv. 81.) His orthodoxy, however, was not beyond suspicion, and in the eighth session, after Theodoret had been reluctantly compelled by the tumultuous assembly to anathematize Nestorius, Sophronius was one of those who were forced to follow his example, with the addition of Eutyches (Labbe, iv. 623). Theodoret wrote a letter to him in favour of Cyprian, an African bishop, driven from his see by the Vandals. (Theod. *Ep.* 53.) (Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* i. 202, 404; *Chron. Edess.*; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xv. 258, 579, 686; Martin, *le Pseudo-Synode d'Ephèse*, p. 184; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 967.) [E. V.]

SOPHRONIUS (11), a layman of Alexandria, who, with three others, successfully accused the patriarch Dioscurus, in the third session of the general council of Chalcedon. He charged him with violence, adultery, and treason (Mansi, vi. 1030; Hefele's *Councils*, iii. 326, Clark's translation). [G. T. S.]

SOPHRONIUS (12) (SOPHRONUS, Phot.; SOPHISTA), patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 633–637 (Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, ii. 558), the unwearied champion of the orthodox faith against the Monothelitic heresy, not unworthy to be ranked with Athanasius and Cyril among the defenders of the truth against successive depravations. According to the Greek Menaea, Sophronius was born at Damascus, his parents' names being Plintos and Myzo. From the title "Sophista," by which he is usually designated, it is probable that in early life he may have been a teacher of rhetoric. He was the pupil and intimate friend of the celebrated Joannes Moschus, the author of the *Pratum Spirituale*, and accompanied him in his wanderings among the Lauras and ascetic settlements of Egypt and the East. Photius (*Cod.* 198) speaks of Sophronius as the οἰκεῖος μαθητὴς of Moschus, by whom he is styled ἱερὸν καὶ πιστὸν τέκνον. Moschus was the first to embrace a religious life, which he did c. A.D. 575 in the laura of St. Theodosius, near Jerusalem. At a somewhat later period Sophronius followed his example (*Pr. Spir.* c. 110). He had previously accompanied Moschus in a visit paid by him to Egypt and the Oasis, apparently on monastic business (*Pr. Spir.* c. 112). From the frequent references to Sophronius in Moschus' work, we may gather that the greater part of the next five and twenty years, during which Moschus was principally resident in Palestine, was spent in his society. When the Persians under Chosroes II. were beginning to overrun Syria, c. A.D. 605, the two friends quitted the Holy Land for Alexandria, where they appear to have spent eight years, with frequent journeys to the Thebaid and the Oasis to visit famous ascetics (*Pr. Spir.* 13, 69–73, passim). At Alexandria they formed intimate relations with the patriarch, the celebrated Joannes Eleemosynarius. John, who was more distinguished for his charity and piety than for learning, regardless of the difference of age admitted the two friends to the most unrestricted intimacy, looking up to them as his spiritual fathers and counsellors, and availing himself of their aid in combatting the Severians and other heretics, large numbers of whom they were successful in bringing back to the orthodox faith (Leontius 616, *Vit. Joann. Eleemos.* c. x. num. 60). On John's death, in A.D. 616, we are informed by the *Menaea* that Sophronius delivered his funeral oration. The advance of the Persians about this time drove the friends from Alexandria. They visited Cyprus, Samos, and other islands of the Mediterranean, and finally settled in Rome, where Moschus completed his *Pratum*, which, according to the Latin *Elogium* prefixed to it (Photius, *Cod.* 199), and John of Antioch (*In Monast. Donat.* c. 5, Cotel. *Mon. Graec.* i. 167), he dedicated to his friend, and committed to his keeping on his deathbed. After his decease Sophronius, with twelve fellow-disciples, sailed with the body to Palestine, c. A.D. 620. Sophronius now devoted himself to theological study and literary composition. To this period we may ascribe his *Life of St. Mary of Egypt*, the *Typicon*, the inordinately long and tedious *Lives of St. Cyrus and St. John*, and the greater part of his hagiological and ritual works, as well as the publication of his friend Moschus' *Pratum Spirituale*, Λείμων πνευματικός, or Λειμωνάριον, which by a singular literary blunder has been ascribed to him as its author by Joannes Damascenus in several places in his book *Pro Imaginibus* (lib. i. p. 238; ii. p. 344; iii. p. 352), as well as by the Fathers of the second Nicene council (Labbe, vii. 759 sq.), and by Nicephorus (*H. E.* viii. 41, ad fin.).

The measures taken by Cyrus, the newly-appointed patriarch of Alexandria, to carry into effect the much desired reunion of the Monophysites with the orthodox church, which was the price of his elevation by Heraclius to so high a dignity (A.D. 630), gave the occasion to Sophronius to appear as the undaunted champion of orthodoxy against the combined power of the chief civil and ecclesiastical rulers of the Christian world, contributing no little by his learning and his courage to the eventual triumph of the faith over the Monothelite heresy. The expression borrowed by Cyrus from the Pseudo-Dionysius of one "divine-human activity," μιὰ θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια, as the instrument of reconciliation, appeared to Sophronius fraught with danger to the truth of our blessed Lord's nature as declared at Chalcedon. To deny the human will in Christ, or even the natural operation of that will, was to detract from his perfect Humanity, and to bring in the old error of Apollinaris under a new and specious form. When, on the summoning of the Synod destined to carry out this compromise, May A.D. 633 (Labbe, v. 1695), the document of nine articles on which the reconciliation was to be based was put into Sophronius' hands by Cyrus for examination, the seventh article asserting that "the one and the same Christ and Son of God wrought both the Divine and the Human actions by one theandric operation," appeared to him so impious that he is recorded to have flung himself with Oriental vehemence at the patriarch's feet, and to have entreated him by the life-giving sufferings of the Saviour not to attempt to impose it on the church (*Disput. S. Maximi cum Pyrrho*, Labbe, v. 1817). His impassioned remonstrances were fruitless. The instrument of reconciliation —the "watery union," ἕνωσις ὑδροβαφής, as the Greeks contemptuously termed it—was rapturously accepted, and thousands of Monophysites in Egypt and the adjacent provinces were brought back into formal union with the orthodox church. Sophronius, shocked at this sacrifice of truth to the peace of the church by an "economy" which he foresaw could only lead to direct Monophysitism—indeed, the Monophysites were everywhere boasting that the church had come over to them, not they to the church—resolved to make a personal appeal from the traitorous patriarch of Alexandria to the patriarch of Constantinople, Sergius. On his arrival at Constantinople Sophronius found that Sergius had already received letters from Cyrus, containing his view of the controversy, and calculated to prejudice the mind of Sergius against him. Sergius fully awake to the peril involved in any attempt dogmatically to define a point of such a mysterious nature when Holy Scripture was silent, endeavoured at once to suppress the controversy. He expressed his dissatisfaction that Sophronius should oppose measures calculated to promote the salvation of thousands now separated from the church, and appealed to him

to substantiate his doctrine of a single will and a single operation by testimonies from the fathers. This Sophronius was not as yet prepared to do. Sergius entreated him to cease from so perilous a controversy, the issue of which could not fail to be injurious. He himself allowed the orthodoxy of the test term "theandric operation" as describing one will and one operation, but he deprecated its introduction into the ordinary language of the church as likely to cause offence to many. When the object sought had been gained, and the Jacobites had become reconciled to the church, he recommended that no further mention should be made of either a single or a twofold will and operation, but that it should be firmly held that the one and the same Christ, the true God, worked both the Divine and the Human, and that all His divine and human operations proceeded equally and entirely from, the same Incarnate Logos. Sophronius, silenced if not satisfied, was in the end induced to promise to cease from prosecuting the discussion. He sailed back to Syria, bearing with him a letter of Sergius' containing his definition of faith (Serg. *Epist. ad Honor.* Labbe, vi. 922). A few months made a great change in Sophronius' position, and rendered him a more formidable adversary. At the end of A.D. 633 (Clinton), or early in 634, he was, much against his will, raised to the patriarchal throne of Jerusalem, as successor of Modestus. His changed position he regarded as releasing him from his promise to Sergius. Silence, which might be pardonable in a private individual, was traitorous in a ruler of the church. The "honey-tongued champion of the truth," μελίγλωσσος τῆς ἀληθείας πρόμαχος (*Lib. Syn.*), at once gathered a synod of his clergy, which pronounced dogmatically for the two wills and the two operations. The acts of this synod he sent to Sergius and to Honorius, bishop of Rome, accompanying them with his own synodical letter, a λόγος ἐνθρονιστικός, announcing his election and declaring his faith (*Liber Synodalis* ap. Labbe, v. 1697; Theophr. *Chronogr.* 274). The length of time required for the production of this prolix and elaborate document—it occupies no fewer than 22 columns in Labbe's *Concilia* (pp. 851 sq.)—caused a delay in the transmission to his brother patriarchs of the usual intimation of his consecration, which gave umbrage to both of them. The letter embodies a detailed profession of faith at great length, which is followed by an elaborate dissertation on the mystery of the Incarnation, and the various heretical views regarding it, which he states minutely and confutes severally. He then states his own belief as to the nature of Christ, which he identifies with that of the Catholic church. The Hypostasis or composite Personality subsists by means of a mixture without composition, and of a conjunction which knows no division. Both natures act each in its own way; they have neither precisely the same modes of action, nor merely one mode of action. But they work in conjunction for one result or work, and so the one Son was known who evolved every activity both divine and human out of Himself, nor can anyone divorce the collective activity from the one Sonship. Dorner remarks (*Person of Christ*, div. 11, vol. i. p. 173 Clark's translation) that "it is clear that Sophronius, with whatever zeal he might assert the duality of the ἐνέργειαι, placed above them the will of the Hypostasis, and in a strict sense attributed to it the sole decision. In reality, therefore, if not in words, he asserts one Will which carries out its volitions by means of the modes of action of both natures, and allots this Will to the One Christ. A duality of wills he never mentions; nor could he in any case have regarded a will of the human nature as, strictly speaking, a free will; he could only have viewed it as an active power which derived its impulse from another source." The document concludes with an immensely long catalogue of heresies, and their several authors, bristling with anathemas, and catathemas and denunciations of eternal perdition, reminding one of Epiphanius. The whole is written in a very turgid, bombastic style, abounding in novelties of expression, which he shows off, as Photius remarks (*Cod.* 231), as a young colt does its prancings, γαυρούμενος τοῖς σκιρτήμασιν. It may be remarked that he asserts Creatianism, and that the bodies with which men will rise will be the same with those in which they lived on earth, and against Origen (whom, strangely enough, he splits into two persons), that the torments of the lost will be never ending (Labbe, *Concil.* vi. 851 sq.; Baron. *Annal.* viii. 310). Before the receipt of the synodical letter Sergius, in alarm at the probable consequences of the elevation of so vehement and uncompromising an opponent to one of the chief sees of the Christian world, applied by way of precaution to Honorius of Rome, informing the pontiff of what had recently occurred, and asking his judgment. Honorius replied on the whole approvingly. But he expressed his alarm at the application of dialectics to such divine mysteries. Refinements of this kind were injurious to the interests of true religion. His own decision was in favour of two natures, each working in its own way, not one only ἐνέργεια, but both governed by one will, producing perfect harmony of action, to which he assigns the Personality. In his second letter to Sergius, written after Stephen of Dor's embassy, Honorius said that instead of teaching one operation it ought rather to be taught that there is one Operator, Christ, Who works by means of both natures, each performing what belongs to it (Labbe, vi. 927 sq.). In the meantime Sophronius had busied himself in compiling a vast body of testimonies to the twofold will of Christ from the writings of the fathers. These, filling two volumes, he sent by the hands of his intimate friend and confidant, Stephen of Dor, to Honorius. He had previously bound Stephen by a tremendous vow, taken in the church of the Resurrection, to maintain the orthodox faith at all risks (Labbe, vi. 103 sq.). Sophronius was prevented from carrying the controversy forward personally by the advance of Omar and his Mahometan forces, who were rapidly making themselves masters of Syria. Honorius returned answer to Sophronius through Stephen that he desired him no longer to insist on the two activities, δύο ἐνέργειαι. Stephen gave this promise in Sophronius' name, but on the proviso that Cyrus also would desist from teaching the μία ἐνέργεια. The rapidly increasing calamities of the Holy Land, however, forbad the patriarch taking any further personal interest in the great question. He had probably died before the

attempted settlement of the controversy by the publication of the "Ekthesis" of Heraclius, probably the work of his old antagonist Sergius. At the Lateran council under Martin I. A.D. 649 Sophronius was most unfairly charged with being the author of the whole of the long-protracted and embittered dispute (Labbe, vi. 103 sq.). We may rather honour him as a courageous and unwearied defender of a vital truth endangered by worldly policy, which sought for seeming strength in an unreal union based on compromise. The last days of Sophronius were overclouded by the ravages of the Mahometans. In A.D. 635 Omar took Damascus, and made himself master of the rest of Palestine with the exception of Jerusalem. Bethlehem being in the hands of the infidels, the inhabitants of Jerusalem were precluded from resorting thither for devotion on Christmas Day, according to their usual custom. Sophronius delivered an impassioned homily on the occasion, graphically describing the calamities which had overtaken the land, and calling the people to repent of the sins which had brought so terrible a punishment on them. Worse was still in store. The Mahometan commander led his army against the Holy City itself. The siege lasted four months. The courage of the defenders, stimulated by the fervent exhortations of the patriarch, inflicted great losses on the assailants. The inevitable issue came at last. Sophronius appeared on the walls, and proposed a capitulation on the condition of Omar himself coming to receive the surrender. Theophanes (*Chron.* p. 282) describes the arrival and demeanour of "the sternly frugal" Omar, who imposed on the patriarch the humiliating duty of acting as his guide to the various sacred sites. Sophronius obeyed, secretly muttering to himself the words of Daniel, concerning "the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place," of which he now beheld the fulfilment, when by Omar's command the hallowed site of the Temple was prepared for the erection of the world-famous mosque bearing his name, which some in the present day have so strangely sought to identify with Constantine's church of the Resurrection. The aged patriarch did not long survive the humiliation of that day. The date of his death is uncertain. Baronius places it in 636, the year of the fall of Jerusalem; Pagi and Clinton at the close of 637, and Papebroch in 638. After his death the see continued vacant for 29 years.

Sophronius was a very voluminous writer in various departments of literature, both in prose and poetry. A large number of his productions, some of which exist only in Latin translations, are printed, in Migne's *Patrologia* (Series Graeca, vol. 87, part 3). The following is a list of them:—i. *Epistola Synodica ad Sergium et Honorium;* ii. *Orationes VIII.:* (1) *In Christi Natalitia,* (2) *In Sanctae Deiparae Annuntiationem,* (3) *De Hypante sive Occursu Domini,* (4) *In Exaltationem Sanctae Crucis,* (5) *In Adorationem Crucis,* (6) *De Angelis et Archangelis,* (7) *In S. Joann. Bapt.* (8) *Elogium in Apost. Petr. et Paul.* [of these, 1, 3, 6 exist only in Latin]; iii. *De Peccatorum Confessione,* a penitential chiefly for the use of bishops and priests; iv. *Fragmentum de Baptismate Apostolorum;* v. *Laudes in SS. Cyrum et Joannem;* vi. *Eorundem Miracula* [immensely long narratives filled with stories of the usual ecclesiastical miracles]; vii. *Eorundem Epitome;* viii. *Vita eorundem Acephala;* ix. *Vita S. Mariae Aegyptiacae;* x. A collection of sacred Anacreontic verses: (1) On the *Annunciation,* (2) *Nativity,* (3) *Adoration of the Magi,* (4) *Presentation in the Temple,* (5) *Baptism,* (6) *Raising of Lazarus,* (7) *Christ's Entry into Jerusalem,* (8) *The Lord's Supper,* (9) *St. Paul,* (10) *St. John,* (12) *St. Stephen,* (13) *St. Thecla,* (14, 15, 16 lost), (17) *Moses, Bishop of Ascalon,* (18) *The Holy Cross,* (19, 20, 21) *Description of the sacred places, his longing to return to them,* (22) *On the false accusation of Menes,* (23) *Dialogue between St. Mary and St. Paul;* xi. *Triodium;* xii. *Commentarius Liturgicus,* a spiritual interpretation of the whole ritual and of the instruments of the liturgy; xiii. *Oratio,* extracted from Goar, *Rit. Graec.* p. 456; xiv. *Troparium horarum;* xv. *Epitaphia,* two on Joannes Eleemosynarius; xvi. *Fragmentum dogmaticum contra Eunomium et Aetium;* x.–xvi. were first published by Mai. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 264 sq.; Baronius, *Annales,* tom. viii.; Papebroch, *in Act. Sanct. ad* xi. *Mart.* tom. ii. p. 51; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 579; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* lib. v. c. 24; Neander, *Church History,* vol. v. pp. 229 ff. Clark's Translation; Dorner's *Person of Christ,* div. ii. part 1, pp. 156–154; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* livre 37; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall,* c. 31; Theophanes, *Chronic.*) [E. V.]

SORANUS, JULIUS, dux of Scythia and a relative of St. Basil, who in 373 exhorted him (ep. 155 *al.* 241) to befriend those who were suffering persecution in Scythia, and begged of him some relics of the martyrs. In 374 Basil wrote to thank him for his fidelity in the persecution, and for having honoured Cappadocia by sending the body of a recent martyr. The martyr is not named, but is believed to be SABAS (1). (Tillem. ix. 8, 194, x. 7; C. A. A. Scott's *Ulfilas,* 83.) [C. H.]

SOSIPATER, a presbyter, to whom one of the pretended letters of Dionysius, the Areopagite, is addressed. [DIONYSIUS (1) in Vol. I. p. 846.] (Ceill. x. 551.) [G. T. S.]

SOTAS (Σωτᾶς), bishop of Anchialus in Thrace, is stated in the letter of Aelius Publius Julius, bishop of Debeltum, quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 19), to have tried to cast the demon out of Priscilla, the Montanist prophetess. Lightfoot suggests (*Ignatius,* ii. 111) that the Sotas of Euseb. v. 19, is possibly identical with the Ζωτικός of the preceding chapter, the interchange of the initial Σ and Z being a common variety of spelling. [MONTANUS, Vol. III. p. 938, a.] [F. D.]

SOTER, bishop of Rome after Anicetus, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, during eight or nine years. As is the case generally with the early bishops, his dates are given variously by ancient authorities. Lipsius (*Chronol. der röm. Bischöf.*) concludes A.D. 166 or 167, and A.D. 174 or 175, to have been probably those of his accession and death. In his time the Aurelian persecution afflicted the church, though there is no evidence of the Roman Christians having suffered under it. But they sympathized with those who did. Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 23) quotes a

letter from Dionysius bishop of Corinth to the Romans, in which he acknowledges their accustomed benevolence to sufferers elsewhere, and the fatherly kindness of their bishop Soter: "From the beginning it has been your custom to benefit all brethren in various ways, to send supplies to many churches in every city, thus relieving the poverty of those that need, and succouring the brethren who are in the mines. This ancient traditional custom of the Romans your blessed bishop Soter has not only continued, but also added to, in both supplying to the saints the transmitted bounty, and also, as an affectionate father towards his children, comforting those who resort to him with words of blessing." Eusebius adds that this primitive and laudable custom of the Roman church was continued during the Diocletian persecution. Dionysius of Alexandria also alludes to it in a letter to pope Stephen (253–257), speaking of all Syria and Arabia having been indebted to the liberality of Rome. St. Basil, too, writing to pope Damasus (ep. 70 *al.* 220), speaks of money having been sent by Dionysius bishop of Rome (*circ.* 260) to Caesarea in Cappadocia for the redeeming of captives, with a letter of consolation preserved to the writer's time. Still later, pope Leo I. mentions the custom of making collections at Rome on the Lord's Day for the like benevolent purpose. A further extract given by Eusebius from the letter of the Corinthian Dionysius to Soter informs us that the epistle of the latter which had accompanied the bounty of the Romans had been read in the church of Corinth on the Lord's Day, and would be preserved and continued to be read as that of the Roman Clement to the same church had been.

Montanus advanced his pretensions and views in Asia Minor during the pontificate of Soter; but there is no good evidence of their having been known so far in the west, or of any bishop of Rome before Eleutherus having been called upon to pronounce on them. It is true that the unknown author of the book called *Praedestinatus* (c. 26) states that Soter wrote a treatise against the Montanists.[a] It has been suggested that Soter may have been here written in mistake for Sotas of Anchialos, who is mentioned by Eusebius, though Soter is not, among the opponents of the new sect. But the anonymous writer appears to be generally so unworthy of credit that his testimony is of no value. [MONTANUS; PRAEDESTINATUS.]

With regard to the Easter question, on which Rome was at issue with the Asiatic Quartodecimans, it seems probable that Soter was the first bishop of Rome who was unwilling to tolerate the difference of usage. His immediate predecessor Anicetus had communicated with Polycarp when at Rome, notwithstanding the difference; but Victor, who succeeded Soter's successor Eleutherus, incurred the reproof of St. Irenaeus and others for desiring the general excommunication of the Asiatic churches on account of it; and Irenaeus in his letter of remonstrance to Victor (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24) refers only to the bishops of Rome before Soter, mentioning them by name, and ending his list with Anicetus, as having themselves maintained communion with the Quartodecimans (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24).

Two spurious epistles, one on the doctrine of Incarnation, the other prohibiting females from touching the vessels of the altar, and several decrees, are assigned to this pope. He is said in the Felician Catalogue to have been a Campanian "e civitate Fundis," his father's name being Concordius, and to have been buried beside the body of St. Peter on the Vatican. He is thus noticed in the Roman Martyrology: "Decimo Kal. Maii (Ap. 22) Romae via Appia natalis S. Soteris papae et martyris." [J. B—Y.]

[a] "Vicesima et sexta haeresis Cataphryges orti sunt; qui hoc nomen a provincia non a dogmate adsumpserunt, quorum auctores fuerunt Montanus Prisca et Maximilla. . . . Scripsit contra eos librum Sanctus Soter papa urbis, et Apollonius Ephesiorum antistes." (*Praedestinatus, sive Praedestinatorum haeresis.* Galland. vol. x. p. 357.)

SOTERICUS, archbishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia. He and Philoxenus presided at the Monophysite council of Sidon in the year 511 or 512. (Mansi, t. viii. 371; Hefele's *Councils*, section 225.) [G. T. S.]

SOTERIS, called also SOTHERIS, SOTHERES, and SOTHERA, Feb. 10 (*Mart. Rom.*), May 12 (Adon.), virgin and martyr at Rome in the Diocletian persecution. She was of noble birth, and seems to have been a member of the family from which St. Ambrose was descended. It is to his writings we owe our knowledge of her history. (Ambros. lib. *De Exhortat. Virginit.* cap. 12, and *De Virginibus*, lib. iii. cap. 7.) In this treatise he adduces her example to justify his view that suicide was justifiable on the part of a christian virgin to avoid violation. (Ceill. iii. 28.) [G. T. S.]

SOTION (Σωτίων, Ζωτίων), deacon of Magnesia and one of the deputies of his church who visited Ignatius at Smyrna. In the received text of Ignatius the name occurs as Zotion, though one authority gives Sotion, which also is the usual form of the word in inscriptions, where it is not uncommon. (Ignat. *Ep. ad Magnes.* c. 2 and Lightfoot's note.) On the interchange of the two letters, see SOTAS. [C. H.]

SOZOMEN, author of a well known *Ecclesiastical History*, born about A.D. 400. His full name appears to have been Hermias Sozomenus, to which is sometimes prefixed the epithet Salamanes or Salaminius. The last mentioned designation has led not a few to the idea, that Sozomen was born at Salamis in Cyprus, a place with which the name has absolutely no connection. With much more probability, the name is traced by Valesius to one of the brothers of a family with which Sozomen stood in the closest relation by the ties of spiritual, if not also of earthly, kindred. Fortunately in one of the passages of his ecclesiastical history, Sozomen has left us some notices both of his birth and of the circumstances amidst which he was brought up (v. 15). His family belonged to a small town named Bethelia, near Gaza, in Palestine, where his grandfather had been one of the first to embrace Christianity. An inhabitant of the same place named Alaphion had become possessed with a devil, and had applied in vain to both pagan and Jewish sorcerers or physicians, as the case might be, to deliver him from his plague. At last he besought the

aid of a Christian monk named Hilarion, and he by simply calling upon the name of Christ expelled the demon. The immediate effect was the conversion of the families both of Alaphion and of the grandfather of Sozomen to Christianity. The conversion was genuine. It stood the test of the many discouragements, if not persecutions, which Christians had to encounter at the hands of the emperor Julian, and the faith then embraced was handed down faithfully by one generation to another. Thus Sozomen was born in a Christian family, and nurtured amidst Christian influences. These latter must also have impressed him at an early age with an admiration of the monkish life of the time, for Hilarion the monk had, after curing Alaphion, become the instructor of his family, and of them Sozomen says long afterwards that, when he knew them in his youth, no one could speak in adequate terms of their virtues, and that the first churches and monasteries erected in that country had been founded and supported by their liberality. There is indeed in Sozomen's remarks upon these bygone days something not only exceedingly pleasing, but highly calculated to impress us with a belief in his own sincerity, as when he tells us, in the chapter of his history above referred to, that his grandfather was endowed with great natural ability, which he consecrated especially to the study of the Sacred Scriptures, that he was much beloved by the Christians of these parts, and that his counsel was there looked upon as necessary to the explanation of the Word of God and the unloosing of its difficulties. Certain it is that Sozomen came to the writing of ecclesiastical history in no spirit of indifference. He rather believed in Christianity, and even in the more ascetic forms of it, with a genuine faith; "for I would neither," he says, "be considered ungracious, and willing to consign their virtue (that of the monks) to oblivion, nor yet be thought ignorant of their history; but I would wish to leave behind me such a record of their manner of life that others, led by their example, might attain to a blessed and happy end" (i. 1).

Sozomen was in all probability educated in the first instance, if not in Bethelia itself, at the neighbouring town of Gaza, for some of the memories of his youth, mentioned by himself in his history, are connected with the latter place (vii. 28). From this he would seem to have gone to Berytus, a city of Phoenicia, that he might be trained for the practice of the civil law at its famous school. His education finished he proceeded to Constantinople, and there entered on the studies of his profession (ii. 3).

It was while thus engaged that he formed the plan of his Ecclesiastical History (ii. 3). To this subject he had been attracted both by his own taste and by the example of Eusebius. Preparatory studies had been made by him for his larger work, and at length the latter appeared in nine books, extending over the period from A.D. 323 to A.D. 439. The history was dedicated to Theodosius the Younger. As the work thus covers the same period as that of Socrates, and as both were written about the same time, and bear many resemblances to each other, a question has been raised as to which was the original and which not unfrequently the copyist. Valesius, upon apparently good grounds, gives his verdict against Sozomen, although he allows at the same time that in many passages he both adds to and corrects his authority. Like Socrates, too, Sozomen is habitually trustworthy. Like him he is a conscientious and serious writer; and in his account of the council of Nicaea, which may be taken as a favourable specimen of the character of his work as a whole, he seems to have drawn from the best sources, to have proceeded with care, and to have made a sufficiently good choice among the apocryphal traditions and innumerable legends which in the fifth century obscured the reports of what had passed at this great council (comp. De Broglie, iv. siècle, ii. 431). At the same time it must be allowed that Sozomen has inserted in his history not a little that is trifling and superstitious. His devotion to the monks may account for this. In style he is generally allowed to be superior, but in judgment inferior, to Socrates.

From what has been said it may be gathered that the history of Sozomen is more than usually valuable for the accounts contained in it of the monks. That these are given by an admirer is true, but they are not for that reason to be despised; or, for the same reason, and with the same degree of propriety, we should be entitled to set aside the accounts given by their detractors. Sozomen may have viewed the monastic institutions of his time in the most favourable light, and he may have been indisposed to receive the charges made against them; but it is impossible to read either his repeated notices of them, or his long account of their manners and customs in chap. 12 of book i. of his history, without feeling that we have in such passages statements in regard to the nature and influence of monasticism in that age, which cannot be neglected by any one who would form an impartial judgment upon the point. In addition to this, the history before us is of great moment for not a few important particulars concerning both the events and the men of the time to which it relates. Mention may be made in particular of the council of Nicaea, of the persecutions of the Christians, of the general progress of the gospel, of the conversion of Constantine, of the history of Julian, of the illustrious Athanasius, and of many bishops and martyrs of the age. It contains also a number of original documents.

An edition of Sozomen's history was published in Greek at Paris in 1544; and another, with a Latin translation, by Christophorsonus and Suffridus Petrus, at Cologne, in 1612. The best edition, that of Valesius, appeared at Paris in 1668, and was followed by one, with the notes of Valesius, at Cambridge, in 1720. The edition of Hussey (Oxon. 1860) ought also to be mentioned. Various Latin translations are also in existence, and a translation into English for Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library, 1855, deserves high commendation. [W. M.]

SPARTIANUS, AELIUS, one of the six writers of the Augustan history. In the *Dictionary of Classical Biography* there will be found an account of these writers under the names CAPITOLINUS and SPARTIANUS. Their writings are also of very great value to the ecclesiastical historian, and often form his only source of information upon the relations of the church to the Roman state, though now likely to be largely

supplemented by the series of edicts from Domitian to Heraclius lately found in the Fayûm in Egypt (cf. *Contemp. Review*, Dec. 1884, p. 908). Of the six writers, three wrote under Diocletian. They were Spartianus, Volcatius Gallicanus and Trebellius Pollio. Spartianus was probably an officer of the imperial chancery. He began apparently with the intention of writing the lives of all the emperors from Nerva to Diocletian. We now possess, however, mere fragments of his work. And indeed it is only with difficulty we can designate the biographies which are due to him, as there is considerable confusion between the names Aelius Lampridius and Aelius. Spartianus. He certainly wrote the lives of Hadrian, Aelius Verus, Septimius Severus, and Pescennius Niger. He probably wrote those of the Antonines, Pius and Marcus, L. Aur. Verus, Albinus and Macrinus. Interesting particulars about the early church can be gleaned from all these writings. The following are some of the principal references to Christianity in the Augustan historians. Lampridius tells us of Alexander Severus that he placed images of Christ and of Abraham in his private oratory. He also wished to erect temples to Christ and enroll him among the gods, an attempt which Hadrian is also said to have made. Hadrian went so far as to build temples without images for the worship of Christ, which were still in existence, and were called Hadriani; but was dissuaded from proceeding farther by the representations of persons, who told him that all men would become Christians, and all other temples would be deserted. Lampridius also tells of the concession by Severus of a site for a Christian church in opposition to the corporation of cooks, who claimed the ground as their property; and of his reference to the care taken by the Christians in ordaining only men of good character to the ministry. Flavius Vopiscus of Syracuse tells us about Saturninus, whom Aurelian sent as ruler of the East. The emperor, knowing his ambitious character, directed him never to enter Egypt because the population was turbulent and revolutionary, being composed of Christians, Samaritans, and other explosive elements. Vopiscus then quotes an epistle of Hadrian from a lost work by his favourite Phlegon (cf. Spartian, *Hadriani*, 16), to prove that the Egyptians had the same character a century and a half earlier. This epistle, which was addressed to the consul Servianus, speaks of Christian bishops and presbyters. It is of considerable interest as bearing on the organization of the Egyptian church, in the earlier years of cent. ii. Hadrian says, "Devoti sunt Serapi, qui se Christi episcopos dicunt, nemo illic Archisynagogus Judaeorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum Presbyter, non Mathematicus, non Aruspex, non Aliptes." Spartianus tells us about Sept. Severus, that on his journey into Palestine he interdicted Jews and Christians from making converts to their religion. Vopiscus tells us of Aurelian's reproof of the senators for their delay in consulting the Sibylline books, describing them as acting more like men in a Christian church than believers in the gods. Many other passages have proved very useful to the historian in determining dates and localities of persecutions; cf. a series of articles by Görres in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie* for years 1877–1880. A good instance of the use which may be thus made of them will be found in an article by the same writer in the *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie* for 1878, p. 273, where he discusses the relations between Christianity and the Roman empire under the emperor Septimius Severus; especially in reference to the flogging of a playmate of Caracalla "ob Judaicam religionem," mentioned by Spartianus in his *Antonin. Caracall.* c. i. [CARACALLA.] Görres thinks the word "Christianam" should be here substituted for "Judaicam;" cf. another article by him on "*Alexand. Severus u. das Christenthum*" in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1877, s. 49; and for the opposite view, see Harnack in *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1877, s. 167. Cf. for another good instance of the value of Spartianus' narrative, another article by Görres in the same review for 1884, p. 408, on *Christianity and the emperor Commodus*. The sources of the Augustan History have been discussed at great length of late by Enmann in *Philologus*, *Supplement*, t. iv. fasc. iv., p. 335–501. He endeavours to trace in Vopiscus the outlines of a general history of the empire composed in Gaul under the rule of Constantius A.D. 292–306. The text of all the Augustan historians is very corrupt. It is now one of the favourite fields for critical emendations and conjectural improvements. Those who delight in such attempts will find a full list of them in *Philologus* for 1880, p. 741, s. v. *Scriptt. Hist. August.*; for 1881, p. 600, s. v. *Spartianus*, p. 679, s. v. *Vopiscus Flavius*. The entire literature of the subject for the last twenty years is accurately set forth in *Philologus* for 1883, t. xliii. p. 137. A good account of the Augustan historians will be found in Teuffel's *Hist. of Roman Literature*, t. ii. p. 320, English trans., and in Simcox, *Hist. of Lat. Literat.* t. ii. p. 225–306. Teuffel gives an accurate account of editions, MSS., and essays on the historic value of those writers. The best edition of the *Scriptt. Hist. August.* is by Herm. Peter, Leipzig, 1865, republished in 1884. [G. T. S.]

SPECIOSUS (1), priest, Gregory the Great's authority for the story of ROMULA (*Dial.* iv. 15). [F. D.]

SPECIOSUS (2), monk, disciple of St. Benedict. His brother Gregorius at Terracina saw the soul of Speciosus, who was then at Capua, leaving his body, and found afterwards that Speciosus had died at the moment of the vision (Greg. *Dial.* iv. 8). [F. D.]

SPECIOSUS (3), subdeacon of Catana, was married, and when pope Pelagius II. ordered Sicilian subdeacons, either to relinquish their office or to abstain from intercourse with their wives, chose the former alternative, and acted as a notary till his death, which took place before A.D. 594 (Gregorius, *Epp.* iv. 36). [F. D.]

SPERANTIUS (1), one of the Numidian bishops, addressed by Constantine I. in a letter concerning building a church in place of one occupied illegally by the Donatists (Baronius, *Ann.* 316. lxii). [H. W. P.]

SPERANTIUS (2), a deacon, who accompanied Caecilianus to the council of Arles (Baron. *Ann.* 314. lii; Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iv. 95). [H. W. P.]

SPERANTIUS (3) (Σπειράντιος, SPIRANTIUS), a gentleman at Rome (ὁ πιστότατος) who received Athanasius on his visit there in 339, and was afterwards put to death by Magnentius (Athan. *Apol. ad Const.* § 6; Tillem. viii. 76). [C. H.]

SPERATUS JULIUS. To a poet of this name, otherwise unknown, the small elegiac poem *de Philomela*, which is to be found in Riese's *Anthologia Latina* (568), has been attributed. The poem has also been assigned, with some probability, to Eugenius, bishop of Toledo, and to Dracontius. [H. A. W.]

SPES (1), an inmate of Augustine's monastery at Hippo, whose variance with the presbyter Bonifacius is described by Augustine in or about 404 (*Ep.* 78 al. 137; Tillem. xiii. 155, 227, 408, 411, xiv. 121). [C. H.]

SPES (2), abbat of a monastery founded by himself at Comple, six miles from Nursia, had been blind for forty years, and then miraculously recovered his sight, it being revealed to him that his death was at hand, and that he must first visit the neighbouring monasteries. Having done so, he died fifteen days after recovering his sight. His brethren saw his soul issue from his mouth in the form of a dove and ascend to heaven (Gregorius, *Dial.* iv. 10). He is commemorated on March 28 (*AA. SS.*, March iii. 717). [F. D.]

SPESINA. See MACARIUS (20); Christian woman at Rome, Cyp. *Ep.* 22; probably a Carthaginian. The name occurs as that of an African martyr in the African calendar on 7 Id. Jun, ap. Morcelli, vol. ii. p. 369; does not occur in Muratori or Gruter; but is found in five inscriptions in Mommsen, all of them Numidian—an indication of the genuineness of the list as against Shepherd, "Letters on the genuineness of the writings ascribed to Cyprian," p. 12. [E. W. B.]

SPES-IN-DEO, praeses of Sardinia, was in A.D. 601 asked by Gregory the Great to assist Victor, bishop of Phausiana, in his missionary work (*Epp.* xi. 22). [F. D.]

SPEUSIPPUS, Jan. 17, martyr, together with his twin brothers Eleusippus and Melasippus, under Marcus Aurelius in France. They were the grandchildren of a St. Leonilla who had been converted by St. Benignus, who had been in turn sent by Polycarp on a mission to Gaul. They suffered at Langres with Neon and Turbon, the official reporters of their examination, who were converted by the example of their constancy. Their story has given rise to a considerable controversy, as many have been inclined to reject their acts as spurious, among whom was Ruinart, who refused to accept them among his *Acta Sincera*. The true state of the case is probably this,—they embrace some historical elements, but have been plainly worked up in later times into the shape they at present present. Baronius regarded their acts as genuine, and inserted a portion of them in his *Annals*, A.D. 179, sec. 37. Tillemont discussed them in his *Mém.* t. iii. p. 43 and 603; cf. *AA. SS.* Boll. Jan. ii. p. 73. In modern times the Abbé Bougaud has discussed the original character and authenticity of the Acts in a work on the mission of St. Benignus published at Autun in 1852. He specially discusses whether they were originally Cappadocians as one tradition has it or born in France, deciding in favour of the latter view. Their acts will be found in Migne's *Patr. Lat.* t. lxxx. col. 186. Benignus, who baptized Leonilla and Speusippus, is regarded as the apostle of Burgundy. His martyrdom is described in Greg. Turon. *Gloria MM.* i. 5; in the last edition as published in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptt. Rer. Meroving.* t. i. pars i. p. 522, Hanover, 1883–1885. (*Mart.* Adon.) [G. T. S.]

SPLENDONIUS, a deacon employed in Gaul, and there condemned for some offence not known, but admitted into the Donatist community, rebaptized by them, and ordained a presbyter by Petilianus, but afterwards rejected by him. The case was related by Fortunatus at a meeting of Catholic bishops at Constantina, and Augustine quotes it to vindicate the church from the charge of retaining in its service unworthy persons by fastening a similar charge on the opposite party (Aug. *Petil.* iii. 38). [FORTUNATUS (10).] [H. W. P.]

SPORACIUS (ASPORACIUS), a man of high rank in the court at Constantinople, Comes Domesticus, A.D. 451, and consul in 452, orthodox and pious, and a warm supporter of Theodoret, who at his request wrote his work on heresies (*Haereticarum fabularum compendium*), which he dedicated to him in a laudatory preface. There is also a distinct short treatise *Adversus Nestorium* (sometimes called *Epistola ad Sporacium*), addressed to Sporacius, in which the author goes over much the same ground as in Lib. iv. c. 12 of the *Haer. Fab.* The genuineness of this treatise has been called in question by Garnier and Dupin and other authorities, but is maintained by Sirmond. Theodoret wrote by the Oriental deputies in 449 to thank Sporacius for his zeal in his behalf and in defence of the truth. (Theod. *Ep.* 27.) Sporacius attended the council of Chalcedon as "comes domesticorum" (Labbe, iv. 77). He may be the same with Asparacius whom pope Leo calls "his son," a member of whose family, Count Rhodanus, was employed by him in June, 453, to carry letters to Julian of Cos, and to the emperor Leo and others (Leo. M. *Ep.* 124 [98]), and also with Sporacius, by whom Leo desired, that his letters addressed to Constantinople, against Timothy Aelurus, Sept. 457, should be presented and supported by his personal advocacy (*Ibid. Ep.* 153 [121]). [E. V.]

SPYRIDON (SPYRIDION, SPIRIDION), bishop of Trimithus in Cyprus, one of the most popularly celebrated of the bishops attending the council of Nicaea, although his name is not found in the list of signatures. He was the centre of many legendary stories which Socrates tells us he heard from his fellow islanders, one or two of which he has preserved (Socr. *H. E.* i. 12). Spyridon was a married man, with at least one daughter, named Irene. He was a sheep farmer, and continued to exercise his calling after for his many virtues he had been called to the episcopate. One of the stories tells how some thieves, attempting to rob his fold by

night, found their hands miraculously tied behind their backs, and were set free in the morning, by Spyridon, who, after many exhortations to give up their bad ways, good-humouredly made them a present of a ram, "lest they should have been up all night for nothing." Another legend, which has its counterpart in Mussulman folk-lore narrates how, after the death of his daughter Irene, he went to her grave and learnt from her where she had hidden a valuable ornament, which was reclaimed by the person who had entrusted it to her keeping (Socr. *u. s.* Soz. *H. E.* i. 11; Rufin. i. 5). Other stories record how he threw open his storehouses to those who were in want, giving to some and lending to others without interest (Soz. *u. s.*), and how on a wayfarer seeking shelter during Lent, when there was no food in the house save some salt pork, he desired his daughter to dress it and sat down with his guest at table. The traveller declining to taste meat on the ground that he was a Christian, Spyridon replied, "so much the less reason have you for abstaining, for to the pure all things are pure" (*ibid.*). On another occasion, when his pupil Triphyllius, the learned bishop of Ledra, had been called upon to address a gathering of the Cypriote bishops, and out of deference to his audience in a quotation from the Gospels (Matt. ix. 6) altered the homely word "bed," κράββατον, into the more refined "couch," σκίμποδα, he interrupted the preacher with the pertinent question, "whether he thought himself better than Christ, that he was ashamed to use his words" (*ibid.*). The well-known story of the heathen philosopher at the council of Nicaea, whose taunts against the faith were silenced, and he himself converted by the recitation of the articles of the creed by an unlearned bishop, "a proof of the magnetic power of earnestness and simplicity over argument and speculation" (Stanley, *Eastern Church*, p. 134), has been fathered by the late writers, Glycas and Metaphrastes, on Spyridon. The silence of Rufinus when narrating the incident is a sufficient proof that the identification is erroneous (Rufinus, i. 3; Niceph. *H. E.* viii. 15). Spyridon is mentioned by Athanasius as among the orthodox bishops at the council of Sardica (Athanas. *Apol.* ii. p. 768). According to dean Stanley his body, which had been buried in his native island, was removed to Constantinople, whence, on the taking of the city by the Turks, it was again transmitted to Corfu, where it is annually carried in procession round the capital as the patron saint of the Ionian islands (Stanley *u. s.* p. 126). His life, written in iambics by his pupil, Triphyllius of Ledra, is spoken of by Suidas as "very profitable." Spyridon is commemorated in the Latin Church on Dec. 14, and in the Greek, on Dec. 12 (Suidas *sub voc.* Triphyllius, ii. 947) (Rufin. 1, 3–5; Socr. *H. E.* i. 8, 12; Soz. *H. E.* i. 11; Niceph. *H. E.* viii. 15, 42; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* vi. 643, 679; vii. 242–246; Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, vol. i. p. 284, Clark's trans.; Stanley, *Hist. of East. Ch.* pp. 124–126; 132). [E. V.]

STAGIRIUS, a sophist, at Constantinople, under whom Nicobulus sent his son to study, without having previously consulted his uncle, Gregory Nazianzen, who however, on the arrangement having been completed, wrote to Stagirius, commending the lad to his care (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 188). Eustochius, the sophist, Gregory's early friend, took great umbrage at the young Nicobulus not being placed under his care, and in his anger brought serious charges against his rival before a magistrate, a course against which Gregory remonstrated, but in vain. (*Ib. Ep.* 61.) [EUSTOCHIUS (3).] [E. V.]

STAGIRUS (STAGIRIUS), a young friend of Chrysostom. He was of noble birth, and against the wishes of his father, whose favourite son he was, embraced a monastic life. He joined the brotherhood of which Chrysostom was a member, and continued there after the failure of health compelled Chrysostom to return to his home at Antioch. The self-indulgent life he had led was a poor preparation for the austerities of monasticism, and he proved a very unsatisfactory monk. The nightly vigils were intolerable to him, and reading was hardly less distasteful. He spent his time in attending to a garden and orchard. Besides this, he manifested much pride of his high birth. His health broke down under the strain of so uncongenial a life. He became subject to convulsive attacks, which we may identify with epilepsy, but which were then considered as indicative of demoniacal possession. Stagirius employed all the recognized means for expelling the evil spirit. He applied to persons of superior sanctity, often taking long journeys to obtain the aid of those who had the reputation of healing those afflicted with spiritual maladies. He visited the most celebrated martyrs' shrines, and prayed long and fervently both there and at home. But all in vain. He was more than once tempted to commit suicide. At the same time his religious character sensibly improved. He rose at night and devoted much time to prayer, and became meek and humble. Chrysostom's state of health forbidding his personally visiting his young friend, he wrote to him at length. His counsels are embodied in the three books *ad Stagirium a daemone vexatum*, or *de Divina Providentia* (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 3). What the issue was as regards Stagirius we do not know. Nilus, who in one of his letters highly commends his piety and humility and contrition, uses language which would lead us to believe that his attacks did not entirely pass away. (Nilus, *Epp.* lib. iii. *Ep.* 19). [E. V.]

STASIMUS, a count to whom Theodoret wrote commending to his liberality Celestiacus, a senator of Carthage, who having had to flee his country on the taking of the city by the Vandals was reduced to extreme poverty. (Theod. *Ep.* 33.) [E. V.]

STATIUS, confessor of Carthage in the Decian persecution; fled to Rome, was received by NUMERIA, Cyp. *Ep.* 21. [E. W. B.]

STAUROS. (See HORUS; VALENTINUS (1), p. 229; Iren. I. iii. 5; Hippol. *Ref.* vi. 31.) [G. S.]

STELECHIUS, designated by Chrysostom "a holy man of God," to whom that writer dedicated the second book of his treatise on "Compunction," περὶ κατανύξεως, of which the former was inscribed to Demetrius. (Chrysost. *Opp.* tom. iv. p. 121 sq.) [E. V.]

STENNIUS, bishop of Ariminum (Rimini), present at Rome at the judicial enquiry under Melchiades, A.D. 313 (Opt. i. 23). [H. W. P.]

STEPHANUS (1) I., bishop of Rome, after Lucius, from 12th May, A.D. 254, to 2nd Aug. A.D. 257, during 3 years, 2 months, and 21 days. These are the dates arrived at by Lipsius (*Chron. der röm. Bisch.*) after careful examination. The dates given by the ancient catalogues are erroneous and conflicting. The Liberian Catalogue assigns to him a reign of 4 years, 2 months, and 21 days, and gives Valerianus III. and Gallienus II. (255) as the consuls of the year of his decease, the same as had been assigned to the decease of Lucius. Here some confusion is evident. Other old authorities differ from this, and from each other. But the Liberian Catalogue appears to be correct in the date of the martyrdom of Xystus, successor of Stephen, about which, as a memorable event, the tradition was likely to be more certain, viz. 6th Aug. A.D. 258, this date being confirmed by Cyprian's letter to Successus (*Ep.* 80). Reckoning back from this ascertained date, and aided by the letters of Cyprian and the course of contemporary events, Lipsius arrives with high probability at the dates above given, which, as far as the duration of Stephen's episcopate is concerned, require the account of the Liberian Catalogue to be altered only by reading 3 years for 4, the number of months and days being regarded as a correct tradition. If Lucius died, as is supposed, on the 5th of March, 254, Stephen was appointed after a vacancy of 61 days.

At the time of his accession the persecution of the church, begun by Decius, and renewed by Gallus, had ceased for a time under Valerian. The internal disputes with respect to the reception of the *lapsi*, which had given rise to the schism of Novatian [NOVATIANUS], still continued.

In the autumn of the year 254 a council of Carthage, being the first during the episcopate of Stephen, replied to letters from Spain, brought by Felix and Sabinus, two bishops who had been ordained in the place of Basilides and Martialis, deposed for compliance with idolatry. Basilides had in the mean time been to Rome to represent his case to Stephen, and through him procure reinstatement in his see; and Stephen had apparently supported him. The synodical letter of the council (drawn up, without doubt, by Cyprian) confirmed the deposition of the two idolatrous prelates and the election of their successors, on the ground that compliance with idolatry incapacitated for resumption of clerical functions, though not for reception into the church through penance. The action of Stephen in the matter was put aside as of no account, though excused as due to the false representations of Basilides. (Cypr. *Ep.* 67.) A letter from Cyprian to Stephen himself, probably written soon after the council and in the same year, is further significant of the relations between Carthage and Rome being less concordant than had been the case under Cornelius and Lucius. Stephen from the first seems to have been determined to act independently in virtue of the supposed prerogatives of his see, while Cyprian shews himself equally determined to ignore any such prerogative. The subject of the letter is one Marcian, bishop of Arles, who had adopted the views of Novatian and joined himself to him, and whose deposition on this account Stephen is urged to bring about by letters to the province and to the people of Arles. It appears from the letter that Faustinus of Lyons had again and again written to Cyprian on the subject, having also, together with other bishops of the province in question, solicited Stephen to take action, but in vain. The tone of the letter is affectionately admonitory, not to say piously dictatorial. While allowing that it rested with the bishop of Rome to influence with effect the Gallic provinces, Cyprian is far from conceding to him any prerogative beyond that of the general *collegium* of bishops, by whose concurrent action, according to his theory, the true faith and discipline of the church catholic was to be maintained. And in praising the late bishops of Rome, Cornelius and Lucius, whose example he exhorts Stephen to follow, he seems to imply a doubt whether the latter was disposed to do his duty. (Cypr. *Ep.* 68.)

But it was a new question of dispute, that of the re-baptism of heretics, that brought about an open rupture between the churches of Rome and Carthage, in which the Asiatic as well as the African churches were arrayed with Cyprian in antagonism to Rome. The question came to the front in connexion with the schism of Novatian, the point being raised whether his adherents, who had been baptized in schism, should be re-baptized when reconciled to the church. (Cypr. *Ep.* 69 *ad Magnum.*) But it soon took the wider range of all cases of heretical or schismatical baptism. It had been long the practice of the Asiatic churches to re-baptize heretics, and the practice had been confirmed by synods; in Africa it was also the prevailing custom, and had been enjoined by the first Carthaginian synod under Agrippinus, though not apparently resting then on so strong a traditional basis as in Asia. Augustine says that Agrippinus had been the author of the African custom, and that it had not been universal since his time. Cyprian himself (*Ep.* 73, *ad Jubaianum*) does not trace the African custom further back than Agrippinus. However, on the question coming up as aforesaid, he insisted uncompromisingly on the necessity of re-baptism, and was supported, after a little hesitation at first on the part of some, by the whole African church. At Rome, on the contrary, admission by imposition of hands only, without iteration of baptism, seems to have been the immemorial usage, the only alleged exception being what Hippolytus states (*Philosophum.* p. 291) about re-baptism having been practised in the time of Callistus. Stephen accordingly maintained a view on the subject totally opposite to that of Cyprian. While Cyprian would baptize all schismatics whatever, whether they had been heretical in doctrine or not, Stephen would apparently baptize none who had been baptized already, let their heresies have been what they might, and whatever might have been the form of their baptism. (Cypr. *Ep.* 74.) The first shot in preparation for the battle that ensued may be detected in a letter (A.D. 255) from Cyprian to one Magnus, who had consulted him about the re-baptism of persons coming over from Novatianism; in which, after expounding and supporting at great

length his views on the subject, he may be taken to mean a hit at Roman laxity when he says "this is a subject of wonder, indignation, and grief, that Christians should support antichrists, and that prevaricators of the faith and betrayers of the church should stand within the church itself against the church."

The first council of Carthage on the subject having been held in the same year (255), and having, in reply to certain Numidian bishops issued a synodal letter supporting Cyprian's position, he wrote soon after a letter to Quintus, a bishop of Numidia, notifying to him the decision of the council, and enforcing it by argument. In this letter, though names are not mentioned, there is an evident reference to the bishop of Rome, and those who held with him: "But," says he, "some of our colleagues (*i. e.* fellow bishops) had rather give honour to heretics than agree with us; and while on the plea of one baptism they are unwilling to baptize those who come, they either themselves make two baptisms by allowing that of heretics to be one, or certainly, which is worse, prefer the wicked and profane ablution of heretics to the legitimate baptism of the Catholic church." In answer to the plea of ancient custom, the only one he acknowledges is that of not re-baptizing those who, having been baptized in the church, had left it for heresy and returned. But he alleges further that reason, not custom, affords the rule to go by. That he is hitting at Stephen appears more plainly from his reference to St. Peter, who in his dispute with St. Paul about circumcision made no insolent and arrogant claims, or said that he held the primacy; but by yielding to the reasons of St. Paul set an example to bishops of giving up their own views in deference to the true and legitimate suggestions of their brethren. (Cypr. *Ep.* 71.) Cyprian's next step was to send a formal synodal letter to Stephen himself, agreed on in a synod at Carthage, probably at Easter, A.D. 256, in which the necessity of baptizing heretics, and also of the exclusion from clerical functions of apostate clergy on their readmission into the church, is pressed upon him. But the tone of the letter is not dictatorial. It is allowed at the end that Stephen may retain his own views if he will without breaking the bond of peace with his colleagues, every prelate being free to take his own line, and responsible to God. (*Ep.* 72.) The answer of the previous council of Carthage to the Numidian bishops, and Cyprian's letter to Quintus, were sent to Stephen along with this synodal letter.

The next letter before us, that of Cyprian to Jubaianus, was written before an answer from Stephen had been received, and still deprecates any wish to break communion with any bishop who might continue to take a wrong view. At the same time Cyprian supports his own view at great length, and replies to arguments against it which had been advanced in a letter transmitted to him by his correspondent. (*Ep.* 73.) But the tone of his next letter, that to Pompeius, is less pacific. Stephen's reply to the synodal letter had now been received, written, according to Cyprian's account of it, "unskilfully and inconsiderately," and containing things "either proud, or irrelevant, or self-contradictory." The letter charges Stephen with "hard obstinacy," "presumption and contumacy," and refers, by way of contrast, to St. Paul's admonition to Timothy, that a bishop should not be "litigious," but "mild and docile." The arguments which had been advanced by Stephen are also replied to in the letter. It does not appear that Stephen had so far broken off communion with those who differed from him. (*Ep.* 74.) This, however, he did soon afterwards, as appears from the letter of Firmilian, bishop of Neo-Caesarea, to Cyprian (*Ep.* 75), as well as from the fragment of a letter to Xystus from Dionysius of Alexandria, preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 5), of which hereafter. Before Firmilian's letter was written, Cyprian had summoned a plenary council of African, Numidian, and Mauritanian bishops, to the number of 87, with presbyters and deacons, in the presence of a large assembly of laity, which met on the 1st of September, 256, the occasion being apparently considered too urgent to allow waiting for the customary Easter synod. In this memorable council Cyprian and other bishops in succession separately gave their opinions, being unanimous in asserting the decision of the previous synod. At the same time Cyprian is careful, in his opening address, to repudiate any intention of judging others, or breaking communion with them on the ground of disagreement. And his ironical reference to Stephen's more imperious attitude is evident when he says, "For not one of us constitutes himself a bishop of bishops, or forces his colleagues to the necessity of compliance by tyrannical threats; since every bishop has his own liberty and power of action, and can no more be judged by another than he can himself judge."[a] The acts of the council are given by Augustin (*de Bapt. contra Donat.* lib. vi. and vii.); also in *Cypriani Opp.* It was after this great council, probably towards the winter of the same year (*hibernum tempus urgebat*), that Firmilian wrote his long letter in answer to one received from Cyprian. It appears from this letter (as might be gathered also from Cyprian's introductory address to the great council) that Stephen had by this time renounced communion with both the Asiatic and African churches; also that he had refused to admit even to an interview the legates sent to him from the previous Carthaginian synod; had forbidden all Christians to receive them into their houses, and had called Cyprian a false Christ, a false apostle, a deceitful worker. The question has been raised whether Stephen's action amounted to excommunication of the Eastern and African churches, or only to a threat. H. Valois and Baronius say the latter only; but Firmilian's language seems to imply more; and Mosheim (*Commentt. de Rebus Christian.* p. 538 sq.) contends for more against Valois. Routh also and Lipsius hold that excommunication was pronounced. Firmilian writes as follows: "Which thing Stephen has now dared to do, breaking against you the peace which his predecessors have always kept with you in mutual love and honour."—

[a] "Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit; quando habeat omnis Episcopus, pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suae, arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare."

"How great sin hast thou heaped upon thyself in severing thyself from so many flocks? For thou hast cut thyself off: do not deceive thyself."—"Seeing that he is really a schismatic who makes himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity."—"For, while thou thinkest that all can be put apart from thee, thou hast put thyself alone apart from all."—"Very patiently indeed and gently did he receive the episcopal envoys in not even admitting them to an ordinary interview; nay, moreover, in being so mindful of love and charity as to enjoin the universal brotherhood of Christians that no one should receive them into his house, that not only peace and communion, but even shelter and hospitality, should be denied them."[b] Dionysius of Alexandria, also, in his letter to Xystus, above referred to, says of Stephen, that before his breach with Cyprian, "he had sent word concerning Helenus (of Tarsus) and concerning Firmilian, and all those of Cilicia, and Cappadocia, and Galatia, and all the adjoining nations, that neither with them would he communicate, on this very same account, because (says he) they rebaptize heretics." (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 5.) Dionysius further implies that he himself had disapproved of Stephen's proceedings, and remonstrated with him by letter:—"And concerning all these doings of his I sent to him, entreating." (*ib.*) Firmilian's language in disapproval of Stephen's conduct, and in repudiation of his assumption of authority over the church at large, is very strong. He says: "And I, on this head, am justly indignant at Stephen's open and manifest folly; that, while he boasts so of the rank of his see, and contends that he holds the succession of Peter, on which the foundations of the church were laid, he brings in many other rocks (*petras*), and constitutes new buildings of many churches, while he defends, by his authority, the position that there is baptism there." Again: "Nor fearest thou the judgment of God, when thou bearest testimony to heretics against the church, it being written, 'A false witness shall not be unpunished.'" Again: "It is manifest that the ignorant are also violent and angry, their lack of reason and of anything to say easily turning them to anger, so that to no one more than to thee does the Scripture apply which says, 'An angry man stirreth up strife, and a furious man aboundeth in transgression.'"[c] The whole letter is so little to the taste of the partisans of the Roman see that, though extant in twenty-six codices, it was purposely omitted in the edition of Cyprian (*Romae ap. Paul. Manutium*, 1563), and first printed in that of Guil. Morelli, Paris, 1564, who is bitterly censured for it by Latinus Latinius and Pamelius. Christ. Lupus (*ad Tertull. libr. de praescr.* Bruxell. 1675) first denied the authenticity of the letter. (Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* div. iii. ch. iv. 3). There is, however, no reason, except objection to its contents, for doubting its genuineness. It is evident from it, as well as from Cyprian's expressions in his own letters, above referred to, that, while Stephen on the one hand claimed authority beyond that of other bishops as being St. Peter's successor, and took much amiss Cyprian's independent action, Cyprian, on the other hand, supported by all the African and Asiatic churches, utterly ignored any such superior authority, his well-known position being that, though Christ's separate commission to St. Peter had expressed the unity of the church, yet this commission was shared by all the apostles, and transmitted to all bishops alike in their several spheres. Unity, according to his theory, was to be maintained, not by the supremacy of one bishop over the rest, but by the consentient action of all, with the concession of considerable differences of practice without breach of unity. The extent to which he would allow such differences appears strikingly in the case before us, where he expressed himself willing to continue in full communion with Rome, though continuing a practice condemned by him in such unmeasured terms. Stephen, on the contrary, seems already to have taken the position, carried out to its full extent by subsequent popes, of claiming a peculiar supremacy to the Roman see, and requiring uniformity as a condition of communion. It would appear also, though it is true we have only the account of his opponents, that in asserting such claims he evinced a spirit of irritability and arrogance that caused additional offence.

With respect to the subject of the controversy itself, and the arguments adduced on both sides, we have to gather those of Stephen from the Cyprianic correspondence, where they are referred to and answered. The arguments of Stephen, and those who held with him, were mainly these: "We have immemorial custom on our side, especially the tradition of St. Peter's see, which is above all others. We have also Scripture and reason on our side; St. Paul rejoiced at the preaching of the gospel, and recognised it, though preached out of envy and strife. There is but one baptism; to reiterate it is sacrilege, and its efficacy depends, not on the administrators, but on the institution of Christ; whoever, then, has been once baptized in the name of Christ, even by heretics, has been validly baptized, and may not be baptized again."

[b] "Quod nunc Stephanus ausus est facere, rumpens adversum vos pacem, quam semper antecessores ejus vobiscum amore et honore mutuo custodierunt."—"Peccatum vero quam magnum tibi exaggerasti, quando te a tot gregibus scidisti? Excidisti enim teipsum: noli te fallere."—"Siquidem ille est vere schismaticus qui se a communione ecclesiastiae unitatis apostatam fecerit. Dum enim putas omnes a te abstineri posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti."—"Legatos episcopos patienter satis et leniter suscepit, ut eos nec ad sermonem saltem colloquii communis admitteret; adhuc insuper dilectionis et caritatis memor praeciperet fraternitati universae ne quis eos in domum suam reciperet; ut venientibus non solum pax et communio, sed et tectum et hospitium negaretur."

[c] "Atque ego in hac parte juste indignor in hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephanis stultitiam, quod qui sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta ecclesiae collocata sunt, multas alias petras inducat, et ecclesiarum multarum nova aedificia constituat, dum iste illic baptisma sua auctoritate defendit." "Nec metuis judicium Dei, haereticis testimonium contra Ecclesiam perhibens, cum scriptum sit, Falsus testis non erit impunitus." "Nisi quod imperitos etiam animosos atque iracundos esse manifestum est, dum per inopiam consilii et sermonis ad iracundiam facile vertuntur, ut de nullo alio magis quam de te dicat Scriptura divina, Homo, animosus parit lites, et vir iracundus exaggerat peccata."

Cyprian's answer to such arguments was: "As to your custom, however old, it is a corrupt one, and not primitive; no custom can be set against truth, to get at which we must go back to the original fountain. Scripture is really altogether against you; those at whose preaching of the gospel St. Paul rejoiced were not schismatics, but members of the church acting from unworthy motives; he re-baptized those who had been baptized only unto St. John's baptism, without acknowledgment of the Holy Ghost; he and the other apostles regarded schism and heresy as cutting men off from Christ; the Catholic church is one, 'a closed garden, a fountain sealed'; outside it there is no grace, no salvation, consequently no baptism; people cannot confer grace if they have not got it; we do not reiterate baptism, for those whom we baptize have not previously been baptized at all; it is you that make two baptisms in allowing that of heretics as well as that of the church. Again, you are inconsistent with yourselves; for you lay hands on those who come over from heresy, to give the Holy Ghost, thus acknowledging that the heretics cannot confer it; but, if so, neither can they baptize, for the operation of the Holy Ghost is essential to baptism." It is to be observed in this controversy that, though Stephen was narrower and more domineering than Cyprian in his demand of universal conformity to the traditions of his own see, yet, on the main question at issue, he was broader and more tolerant in allowing the operation of grace beyond the strict limits of ecclesiastical organisation. And, notwithstanding the unanimous opposition at the time of so large a portion of the church, the broader view upheld by Rome was, in the main, accepted finally; not, however, to the full extent apparently allowed by Stephen. The council of Arles, held in the time of pope Sylvester (A.D. 314), eventually endorsed the intermediate rule that converts from heresy, who could show that they had been baptized in the name of the Trinity, should be received by laying on of hands only, that they might receive the Holy Spirit; but those who could not should be baptized. (*Can. Arelat.* 8.) And this has since been the received orthodox view.

Stephen is honoured as a martyr in the Roman Calendar on Aug. 2. But though his martyrdom under Valerian is asserted in the Felician Catalogue and later editions of the Pontifical, and in Jerome's Martyrology, and though the acts of St. Stephen (dating probably from the 7th century) give particulars of it;—that he was beheaded in the cemetery, sitting on his chair, and there buried;—yet the probabilities are strongly against the alleged fact. His martyrdom is not mentioned in the earlier Liberian Catalogue, though that of his successor Xystus is; his name appears in the Liberian "depositio episcoporum," not "martyrum"; Augustin, who, in his controversy with the Donatists often mentions Stephen, makes no mention of his martyrdom; nor does Vincentius of Lerins. There is no allusion to it in the Cyprianic correspondence, nor in the life of Cyprian by Pontius, though there is in both to that of Xystus. Further, it was not till the middle of the year 258 that Valerian so far departed from his early fairness towards the Christians as to issue the edict visiting them with death (Cypr. *Ep.* 80). The origin of the story about Stephen's martyrdom is traced conclusively by De Rossi to a mistaken application to him of a Damasine inscription in the cemetery of Callistus which really referred to Xystus. The latter having been, according to authentic tradition, beheaded in another cemetery, that of Praetextatus, it was supposed that he had been also buried there, and hence that the chair of his martyrdom found in that of Callistus and the accompanying inscriptions belonged to another bishop, who was concluded to have been his predecessor, Stephen; the real fact being that the body and chair of Xystus had been removed after his martyrdom to the usual burial-place of the Roman bishops. [XYSTUS II.]

Stephanus is said in the Felician Catalogue to have been a Roman by birth, "ex patre iobio," and to have ordained that priests and Levites should not use their sacred vestments for daily wear, but only in church. Anastasius states that his father's name was Julius, that he was exiled, and after his safe return committed to prison by Maximinianus, together with nine presbyters, two bishops and three deacons; that there he held a synod, and that, after committing the treasures of his church to his deacon Xystus, he was beheaded. The Roman martyrology, celebrating him as saint and martyr on Aug. 2, says he was beheaded in his chair during the persecution under Valerian, before the altar, while saying mass, which he persisted in continuing, undeterred by the arrival of the soldiers. There is no reason to doubt the statement of the Felician Catalogue and the Martyrologia, that he was interred in the usual burial-place of the popes of his day, the cemetery of Callistus.

Three spurious decreta, addressed to a friend. Hilarion, and twelve to all bishops, have been assigned to Stephanus, their main purport being to direct proceedings against accused clergy, with reservation of appeals to Rome. [J. B—Y.]

STEPHANUS (2) II., pope elect, but not ordained, A.D. 752. Pope Zacharias having been buried on the 15th of March, this Stephen, a presbyter, was elected, and conducted to the Lateran palace: but after rising from sleep on the third day after his arrival there, he suddenly lost speech and consciousness, apparently from a stroke of apoplexy, and died on the following day. Another Stephen was then elected in his room. In modern lists of popes this latter is called Stephen III., the former, though he was never ordained, being, in virtue of his election, reckoned as Stephen II. So Baronius, though Pagi (*Critic. ad ann.* 752, xiii.) denies the claim of Stephen II. (so called) to a place among the popes. Onuphrius Panvinius (in *Chronic. Ecclesiast.*) is said to have been the first to give him one. Anastasius, and the ancients generally, speak of the pope now usually known as Stephen III. as the immediate successor of Zacharias.

[J. B—Y.]

STEPHANUS (3) III. (commonly so called: see foregoing article), bishop of Rome after Zacharias, chosen, after the sudden death of Stephanus the pope elect, unanimously in the church of St. Mary ad Praesepe, carried thence to the Lateran, and there ordained 26 March, A.D. 752, the see having been vacant for twelve days (Anast. *in Vit. Steph.*). He and his younger

brother Paulus, who succeeded him in the see, having been left orphans in childhood by their father Constantine, had been educated together in the Lateran under Gregory II. and succeeding popes, and ordained deacons by Zacharias.

His episcopate was of great political importance, being marked by the commencement of the temporal sovereignty of the popes over the Exarchate of Ravenna, and their ceasing to be, in any practical sense, subjects of the Greek emperors. The first step towards this important result was when pope Gregory III. (A.D. 741), despairing of succour from Constantinople or Ravenna, and being further estranged from the emperor through the iconoclastic controversy, had appealed to Charles Martel for aid against the invading Lombards. Afterwards pope Zacharias had carried on the policy of courting the favour of the Carolingian dynasty by giving the solemn sanction of the Apostolic see to the deposition of Childeric and the assumption of royal rank by Pippin. Thus the Frank monarch was already disposed by gratitude, as well as political and religious motives, to take the popes under his protection, and strengthen their position as his allies in Italy. The state of things was as follows. Before the accession of Stephen, pope Zacharias had concluded a treaty of peace for twenty years with Luitprand, the Lombard king; which had been confirmed by Luitprand's successor, Rachis, and (A.D. 749) by Aistulph, who succeeded Rachis. But Aistulph had already shown no disposition to observe the treaty. Stephen, therefore, in the third month after his ordination, sent to him his brother Paul and the Primicerius Ambrose, with many presents, to plead for observance of it; and they obtained from the king a confirmation of it for forty instead of twenty years. But this was a mere blind on the part of Aistulph, who only four months afterwards invaded the Exarchate, got possession of Ravenna, threatened Rome, and demanded from the Romans submission and tribute. Two venerable abbats, those of St. Benedict and St. Vincent, sent to him by Stephen, were contemptuously sent back to their monasteries with orders not to return to the pope. At this juncture John, one of the *Silentiarii* of the emperor Constantine Copronymus, came to Rome from Constantinople, with an injunction to Aistulph that he should restore the territory he had seized, and to the pope that he should move him to do so. The emperor, unprepared to do anything effective by force of arms, reckoned on the pope's spiritual influence, such as had been brought to bear with such effect by Gregory II., and by Zacharias too, on Luitprand. But Aistulph was not equally amenable to such influences. Hence, when Stephen sent his brother Paul, along with the imperial emissary, to Aistulph at Ravenna, they effected nothing, except that the king consented to send an ambassador to Constantinople. John then returned to his imperial master, accompanied by messengers from the pope, charged with letters in which the emperor was implored to send aid for the rescue of Rome from the invader. Stephen meanwhile exhorted and encouraged the Roman people, instituting processions, litanies, and continual devotional exercises, for imploring the aid of heaven. He himself, with naked feet, accompanied by the people with ashes on their heads, walked to the church of St. Mary ad Praesepe, bearing on his shoulder the image of the Saviour, and with the treaty that had been agreed to by the Lombard king attached to the cross which he carried. Every Saturday processions were made to the churches of St. Mary, or St. Peter, or St. Paul. But he did something still more practical. Despairing of redress from Constantinople, he contrived to send, through a pilgrim, a message to Pippin, appealing to him for succour. Pippin at once sent an abbat Droctegang (called by Anastasius "Rodigang") with a favourable reply; by whom, on his return, the pope sent further letters into France. He addressed on this occasion not only the king, but also the Frank nobles, urging them to further Pippin's pious designs, and holding out to them the prospect of remission of their sins and eternal reward in return for their defence of St. Peter (*Cod. Carolin. Ep.* 10, 11). Other emissaries were accordingly sent by Pippin, a bishop Chrodigang, and a duke Antcar, who on their arrival at Rome found there John the Silentiarius, who had been sent again by the emperor with a command to the pope to go in person to Aistulph, and obtain from him the cession of Ravenna and the Exarchate. Stephen accordingly proceeded to Pavia, where Aistulph was, accompanied by John and Pippin's messengers, intending, if possible, to escape to France in case of the probable failure of his mission to the Lombard king. He left Rome on the 14th of October, amid the tears and remonstrances of the people of the city and neighbourhood, and, though weak in body, resolutely proceeded on his way. He was encouraged by the serenity of the weather, which he regarded as betokening the favour of heaven, and by the sight of a globe of fire in the air, which seemed to pass from the direction of France into the Lombard territory. Arrived at Pavia, he implored the king, proffering gifts, to restore the Lord's sheep to their rightful owner, and John presented the letters of the emperor; but all in vain. Aistulph felt himself strong in his position, fearing neither the arms of the emperor nor the displeasure of St. Peter, and probably not then anticipating the action which Pippin was prepared to take. The Frank ambassadors then earnestly requested him to give the pope leave to retire with them to France. This demand seems to have surprised and alarmed him. Having interrogated Stephen whether this was his own wish also, and having found that it was, he is said by Anastasius to have ground his teeth like a lion; and he in vain sent messengers to dissuade the pope. At length, fearing, we may suppose, to provoke the wrath of the warlike Pippin, he gave his consent; and Stephen, with a company of clergy and others, left Pavia on the 15th of November for France. He travelled in haste, having received intelligence of a design of Aistulph to stop him after all, and did not feel safe till he was in Pippin's territory. It was an arduous undertaking for him, in his weak state of health, thus to cross the Alps in the winter season. In a subsequent letter to Pippin he speaks of the hardships and perils of his journey;—how he had been "afflicted in snow and frost, inundations of waters, violent rivers, most atrocious mountains, and divers dangers" (*Cod. Carolin. Ep.* 7). He rested at

length in the convent of St. Mauricius, in the valley of the Rhone above the lake of Geneva. A few days after his arrival there, the abbat Falrad and a duke Rothald came from Pippin to invite him to his palace at Pontico (Pontyon, near Langres); the queen, Bertrada, and the two princes, Charles and Carloman, with a company of ecclesiastics and nobles, were sent forward to escort him on his way; and at a distance of three miles from the palace the king himself met him, descended from his horse, prostrated himself, and proceeded on foot at the stirrup of the pope: and thus, amid "hymns and spiritual songs," Stephen arrived at Pontyon on the 6th of January, A.D. 754. It was there, the two potentates sitting together in the oratory of the palace, that Pippin is said to have first promised with an oath to recover the Exarchate for Rome. Thence they departed for Paris, with the intention that the pope should repose in the abbey of St. Dionysius till the termination of the winter season. When there, he fell dangerously ill, so that his life was despaired of; but he recovered unexpectedly through the special intervention, as was supposed, of St. Dionysius. He himself gave the following account of a vision which assured him of his recovery: "When the physicians despaired of me, I was praying in the Church of the Blessed Martyr under the bells, and I saw before the altar the good shepherd, the lord Peter, and the teacher of the Gentiles, the lord Paul, whom I recognised *de illorum surtariis* [a], and also the thrice blessed lord Dionysius to the right of the lord Peter, thin and tall, with beautiful face and white hair, clothed in a most white colobium bordered with purple, and a mantle all of purple starred with gold; and they conversed together joyfully. And the good shepherd, lord Peter, said, 'This our brother desires health': and the blessed lord Paul said, 'He will soon be healed': and he put his hand in a friendly manner on the breast of the lord Dionysius, and looked to the lord Peter, and the lord Peter said pleasantly to the lord Dionysius, 'His healing is thy boon.' And forthwith the blessed Dionysius, holding a censer of incense and a palm, with a priest and a deacon who were standing by, came to me and said, 'Peace be with thee, brother; fear not; thou shalt not die till thou hast returned prosperously to thy see. Rise whole, and dedicate this altar to the honour of God and of his apostles Peter and Paul whom thou beholdest, celebrating masses of thanksgiving.' There was at the same time inestimable brightness and sweetness. And being made presently whole by the grace of God, I desired to fulfil what had been enjoined me, and those who were present said that I was mad. Wherefore I related to them, and to the king and his nobles, what I had seen, and how I had been made whole: and I fulfilled what had been commanded me. Blessed be God." (*Apud Hilduin. in Areopagit.* See Baron. *ad ann.* 754, iii.; Labb. *in* Stephan. II.) A still more important function than the dedication of the altar was performed at the same time by Stephen in the church of St. Denys; viz. the anointing of Pippin and his two sons, Charles and Carloman, as kings of the Franks, the queen Bertrada being anointed also. Stephen is said on this occasion to have charged the Frank nobility, under the authority of St. Peter, that neither they nor their posterity should ever choose or accept any king but one of the Carlovingian race (*Ap. Hilduin. in Areopagit.*). A similar ceremony of anointing had been previously performed at Soissons under the authority of pope Zacharias. It appears to have been repeated on the occasion before us by the pope in person. The Frank annalists speak of both anointings, though Anastasius, Theophanes (*lib.* 22), and Paulus Diaconus (*lib.* 6, c. 5) refer only to the second. The anointing by Stephen took place (according to Hilduin) on the 28th of July, A.D. 754. From Paris Pippin proceeded to Carasiacum (*Chiersi*, near Noyon on the Oise, to the north-east of Paris), where he laid before his assembled nobles his design of invading Italy in fulfilment of his promise to the pope. Thither also came Carloman, the king's brother, who had a short time previously become a monk in Mount Cassino, and who was now sent by his abbat at the command of Aistulph, to dissuade Pippin from his purpose. Leo Ostiensis (*lib.* i. c. 7) asserts that he had undertaken this mission unwillingly, in obedience only to the order of his superior. Still, according to Anastasius, he pleaded earnestly against the proposed expedition; but in vain. Pippin and the pope, having taken counsel together about him, resolved on preventing his return to Italy by confining him in a monastery at Vienne, where he died in the following year. Before proceeding further, Pippin (at the earnest desire, Anastasius says, of Stephen) sent embassies once and again to the Lombard king, and it was not till the latter had shown himself determined to keep what he had got, that the Franks, late in the season, set forth, accompanied by the pope. They marched down the valley of the Rhone, by way of Lyons and Vienne. A detachment sent forward to secure the passes of the Cottian Alps was attacked there by Aistulph with a superior force, but routed the assailants: Aistulph fled, and shut himself up in Pavia: the main army of the Franks entered the Lombard territory, devastated it as they proceeded, and took Pavia after a short siege. Aistulph now sued for peace, which was granted him on easy terms. He was

[a] Al. *Surcariis.* The same word, with the same variation of the spelling in the MSS., occurs in a letter of Gregory I. to Secundinus (*Epp. Lib.* ix. *Indict.* ii. *Ep.* 52, *al.* 54):—"Ideoque direximus tibi surtarias (*al.* surcarias) duas imaginem Dei Salvatoris et sanctae Dei genetricis Mariae, beatorumque apostolorum Petri et Pauli, continentes." Baronius (*ad ann.* 754, iii.) interprets thus; "Surtaria idem quod scuta ubi sunt pictae imagines." So also Du Cange, who suggests *scutarias* as the original word. Stephen's meaning apparently is that he recognised the apostles from pictures of them preserved at Rome. The representations he was familiar with would naturally suggest the form of his dream or vision, the appearance and dress of S. Denys being probably suggested further by some picture of him in the church or convent. The whole story is perfectly natural and probable, not involving, as told by the pope himself, any miraculous intervention. A favourable turn after a crisis in his disease may have favoured the happy impressions experienced, probably in a dream, after prayer; and these impressions, strengthening his faith, might well hasten his recovery so as to surprise those who had been every day expecting him to die. Hence the sneers of Bower (*Lives of the Popes*) as though the whole story had been an invention of the pope's, are singularly out of place.

required only to pledge himself by solemn oath to surrender to the pope Ravenna and all the cities of the Exarchate, and to give hostages. With the latter Pippin returned to France, the abbat Fulrad, and Jerome, a son of Charles Martel, being left behind to accompany the pope to Rome. Anastasius, who throughout his narrative speaks of the pope's repeated attempts to avoid the necessity of warfare, attributes the peace thus concluded to his intercession with Pippin, and his deprecation of any further shedding of Christian blood. But the Frank continuator of the annals of Fredegarius, who tells the story of the campaign with more detail than Anastasius, says nothing of this, referring all to the clemency and compassion of Pippin, who, as he further significantly says, received, as well as his nobles, large gifts from the Lombard king. And that Stephen had not really been the instigator of the easy terms granted after conquest appears plainly enough from a letter of his own, written to Pippin after Aistulph had broken his engagement, in which he says, "They (i.e. Aistulph and his associates) deceived your prudence through bland discourses and persuasions and oaths, and you believed them, speaking falsehood, rather than us, who spoke the truth. For with great grief and sadness, most excellent king, our heart was filled, that your goodness would not hear us."—Again, "We truly forewarned you of all the lying and falseness of that impious king, and what we told you is now manifest" (*Cod. Carol. Ep.* 7). This evident inconsistency between Stephen's own language and the assertions of his panegyrist much invalidates what the latter tells us of the pope's unwillingness to avail himself of the armed intervention of his protector. No such unwillingness appears from any of his extant letters. On the contrary, he passionately adjures him, when in subsequent straits, to bring his arms to bear.

After the departure of the French army, Aistulph, as Stephen seems to have expected, entirely disregarded the treaty he had been compelled to swear to. He refused to cede any part of his previous conquests, and, further, began to harass the Roman territory. Stephen wrote to France to represent the state of things, which he says would be attested by Fulrad, who accompanied his envoy. His letter is addressed to Pippin and his two sons, and implores them in the most earnest language to complete quickly the work they had promised Peter, the doorkeeper of heaven, to accomplish for him. It reminds them of their high privilege in having been chosen by the apostle as his champions, and of their confusion at the day of judgment if he should exhibit against them the handwriting of their unfulfilled promise. This letter appears to have been despatched before the close of the year 755; for it was evidently before the siege of Rome by Aistulph, which appears from a subsequent letter to have been commenced on the 1st of January in the following year.[b] This second letter was sent by Warner, a Frank abbat, who had been with the pope in Rome, and who, after keeping guard in armour by day and night on the walls of the beleaguered city, had managed with difficulty to escape by sea to Marseilles. It is full of most lamentable complaints, and most impassioned appeals. The state of things is described as so desperate that even the stones might be said to weep; Rome had been closely invested for fifty-five days; the Lombards, with worse than heathen ferocity, had devastated the country, burnt the houses, slain the inhabitants, robbed churches, burnt sacred images, carried away in bags the consecrated hosts, which they had eaten while gorged with food, beaten monks, and violated nuns; Aistulph, confident of success, had called on the Romans to give the pope into his hands under pain of having their walls battered down and being all killed with one sword: Pippin is both affectionately entreated and solemnly warned; the writer represents himself as falling at his feet and clinging to his robes, and adjuring him by the divine mysteries, by the living God, and by Peter the prince of the apostles, to come to the rescue without the least delay: and the king is more than once reminded of the day of judgment, when, if he came not, the Lord would say to him, "I know thee not, because thou hast not helped the church of God, and defended his peculiar people in the hour of danger"; whereas, if he came at once, he might hope for success in arms and all prosperity in this life, and eternal glory in the next (*Cod. Carol. Ep.* 6). A more extraordinary letter was sent after this, addressed to Pippin, his sons, the bishops, clergy, abbats, monks, nobles, generals, and people of France, in the name of St. Peter himself. The apostle is made to speak throughout in his own person, beginning, "I, Peter." He adjures and commands his adopted sons to come to the rescue of his church and people, promising to be with them and help them, though unseen, to befriend them in the day of account, and prepare for them "most bright and beautiful tabernacles, and eternal rewards, and infinite joys of Paradise," in return for their services. He threatens them, should they disobey him, with "torments of body and soul in the eternal and inextinguishable fire of Tartarus, with the devil and his pestiferous angels"; and, finally, in case of any delay whatever in coming to the deliverance of his own Roman church and its vicar, he declares them by the authority of the holy and undivided Trinity, to be alienated from the kingdom of God and eternal life. He also tells them, in the course of his address, that the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of God, sent her commands and adjurations also, together with the whole heavenly host, and the martyrs of Christ (*Cod. Carol. Ep.* 3). It may be that the pope intended Pippin to accept this as a real communication from the courts of heaven, and that he did not, in doing so, overrate the king's simplicity of faith. No such tremendous appeal, however, seems to have been needed. Pippin, as soon as he had heard of Aistulph's treachery, "moved with exceeding anger and fury" (says the Frank annalist), set out on his march by the same

[b] Baronius and Pagi suppose the siege of Rome by Aistulph to have been at the beginning of the year 755. Mansi sees reason for concluding that the year was 756. Independently of the documentary evidence which he adduces, the later date seems in itself more likely, since it gives the Lombard king more time to have recovered himself for aggressive action after the departure of the Frank army.

route as before, again penetrated the Lombard kingdom, driving Aistulph's opposing hosts before him, and again besieged him in Pavia. Meanwhile emissaries from the emperor (John the Silentiarius and another) came to Rome, intending to proceed to Pippin's court, and could hardly believe the news that he was already on his march to Italy. They went on by sea to Marseilles, a messenger from the pope accompanying them, and found that the Frank army had already entered Lombardy. Thither they followed, having schemed, without success, to leave the pope's messenger behind them, and found Pippin approaching Pavia. They pleaded with him, offering bribes, that to the emperor, and not to the pope, the Exarchate, when recovered, should be restored. But he is said by Anastasius to have replied to this effect: "By no means will I suffer these cities to be in any way alienated from the power of the blessed Peter, of the Roman church, and the pontiff of the apostolic see. I swear that not for the favour of any man have I twice given myself to this contest, but for the love of the blessed Peter and the pardon of my sins; and no amount of treasure shall induce me to take away from the blessed Peter what I have once offered to him." There is no reason to doubt that Pippin was sincere in such a declaration of his motives, though, human motives being usually mixed, other considerations may have impelled him also. He doubtless fully believed in the religion he had been taught; and he regarded with peculiar awe, as well as gratitude, the bishop of Rome, who was to him the representative of the prince of the apostles and the doorkeeper of heaven, and who had given the sanction of heaven to his own assumption of royalty. The result of this second compaign was that Aistulph was compelled to surrender all and more than he had previously promised; the abbat Fulrad was left in Italy to receive the cession of the various cities, and to take hostages from all; and with these he proceeded to Rome, and laid the donation of Pippin, with the keys of the ceded cities, on the tomb of St. Peter. It is to be observed that this memorable donation did not imply the entirely independent sovereignty of the popes. At first, the theory at least of the emperor's supremacy over the Exarchate seems to have been retained; and afterwards, under Charlemagne, the popes were still regarded as owing homage and allegiance to their Frank suzerain, such as had been previously due to the Greek emperor, though the conquered territories were thenceforth made over to St. Peter as his inalienable possession. (See under HADRIANUS (8), with respect to the subsequent confirmation of this donation by Charlemagne.) It is to be observed also that Rome was now regarded politically as a republic under the pope as its head, and is so spoken of in the transactions with Pippin. The forms of the ancient republic had been reverted to under Gregory II. Pippin received the title of *Patricius* of Rome.

While measures were still in progress and incomplete for the cession to the pope of the recovered territories, Aistulph was killed by a fall from his horse in hunting, probably at the end of the year 756, leaving no issue. Desiderius, a Lombard duke, who was in command in Tuscany, thereupon collected an army of Tuscans with a view of seizing the throne, but was opposed by Rachis (Aistulph's elder brother, who, after reigning for a short time, had abdicated and retired into a monastery), and by the Lombards generally. Desiderius then had recourse to Stephen, who, with Fulrad, took up his cause, having obtained from him a promise, on oath and in writing, to cede the territory without delay. They were prepared to aid him with an army of Franks and Romans; and he thus obtained the kingdom without further conflict. How far he kept his promises will be seen under PAULUS (43). Stephen announced to Pippin what had been done in a letter written in his usual extravagant style. It is full of most exuberant expressions of exultation, gratitude, and laudation of the Frank king and his family. It calls him a new Moses, and a most illustrious David. Dominion and prosperity through lengthened life, and eternal crowns at last, reserved for them from the beginning of the world, are prayed for in behalf of him, his most sweet and most Christian wife, and his most sweet sons, who are the pope's also. At the same time the necessity of Pippin's completing his work by making Desiderius fulfil his promises is strongly intimated thus: — "I beg thee, my son, I beg thee before the living God, and strongly conjure thee, to continue more perfectly this good work, and not be moved to decline to another side (which God forbid) by the blandishments, persuasions, or promises of men." The king is also implored, as if there were a little fear on this head, for the sake of his own soul, to maintain the holy catholic and apostolic faith uncontaminated by the pestiferous malice of the Greeks. The allusion is probably to the iconoclastic controversy. The death of Aistulph is referred to thus:—"That tyrant and follower of the devil, Aistulph, that devourer of the blood of Christians, that destroyer of the churches of God, has been smitten by a divine blow, and sunk into the gulf of hell." (*Cod. Carol. Ep.* 8.)

In the year 754 the emperor Constantine Copronymus had assembled a council at Constantinople, purporting to be a general one, and called by its adherents the 7th ecumenical, by which image-worship was condemned. But it was not attended by the patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, or Alexandria, and of course the bishops of Rome repudiated it. We have no record of any action of Stephen with respect to it; he was at the time, as has been seen, otherwise occupied; but he is referred to in a letter of pope Hadrian to Constantine VII. and Irene as having, as well as other popes during the controversy about images, remonstrated with the emperor on the subject.

When Stephen was at Chiersi, the monks of a neighbouring monastery called Brittaniacum appear to have applied to him for instruction on certain questions about which they were in doubt; and he replied to them under nineteen heads. Some of his answers refer to conjugal relations, others to baptism, others to clerical and monastic discipline. One of those relating to baptism is interesting, as showing that immersion was then so much the rule that even the validity of aspersion had been doubted among the Franks. Stephen rules that baptism by aspersion from a shell or the hands in cases

of sickness was allowable and valid. Among the letters of Stephen there is one, granting to the abbat Fulrad the possession during his life of a house and hospital at Rome, and another to the same, giving him licence to found monasteries anywhere in France, exempt from all episcopal jurisdiction except that of the apostolic see. Anastasius describes Stephen as a swift succourer of Christ's poor, a visitor of widows and orphans, and a steadfast preacher of the word of God, and speaks of his having restored and enriched four hospitals in Rome. He was buried, according to Anastasius, in St. Peter's, on the 26th of April, A.D. 757, having held the see a little more than five years. The authorities for his life are Anastasius (*in Lib. Pontif.*), the Frank annalists, and his own letters, preserved principally in the *Codex Carolinus.* [J. B—Y.]

STEPHANUS (4) IV. (commonly so designated, though more properly STEPHANUS III., as he is called by Anastasius: see under STEPHANUS II. and III.), bishop of Rome, from 7 August, A.D. 768, to the beginning of February, A.D. 772, during three and a half years. An account of the usurpation of the see after the death of pope Paulus (A.D. 767) by Constantine, and the overthrow of the usurper after a reign of thirteen months will be found in other articles [CONSTANTINUS II., and PHILIPPUS (19)]. Christophorus the primicerius, who, with the aid of certain Lombards, had been the main agent in the deposition of Constantine, assembled without delay the clergy, military, notables, and general population of Rome, who elected Stephen presbyter of the church of St. Caecilia. He was a Sicilian, who had come to Rome in the time of pope Gregory III., and by him been placed as a monk in the newly founded monastery of St. Chrysogonus; had been taken by pope Zacharias into his own service in the Lateran palace, and made presbyter of the church of St. Caecilia aforesaid; had been similarly retained in the service of popes Stephanus and Paulus; and had waited on the last-named pope during his last illness till his death. Between his election (5 Aug.) and his consecration (7 Aug.), horrible barbarities, sadly significant of the savagery of the time, were perpetrated by his supporters on the leaders of the vanquished party. Passivus, brother of the usurper Constantine, had his eyes put out, and was confined in the monastery of St. Silvester; a bishop Theodore was deprived of his tongue as well as his eyes, and left to die of hunger and thirst in a monastery on Mount Scaurus, crying in vain for water; Constantine himself, having been publicly exhibited on horseback on a woman's saddle, with great weights tied to his feet, was secluded in the monastery of Cellae Novae, whence he was brought before a conclave of clergy in the Lateran Basilica on the day before the consecration of Stephen, finally deposed, and sent back to his confinement. The ordination of the new pope was accompanied by a general act of penitence of the Roman people for having allowed the recent usurpation, their confession being read out in a loud voice from the ambo of St. Peter's church. Even after this the cruelties were continued, though not, it is to be hoped, with the pope's sanction, whom Anastasius, who relates them, acquits of complicity. Gracilis, a tribune, who had supported Constantine, was brought by the soldiery from Aratrum in Campania to Rome, imprisoned, and deprived of his eyes and tongue; Constantine, the deposed usurper, was dragged from the monastery of Cellae Novae by a band of soldiers, blinded, and left lying in the street; Waldipert, the Lombard priest, who, after aiding Christophorus the primicerius against Constantine, had taken upon him to set up the monk Philip as pope [PHILIPPUS (18)], having been accused of treating with Theodicius, duke of Spoleto, for the assassination of Christophorus and the betrayal of Rome to the Lombards, was seized in the church of St. Mary ad Martyres (the Pantheon), where he had taken refuge, had his eyes and tongue torn out, and died in prison from the treatment he had received.

Stephen, after his consecration, pursued at first the policy of his predecessors, who had sought with such good effect the protection of the king of the Franks. He sent a messenger to Pippin and his sons, to ask for divines from France, who might assist in a council at Rome for restoring canonical order. Pippin was dead when the messengers arrived in France, but his sons Charles and Carloman received them graciously, and sent twelve bishops for the purpose indicated. A council of Italian prelates was held in the Lateran basilica, at which the bishops from France assisted, under the pope's presidency, A.D. 769. Its proceedings, according to Anastasius (*in vit. Stephan.*), were as follows:—

The recent usurpation was first brought under review. The blinded Constantine was brought in, and asked how, being but a layman, he had dared to usurp the popedom. He pleaded compulsion on the part of the Roman people, resorted to with the view of remedying the grievances they had suffered under pope Paul; he prostrated himself on the pavement, confessed his guilt, and implored pardon. Introduced on the following day, and again questioned, he pleaded other instances of laymen having been advanced at once to the episcopate—Sergius of Ravenna, Stephen of Naples, and others; but he was interrupted by the indignant bishops, beaten on the neck, and cast out of the church. Pope Stephen, as president, however innocent he might be of complicity with former atrocities, cannot but have sanctioned this unseemly violence. The culprit being thus summarily disposed of, the written acts of his episcopate, and those of the council that had confirmed his election, were burnt in the church; and the pope himself, with the rest, performed an act of penitence, falling on the ground and crying, "Kyrie eleison," for having received the communion at his hands. The council proceeded to decree that all ecclesiastical acts performed by Constantine during his usurpation, except baptism and holy chrism, should be accounted null and void, and that all bishops, priests, and deacons, ordained by him should, if re-elected, be consecrated anew,[a] and, even so, be debarred from

[a] Holy orders conferred by a bishop being regarded as indelible, and Constantine, however irregularly appointed, having received episcopal consecration, Baronius

rising to higher rank in the church. It was further ordained, under anathema, that in all future time none should be eligible for the popedom but such as had already risen regularly through the inferior orders to the rank of Cardinal priest or deacon.[b] In certain fragments of the acts of this council (edidit Romae Lucas Holstein: see Labbe, tom. viii. p. 484), a further decree appears that none of the laity, whether of the army or otherwise, should take part in the future election of popes; that no persons should be present armed, or carrying clubs; and that none from the camps of Tuscany or Campania should be invited or introduced into the city at the time of an election. The council proceeded to pass decrees in support of the worship of images, and to anathematize the council under Constantine Copronymus at Constantinople (A.D. 754), in which their use had been condemned. It appears that, among other arguments in favour of their retention and adoration, there was adduced, by Sergius of Ravenna, the testimony of St. Ambrose as to his having recognised one of the apostles, seen in vision, from a picture; and also the story of our Lord having sent a representation of himself to Agbarus, king of Edessa (Anastas. *in Vit. Stephan.*; also *Ep. Hadrian. pap. ad Carol. Magn. de imaginibus, Post act. Concil. Nicaen.* ii.: Labbe). After the council, there was a procession of pope, clergy, and people, chanting hymns and with bare feet to St. Peter's, where the decrees were read publicly from the pulpit, and then, by three bishops, an anathema against all who should at any time transgress them.

The Lombard king, Desiderius, who still failed to give up all the cities ceded to Rome under the treaty of Pavia [STEPHANUS (3) and PAULUS (43)], was a cause of continual trouble to the pope, most, if not all, of his recorded action being with reference to difficulties due to him. Sergius, archbishop of Ravenna, already alluded to us an instance, cited by Constantine, of a layman having been made a bishop, and also as having taken part in the proceedings of the Roman council, died soon after its conclusion. One Michael, scriniarius of the church of Ravenna, himself also a layman only, obtained the aid of an armed force from Mauritius, duke of Ariminum, with the support of Desiderius, to take possession of the see,—Leo, the duly elected successor of Sergius, being removed to Ariminum, and there confined. The bishops of Ravenna, in virtue of its being the seat of the exarchate, had previously claimed an autocephalous position against the claims of Rome [VITALIANUS (6)]; and the Lombard king was probably glad of the chance of getting a bishop placed in that important see, who, being indebted to himself for his elevation, would not be likely to support the pope against him. But if so, the project failed. It was at this time, though not always in former times, acknowledged at Ravenna that the new patriarch must receive consecration from the pope. Though solicited with bribes by Mauritius and the magistrates of Ravenna, Stephen refused to acknowledge or consecrate Michael; and at length, after protracted negociations, having the important support of ambassadors from the court of France, he prevailed on the people of Ravenna to rise against the intruder and recall Leo, who was consecrated by himself, and obtained possession of the see (Anastas. *in Vit. Stephan.*). More serious was the trouble in which the pope was involved through the action of Desiderius at Rome. There Christophorus and his son Sergius (who had been the leading opponents of the usurper Constantine) had been instant with the Lombard king for the fulfilment of his promises under the treaty of Pavia. Their ascendancy, therefore, Desiderius was in the first place desirous to put down. With this view, having bribed one Paulus, surnamed Asiarta, the pope's chamberlain, to further his schemes, he went himself with an armed force to Rome, but found an army from Tuscany and Campania collected to resist him, and the gates of the city closed against him. He then took possession of the Vatican, which was outside the walls, and sent for the pope to visit him there on the plea of treating with him about the cession of the territories which he still retained. The pope went, and after pleading for the rights of St. Peter, returned to the city. Meanwhile, Paul Asiarta had raised a party among the people against Christophorus and Sergius, who collected also an armed party of their own: conflict ensued; the party of Paul, getting the worst of it, took refuge in the Lateran; the other party attacked them there, but were reprimanded by the pope, and ordered to return. Stephen again visited Desiderius in the Vatican, who now insisted on his dismissing his two advisers, Christophorus and Sergius. He closed also all the gates of the Vatican, allowing none of the pope's followers to escape till his desires were complied with. The pope accordingly sent two bishops to Christophorus and Sergius, desiring them either to retire into a monastery for the salvation of their souls, or to come at once to the Vatican. They, naturally fearing the consequences of putting themselves into the power of Desiderius, refused to come, sending word that they would rather surrender themselves to their own fellow citizens than to a foreigner. But, as they now appeared to be in the pope's, as well as the Lombard king's, disfavour, their adherents began to fall off; and one Gratiosus especially, a duke who was related to them, deserted their cause, and, with others of the Romans, repaired by night to the pope in the Vatican. Christophorus and Sergius, finding themselves thus deserted by their friends, made their escape over the walls of Rome, but were captured by the Lombard guards and taken to the king, who delivered them to the pope. He, after ordering them to become monks, left them in the Vatican, and returned into the city. After this, they were seized in St. Peter's church by Paulus Asiarta and his followers, after conference of the latter with Desiderius, and had their eyes put out,

is unwilling to believe an actual repetition of ordination to be intended. But the word used by Anastasius is *consecrandi*, which elsewhere means ordination; and he expressly says, "Statutum est ut omnia quae idem Constantinus in ecclesiasticis sacramentis ac divino cultu egit iterari debuissent, praeter sacrum baptisma ac sanctum chrisma."

[b] Cardinal priests and deacons were those appointed as permanent ministers of churches with cure of souls, such being still so designated, not at Rome only, but elsewhere. Hence the ordinance did not, in virtue of this expression, confine eligibility to the Roman clergy.

after the savage custom of the time. Christophorus, carried to the monastery of St. Agatha, died there after three days; Sergius remained in a prison of the Lateran palace during the remainder of Stephen's reign.

Such is the account given by Anastasius of what occurred. A different one is given by pope Stephen himself in a letter written by him to queen Bertrada, Pippin's widow, and her son Charles (*Charlemagne*). In this letter he asserts that Christophorus and Sergius had conspired against his life with Dodo, the emissary of Charles's brother Carloman; that they had invaded the Lateran with an armed force in order to kill him; that he had escaped to the Vatican, and put himself under the protection of Desiderius, who had come to Rome in order to render justice to St. Peter, that the conspirators had thereupon raised sedition in Rome, and closed the gates; that numbers of the people had, notwithstanding, escaped to the Vatican, and had at length brought Christophorus and Sergius thither; that the latter would have been slain there by the incensed multitude, had not he (the pope) protected them; and that they had been afterwards attacked and deprived of their eyes; but, he calls God to witness, against his own will and purpose. He attributes his own escape from assassination, after God and St. Peter, to his most excellent son Desiderius, who, he adds, had fully satisfied all the claims of St. Peter; and he further intimates his belief that Carloman would not approve of the iniquity of his emissary Dodo. (*Cod. Carolin.* ep. 46.) This account of things is so different from that given by Anastasius, and the assertion that Desiderius had fully satisfied the claims of St. Peter so inconsistent with known facts, and with what Stephen himself says in other letters, that he is supposed by some to have written on this occasion under intimidation or compulsion, while he was confined in the Vatican by the Lombard king.[e] The plan of the latter evidently was to force the pope into submission to himself, as his only available protector, and to alienate him from his Frank allies. With this view Christophorus and Sergius, who had been the strenuous supporters of the Frank alliance, were got rid of; and the pope himself was artfully induced to concur in degrading them, and to accuse also Carloman's emissary in his letter to Charlemagne, who, being already at variance with his brother, was not at that time likely to co-operate with him, especially when assured by the pope himself that Desiderius was friendly. His general design appears from pope Hadrian's statement (Anastas. *in Vit. Hadrian.*), that, when Stephen afterwards demanded from him the fulfilment of his promise, he replied,—"Sufficit apostolico Stephano quia tuli Christophorum et Sergium de medio, qui illi dominabantur, ut non illi sit necesse justitias requirendas. Nam certe, si ego ipsum apostolicum non adjuvero, magna perditio super eum eveniet. Quoniam Carolomannus rex Francorum, amicus existens praedictorum Christophori et Sergii, paratus est cum suis exercitibus ad vindicandum eorum mortem Romam properare, ipsumque capiendum pontificem." But whether or not Stephen had for a time really trusted Desiderius, or been inclined to the policy of alliance with him, he soon found occasion to adopt a very different one: for the royal brothers, Charles and Carloman, having been reconciled to each other, sent not long afterwards an embassy to Rome to announce the fact; and Stephen replied, expressing his great joy, and calling on the two kings in the name of St. Peter, and in view of their prospects at the day of judgment, to lose no time in completing what they and their father had undertaken by compelling the Lombard king to fulfil his engagements; imploring them also to believe no one who might tell them that he had already done so. (*Cod. Carolin.* ep. 47.) But Desiderius now plotted against him by courting on his own part the friendship of the reconciled brothers, and proposing even a matrimonial alliance, viz.: that Adalgisus, his son, should marry Gisila, the daughter of Pippin, and that either Charlemagne or Carloman should marry his own daughter Desiderata. The fact that both the French kings had wives already does not seem to have been any serious difficulty. For, notwithstanding this impediment, Bertrada, the Frank queen-mother, took up and furthered the scheme, so far at least as the marriage of one of her sons to the Lombard princess was concerned. But Stephen, on being informed of it, opposed it earnestly. He wrote a long letter to Charles and Carloman, using every argument he could think of to dissuade them from it. He urged, among other considerations, the unlawfulness of their putting away their existing wives,—two most beautiful ladies of their own nation, to whom their father Pippin had espoused them, and to whom they ought to be bound in love; but still more forcibly he enlarged on the degradation and pollution that would ensue, if royal scions of the glorious Frank nation, which was the first of all nations, should unite themselves to strange women,—and these of the perfidious and most fetid Lombard race, which could not even be numbered among the nations, and from union with which a leprous progeny would be sure to spring. "No one in his senses (he says) "would even suspect that such most illustrious kings could be implicated in such a detestable and abominable contagion." He pressed also the fact, that the Lombards were the persistent enemies of himself and of St. Peter, whom the two kings had sworn to defend, and whose favour, so important for their eternal interests, would be forfeited by the proposed alliance. Finally, he informs them that he had placed this his exhortation and adjuration, before sending it, on the tomb of St. Peter, and had offered the holy sacrifice over it, and that whosoever should act in opposition to it would be under the anathema of the prince of the apostles, and alienated from the kingdom of God, and condemned to burn eternally in hell. (*Cod. Carol.* ep. 45.) But not even this tremendous fulmination deterred queen Bertrada from her purpose. The energetic lady, in the interests of peace, went in person first to her son Carloman, at a place called Salossa, to cement his reconciliation with his brother; thence to Thassilo, duke of Bavaria and nephew of Pippin, who

[e] So Le Cointe maintains (*Annal. Eccles.* ad ann. 769); and Pagi (*Critic. in Baron.*). Mansi, on the contrary, sees no sufficient ground for the supposition, inasmuch as neither Stephen in any subsequent letters, nor pope Hadrian afterwards, say a word about any compulsion.

had been inclined to throw off his allegiance to the Frank kings; and from him to Desiderius in Italy; and, after visiting Rome, returned to France with Desiderata, who was married to Charlemagne, though only to be repudiated by him, and sent back to her father, in the following year. Neither Charlemagne nor his brother had, it may be gathered, any great liking from the first for the matrimonial scheme, which seems to have been accomplished entirely through Bertrada, whom Charlemagne held in great reverence, being said never to have had any difference with her, except when, against her will, he divorced Desiderata. "Mater quoque ejus Berthrada in magno apud eum honore consenuit. Colebat enim eam cum summa reverentia, ita ut nulla unquam invicem sit exorta discordia praeter in divortio filiae Desiderii regis, quam illa suadente acceperat." (Einhard. *in Vit. Caroli M.* c. 18.) It may excite surprise that the widow of Pippin, who had himself evinced such great reverence for St. Peter's see, should after his death have so entirely disregarded the pope's anathema, and worked so resolutely in defiance of him. Usually queens, rather than the male members of royal houses, have been found most amenable to spiritual influences; but it was evidently not so in this case. She was plainly a strong-minded woman with a will of her own; and Stephen's previous conduct had not been such as to inspire her with respect for his personal character or consistency; for he had once (whether under intimidation or not) lauded Desiderius as being his excellent friend. Her action, however, seems to have been intended for the pope's advantage, as well as for the promotion of general peace: for her visit to Desiderius is said by the Frank annalists to have had the further result of inducing him to cede some at least of the cities claimed by St. Peter's see. "Hoc anno Domna Berta fuit in Italia propter filiam Desiderii regis; et redditae sunt civitates plurimae Sancti Petri." (*Annal. Petavian.* ad ann. 770.) Stephen's opposition to the match may have thus been mitigated. There is no record of any further protest from him. The part of the original proposal of Desiderius, which consisted in the marriage of his son to Gisila, was not carried into effect. Bertrada probably herself rejected it. The princess, who had been adopted by pope Paul I. at the time of her baptism as his spiritual daughter, and who had been early devoted to a religious life, entered a convent afterwards, and became an abbess. The ancient authorities for the life as above given are, Anastasius (*Vit. Stephani III.* and *Vit. Hadrian.*), Einhard (*Vit. Caroli M.*, and *Annales*); the Frank annalists generally; and the *Codex Carolinus*, containing letters, some of which have been referred to. [J. B—Y.]

STEPHANUS (5), African bishop, Cyp. *Ep.* 44, 45. See POMPEIUS (1). [E. W. B.]

STEPHANUS (6), seventh in the list of the mythical British bishops of London. For authorities, *vid.* OBINUS. [C. H.]

STEPHANUS (7), bishop of Laodicea in Syria Prima, succeeded Anatolius shortly before the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution. He was very celebrated for his knowledge of philosophy and general secular culture; but in the persecution he turned coward, and concealed his faith. (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32.) [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (8), a bishop among the Eusebian party mentioned in the synodal letter of the council of Sardica (Theod. *H. E.* ii. 8). Tillemont (vii. 270) thinks he may have been bishop of Antioch after FLACCILLUS. [C. H.]

STEPHANUS (9), bishop of Germanicia, in the province of Euphratensis, ordained to the see by Meletius of Antioch, to correct the erroneous teaching of Eudoxius the Arian, who, before his successive elevation to the patriarchal thrones of Antioch and Constantinople, had been bishop of that city. The event proves the wisdom of the choice. The orthodox faith triumphed, and, according to Theodoret, "by his spiritual teaching wolves were changed into sheep." (Theod. *H. E.* v. 4; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 940.) [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (10), a Libyan bishop ordained by SECUNDUS (2), bishop of Ptolemais in the Libyan Pentapolis, by both of whom the presbyter Secundus was murdered (Athan. *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 65). He is mentioned again by Athanasius (*De Synod.* § 12) as accused with Serras and Polydeuces of various crimes. (Tillem. viii. 176.) [C. H.]

STEPHANUS (11), bishop of Jamnia or Jabne in Palaestina Prima, 440–457 (Gams), frequently mentioned in the life of St. Euthymius. He was one of the three brothers, natives of Melitene, the other two being Andrew and Gaianus, kinsmen of Synodius by whom Euthymius himself had been brought up, who became disciples of that celebrated ascetic (*Vit. S. Euthym.* c. 41, *ap.* Coteler, *Mon. Graec.* ii. 233). Synodius having visited his former pupil at his Laura, after the council of Ephesus, took him back with him to Jerusalem, where he induced Juvenal to ordain him deacon at the same time with Cosmas (*ibid.* c. 54, p. 245). Juvenal subsequently ordained him to the see of Jamnia (*ibid.* c. 57, p. 247). Stephen attended the council of Chalcedon in 451, when he subscribed the decrees (Labbe, iv. 82, 585, 788), and personally joined in the condemnation of Dioscorus (*ibid.* 445). As soon as the council was over, he and John, bishop of the Saracens, returned with all speed to Euthymius to communicate its decrees to him, reserving their own judgment until they were put in possession of his (*Vit. S. Euthym.* c. 78, p. 260; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 588). [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (12), bishop of Ephesus, at the time of the Robber Synod and of the fourth general council of Chalcedon. The whole of the eleventh session of that council held on Oct. 29, 451, was taken up with an investigation of the complaint brought forward against Stephen by Bassianus, formerly bishop of Ephesus [BASSIANUS]. From the pleadings in that trial we learn that Stephen had been then during fifty years one of the clergy of Ephesus, which would fix his ordination about the year 400, so that he must have been a man of very advanced years at the time of the council. Stephen was substituted as bishop in place of Bassianus, who was expelled by violence

about A.D. 448. Stephen and Bassianus were both deprived of the bishoprick by decree of the Synod, but allowed a pension of two hundred gold pieces. (Mansi, t. vii. 271–294; Hefele's *Councils*, t. iii. p. 371, Clark's trans.) The name of Stephen of Ephesus is attached to a MS. collection of sermons in the imperial library at Vienna (Lambecii *Commentar.* iii. 66; Fabric. *Bib. Graec.* xii. 183, ed. Harles). [G. T. S.]

STEPHANUS (13), bishop of Tripolis in Phoenicia Prima, in the 5th century, mentioned in the life of St. Euthymius, as the founder of a monastery in honour of the martyr Leontius, which he presided over for twenty-one years. He was succeeded by his nephew Leontius (*Vit. S. Euthym.* cc. 128, 129, *apud* Coteler. *Mon. Graec.* ii. 309, 310). A Syriac translation of a letter of Severus of Antioch to Stephen is among the MSS. of the British Museum (Wright, *Catalogue*, dcxcii. 9). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 824.) [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (14) I., bishop of Hierapolis, succeeded John in 445, Domnus of Antioch coming in person to enthrone him (Labbe, iv. 658). Immediately afterwards (according to the Latin Subscriptions (*ibid.* 644) he attended the Synod summoned by Domnus at Antioch, at which Athanasius of Perrha was deposed, and the complaints against Ibas of Edessa were first entertained. In obedience to the injunctions of this Synod, Stephen proceeded to the ordination of a successor to Athanasius in the person of Sabinianus (*ibid.* 719, 722). In August, 459, he took part in the "Robbers' Council" at Ephesus (*ibid.* 117, 261, 308), where he followed the majority in rehabilitating Eutyches and condemning Flavian. We find him again at Chalcedon in 451 (*ibid.* 79, 373, 450) repudiating his former acts, and joining in the condemnation of Eutyches. The encyclical of the emperor Leo in 547 was addressed to Stephen among other metropolitans (*ibid.* 890), but his reply does not appear. According to Le Quien he signed the synodal letter of Gennadius *de Simoniacis* in 459, but his name is not among the few preserved in the mutilated list given by Labbe (*ibid.* 1029). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 928.) [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (15) II., bishop of Hierapolis, c. 600, who, according to Evagrius, wrote the life of Golanduch, a Persian female martyr under Chosroes I. (Evagr. *H. E.* v. 20; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 930). [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (16) I., patriarch of Antioch A.D. 478–480 (Clinton, *F. R.* ii. 536, 553). On the deposition of Joannes Codonatus, of Apamea, after his three months' occupancy of the see of Antioch (JOANNES (35)) Stephen (ἀνὴρ εὐλαβής) was elected to succeed him by the same synod, summoned by the decree of Zeno (*lib. Synod.* ap. Labbe, iv. 1151; Theophan. *Chronogr.* p. 107). Stephen immediately sent a synodic letter to Acacius, bishop of Constantinople to announce his consecration to the see, and to acquaint him with the circumstances connected with it. Acacius thereupon convened a synod, A.D. 478, by which the whole transaction was confirmed. The partisans of Peter the Fuller accused Stephen to Zeno of Nestorian heresy, and demanded to have his soundness in the faith made a matter of synodical investigation. Zeno yielded to their importunity, and a synod was called for the Syrian Laodicea (Labbe, iv. 1152). The charge was declared groundless, and Stephen returned victorious (Theophan. 108). His enemies, rendered furious by their defeat, made an onslaught on the church of St. Barlaam, in which he was celebrating the Eucharist, and violently dispersed the worshippers, wounding many and killing some. Stephen himself they dragged from the altar, and (according to Evagrius, on the authority of the contemporary writer, Joannes Rhetor) in brutal mockery gave him over to the boys and lads of their party, by whom he was tortured to death with spear-like reeds, and his body thrown into the Orontes. (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 10; Niceph. *H. E.* xv. 18.) His martyrdom is commemorated on the 25th of April.

The emperor, indignant at the murder of his nominee, despatched a military force to apprehend and punish the Eutychian party, at whose instigation the crime had been committed. (*Simplicii Epist. xiv. ad Zenonem*, Labbe, iv. 1033; *Lib. Synod. ibid.* 1152.) According to some authorities it was Stephen's successor, also a Stephen, who was thus murdered, his predecessor having died a natural death. This is the statement of Theophanes (p. 116), and Joannes Malalas (lib. xv. p. 91), in which they are followed by Le Quien, Clinton and others. Valesius, however, and Seb. Binius take the view given above, which is also that of Tillemont (*Mém. Ecclés.* xvi. 315; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 726). [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (17) II., patriarch of Antioch, succeeded his namesake A.D. 480 (Clinton, *F. R.* ii. 536, 553). On account of the disturbed state of Antioch after the murder of his predecessor as a precautionary measure to avoid fresh tumults and bloodshed Zeno chose the new patriarch without consulting the bishops of his province, and had him consecrated by Acacius A.D. 480 at Constantinople (Labbe, iv. 1032). This step being entirely uncanonical, Zeno and Acacius felt it essential at once to write to pope Simplicius to justify their conduct. Simplicius in his reply firmly remonstrated against so direct a violation of the canons which he only consented to sanction on the ground of necessity. [CALANDIO.] (Simplicii *Epistolae*, xiv. xv. ap. Labbe, iv. 1034–5.) The newly elected prelate only survived his consecration a few months, dying A.D. 481 (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xvi. 317; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 727.) [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (18) III. patriarch of Antioch. Theophanes (p. 349) relates that after the see of Antioch had been vacant for forty years, in consequence of the Mahometan dominion, Isam, the chief of the Arabians (d. A.D. 744) allowed the Christians to elect as their bishop a monk named Stephen, with whom he was intimately acquainted, "rustic in demeanour but conspicuous for his piety." The Christians joyfully accepted the permission as a Divine interposition in their behalf, and made Stephen their bishop. Eutychius (ii. 379) places his ordination in the first year of Leo the Isaurian, A.D. 717, and states that his episcopate lasted thirty-seven years. This, however, is more than doubtful. [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (19), bishop of Lyons, was written to by Avitus, bishop of Vienne (Avitus, *Epp.* no. 24; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lix. 240), and by Ennodius, bishop of Pavia (Ennodius, *Epp.* no. 17; Migne, t. lxiii. 63), and held the see between Lupicinus and Viventiolus at the close of the 5th century (Gams, *Ser. Episc.* p. 570, but with no date). In the year 499 he took part with Catholic bishops in the conference held between the Arian and Catholic bishops in the presence of the Burgundian king, Gundobald, at his palace near Lyons. If Stephanus was formally the head of the conference, Avitus of Vienne was the chief speaker, and is said to have convinced Gundobald [AVITUS, GUNDOBALD] (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxi. 1154; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 678–82; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 559, 566). [J. G.]

STEPHANUS (20), bishop of Bostra, is mentioned as the author of a treatise *Contra Judaeos* quoted in the appendix to Joann.-Damasceni *de Imaginibus*, lib. iii. (Fabric. *Bibl. Graeca* vi. 747; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 858). [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (21), bishop of Salona, at whose solicitation Dionysius Exiguus published his collection of canons, and to whom the epistle prefixed to them is addressed [DIONYSIUS (19)]. Ceill. xi. 122. [G. T. S.]

STEPHANUS (22), bishop of Larissa, and metropolitan of Thessaly, A.D. 531. He was a layman and a soldier when elected. After his consecration two bishops, Probianus and Demetrius, with Antonius, a presbyter, appealed to EPIPHANIUS (17) of Constantinople against the election. Stephen appealed to pope Boniface, asserting the claims of the papal see to supremacy over the churches of Thessaly. The pope held a synod on the subject, but its decrees are lost. The patriarch of Constantinople deposed Stephen. (Hefele's *Councils*, sec. 244; Ceill. xi. 841.) [BONIFACIUS II.] [G. T. S.]

STEPHANUS (23), Jacobite bishop of Cyprus, known to us from his persecution in the reign of Justin II., as narrated by John of Ephesus (transl. by Dr. R. Payne Smith). The persecution broke out in 571 [PAULUS (11)], and Stephen, provoking the hostility of the patriarch John Scholasticus by denouncing his practice of annulling the Jacobite ordinations, was banished to the island of Platea, off the Cyrenaic coast. Thither John sent a party of his clergy to fetch him to Constantinople, and in their company a number of excubitores with orders to beat him with clubs until he consented to receive the communion with them. Under these severities he submitted, and when arrived at Constantinople he made further submission to the patriarch; but when John proposed that he should be sent back to Cyprus to have his orders annulled, and to be reconsecrated "to the bishopric of Cyprus," he refused with the greatest indignation, and burst out of the church where the proceedings were going on into the imperial palace, and there remonstrated with Justin for permitting such iniquities, saying he had been a bishop for twenty years since his consecration by Theodosius, patriarch of Alexandria. Justin, won by the appeal, had an edict against such severities drawn up, but before it was published the patriarch contrived to get it suppressed. Great enmity ensued between Stephen and John all their days. The emperor, however, took Stephen's part, appointed him bishop of Cyprus without his orders being interfered with, and even for his sake granted the island some fiscal alleviation. Stephen continued in union with the synod of Chalcedon, employing all his influence to mitigate the severities employed against the Jacobites. (Smith, pp. 18–22.) [C. H.]

STEPHANUS (24), bishop, is congratulated by Gregory the Great on the conversion of the patrician lady Maria by his preaching (*Epp.* vii. 8). [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (25), bishop in Bruttii, was with Venerius of Vibona, appointed visitor of the churches of Taurianum and Turris in A.D. 600, *sede vacante*, by Gregory the Great, who two years later asked him to help SABINUS in getting timber (*Epp.* x. 17; xii. 23). [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (26), bishop of an unknown see in southern Spain, mentioned in the letter of Gregory the Great (*Epp.* xiii. 45) in August, A.D. 603 (Jaffé, *Reg.* n. 1530) to John the defensor, which also deals with the case of JANUARIUS (26) of Malaga. Stephanus had been accused of treason and condemned by the synod of another province, as he alleged. As no sentence of John, like that in the case of JANUARIUS exists, it is supposed that Stephanus was really guilty. His treason, no doubt, consisted in some dealings with or leaning to the Goths as against the Byzantines. Gams (*Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2) 35) from the missing signatures to the councils of 589 and 590, concludes that the sees in Byzantine hands were Carthagena, Malaga, Asidonia and Urci, and perhaps Ilici, Dianium, and Saetabis. Of these Gams considers Asidonia, or more probably Urci, to have been the see of Stephanus. The statement that he had no metropolitan is explained by Gams by the probable death or absence of LICINIANUS of Carthagena, and he conjectures from the statement that he had been tried before an alien synod, that bishops from other parts of the imperial dominions, *e.g.* Mauritania or the Balearic Islands, had been summoned. Florez (*Esp. Sag.* xii. 313), on the grounds there stated, denies the genuineness of the letter. [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (27), bishop of Dor, in Palaestina Prima, in the first half of the 7th century, originally a monk of the monastery of St. Theodosus, who, after the death of Sophronius the patriarch of Jerusalem whose disciple he was, carried on, almost single-handed, his master's uncompromising struggle against the rising Monothelite heresy. In another article it has been narrated how Sophronius, prevented from quitting his diocese by the Saracen invasion, led Stephen into the church on Calvary, and in the most solemn manner, adjured him, by the memory of the sufferings of Christ and the prospect of the final judgment, to repair to Rome, and never to rest till he had obtained from the apostolical see a formal condemnation of the doctrine of the single will in Christ, by which the faith was imperilled. [SOPHRONIUS.] Stephen

in obedience to this tremendous adjuration, departed to Rome, A.D. 633. (Baron. *Annal. ad ann.*) Honorius, the then pope, had fully accepted the doctrine of a single will in Christ; and had enjoined the abstinence from all discussion on such a mysterious subject. Stephen's first appeal was therefore entirely fruitless. He persevered, however, in the fulfilment of Sophronius' charge, and after the death of the latter, c. 637, he repaired once more to Rome to make his appeal to the apostolic see. This was in 645. Theodore I., who had succeeded after the two short popedoms of Severinus and John IV., was as zealous in repudiating Monothelitism as Honorius had been in accepting it. He received Stephen with the utmost courtesy, listened to his complaints of the irregular consecration of bishops in Palestine by Sergius of Joppa [SERGIUS], who, supported by the authority of Paul, the Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople, had usurped the vicariate of the vacant see of Jerusalem, and sent him back to Palestine with full vicarial powers, authorising him to depose the uncanonical bishops unless they professed repentance and submitted to lawful authority, and to ordain others in their room. This Monothelite party, who had done all in their power to prevent his presenting his appeal, lying in wait for him on the way with the intention of loading him with fetters and throwing him into prison (Labbe, vi. 101), now took measures to reduce his delegated powers to an absurdity. Having got the papal commission, which had followed Stephen, into their hands, they are charged by Stephen with suppressing the part which conveyed authority to appoint new bishops, only transmitting that relating to the deposition of the existing ones, hoping thus, by keeping so many sees empty, to raise the cry of a widowed church against the orthodox party. (Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* xxxviii. 34; *Epist. Martini*, 5, 9, *ap.* Labbe, vi. 22, 34.) Stephen was once more in Rome in 649, on the summoning of the first Lateran council by Martin I. On this occasion he presented a lengthy "memorial" in which, after recounting the whole history of his antagonism to Monothelitism, from the solemn vow imposed on him by Sophronius' commands, his visits to the apostolic see, the plots of his enemies, &c., he denounced the heresy of the single will, and asserted the truth of the combination of the perfect God and the perfect man in the same Christ, which could not have been if he had not possessed both an essentially human and an essentially divine will. The like holding good of the "energy." (Labbe, vi. 101, ff.) The issue was a triumphant success for Stephen and the cause for which he had so perseveringly contended. The Monothelite heresy was unanimously repudiated by the whole West, Stephen having the satisfaction of uniting his signature to those of the 104 brother bishops who joined in the condemnation. (Labbe, vi. 79, 367.) On his first arrival his enemies had done their best to weaken his credit with the pope and the council, by urging accusations against him which on investigation proved groundless. He was sent back to Palestine with the confirmation of his vicarial authority, commissioned to admit the penitent among the heretical bishops to communion, and to recognise their episcopal "status," by reason of the present distress. (Martin. *Epistola ad Pantaleonem, Ep.* 9; Labbe, vi. 34. Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 858; iii. 129, 278 ff; *Fabr. Bibl. Graec.* xii. 236; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 167, 182, 193; Schröckh, xx. 426; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* livre xxxviii.) [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (28), a person to whom Eusebius addressed his *Questions and Solutions on the Genealogy of the Saviour.* [EUSEBIUS (23) of CÆSAREA, ii. 338.] [G. T. S.]

STEPHANUS (29), an adherent of Chrysostom, banished to Arabia, but taken from his custodians by the Isaurians and sent into mount Taurus (Pallad. *Dial.* c. 20, *P. G.* xlvii. 72; Tillem. xi. 329). [C. H.]

STEPHANUS (30), a monk, punished in the persecution of Chrysostom's friends for bringing letters from Rome (Pallad. *Dial.* c. 20, *P. G.* xlvii. 72; Tillem. xi. 329). [C. H.]

STEPHANUS (31), an ascetic, Libyan by birth, who lived not far from Marmarica, near the Mareotic lake. He was intimate with St. Antony, and followed the ascetic life for sixty years. Instances of his patience and fortitude are recorded. (Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* c. 30; Heracl. *Parad.* c. 12, ap. Rosweyd. *Vitae Patrum*; Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 29; Niceph. *Hist. Eccl.* xi. 36.) [I. G. S.]

STEPHANUS (32), deacon, author, with Messianus presbyter, of the older Life of Caesarius, of Arles, c. A.D. 542. He and Messianus are said by the authors of the other Life to have served Caesarius from their youth (*Pat. Lat.* lxvii. 1001; Boll. *AA. SS.* Aug. vi. 65; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 242; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 128). [J. G.]

STEPHANUS (33), priest at Auxerre, was probably a native of Gaul, but had newly returned from Africa, when he was asked by Annarius, bishop of Auxerre, to write the lives of his predecessors, Amator and Germanus, the former in prose and the latter in verse (see the correspondence in Boll. *AA. SS.* 1 Mai. i. 51; Sept. vii. 85). The latter, if ever written, is lost; but the *Life of Amator* is given by the Bollandists, *l. c.* He flourished at the close of the 6th century (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 361, 362; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 323, 324). [J. G.]

STEPHANUS (34) BARSUDAIL, correspondent of St. James of Batna. He lived at Edessa, in cent. 6. There exists in MS. at the Vatican a letter addressed to him by St. James, on the eternity of future punishment. [JACOBUS (13), p. 328.] He afterwards lapsed into heresy, and was refuted by Philoxenus Mabugensis (Assem. *Bib. Orient.* t. i. p. 303; Ceill. x. 641). [G. T. S.]

STEPHANUS (35), priest in the province of Valeria, of whom Gregory the Great relates a strange story (*Dial.* iii. 20). [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (36), abbat of a monastery near Reate, highly praised by Gregory the Great for his patient and unworldly disposition. (Gregorius, *Dial.* iv. 19, *Hom. in Ev.* ii. 35, in Migne,

Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 352, lxxvi. 1263.) He is commemorated on February 13th (*AA. SS.*, Feb. ii. 674). [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (37), vir illustris, related to Gregory the Great a strange account of his apparent death and return to life. (*Dial.* iv. 36.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (38), one of those at Naples, who, having from certain doubts separated from communion, afterwards desired to be received back into the church. (Gregorius, *Epp.* i. 14.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (39), deacon of Thebes in Thessaly. One of the charges against HADRIANUS (4) was that, knowing the scandalous life of Stephanus, he did not deprive him of his orders. (Gregorius, *Epp.* iii. 7.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (40), of Cagliari, had by his will directed a monastery to be founded on a property of which he had a lease. As the freeholder refused to consent, his widow Theodosia proposed instead to establish a nunnery in a house, of which she was absolute owner. Bishop JANUARIUS (25) appears to have hindered her, and then to have represented that it was her fault that her husband's wishes were not carried out. Even after Gregory the Great had interposed, he apparently continued his opposition. (*Epp.* iv. 8, 15, v. 2.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (41), chartularius of the emperor in Sicily. Gregory the Great, in a letter to the empress, complains of his offensive conduct in illegally seizing the property ot private persons (*Epist.* lib. v. ind. xiii. 43). He is also mentioned in lib. iii. ind. xi. 3. He is apparently not the same person as the Stephanus chartularius addressed in lib. ii. ind. x. 28, in which Gregory requests him to cause two fugitive monks to return to their monastery; if he is, he is spoken of in very different terms from those of the later letters. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 563, 605, 707.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (42), vir magnificus, by whom Gregory the Great sent money to the subdeacon, Anthemius, in May A.D. 596, to ransom prisoners taken in Campania by the Lombards. (*Epp.* vi. 35.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (43), abbat of a monastery in Gaul—according to the reading of some MSS. of Lérins—to whom Gregory the Great addressed a letter in A.D. 596 (vi. 56) by St. Augustine on his second mission after his return to Rome (AUGUSTINUS, Vol. I. p. 226). In this letter Gregory exhorts him to vigilance, and thanks him for certain presents. If Lérins was the monastery of Stephanus, it appears by another letter of Gregory's (xi. 12), that he had died before A.D. 600, and that Gregory thought him careless in the government of his monastery. [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (44), of Naples, was betrothed to a woman who, before marriage, entered a nunnery. Her brother then charged Stephanus with keeping possession of her house and some other property. Gregory the Great directed that if so he should be compelled to make restitution. (*Epp.* vii. 23.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (45), abbat of St. Mark, complained to Gregory the Great that the lands granted by his predecessor, BENEDICTUS I. *q. v.* were unjustly retained by the Roman church. (*Epp.* ix. 30.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (46), deacon of Salona, had been sent by MAXIMUS (18) to Rome, and was delayed there by illness. (Gregorius, *Epp.* ix. 125.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (47), of Campania, had been ransomed by one Accellus. As his wife was a slave of the Roman church, Gregory the Great directed that Accellus should be repaid by the subdeacon Anthemius, and the sum allowed in his accounts. (*Epp.* xii. 44.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (48), optio or adjutant. [EUMORPHIUS.]

STEPHANUS (49), primicerius. [RESPECTUS.]

STEPHANUS (50), deacon of Macarius, Patr. of Antioch. When Macarius retracted his Monothelite views at the sixth general Council, Stephen remained stedfast and was expelled the assembly. (Ceill. xii. 749.) [G. T. S.]

STEPHANUS (51) (THE YOUNGER), **ST.**, lived sixty years in a Byzantine monastery in the 8th century. He was one of those who took an active part in defence of images in the iconoclastic controversy, and was put to death after tortures by the emperor Constantinus Copronymus. He is commemorated on Nov. 28. (Cave, *Hist. Liter.* ii. p. 6.) Among the letters of Ephraim Syrus there is one (paraen. xxv.) addressed (according to one MS.) to a certain Stephanus as "the young," who may be, as Vossius thinks, the Stephanus of this article, but in that case the letter is interpolated. (Eph. Syr. *Opp.* ed. Voss. p. 377, ed. 1603; Tillem. viii. 756.) [I. G. S.]

STEPHANUS (52), of Byzantium, priest or monk, in the latter part of the 8th century, author of a life of St. Stephen the younger. There was another Stephen of Byzantium, a heathen of more ancient date, author of a treatise "περὶ πολέων." (Cave, *Hist. Liter.* ii. 267.) [I. G. S.]

STEPHANUS (53) Thaumaturgus, monk in the Laura of St. Saba, near Jerusalem. His life by LEONTIUS (65) is given by the Bollandists (*AA. SS.*, 13 Jul. iii. 504), prefixing their Commentarius Praevius; he is commemorated in the Greek Menaea and Anthologia on July 13, and October 28, but the Bollandists place his feast on April 23, the day of his death. The life abounds more in miracles than in historical points.

Stephanus was the son of a brother of JOANNES (529) DAMASCENUS, and, contrary to the usual rule regarding age, was taken into the Laura at the age of ten years; this was in A.D. 735, and probably on the recommendation of his uncle, while Martyrius was abbat. At the age of twenty-five he left the Laura, and visited various monasteries, before retiring, at the age of thirty-seven, to the strictest seclusion for five years, and to an anchorite's cell for other fifteen. He then returned to the Laura, and died, A.D. 794, aged 69 years. [J. G.]

STIDBERT, an abbat, to whom Offa, king of Mercia in 767 (K. *C. D.* 116, A.D. 767 corr. for 757), gave lands in Middlesex, in exchange for other land in Chiltern (Ciltinne). The act was confirmed thirty years after, in a council at Chelsea under king Kenulf. The Middlesex lands are said to be on a stream called Lidding between "Gumeninga hergae [Harrow] end Liddinge"; the lands exchanged are at "Wichama." The act is attested by Offa, Jaenbert, and two bishops. The name of Stidbert does not occur in any list of abbats; but the exact locality of the land and original home of the charter, now in the Cotton Collection, may yet be discovered, and might throw a ray of light on the obscure history of Middlesex at this date. [S.]

STILICHO. An account of his life will be found under HONORIUS (1), emperor, and in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography.* A few points only require additional notice. The chronology now generally accepted (Dahn, *die Könige der Germanen*, v. 36; Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, i. 310) on the authority of Prosper places Alaric's first invasion at the end of A.D. 400, which is confirmed by Paulinus of Nola (*Carm.* xxvi. 5, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 638), and the battle of Pollentia on Easter Day, A.D. 402, not 403. As to Stilicho's relations with St. Ambrose, when his soldiers carried off one Cresconius, who had taken refuge in a church at Milan, he repented, and let him go unhurt, and when St. Ambrose was on his death-bed he exclaimed, that if he died it would be the ruin of Italy, and sent him a deputation of the noblest men of the city to entreat him to pray that his life might be prolonged (Paulinus, *Vita Ambr.* 34, 45; in *Patr. Lat.* xiv. 39, 42). To the literature referred to in the above articles should be added *Trois Ministres des Fils de Théodose* by A. Thierry. [F. D.]

STRATEGIUS (1), a married layman at Constantinople, who shewed hospitality to Gregory during his residence there, and to whom he commended his friend Sacerdos when visiting that city after his being deprived of the superiorship of the hospital at Caesarea (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 92). [SACERDOS.] [E. V.]

STRATEGIUS (2), a presbyter by whom letters passed between Basil and Patrophilus of Aegae and Theophilus of Castabala, on the business of Eustathius of Sebaste (Basil, *Epp.* 244, [82]; 250, [85]; 245, [309]. [E. V.]

STRATEGIUS (3). [EUSEBIA (6).]

STRATIOTICI. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 26), in his article on the sect to which he gives the name of Gnostics (under which head he appears to have included different branches of the Ophites of whom he had heard in Egypt), says that in Egypt they were called, among other names, Phibionites and Stratiotici. He gives no explanation of either name. Philaster (*Haer.* 57), speaking of the Floriani (*q. v.*) says they were called "milites" because so many of them were soldiers. This seems to be a mere guess. [G. S.]

STRATON, a deacon, against whom at the Carthaginian conference the Donatists brought a charge, that having been guilty of "tradition" he had afterwards been employed by Melchiades to execute the decree of Maxentius for restoring to the Christians their property, thus implicating Melchiades himself in the same charge. The president asked for proof of identity, as more than one person might bear the same name, and the Catholics pointed out that this question was full of uncertainty, but the Donatists persisted in their clamorous objection (Aug. *Brevic.* 34, 36; *Post Coll.* 17). [H. W. P.]

STRATONICE, Oct. 31, martyr at Cyzicum, in Mysia, with Seleucus, her husband, at the Quinquennalia of Galerius and during the Diocletian persecution. She was the wife of a leading magistrate of the town and as such came to see the tortures of a large number of Christians who had been there assembled. Their patience converted her, and she converted her husband. Her father, Apollonius, made every effort to win her back to paganism, but when he failed he became her most bitter accuser. The narrative of their various sufferings and miraculous deliverances is a very long one. They were finally beheaded and buried in the one tomb, over which Constantine built a church (Asseman. *Acta Mart. Orient.* t. ii. p. 65). The Acts offer many marks of authenticity. Cf. Le Blant, *Actes des Martyrs*, p. 224, etc.; *AA. SS.* Boll. Oct. xiii. p. 893–916; Ceill. ii. 481–483). [G. T. S.]

STRATONICUS (1), bishop of Charrae (Haran) c. 512 (Gams). He had been a presbyter and oeconomus of the Greek church at Edessa, and in the latter capacity, during a severe famine and pestilence, in December 511, he built a hospice and infirmary for the sick poor. Shortly after this he was appointed bishop of Charrae (Jos. Stylit. xlii.; Assemann. *Bibl. Orient.* i. 271; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 977). [E. V.]

STRATONICUS (2), bishop of Soli in Cyprus, at the close of the 7th century. He accompanied his metropolitan, Constantius, to the Sixth General Council of Constantinople in 680, and in the 12th session they both brought forward numerous testimonies from the writings of the fathers to the twofold operation of Christ. (Labbe, vi. 973, 1033; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1072). [E. V.]

STUDIUS (1), a correspondent of St. Ambrose (*Epp.* xxv., xxvi.). In answer to an inquiry of his, whether it were right to execute sentences passed on criminals, St. Ambrose gives him advice. [J. Ll. D.]

STUDIUS (2), prefect of Constantinople at the time of Chrysostom's deposition and exile, June A.D. 404 To him is addressed the imperial decree of Aug. 29th, threatening the friends and adherents of Chrysostom with the confiscation of their houses if unlawful assemblies were held in them, but at the same time giving permission for the enlargement of the ecclesiastics and others who were in prison or on ship-board on the charge of having caused the conflagration. All foreign bishops and clergy were ordered to leave the city. This was followed by another decree, also addressed to Studius, Sept. 11th, ordering masters to keep their slaves from attending the assemblies of the Joannites at the risk of fine to themselves and corporal punishment to the slaves, and threatening the Nummularii and other corporations of

Constantinople with a fine of 50 lbs. of gold for the same offence (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. tit. ii. lex 37; tit. iv. lex 5, tom. vi. pp. 75, 103). Studius was a personal friend of Chrysostom, who wrote to console him on the death of his brother soon after his arrival at Cucusus (Chrys. *Ep.* 197). Studius's favourable feelings towards Chrysostom rendering him an unfit instrument for carrying out the designs of his enemies, he was speedily removed from his office, and replaced by the pagan Optatus. [E. V.]

STUDIUS (3), a consul of the 5th cent. and founder of a monastery of the sleepless monks under Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople. A.D. 471. (Ceill. x. 345.) [GENNADIUS (10).] [G. T. S.]

STYLITAE. The example set by Simeon, the famous Syrian pillar-saint, found not a few copyists in Syria and Greece, so late even as the 11th century, but scarcely elsewhere. (Nil. Epp. ii. 114, 115.) Sometimes the saint lived inside the pillar, more usually on the top. (Miraei, *de Scr. Eccl.* c. 93, ap. Fabric. *Biblioth. Eccl.*) The monks of Egypt seem from the first to have been averse to the practice. In the more practical western church the custom never prevailed. When an ascetic, Wulfilaich, near Trèves in the 6th century, tried the experiment, his bishop demolished the pillar (Gregor. Turonens. *Hist. Fr.* vii. 15). The Stylitae must not be confounded with some devotees at Alexandria in the 4th century, who slept on prostrate obelisks, described by the emperor Julian as "filthy and superstitious" (ap. Fabric. *Biblioth. Graeca*, v. 41). The Stylitae, partly perhaps through their independence of authority, were apt to fall into heresy. Ephraem of Edessa is said to have converted one of them miraculously from heresy (Mosch. *Prat.* c. 36, ap. Rosw. *Vit. Patr.*). The state of mind engendered by this morbid and unnatural existence is described with poetic insight by Tennyson in his poem on the founder of the Stylitae. (See SIMEON STYLITES and DANIEL THE STYLITE in this Dictionary; also Evagr. *Hist. Eccl.* i. 13, vi. 23; Theodor. Lect. *Hist. Eccl.* i. 12; Niceph. *Hist. Eccl.* xv. 23, on the Acoemetae or Studitae.) [I. G. S.]

SUAEBHARD, king of Kent, 676. (Kemble, *C. D.* 14, 15.) [SUEFRED.] [C. H.]

SUAEBRAED, king of Essex, 704. (Kemble, *C. D.* 52.) [SUEFRED.] [C. H.]

SUCCESSUS (1), bishop of Abbir Germaniciana (Abbir minus, *Mommsen, hod.* Hren Naâm Momm.), in the far south (Morcelli) of proconsular Africa. The city was so called from Galba's German legions, who were sent to tranquillise the tribes. Castra Galbae received its name at the same time. Successus attended every one of Cyprian's councils in A.D. 252, A.D. 254, A.D. 255, *Epp.* 57, 67, 70, and spoke sixteenth in the third council on baptism. To him Cyprian addresses (and requests him to circulate) the important information he obtained from Rome as to the rescript of Valerian ordering the general persecution of A.D. 258, in which year Successus himself was martyred (Morcelli). [Is it possible that this distant see was too hot with barbarians, and that he was a kind of bishop *in partibus* residing in or near Carthage?] [E. W. B.]

SUCCESSUS (2) (SUCCENSUS), bishop of Diocaesarea in Isauria, c. 431 (Gams), to whom Cyril of Alexandria addressed two celebrated letters on the Incarnate Word, in reply to requests for a statement of his belief on the one Incarnate Nature (Cyrill. Alex. *Epp.* 38, 39; Labbe, iv. 173; Phot. cc. 229, 230, pp. 788 ff.; Tillem. xiv. 570; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1021). [E. V.]

SUCCONIUS (SACCONIUS), bishop of Uzalis near Utica (Aug. *de Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8), was one of the bishops who attended the council at Carthage in February 484, and was afterwards banished (*Not. Afric.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 270). A report reached the pope, either Felix III. or Gelasius, that Succonius had communicated at Constantinople with Acacius, and a letter is extant in which the pope rebukes him if he had really done so. (Felix III., *Epp.* in *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 967; Ceillier, x. 417 n.) [F. D.]

SUEFRED (SUEBRED, SUAEBHARD, SUAEBRAED), a son of Sebbi, king of the East Saxons, who about the year 695 came to the throne conjointly with his brother Sighard, and ceased to reign some time before 709 (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 11). His name, with those of his father and brother, is attached to the Barking charters (Kem. *C. D.* 35, 38) and to the forged Peterborough charter, in which he appears as king of Kent. [SEBBI, SIGHARD.] The only question of interest that attaches itself to Suefred is his possible identity with Swebheard, or Webheard, king of Kent, and his connexion with the conquest of Kent by Ethelred of Mercia in 676 (*Chr. Sax. M. H. B.* 321). Bede (*H. E.* v. 8) mentions as kings of Kent in 693, the year in which archbishop Brihtwald was consecrated, Wihtred, who certainly belonged to the royal house of Kent, and Swæbhard, of whom nothing else is known. Matthew of Westminster indeed makes him the brother of Wihtred, but gives no authority. The Chronicle (*M. H. B.* 323) simply copies Bede. In the spurious charter of Peterborough above referred to, Suebheard appears as king of Kent in immediate connexion with a statement that that kingdom had fallen under the sway of Sighere king of the East Saxons. Swebheard appears in Kentish charters more than once; he attests grants of king Oswin to Minster, dated Jan. 27, 675, without the title of king (Kem. *C. D.*, No. 8; Elmham, pp. 229, 230; Thorn, col. 1770); he himself grants land in Thanet to the same monastery, as king of the Kentishmen with the advice of Theodore, of king Ethelred and his father king Sebbi, dated March 1, 676 (*C. D.* No. 14; —Elmham, pp. 232-234; Thorn, 1770); and another charter granting land at Sturry (Kemb. *C. D.* No. 15.—Elmham, pp. 234, 235; Thorn, col. 1770); Elmham identifies him with the Suefred as well as with the Swebheard of Bede, and gives his pedigree (pp. 235, 236, 298), from the East Saxon kings. Under the name of Suaebræd, the king of the East Saxons, in 704, he and another person named Pæogthath, make a grant to Waldhere, bishop of London, of land on the Thames named Fiscesburna (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 52) at Twickenham, which is confirmed by Coenred and Ceolred

kings of Mercia; and this last seems to be a genuine charter. Granting that the Kentish and Peterborough charters, above cited, are spurious or interpolated, they point unquestionably to a tradition that the Swebheard of Bede was an East Saxon prince, and, if so, that he was a representative in Kent of the Mercian authority which at some periods of Ethelred's reign was supreme there. Thorn represents him as having obtained the kingdom by violence (ap. Twysden, c. 1770). No more is heard of either Sighard, Suefred or Swebheard, either in Essex or Kent. Offa must have succeeded soon after the granting of the charter to bishop Waldhere. [See EAST SAXONS, Kings of.] It is, however, possible that Swebheard shared the kingdom with him, and that he should be identified with the king Swebriht, whose death is recorded by Simeon of Durham, from the Northumbrian Annals in 738 (*M. H. B.* 659). [S.]

SUENES (Σουήνης), a wealthy Persian Christian, persecuted under Isdegerd. (Theod. *H. E.* v. 38 al. 39; Tillem. xii. 360.) [C. H.]

SUFFRONIUS, bp. [EUFRONIUS (3).]

SUIDBERHT, abbat of Dacre (Dacore), in Cumberland. Beda mentions a cure wrought there by St. Cuthbert's reliques during Suidberht's abbacy. (Beda, iv. 32.) [J. R.]

SUIDBERT (SUIDBERCT, SUITBERT, SUIBERT), regionary bishop in Frisia, one of the twelve whom St. Egbert sent out to Northern Europe. He went to Frisia, A.D. 690, and was so successful in his mission, that about the time when St. Willibrord went to Rome for consecration, Suitbertus was selected by the rest of his associates and sent to Britain for the same purpose. He followed St. Wilfrid into Mercia, and was consecrated by him, June 29, 693 (Pagi, ann. 693, § 5; Stevenson's note on Bed. v. 11). On his return to the continent, he devoted himself more specially to the conversion of the Bructeri lying to the north of the Rhine and the Lippe; but Pepin d'Heristal, some time after, at the request of Blythryda his wife, gave to St. Suitbertus an island in the Rhine, called by Bede "In littore," and now Kaiserswerth, six miles from Düsseldorf. There he built a monastery and died A.D. 713. Bede, who is our only real authority (*Hist. Eccl.* v. c. 11), calls him "vir modestus moribus et mansuetus corde": his monastery was long illustrious, and his memory is still revered in Germany. The *Vita S. Suitberti*, attributed to Marchelmus or Marcellinus, and given by Surius at March 1, is probably of the 12th century. The Bollandists (*AA. SS.* Mart. i. 67) treat fully regarding St. Suidbert and his companions, and give a sermon on St. Suidbert by St. Radbodus, the bishop of Utrecht, in the 10th century (see also *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 433 sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xii. 218). [J. G.]

SUINTHILA, king of Spain, A.D. 621–631, succeeded on the death of Reccared II., the youthful son of Sisebut. There is no ancient authority for the statements that he was a son of Reccared I. or a son-in-law of Sisebut. He had been one of the generals of the last-named king, and completed the work of extinguishing the last remnants of the power of the Byzantines in the peninsula. He had previously defeated them in a pitched battle, taken one of their governors prisoner, and won over another. He thus became the first Gothic king over the whole of Spain. At the beginning of his reign he put down a revolt of the restless Basques, to curb whom he founded the city of Ologitis. Before A.D. 625 he associated with himself his son Racimir in the kingdom. Isidorus concludes his *Historia Gothorum* in A.D. 625 with praises of his justice, his devotion to business, his generosity, and his care of the poor. From the fact, however, that no council was held in his reign, and that it was marked by no measures against the Jews, it is supposed that he was unfavourable to the clergy, or at any rate maintained an independent attitude towards them. He certainly became obnoxious to the magnates, probably on account of his attempting to make the crown hereditary, and thus encroaching on their right of election. One of them, Sisenand, formed a conspiracy and called in the aid of Dagobert I., who, bribed by the promise of the golden dish weighing 500 pounds, the gift of Aetius to Thorismund, sent the army of Burgundy under Abundantius and Venerandus to assist the rebels. It advanced to Saragossa, the Gothic troops and Suinthila's adherents including his brothers, went over to Sisenand, who was proclaimed king at Saragossa. Suinthila abdicated when he saw his cause was hopeless, his life was spared, but he and his wife and sons were deprived of all their property except what the generosity of the victor allowed them. The confiscation was confirmed by the 75th canon of the fourth council of Toledo in A.D. 633, from which it appears that Suinthila was then alive. The same canon excluded him, his wife and his sons from communion. Dagobert afterwards sent an embassy for the dish, which was accordingly given up by Sisenand, but the Goths prevented its removal from the country by force. Sisenand finally sent Dagobert instead 200,000 solidi. (Isidorus, *de Reg. Goth.*; Fredegarius, in Migne *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 651; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 313; Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen*, v. 184; Gams, *Kirchg. von Spanien*, ii. (2) 81.) The crown of Suinthila found with the Guarrazar treasure [RECCESVINTH] is preserved at Madrid. It is described with an illustration in the DICT. OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES, i. 510. [F. D.]

SUITHANA (SUITHA, OSUITHA), an abbess in the diocese of Mainz, excommunicated by Lullus, her archbishop, for permitting lax discipline in her monastery between cir. 755 and 786 (ep. 14). For the readings, cf. *Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 827, and Jaffé, *Monum. Mogunt.* 292. [C. H.]

SULPICIUS (1) I., ST., consecrated archbishop of Bourges A.D. 584. Gregory of Tours says: "He is in truth a most noble man, of the first senatorial families of Gaul, versed in rhetoric, and in poetry second to none" (*Hist. Franc.* vi. 39). One of his first acts was to summon a council at Clermont, to settle a dispute beween the bishops of Cahors and Rodez as to the jurisdiction over certain parishes (*ibid.* 38, 39). In 585 he subscribed the second council of Mâcon. He died in 591 (*ibid.* x. 26), and is said to have been buried in the church of St. Julian, but to have been transferred to that of St. Ursinus afterwards. Though he is sometimes distin-

guished from Sulpicius II. by the cognomen of Severus, he must not be confounded with Sulpicius Severus the historian (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 969; cf. *Gall. Christ.* ii. 15). His day is Jan. 29. (Boll. p. 967.) [S. A. B.]

SULPICIUS (2), II., ST., twenty-ninth archbishop of Bourges, surnamed Pius to distinguish him from Sulpicius I. of this see. We have two lives of him, both purporting to be written by men who had known him personally. The longer of the two, which was probably the work of a monk of the monastery in which Sulpicius ended his days, was first published by Surius (Jan. 17) with his customary abbreviations and alterations, then accurately by Mabillon, in the second saeclum of his *Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti*, whence it has been transferred to the *Patrologia Latina*, lxxx. 574–92. Both are to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.*, Jan. ii. 167, seqq. For an estimate of them see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 578. From these and other sources we learn that he was born at Vatan in the diocese a little before the close of the 6th century, and was ordained by St. Austregisilus, and became his archdeacon (Boll. *ibid.*, p. 166). In 613 Clotaire II. became sole king of the Franks, and Sulpicius was made his abbas castrensis, which office he held till 624, when he was appointed to the episcopate of Bourges. As bishop he was at the council of Rheims under Sonnatius, the date of which is variously given between 625 and 630 (Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 5), and in the latter year, by the order of Dagobert, whose letter to him survives (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 16; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1177), he convened the bishops of his province and consecrated his friend, Desiderius, bishop of Cahors. The biographies give but few details of his episcopate beyond the usual miracles of the age, but he is said to have applied himself with much success to the conversion of the Jews. About three years before his death, weakness compelled him to resign the principal duties of the see to Vulfoledus, who afterwards succeeded him. He died Jan. 17, 644, in a neighbouring monastery, which he had founded and which took his name.

Three letters of Sulpicius are extant, two to Desiderius of Cahors and one to Verus of Rodez. They are printed in the *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 591–4, but are of little interest. The *Historia Septem Dormientium*, which purports to be written by Gregory of Tours, is addressed to him (*Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1105).

Sulpicius' day is Jan. 17, on which he appears in many martyrologies both ancient and modern (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 165). Many churches are said to have been dedicated to him in the diocese of Liége by his disciple St. Remaclus (*ibid.* p. 166), and the large parochial church of Saint-Sulpice at Paris derives its name from him. [S. A. B.]

SULPICIUS SEVERUS, ecclesiastical historian [SEVERUS, SULPICIUS].

SUNNA, Arian bishop of Merida, intruded by Leovigild c. A.D. 682 when he found he could not win over MASONA. Sunna, on his arrival, seized some of the churches and tried to get possession of the basilica of St. Eulalia. Masona resisted, and Sunna wrote accusing him to Leovigild, who ordered that Sunna and Masona should hold a dispute before the local magistrates in the atrium of the basilica, which should be the reward of the victor. In this the orthodox writer represents Masona as gaining an easy victory, and he accuses the defeated Sunna of then procuring the banishment of Masona by false charges. On Reccared's accession Sunna, unlike most of his fellows, adhered to his former creed. For his conspiracy and banishment see RECCARED and MASONA. Reccared urged him to become a catholic, and promised in that case to appoint him to some other see. He replied, "A catholic I will never be, but will live in the rite in which I have lived, or will die most willingly for the religion wherein I have remained from my earliest years, even until now." The little known of Sunna mainly comes through the frantic partisan of orthodoxy who wrote *De Vitis Patrum Emeritensium* (11, 12, 17, 18, in *Esp. Sag.* xiii.), but his conspiracy is also mentioned in the chronicle of Joan. Biclarensis. (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 182: Görres in *Zeitsch. für wissensch. Theol.* 1885, 329, 331; C. A. A. Scott's *Ulfilas*, 216, 217.) [F. D.]

SUNNIAS, a presbyter of Getica in the beginning of the 5th century. He, with Fretela, wrote to Jerome about the year 403, and received his reply. (*Ep.* 106 ed. Vull.) [FRETELA.] [W. H. F.]

SUNNILA, bishop of Viseo, was originally an Arian, and was probably appointed by Leovigild after his conquest in A.D. 585 of the Suevic kingdom, which included Viseo. At the third council of Toledo in A.D. 589 he however abjured Arianism, and was allowed to retain his see. Immediately before him Joannes subscribes as Velensis. No such see being known, it is generally supposed to be a mistake for Valeriensis (JOANNES (430)), but Florez conjectures the true reading to be Vesensis, and that Joannes was the Catholic bishop of Viseo, several sees at this council being represented by both an Arian and a Catholic bishop. (*Esp. Sag.* xiv. 312; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 277, 254.) [F. D.]

SUPERIUS (1), African (? Tingit) bishop (see AHIMNIUS); first proposed the case in Cyp. *Ep.* lvi., as to whether lapsed persons who subsequently suffered as confessors might be restored. [E. W. B.]

SUPERIUS (2), a presbyter, convicted with others of stealing property from the temple of Serapis at the same time as Silvanus (*Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 179–181, ed. Oberthür, p. 170, 171, ed. Dupin). [H. W. P.]

SUPERIUS (3), a centurion, present at the enquiry about Felix of Aptunga (Opt. i. 26; Aug. *Ep.* 88). [H. W. P.]

SUR, otherwise Syr, one of the three original disciples of Pachomius, the Egyptian founder of regular monastic communities in cent. iv. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii.). [PACHOMIUS.] [G. T. S.]

SURANUS, abbat of a monastery at Sora, expended all he had in relieving the fugitives from the Lombards. Being therefore unable to ransom himself, he was murdered by them; and as his body fell to the ground, the whole of the

neighbouring mountain and forest, it is said, was shaken. (Gregorius, *Dial.* iv. 22; *AA. SS.* 24 Jan. ii, 606.) [F. D.]

SWEBHEARD, SWÆBHARD, SWABERT, SUEBRED. [SUEFRED.]

SWITHÆD (SWITHRED), king of the East Saxons. He appears in the pedigrees (*M. H. B.* 629), as the son and successor of Selred, who was killed in 746. Under the name of Swithred he is mentioned by Florence of Worcester as king in 758 (*ib.* 544), and he is the last king mentioned in the appendix to the Chronicle of Florence, although two more generations are included in the pedigree (*ib.* 629, 637), in which Sigeric is named as his son and successor. [S.]

SWITHELM (SUIDHELM), king of the East Saxons. He is described by Bede as the son of Sexbald, and in the pedigrees of the ancient kings as son of Sigebald, in which case he was brother of Sigebert the Good, whom he succeeded some time after the year 653 (*M. H. B.* 629, 637; Bede, *H. E.* iii. 22, 30). He, like Sigebert, was a Christian, and under the influence of bishop Cedd who baptized him at Rendelsham, in Suffolk, Ethelwald, the king of the East Angles, being his godfather. He died in or before the year 665; and nothing more is known about him. The next rulers of the East Saxons, still under Mercian dominion, were Sebbi and Sighere. [S.]

SWITHULF, an abbat, probably of some northern monastery, who is said by Symeon (*H. R.*) to have died in A.D. 772. He is mentioned in the *Liber Vitae* of the monks of Durham (p. 9). [J. R.]

SWITHUN, a benefactor of St. Andrew's church, Rochester, bequeathing to it lands settled on him by charter of Kenulf king of Mercia, and Cuthred king of Kent, in 801. (Kemble, *C. D.* 179; Thorpe's *Registrum Roffense*, p. 20.) [C. H.]

SYAGRIA, a charitable lady at Lyons, c. 500, praised by Ennodius (*Vit. Epiph.* in *Pat. Lat.* lxiii. 234). When Epiphanius bishop of Pavia came into Gaul to redeem the Italian captives in the hands of Gundobald, it was she who supplied much of the ransom money. She is mentioned very honourably in the life of the abbat Eugendus (§10, Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Jan. i. 52; Tillem. xvi. 103, 143, 489). [C. H.]

SYAGRIUS (1), of Verona. [INDICIA.]

SYAGRIUS (2), author, mentioned by Gennadius (*De Script. Eccl.* lxv.) among authors who wrote before A.D. 450; he wrote *De Fide* against the heretics who denied that there could be any distinction of persons in the Godhead. The work is lost, but Gennadius gives a short account of the arguments used (*Hist. Litt. de la Franc.* ii. 652; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 469). Cave (i. 426) thinks he may be placed in 437. [J. G.]

SYAGRIUS (3), addressed by Sidonius in three letters, a person of good family if all three are to the same person. His ward, the daughter of Optantius, is asked in marriage by Projectus a man of rank, of whom Syagrius receives from the bishop an honourable character (*Epp.* lib. ii. ep. 4). He is studying the German language with astonishing ardour, and Sidonius styles him "novus Burgundiorum Solon in legibus disserendis" (lib. v. ep. 5). He owes it to his illustrious ancestry no longer to neglect the duties of civic life for rural pursuits (lib. viii. ep. 8). [R. J. K.]

SYAGRIUS (4), ST., nineteenth bishop of Autun, held a position of some eminence in France in the latter half of the 6th century. From an expression in a letter of Gregory the Great to queen Brunichilde (quem i.e. Syagrium, vestrum proprium novimus, ix. 109) it has been inferred that he was her brother, but without foundation. It is not however improbable that he was a member of the noble family to which belonged the Syagrius with whom Sidonius Apollinaris corresponded (*Epist.* viii. 8, see too v. 5). He was consecrated by St. Germanus of Paris about 560 (Venant. Fort. *Vita S. Germ. Par.* 64), and acquired considerable influence both with king Guntram (see Florentius Gallus, *Vita S. Rusticulae*, cap. i., Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. ii. 658; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* x. 28; *Vita S. Aridii*, xxxv.) and with queen Brunichilde. The latter obtained for him from Gregory the gift of the pallium, to which his see gave him no claim (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* ix. 11, 108), and assisted him in founding two monasteries at Autun, one for men and one for women, and a xenodochium (*ibid.* xiii. 8) and perhaps in his embellishments of the cathedral. On the other hand, the *Historia Epitomata* of Greg. Tur. (lxxxix.) states that he joined the party of the pretender Gundovald against Guntram, but its accuracy is doubtful (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. vi. 84). There are various indications of his activity as a bishop. He attended numerous councils (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 344), was a trusted agent of Gregory the Great, who recommended to his good offices St. Augustine and his monks (*Epist.* vi. 54) and made numerous appeals for his co-operation in the war he was waging against simony and other ecclesiastical abuses in France (*Ibid.* ix. 106, 113, 114, 115). St. Aunarius or Aunacharius, of Auxerre, was his disciple (AUNARIUS) and according to Gregory of Tours, St. Virgilius, his archdeacon, owed to him his elevation to the archbishopric of Arles in 588 (*Hist. Franc.* ix. 23). He is believed to have died in the year 600, and was buried in the nunnery of St. Andochius which he had built.

His cult began very early. Gregory of Tours speaks of him as venerabilis et egregius antistes (*Vita S. Aridii* xxxv.), Gregory the Great as reverendae memoriae episcopum (*Epist.* xiii. 8, 9), Venantius Fortunatus, as dominus sanctus et apostolicâ sede dignissimus papa (*Misc.* v. 6, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 191), and Ado characterizes him as, vir summae sanctitatis (*Chronicon*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiii. 111). His day is Aug. 27, on which he appears in many of the ancient as well as the modern martyrologies (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. vi. 84). [S. A. B.]

SYLVIA, sister of Flavius Rufinus, consul in 392 and prefect of the East under Theodosius and Arcadius. A work written by her was discovered at Arezzo in 1885, bound up with an unpublished work of St. Hilary of Poitiers *de Mysteriis*. It contained two hymns and the account of a journey in the East. M. Ch. Kohler gave an analysis of the text in the *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, while M. Ganurrini discussed its authorship in a paper

before the Academy of Christian Archaeology at Rome (cf. *Revue Critique*, May 25, 1885, p. 419.
[G. T. S.]

SYL- *vid.* SIL.

SYMEON *vid.* SIMEON.

SYMMACHIANI, heretics so called, are enumerated by Philaster (c. 63), are supposed by him to have derived their doctrine from PATRICIUS, the preceding heretic on his list, and are described by him as secularists, looking forward to no future judgment, and satisfying without scruple all the lusts of the world and the flesh. It is uncertain whether or not we are to identify these with Ebionites, known under the name of Symmachiani in the time of St. Augustine (*Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, xix. 4, 17; *Contra Cresconium Donatistam*, i. 31), and who, perhaps, were called after Symmachus, the translator of the Old Testament. These last are also referred to by Ambrosiaster (*Prol. Epis. ad Gal.*), and are described by him as taking their origin from the Pharisees as keeping the Mosaic law, but calling themselves Christians, and as teaching that our Lord was mere man. [G. S.]

SYMMACHUS (1), the twenty-second bishop of Jerusalem, the seventh of the Gentile succession, was preceded and followed by a Gaius. The beginning of his episcopate is placed in the first year of Commodus, A.D. 180. Eutychius (367) assigns him two years of office. (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 12; Epiphan. *Haer.* lxvi. 23; *Chron. Armen.*) [E. V.]

SYMMACHUS (2), author of the Greek version of the Old Testament which in Origen's Hexapla and Tetrapla occupied the column next after that of Aquila and before those of the LXX. and Theodotion. Above, Vol. III. p. 19 [art. HEXAPLA], will be found the contradictory accounts (*a*) of Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 17; *Demonstr. Evang.* vii. 1), followed by Jerome (*De Viris Ill.*, s. v. Origenes; *Praef. in Esdr.*; *Comm. in Abacuc*, ii. 3), who make him an Ebionite,—and (*b*) of Epiphanius, who makes him a Samaritan apostate to Judaism (*De Menss. et Pondd.* 16). It has been attempted to reconcile these authorities by supposing an Ebionite sect to have existed among the Samaritans. But the contradiction lies too deep to be thus removed: for it is plain that Eusebius speaks of Symmachus as a heretical Christian, while Epiphanius represents him merely as passing from one to another of two sects, both of which lay outside the Christian pale. This latter account is discredited by the improbability that a Samaritan, however learned, should have had such knowledge of the Old Testament outside the Pentateuch as to execute a version of it so far independent as that of Symmachus appears even in its surviving fragments to have been. That of Eusebius, on the other hand, is confirmed,—(1) by the name "Symmachians," which as we know from the Ambrosiaster (*Prolog. in Ep. ad Galat.*), and from Augustine (*Contra Cresc.* i. 31; *Contra Faust.* xix. 4), was applied even in the fourth century to the Pharisaic or "Nazarean" Ebionites—and (2) by the fact that Eusebius was able to refer to a work of Symmachus as extant (*ὑπομνήματα τοῦ Συμμάχου*), in which he maintained the Ebionite heresy in the shape of an attack on the Gospel of St. Matthew. This work, according to Eusebius (*l. l.*), was stated by Origen to have been obtained by him, together with other interpretations on the Scriptures (*μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων εἰς τὰς γραφὰς ἑρμηνειῶν*), from one Juliana, who had received them from Symmachus himself. A later writer, Palladius (circ. 420), adds that this Juliana was a virgin, *λογιωτάτη καὶ πιστοτάτη*, who lived in Caesarea of Cappadocia, and gave refuge in her house to Origen for two years in the time of a persecution; adducing as his authority an entry which he says he found written by Origen's own hand, in a book which he describes as "very ancient, and arranged in *στίχοι*" (*παλαιοτάτῳ βιβλίῳ στιχηρῷ*), as follows: "This book I found in the house of Juliana the virgin in Caesarea, when I was hiding there; who said that she had received it from Symmachus himself, the interpreter of the Jews" (*Hist. Lausiaca*, 147).* Huet (*Origeniana*, libb. I. iii. 2; III. iv. 2) is probably right in assigning the sojourn of Origen in this lady's house to the time of Maximin's persecutions (A.D. 238–241); but his statement, that among the books found there by Origen was Symmachus's version of the Old Testament, is a misrepresentation of Eusebius's account: and it is not borne out by the words just cited from Palladius, though his description of the book he saw, as *στιχηρὸν*, would suit a volume of that version containing the poetical books. And neither that author, nor Eusebius, gives any ground for Huet's idea, that the Old Testament version of Symmachus had been unknown to Origen until he discovered it in Juliana's possession. The memorandum written by Origen in the book described, tells us how it came into his possession, but does not convey that its contents had not been previously known to him *aliunde*. And Eusebius speaks of the version of Symmachus (vi. 16), not as freshly discovered by Origen, but along with those of Aquila and Theodotion as being in common use (*καθημαξευμένας*) in Origen's day, in contrast with the obscure "Fifth" and "Sixth" versions, which Origen was the first to bring to light out of places of concealment (see above, Vol. III. p. 22). Indeed, we have sufficient evidence in Origen's extant remains, that he knew and used Symmachus's version long before the time of Maximin (236–239). Quotations from it occur (*e.g.*) in the fragments of his *Commentaries* on Lamentations of which he tells us (p. 321, Delarue) no version save those of Symmachus and the LXX. were known to him when he wrote;—sc., before 231 (see above, ORIGEN, p. 109). He quotes it also in his *Commentaries* on Gen. ii. 7 (p. 29), and on Pss. ii. 2; iv. 1 (pp. 539, 556); both in all probability equally early works (ORIGEN, pp. 104, 105, 108, 109). For the note on Genesis comes from the *third* *Τόμος*, and we know that he had written the first *eight* before 231; at which date he had also completed his *Commentaries* on the Psalms to the end of the 25th (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 24). Baronius (*Annal.* t. ii., s. a. 295) similarly misrepresents Eusebius and Palladius as relating that Origen found Symmachus's version in Juliana's house; but infers that the time of the occurrence was that of the

---

* This ambiguous expression probably means "translator of the Jews' Scriptures."

persecution of Severus (circ. 205), inasmuch as that version must have been in Origen's hands long before the reign of Maximin.[b]

The statement of Palladius, as an incidental corroboration, coming almost direct from Origen himself, and resting on the testimony of a lady who had known Symmachus personally, powerfully confirms Eusebius, and leaves no room to doubt that Symmachus was a Christian (or "semi-Christian" as Jerome expresses it) of the Nazaraeo-Ebionite sect. Epiphanius's narrative of his secession from the Samaritan to the Jewish religion, is therefore to be rejected; and with it the recent theory of Geiger, who seeks to identify him with the Jew Symmachus son of Joseph (see above, Vol. III. p. 20).

The authority of Epiphanius has however been commonly accepted for placing the date of Symmachus under the reign of Severus (193–211),—as by the compiler of the *Chronicon Paschale* (s. a. 202), as well as by Cave (*Hist. L.* s. a. 201) and more recent writers;—notwithstanding the gross historical blunders and the self-contradiction which disfigure the chronological arrangement as it stands in the Greek text of the treatise *De Menss. et Pondd.* above referred to. In chapter 16, the thirteen years' reign of Commodus is omitted from the list of emperors by which the author professes to fix his dates; while in ch. 18 it is duly inserted. And though he places Symmachus, as has been said, under Severus (ch. 16), he makes his version prior to that of Theodotion, whom (ch. 17) he places under Commodus, the predecessor of Pertinax the predecessor of Severus. The ancient Syriac version of this treatise, however, clears away most of this confusion by reading *Verus* for Severus, in ch. 16, and, by adding in ch. 18 a sentence explaining that the emperor meant is Marcus Aurelius (161–180),—whose paternal name was (as is well known) Annius Verus. Accepting these corrections, we find that the account of Epiphanius, *quantum valeat*, dates Symmachus thirty, or at least twenty years earlier than has hitherto been supposed.

The extract above given from Palladius roughly fixes limits for the possible date of Symmachus, by shewing that he was an elder contemporary of Juliana, who was contemporary with Origen, but that he had died before Origen's sojourn in her house. If, with Baronius, we fix that sojourn in the reign of Severus, it follows that to place Symmachus, as the Greek text of Epiphanius does, in that reign, is inadmissible. But if, with Huet, we fix it in the reign of Maximin, any date not earlier than the beginning of the reign of M. Aurelius, and not much later than the end of that of Severus, will suit for Symmachus.

For fuller particulars concerning the Syriac rectification of the chronology of Epiphanius, see below under THEODOTION, under which head will be found also the reasons for believing Theodotion to be prior to Symmachus. One argument which has been advanced to prove this point is to be noted as untenable, that namely which rests on the fact that Irenaeus does not mention Symmachus in the passage (iii. 21), where he cites from Aquila and Theodotion their readings of Isai. vii. 14; whence it has been inferred that he was ignorant of Symmachus's version, and that therefore it was probably the latest of the three. But it is quite possible that even if made in the reign of M. Aurelius, it might have failed to become known to Irenaeus writing in Gaul, circ. 180–185. The work might have existed, though Irenaeus had not met with it; and besides, his ignorance of it is not proved by the fact that he does not mention it. As well might we infer that Symmachus was unknown to Origen, because he does not mention him in the passage where he tells how Aquila omits, while Theodotion gives the verses appended to Job in the LXX. And yet this passage occurs in his Epistle to Africanus, written after he had compiled his Hexapla, of which the version of Symmachus was an essential part.

A description of his version will be found in the article HEXAPLA, already referred to. His object in forming it seems to have been to imitate Aquila in following the Hebrew exclusively, but to avoid his barbarous diction, and to commend his work to Greek readers by purity of style. Thus, his renderings are at once externally dissimilar to Aquila's, and (frequently) internally akin to them. Remarkable cases of identity of translation between these two versions occur, *e.g.* the long passage, Dan. ix. 26, 27, which appears to have been borrowed by Symmachus verbally from Aquila.[c] Of his other writings nothing further is known, except that some of them (apparently in a Syriac version) were in the hands of Ebedjesu (*d.* 1318), who gives the title of one of them, as ܕܦܘܪܫ ܦܘ̈ܩܕܢܐ (*Catal. Scriptorum*, ap. Assem. *B. O.* iii. p. 17); which title Assemani renders "*De Distinctione Praeceptorum*," and identifies the work, not improbably, with that described by Eusebius, conjecturing that the "*praecepta*" may be those of our Lord, as given by St. Matthew.

[J. Gw.]

SYMMACHUS (3) Q. AURELIUS, the last eminent champion of paganism at Rome, was the son of L. Aurelius Avianus Symmachus, who was prefect of the city in A.D. 364, and Consul suffect and praetorian prefect in A.D. 376, and was one of the envoys sent by Julian to Constantius (Ammian. xxi. 12, 24). He was educated at Bordeaux (*Epp.* ix. 88), where he and Ausonius became firm friends. (Auson. *Id.* 11, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xix. 895; Symm. *Epp.* i. 13–43). After holding the offices of quaestor and praetor, he became Corrector of Lucania and Bruttium in A.D. 365 and proconsul of Africa in A.D. 373. (*Cod. Theod.* viii. tit. v. 25, xii. tit. i. 73). He was again in Gaul about A.D. 369, when he delivered his first panegyric on Valentinian, as he witnessed the construction of his fortifications on the Rhine. (*Laud. in Valent. Sen.* ii. 6.) He was appointed prefect of the city at the end of A.D. 383 or the beginning of A.D. 384. He bore himself modestly

[b] Huet's erroneous view has been more or less fully adopted by Neander (*Hist.*, vol. ii., p. 477, Bohn's ed.), and by other modern writers. Dr. Field, on the other hand, seems unreasonably to discredit the whole evidence of Palladius.

[c] For a good example of the mutual relations of the four versions, see Field under Malachi ii. 13. See also Ex. ii. 14; Ps. cxxxviii. 16; Jer. xxiii. 23, etc.

in that great office, which had been conferred on him unsolicited, declining the silver chariot which his predecessors had obtained permission to use (*Epp.* x. 24, 40) and the title of "Magnificence" (*Epp.* iv. 42). During his term of office he was accused of dragging from the churches people who had taken sanctuary there, and bringing bishops from various near and distant cities in chains to Rome. These charges were apparently founded on an inquiry undertaken by him by the emperor's orders into the condition of the fortifications of Rome, and he succeeded in clearing himself without much difficulty by means of a letter from pope Damasus (*Epp.* x. 41).

In A.D. 382 he headed a deputation in the name of the majority of the senate, to the emperor Gratian, to request the replacement of the altar of Victory in the senate house, and the restoration of their endowments to the vestals and the colleges of priests. The Christian senators, who according to St. Ambrose were really the majority, forwarded through pope Damasus a counter petition, and by the influence of St. Ambrose the efforts of Symmachus were defeated [GRATIANUS (5)]. Again in A.D. 384, after Gratian's death, a repeated attempt of Symmachus was foiled, and his arguments were refuted by St. Ambrose (S. Amb. *Epp.* 17, 18, 57, in *Patr. Lat.* xvi. 961, 972, 1175; Symm. *Epp.* x. 61).[a]

He probably took part in the missions for the same purpose sent by the senate to Theodosius after the fall of Maximus, and to Valentinian II. in A.D. 392 (S. Amb. *Epp.* 57), and again suffered the same disappointment. In A.D. 393 the pagan party had a momentary triumph. Eugenius, at the instigation of Flavian and Arbogast, who had placed him on the throne, restored the altar of Victory and the endowments of the priests (Paulinus, *Vita S. Amb.* in *Patr. Lat.* xvi. 30), but they were again abolished by Theodosius after the defeat of Eugenius and Arbogast. Symmachus appears to have made a final attempt in A.D. 403 or 404; at least such is the natural inference from the two books of Prudentius, *Contra Symmachum*, which were written after Pollentia and consequently about the latter year.

After the defeat of Maximus, Symmachus endeavoured to remove the bad impression caused by his panegyric on the fallen emperor, by an eloquent harangue on the glorious actions of Theodosius both in war and peace. (*Epp.* ii. 31, 13.) This was delivered before January 23rd, A.D. 389, the date of the law *De Codicillis* (*Cod. Theod.* iv. tit. iv. 2), and therefore before the triumphal entry of Theodosius into Rome. He is said to have inserted in his speech a petition for the restoration of the altar of Victory, which so irritated Theodosius that he banished him a hundred miles from Rome. (*De Promiss.* iii. 38, in *Patr. Lat.* li. 834.) The story, related by Socrates (*H. E.* v. 14, in *Patr. Gr.* lxvii., 601) and repeated by Cassiodorus (*Hist. Trip.* ix. 23 in *Patr. Lat.* lxix. 1140), that Symmachus was accused of high treason on account of his panegyric on Maximus, was obliged to take sanctuary in the church of the Novatians at Rome, and was pardoned by Theodosius as a compliment to the Novatian bishop, is probably a distorted version of these events. Tillemont (*Emp.* v. 755) discusses the whole question. Theodosius at any rate soon pardoned him and raised him to the consulate in A.D. 391.

It is singular that, champion as Symmachus was of the pagan cause, he was on excellent terms with the leaders of the Christians. His friendship with the semi-pagan Ausonius indeed proves nothing, but he was a friend of pope Damasus, and apparently of St. Ambrose himself, whom Cardinal Maï considers to be the Ambrose to whom seven of his letters are addressed (*Epp.* iii. 31–37) and of St. Ambrose's brother Satyrus (S. Amb. *De Excessu Fratris*, i. 32, in *Patr. Lat.* xvi. 1300). He was also an intimate friend of Mallius Theodorus, to whom St. Augustin (*Retr.* i. 2, in *Patr. Lat.* xxxii. 588) dedicated one of his works. When prefect, he sent St. Augustin as teacher of rhetoric to Milan (*Conf.* v. 19, in *Patr. Lat.* xxxii. 717), and he was thus the unconscious instrument of his conversion. His Christian opponents always speak in the highest terms both of his character and his abilities. He was a member of the college of pontiffs, and as such exercised a strict supervision over the vestal virgins. In the case of one of the Alban vestals, who had broken her vow of chastity, he demanded the enforcement of the ancient penalty against her and her paramour (*Epp.* ix. 128, 129), and he sternly refused the request of another to be released from her vows before she had completed her full time of service (*Epp.* ix. 108).

The letters of Symmachus give a remarkable picture of the circumstances and life of a Roman noble just before the final break-up of the empire. Though his wealth was not above that of an average senator (Olymp. *apud Photium*), it was very great. Besides his mansion on the Coelian near S. Stefano Rotondo, he had other houses in Rome (*Epp.* iii. 14), and numerous country residences, of which he mentions four suburban—the Ostian on the Tiber, the Arabian, the Vatican, and the Appian (*Epp.* i. 6, iii. 55, ii. 57, vi. 58), and several more remote, at Bauli, Formiae, Capua, Naples, Praeneste, Laurentum, Tivoli, Lavinium, and Puteoli (*Epp.* i. 1, 8, 10, ii. 60, iii. 50, vii. 35, iv. 44, vi. 81, vii. 15, vi. 66.) He had property near Aquileia, in Samnium, in Sicily, and in Mauritania (*Epp.* iv. 68, vi. 11, ii. 30, vii. 66.) The expenses of his son's praetorship, which he paid, amounted to 2000 pounds of gold (Olymp. above cited), and in many of his letters he asks his friends to send him rare wild beasts for the sports of his son's praetorship and questorship. Among others, seven Irish wolf-dogs may be mentioned (*Epp.* ii. 77). By his wife Rusticiana, daughter of Orfitus, prefect of the city under Constantius, he had a daughter, who married Nicomachus, and a son, the subject of the next article. In three of his letters he speaks of his advancing years (*Epp.* iv. 18, 32, viii. 48), but the date of his death is unknown. He was certainly alive in A.D. 404.

Till recently his only works known to exist were his letters. The editio princeps, printed at Venice in the pontificate of Julius II. is exceedingly rare. The first complete edition was published at Paris in A.D. 1580, by Juret and

[a] Gibbon, ch. 28, gives a summary of the arguments of Symmachus and St. Ambrose.

Lectius. They are reprinted in ten books in *Patr. Lat.* xviii. Early in the present century Cardinal Mai discovered in the Ambrosian library, among the MSS. from Bobbio, a palimpsest containing fragments of nine speeches of Symmachus, which he published in A.D. 1815, and republished in A.D. 1846, with three more palimpsest fragments from Bobbio, now in the Vatican library. There are many other speeches entirely lost. Cardinal Mai gives the titles of those that are known. A new edition of the *Relationes*, his official correspondence with emperors, which, in the common editions, are printed in the tenth book of the letters, was published in A.D. 1872 by W. Meyer. [F. D.]

SYMMACHUS (4), a presbyter to whom Chrysostom wrote consoling him under the trials and difficulties which beset him, which are the necessary portion of one who has entered on the narrow way. (Chrys. *Ep.* 45.) [E. V.]

SYMMACHUS (5) Q. FABIANUS MEMMIUS, son of the orator (No. 3), praefectus urbis in A.D. 418, 419. The part he took in the contested election between BONIFACIUS I. and EULALIUS (1) is sufficiently described under those names. He was proconsul of Africa in A.D. 415. (*Cod. Theod.* xi. tit. xxx. 65.) His official letters to the emperor, with the replies, are printed in Baronius and at the end of the tenth book of those of his father (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xviii.). A fragment of one of the letters which is imperfect in the common editions is added by Cardinal Mai in his edition of the fragments of the elder Symmachus. [F. D.]

SYMMACHUS (6), one of the two bishops who visited Paulinus of Nola on his death-bed (Uranius, *Epist.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liii. 860). He is perhaps the same as the Symmachus, bishop of Capua, whose festival was kept on October 22nd (Ughelli, vi. 320). [F. D.]

SYMMACHUS (7), a correspondent of Isidore of Pelusium, who (lib. i. *Ep.* 152) tells the story of St. Chrysostom's sufferings, and commends his work on the priesthood. [ISIDORUS (31).] (Ceill. viii. 483.) [G. T. S.]

SYMMACHUS (8) Q. AURELIUS MEMMIUS, probably the grandson of the prefect (No. 5) and great-grandson of the orator (No. 3), patrician, and consul in 485, was one of the most distinguished senators in the times of Odovacar and Theoderic. His son-in-law Boethius (*De Cons.* i. pr. 4, ii. pr. 4) and Procopius (i. 1) speak in the highest terms of his virtues, learning, and charity. He was not only a Christian but a catholic (Paul. Diac. *Hist. Rom.* xvi. 9). Cassiodorus (*Var.* iv. 51) praises the magnificence of his buildings, and asks him on Theoderic's behalf to undertake the supervision of the repairs of the theatre of Pompey, and he is named first in the commission of five senators who were to try Basilius and Praetextatus on the charge of magic (*Var.* iv. 22), and this may have been the cause of Basilius afterwards becoming the accuser of Boethius. (*De Cons.* i. 4.) Avitus writes to him (*Epp.* 31) and FAUSTUS (36) as the leaders of the senate with regard to the trial of pope Symmachus. At the end of 525 or beginning of 526 Theoderic, who feared some design against himself on the part of Symmachus in revenge for the execution of Boethius, had him brought to Ravenna, put him to death and confiscated his property (*An. Vales.*; Procop. i. 1), which was however restored by Amalasuintha after her father's death to his children (Procop. i. 2). He left only daughters, RUSTICIANA the wife of Boethius, GALLA (9), who was canonised (*AA. SS.* Oct. iii. 147), and probably a third, Proba. [F. D.]

SYMMACHUS (9), bishop of Rome from November, A.D. 498, to July, A.D. 514, under the reigns of Theoderic the Ostrogoth as king of Italy, and Anastasius as emperor in the East. The circumstances of his election simultaneously with that of the antipope Laurentius, the conflict which ensued between the two parties into which Rome was divided, and its final settlement through the intervention of Theoderic, have been noticed in the article on LAURENTIUS (10). What follows with regard to these events is here given as supplementary.

The proceedings which terminated in the *Synodus Palmaris*, at which Symmachus was acquitted of the charges made against him, appear to have been as follows:[a]

For several years after Symmachus had been confirmed in the see by Theoderic as the lawfully elected pope the party of Laurentius continued their opposition to him, causing violent conflicts and general disturbance at Rome. The evident virulence of the two opposed parties against each other is to be accounted for (be it remarked) by the fact, that they represented two opposite policies with regard to the then existing schism between the Western and Eastern churches. Laurentius had been elected in the interests of the policy of concession to Constantinople and the East, which the last pope, Anastasius II., had favoured; Symmachus for the maintenance of the unbending attitude which had been taken by Felix III., when the schism first began. Hence the question at the root of those violent and continued conflicts was not merely that of the legality of the two elections, or of predilection for one or the other claimant to the see; it was rather one of principle on the absorbing topic of the day. What occurred was this.—Moved by representations made to him at Ravenna of the disturbed state of Rome, and of the accusations brought against the reigning pope, Theoderic in the first place sent Peter, bishop of Altinum, to Rome in the capacity of visitor, and summoned a synod of Italian bishops for entertaining under him the charge against Symmachus. The visitor

[a] It is to be observed that the date of this synod is, in this as in the former article, assumed to have been A.D. 501, and its acts to be what are given in Labbe as those of *Synodus Romana III. sub Symmacho*, though it is spoken of by Ennodius (*libellus apologet.*), and in the acts of subsequent councils, as *Synodus IV*. The question of date not being of any great importance, it has not been thought necessary to discuss it in these pages. Its uncertainty partly arises from the corruptness of our text of the ancient documents which bear on it. See with regard to it, Pagi in Baron. *ad ann.* 503, iv., and Mansi's *Notae ad ann.* 502, i. There is, however, no doubt that *Synodus Romana III.* (*apud* Labbe) was what was called the *Synodus Palmaris*, at which Symmachus was acquitted.

is said to have been directed by the king to treat Symmachus with respect, visiting him, in the first place, at the Vatican; but he seems to have been intended to supersede him in his functions till the case had been adjudicated, and to have, in fact, taken temporary possession of the temporalities of the see, and to have officiated in his stead in the solemnities of Easter (501), having arrived at Rome before the festival with that special purpose (*Fragment. Vit. S. Symm., vulg.* a *J. Blanchinio;* referred to by Mansi, *Not. in* Baron. *ad ann.* 502. I.). After Easter the synod convened by the king assembled, but separated in confusion without effecting anything, and some of the bishops left Rome. The reason was, that Symmachus had refused to appear before it, objecting to the jurisdiction of the visitor, and that it was alleged in his behalf that none but the pope himself could canonically summon or preside at a Roman council. This state of things was represented to Theoderic by the metropolitans of Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna, in the name of the bishops who had remained in Rome, and the suggestion made to him that the council should be summoned to meet at Ravenna in his own presence. He declined the proposal, saying that he would rather, if it were necessary, come himself to Rome; but he urged them to re-assemble and finish the business, after waiting for the bishops who had left the city, but who would be called upon to return. He further obviated former difficulties by allowing the council to be assembled under the authority of Symmachus himself. The day for it fixed by the king was the Calends of September. It met in the basilica of Julius; Symmachus appeared at it, and duly authorized its proceedings, expressing thanks to the king, and declaring himself willing to reply to his accusers. But he demanded that, as a preliminary step, Peter the Visitor should cease to perform ecclesiastical functions in his stead, and that he should be put again in possession of the temporalities as well as the full powers of his see. If this were done, he would reply to the charges made against him, but not otherwise. This demand caused a further postponement; Theoderic was asked to consent to it, but refused. After hearing from him to this effect, the synod again met, prepared, in obedience to the royal command, to hear the charges against the pope. Altercation at once ensued. First, the form of the accusation was objected to, in that it was so framed as to imply that the king was aware of the pope's guilt, and had only remitted the case to the synod for sentence to be pronounced; secondly, the evidence of the pope's slaves, who were adduced as witnesses against him, was objected to as inadmissible. While the dispute was going on, Symmachus himself appeared, but was attacked by a mob of his opponents with such violence that he had to be rescued by the two *majores Domûs*, who had been sent to Rome to represent Theoderic, and took refuge under their escort in the Vatican. After this occurrence he refused to attend or authorize any subsequent synod. The bishops again wrote to Theoderic, representing their helplessness, seeing that they could not proceed canonically without the pope's authority, but that he now refused to give it, and could not be compelled. They therefore requested to be allowed to return to their several homes, leaving the matter in the king's hands. But Theoderic would not let them off, the purport of his reply to them being as follows:—"I could have settled the whole matter myself before now, had I been so minded; but it is one for you ecclesiastics, not for me, to settle; I have no wish to usurp authority in matters spiritual; I call upon you to accomplish what you have been assembled for; it will be a disgrace to you all if you leave things as they are; if you cannot see your way to entertain these charges against the pope without his leave, dismiss them, if you like, without discussion, but at any rate come to some conclusion; I am ready to endorse and carry out whatever you decide; my one desire is to see peace and order restored at Rome." (See *Praeceptiones Regis*, inserted by Labbe after the Acts of *Synod III.*) To this effect wrote the Arian monarch, who, together with the other Gothic kings of the same persuasion, seems to have acted with great fairness towards his Catholic subjects, and with reluctance to intervene in their disputes. The result was, that the synod, so often adjourned, met once more on the first of November, and, dismissing all charges against Symmachus without any hearing of his accusers, declared him innocent, and further required all, under pain of being accounted schismatics, to accept him and submit to him as lawful pope. The preamble to the verdict implies that it was arrived at with a view to peace, and as led to by providential ordering, rather than on the merits of the question at issue; and thus it remains undetermined whether the charge (supposed to have been of adultery) had any ground. But the result was that Symmachus retained thenceforward undisturbed possession of the papal see. As was to be expected, the defeated party objected to the proceedings of the synod. A remonstrance came out, entitled *Adversus synodum absolutionis incongruae*, to which Ennodius, being at that time in Rome, was employed to reply (as to who he was, see *Art.* on ENNODIUS). His work, called *Libellus apologeticus pro synodo IV. Romana*, will be found in Labbe. Written in the affected style of a somewhat pedantic rhetorician, it is a defence in all respects of Symmachus and his supporters in the synod, and is not sparing in contemptuous abuse of his opponents. Still it is valuable as throwing much light on the history of events; and it is further noteworthy as containing the earliest well-established expression of the view (which seems to have been maintained by the friends of Symmachus at the synod) of the pope's entire immunity from all human judgment. "St. Peter (it is said) has transmitted to his successors the perennial dowry of his merits, with the inheritance of his innocence; what was granted to him for the light of his deeds pertains to them, whom an equal splendour illuminates. For who can doubt him to be holy who is exalted to such a summit of dignity, for whom, should his own merits be deficient, those of his predecessor suffice?" Again, "The causes of other men God may have willed to determine through men; the bishop of this see He has, without question, reserved to His own judgment."....

"And, again, I say that by the voice of holy pontiffs the dignity of his see has been made venerable throughout the world, the causes of the faithful everywhere being submitted to him, while he is designated the head of the whole body; concerning which this appears to me to have been said by the prophet, 'If this is humiliated, to whose help will ye flee? And where will ye leave your glory?'"

In a subsequent synod of 218 bishops at Rome (*Syn. Rom. V. sub Symm.* Labbe), this *libellus* of Ennodius was read and approved, having synodical authority given to it; and Symmachus ordered it to be inserted among the apostolical *decreta*. In this same synod, according to its Acts handed down to us, it was further ordered under the direction of Symmachus that all bishops everywhere should thenceforth have immunity from accusations brought against them by their flocks, except in cases of heresy or injustice; *i.e.* that charges of immorality (such as had been brought against the pope) should not be entertained against them: further, that, in all cases of bishops being legitimately accused before provincial or general synods, they should have, if they had been spoiled or deprived, full restitution before being brought to trial.

Other Roman synods held under Symmachus were as follows:—(1) One of bishops and other clergy, held A.D. 499, after his first confirmation in the see, with the purpose of providing against scandals that had attended elections to the popedom. It forbade, under penalties, all canvassing for the see, or promises of money, during the lifetime of any pope, and ordered that after the decease of a pope, in case he should not have given directions about the election of his successor, the election should be made by the majority of the clergy, any elector proved to have received bribes being disqualified; and, further, that any one adducing conclusive evidence of bribery or canvassing should, though himself implicated, be pardoned, and even receive reward. (2) One apparently held after the *Synodus Palmaris*, A.D. 502 (though erroneously given in collections of councils as *Synodus IV. Palmaris*), for the consideration of a law against the alienation of church property which had been made by Odoacer the predecessor of Theodoric. After the death of pope Simplicius, A.D. 483, Basilius, Praefectus Praetorio, had come into the synod assembled for the election of a new pope, had declared the action of the clergy without the king's leave unlawful, and had further propounded to them a law in Odoacer's name, which forbade under pain of anathema all future alienation, either by popes or any other, of lands or goods belonging to the church (see FELIX III.). That synod seems to have accepted the law without protest; but it was objected to as invalid by the synod under Symmachus, as having been imposed on the church by mere lay authority, during the vacancy of the see, and without the concurrence of the clergy; the anathema appended to it being especially protested against as an assumption of spiritual powers by laymen. It was therefore on these grounds declared null and void; but an ordinance to the same purport was passed by the synod, and thus made spiritually valid, all future popes, as well as other persons, being declared to be bound by it. (3) One of which the date is not given, at which invaders of ecclesiastical possessions, and appropriators of offerings to the church, though they might be princes or supported by princes, were subjected to excommunication.

Among the extant letters of Symmachus several refer to the old question of rivalry between the Gallic sees of Arles and Vienne. For accounts of earlier disputes between them; of the authority claimed, and in the end successfully maintained, by the popes over the churches of Gaul; of the settlement of the jurisdiction of the two sees by pope Leo I.; and of subsequent difficulties under pope Hilarius (see Articles on ZOZIMUS, LEO I., HILARIUS (pope), and HILARIUS ARELAT). It appears that Anastasius II., the predecessor of Symmachus, had sanctioned some invasion, on the part of Vienne, of the jurisdiction assigned to Arles by Leo. After the accession of Symmachus, Eonus, then the primate of Arles, wrote to him to complain of Avitus of Vienne having, under such sanction, ordained bishops beyond the limits of his proper jurisdiction. The reply of Symmachus shews an evident readiness to impute blame to Anastasius (whose whole policy, with regard to the East, as has been seen above, he had been elected to counteract), and is remarkable among the utterances of popes for its decided repudiation of the action of a predecessor. He lays down the principle, that the ordinances of former popes ought not to be varied under any necessity, as those of Leo had been by Anastasius, and that they must be now maintained. Still he does not at once adjudicate on the pending dispute, but requires both Eonus and Avitus to send full statements of their case to Rome; and in his letter to Avitus, while he repeats what he had told his rival, that the confusion introduced into the province by Anastasius, contrary to ancient custom and former papal ordinances, was not to be tolerated, he still allows that Avitus may have reasons to allege for some equitable dispensation under existing circumstances, and invites him to state such reasons. The appeal of Eonus to Rome appears to have been in 499; but it was not till 513 that we find the bishop of Arles finally confirmed in all the rights of his see which had been accorded to it by pope Leo, Caesarius having then succeeded Eonus. Symmachus in that year wrote to this effect to the bishops of Gaul, and in the following year to Caesarius, warning him at the same time to respect the ancient rights of other metropolitans, and to report whatever might be amiss in either Gaul or Spain to Rome.

In the meantime the church of Gaul had evinced interest in the cause of Symmachus when he was accused at Rome. A letter from the aforesaid Avitus of Vienne to the senators and ex-consuls Faustus and Symmachus, after the proceedings of the *Synodus Palmaris* had been made known in Gaul, purports to convey the sentiments of the whole Gallic episcopate. Faustus, be it remembered (see Art. on LAURENTIUS), had been the leading lay supporter of Symmachus. In this letter, while the liability of ecclesiastics, according to Christ's prediction, to be brought before "rulers and kings" is acknowledged, alarm is expressed at the pope's ecclesiastical subordinates having presumed to

sit in judgment on him, lest the prerogatives, not only of the head of the whole church, but also of the episcopate at large, might by such precedent have been endangered; and the influential senators addressed are earnestly conjured to support the pope, and see that he suffer no harm in his position.

After the defeat of the party of Laurentius at Rome, and the final settlement of Symmachus in the see, the emperor Anastasius, to whom the result would, of course, be peculiarly unwelcome, issued a manifesto against Symmachus, in which he reproached him with having been unlawfully elected, accused him of Manichean heresy, and protested against his presumption in having (as he said) excommunicated an emperor. To this invective Symmachus replied in a letter to the emperor, entitled "Apologetica adversus Anastasii imperatoris libellum famosum." In this reply, which is expressed in strong and indignant language, the pope rebuts the charges against himself, and retorts that of heresy on the emperor; he accuses him of presuming on his temporal position so as to think to trample on St. Peter in the person of his vicar, and reminds him that spiritual dignity is, at least, on a par with that of an emperor; and he protests strongly against the violence that had been used against the orthodox in the East. As to the allegation that he (Symmachus) had excommunicated the emperor, he says that it was not the case; he had only followed in the steps of his predecessors, and it was not the emperor but Acacius that they had excommunicated; the emperor, in fact, excommunicated himself; he had only to cease to take part with heretics, and to repudiate the deceased Acacius, and Rome would receive him into communion. The tone of this letter is sufficient to shew that the supporters of Symmachus had not been mistaken in their man, when they elected him with the view of maintaining a firm attitude against Constantinople.

Anastasius was by no means awed, or deterred from his course, by any such papal fulminations, which had probably the opposite effect upon him. He appears after this more than ever determined to support Eutychianism. In the year 511, Macedonius, the orthodox patriarch of Constantinople, who could not be induced to condemn the council of Chalcedon, was expelled from his see [see Art. on MACEDONIUS (3)], and violent conflicts, accompanied with bloodshed, occurred in the imperial city. At Antioch also bloody contests ensued between the Eutychians and the orthodox, which terminated in the expulsion of Flavianus from the see [FLAVIANUS (16)]. It was probably during these troubles that the orthodox bishops of the East addressed a letter to Symmachus, imploring his countenance and support. They address him in their need as the successor of St. Peter, charged with the care of feeding the sheep of Christ through the whole habitable world. Being themselves entirely orthodox (and they embody in their letter a confession of their faith), they beg to be recognized as in communion with Rome, even though some of them had, on urgent request being made to them, retained their sees for the support of orthodoxy, rather than leave Christ's sheep to wolves. They think it hard that they should suffer for the prevarication of the deceased Acacius, quoting the text, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." They beg the pope to receive them as Joshua received the Gibeonites and Rahab the harlot. They even adulate him so far as to say that as, when the whole world was sick through the transgression of one, the disciples of the heavenly physician called upon Him for cure, so those who now suffered through the transgression of Acacius, called upon the pope to come to their relief, in imitation of his Heavenly Father, who "maketh His sun to arise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and the unjust." The drift of their petition was to be received into communion with Rome, and have the pope's countenance in their opposition to Eutychianism, though some of them still remained in outward communion with the Eastern churches, and (whether willingly or as a necessary consequence of this) retained the name of Acacius in their diptychs. But such conditions Symmachus was not likely to accept, concurrence in the excommunication of Acacius, as well as of Peter Mongus and others who had been condemned by Rome, being insisted on by successive popes (with the exception of the yielding Anastasius) as a preliminary to any terms of peace (See FELIX III., GELASIUS (1), HORMILDAS). Accordingly there is no evidence of his having responded in any way to the humble supplication of those Eastern bishops. What his attitude towards them would be appears plainly from a letter of his addressed generally to the bishops of the East, dated A.D. 512, *i.e.*, soon after the expulsion of Macedonius from the see of Constantinople, but containing no reference to the appeal to himself which has just been referred to, having perhaps been written before he received it. In this letter he calls on them to dissociate themselves entirely from heretical communion, and to have no part with any (including the deceased Acacius) whom the Roman see had condemned, but rather to endure gladly banishment or any other penalties. Such as were ready thus to act, but no others, would be received into communion by him. In the same spirit he sent also a letter of congratulation and encouragement to certain African bishops who had been deposed and banished, and, who, it seems, had written to Ennodius at Rome, asking to have certain relics of the saints Nazarius and Romanus sent them.

At some time during the episcopate of Symmachus Theoderic visited Rome; probably before the accusations against the pope which led to the *Synodus Palmaris;* for Cassiodorus, who gives an account of the visit, places it under the consuls of the year 500; and that Theoderic remained at Ravenna while the case was pending may be gathered from the documents that refer to it. Being himself an Arian, he evidently had no desire to intervene personally in the disputes of the Catholics, declaring it to be his sole desire that they should agree among themselves, and that order should be restored at Rome. His visit is described by Cassiodorus, and by an anonymous author cited by Valesius, as having been welcomed with enthusiasm. Symmachus and the senate (we are told) met him on his approach to the city; he shewed devotion to St. Peter, as though he had been

a Catholic, promised to maintain inviolably whatever the rulers of Rome before him had ordained, entertained the people with games, and bestowed on them princely benefactions. The Catholic church fared, in fact, better, and enjoyed more independence, under the Arian kings of Gothic race than under many meddling and domineering emperors; and, acting as they did, they received equal respect and allegiance from their catholic subjects.

Symmachus is said by Anastasius (*Lib. Pontif.*) to have built, restored, and enriched with ornaments many Roman churches, to have spent money in redeeming captives, to have furnished yearly money and clothing to exiled orthodox bishops, and to have ordered the "Gloria in excelsis" to be sung on all Sundays and Saints' days. He is commemorated as a saint in the Roman calendar on the 19th of July, and is thus noticed in the Roman Martyrology:—"Romae sancti Symmachi papae, qui schismaticorum factione diutius fatigatus demum sanctitate perspicuus migravit ad Dominum." [J. B—Y.]

SYMMACHUS (10), Q. AURELIUS ANICIUS, son of Boethius and grandson of No. 8, at a very early age consul with his brother Boethius in 522. (Boethius, *De Cons.* ii. Pr. 2, 4.) [F. D.]

SYMMACHUS (11), defensor of the Roman church in Corsica, addressed by Gregory the Great (i. 52) [HOROSIUS]. He was also ordered to check the alleged practice in Corsica of priests having women living with them. If he was the same person as the "vir magnificus domnus Symmachus" named in xi. 44, he probably belonged to the same house as the preceding, as he is there mentioned in connexion with RUSTICIANA, which was a family name of the Symmachi (Mai, *Praefatio in Symmachi orat.* xvii.). [F. D.]

SYMPHONIA, the name of a book used by the ARCHONTICI (see Vol. I. p. 153; Epiph. *Haer.* 40). [G. S.]

SYMPHORIANUS (1), Aug. 22, martyr, according to the MSS. of his acts, under Aurelian, for which name Ruinart would substitute Aurelius, dating his passion about A.D. 180. He was born in Autun, of noble birth, the son of a man named Faustus. He was trained in christianity from his childhood. The city of Autun was devoted to the worship of Berecynthia, a cult which held its ground there most pertinaciously till the time of Gregor. Turon. (cf. *de Glor. confess.* cap. 77). The consular Heraclius, who governed there, was most anxious to convert the christians by argument. He entered into discussion with Symphorianus, who reviled his false deities. The judge then used threats and tortures, and finally beheaded him outside the walls, in the place of common execution; his mother, from the city wall, encouraging him to suffer, in words which have been embodied in the Gothic Missal. The acts of this martyr have been evidently compiled out of very ancient documents. The judicial investigation is reported in the most exact and most technical forms of Roman law. The questions proposed and the answers given are such as we find in the most genuine remains of antiquity. Yet there are also indications that they have been worked up into their present shape. Le Blant (*Actes des Martyrs*, p. 25) notes as one proof that early documents have undergone this process, the use in them of the word *consularis* for *proconsul*, as well as in the sense of governor, which was not so used till after the triumph of Christianity. The details of the worship of Cybele may be very usefully compared with those given in the passion of St. Theodotus and the Seven Virgins of Ancyra. Celtic idolatry in Asia and in Gaul followed precisely the same ritual. (Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 67–73; Ceillier, i. 472; *AA. SS.* Boll. Aug. iv. 496–498.) [G. T. S.]

SYMPHOROSA, July 18 (*Mart. Rom.*), June 27 (Us. Adon.), the wife of Getulius, tribune and martyr, under the emperor Hadrian [GETULIUS]. She suffered shortly after, with her seven sons, Crescens, Julianus, Nemesius, Primitivus, Justinus, Stracteus or Extacteus, and Eugenius. The occasion of their deaths was, according to their acts, the dedication festival of the new palace which Hadrian built at Tibur, cf. Spartianus's account of Hadrian in the *Scriptt. Aug. Hist.* Ruinart, in his *Acta Sincera*, fixes the date of their martyrdom at A.D. 120, at which period, as Dion Cassius notices, Hadrian put many persons to death. The composition of their acts is attributed in MSS. to Julius Africanus, a view which modern criticism rejects. [JULIUS AFRICANUS, Vol. I. p. 57.] The acts however must have been compiled at an early period, and from historical documents. There are no miraculous stories in them, while there are various historical coincidences and genuine touches in the acts both of Symphorosa and of Getulius, which have led Le Blant to attribute some authority to them (*Actes des Martyrs*, pp. 48, 128). [G. T. S.]

SYMPHOSIUS, bishop probably of Astorga (Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (1) 370 n.), a Priscillianist leader, is first mentioned in A.D. 380 at the council of Saragossa, from which he withdrew after one day to avoid joining in the condemnation of the Priscillianists. After the death of Priscillian in A.D. 385 St. Ambrose offered his mediation, proposing that the Priscillianist bishops should be received on certain conditions if they recanted their errors. Symphosius and his son DICTINIUS then seem to have gone to St. Ambrose, and in his presence agreed to these conditions, Dictinius being allowed to retain his priesthood, but being declared incapable of being raised to the episcopate. Symphosius then desisted from honouring Priscillian and his companions as martyrs, and from using his apocryphal and other writings, but afterwards, yielding, as he said to the importunity of the people, he consecrated Dictinius as his coadjutor and successor in the see of Astorga (Gams, p. 392). As the feeling throughout almost the whole province of Astorga or Gallicia was strongly Priscillianist, he consecrated other Priscillianists to the sees vacant there, and he and Dictinius refused to attend a council summoned at Toledo in A.D. 397. However, they appeared before the first council of Toledo in September, 400, and renounced both verbally and in writing (Idatius, *Chron.*) the doctrines and writings of Priscillian, and condemned him as a heretic. They were excluded from com-

munion till answers had been received from the pope, bishop SIMPLICIANUS of Milan, and the other bishops who were consulted. In the meantime, also, they were not to ordain bishops, priests or deacons. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 124, 191, 195.) The reception of Symphosius and the other recanting bishops and the retention of their sees caused a schism, the bishops of Baetica and part of Carthaginiensis refusing to accept the decision of the council, which was approved of by INNOCENT I. c. 404 (Innoc. *Epp.* 3 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 486). (Tillemont, *M. E.* viii. 518-523.) [F. D.]

SYMPOSIUS (SYMPIUS, SAMUS), bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, from whom, in A.D. 374, Basil received kindly expressed letters of communion. He sent his reply through Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, in order that he might criticize it and pass it on accompanied by a letter of his own (Basil, *Ep.* 190, [406]). Symposius attended the council of Constantinople in A.D. 381 (Labbe, ii. 655). He was buried in the martyry of St. Thecla (Basil. Seleuc. *de Miraculis S. Theclae*, c. 15; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1012). [E. V.]

SYMPRONIANUS, a Novatianist controversialist, to whom Pacianus of Barcelona addressed his letters against Novatianism. [PACIANUS.] [G. T. S.]

SYNADIUS, a correspondent of Isidore of Pelusium. Isidore (*Epist.* i. 284) discusses for his use the doctrine of the Resurrection of the body. [G. T. S.]

SYNCLETICA (1), a virgin and deaconess of 5th cent., celebrated by Sedulius the poet in his epistle to the abbat Macedonius. She was of noble blood, but of such humility, says the poet as to deserve to be chosen a member of Heaven's senate. She was also so learned a theologian as to be capable of teaching, did not her sex prevent. (Sedulii Opp. in *Corp. Scriptt. Ecclesiast. Lat.* Vindob. 1885, t. x. p. 9; Ceill. viii. 107.) [G. T. S.]

SYNCLETICA (2), Jan. 5, a virgin of Alexandria, whose life has been attributed to St. Athanasius, but only, as it would seem, on the authority of Nicephorus Callistus, a writer of cent. xiv. The life is, however, an ancient document written by one Polycarp, an ascetic and a contemporary of the saint. It is useful to shed light on the controversies and social life of cent. iv., cf. *AA. SS.* Boll. Jan. t. i. p. 242-257; Coteler. *Monumenta*, t. i. p. 216. [G. T. S.]

SYNCLETION (SYNCLETICA), a lady who sent medicines to Chrysostom during his last winter at Cucusus which relieved him in three days. He begs Olympias to obtain more for him through count Theophilus. (Chrys. *Ep.* 4.) [E. V.]

SYNCLETIUS (1), bishop of Trajanopolis in Thrace, and metropolitan, one of the three episcopal commissioners—Palladius of Helenopolis, and Hesychius of Parion (who, being a friend of Antoninus, speedily abandoned his commission on the plea of health) being the other two—deputed by Chrysostom A.D. 400 to proceed to Asia, and, in conjunction with the bishops of the province, examine and decide on the charges brought by Eusebius against Antoninus bishop of Ephesus. The commission was opened at Hypaepi, but the investigation proved abortive through the artifices of Eusebius, whom Antoninus had gained over by bribes, and who pretended that his witnesses were not forthcoming, and that time was needed to produce them. Syncletius and Palladius waited more than two months in vain and then returned to Constantinople, having previously passed a sentence of excommunication on Eusebius for non-appearance and false accusation. On their return to Constantinople they found Eusebius, who pretended that he had been ill, and promised still to produce his witnesses. In the meantime Antoninus died, and the case against him came to a natural termination. (Pallad. pp. 131-133.) [E. V.]

SYNCLETIUS (2), a deacon, by whom Euphemius patriarch of Constantinople wrote a letter to pope Gelasius, A.D. 492, seeking a restoration of communion between the two sees. (Ceill. x. 486; Bower's *Hist. of the Popes*, t. ii. p. 217.) [G. T. S.]

SYNCLETIUS (3) (SYNCLETICUS), bishop of Tarsus in the middle of the 6th century. By incautious reading of some heretical writings he became tainted with Eutychianism, together with the monk Stephen his "syncellus." His metropolitan, Ephraim of Antioch, wrote letters to him and held a synod to take cognizance of his errors, and was successful in bringing him back to the orthodox faith. (Photius, *Cod.* 228, pp. 780, 781; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 875.) [E. V.]

SYNEROS, Marcionite teacher, mentioned by Rhodo (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* v. 13). See the article MARCION, Vol. III. p. 819, a. [G. S.]

SYNEROTIS, a martyr in the Diocletian persecution, whose true name has only been lately discovered. In Ruinart's *Acta Sincera*, p. 546, the passion of a saint Serenus is recorded with a variety of spellings—Serenus, Sirenus, Sinerius, Sinerus. He was a gardener at Sirmium in Pannonia. He reproved the wife of one of the emperor Maximian's officials for immodesty. She complained to her husband, through whose influence he was arrested and put to death. A Christian cemetery was lately discovered at Sirmium with ancient inscriptions, shewing that the true way of spelling the martyr's name was Synerotis. De Rossi's *Bullet.* 1884-85, p. 145, discusses the circumstances of the martyrdom and of the new discovery (cf. *Archaeologische Epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich*, ix. (1885) 138). [G. T. S.]

SYNESIUS (1), a youthful relative of Gregory Nyssen, but otherwise unknown, charged with a capital offence. Gregory (*Ep.* 7 in *Pat. Gr.* xlvi. 1036) solicits his pardon from some high official, thought to have been Cynegius, pretorian prefect (384-390), pleading that the offence had been committed by misadventure and without premeditation. [C. H.]

SYNESIUS (2), bishop of Ptolemais in the Libyan Pentapolis, early in the 5th century. Two treatises have appeared on the subject of Synesius within the last few years, one in French

by H. Druon, *Études sur la vie et les œuvres de Synesius*, Paris, 1859; the other in German, by Dr. Volkmann, *Synesius von Cyrene*, Berlin, 1869. To the former I am indebted for much information respecting the chronological arrangement of Synesius's writings, especially the letters, though in some respects I cannot accept M. Druon's arrangement. The latter I did not see till this essay was nearly completed; it is a well-written treatise, but not so elaborate as the former.

There are some men whose writings have a particular value for students of history, precisely because they are deficient in marked originality. The man of original genius necessarily stands almost alone. He may express the highest thoughts and aspirations of his age, but for that very reason he is the representative of a small class rather than of the mass of his contemporaries. There are others whose works, though far inferior in literary and philosophical value, are almost, if not entirely, equal in historical importance. They are men of real ability, whose minds are receptive rather than creative, who are not great thinkers themselves but can reproduce faithfully the ideas of others, who are easily impressed by the various influences to which they are in turn exposed, and have great power of conveying to others the impressions made upon themselves, who are seldom consistent throughout their lives to one form of belief, or to one principle of policy, and so represent in turn widely different phases of thought and feeling. Such a man at the close of the 4th and commencement of the 5th century was Synesius of Cyrene. His life was almost exactly coincident with what is probably the most important crisis through which the world has passed. He witnessed the accomplishment of the two great events on which the whole course of history for many centuries depended—the ruin of the Roman empire and the complete triumph of Christianity. He was born when the pagan world was mourning the untimely death of the last of the pagan emperors. He died amidst the horrors of the barbarian invasions, when the recent fall of Rome seemed to every portion of the Roman empire a sign of impending ruin. With all the varying influences of this great age of change he was brought into contact, by all in turn his character was moulded, and all, with more or less completeness, are depicted in his works. He never attained the highest rank of literary excellence, but he writes as one who had carefully observed and considered the political, social, and intellectual condition of society. He was not a great philosopher, but he has described for us better than any one else one of the latest phases of Greek philosophy, which is not without its value even now. He was not a great poet, but he attempted with success a style of poetry of which we have hardly any previous examples. He had no pretension to vie with his illustrious contemporaries Augustine, Jerome, and Chrysostom, as a leader of religious thought, but he does represent at least one side of the religious history of that day, which we should look for in vain in the writings of those great champions of the Christian faith.

Synesius was born about the year 365 at Cyrene, "a Greek city of ancient fame, celebrated in the songs of countless poets," but then already in decay, and superseded by Ptolemais as the capital of Pentapolis. He was of good family, and loved to boast of his descent from the Heraclids, who led the first colony from the Peloponnese to the shores of Africa. Though a younger son, he inherited an ample fortune, with considerable estates in the interior of the country. Of his early years but little is known, except that he served in the army, and was passionately fond of field sports. The extremely interesting series of his letters which have been preserved to us begins with the time when he had left the army and commenced his studies at Alexandria. With a pardonable condescension to the tastes of novel-readers, Mr. Kingsley has described his heroine as still young and beautiful at the time of her cruel death. Twenty years at least before that date Hypatia was already the most distinguished teacher of philosophy in the civilised world. The wonderful influence she exerted over such a man as Synesius is itself a proof of the greatness of her abilities. Throughout his life, in all his troubles, in spite of all his changes of opinions, he always turned to her with reverence and chivalrous devotion. From her he derived his attachment to Neoplatonism, that strangely attractive system, a religion rather than a philosophy, by which those who still clung to the teaching of ancient Greece found means to combine their love of literature and their religious feeling in a poetical form of mystic Theism.

But even in the time of Hypatia the great school of Alexandria was not considered sufficient for any one who aimed at acquiring the reputation of a philosopher. Athens, though fallen, was still the chief university of the Roman world. Students from Athens looked down with contempt on all who had not studied the great systems of philosophy in their ancient home. To Athens, therefore, Synesius was driven by the remonstrances of his friends. "I shall get one advantage at least by going there," he said, "I shall no longer have to look with reverence on those persons who have no advantage over us in the knowledge of Plato and Aristotle, and yet because they have seen the Academy and Lyceum treat us as if they were demi-gods and we but demi-asses." On his arrival at Athens, he playfully declared he had at once grown wiser by a hand's breadth and an inch over. But both with the city and its teachers he was profoundly disappointed. Athens seemed to him like an animal of which only the skin remained to shew what it had once been. Of its former grandeur nothing, in his opinion, was left but the names of the places. It was distinguished only for the manufacture of honey. The two most eminent teachers of philosophy attracted young men to their lectures, not by the fame of their eloquence, but by presents of honey from Hymettus.

From Athens and Alexandria Synesius returned to his country home in Pentapolis, determined to divide his time between country pursuits and literature, planting trees, breeding horses, training dogs for hunting, writing poetry, and studying philosophy. From this pleasant life he was called away to plead the cause of his native city before the court of Constantinople. He arrived in that city A.D. 397, and remained there three years. A man of refined literary taste and strong religious feelings, enthusiastically fond of

a country life, naturally turned with disgust from the corruptions of that court and city which have been so vividly painted for us in the elaborate satires of Claudian, and the indignant denunciations of Chrysostom. Amid the intrigues of the palace, while Goths and eunuchs struggled for supremacy, the cause of an obscure and distant city had little chance of attracting attention. But Synesius was fortunate in the friendship of Aurelian, a distinguished statesman, the leader at that time of what may be called the patriotic party. By his influence Synesius was allowed to pronounce before the emperor Arcadius and his court an oration on the nature and duties of the kingly office.* This oration is still extant, but the language is in parts so bold, the invective so personal, as to suggest a doubt whether it could really have been delivered, at least in its present form. It is well known that great orators, especially in that age, published orations which either had never been delivered at all, or had been considerably altered after they were delivered. Still Synesius, on a subsequent occasion, claimed to have spoken before the king with greater boldness than any Greek had ventured to do before; and it is probable that the anti-Gothic party put him forward as a "rustic philosopher," who would be allowed much of that license which was then accorded to Christian preachers. In any case the oration is one of the most important historical memorials of that age. It expresses the deliberate judgment of a man of great ability, strong patriotic feeling, and highly cultivated mind, who could denounce moral evils with the righteous indignation of a Christian bishop, and, unlike the Christian bishops of that day, did not neglect the nature and extent of the political evils which, no less than the moral evils, were destroying the state. He began with a dignified exordium, skilfully contrived to prepare the emperor and his court to receive his words, not as the ideas of the envoy of a petty state, but as the teaching of philosophy itself. Much of what followed was derived from Plato and other teachers; but when Synesius passes from vague philosophical generalities he at once becomes vigorous and instructive. A brief abstract of the more important portions of the speech may not be altogether devoid of interest:

"Kingly power has been divinely appointed to be the representative upon earth of God's providence. Therefore the foundation of the kingly character must be laid in piety. Before undertaking anything, however small, the king will seek God's guidance. There is nothing more impressive than the sight of a king in the midst of his people lifting up his hands in prayer to God—his King and theirs. It is reasonable to suppose that God especially delights in the worship of a pious king, and unites that king to Himself by mysterious bonds of union. The more the king is loved by God, the more will he love men. The character which he finds in his own King he will display towards his own subjects.

"To secure success in war, philosophy shews us that the king should make a habit of living with his soldiers, sharing in their hardships, joining in their military exercises, treating them as his friends, making himself personally acquainted with their names and characters, and so winning the affections of that simple noble race. Look at Homer. See how he has represented Agamemnon, not only himself addressing even the common soldiers by name, but also exhorting his brother to do the same. Besides the king is a manufacturer of wars as a shoemaker is of shoes. Now a shoemaker would be justly ridiculous if he knew nothing about the implements of his trade, and how can a king know how to use his implements—the soldiers—when he is not even acquainted with them? Nothing has done more harm to the Roman state than the habit of surrounding the person of the king with a theatrical pomp and a sort of divine mystery. Do not be vexed at what I say. The fault is not yours. It is the fault of those who began this evil custom, and have handed it down to posterity as a thing to be proud of. The fear that if you are often seen you will be reduced to the level of mere men makes you state prisoners. You see nothing, you hear nothing which can give you any practical wisdom. Your only pleasures are the most sensual pleasures of the body. Your life is the life of a sea-anemone. The result of this studied seclusion is that you repel the wise and noble while you admit to your familiarity creatures who are the counterfeits of humanity; creatures with small heads and scanty brains, who, with idiotic grins and equally idiotic tears, with the language and gestures of buffoons, help you to kill the time, and to lessen the burden of that cloud which the unnatural character of your lives brings upon you.

"When do you think the Roman state was at the height of its power? Is it now, when you are arrayed in purple and gold; when precious stones from the mountains and the seas of barbarous countries are set in your hair, in your sandals, in your robe, in your girdle, in your ears, in your seats? Is it now, when the bare pavement is intolerable to you; when you will not even walk on the natural ground, but golden earth must be brought for your use by waggons and transports from distant continents—and the men who sprinkle it before you would form no despicable army—for you think it unkingly not to indulge the very soles of your shoes in luxury? Were not things better then, when the armies were commanded by princes who lived in the midst of their soldiers, men of simple habits and coarse dress, whose faces were tanned by the sun; men whom the common people would think to have been badly off indeed compared with you, but who, at all events, had not to guard their homes against attacks from the barbarians of Europe and Asia, for those barbarians were themselves obliged to fortify their own country against the danger of their attacks? Things cannot go on quietly as they have done. We are now at the turning-point. The stone of Tantalus hangs over the state suspended by a slender thread. Our chief danger is from the employment, not of citizens, but of barbarians as soldiers; not of sheep-dogs, but of wolves to guard the fold. While this is

* Synesius says that in the Eastern empire the emperors were generally addressed by the title of king, but that they did not use that title themselves on account of the old Roman prejudice against it.

so, to grant exemption from military service to all who ask for it, and to let our own countrymen devote themselves to every other kind of occupation, is it not the conduct of men hastening to their destruction? Rather than tolerate the employment of Scythians as soldiers, we should demand from friendly agriculture the men who will fight in her behalf. The philosopher should be taken from his study, the trader from his shop, the drone-like populace from the theatres where they spend their lives. These Scythian soldiers will be sure to turn their arms against us as soon as they think they can do so with success. And they will have many to help them in this city. Every family, which is at all well off, has a Scythian slave. The baker, the water-carrier, the waiter at table, the men who carry the seats for their masters to sit down on in the streets are all Scythians; for this race has long been marked out as the fittest to supply the Roman people with slaves. The servile insurrection of Spartacus and Crixus[b] was one of the greatest misfortunes which befel the Romans in former times. But our slaves, if they revolt, will be joined by their brethren, who form our army. They will be commanded by men who are high in rank, both among them and among us, men who take their place among Roman magistrates and scorn all that has long been most honoured among Romans, men who put on the toga to appear in the senate, but when they leave the senate-house quickly exchange the toga for the sheep-skin, and laugh at the toga as a dress in which men cannot draw their swords easily. We must get rid of these men. Do not think I am urging you to a task beyond our powers. We are Romans, and the Romans have conquered every nation. They are Scythians, and the Scythians, as Herodotus says, and as we ourselves see, have the vice of effeminacy. They have repeatedly been conquered, have frequently fled from their own country; they are always being driven forward by one nation and back again by another. Your father Theodosius vanquished them in arms, and then was vanquished by pity for them. He admitted them to the citizenship, and to the honours of the state; he gave land to these pests of the country. Since this has been known, fresh hordes are continually arriving, claiming the same treatment. But with increased spirit, and increased levies of native citizens, above all if you display what Homer calls the mighty wrath of Zeus-born kings, we shall either make these men our helots or send them back across the river (Danube) to tell men that the old softness is no longer to be found among the Romans.

"Then as regards the duties of the king in times of peace. The chief characteristic of the true king, as of God, is benevolence. The discharge of his duties is not more troublesome to him than giving light is to the sun. He will visit as far as he can all his dominions. He will receive readily, and with paternal kindness, the embassies from subject cities, that he may, when necessary, relieve them from public burdens and restore their lost prosperity. He will take care that his soldiers are as little burdensome as possible to citizens and agriculturists. As he cannot see to everything himself he must appoint governors in the different states, thus like God working through lower agencies. These governors must be chosen for virtue, not for wealth, as now. A man who has bought his office with money unscrupulously gained cannot really know what justice is. It is not likely he will hate injustice; he will hardly refrain from turning his tribunal into a market-place. He will not look with a noble contempt on bribes, when he knows that he is indebted to bribes for the dignity he holds, and that he has hired the government of the province as he might hire a house or farm. It is for you to make virtue, not wealth, an object of envy by promoting the poor and virtuous, and by shewing your detestation of that most ignoble vice of avarice. God has given many enviable privileges to the king, but the greatest of all is this: that he can by his example change even the ideas of morality which have been branded on the hearts of the people by long custom.

"Finally I pray that the king may become enamoured of philosophy; then philosophy, whose flame is now almost quenched, will have many disciples. It is not in the interests of philosophy that I pray for this. She does not suffer by being exiled from men, her home is with God; even when here her chief thoughts are with Him, and when the earth will not receive her, she remains with the Father. But human affairs prosper or decline as she is present or absent from us. May I then be successful in the prayer which Plato prayed in vain. May I see philosophy admitted by you to a share in the government. In this all my wishes are combined. And I myself shall justly be the first to reap the harvest from the seeds which I have sown, if, when I come to confer with you about the wishes of my country, I find you are yourself the king whose ideal picture I have drawn."

Some of the evils which Synesius anticipated were soon realised. The Gothic, or, as Synesius would have contemptuously called him, the Scythian, leader Gainas revolted, and triumphed without difficulty over the effeminate court of Arcadius. Aurelian was sent into banishment, and his supporters in Constantinople were exposed to considerable dangers. In after years, Synesius declared that he had only escaped the devices of his enemies through warnings sent to him in dreams by God. At the time he shewed his courage by publishing a curious political pamphlet, in which, under the transparent veil of a supposed Egyptian myth relating to the contest between Good and Evil in the persons of Osiris and Typhon, he described the conflict between Aurelian and Gainas. It was doubtless easy at the time to detect the personal allusions, but the piece is of very little historical value now, and is chiefly remarkable for a theory of Providence which will be noticed when we come to the subject of Synesius's religious opinions. In a few weeks the power of Gainas sank as rapidly as it had risen. Part of his army perished in a popular rising in Constantinople. The rest were destroyed by an army of Huns in the pay of the emperor. Aurelian returned to Constantinople, and for the remainder of Arcadius's reign occupied a position of great import-

[b] Speaking of these men, Synesius says that gladiators fought as expiatory sacrifices for the Roman people.

ance at the court. By his influence Synesius obtained the boon which he asked for Cyrene, and was able at length to quit the hateful city. The letter in which he thanked his friend is too characteristic to be omitted: "If there are spirits, gods, and daemons,[c] who preside over the destinies of states, as there certainly are, believe they are all grateful to you, remembering the benefits which, when holding the highest magistracy, you conferred upon mankind. Believe that at all times they are present with you, to aid and support you, praying always to your God and theirs that you may receive the fitting reward for having, as far as in you lay, imitated Him. For the work of benevolence is the only work which belongs to God and man alike. Now imitation is a form of resemblance, and there is a connexion between the imitator and the thing imitated. Feel, then, that you are become like God, by participating in His benevolence, and indulge the pleasant hopes which accord with such a frame of mind."

He returned to the country life of which he was so fond, and for which he was so well fitted. It must have been a pleasant home. "With us," he wrote to his brother Evoptius, who was suffering from the heat by the sea-side, "you can sit under the shade of the trees, and when you are tired of one tree you can move to another, and from one grove to another grove. Then think how delightful it is to cross the running stream! How pleasant is the light breeze when it softly stirs the boughs. And there are the varied songs of birds, and bright flowers, and shrubs in the meadow,—some the results of cultivation, others the gift of nature, all fragrant. I will not celebrate the praises of the nymphs' cavern, it would need a Theocritus to do that. Nor is this all." The pursuits and inhabitants of this country retreat are described by him with pleasant irony in a letter unhappily too long to be given in full. "We are roused in the morning by the neighing of horses, the roaring of bulls, the bleating of sheep and goats. With the first rays of the sun we hear the hum of the bees, which is quite as pleasant as any music. Our meetings are extremely social, we help one another, in agriculture, in flocks, in shepherds, and in hunting, of which the country affords a great variety. Neither we nor our horses can live without toil. We feed upon barley-meal, which is very pleasant to eat, and very pleasant to drink, such as Hecamede mixed for Nestor. After severe labour, this drink is a protection against the effect of the summer heat. We have also wheaten cakes, and excellent fruits, and honeycomb, and the milk of goats,—for it is not our custom to milk cows. Our best supply for the table comes from the chase. I cannot understand why Homer did not give the epithet 'man-ennobling' to the chase, whereas he does give it to the agora, which only produces shameless, infamous mannikins, who are of no good, but are scurrilous, and skilful only in mischief. Even if we allow that our honey is inferior to that from Hymettus, it is so good that when you can have it you have no wish for any foreign production. Our oil is clearly better than any other kind of oil, unless judgment is given by persons of perverted tastes. Our music is pre-eminently national. We have a small rustic pipe, of masculine tone, not unworthy of being used in training the boys of Plato's republic. For it does not admit of any modulations, nor will it harmonise with every voice. The singers adapt themselves to the simplicity of the music. Then we have capital songs, no effeminate subjects, but the praises of the dog who does not fear the hyaenas and dashes at the wolf's throat, of the ewe which bears twins, of the fig-tree and of the vine. But nothing is so common in our songs as thanksgivings and prayers for blessings on the men, the plants, and the herds. About the king and the king's friends there is naturally hardly a word. There is a king—that, I may say, they know well. We are reminded of that every year by the tax-gatherers. But who he is, that is not so clear. Some among us think that Agamemnon, son of Atreus, who was so distinguished at Troy, is still reigning, for this has been transmitted to us in our childhood as a name for a king. And the good herdsmen speak of his friend Ulysses, a bald-headed man, but clever in finding his way out of difficulties. They roar with laughter when they talk of him, as if it was but last year that he blinded the Cyclops. . . . They often ask me about ships and sails, and the sea. Though they may accept what I tell them about ships, they steadily refuse to believe that any food fit for men can come out of the sea. That, they think, is the special prerogative of mother earth. Once, when they would not believe what I told them about fishes, I took a jar, opened it with a stone, and shewed them some preserved fish from Egypt. But the men said these were poisonous serpents, jumped up and ran away, believing the bones would be as poisonous as the teeth. One very old man, who was considered the cleverest among them, said he certainly could not believe that anything good to eat could come out of salt water, when good tanks of drinkable water only produced frogs and leeches, which no madman even would think of eating. . . . You will say this is the kind of life men led in the time of Noah, before slavery became the punishment of men's crimes." Synesius's own estates were of course cultivated by slaves, who were subjected to what he calls a philosophic and Laconian discipline. "They are so liberally treated, and, I may say, placed so nearly on an equality with ourselves, that they look on me rather as a ruler whom they have chosen for themselves, than a despot who has been imposed on them by law." These, however, were the slaves whom he had inherited, whose ancestors probably had lived with his ancestors for many generations, till it was felt that masters and slaves formed but one family. He was not so fortunate with those whom he acquired in other ways. We find him writing to a friend to claim his aid for the recovery of a slave, his cousin's property, who had run away and escaped to Egypt. Another, whom he had unfortunately bought at a friend's sale, turned out quite a disgrace to his "philosophic master." "I shall not punish him," says Synesius, in a letter to his brother; "wickedness is a sufficient punishment to the wicked." So he sends him back to his native land, glad enough to be rid of him, but still with something of a secret liking

[c] The word daemon occurs in the letters and in his other works both in a good and bad sense, but in the hymns only in a bad sense.

for the amusing scoundrel. "He must be tied to the hatches during the voyage; don't let him go down into the hold, or you must not be surprised if he makes several of your wine-skins half empty. And if the voyage should be long, he would gulp down the fragrant wine to the very dregs, and induce the sailors to do the same, for, in addition to everything else, the scoundrel is very clever in persuading people to enjoy themselves. What hired sailor is grave enough to resist when he sees the wretch exulting in his wantonness as he passes round the cup? He has other buffooneries besides, of which the captain must beware. Now Ulysses, when *he* sailed by the sirens' shore, was bound lest he should yield to pleasure; but this man, if the captain is wise, will be bound lest he should induce the sailors to do so."

From his country retreat, and from the city of Cyrene where he occasionally resided, Synesius kept up a brisk correspondence with his friends in different parts of the world, especially at Alexandria and Constantinople. But the difficulties of communication were great. It was often necessary to wait till some trustworthy person was going to these cities, to whom a bundle of letters might be confided to be distributed on his arrival. In the winter there was no communication with Constantinople. At all seasons the voyage was dangerous. Sometimes the ship was obliged by stress of weather to put in at an intermediate port, the letters were landed and often stayed there. A letter for a friend in Syria had to be sent first to a friend in Alexandria, who in his turn must watch for an opportunity of forwarding it on. Under these circumstances it is not wonderful that letters were often mislaid, were often more than a year upon the road, arrived sometimes in an almost illegible state, and even moth-eaten. Synesius's most intimate friends, who lived at a distance, seem to have written to him only once a year. "When I received," he writes to his friend Pylaemenes, "the spring letters from Thrace (Constantinople), I turned over the packet again and again to see if one of them was marked with the honoured name of Pylaemenes, for I could not open any letter before his. But there was none. If you were away from Constantinople at the time, I hope you will return speedily and prosperously. But if you were there when all my acquaintances gave their letters to Zosimus, it would be strange indeed if any one was more mindful of me than Pylaemenes."

Naturally in those days letters were of far greater importance than they can be now, in this age of newspapers and the penny-post. Naturally, therefore, the arrival of a letter from the capital, or from a distinguished literary man, was a great event. The fortunate recipient hastened to communicate it to his neighbours. "A man from Phycon," writes Synesius to Pylaemenes, one of his greatest friends at Constantinople, "gave me a letter he had brought inscribed with your name. I read it with pleasure and astonishment, with pleasure for the love I bear you, with astonishment for the beauty of the language. I collected in your honour an Hellenic audience [d] in Libya, telling the people they must come and hear a remarkable letter. And now Pylaemenes is celebrated in these cities as the creator of the divine epistle. One thing surprised the audience. You asked for my Cynegetics,[e] as if there was really something valuable in them. They thought you must be very satirical. They felt that one who was considered amongst themselves very deficient in eloquence could not have produced any trifle worthy of your attention. But I defended you from the charge of irony, and told them that besides your other virtues you were extremely kind-hearted and very lavish of praise, so that your request had not been made in mockery, but to give me the pleasure of being honoured by the testimony of so great a man in my favour. Write to me, then, as often as you can, and feast the people of Cyrene with your eloquence. Nothing could give them greater pleasure than to hear a letter from Pylaemenes read, for they are already enchanted with the specimen they have had. You will certainly find several persons coming here; if nobody else, there will be the persons who are appointed to the higher or lower magistracy in this state, or to the governorship of Egypt. You will easily know who they are by the crowd of debtors who accompany them." This letter is itself an example of the prejudicial effect which the knowledge that their letters would be widely read and criticised had upon the writers themselves. It was impossible for them to write with ease and freedom when they knew that what they wrote would be subjected to the jealous scrutiny of strangers. "I should like to write to him," says Synesius of a friend at Constantinople, "but I do not dare to do so lest I should have to stand the scrutiny of those Universalists, who dissect every word." Men naturally became rhetorical and affected in letters which, though nominally intended for the private perusal of a friend, were really designed to be read to a public audience. It is not surprising, then, that many of Synesius's letters are highly studied productions, that there are in them frequent signs of affectation, of straining for effect, of an unnecessary parade of learning. Besides, the taste of the day in literary circles was strongly in favour of an elaborate style, with extravagant compliments, forced metaphors, and artificial antitheses; and how great an influence such a taste may exercise even on the highest minds, will be known by all those who have read the letters of St. Basil to Libanius. Such a taste is the natural product of an age of intellectual degeneracy. When the power of searching criticism has passed away, writers are themselves unable to distinguish between real originality of thought and mere ingenuity of expression. With all their defects, however, the letters of Synesius are, on the whole, extremely interesting. The worst, from a modern point of view, are good examples of what was considered fine writing fourteen or fifteen centuries ago. And happily many were written without any thought of an audience, and so are simple natural descriptions of his life and feelings. They shew him to us as he really was, a straightforward honourable man of strong religious feelings, very affectionate and kind, skilled in all the literary culture of that age;

[d] The allusion is to a literary circle in Constantinople which Synesius calls the Hellenicum.

[e] A poem on hunting not extant.

a very pleasant companion, shrewd and witty, with a great variety of tastes and an equal variety of powers; fond of a quiet, domestic life, but very energetic in everything he undertook; very sensitive, easily excited and depressed, and so naturally shrinking from all intricate business, especially from political life, and only to be roused from his repose by the prospect of doing a kindness to his friends or neighbours.

Some of his letters were addressed to influential friends in behalf of persons in distress. Thus he wrote to Heliodorus at Alexandria,—"Fame says you have great influence with the governor of Egypt, and it says truly, for you thoroughly deserve it, because you make a good use of your influence. In order, then, that you gain some advantage from your virtues and from your influence, listen to the request of my friend Eusebius." In this very difficult style of letter-writing Synesius shewed his ingenuity by suggesting that whenever he gave his friends the opportunity of doing a kindness he was really conferring a benefit upon them. So he wrote to Pentadius, who was Augustalis, or civil governor of Egypt, "I am anxious both for you and for this man; for you lest you should do wrong, for him lest he should suffer wrong. Now if you agree with Plato that to do wrong is worse than to suffer wrong, I think I am conferring a greater benefit on you than on him by pleading on behalf of one who is accused of crimes he never committed." In a somewhat different tone is his letter to Anastasius, an influential friend at Constantinople: "Some God, some reason, or some daemon, has persuaded Sosenas that the place in which we are has something to do with our finding the Deity propitious or unfavourable to us. As, then, he is doing badly here, and has entirely lost the property he inherited from his father, he has determined to sail away to Thrace and there reconcile himself with Fortune. If you have any influence with that deity commend the young man to her, and let her find him some way of acquiring wealth. She can easily do so if she likes. She has had no difficulty in transferring to others the property of his father, Nonnus. Let her then make Sosenas the heir of some other father, and thus justice will succeed injustice." The following letter was obviously intended to be read by literary friends. It is addressed to a Cyrenaean named John, of whose misdeeds we shall hear again. "Fear of the laws is the greatest fearlessness. But you are always afraid of appearing to be afraid of them. Fear then your enemies and the judges also—unless they are corrupt. And if they are corrupt, and you are not the person who gives the highest bribes, you should be still more afraid. They are terribly zealous for justice, especially when they are bribed to be so."

Of the hundred and fifty-six letters which are still extant no less than forty-nine are addressed to his brother Evoptius. They form a pleasant series, full of interesting details, but it is somewhat remarkable that there is no allusion in them to their early years or to their parents. This would make it probable that they had been left orphans when quite young. To Evoptius himself, Synesius was warmly attached, and the letters themselves abound with frequent proofs of their mutual affection. There are few more characteristic letters in the whole collection than the one written when his brother, who usually resided at Cyrene, went on a visit to Alexandria: "You had loosed the cables when I checked the mules on the western beach. When I stept from the chariot the sail was already unfurled and the wind was blowing on the stern. Still with my eyes I attended you on your way as far as they could reach, and many prayers I uttered to the winds for the life so dear to me, commending to their care the bark, because it bore that freight most precious to me. And they—for they love what is good—promised me you should go and return in safety. They are good daemons and will not deceive me. As then you prayed to them for your voyage hence, so pray to them for your voyage hither; in that they will aid you still more gladly."

Probably Synesius would have owned that next to his brother his greatest friends were his books. It is touching to find him just before the birth of his eldest son talking of the pleasure he will have in introducing his son to the society of these old friends—a pleasure which he never knew. They were to be the most valuable part of his inheritance. "I have lessened my estates, and many of my slaves have bought their freedom from me, I have no money in women's ornaments or in coin, but I have many more books to leave than I inherited." In the opinion of some of his contemporaries, however, the money had not always been judiciously laid out. He was loudly accused of not being particular in buying correct copies. Of course in those days, when books were rare and dear, the more correct a copy was the dearer it became, and Synesius, with all his love for literature, had none of that minute carefulness of thought which would have led him to attach a very high value to precise accuracy of expression. He was one of those men who are easily struck by the general beauty of a piece, but are not inclined to weigh deliberately the importance of each separate phrase. He was sure to prefer a large number of somewhat imperfect manuscripts to a small number in which no inaccuracies could be detected. This, however, is not what he says himself in his defence, and the defence he does make has certainly the merit of originality. The great object of reading, according to him, is to develope the powers of the mind, but in reading we are too apt to leave the whole work to the eyes. Where, however, the manuscript is itself imperfect, the mind is continually compelled to exert itself to supply the missing words and to reconstruct the broken argument. There is therefore, at least for intelligent persons, a positive advantage in reading a book full of corrupt passages.[f]

In connexion with this theory he mentions some curious facts which throw great light on his literary habits and abilities. When he was reading any book he would often pause, close it, and improvise a continuation to what he had already read. On comparing this with the book he often found he had correctly divined the sense and style of the passage, and even in philosophical works the precise form of the argument. When he read aloud to a circle

[f] Any one who reads Synesius's letters and hymns, especially in the Abbé Migne's edition, will be able thoroughly to test the value of this theory.

of friends, he often improvised additions to the poem or to the narrative, and his friends, without detecting the change of style, often praised the author most loudly for the very passages which were due to the ingenuity of the reader. There was no kind of poetry which he did not imitate. "You would think me at one time a contemporary of Cratinus and Crates, at another of Diphilus and Philemon. Of such soft materials, so to speak, has God formed my soul that it readily takes the impressions of language and of characters." It is this flexibility of mind, indeed, seldom united in any one with great originality, which makes Synesius's writings so attractive, enabling him to represent so many different phases of thought, and so many different shades of character. He seems to have been naturally impelled to attempt in turn every form of composition, attaining in each a high, but never the highest, degree of excellence. Not content with his fame as an orator, a pamphleteer, a poet, and a philosopher, he resolved to enter into competition with the rhetoricians, or, as they were generally called, the sophists, of that day. Among the Greek rhetoricians under the empire no one was more celebrated than Dion, commonly surnamed Chrysostom, of whose writings Synesius has left an interesting criticism, and whose orations addressed to Trajan he had aspired to rival in his oration addressed to Arcadius. Among the works of Dion then extant was a Eulogy of Long Hair. It was one of those elaborate trifles which so much delighted literary circles in the decay of thought and learning under the despotism of the Caesars. When so many of the higher paths of literature were practically closed against them, when the serious discussion of historical, social, and political subjects was constantly attended with danger, even if, under the altered conditions of life, men retained much taste for such subjects, a very disproportionate value was naturally assigned to these trifles, which had, at all events, the merit of displaying the ingenuity of the rhetorician. The more insignificant the subject, the greater the ingenuity required. The subject might be a parrot, a gnat, a bit of dust; the interest of the piece consisted in the skill with which the author invested the subject with a fictitious importance, expending on it all the resources of his learning, bringing all the arts and sciences to embellish his declamations and support his arguments. Of this style of composition, interesting as an illustration of literary tastes in former times, there is, I believe, no better specimen extant than Synesius's Eulogy of Baldness, of which a brief abstract is subjoined:

"Dion has written such an eloquent encomium on long hair that a man is quite ashamed of being bald. When my hair began to fall off I was smitten with grief. To whom of the gods, to whom of the daemons did I not pray for help? When that did no good, I began to doubt the existence of a providence. But now I think that treatise was so eloquent simply because Dion was such a clever man. He could easily have written a much better encomium on baldness. For, if we look at the matter fairly, there is an antagonism between hair and wisdom: where the one flourishes the other does not. The most hairy of all animals is the sheep, and everybody allows that of all animals the sheep is the most stupid. The least hairy of all animals is man, and by common consent man is of all animals the wisest. Then consider the different classes of men. If you go into a museum, and look at the statues of the philosophers, you will see that they are all bald. It is true Apollonius of Tyana had long hair, but then, I fear, that shews that he was only a conjuror and a dealer in magic arts. Socrates, who in every other respect was so modest, was extremely proud of his resemblance to Silenus, and the reason was because Silenus was bald. In the Bacchic orgies the frantic revellers have long hair and are covered with hairy skins, but Silenus, who was appointed by Jupiter for his wisdom to restrain the excesses of Bacchus, sits among them bald-headed. Besides, our hair grows most freely when we are children, that is to say when we are least wise. As we grow older and wiser our hair gradually falls off. It is true some people fail to become bald even in old age, but then some people also fail to become wise.

"The reason of all this is a divine mystery not to be revealed to the vulgar. I will endeavour to say as much as can be said with reverence on the subject. Before the fruit, which is the object of the plant's existence, is produced, nature, for her own amusement and pleasure, produces the flower, and the husk in which the fruit is wrapped. These all fall off or wither before the fruit attains maturity. So the hair, which nature produces as an ornament like the flowers, or a covering like the husk, must fall off before wisdom, the fruit of the mind, can be brought to perfection. Again, the Father has appointed the universe to be the habitation of the third god, the soul of the universe. The universe has therefore the most perfect and comprehensive form. This form geometry shews us is in plane figures the circular, in solid figures the spherical. Therefore the universe is spherical. Now all souls are emanations from this god, therefore they naturally seek a habitation similar to his, that is to say one which is spherical. The most perfect souls inhabit the stars, those who are next in excellence inhabit the heads which are most spherical, that is to say which are most bald. Only the least rational souls will enter the heads which lose the spherical form through the profusion of their hair.

"If Homer and Phidias represented Zeus with long hair, that was only to humour the popular prejudice. The Greeks were always indifferent to the pursuit of truth. Any one who innovated on their traditional religion would soon have drunk the hemlock. Homer would have fared ill if he had told the truth about Zeus, and invented none of the fables which astonish children. If the gods really have any bodily form, the only idea we can gain of it must be from considering the heavenly bodies, but these are all spherical. The only heavenly bodies which have anything like hair are the comets, so they are the only heavenly bodies which perish. Besides they are always the forerunners of great calamities.

"When men are ill they have their heads shaved. Indeed the head is the citadel of life, and from it the cables, so to speak, of disease and health proceed. Now, by being bald, the head is exposed to all the inclemencies of the

weather, and so becomes harder and stronger, therefore disease has the more difficulty in penetrating into it. But the head which is covered with hair is necessarily weak, like a tree which has grown in the shade. If you want any proof of this, you may visit the battle-field which Herodotus describes on the borders of Arabia and Egypt. He says that, while the Persian skulls were quite weak, the Egyptian skulls, which were shaven, were so hard that you could not break them even with a large stone. If you do not like to undertake so long a journey, or think it would be wrong to hit a dead man's skull with a stone, and yet are unwilling to believe Herodotus, there are plenty of long-haired Scythian slaves in this city. If you were to hit one of them on the head, even with a knuckle-bone, you would kill him.

"The instances Dion quotes in support of his opinions are unfortunate. It is true the Spartans combed their long hair before the battle of Thermopylae, but then they were all killed there. On the other hand before the battle of Arbela, where the Persian empire was overthrown, Alexander caused all his soldiers to have their heads shaved.

"Then Dion says Achilles had long hair. 'The goddess seized him by his flaxen locks.' Well, suppose Achilles *had* long hair! He was at that time young and passionate. When a man is young it is natural that as his heart swarms with passions, so his head should swarm with hairs. Had Achilles lived longer he would doubtless have become wise and bald. But the truth is Dion has left out the most important part of Homer's line. 'She stood behind and seized him by his flaxen lock.' Stood *behind* him! Of course because there was no hair in front to take hold of. Why even with me anybody might still take hold of the hair at the back of my head. So I conjecture Achilles was already partially bald. . . .

"As then baldness is the end at which nature aims, and as those whose nature is highest are as I am, it would be well to assist others to the attainment of this perfection by the use of the razor."

There are many works whose very style shews that they have been written with pleasure and finished with satisfaction, and no one who has read this treatise in the original will be surprised to find that it was, at least at first, an especial favourite with Synesius. If his books were his friends, his writings were his children. Some, as he playfully told his friend Nicander, were his legitimate sons, the offspring of his union with divine Philosophy or her companion Poetry. But others were too obviously the offspring of Rhetoric to be regarded by a philosopher as his lawful issue. To this latter class he feared the Eulogy of Baldness must belong, and yet he had a special affection and admiration for it. "But they tell me the mother-apes gaze with rapture on their own offspring, and are astonished at their beauty, though they see clearly enough that the other young ones are but the children of apes. So then I also must leave others to judge of my children." Probably this treatise was written while he was still at Constantinople. In later years he spoke with a just depreciation of such elaborate trifling. For then misfortunes had come to trouble the easy current of his life, and in the dark days before him he had deeper thoughts to occupy his mind and a sterner work to do.

With the death of Theodosius, the last hope of maintaining the grandeur of the Roman empire seemed suddenly to die away. The burden of the government was too heavy for any but the strongest man to sustain, and from his firm grasp the sceptre fell into the feeble hands of his children, who, throughout their lives, except in name, were never more than children. On all sides the barbarians pressed in through the weakly guarded frontier to the rich and defenceless provinces. Everywhere the same miserable story is repeated of pillage and slaughter, and ruined civilisation. It has often been alleged as a proof of the degeneracy of the Britons under the Roman sway, that, when the Roman soldiers were withdrawn, they were so unable to defend themselves. As a matter of fact, however, the resistance in Britain was more vigorous, certainly more national, than in the other parts of the Roman empire. The Britons at all events did not fall without leaving behind them some record of a bloody struggle. The extraordinary feature of the barbaric invasions is the general apathy of the inhabitants whose countries were invaded. No love of country, no fear of confiscation, no cruelties inflicted on themselves, no indignities offered to those most dear to them, could kindle in them one spark of courage, even the courage of despair. The only armies which encountered the barbarians were chiefly composed of barbarians themselves. The generals who commanded them, even if nominally Roman, were usually like Stilicho of barbarian descent. Not even the inhabitants of the great cities could find in their numbers, their superior intelligence, and the strength of their fortifications, sufficient confidence for a vigorous defence. Rome and Milan, Lyons and Arles, fell by turn before Goths and Vandals, leaving many records of their sufferings, but not one of a single heroic struggle for life and liberty. The various characteristics of this miserable time are well illustrated by the letters of Synesius. The miseries which descended upon the Western empire did not spare the distant province of Pentapolis. The nomadic tribes of Libya took advantage of the weakness of the Roman government to sweep down upon the fertile land. Their inroads were not, like the great Teutonic invasions, a national migration for the acquirement of a new country. At least at first they were merely predatory incursions. In the absence of precise chronological indications to determine the dates of all Synesius's letters, it is difficult to distinguish between the events of different years. I have therefore grouped together from different letters such details as throw light on the general character of these inroads.

They seem to have begun not long after Synesius's return from Constantinople. At Cyrene, as elsewhere, there were no troops to oppose them. Synesius's spirits rose with the danger. "I at all events," he writes, "will see what manner of men these are who think they have a right to despise Romans. I will fight as one who is ready to die, and I know I shall survive. I am Laconian by descent, and I remember the letter of the rulers to Leonidas—'Let them fight as men who are ready

to die, and they will not die.'" Here and there a few displayed the same courage. "Blessings on the priests of Auxiditae, who, when the soldiers hid themselves in the caves, called the people together and, after divine service, took the offensive against the enemy. Now, Myrsinitis is a long deep ravine, thickly wooded; but as the barbarians had hitherto met with no opposition, they were not alarmed at the badness of the ground. They encountered a hero, however, in the deacon Faustus. Though unarmed, he attacked a man who was fully armed, and struck him a blow with a stone on the head, not throwing the stone, but rushing on the man and striking him like a boxer. Then he took the arms of the fallen man, and killed several others. For my part I should like to give triumphal crowns to all who took part in the fray, and make a public proclamation in their honour. For they are the first who have done a gallant deed, and have shewn that these invaders are not Corybantes, or daemons such as wait on Rhea, but men who can be wounded and killed like ourselves." As time went on, the inroads became more destructive. "They have burnt the barns, and devastated the land, and carried off the women as slaves. The males they never spare. Formerly they used to take young boys alive; now I suppose they feel they are too few in number to leave many guards with the booty, and still have men enough to resist attacks. Yet none of us are indignant. We sit at home hoping in vain for the soldiers. Shall we not cease our folly? Shall we not march against these men in behalf of our children, our wives, our country? For my part, I have dictated this letter almost on horseback, for I have levied a troop among our neighbours. When we begin our march, and it is known that I have a force of young men with us, I hope that many will join me." The supply of arms, however, for this volunteer force was a great difficulty, and we find Synesius writing even to a friend in Syria to send him bows and darts, especially the long Syrian darts, which he found went further and straighter than the Egyptian. On the eve of an engagement with a body of marauders, he thus describes the arms of his party: "We have already three hundred spears, the same number of bills, but only ten two-edged swords. Still I think the bills will give the strongest blow to the enemies' bodies. We shall certainly use them. If necessary we shall use clubs, and some of us have axes to cut down their shields and compel them to fight us on equal terms." The Ausurians had got the shields from the runaway soldiers. "I believe we shall fight to-morrow." It was, however, by no means safe for private persons to levy men for the defence of the country which was abandoned by its rulers, and his brother wrote to him in great alarm that he was exposing himself to a charge of treason. Synesius replied with spirit, "You are a pleasant person, hindering us from taking up arms when the enemy are at hand, plundering everywhere, and every day slaughtering whole villages, and when there are no soldiers, at least none to be seen. Will you say after this that it is not lawful for private persons to bear arms, and that they may be put to death, seeing that the state may be angry with any one who attempts to save himself? . . . I would gladly die at once if my country could regain her former aspect." Things grew worse, till he wrote almost in despair this touching letter to Hypatia: "Even if, as Homer says, 'The dead forget in Hades,' yet even there will I remember the beloved Hypatia. I am surrounded by the misfortunes of my country, and mourn for her as each day I see the enemy in arms, and men slaughtered like sheep. The air I breathe is tainted by putrefying corpses, and I expect as bad a fate myself, for who can be hopeful when the very sky is darkened by clouds of carnivorous birds? Still I cling to my country. How can I do otherwise, I who am a Libyan, born in the country, and who have before my eyes the honoured tombs of my ancestors? For your sake alone I think I would leave my country, and change my abode if I am ever again free from anxiety." In a short time afterwards, owing to the arrival probably of a new general, the Ausurians were repulsed, and Synesius in the year 403 left for Alexandria, where he married and remained two years. On his return he found Cerealis governor, under whose rule the predatory incursions of the barbarians became a regular invasion. "He is a man," wrote Synesius to an influential friend at Constantinople, "who sells himself cheaply, who is useless in war, and oppressive in peace. As if what belonged to the soldiers was the property of the general, he took all they had and gave them furloughs in return, allowing them to go where they thought they should find people to maintain them. Thus he treated the native soldiers; as he could get no money out of the foreign troops, he got money by their means out of the cities, for he went and established himself with them, not where he thought he could do most good, but where he thought he could get most money. For the cities oppressed by the presence of these soldiers paid money to be rid of them. The Macetae soon heard this, and from that mixed tribe the story spread to the barbarians. 'Thus came they as the flowers and leaves of spring in multitude.' Alas for the youths we have lost! Alas for the harvest we have sown in vain! We have sown our land for the enemies' flames. The wealth of most of us consisted in flocks, and in herds of camels and horses. All is gone. All has been carried off. I am distracted by our misfortunes. Pardon me. As I write to you I am being besieged, many times in an hour. I see the fire signals, and light others in reply. . . . When Cerealis saw the danger he embarked his money, and is now at anchor in the bay. He sends us orders by a boat that we are to keep within the walls, and not attack these invincible men, otherwise, he protests, he is not to blame for the consequences. Besides, we are to set four watches at night, as if our hopes depended on our not going to sleep." While the governor thus deserted his duties, "Synesius the philosopher" mounted on the ramparts, and prepared for a vigorous defence. "I have no time for letters," he says, "I am occupied in devising a machine which shall hurl large stones a considerable distance from the walls." "At break of day I ride out," he says in another letter, "as far as possible to gain tidings of these brigands. I will not call them enemies, but robbers and murderers, since they do nothing but kill and plunder the helpless. At night with a body of

young men I make circuits round the hill, that the women may sleep without fear. I have some soldiers with me, of the company of the Balagritae, who, before Cerealis was governor, were mounted archers, but he has sold their horses. Still they do for me without horses, for we need archers to guard the wells and river, as we have no water within the walls. I want a few men who do not belie the name of men. If I get them, with the help of God, I am confident of success. But if I must die, there is this benefit in philosophy that I should not shrink from leaving this 'little bag of flesh.' But that I shall shed no tear at the thought of my wife and child, that I cannot pledge myself to do." The city which was thus besieged was probably Ptolemais, the capital of Pentapolis. As Volkman has pointed out, it cannot have been Cyrene, for there was a celebrated spring of water in that city. Besides, the capital was the most probable place for the governor to be at; it was close to the sea-shore, and Procopius mentions that, in the reign of Justinian, it was almost deserted owing to the want of water, and that the aqueducts were restored by that monarch. Happily for the people of Pentapolis, Cerealis was superseded, and a new and vigorous general soon repelled, at least for a time, the incursions of the barbarians, and restored comparative tranquillity to the country.

It was obviously Synesius's belief that, at all events in Pentapolis, the country might have been easily protected against the barbarians if there had been any ability in the government or vigour in the people. He was probably right. The Roman empire fell because so few of its own citizens cared to do anything to preserve it. In this respect Synesius's own career is very suggestive. The vigour he displayed during these invasions shews that he was one of those men whom every wise government seeks to enlist in its service. He had, indeed, before his embassy to Constantinople, consented to hold office for a time; "the injuries done to my friends, both private individuals and soldiers, compel me to wish for a political office, though I know I am naturally unfit for it." The corruption of the law courts, however, and the oppressions of the government, had soon filled him with disgust. He not only resigned this office, but while at Constantinople employed all his influence, at last with success, to get released from serving as a member of the senate of Cyrene, a duty he was bound to discharge in consequence of the estates he possessed in that district. Only if freed from this "accursed public service" could he have leisure for philosophy. From the charge of want of patriotism he vigorously defended himself in a letter to his friend Pylaemenes. "If circumstances gave free play to philosophy, no other science, nor all the sciences combined, would do so much for the harmonious arrangement of the government and the benefit of mankind. ... I had rather my soul was guarded with virtues than my body with soldiers, now that the state of affairs no longer allows a statesman to be a ruler. ... In our law courts a man can only become rich by subverting all rights, human and divine, and giving up his freedom to become a pitiable slave."

While he still took part in public affairs he advocated, but of course unsuccessfully, two important measures for the benefit of his country. One was the enrolment of a national militia, certainly the only way of successfully resisting the barbarians, though the general adoption of such a measure would inevitably have broken up the Roman empire by degrees, and made the provinces independent states. In Synesius's letters the very names of the soldiers are significant. They are called Marcomanni, Balagritae, Unnigardae, Arabians, never Romans. Such men were not likely to expose themselves very vigorously to any great dangers in behalf of a people they despised. Still it is remarkable that Synesius lays far more blame on the generals than on the soldiers. He repeatedly says that the soldiers fought well when well commanded, but he shrewdly adds, as the result of an extended experience, "the command of foreign mercenaries makes even the best generals merchants." Commanders, looking upon military service simply as a question of money, were chiefly anxious to make their fortunes as quickly as possible. For many years the legislation of the Roman emperors had steadily discouraged Roman citizens from serving in the army. In the increasing poverty of the empire, and the increasing burden of taxation, numerous laws had been made to prevent citizens volunteering into the army, in order to escape the burden of taxation that was crushing them hopelessly down. Those who could earn money to pay taxes were not to be allowed to serve the state as soldiers. While they were thus prevented from learning the use of arms, and were so oppressed by the exactions of the government, it is no wonder that men had no heart to encounter a savage enemy, fond of fighting and careless of life. When men were selling themselves as slaves to gain protection against their oppressors, many not unnaturally thought they could hardly be worse off through any change of rulers. It was not only in Spain that, to use the expression of Orosius quoted by Gibbon, many preferred liberty with poverty under the barbarians to the vexatious burdens of taxation under the Romans.

The other proposal was that the military governor of Pentapolis should, as in former times, be made dependent on the governor in Egypt, instead of being sent direct from Constantinople. This suggestion points to the want of responsibility in the governors of the distant provinces, owing to the difficulty of exercising any efficient supervision over them from the capital. The reason for the proposed change obviously was the far greater ease of communication between Pentapolis and Alexandria, than between Pentapolis and Constantinople. A governor knew that a long time must necessarily elapse before any action could be taken in the capital in consequence of complaints made against him, as the voyage was always long, and for several months in the year almost impossible. But with Alexandria the communications were comparatively easy and frequent. The chief people of Pentapolis often visited Alexandria, almost all of them had friends and relations living there. There would be no difficulty in bringing complaints against a deputy before his official superior in Egypt, and in securing at least some attention to them. In his oration on the duties of the kingly office Synesius had asserted that go-

vernors were generally appointed not for merit but for money, and his letters abound with illustrations of this remark. He mentions one man who obtained the governorship of Pentapolis after making a fortune by keeping a house of ill-fame. In another letter he speaks of a newly-appointed governor of Egypt who owed his wealth to unscrupulous embezzlement. Other cases are alluded to in which offices were purchased for noblemen by their creditors, as the best way of enabling them to pay their debts. It was impossible for such men in the short tenure of their offices to make their fortunes, as well as satisfy the demands of the central government, by any taxation which could under any show of legality be imposed upon the people. Hence arose a class of men whom Synesius calls the common pests of the country, the worst of brutes, informers who accused rich men of imaginary crimes, that the confiscation of their properties might enrich themselves and the needy governors. If any governor was high-minded enough to repress these informers, he was almost sure, according to Synesius, to be falsely accused himself on laying down his office. It was indeed an almost hopeless task in that day for the best of rulers to hold the balance fairly between the claims of the people he ruled and the claims of the imperial government he served. It was almost impossible, even for well-meaning men, to avoid being at once tyrants to the slaves below them and slaves to the tyrants above them. It is not surprising then that men of strong religious feeling, like Basil, turned from this mingled state of servitude and tyranny to find in the solitude of the desert, or the duties of the Christian ministry, the possibility of that life of holiness to which they felt God had called them. It was but natural that men, even of strong patriotic feeling, like Synesius, should turn from the degradation of official life, to live in thought among the glories of the heroic age of action in the pages of Homer, and the heroic age of thought in the pages of Plato.

His philosophical studies did not meet with much encouragement among the people of Pentapolis. "I never hear in Libya the sound of philosophy, except the echo of my own voice. Yet if no one else is my witness, assuredly God is, for the mind of man is the seed of God, and I think the stars look down with favour on me as the only scientific observer of their movements visible to them in this vast continent." He pursued the study of astronomy, not only with his usual fondness for the beauties of nature, but as a valuable introduction to the highest branches of philosophy. To him, as to Plato, astronomy is "not only a very noble science, but a means of rising to something nobler still, a ready passage to the mysteries of theology." He had received instruction in it from Hypatia, his "most venerated teacher," at Alexandria. While at Constantinople he sent his friend Paeonius a planisphere, constructed in silver according to his own directions, with a letter which contains a curious and rather obscure description of it. He mentions that Ptolemy, and the sacred college of his successors, had been contented with the planisphere on which Hipparchus had marked only the sixteen largest stars, by which the hours of the night were known, but that he himself had marked on his all the stars down to the sixth degree of magnitude.

In philosophy itself Synesius is not entitled to rank as an independent thinker. He is simply an eclectic blending together the elements of his belief from widely different sources, without taking much trouble to reduce them to a strictly harmonious system. He had neither depth nor precision of thought sufficient to win for himself a high place in the history of philosophy. At the same time, he constantly speaks of his delight in philosophical studies, and he always claims as his especial title of honour the name of a philosopher. But if he had been asked which he considered the most philosophical of his writings, he would probably have answered his poems. For, from his point of view, poetry was inseparably connected with philosophy, as both are occupied with the highest problems of life; both look at the ideal side of things, and in the union of the two religion itself consists. The Homeric poems were valuable to him, not only for their literary excellencies, but as furnishing a rule of conduct. He quotes Homer, as a Christian of that day quoted his Bible. His quotations are not merely happy illustrations of his arguments and descriptions. He evidently looked up to Homer as an authority in political, social, moral, and even religious questions. Besides Homer and Plato, who seem to have been his favourite authors, he was certainly well versed in the whole range of Greek literature. There is hardly a poet, or historian, or philosopher of eminence from whom he has not quoted or to whom he does not allude.

And in this, as in other respects, he is a faithful representative of one of the latest phases of thought in the Alexandrine school. The ascetic system of Plotinus and Porphyry had failed as an opposing force to the rising tide of Christianity. The theurgical rites, and mysterious forms of magical incantation, with which Iamblichus and others sought to prop up the falling creed, had had but a limited success. Repeated laws of increasing severity had been passed to repress the practice of magical arts, and many men accused of practising them had been imprisoned and even executed. Besides, the very persons over whose credulity such pretensions could exercise any influence would in the fourth century naturally be far more attracted by the far more wonderful pretensions of the Christian hermits. Those, who, in the uncertainties of changing creeds and falling institutions, craved for some visible yet supernatural confirmation of their faith, could hardly fail to feel that the stories told half in secret of supernatural powers exercised by Iamblichus were poor indeed compared with the countless tales of visions seen and miracles wrought by monks of Nitria and Scetis, which continually excited the wonder and stimulated the religion of the people of Alexandria. In supposed miracles, as in real austerities, no pagan philosopher was likely to rival the fame of Antony or Ammon. Among the higher classes the great majority of thinking men, who were still unwilling to embrace Christianity, were chiefly influenced in the Eastern empire by their attachment to Greek literature, in the Western empire by their reverence, partly political, partly religious, for Rome itself, whose greatness seemed to them to depend on the maintenance of that system, partly political,

partly religious, under which it had been acquired. Ambrose might employ his great abilities in supporting the imperial government, believing that the glory of Rome would acquire fresh lustre from the triumph of Christianity. Basil might display his eloquence in advocating the study of Greek literature by Christian youths, and shew by his own example the benefits they might receive. The senators of Rome and the literary men of Greece instinctively felt that the progress of Christianity would be fatal to that form of political greatness, and to those intellectual ideas, to which they were attached. The Greek mythology had lost its hold on their belief, but the poetry which that mythology had inspired and in which it was enshrined still retained its power over the imagination of educated men among the cities of the Eastern empire, which, however slightly Greek in origin, had become thoroughly Greek in language and in culture. Besides, the ideal of life presented in Greek literature was far more attractive to many minds than the ideal presented by the popular teaching of Christianity at that day, especially to those minds in which the intellectual were stronger than the moral impulses. Those who "still cared for grace and Hellenism," to use Synesius's expression, turned with increasing fondness from the intellectual degeneracy of their own day to the masterpieces of former times, seeking to satisfy the craving, then universally felt, for a definite religious creed, by taking from all the writers they admired the elements of a vague system, to which they gave the name of a philosophy, but which was far stronger in the poetical feelings it evoked than in the philosophical arguments by which it was supported.

Synesius's own poems are the most original of his works. Their literary merit indeed is not of the highest order. To express poetically the abstruse doctrines of the Neoplatonic philosophy would have taxed to the utmost the powers of the highest genius, and Synesius's power lay not so much in the strength of imagination as in warmth of poetical feeling. The metres are unfortunately chosen, and are not sufficiently varied to preserve them from monotony. The fatal facility of the short lines constantly led to a jingling repetition of the same cadences and the same turns of construction. Still the ten hymns which are extant would be interesting, if for no other reason as specimens of a style of lyrical poetry, the meditative poetry partly philosophical and partly religious, which was hardly ever attempted in ancient Greece, though common enough in modern times. Their chief value however, consists in the light they throw on the religious feelings and experiences of a man of deeply interesting character. Any one who wishes to know the religious aspect of Neoplatonism and the different phases of thought through which an able man of strong religious feelings could in the fifth century pass from it to Christianity, can hardly do better than study these hymns. Some idea of their general character may be gained from a description of the first hymn, written in his country home before he went on the embassy to Constantinople. The version however rough is faithful, and the greatest success which any translation of poetry can have is to suggest to the reader that the original must be so superior as to make it worth his while to turn to it.

Synesius begins with professing his intention of tuning the Doric music to nobler themes than the praises of sweetly-smiling virgins and young men in the bloom of youth.

> "For what are strength and beauty,
> And what are gold and fame,
> And what are kingly honours,
> Compared with thoughts of God?
> Let others drive the chariot,
> Let others bend the bow,
> Let others heap up riches,
> And hug the joy of gold.
> Be mine to lead unnoticed
> A life remote from care,
> Unknown indeed to others,
> But not unknown to God.
> * * * *
> Hark to the shrill cicala
> Who drinks the morning dew!
> Untouched by me the lyre sounds,
> A mystic voice is near!
> O what divine conception
> Will have its birth in me?
> The self-derived Beginning,
> The universal Lord,
> The unbegotten Father,
> Above the heavens throned,
> In matchless strength rejoicing,
> Remains for ever God,
> The Unity of Unities
> And of all monads first."

This monad in an ineffable manner has produced and keeps united the highest forms of pure existence. In thus diffusing itself it has acquired a trinal force. This ineffable fountain of existence is glorified by its offspring, who issue from and flow around it as their centre. But here the poet rebukes his lyre for proclaiming the divine mysteries to the vulgar. The things of God should be covered with sacred silence. To the intelligence of man belong only the worlds of intelligence. This intelligence, itself immortal, the offspring of divine parents, has become united to matter. Though small it is indivisibly transfused throughout the universe which it preserves and rules.

> "Part rules the starry courses,
> Part guides the angelic quires,
> But part with heavy fetters
> Was bound to human form,
> And, severed from its parents,
> Drank dark forgetfulness,
> Because with blinded passion
> It loved the loveless earth.
> And, though divine, delighted
> On mortal things to gaze.

Holy servants of the Spiritual Father, listen propitiously to hymns in His honour, and propitiously convey my prayers to Him."

> "And yet a light remaineth
> On these veiled eyes to shine,
> And yet a strength existeth
> To lead the fallen back,
> When, joyously escaping
> The troubled waves of life,
> They tread the holy pathways
> Which to their Father lead.
> Bless'd is the man delivered
> From matter's yawning gulph,
> Who with light step ascending
> Directs his course to God

Who after all the troubles
And bitter cares of earth,
Has trod the paths of *spirit*
To the depth illumined by God.
'Tis hard indeed to struggle
The whole heart to upraise
By those divine affections
Which are the wings to heaven.
Yet follow without ceasing
This impulse of the mind;
Thy Father will draw nigh thee,
And stretch a hand to aid.
A light will go before thee,
And shine upon thy road,
The land of Thought revealing
From which all beauty springs.
Then come, my soul, and quaffing
The fountain of all good,
With earnest supplications
Implore thy Father's aid.
Arise, my soul, delay not,
Leave earthly things to earth,
Soon mayst thou with the Father
As God in God rejoice."

The three hymns which follow are mainly amplifications of the same ideas. He had returned from Constantinople with an increased love for nature, and an increased feeling of the difficulties of life, which led him to a more profound conviction of his dependence upon God, and a more solemn view of the relation between God and created things. Wandering along the valleys and mountains of his country home, "unpolluted by the tread of men with city thoughts," he heard a universal hymn of thanksgiving to God. "Mother nature in all her varied colours, and all her varied works, with all the different voices of her children, offers up one harmonious hymn to Thee. Day and night, lightning and snow, air and water, seeds and plants, cattle and birds and fishes, all bodies and all spirits utter an eternal song of praise to Thee." And so his own thoughts found expression in solemn prayer. "Let the earth be silent when Thy hymns are sung, when prayer is offered to Thee let all things in the world keep silence, for they are Thy works, O Father. Let the sighing of the wind and the whispering of the trees, and the song of the birds, be hushed. In silence let the sky, in silence let the air, listen to my song. Let the stream already flowing gently stay its course. Let those who check all holy strains, the darkness-loving daemons, haunters of the tomb, fly from my prayer. But let those to whom belong the depths and heights of the universe, the pure and holy servants of the Spiritual Father, listen propitiously to hymns in his honour, and propitiously convey my prayers to Him."

The God to whom he thus offers the "unbloody sacrifice" of his prayers is at once One and Three —"one root, one source, a triple form." To attempt to explain the mystery of this Trinity would be the atheistic boldness of blinded men. The three persons of the Trinity, to use the Christian form of expression never employed by Synesius himself, are not as with Plotinus—Unity, Intelligence, Soul. Most frequently the Christian terms are used—Father, Spirit, Son—for the resemblance between the attributes assigned in the Neoplatonic philosophy to the soul, the third God, the ruler of the world, and the attributes assigned by Christianity to the Son apparently led Synesius to place the Son third in his system of the Trinity. The Father is also called the Unity. The Spirit is nowhere called the Intelligence,[g] but is often called the Will. The Son, who emanates from the Father through the Spirit, is also called, with a curious combination of expressions, the Word, the Wisdom, and the Demiurgus. The stream of life and intelligence descends from the Father through the Son to the intellectual worlds, and from them to the visible world which is the image of the intellectual. To all in heaven and in the sky, and on the earth and beneath the earth, the Son imparts life and assigns duties. To the gods and to all mortals who have imbibed the showers of intellectual life, He gives intelligence. Though remaining eternally with the Father He issues forth to guard the worlds which He Himself has framed from evils, and to bring to all the joy of life from the source whence He Himself receives it. Nor is the Father, however mysterious in His nature, so "hidden in His glory" as to be inaccessible to sympathy for His children. In the efficacy of prayer and in the reality of spiritual communion with God Synesius firmly believed. "Give, O Lord, to be with me as my companion the holy angel of holy strength, the angel of divinely-inspired prayer. May he be with me as my friend, the giver of good gifts, the keeper of my life, the keeper of my soul, the guardian of my prayers, the guardian of my actions. May he preserve my body pure from disease, may he preserve my spirit pure from pollution, may he bring to my soul oblivion of all passions." And again in the beautiful prayer of the soul for reunion with God—"Have pity, Lord, upon Thy daughter. I left thee to become a servant upon earth, but instead of a servant I have become a slave. Matter has bound me in its magic spells. Yet still the clouded eye retains some little strength, its power is not altogether quenched. But the deepflood has poured over me and dimmed the God-discerning vision. Have pity, Father, on Thy suppliant child, who, often striving to ascend the upward paths of thought, falls back choked with desires, the offspring of seductive matter. Kindle for me, O Lord, the lights which lead the soul on high."

Synesius has nowhere expressly stated that he regarded matter not as created by God but as existing independently and necessarily evil, but this idea is most consistent with the language he generally employs. God is nowhere said to have created the world, but the Son is said to have framed the visible world as the form and image of the invisible. At all events the corruption of the soul in each individual is attributed to the seductive influence of matter, a view which he has expressed at some length in his very curious treatise on Dreams. The soul, he says, descends from heaven in obedience to a law of Providence to perform its appointed service in the world. It then receives, as a loan, the imagination, which is figuratively called the boat or chariot by which the soul travels on its earthward voyage. In other words it is the connecting link between mind and matter. It is something intermediate between the corporeal and incorporeal, and philosophy therefore has

[g] This is the more remarkable as the words intelligence and intellectual are constantly used where we should naturally say spirit and spiritual. The Intelligence is sometimes used as a name for the Father.

great difficulty in determining its real nature. It is through this imagination that we realise to ourselves not only the sensations of the body but also the conceptions of the mind. It is the duty of the soul to purify and elevate the imagination. It is the constant aim of matter, or rather of the daemon of matter, to corrupt and degrade it. Of the way in which this is done Synesius gives a curious semi-physical explanation. The proper habitation of the imagination, or, as he more generally calls it, the imaginative spirit, is the brain cells. Now, in proportion as this spirit is purified it becomes more and more aetherialised, and so expands as to occupy fully its appointed place. But when it is corrupted it thickens and contracts so that it can no longer fill the hollows of the brain. Then, as nature abhors a vacuum, this empty space, intended to be filled by spirit and no longer filled by a good spirit, is naturally occupied by an evil spirit, which thus mingles with and still further corrupts the good spirit. The great danger to men is that the soul will be induced by the pleasures of earth to forget its divine origin, and become a willing slave to the influence of matter. To save us from this evil Providence sends us sorrows, for the soul would never be diverted from earth if on earth it met with no misfortunes. What are called undeserved calamities are really designed by God to loosen the chain which binds us to earth. What are celebrated as wonderful pieces of good fortune are really snares which the earth daemons set to entrap the soul. If the soul is ensnared by them it is difficult indeed, but not impossible with God's aid, to break off this degrading slavery. The difficulties of doing so have been fully symbolised in the sacred records by the so-called labours of Hercules.

The action of Providence in the government of the world is described by Synesius in the treatise written at Constantinople which has been already mentioned. All existence, he says, proceeds from God and has been assigned by Him to an infinite variety of beings, descending in regular gradations from God Himself, who is pure existence, to matter, which, being in a state of constant flux, does not, properly speaking, admit of existence at all. The beings of the highest order are called Gods, and they are divided into two classes, to the first of which the upper parts of the universe, to the other this earth is entrusted. These Gods find their chief happiness in the contemplation of the God who is above them, but to preserve the earth from the evils which would soon result from the destructive activity of the earth-daemons it is necessary for them to interpose from time to time. This they do gladly, because by doing so they render their appointed service to the supreme Deity. Still, as from their very nature their chief blessedness consists in the contemplation of the divine nature, we have no right to expect that they will continually give this up to interfere in our behalf. Now the good man is exposed to especial trials and temptations. The daemons, who spring from the earth and consider that the earth is theirs, are naturally irritated by the existence upon earth of any one whose character is diametrically opposite to their own. At first they endeavour to win him over, trying to seduce him by stimulating his passions. For they have the power of assailing men through the irrational part of their nature. Indeed the human soul, exposed to their attacks, is like a fortress, part of whose garrison is in secret league with the enemy. But if the divine element in the man prove too strong for them they devote all their energies to crushing or killing him, mortified at their defeats and afraid lest others should be emboldened to resist them by this example. This fact, in part at least, accounts for the calamities which often befall good men. When we are assaulted by temporal misfortunes, instead of looking to the Gods to deliver us from them we must use the means which the Gods have entrusted to us for that purpose. There is no opposition between prudence and piety. Providence deals with us as a mother with a grown-up son, giving us arms and bidding us use them ourselves in our own defence. If after that we give way weakly, we may expect the Gods will be slow to come to our assistance. There is no real opposition between this theory and the views Synesius has elsewhere expressed on the efficacy of prayer. He held that between the intelligence, the divine element in man, and God there might be ready and frequent intercourse, so that intellectual, or as we should say spiritual blessings are continually imparted by the Father to His children. But as regards merely earthly trouble and difficulties the Gods did what the best and wisest of men did, and abstained from meddling with them unnecessarily —a theory likely enough to commend itself to the judgment of men living in the decline of the Roman empire.

As regards a future state, Synesius says philosophy teaches us that it is the result of the present life. With death the husk of matter, which we call the body, perishes, but the soul and the imagination still remain, and there also remain, Synesius is inclined to think, certain particles of the primary elements of fire and air which the soul attracted to itself in the course of its original descent to earth. After death the soul, which has been corrupted through the corrupted imagination, sinks down towards the region of darkness. The purified soul, with the imagination it has purified, rises up towards the region of light. Between the extremes of light and darkness there exists an infinite variety of abodes fitted for the different souls according to their respective degrees of purity and corruption. The purified soul ascends by progressive stages to the region of light which is above the visible universe, but it seems to have been Synesius's belief, though he states it in obscure and hesitating language, that the soul was there separated from the imagination, and ultimately reabsorbed into the Divinity from which it had originally issued. The corrupted soul suffers in and through the imagination, but it may rise again purified by suffering and time through other forms of life.

Synesius has explained at some length his views on the nature of future punishment in a letter written from Alexandria at a time when he was most under the influence of the Neoplatonic philosophy. The style is studied, the ideas often paradoxical. It was obviously written rather to be read by his philosophical friends than with any hope of influencing the person to whom it was addressed. It may therefore be regarded as expressing, perhaps in somewhat exaggerated terms, the ideas generally held on that subject by the circle over which Hypatia

presided. A citizen of Cyrene, named John, was accused by popular rumour of having employed one of his attendants to murder another citizen, named Aemilius. Synesius writes to John, urging him to insist upon a judicial enquiry. Sooner than nothing should be done he would, were he at Cyrene, as a proof of the greatness of his friendship, bring John to trial himself. As it is, John should, if necessary, beseech and implore the judge to have his servant examined by torture. In the opinion of Synesius, as of most Romans, the examination by torture was the surest means of discovering the truth. "The torturers are exceedingly clever in detecting imposture. They have certain flesh-hooks which extract the truth as accurately as scientific syllogisms. Whatever they bring to light is certainly correct." If after this examination John is acquitted all is well, but if on the other hand John is conscious of guilt, he ought for his own sake to deliver himself up to justice without waiting to be accused. If he is guilty it is most desirable for him that he should suffer for his crime while still alive on earth. It is much better to be tortured by men than by daemons. For the daemons are appointed to cleanse the souls by punishments as fullers clean dirty cloths by carding them. In some cloths the stains are so deeply fixed that the cloth would be destroyed before they could be got out. But the soul is immortal, and therefore if its stains are of too long standing and too inveterate to be got out the soul endures immortal sufferings. When then a crime is committed, we should hasten at once to remove its stain by the infliction of punishment. Besides, it is highly probable that those who have been wronged have the power in the future state of increasing or diminishing the punishments inflicted on the wrongdoer. Will they not be most inclined to pity if they see we have already owned our guilt and voluntarily submitted to punishment? Will they not be still more incensed against us if they see us feasting on the produce of our crimes? "What will be your feelings when you quit the body, when you have no tongue to deny your guilt, but the mark of your crime is branded on you? Shall you not turn dizzy, bewildered with fear? You will be dragged away in silence and exposed to public view before the judgment seat. Play the man then now, let the pleasures be despised for which crimes are committed, let immediate punishment appease the avengers below. The man who remains long unpunished in his wickedness ought to be considered most unfortunate, as one for whom neither God nor man cares."

In considering Synesius's philosophical and theological views, it should always be remembered that he repeatedly protests against giving publicity to those abstruser doctrines which are above the comprehension of men who have not been thoroughly trained in philosophical studies. "It is, I think, an ancient and thoroughly Platonic custom to conceal the great truths of philosophy under the form of some less important subject, so that what has been discovered with difficulty, may neither be lost to mankind nor be defiled by being exposed to the profane vulgar." "Philosophy is one of the most ineffable of all ineffable subjects." He reproves his friend Herculian for talking on such subjects with unphilosophical persons, and will not even discuss them in letters lest the letters should fall into the hands of people for whom they were not intended. Proteus is the emblem of the true philosopher eluding vulgar curiosity by concealing what is divine under earthly forms, and only revealing it to the persistent efforts of heroic men. This desire for secrecy did not arise from any fear of making public profession of opinions contrary to Christianity, but from the fear lest the highest truths should be corrupted and degraded by those who were unfit to receive them, a feeling by no means unknown in the Christian church at that time.[h] Lysis, the Pythagorean, is quoted by Synesius with great approbation, as saying that "the publicity given to philosophy has caused many men to look with contempt upon the Gods." Doubtless enough has been plainly stated to enable us to form a sufficiently accurate idea of Synesius's philosophical and religious views, but there are subjects—such as the nature of the Trinity, the connexion between the old mythology and philosophy, the reabsorption of the soul, and indeed of all intelligence and existence, into the Divinity, the nature and origin of matter, the nature and work of the imagination, the scientific arrangement and nomenclature of the virtues—on which we have not the last word of Hypatia's teaching.

Another of these mysterious subjects is the subject of divination, which is discussed in a treatise on dreams, from the preface to which the passage quoted above is taken. Amid the increasing difficulties and disasters of the age, and the rapid growth of superstition, the belief in divination, under some form or other, had become almost universal. Even Theodosius, before commencing an important war, despatched an embassy to consult a Christian hermit, just as some centuries before a Spartan king would have sent to consult the oracle of Delphi.

Divination, Synesius says, is possible because the whole world forms as it were one living being. All the different members of this great body are mutually connected so that the action of one influences the action of the others, and wise men will see in each thing indications of other things. This may perhaps explain the success obtained by the incantations of magicians; there may be particular stones and plants, so connected by nature with particular Gods, that they naturally have the power of attracting them, and causing them to appear. This, however, only refers to the Gods of this world; the Gods beyond this world are not affected by incantations. The divination by dreams is superior to any other form of divination, because it can be practised by all persons, of all classes, of all ages, at all times, and in all places. It requires no outlay of money for costly preparations, such as herbs from Crete, birds from Egypt, bones from Iberia, which are needed in other cases. It does not expose us to the penalties of that malicious policy which has lately crowded the prisons. Above all it is more reverential to God, as thankfully accepting what

[h] So Theodoret (quoted by Bingham, vol. i. p. 35) says: "We speak of the divine mysteries in obscure language because of the uninitiated (the unbaptized), but when they are gone we instruct the initiated (baptized) plainly."

He is pleased to impart, and not using means to compel Him to appear. The surest way of obtaining such dreams as convey a revelation from God is to lead a virtuous life, temperate and frugal, following the precepts of philosophy, and keeping down all disturbing passions. As the perception still works in sleep, though the bodily organs are in repose, this would seem to be the most divine form of perception. So it is no wonder if men have discovered treasures from dreams, or if, as has happened in our own times, an uneducated man has become a skilful poet by holding intercourse with the Muses in his dreams. Besides, according to his own account, Synesius had himself been greatly indebted to dreams throughout his life. Dreams had taught him to invent the best snares for catching animals. Dreams had often encouraged him to renew his hunting with success, when he was inclined to abandon it in despair. Dreams had preserved his life at Constantinople from the plots of hostile magicians. Above all, dreams had aided him in his literary work, suggesting new ideas and arguments, and rendering his style more natural by removing whatever was turgid and affected. So Synesius advises all who have the requisite leisure and literary culture to make a practice of writing an account of their dreams. "In this way their knowledge of themselves will be perfected, as they will have a record both of their sleeping and of their waking life. Indeed dreams are really the best indication of character, because in sleep the imagination is not influenced by external objects. Besides, this plan is also valuable as affording an excellent discipline for our powers of composition, owing to the difficulty which must necessarily be experienced in describing the strange and apparently inconsistent events which occur to us in our dreams. Dreams will give us far better subjects than the ridiculous themes on which the sophists dispute, often with such misplaced zeal, in the theatres." It is of course impossible to say how far the character of men's dreams would be affected, especially in Eastern countries, by their belief that they might receive important communications from God in sleep, but when a man like Synesius, of great ability and earnestness, after all his experiences of literary and poetical life, could turn to dreams as the source of inspiration, both for literature and religion, it was plain that he was beginning to feel the need of some new influence which could stimulate the higher powers of his mind to fresh activity, and direct them to nobler objects. Such an influence in the 5th century resided only in the Christian church.

What means Synesius had of becoming acquainted with Christianity in his early years it is impossible to say. No one living in any part of the Eastern empire at the close of the 4th century could fail to be brought into frequent contact with Christians. But throughout his works, written before he became a Christian himself, the same phenomenon appears which is so striking in Claudian's poems—the existence of Christianity is entirely ignored. In his speech addressed to Arcadius, though the greatest prominence is given to the religious idea of duty, there is no allusion to the principles of Christianity, even where such a reference would have given force to his arguments. The orator appears unconscious that he is addressing a Christian emperor. The Deity to whom he appeals is the God of the Theist, "whose nature no man has ever yet found a name to represent." Still more striking is a passage in one of the hymns written immediately after his return from Constantinople: "To all Thy temples, Lord, built for Thy holy rites I went, and falling headlong as a suppliant bathed with my tears the pavement. That my journey might not be in vain, I prayed to all the gods Thy ministers, who rule the fertile plain of Thrace, and those who on the opposite continent protect the lands of Chalcedon, whom Thou hast crowned with angelic rays, Thy holy servants. They, the blessed ones, helped me in my prayers; they helped me to bear the burden of many troubles." Of course the temples of which he speaks were Christian churches. No pagan temples had been erected in Constantinople, and even in the other cities they had been closed some years by an edict of Theodosius. At the same time it is perfectly certain that Synesius was not then a Christian himself. This picture of a pagan philosopher praying in a Christian church to the saints and angels of Christianity, while investing them with the attributes of the daemons of Neoplatonism, is no bad illustration of the almost unconscious manner in which the pagan world in becoming Christian was then paganising Christianity. As thoroughly eclectic in religion as in philosophy, Synesius took from Christianity whatever harmonised with the rest of his creed, often varying the meaning of the tenets he borrowed to bring them into accordance with his philosophical ideas.

Some of the points of difference between his views and the opinions then generally prevalent among Christians are well stated in a treatise written by him at Alexandria, about the year 404, to defend his conduct against various criticisms. He says he has been accused of sinning against philosophy, both by people in white and people in black dresses, that is to say, both by pagan philosophers and Christian monks. The treatise is chiefly a reply to the latter, but they are never spoken of as Christians, believers in a particular religion, but as professors of a particular form of philosophy. This mode of speaking indeed would not seem so absurd in Alexandria then as it does to us now. The name of philosopher was so generally given to those who aimed at the highest rule of life, and turned their thoughts to the contemplation of God, that it was given even to the Christian monks and hermits, whose life and teaching were in the strongest possible opposition to all that had as yet been known as Greek philosophy. Thus Sozomen speaks of the monks who practised the greatest austerities at Nitria as being those who had reached the highest point of philosophy. The hermit and the philosopher, Synesius felt, aimed at the same object, the contemplation of God. Both, in order to attain that end, sought to withdraw themselves from the cares of active life. Both recognised the necessity of steadily controlling the bodily appetites. Both believed that the way to God lay through the practice of virtue. Yet with all these points of resemblance the separation between them was wide and strongly marked. The hermit sought

to rise to a superhuman state of holiness by crushing the natural affections of humanity. Synesius believed that the truest progress towards the Divinity is made by giving free play to all the affections which are not positively sinful. To the hermit, pleasure was a temptation of the devil to destroy the soul; to Synesius, pleasure was a gift from God to the soul to reconcile it to the life on earth. "God has given pleasure to the soul to be as it were a fastening by which it may preserve its connexion with the body."[i] The hermit looked on indulgence in pleasure as sinful. Synesius says: "I should be glad indeed if our natures allowed us to be always occupied with the contemplation of God, but as this is impossible I wish to enjoy some mirth, and, as it were, to anoint my life with cheerfulness. For I know I am a man, not a God that I should be free from all inclination to pleasure, nor a brute that I should find my delight in bodily pleasures." Again, the hermits considered that the study of general literature was dangerous to the soul. Synesius believed that men ought to be trained through the lower branches of knowledge to the higher.[k] Poetry, rhetoric, astronomy, all helped to enable men to rise through philosophy to the knowledge of God. Philosophy, he says, is to the other arts and sciences what Apollo is to the Muses, their companion and their guide. "I consider that a philosopher should be free not only from other defects, but also from that of rusticity; he should be initiated into the mysteries of the Graces, and should be a thorough Greek, that is to say, he should be able to mix freely with other men, by being acquainted with all literary works of importance." Above all, Synesius reproaches the hermits with considering as the end and object of life what were only the means towards the attainment of that end. For instance, he reproves them for valuing celibacy as a thing good in itself, instead of judging it according to its effect upon the character in individual cases. Besides, Synesius maintains that the highest object of man is not to lead a virtuous life, but a life of active intellectual effort. This intellectual life cannot indeed be separated from the pursuit of virtue, because it is virtue which purifies the mind so that it can rise above the earth to the contemplation of God. The virtues are, therefore, the first elements of philosophy; but the philosopher must not be content with them, as it is only through the intellect that God who is pure intellect can be apprehended. "I believe we are not permitted to think that God dwells in any other part of us than the intellect." Though there is much that is true as well as striking in this contrast, it is unfair to the Christians because it does not sufficiently recognise the fundamental distinction between the two creeds. Sin, and consequent separation from God, according to the one was the result of a depraved will; according to the other, of a darkened intellect. Hence the Christians naturally turned their chief attention to subduing the corrupt affections of the mind and body, the Neoplatonists to the cultivation of their intellectual powers. Still, the treatise is valuable as shewing the difference of ideas which separated literary men, deeply imbued with the tastes and ideas of ancient Greece, from what was generally considered in that day the highest form of Christianity. It is interesting as a last protest in behalf of the old Greek feeling of the natural grace and beauty of life, when that idea was on the point of being almost entirely lost for many centuries through the triumph of barbarism in the state, and asceticism in religion.

This treatise and the treatise on Dreams, which was written about the same time, were sent to Hypatia for approval, and were doubtless considered by her as a satisfactory profession of faith. How his opinions were so far altered in the next four years that he became a Christian, we have, unhappily, but scanty means of knowing. In none of his letters is there the slightest trace of any mental struggle. This of itself shews that the change was effected gradually, probably almost imperceptibly even to himself. He had never been really hostile to Christianity, and now as the world gradually became more Christian he became more Christian too. Almost without a struggle the old pagan society had yielded, and was still yielding, to the tide which each year set more strongly in the direction of Christianity. Almost without a struggle Synesius each year yielded more and more to the movement around him; for with all the vigour he displayed, in great emergencies he was not a man to stand long alone, or to fight to the end a battle that was already lost. Some personal influences had also been brought to bear on him. He had known and highly respected Chrysostom at Constantinople. He had afterwards come into contact with Theophilus the patriarch of Alexandria, and that able and ambitious prelate was not likely to neglect any opportunity of winning over to the Christian church one whose reputation for ability and learning stood so high. His wife, to whom he was warmly attached, and whom he married at Alexandria in the year 403, was a Christian, and in her he may have had an opportunity of remarking one of the noblest features of Christianity, the elevation which it imparted to the female character by the prominence given to the feminine virtues in the character of Christ, and therefore in the teaching of the church. But above all, when he returned to Pentapolis, in the year 404, to find his country desolated by the horrors of barbarian invasions, he must have felt how little the highest form of Neoplatonism could do to meet the wants of such a troubled age. The philosophical and poetical creed was the religion of a prosperous man in peaceful times. When the burden of suffering and danger was laid upon it, its support failed precisely where it was most needed. To enjoy that intellectual communion with God for which he craved with his whole heart, and on the possibility of which his whole system of belief depended, he needed above all things an untroubled mind. It was one of the points which had marked most strongly his separation from Christianity, that in his hymns

[i] Curiously enough this expression is borrowed from a passage in which Iamblichus speaks of pleasure as the greatest of all evils. Iamblichus, however, is speaking of bodily, Synesius of intellectual pleasures.

[k] At the same time he owns some few men have been endowed with such strength of mind as to be able to dispense with a literary training, and he instances Ammon, Zoroaster, Hermes, and Antony.

he had always prayed at least as earnestly for freedom from anxieties as for freedom from sin. A century earlier he would probably have continued in his country home, reading, writing, and hunting, "enjoying life as a festival" to the end, and dying in the full conviction that his soul was about to rise to those regions of light on which he had so often gazed with reverence and love. But now this was impossible. He had formed an ideal of life which could not be maintained, and with it necessarily fell the beliefs with which it was necessarily connected. The old creed told him that "the woe of earth weighs down the wings of the soul so that it cannot rise to heaven." The new religion taught him that cares and sorrows rightly borne, so far from hiding the divine light, reveal it in increased brightness. In former days, when he shrank into private life from "the polluting influence of business and the vicissitudes of fortune," he had probably considered the doctrine of the Incarnation as the greatest obstacle to his becoming a Christian, because it seemed to degrade the Deity by connecting it with the contamination of matter. Now, when he had left his seclusion to battle and suffer with his fellow-citizens, no doctrine of Christianity had such attraction for him as the doctrine of the incarnation, because it told of a God who had resigned His glory to share the sufferings of His creatures, and to be the Saviour of mankind. Formerly he had sought to purify his mind that it might ascend in thought to God; now he caught at the doctrine of the Holy Spirit descending into men's hearts to make them the temples of God. So the first hymn which marks the transition to Christianity begins with an invocation to Christ as the son of the Holy Virgin, and ends with a prayer to Christ and to the Father to send down upon him the Holy Spirit "to refresh the wings of the soul, and to perfect the divine gifts." But though his prayers were now addressed to Christ, it is obvious that he had rather added certain Christian tenets to his old creed than adopted a new religion. The attributes of Christ are described in almost exactly the same terms as the attributes of the Son had been described in former hymns.

The prayers for himself are almost identical. It is also curious to find that he still considered the Spirit the second person of the Trinity; to use his own illustration, "the Father is the root, the Son the branch, the Spirit intermediate between root and branch." Still, the decisive step had been taken by acknowledging Christ as the Saviour of mankind; after that the subsequent steps were natural and almost inevitable. He was baptized, probably about five years after his marriage. How far he then felt it necessary to give up the language and ideas of his old creed may be imagined from the following hymn, addressed to Christ: "Thou camest down to earth and didst sojourn among men, and drive the deceiver, the serpent-fiend, from Thy Father's garden. Thou wentest down to Tartarus, where death held the countless races of mankind. The old man Hades feared thee, the devouring dog (Cerberus) fled from the portal; but, having released the souls of the righteous from suffering, Thou didst offer, with a holy worship, hymns of thanksgiving to the Father. As Thou wentest up on high the daemons, powers of the air, were affrighted. But Aether, wise parent of harmony, sang with joy to his seven-toned lyre[1] a hymn of triumph. The morning star, day's harbinger, and the golden star of evening, the planet Venus, smiled on Thee. Before Thee went the horned moon, decked with fresh light, leading the gods of night. Beneath Thy feet Titan spread his flowing locks of light. He recognised the Son of God, the creative intelligence, the source of his own flames. But Thou didst fly on outstretched wings beyond the vaulted sky, alighting on the spheres of pure intelligence, where is the fountain of goodness, the heaven enveloped in silence. There time, deep-flowing and unwearied time, is not; there disease, the reckless and prolific offspring of matter, is not. But eternity, ever young and ever old, rules the abiding habitation of the gods."

While the old and new were thus strangely blended together in his creed, an unexpected event happened which changed the whole current of his life. In defiance of the law, which enacted that no one should hold the governorship of the province of which he was a native, Andronicus had been appointed governor of Pentapolis. He was a native of Berenice, a man of low origin, and had gained the office, Synesius says, by bribery. Against his appointment Synesius vigorously protested, in a letter to an influential friend at Constantinople: "Send us legitimate governors; men whom we do not know, and who do not know us; men who will not be biassed in their judgments by their private feelings. A governor is on his way to us who lately took a hostile part in politics here, and who will pursue his political differences on the judgment seat. From this many other evils spring—private entertainments become the subject of calumny, false accusers are suborned, the ruin of a citizen is given as a present to a woman. I have seen a man thrown into prison because he would not accuse the excellent governor, who lately resigned, of embezzling the public funds. Or rather I did not see him, no one was allowed to visit him, and he was only permitted to see the sun again on condition of accusing Gennadius."

When the ancient Romans were threatened with oppressive rulers, they chose the bravest of their fellow citizens as tribunes to protect them. In the fifth century of the Christian era, under similar circumstances, the people of Ptolemais elected Synesius a bishop. He was known to them as a man of high character and great abilities, universally liked and respected, but probably still more recommended to them by the vigour he had displayed in the recent siege. No one who has attentively studied his life and writings can doubt that he was sincere in his wish to decline the proffered honour. A frank statement of his feelings was made in a letter written to his brother Evoptius, then resident at Alexandria, and intended to be shewn to Theophilus: "I should be devoid of feeling if I were not deeply grateful to the people of Ptolemais who have thought me worthy of higher honours than I do myself. But what I must consider is not the greatness of the favour conferred, but the

[1] This expression refers to the seven starry spheres which Aether, or rather the Intelligence of Aether, guides in harmony.

possibility of my accepting it. That a mere man should receive almost divine honours is indeed most pleasing, if he is worthy of them, but if he is far from being so, his acceptance of them gives but a poor hope for the future. This is no new fear, but one I have long felt, the fear lest I should gain honour among men by sinning against God. From my knowledge of myself I feel I am in every respect unworthy of the solemnity of the episcopal office.[m] . . . I now divide my time between amusements and study. When I am engaged in study, especially religious studies, I keep entirely to myself, in my amusements I am thoroughly sociable. But the bishop must be godly, and therefore like God have nothing to do with amusements, and a thousand eyes watch to see that he observes this duty. In religious matters, on the other hand, he cannot seclude himself, but must be thoroughly sociable, as he is both a teacher and preacher of the law. Single-handed, he has to do the work of everybody, or bear the blame of everybody. Surely then it needs a man of the strongest character to support such a burden of cares without allowing the mind to be overwhelmed, or the divine particle in the soul to be quenched, when he is distracted by such an infinite variety of employments." Again, there was the difficulty of his marriage. "God and the law, and the sacred hand of Theophilus, gave me my wife. I therefore declare openly to all and testify that I will not separate entirely from her, or visit her secretly like an adulterer. The one course would be contrary to piety, the other to law. I shall wish and pray to have a large number of virtuous children." Still more important in his opinion was the question of religious belief. "You know that philosophy is opposed to the opinions of the vulgar. I certainly shall not admit that the soul is posterior in existence to the body. I cannot assert that the world and all its parts will perish together. The resurrection which is so much talked about I consider something sacred and ineffable, and I am far from sharing the ideas of the multitude on the subject." He would indeed be content to keep silence in public on these abstruser points of theology, neither pretending to believe as the multitude, nor seeking to convince them of their errors, "for what has the multitude to do with philosophy? the truth of divine mysteries is not a thing to be talked about. But if I am called to the episcopacy I do not think it right to pretend to hold opinions which I do not hold. I call God and man as witnesses to this. Truth is the property of God,[n] before whom I wish to be entirely blameless. Though I am fond of amusements—for from my childhood I have been accused of being mad after arms and horses—still I will consent to give them up—though I shall regret to see my darling dogs no longer allowed to hunt, and my bows moth-eaten! Still I will submit to this if it is God's will. And though I hate all cares and troubles I will endure these petty matters of business, as rendering my appointed service to God, grievous as it will be. But I will have no deceit about dogmas, nor shall there be variance between my thoughts and my tongue. . . . . It shall never be said of me that I got myself consecrated without my opinions being known. But let Father Theophilus, dearly beloved by God, decide for me with full knowledge of the circumstances of the case, and let him tell me his opinion clearly. Then he will either leave me in private life to philosophise quietly by myself, or else he will have no opening left for afterwards judging me, and removing me from the episcopal body."

For seven months at least the matter remained undecided. Synesius went to Alexandria to consult Theophilus, and popular feeling ran so high throughout the country that he felt if he declined the bishopric he could never return to his native land. The people also sent two envoys to Theophilus urging him to use all his influence to overcome Synesius's scruples. This Theophilus was sure to do, for, apart from the regard he may well have had for Synesius, it must have been a welcome triumph for him over his opponents at Alexandria that the most distinguished pupil of the Alexandrine school should be consecrated by him a Christian bishop, a visible sign to the people that even the noblest form of paganism was found insufficient by its noblest disciples. The religious difficulties were just those which might be expected in a pupil of the Alexandrine school, whether he derived his inspiration from Origen or from Hypatia. How far, and in what way, Theophilus, already so well known as a vigorous opponent of such views, succeeded in inducing Synesius to change them we have unfortunately no means of knowing. After all, these views were rather in opposition to the commonly received opinions among Christians than to any dogmatical teaching of the church. Even as regards the doctrine of the resurrection, Synesius would probably have had no difficulty in accepting the Greek form of the creed, the resurrection of the dead, though he could hardly have accepted the Latin form, the resurrection of the body, or the resurrection of the flesh. His amusements and his hunting seem to have been given up entirely. It has been hastily assumed that he retained his wife, but there is no evidence whatever to shew that he did so. His own letter is of itself a sufficient proof that a bishop was generally expected to separate from his wife, or, in the language of the day, to live with her as a sister, though it may be true, as Socrates asserts, that exceptions to the rule might easily have been found in the Eastern Empire. The bishop, especially if occupying an important post, felt that by retaining his wife he lost caste among his people, and Synesius, in giving up so much in the hope of benefiting the people of Ptolemais, was hardly likely to pursue a course which must fatally damage his influence, even if his wife would have consented to a mode of life which must inevitably lower both herself and her husband in public estimation. Besides, Synesius never mentions his wife in any subsequent letter,[o]

[m] ἱερεύς and the kindred terms are applied by Synesius after he became a Christian only to bishops; the term presbyter is always used of the second order of the Christian ministry. Before his conversion he uses ἱερεύς apparently of heathen priests, and on one occasion certainly of Christian presbyters. There are, however, one or two instances in which ἱερεύς may be intended to include presbyters as well as bishops.

[n] In another place he says, "To be almost or altogether truthful, is to be almost or altogether divine." And again, "Truth is the nobility of language."

[o] It must be remembered, however, that Synesius only very rarely and very briefly alludes to his wife in former

and in one written only one year afterwards he speaks of his desolation in terms which make it almost incredible that his wife was still living with him then. It is certain that no child was born to him after he was elected bishop.[p]

Yielding at last to the importunities and arguments of his friends, Synesius, in the year 410, wrote to the presbyters of the diocese of Ptolemais—"Since God has laid upon me not what I sought but what He willed, I pray that He who has assigned me this life will guide me through the life He has assigned me. How shall I who have spent my youth in philosophical leisure and contemplation, I who have only meddled with the cares of life so far as was necessary for me to discharge my duties as a private person and as a citizen, how shall I be able to bear the continued pressure of anxiety, how shall I, while devoting myself to a multitude of affairs, still turn my thoughts to those intellectual beauties, which are only enjoyed in happy leisure, without which life is no life to me and to such as I am? I know not. But to God, they say, all things are possible, even the impossible. Do you then lift up your hands in prayer for me to God, and exhort the people in the city, and those who frequent the churches, in the villages and the country, to pray both in public and private for me. If I am not abandoned by God, I shall realise that the episcopacy is not a descent from philosophy, but an ascent to a higher form of it."

Synesius soon found that his fears had been more prophetic than his friends' hopes. When he returned, Ptolemais presented the appearance of a city taken by storm. Nothing was to be heard in the public places but the groans of men, the screams of women, and the cries of boys. New instruments of punishment had been introduced by Andronicus, racks and thumbscrews and machines for torturing the feet, the ears, the lips, the nose. One man was imprisoned and tortured because he favoured a marriage of which the governor disapproved. Another man was kept in prison for not paying his taxes, while the governor prevented him from selling his land to raise the money. Double tribute was exacted, and the duty of levying the taxes was entrusted to men whom Synesius describes as more pitiless than the daemons themselves. One story which he tells shews a certain grim humour, as well as a remarkable audacity. Thoas, a satellite of Andronicus, arrived suddenly from Constantinople, the bearer, as he asserted, of a most important state secret. The prefect Anthemius was dangerously ill, and had been warned in a dream that he would never recover unless Maximius and Clinias, two rich citizens of Ptolemais, were put to death. Thoas, so he said, had been hastily summoned to the palace, and despatched with all secrecy to apprehend these culprits, guilty of having lives which were inseparably connected with the great man's sickness. Of course, no tidings had reached them of their danger, they were apprehended, and immediately tortured for the benefit of their ruler's health.

At first Synesius remonstrated, his remonstrances were treated with contempt. He reproved, his reproofs made the governor more furious. His house was beset with crowds demanding his sympathy and protection. He could not move without seeing and hearing the sufferings of his people. To add to his grief "the dearest of his children died." With a heart wrung with anguish he turned for consolation to God. "But what was the greatest of my calamities, and what made life itself hopeless to me, I who had hitherto always been successful in prayer, now for the first time found that I prayed in vain." He had accepted the office of a bishop in times of difficulty without being sufficiently in sympathy with the prevailing spirit of the Christian church, and the consciousness of this increased his natural self-distrust. The calm serenity of thought, with which in happier years he had held communion with God, was gone. As he prayed, the calamities of his house and country rose up before him as a sign that he had, by his unworthiness, profaned the mysteries of God. The soul distracted by conflicting feelings, grief and anger, shame and fear, could not rise above the earth. He prayed, and God was afar off. At first it seemed that he would sink in despair under these accumulated sorrows; there were even thoughts of suicide. He was roused by fresh tidings of Andronicus's excesses. Ever ready to assist others in their misfortunes, however great his own might be, he heard the people murmuring that they were forsaken by their bishop. Self-distrust gave way to indignation. Once roused he acted with vigour and judgment. He wrote to influential friends at Constantinople, detailing the cruelties of Andronicus, and earnestly pleading for his recall. Then, without waiting the result of his appeal to the authorities of the state, he proceeded to pronounce against the offender the judgment of the church by a formal act of excommunication.

The people were assembled in the church of Ptolemais. Synesius began by reminding them that earthly misfortunes are inflicted upon nations by God as a chastisement for their sins, and that for this purpose God makes use of evil men or daemons as instruments of His wrath, who are yet for their wickedness themselves objects of His wrath and deserving of punishment. Such a minister of vengeance was Andronicus. Then he reminded them how long and how earnestly he had himself shrunk from the episcopal office. He repeated his conviction, that he was quite unequal to the burden which they had sought to impose upon him. He implored them, if they still wished for a bishop to help them in their secular affairs, either to elect some one in his place, or to appoint him a coadjutor. When the cries of the people shewed that they refused his proposals, and desired no bishop but him, he proceeded to read the sentence of excommunication drawn up by himself and the council of presbyters, and addressed to the bishops of the Christian church throughout the world. It is noticeable that in this document he dwells chiefly on Andronicus's crimes against the church, which he had not mentioned at all in his letter to Constantinople, as if he was anxious to avoid all appearance on

letters. In letters to his friends he never once mentions their wives, except in the case of his brother Evoptius and his cousin Diogenes, and then in the list of salutations the wife is placed after the son, a curious illustration of the secluded, and comparatively unimportant, position then occupied by women.

[p] Three had been born in the five previous years.

the one hand of soliciting the interference of the state in matters more directly concerning the church, and on the other of passing an ecclesiastical sentence for offences more directly against the government of the state. In defiance of the law Andronicus had affixed a notice to the doors of every church, that fugitives from his exactions would not be allowed to avail themselves of the asylum of the altar. The priests who received them were threatened with punishments "such as even Phalaris of Agrigentum, even Cephren the Egyptian, even Sennacherib the Babylonian, would have shrunk from threatening." What was still worse, he had seized a man of wealth and high character, on a frivolous pretext, and condemned him to be tortured, as usual, in public, but at the hottest time of the day, so that none of the citizens might be there to cheer him with their sympathy; "directly I heard of it I ran out just as I was, I sat with the sufferer, I helped him to endure his sufferings. Andronicus was infuriated at the tidings that a bishop dared to pity a man whom he hated. After many lawless insults to which he was incited by Thoas, the most audacious of his satellites, whom he has used as his instrument in oppressing the people, he reached the limits of his madness by exclaiming that it was in vain for any one to hope for the succour of the church; no one should escape his hands, even by clinging to the feet of Christ. After this he is no longer a man to be reasoned with, but like an incurable limb must be cut off lest the sound part of the body should be corrupted by contagion. Therefore the church of Ptolemais communicates this decree to her sisters throughout the world.

"Let no temple of God be open to Andronicus and his family, to Thoas and his family. Let every sacred building and precinct be closed against them. The devil has no part in paradise; if he enters by stealth he must be driven out. I therefore exhort all men, whether private individuals or rulers, neither to dwell under the same roof, nor to sit at the same table with them; especially I exhort the bishops neither to speak to them while living nor bury them when dead. But if any one despises our church as the church of a small city, and receives those whom she casts out on the ground that it is not necessary to obey such a poor church, let him know that he has divided the church which Christ wishes to be one. Such a person, whether a levite, a presbyter, or a bishop, will be treated by us like Andronicus. We will neither take him by the hand, nor eat at the same table with him; far shall it be from us to share the ineffable mystery with those who take part with Andronicus and Thoas."

Before this letter was sent off Andronicus professed his penitence for the crimes he had committed, and entreated that the sentence against him might not be published—a strong proof of the power which the sentence of excommunication then exercised on men's minds. Synesius unwillingly yielded to his entreaties, and to the representations of the other bishops of the province. Relieved from this momentary fear, Andronicus soon returned to his old cruelties, and the sentence of excommunication was definitely pronounced. A short time passed and Synesius wrote in triumph to Constantinople thanking his friends for procuring the dismissal of Andronicus. Another short interval, and Synesius was writing to the patriarch of Alexandria to implore his good offices for the fallen governor. "Justice has perished among men; formerly Andronicus acted unjustly, now he suffers unjustly. But it is the custom of the church to lift up the humble and to humble those who are lifted up. So Andronicus was hated by her for his evil deeds, but now is pitied for the calamities he suffers, beyond her curse, and in his behalf we have even offended those who are now in power. Alas that I shall never be on the side of those who rejoice, but shall always be mourning with those who weep! I have saved him from the hateful judgment-seat, and in other respects I have very much lessened his misfortunes. And if your holiness shall think him deserving of your care, I shall accept this as the clearest proof that he has not been altogether rejected by God." Freed for a time from these secular cares, Synesius was able to attend to his other episcopal duties. In a long letter addressed to Theophilus he has given a very interesting account of a visitation tour, undertaken at Theophilus's request in the course of the same year. This journey lay, through a part of the country which was still exposed to the incursions of the barbarians, to the villages of Palaebisca and Hydrax on the confines of the Libyan desert. His object was to induce the villagers to elect a bishop, but he was met at once by the objection that they had a bishop already, "the most religious Paulus of Erythron." The explanation which followed reveals a very curious page in ecclesiastical history. By ancient and apostolic custom, so the people said,[q] their villages had always formed part of the diocese of Erythron. In the reign of Valens the bishop of Erythron was an old man named Orion, whose only fault was his extreme gentleness. But what the rough inhabitants of these border villages wanted in a bishop was a man to rule them, a secular as well as a religious guide, a strong-minded and, if necessary, a strong-handed man, who should be judge in their disputes, a counsellor in their difficulties, a protector against their oppressors. As Orion was unequal to such a difficult post, the villages of Palaebisca and Hydrax revolted from the old man's rule and elected as their bishop Siderius, "a young active man who had just come home from the army to look after his estates, a man who could help his friends and injure his enemies." If his election was illegal his consecration was still more so. No permission was received from the patriarch of Alexandria, and only a single bishop could be found to officiate. But these were the times of the Arians, the majority of the people were heretics, and even the great Athanasius himself considered that in such perilous times the laws could not always be closely observed. Shortly afterwards, in hope of reviving the small spark of orthodoxy in Ptolemais, Athanasius promoted Siderius to that see, the metropolitan see of Pentapolis. In his old age Siderius retired to Palaebisca, and resumed the discharge of his episcopal duties there. At his death the people of Palaebisca and Hydrax returned to their ancient allegiance to the see of Erythron. When then

[q] By apostolic custom is doubtless meant the custom established by the apostolic see at Alexandria.

Synesius, at the request of Theophilus, who was probably not well informed of all the circumstances of the case, called on the people to elect a successor to "Siderius of happy memory," a striking scene occurred. With mingled cries of grief and expostulation they protested they would have no bishop but "the most religious Paulus of Erythron." In vain Synesius reproved and upbraided them for their impiety in resisting the commands of Theophilus, "whom to disobey or to honour is to disobey or to honour God." The people threw themselves upon the ground as suppliants, invoking the mercy of Theophilus, as if he were present and could hear their cries. All was confusion. No arguments could be listened to. Nothing was heard but the groaning of the men, the screams of the women, the weeping of the children. In vain Synesius had the most disorderly removed. The men were bad enough; but the women, "always most difficult to deal with," holding their infants in their outstretched arms, and closing their eyes that they might not see the bishop's seat unoccupied by their beloved ruler, continued weeping till Synesius himself was inclined to weep in sympathy with them. He dismissed the people and ordered them to reassemble on the fourth day. As the same scene was then repeated, he ultimately consented to send an account of all that had happened to Theophilus, leaving him to decide whether any further steps should be taken.

The next case which was brought before Synesius may perhaps explain what were the episcopal qualities which the people so much admired in "the most religious Paulus." Like "Siderius of happy memory" he was obviously an active man, one who could help his friends and injure his enemies. Near the village of Hydrax, on the summit of a precipitous hill, stood the ruins of an old castle. Part of its walls had been thrown down by an earthquake, but they could be so easily repaired, and the position was naturally so strong, that it was a place of great importance to the neighbouring villages in such troubled times. In those times of war and devastation it was a great advantage to the people to have a fortress close at hand to which they could retire with their cattle, and from which they could easily repel the attacks of the barbarians. Unfortunately for the people of Hydrax, the hill was the property of Dioscorus, bishop of the neighbouring town of Dardanus. Failing to obtain it by any other means, Paulus broke into the place by force, a table was brought and set up as an altar in a small out-building at the extremity of the hill, and then Paulus consecrated the building as a church. If this consecration held good, the building by law ceased to be private property, and as it was in the diocese of Erythron, it would remain in Paulus's hands, and as it could only be reached by a path which traversed the whole crest of the hill, the rest of the property would become almost valueless to any other owner. The question was referred to the bishop of the province, who strongly disapproved of what had been done, but hesitated to declare the act of consecration void. Synesius had no such scruples. He urged that the mere fact of celebrating the divine rites in a place could not make that place for ever sacred, otherwise all castles in time of war would become churches. "Besides," he said, "I distinguish between religion and superstition, a vice which wears the mask of virtue and is considered by philosophy the third form of atheism. I consider that nothing is holy or sacred which is not done in conformity with justice and piety. It is not the Christian belief that the divine presence must necessarily follow certain mystic rites and words, as if they had a magical power of attracting it, which might be the case with an earth-spirit.[r] The divine presence comes to those souls which are free from passion and devoted to God. Where wrath and anger and the spirit of contention rule, how can the Holy Spirit enter, for were He already dwelling there He would depart when these vices came." After this declaration of the metropolitan's views it was clear that judgment must be given in favour of Dioscorus. Then followed a scene very characteristic of the time and place. Overpowered probably by the general indignation, Paulus professed his penitence, and "when he owned his guilt and shewed the bitter grief he felt for the evil he had done, we were all conciliated, and began to sympathise with him." Dioscorus, who had refused even compromise before, now that his rights were established, shewed a most accommodating spirit. He was ready to sell the whole or part of the property to Paulus; he was willing to facilitate an arrangement by any means in his power. The affair terminated in Paulus becoming the purchaser of the hill and castle, and the people of Palaebisca and Hydrax doubtless congratulated themselves on the sagacity they had shewn in adhering to a bishop of such practical abilities.

Then the case of Lamponianus was brought forward, who pleaded guilty to the charge of having assaulted another presbyter, named John. Though the people interceded for him, and though he had acted under strong provocation, sentence of excommunication was pronounced against him, and it was expressly stipulated that he should only be absolved by the patriarch of Alexandria. If, however, he were dying, any presbyter might receive him to communion. "No one," said Synesius, "shall die excommunicated if I can help it."

The next subject which occupied Synesius' attention was connected with one of the worst evils which resulted from the misgovernment of the country. He found that even bishops were often accused by other bishops, not with any desire that justice should be done, but to give the commanders of the armies opportunities for extorting money. In such times of confusion it was doubtless easy to bring plausible charges against almost any one in high position. Synesius requested Theophilus to write to him on the subject, strongly condemning, but not by name, all who were guilty of doing so.

Then Synesius asked the patriarch's advice with regard to certain bishops, whom he calls Baskantibae, a Greek form of the Latin term Vacantivi. "They are men who do not choose to have a fixed diocese, for they have left their own without necessity, of their own accord. They enjoy the honours of their office, wandering to every place where they think they shall

[r] This is a curious allusion to his old belief in divination.

be best off. It seems to me, right reverend father, that these men who have rejected their own churches should be rejected by all churches, and until they return home should not be admitted to the altar, nor invited to occupy the places of dignity, but when they come to church should be left to take their seats among the common people. They will, perhaps, go home again, if they find they are losing the honours which they wish to enjoy anywhere rather than where they ought to be." . . . "Above all things pray for me. You will pray for one who is abandoned and utterly deserted, and who stands in need of such assistance, as I shrink from praying to God in my own behalf. For all things are against me, because of my reckless daring, because, though a sinful man, brought up an alien from the church, trained in another discipline, I have laid my hand upon the altar of God."

The morbid despondency shewn in these last lines was the result of many causes. He had hoped that in the episcopacy he should rise to a higher form of philosophy; he had found that he was not only overwhelmed with the secular cares he hated, but that even as a bishop his chief occupation seemed to be to settle the disgraceful quarrels of his suffragans. Like most highly sensitive men he needed personal sympathy as an assurance of divine favour, and he had no longer his happy home to fall back on as a refuge from his troubles. When the things went wrong, with his usual self-distrust he laid the blame upon himself. Above all, the conviction of personal sinfulness, which it seemed the special work of Christianity to produce in that day, was gradually being wrought into his conscience. Against his better judgment he had allowed himself to be ordained, trusting that fitness for the office would come with the discharge of its duties; and so he was continually making efforts to hold a position and to speak a language which were unnatural to him, and consequently when the reaction came he fell back into a state of exaggerated despondency.

The time during which he held his bishopric was so short, apparently only three years, and was marked by so many public and private calamities, that we possess but few letters which throw much light upon his life. In one we find him writing to his presbyters commending to their care the bearer of the paschal letter from Alexandria, who was travelling even through the parts of the country infested by the barbarians to announce to all the churches on what day Easter was be observed. In another he thanks Theophilus for the address he had sent by this messenger, praising it in the highest terms: "It conferred both a pleasure and a benefit on our cities, the latter by the grandeur of the ideas, the former by the grace of the language." In a third he urges his presbyters to vigorous, but peaceful, action against "the most impious sect of Eunomius, lest the newly-arrived apostles of the devil and Quintianus should secretly assail the flock." In a fourth he congratulates a friend on having embraced the monastic life, and "reached with a bound the goal, while I for a long time with labour and scanty success have been knocking at the outer door." In another he speaks of founding a monastery himself by the side of a running stream. His principal correspondent, however, at this period was Theophilus, whom he always addresses with a reverence and affection which may surprise those who have only known that prelate as the persecutor of Chrysostom, and which are the more important because Synesius, even in writing to Theophilus, professed his admiration for Chrysostom. Equally noticeable is the unqualified obedience which Synesius, though himself metropolitan of Pentapolis, cheerfully yielded to the "apostolic throne" of Alexandria. "It is at once my wish and my duty, to consider whatever decree comes from that throne binding upon me," he writes to Theophilus. The unquestionable superiority of Alexandria to all the cities of eastern Africa had given to the patriarch of Alexandria an authority over the bishop of those cities unsurpassed, even if it was rivalled, by the supremacy of Rome in that day over the bishoprics of Italy.

Of the bishop of Rome, and of the affairs of Rome, there is no mention in any of his letters—one of the many proofs which his works afford of the greatness of the separation, not only in government but in feeling, between the Eastern and Western empires. Though thoroughly well versed in all the branches of Greek literature, he never even alludes to any Latin author. After attentively reading his works, it is almost impossible to resist the belief that Synesius was ignorant even of the Latin language. If the interview, so pleasantly imagined by Mr. Kingsley, between Synesius and Augustine had ever really taken place, it is very unlikely that either would have understood what the other said. Still some notice of the crowning calamity, when the queen of the world yielded to Alaric without a struggle, could hardly have failed to appear in his writings, had not the misfortunes of Pentapolis been so great as to absorb all his thoughts. A vigorous general named Anysius, with only a troop of forty Unnigardae, had cut to pieces several detachments of Ausurians scattered in pursuit of plunder. A permanent force of only two hundred such soldiers under such a commander would have been amply sufficient, according to Synesius, for the protection of the country. The only result of these victories was that Anysius was speedily recalled to make way for an incompetent successor, and the Unnigardae, as no longer needed, were deprived of their horses and their higher pay as cavalry. When the means of resistance were thus destroyed, the Ausurians returned, only the more furious for the temporary check. The horrors of this last and worst invasion are graphically told by Synesius in a document apparently dictated to a secretary, and addressed to a friend at Constantinople who was to lay it before the emperor. The very abruptness of the style and the inconsistencies of the language shew, more strikingly than the most studied eloquence could have done, the troubled feelings of the speaker[a] . . . . "I have read of a country where only the women and children were left, the sign of its desolation. Things are still worse with us. There is no booty the Ausurians so much value as women and children, the women to bear fresh children to them, the children to swell their ranks. These children

[a] I have translated only a part of this Catastasis, as it is called.

will return one day to their native land, but they will return as enemies. The young man will devastate the fields which he cultivated as a boy by his father's side. Yet if we had had good generals it would have been easy enough to take vengeance on this sacrilegious and contemptuous enemy. What holy places have the barbarians spared? Have they not devastated the very tombs upon the plain of Barca? Have they not burnt and ruined my churches at Ampelis? Have they not defiled the holy tables, and used them for their feasts? Have not the sacred vessels of our public worship been carried off to be used in the worship of daemons? It is useless to speak of the forts they have demolished, the cattle they have seized in the caves of the mountains, the goods they have carried off. Pentapolis is ruined, is extinguished, has perished. I have no longer a country to fly from . . . Alas for Cyrene where the public records trace my descent from Hercules! Alas for the tombs where I shall not be laid, the tombs of the Dorians! Alas for Pentapolis, of which I am the last bishop! But the calamity is too near me—I can say no more—tears check my tongue. . . . I am overwhelmed at the thought of abandoning the house and services of God. I must sail away to some island, but when I am summoned to the ship I shall pray them to leave me a little longer here. First I shall go to God's temple; I shall embrace the altar, I shall wet with my tears the precious pavement, I will not leave till I have kissed the well-known door, the well-known seat. How often shall I call on God for help; how often shall I turn back, how often clasp the altar-screen . . . I would I could refresh my eyes with sleep, unbroken by the trumpet's sound. How long am I to be stationed on the battlements, how long am I to mount guard upon the wall? I am weary of setting the watches, guarding and being guarded in turn. I, who used to spend whole nights in observing the movements of the stars, am worn out by looking night after night for the movements of the enemy. Our time for sleep is measured by the water-clock, and often it is broken by the alarm bell. And if I do doze a little, what frightful dreams I have! In my dreams I fly, I am taken prisoner, I am wounded, I am fettered, I am sold as a slave. How often have I started from my sleep with joy because I escaped from my tyrant! How often have I awoke panting, bathed in perspiration, for the end of my sleep was the end of my flight from the soldier who pursued me . . . If the islands are free from such troubles as these, I will certainly set sail when the storm is abated. But I fear the calamity will overtake us before we can escape. The day for the assault draws near. When the peril of the city is extreme, then will be especially the time for the bishop to hasten to God's temple. I will stay in my country, in my church. I will place before me the sacred vessels of holy water. I will cling to the sacred pillars which raise the holy table from the ground. There will I remain while living, there will I lie when dead. I am God's minister, appointed to present the offerings to Him: it is perhaps His will that I should present to Him the offering of my life. Surely God will not look with indifference on His altar, stained for the first time with blood, the blood of His bishop."

But this was not to be. A new general, Marcellinus, arrived "like a God upon the scene." In a short time discipline was restored among the soldiers, and the Ausurians defeated in a decisive battle. Ptolemais was saved for a time, but the country was ruined. The enemy were gone, but desolation, poverty, and disease remained. In the winter Synesius lost "the last comfort of his life, his little son." The blow was too much for the father already crushed by the cares of his office, the labours of the siege, and the misery of his country. As death drew near his thoughts were curiously divided between the two objects to which in life he had given his faith. His last letter was addressed to Hypatia. His last poem was a prayer to Christ. The pagan philosopher retained to the end the reverence and affection of the Christian bishop. "You have been to me a mother, a sister, a teacher, and in all these relationships have done me good. Every title and sign of honour is your due. As for me, my bodily sickness comes from sickness of the mind. The recollection of the children who are gone is slowly killing me. Would to God I could either cease to live, or cease to think of my children's graves." In the hymn to Christ Synesius added an epilogue to the poems in which he had already recounted the drama of his soul. The actor who began so confident of success ended with a humble prayer for pardon. "O Christ, Son of God most high, have mercy on Thy servant, a miserable sinner, who wrote these hymns. Release me from the sins which have grown up in my heart, which are implanted in my polluted soul. O Saviour Jesus, grant that hereafter I may behold Thy divine glory." So in gloom and sadness, cheered by the Christian hope of the resurrection, closed the career of one, who in his time had indeed played many parts, who had been a soldier, a statesman, an orator, a poet, a sophist, a philosopher, a bishop, and in all these characters had acted as a man who deserved to be admired and still more to be loved. [T. R. H.]

NOTE.—This article was written by the Rev. T. R. Halcomb, Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, who died prematurely at Nice in the summer of 1880. Mr. Halcomb has also left behind him a considerable work on St. Gregory the Great, but it is unfortunately in too incomplete a condition to be published.

SYNUSIASTAE (Συνουσιασταί), a name given by Cyril to those who maintained that the divine and human natures were so united in one Christ that only one nature remained after the Union. (Cyrill. Alex. *Opp.* ed. Migne, *Patr. Graec.* lxxvi. 1427; Mai, *Bib. Nov. Patrum*, ii. 445.) [POLEMIUS (1).] [G. T. S.]

SYRIANUS, dux of Egypt, who in 356, instigated by the Arians, burst with his armed soldiery into the cathedral of Alexandria in the time of divine worship, when men were trampled down, women crushed to death and some of them stripped naked, while Athanasius himself barely escaped being torn in pieces (Athan. *Ap. ad Const.* §§ 22, 25, *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 81; Tillem. viii. 151, 153–156). [C. H.]

SYRUS, the abbat of a monastery in Egypt, to whom is addressed one of the epistles of Pachomius with a mystic use of the Greek

letters. This use of the alphabet was believed to have been communicated to them by angels. Syrus is said by Jerome to have been living in the year 406 at the age of 110. (Jerome, vol. ii. p. 85–6, ed. Vall.; Gennadius, c. 7; Rufin. *Hist. Mon.* c. 10.) [W. H. F.]

T

TADIOCUS, said to have been the last bishop of York in the British line, and to have fled with Theonus, bishop of London, into Wales at the coming of the Saxons. There is no evidence for this save the chroniclers of the Arthurian school. [J. R.]

TALARICANUS (TARKIN), Pictish bishop, said in the *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. SS. p. aest. f. cxxxiv.) to have been an Irishman raised to the episcopate by pope Gregory to convert the heathen nations, having his field of labour in the north of Scotland, where churches were dedicated to his memory. But the Scotch annalists make him bishop of Man late in the 9th century, while Skene (*Chron.* 168 and *Celt. Scot.* ii. 153) identifies him with Tolorggain, who died A.D. 616 (*Ann. Inisf.* A.D. 610 Cod. Bodl.), but both dates are doubtful. His feast is Oct. 30 in all the Scotch kalendars. Dempster places him at Lismore, Argyleshire (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 449 et al.). [J. G.]

TALASIUS, sixth bishop of Angers, was consecrated on the occasion of the synod of Angers, held in October 453, in which he took part (Mansi, vii. 899). He was not present at the first council of Tours in 461, but subscribed the *Acta* in his own diocese (*Ibid.* 947). There is extant a letter from Lupus of Troyes and Euphronius of Autun, in answer to questions he had put to them on some doubtful points of discipline and practice (*ibid.* 941; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 66; Ceillier, x. 357–8; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 546–7). [S. A. B.]

TALITANUS, "publici patrimonii curator," is requested by Gregory the Great to prevent the officials of the state levying unjust exactions on the property of the church. (*Epp.* xi. 10.) [F. D.]

TAOR, a nun of a monastery near Antinople in Egypt, about A.D. 420. She was of singular beauty. While the other nuns went for communion to the church of the neighbouring city, she never left her cell for thirty years (Pallad. *Hist. Lausiac.* cap. cxxxviii.). [G. T. S.]

TAORGIUS, a bishop who ordained Ephesius as Luciferian bishop of Rome in opposition to Damasus, who persecuted him. (Marcell. et Faustin. *Libell. Precum*, cap. 23, 29, in Migne's *Patr. Lat.* t. xiii.) [G. T. S.]

TARACHUS, Oct. 11 (*Mart. Rom.*), Oct. 12. (Bas. *Men.*) He was also called Victor. He was an Isaurian from Claudiopolis, and a soldier, but left the army on the outbreak of the persecution. The acts of this martyr and his companions, Probus and Andronicus, are one of the most genuine pieces of Christian antiquity. They were first published by Baronius, in his Annals, at the year 290, but from an imperfect MS. Rosweyd and Bigot published subsequent editions, and finally Ruinart, at Baluze's suggestion, brought out the most complete edition in Greek and Latin from a comparison of several MSS. in the Colbertine Library. The martyrs were arrested A.D. 304 in Pompeiopolis, an episcopal city of Cilicia. They were publicly examined and tortured at three principal cities—Tarsus, Mopsuestia, and Anazarbus—where they were put to death. They were buried at Anazarbus, where their relics were carefully preserved. Towards the latter part of cent. iv. Auxentius, bishop of Mopsuestia, who, though a confessor in earlier life was then an Arian, built a church in their honour. He wished to obtain some of their relics for the use of this church. The martyrs, however, would have nothing to say to heretical honours. Their graves were opened, but such prodigies took place that no one dared to touch the sacred bodies. The martyrs were, however, more zealous for orthodoxy than the Roman martyrology, as Baronius has admitted this same heretical bishop as a confessor under date of Dec. 18, because he refused to place a bunch of grapes upon the pedestal of a statue of Bacchus, when ordered to do so by the emperor Licinius. The Acts of Tarachus are often quoted by Le Blant, in *Les Actes des Martyrs*, to illustrate his argument. Thus, p. 9, he notes the sale of copies of the Proconsular Acts by one of the officials for two hundred denarii. He also illustrates by them the judicial formularies, proconsular circuits, &c. Cf. pp. 27–29, 32, 63, 68, 72, 74, &c. They suffered under a president Numerianus Maximus. (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* 454–492.) [G. T. S.]

TARASIUS, ST., patriarch of Constantinople, was the son of the patrician Georgius, and himself became chief secretary to the emperor. Though a layman, he was designated by PAULUS IV. on his death-bed as his successor. The empress IRENE (10) desirous to find a fitting instrument to assist in restoring image-worship, procured his election, though the Iconoclastic clergy refused to assent. Tarasius was then ordered to come forward, and accepted the office on condition that a general council should be convened to heal the schism in the church. He was consecrated on Christmas Day, A.D. 784, and sent the usual synodic letters to Rome, and the three eastern patriarchates. The pope in his reply, in consideration of his zeal against the Iconoclasts, pardoned the irregularity that had been committed in appointing a layman *per saltum* to the patriarchate. For the history of the council which eventually met at Nicaea on Sept. 24, 787, see IRENE (10), Vol. III. p. 286.

When the emperor, in A.D. 795, repudiated his wife MARIA (7), Tarasius remonstrated with him, and threatened to exclude him from communion, nor when the emperor remained inflexible, would he consent to perform the ceremony of marriage between him and Theodote, but he did not carry out the threat of excommunication. He allowed the catechist of

the church of Constantinople to tonsure Maria, and he did not excommunicate JOSEPHUS (30), who had actually celebrated the marriage. He adopted this temporising policy from fear of driving Constantine over to the Iconoclasts, but Plato the abbat of Saccundion, and his nephew Theodore the Studite, the leaders of the monastic party, disapproved of his conduct as a sacrifice of principle to expediency, and withdrew from communion with him. They also ventured to excommunicate the emperor himself, for which they were imprisoned or banished. The fall of Constantine and the accession of Irene in A.D. 797, changed the whole position. The banished monks were recalled and entered the city in triumph, the patriarch and empress going out to welcome Theodorus, Josephus was degraded by Tarasius from the priesthood, and peace was restored to the church.

The only subsequent action recorded of Tarasius was his crowning Stauracius, the son of the emperor NICEPHORUS, in Dec. A.D. 803. He died on Feb. 25th, A.D. 806, on which day he is commemorated. He was buried in the monastery of All Saints at the mouth of the Black Sea, which he had founded himself. His life was written by his contemporary the deacon Ignatius, who praises his charity to the poor, and the discipline he maintained among his clergy, whom he forbade to frequent the chariot races of the circus. A Latin translation of his life is given in *AA. SS.* Feb. iii. 576, and reprinted in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xcviii. 1385, where his letters, and his address to the people on his election, and a sermon attributed to him, preached on the day of the Presentation of the Virgin, are collected (Theophanes, 386–390, 396, 397, 406, 407; *Vita S. Theod. Stud.* 19, 25, 26, 43; *S. Theod. Stud. Epp.* 53; in *Patr. Gr.* xcix. 137, 141, 156, 1101; *Or. Christ.* i. 239). [F. D.]

TARBULA, martyr. [PHERBUTHA.]

TARCONDIMANTUS (TARCODIMANTUS, or TARCODUNANTUS), bishop of Aegae in Cilicia Secunda, one of the prelates of the Arian party present at Nicaea (Labbe, ii. 52); and also at the council of Antioch "in Encaeniis," A.D. 341 (*ibid.* 560); (Philostorg. ap. Nicetam. *Thes. Ord. Fid.* v. 7; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 895). [E. V.]

TARSIANS (THARSENSES), a name applied by St. Jerome to the followers of the semi-Arian Silvanus, bishop of Tarsus, in a letter addressed to Damasus about the year 376. [SILVANUS (6)] (Ceill. vii. 583.) [G. T. S.]

TARSINUS, priest of the church of Suedra, in Pamphylia, in response to whose appeal for help against the Arians, St. Epiphanius wrote his work called *Ancoratus*, cf. EPIPHANIUS (1) t. ii. p. 2; and his works in Migne's *Patr. Graec.* t. xliii. p. 14. [G. T. S.]

TASGODRUGI, heretics in the enumeration of Sophronius (Mansi, xi. 850 D), named in the version of Hardouin (iii. 1291 B) Τασκοδοῦργοι (for Τασκόδρουγοι) and Abrodici. [ASCODRUGITAE.] [C. H.]

TASO, second abbat of St. Vincent ad Vulturnum. He and his brother Tato and their cousin Paldo were of a noble family of Beneventum. They determined to leave their homes and enter monasteries in Gaul. When they crossed the Beneventan frontier, they sent back their servants and horses, and meeting some beggars changed clothes with them. Arriving at Farfa on their journey the abbat washed their feet, and thus discovering that they were disguised, inquired who they were. They told him their story and their purpose; he promised to aid them, and accompanied them to Rome, and then advised them to return to Farfa and live there some time with him in order to learn and practise the monastic life. In the mean time their relations heard where they were, and came to Farfa, entreating them to return, and not to desert them. When they, on the other hand, replied they must go to Gaul, as they had vowed, the abbat interposed, declaring that if they would take his advice, he would show them a place God had prepared for them. He then described a spot on the Vulturnus, near its source, where there was an oratory dedicated to St. Vincent in the midst of thick woods, and advised them to take up their abode there. They accordingly did so. Their fame spread abroad, and numbers came to them desiring to imitate their life. Such was the origin of the monastery of St. Vincent. Paldo, the first abbat, was succeeded in A.D. 720 by Taso. The strictness of his government caused a mutiny among the monks, who expelled him, and made his elder brother Tato abbat in his stead. Both sides appealed to pope Gregory II., who ordered Taso to be reinstated, and imposed a heavy penance on the mutineers. Taso died on January 11, 729, and was succeeded by Tato. The names of Taso and Tato are sometimes confused. (Autpertus, *Vita Paldonis, Tatonis, et Tasonis in Script. Rer. Lanq.* 547.) If Leo of Ostia (*Chron. Cas.* i. 4, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* clxxxiii. 494) is to be trusted, the three kinsmen aided Petronax in his restoration of M. Cassino (Mabillon, *Ann. Ben.* xvii. 21, xx. 34. 73). [F. D.]

TASSACH (TASSA), bishop of Raholp, in par. Ballyculter, co. Down, gave the viaticum to St. Patrick shortly before he died. St. Patrick had given him the church (Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 39, 138, 142, 223, 377). He was one of St. Patrick's three artificers of great endowment. and in the notes on St. Fiac's *Hymn* is said to have first adorned the Baculus Jesu with a precious covering (*Book of Obits C.C. Dublin*, p. xiii.; Cotton, *Fast.* iii. 195). [J. G.]

TATBERT, a kinsman and companion of Wilfrid I., bishop of York, who received, by his bequest, the monastery of Ripon, of which he became provost or abbat. Tatbert was also one of those to whom Wilfrid gave his last instructions. It was at the request of Tatbert and Acca that Eddi undertook to write a life of Wilfrid, in which Tatbert was eminently qualified to assist him. Tatbert occurs in the *Liber Vitae* of Durham (p. 6). (Eddi, *Vita Wilfr.*, Pref. and Capp. 62–5.) [J. R.]

TATFRITH, a pupil of St. Hilda, whom Bede describes as a most strenuous and learned man, of excellent genius, and an inmate of her monastery. He was elected to the newly constituted see of Worcester, in or about the year

680, but died before he could be consecrated; Bosel, the first in the list of the bishops of the Hwiccii, being appointed in his place: see Bede, *H. E.* iv. 23; the lists in the Appendix to Florence, *M. H. B.* p. 622, &c. [S.]

TATHAI (TATHEUS, TATHAN, ATHAN), Welsh saint, with an Irish and a Welsh tradition. According to the former (in the *Vita S. Tathei*, given in full from the Cotton MS. by Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 255–64, with English translation, and abridged by Capgrave, *Nov. Leg. Angl.* ff. 279–280), he was son of an Irish king, Tathalius, forsook the earthly kingdom for the heavenly, and came to Wales, where he landed in Gwent and received the friendship of king Caradoc. In Gwent he had a school, and, on land given him by Ynyr ap Caradoc, founded a church to the Holy Trinity; after many miracles he died in his monastery and was buried in the floor of his church (Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. pt. i. 85, pt. ii. 897; Nicolson, *Ir. Hist. Lib.* 51, ed. 1736; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 144). According to the Welsh *Achau Saint*, Tathan was an Armorican, son of Amwn Ddu and Anne, daughter of Meurig ap Tewdrig, a member of St. Illtyd's college, and settled first in Glamorganshire, where he founded the church of Llandathan or St. Athan's, and then was called away to Caerwent, Monmouthshire, where he presided over a college or monastery under the patronage of Ynyr Gwent, to whom he was confessor; but returned and died at Llandathan. Llanvaches, Monmouthshire, is also called Llandathan from its connection with him. In the genealogies he is brother of Samson of Dol, but Haddan and Stubbs (*Counc.* i. 158) think he is certainly older; Wakeman (Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 315) identifies him with MEUTHI, the hermit who baptised and taught St. Cadoc. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 419 sq.; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 256.) [J. G.]

TATHYRIANI, heretics in the enumeration of Sophronius (Mansi, xi. 850 D), in Hardouin (iii. 1291 B) Ψαθυριανοί and Psathyriani. [PSATHYRIANI.] [C. H.]

TATIANA, a noble Roman lady of the later part of the 4th century, who married into the Furian family. She was related to Paula and Eustochium, and became a friend of Jerome. Her son married Blaesilla, the daughter of Paula, and her daughter Furia, the son of Probus [FURIA]. She imbibed ascetic ideas, and imbued her daughter with them, as we learn from Jerome's treatise addressed to Furia, *De Viduitate Servanda* (*Ep.* 54, ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

TATIANUS (1) the "Apologist," was "born in the land of Assyria" (*Oratio* c. xlii.), i.e. east of the Tigris, in a land incorporated in the reign of Trajan, together with Mesopotamia and Armenia, into one Roman province—that of Syria (Zahn, *Forschungen z. Gesch. d. N. T. lichen Kanons;* I. Theil, "Tatian's Diatessaron," p. 268). Of his parents, date of birth (c. A.D. 110, Zahn; c. A.D. 120, Funk), and early training, little is known which is not conjectural. In the province of Syria were to be found Greek official representatives of Rome, merchants, and residents. Among such, stationed in the Assyrian district, may have been the parents of Tatian; persons, perhaps, of good birth and wealth (cp. *Oratio* c. xi.). The lad, Semitic as regards the land of his birth, but possibly Greek by parentage and name, was educated in the Greek teaching open to him (*Oratio*, c. xlii.). As he grew older, a restless if enquiring mind led him to turn from his teachers to a personal examination of their current systems (ch. xxxv.). A peripatetic by disposition, if not in philosophy, he "wandered over many lands, learning from no man," but with eyes open and ears unstopped, listening, observing, hearing, pondering, until —sickened with "the mysteries" into which he had been initiated and the sanguinary rites of popular worship (ch. xxix.); disgusted with philosophers, whose greed for money was to him the most noticeable feature in their unlovely lives (ch. xxv.); and scorning that *profanum vulgus* which erected statues to courtesans, gloated over the immoralities of the theatre, and grieved when absent from the brutalities of the arena (chs. xxii.–iv.)—he abandoned what had made him a pessimist, unlearnt what he had learnt, and became a teacher of that "Word of God" which had taught him a holier faith and a happier life (chs. xxvi., xlii.).

Tatian notes the simplicity of the style of the Holy Scriptures as that which, beginning by attracting him, had ended in converting him (ch. xxix.). Greek purists squabbled over the respective merits of Doric or Attic pronunciation, Aeolian or Ionian dialects (ch. i.). In Rome he heard nothing but magniloquent arrogance, in Greece cold and exaggerated reasoning (ch. xxxv.). The "barbaric (i.e. Christian) writings," upon which he stumbled by chance, charmed him at once both by the modesty of their diction and the easy naturalness of their writers. He soon proceeded to discover that these writings were both older in date than the oldest remains of Greek literature, and in their prophecies and precepts diviner and truer than the oracles and practices of the most powerful of the gods and of the purest of the philosophers.

Tatian's information about himself ceases with the autobiographical allusions and statements which are to be gathered from the *Oratio*. A few more facts are to be gathered from later writers. According to Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* i. ch. 28; cp. Eusebius *H. E.* iv. ch. 29) Tatian was a hearer (ἀκροατής) of Justin Martyr; and the *Oratio* indicates that he and the "most admirable" Justin were at Rome at the same time, and that both of them were exposed to the hostility of the Cynic Crescens (chs. xviii., xix.). Tatian does not, however, appear to have owed his conversion to the teaching of Justin; for though the *Oratio* contains many thoughts and arguments resembling those of Justin (see Otto's notes to the *Oratio*), the sympathy of the latter in dealing with Greek philosophers finds no counterpart in the unmitigated abuse with which the former bespatters them—Socrates alone, perhaps, excepted (ch. iii.). The minds of the two men were in truth cast in different moulds; and if, which is doubtful, Tatian ever saw Justin's *Apology*, it is quite certain that it exercised little permanent influence upon him.

Tatian's Christian life, like that of Tertullian, has had assigned to it a division into pre-heretical and heretical periods. So long as Justin

was alive, says Irenaeus, he brought out no "blasphemy"; after his death it was different. It may be that Tatian's respect for one so respected prevented him or made him unwilling to do so; it may be that his peculiar opinions had hardly found sufficient consistency to justify expression.

The testimony of his pupil Rhodon (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 13) leaves the impression that Tatian remained for some time after Justin's death working and teaching at Rome, busying himself amongst other things with his "book of questions" (προβλημάτων βιβλίον), dealing with what was "hidden and obscure in the sacred writings" (i.e. of the Old Testament). And the phrase, taken in connexion with other indications, may also mean that his mind had become unsettled, and that he was drifting from the moorings of his happier days.

The chronology of Tatian's literary career is more or less connected with the martyrdom of Justin c. A.D. 163–7 (see s. n. JUSTIN MARTYR). Many critics consider Justin's *Apology* and the *Oratio* to have been composed about the same time (cp. Zahn, p. 279; Harnack, *Texte u. Untersuchungen z. Gesch. d. altchristlichen Literatur*, i. p. 196), i.e. A.D. 150–3. The activity of Crescens, whose hostility to them both has been already mentioned (cp. Justin, *Apol.* ii. 3; Tatian, *Oratio* ch. xix.), and Tatian's allusion to the Cynic Proteus (ch. xxv.), whose expulsion from Rome is dated about A.D. 150 (cp. Lightfoot's *Ignatius* i. pp. 129, 331, 450; Harnack, 197), are considered evidences pointing to the same conclusion. Others place the *Oratio* after the death of Justin (Lightfoot in *Contemporary Review* for May, 1877; Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte*, p. 395; Funk, *Zur Chronologie Tatian's* in Tübingen *Theolog. Quartalschrift* for 1883, p. 219, etc.). The difference in opinion turns very much upon the estimate formed of a passage in Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 16); the first-named critics finding in it a falsification of the facts given in the *Oratio*, ch. xix.; the others denying this (see Otto's note *in loco*).

A similar want of unanimity prevails as regards the place of the composition of the *Oratio*. Harnack (pp. 198–9), admitting that the question is one of probability, argues from the language of the treatise that it was not written at Rome, where Zahn (p. 280) places it; but there is nothing in the passages referred to by Harnack which a defiant rhetorician like Tatian would not have purposely used in his open contempt for his adversaries; and there is much which supports the counter-opinion, that Tatian did not leave Rome till after the death of Justin, and until his changed opinions made his stay there impossible. The points in dispute can, however, hardly be settled till the date of the Diatessaron is under consideration.

A. *The Oratio.*

The *Oratio* belongs to that part of Tatian's life which is reckoned orthodox. If reputed the first of his Christian writings, it was not, however, his first literary effort. He himself mentions in the *Oratio* (ch. xv.) a work on animals (περὶ Ζώων; cp. also ch. xvi., ὡς ἐν ἄλλοις ἀπεδείξαμεν, a sentence generally taken to allude to the same work), a treatise apparently of an anthropological character, and dealing with matters of natural philosophy. The subject was treated by him when a heathen, and from the heathen point of view (Zahn and Harnack. Hilgenfeld, p. 395, assigns it to his Christian period), and therefore was likely to commend itself to his Greek readers. The work is lost. It is by the *Oratio* that Tatian is best known, a work which is at once one of the most interesting and difficult of the Greek Apologetic writings. The title, Τατιανοῦ πρὸς Ἕλληνας, terse and abrupt, is characteristic of the treatise; the condensation and conciseness of which—amounting at times to that obscurity which procured for its writer the title of a Heraclitus, second to him whom he had himself denounced (ch. iii.)—is better remembered than an occasional diffuseness. In common with other Apologists (Athenagoras excepted) Tatian did not care for style. Christianity was not, in his opinion, dependent upon it. It was absent from the Scriptures which had fascinated him; it belonged to the Greek culture he had left behind. In one passage, bubbling over with sarcasm (ch. i.), he puts aside such niceties with a quotation from the *Frogs* of Aristophanes, as "small grapes left for gleaners, small talk, museums of swallows, corrupters of art." In another (ch. xxvi.) he brands as jackdaws strutting in borrowed plumes the writers who paraded their borrowed sayings. Yet Tatian can at times show himself no novice in the art he contemned. Ch. xi. is a noble piece of declamation; ch. xix.—τί γάρ ἐστι μαντική κ.τ.λ., a scathing denunciation of what was false passing into a grave appeal in behalf of what was true. He can draw word-pictures, such as those of the actor (ch. xxii.), the wealthy patron of the arena (do.), and the Cynic philosopher (ch. xxv.), which are as clever and life-like as those of Tertullian. The very audacity of his compounds, his solecisms, his grammatical peculiarities, partly his own, partly those of his age, are characteristic of the writer and thinker who employs them (cp. Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi*, vol. vi.; *Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos*, p. xxix., etc.). The *Oratio* has two principal divisions introduced by a preface (chs. i.–iv.). The first division states the Christian doctrines with a view of setting forth both their intrinsic excellence, and their superiority to the heathen opinions (chs. v.–xxx.). The second division demonstrates the superior antiquity of the Christian religion (chs. xxxi.–xli.). The whole closes with a few words autobiographical in character (ch. xlii.).

i. *Analysis of the Oration to the Greeks.*—The text followed is Otto's. Tatian opens (ch. i.) by deprecating as unreasonable the contemptuous animosity of the Greeks towards "Barbarians."[a] And as one reason he points out that there was no practice or custom current among them which they did not owe to "Barbarians." Oneirology, astrology, auguries from birds or sacrifices had come to them from external sources. To the Babylonians they were indebted for astronomy, to the Persians for magic, to the Egyptians for geometry, to the Phoenicians for instruction by letters. They must therefore cease from claiming as inventions what they had, in

[a] A word used in the most expansive sense. Applied to those who were not Greeks it included the Latins of the West and all Orientals, Hebrews and Christians (chs. xii., xxxi., xxxv., xlii.). See Otto's note *in loco*.

reality, only imitated. An Orpheus had taught them poetry, song, and initiation into the mysteries, the Tuscans sculpture, the Egyptians history. To rustic Phrygians they owed the harmony of the shepherd's pipe, to Tyrrhenians the trumpet, to the Cyclopes the smith's art, and to Atossa, queen of the Persians, the method of joining letter-tablets (see Otto's note). Again, they should not boast of the excellency of their diction when they imported into it "barbaric" expression, and maintained no uniformity of pronunciation. Of Doric, Attic, Aeolian, Ionian, which was the real Greek? Further, let them not boast when they employed rhetoric to subserve injustice and sycophancy, and poetry to depict battles, the amours of gods, and the corruption of the soul.

Tatian has no love for Greek philosophy or its teachers. Hence he finds no difficulty in accepting and circulating the most exploded errors about them (ch. ii., iii.). What holy thing (σεμνὸν), he asks, has this philosophy ever produced, or which of its most zealous teachers has ever been free from imposture or arrogance (ἀλαζονεία)? Look, he cries, at their characters —Diogenes killed by his gluttony; Aristippus, the purple-clad, practising the profligacy he preached; Aristotle, shut up and carried about like a wild animal in most Aristotelian fashion by his pupil Alexander; Heraclitus, "the dark," the man who had "explored" himself, physician and philosopher in one, stupidly killing himself with his plaster of cow-dung; Zeno, the Stoic, reviving, by his doctrine of conflagration, more bad men than good!

Men must not allow themselves to be carried away by such non-philosophic philosophers. They dogmatise one against the other, and do but utter the crudest thoughts of the moment. They are stumbling-blocks to each other; they hate one another; they differ; and they who should (philosophically) wait till the great ones of the earth pay court to them, pick out arrogantly places of pre-eminence.

Tatian next formulates a grievance against the Greeks. They wished to bring upon Christians the blows (ὥσπερ ἐν πυγμῇ) of the civil power. Why? Practically for disobedience to the laws. Tatian answers: "When a king orders me to pay tribute I am ready. When my master commands my service and duty I recognise his right. But when he bids me deny my God—Who alone is to be feared—then I will die rather than obey or be false and ungrateful." Was that wrong? Not if the Greeks really knew Who it was the Christians worshipped; and then he explains: "Our God hath nothing which can be estimated by time (σύστασιν ἐν χρόνῳ), He alone is without beginning (ἄναρχος), and He Himself is the beginning of all things." God is Spirit (cp. St. John iv. 24), not (simply) pervading matter (ὕλη), but One Who prepares (κατασκευαστὴς) material spirits and the forms which exist in matter. He is invisible and impalpable; Himself the Father of what is cognisable by the senses and of what is invisible. We know Him through His creation, and His invisible power we apprehend through His works (cp. Rom. i. 20). "I will not worship," says Tatian, "workmanship (δημιουργίαν) which He hath created for our sake. He hath made the sun and the moon for us. How can I worship my servants (ὑπηρέτας)? How can I call stocks and stones gods? The spirit that pervades matter is inferior to the more Divine Spirit; but, even when assimilated to the soul, it is not to be honoured equally with the perfect God. Neither will I offer gifts to our ineffable (ἀνωνόμαστος) God" (contrast the title δωρολῆπται applied to the gods of the heathen), "for He Who needs nothing (ἀνενδεὴς) is not to be slandered as if He were needy" (cp. Acts xvii. 25). This train of thought leads Tatian to set forth more distinctly the Christian doctrines: e.g. on the Logos (ch. v.) and the resurrection.

Ch. v., if one of the most important (doctrinally) in the *Oratio*, is also unhappily one of the most difficult. The following translation is submitted with considerable diffidence:—

"In the beginning was God. We have been taught that the beginning is the power of the Logos. For the Lord of all, being Himself the substance (ὑπόστασις) of all, in so far that creation had not yet taken place, was alone; but in so far as He was Himself all power, and the substance of things visible and invisible, all things were with Him: (and thus) with Him by Logos-power (διὰ λογικῆς δυνάμεως), the very Logos Himself, Who was in Him, subsisted (ὑπέστησε). By the simple will of God the Logos springs forth, and not proceeding forth without cause (κατὰ κενοῦ), becomes the first-begotten work of the Father. Him we recognise as the beginning of the world. He was born by participation, not by scission (κατὰ μερισμὸν οὐ κατὰ ἀποκοπήν); for He Who proceeds by scission is separated from the first, but He Who has proceeded by participation and has accepted a part in the administration of the world (τὸ . . . οἰκονομίας τὴν αἵρεσιν προσλαβὸν), hath not rendered Him defective from Whom He was taken. Just as many fires are lighted from one torch, but the light of the first torch is not lessened through the kindling of the many, so the Logos coming forth from the power of the Father hath not made Him Who begat Him without Logos (ἄλογον). I myself speak and you hear, yet surely I who talk with you do not by the transmission of speech become empty of speech; but in putting forth my voice I give order to the unordered matter in you. And as the Logos, begotten in the beginning, begot in His turn our creation, He having first created for Himself the material (τὴν ὕλην δημιουργήσας); so also I, in imitation of the Logos, being begotten again, and having apprehended the truth, remodel what is indistinct in matter kindred (to myself). For neither is matter without beginning like God, nor is it—since it is not without beginning —of equal power with God; but it is begotten and not made by any other being, but produced by the Creator of all things."

As a sequence to this belief in the power of God being greater than that of matter, Tatian upholds the belief in the resurrection of the body at the end of all things. It will be a resurrection accompanied by judgment in which, not Minos nor Rhadamanthus, but God the Creator will Himself be the Judge (δοκιμαστὴς). "You may think us," says Tatian, "chatterers and babblers" (σπερμολόγους, cp. Acts xvii. 18) for holding this belief; but the sneer does not trouble him. His argument is briefly this:— "There was a time when I did not exist: I was

born and came into existence. There will be a time when (through death) I shall not exist; but again I shall exist, just as before I was not, but was afterwards born (cp. Tertullian, *Apol.* xlviii). Let fire destroy my flesh, let me be drowned, or torn to pieces by wild beasts, I am laid up in the treasure-chambers of a wealthy Lord. God Who reigneth can, when He will, restore to its pristine state that which is visible to Him alone."

In ch. vii. Tatian returns to the Logos, that he may demonstrate His work as regards Angels and men. The heavenly Logos, at once a Spiritual Being as proceeding from (ἀπὸ) the Father (Who is Spirit) and the Logos from (ἐκ) the Logos-power—in imitation of the Father Who begat Him—created man (ἄνθρωπον) an image of immortality; in order that, as incorruption is with God, in the same way man receiving a share of the spiritual part of God might have immortality. Therefore indeed did the Logos create Angels even before men of the noblest stamp (ἄνδρες). Each of these orders of creation was made unconditionally free (αὐτεξούσιον); not having the nature of good which is with God alone, but (that nature) which, in the case of men (ἀνθρώπων), is brought to perfection by freedom of choice, so that the worthless (φαῦλος) man, bad (μοχθηρὸς) through his own fault, may be punished, and the righteous man be deservedly praised for his brave honest deeds (ἀνδραγαθήματα); inasmuch as of his own free-will he does not transgress the will of God.

Now the power of the Logos having in itself the faculty of foreknowing the future, not as fated, but as determined by the mind of free agents, foretold the results of things to come. It became the prohibitor of wickedness and the encomiast of those who continued in goodness. But when men followed that first-born more subtle than the rest (Gen. iii. 1), and declared him god who resisted the law of God, then the power of the Logos excluded from fellowship with Him both the beginner of this folly and his followers. So he who was made in the image of God, the more powerful Spirit having been separated from him, became mortal; and that first-begotten one became a demon, on account of his transgression and ignorance (*al.* madness, ἄνοια instead of ἄγνοια); and they who imitated him and his phantasies became an army of demons, and on account of their liberty of choice have been given over to their own folly.

The mal-practices of the demons, their antagonism to man, their absurdities, devices, etc., form the principal subject of the next ten chapters (viii.-xviii.). Irony, ridicule, anger are dominant throughout Tatian's language, and his passion against what is false tends to increase, by contrast, the beauty of thoughts interspersed here and there about the soul, the spirit, and the truth.

Man, the cause of the apostasy of the demons, is also the material upon which they work. By introducing astrology, they have sought to replace belief in God by a belief in fate. They teach that a man is a judge or one judged, a murderer or one murdered, a rich man or a poor man—by fate. They urge men to copy their own foul examples; and in their indulgence of their passions the demons, with Jupiter at their head, are, according to Tatian, but acting as slaves of fate.

Further, asks Tatian, how can you Greeks expect us to honour as deities those whose opinions are so contradictory, and whose practices are often so abominable? One god poisons, another heals; one goddess advocates continence, another incontinence; one deity saves men's lives, another destroys them. He comments also upon the superstitions encouraged by the demons. A fundamental principle (στοιχείωσις) with them was the peopling the heavens with life. The demons raised to divine rank the creeping things of earth, and fish, and animals, and by means of astrology fostered the belief that they, though expelled, still lived in heaven. The zodiacal circle they presented as divine. They asserted that they could control every man's destiny from the hour of his birth. "We," bursts out Tatian, "are above this fate. We believe, not in wandering (πλανητῶν) demons, but in one Lord, Who wanders not (ἀπλανῆ). We do not follow fate, and we reject its law makers." Sarcastically he asks, why some gods are placed in the heavens, but others, far better, are omitted; and he summons them to reject what is so absurd and not to hate the Christians unjustly.

He advances one more absurdity,—the metamorphosis of the gods; e.g. Zeus into a dragon or a swan, or an eagle, to give free play to his coarse passions! But that absurdity becomes sacrilege when men sacrifice a sheep and worship it (*Aries*), when they place the bull (*Taurus*) in the heavens and kill it on earth! Angry and disgusted, Tatian breaks into a noble protest (ch. xi.): "How can I admit this life according to fate when I consider who are its administrators? I am not a man who wants to be a king; I have no wish to be rich; I decline official position. I hate fornication. No insatiate desire impels me to traverse the seas; I do not contend for wreaths (στεφάνους); I have no passion for fame. I despise death and am superior to disease; grief does not consume my soul. Should I be a slave, I would bear my slavery. Am I free, I make no boast of my good birth (cp. 1 Cor. vii. 21). I see, indeed, that the same sun shines upon all, and that there is one death to the man living in pleasure and to the man dying in destitution. . . . But tell me, is it due to fate that an avaricious man is sleepless (or is it due to his own folly)? Is it due to fate (or to your own will) that you so often covet and so often fail, perhaps die? Ah! die to the world! Repudiate its insanity! Live to God! Lay hold on Him and reject your old nature! We were not created to die, but we die through our own fault. Our free-will has destroyed us. We who were free have become slaves; we have been sold through sin. Nothing evil has been made by God; it is we who have shown wickedness. Yet are we, who have shown it, also able to reject it."

In ch. xii. Tatian returns again to a thought akin to that of the two orders discussed in ch. vii. There are, he says, two varieties of spirit, the soul and (which is greater than the soul) the image and likeness of God. Both existed in the first men, who were thus in one sense material (ὑλικοί), in another superior to matter (ἀνώτεροι τῆς ὕλης). This "difference of honour" he illustrates from the analogies of the created world and the human body, carefully noting (e.g. in the case of the latter) that together

with such differences there is always "a harmony as of music." All may know these things who do not vaingloriously reject those holy interpretations which have come down to the Christians in writing, and render those who attend to them great lovers of God. The demons also present a similar distinction in character. Made of matter and possessing a material spirit, some have turned to what was purer; but others (and the majority), having chosen what was inferior and conformed their lives to it, have become profligate and greedy. These last—cries Tatian, with intense scorn—are what the Greeks worship! These "unbridled robbers of Deity" are permitted by the Lord of all to revel till the world shall be dissolved and the Judge shall appear; a day when all who have, though assailed by these demons, striven after the knowledge of the perfect God, shall obtain, by means of their very conflicts, a more perfect testimony.

Further, he points out that everywhere there is spirit; one and the same yet marked by distinction:—a spirit in stars, a spirit in Angels, a spirit in plants, a spirit in waters, a spirit in men, a spirit in animals. We affirm this, says Tatian, not from hearsay, nor from conjecture, nor from sophistical reasoning, but from Divine teaching: and he calls upon the Greeks who did not reject the teaching of the Scythian Anacharsis, not to refuse the teaching of (Christian) "barbarian" laws. "Count," he asks of them, "our doctrines at least as oracular as you do the divinations of the Babylonians. Listen to our words with the same attention that you do to the oaks of Dodona or Africa." He adds—not too wisely for his purpose—"These (last) are but the trickeries of demons. The Christian teaching is what the (heathen) world could not apprehend."

Tatian, having expressed himself about spirit, now (ch. xiii.) turns to the soul, and develops a similar line of distinction between the soul exalted and the soul degraded. The soul, he affirms, is not immortal in itself, but mortal; yet it rests with itself not to die. If it knows not the truth it dies and is dissolved with the body; but it rises again with the body at the end of the world and receives death as a punishment in immortality. On the other hand it does not die, even though it be dissolved for a time, if it acquire the knowledge of God. Of itself the soul is darkness, and there is no light in it. Hence it is written, "The darkness apprehended it (i.e. the light) not" (St. John i. 5). It is not the soul which has preserved the Spirit, but the Spirit the soul. As light apprehends darkness, so the Logos—the Light of God—will apprehend the ignorant soul—darkness. Wherefore if the soul abide alone (μόνη) it inclines downwards to matter and dies with the flesh; but if it be yoked with the Divine Spirit it is no longer helpless, but rises whither the Spirit leads it; for the dwelling-place of the Spirit is above, but the origin of the soul is from below. In the beginning Spirit and soul dwelt together; but the soul would not follow the Spirit, and the Spirit left it. Then the soul, retaining a spark of the Divine power, if unable—on account of the separation—to discern what was perfect, yet sought for God, and in its wanderings fashioned many gods and followed the sophistries of demons. Thus the Spirit of God is not with all. It came down to those who lived justly, and interweaving itself with their soul, proclaimed to other souls by means of prophecies things hidden. And the souls that are obedient to wisdom have attracted to themselves this kindred Spirit; but the disobedient and all who reject the minister (i.e. the Holy Spirit) of our God Who suffered, are found to be not worshippers of, but fighters against, God.

The Greeks were, in Tatian's opinion (ch. xiv.), like these disobedient souls. They had surrendered the doctrine of the Unity of God (μοναρχίαν); they had accepted the rule of gods many (πολυκοιρανίην), and had submitted to demons supposing them to be possessed of power. It was a terrible submission, for the demons had in reality imposed upon them. These demons, who practised and taught men the ways of death, if dying continually while they lived, were yet themselves undying and bodiless, and should find in their deathlessness their greatest punishment in immortality. The boundless extent of their life might perhaps be the explanation of the boundless extent of their sins.

Should men then yield to the demons? Should they not rather seek again what they once had, but had lost, reunite the soul with the Holy Spirit and work for union with God? The soul, says Tatian, is multipartite (πολυμερὴς . . . οὐ μονομερὴς) and is manifested through the body. We cannot conceive a manifestation of the soul apart from the body, nor a resurrection of the body apart from the soul. Man is not, as croakers dogmatize, a mere rational animal possessed of mind and knowledge. The brute animals (τὰ ἄλογα) have that. Man, and man alone, is the image and likeness of God, and man alone is capable of advancing unto God Himself. What is this image and likeness after God? The perfect God is without flesh, man is flesh. The bond of the flesh is the soul, the flesh holds (σχετικὴ, a Stoic term) the soul firm. In it, as a sanctuary, God is pleased to dwell by the Spirit; but if it be not His tabernacle, then is man superior to the wild beasts only in being able to speak; in other respects he is as they are; he is not a likeness of God. Now none of the demons possess flesh, their composition is spiritual, like that of fire or air. They only, in whom the Spirit of God dwells, can see them; the natural man (ψυχικὸς; cf. 1 Cor. ii. 14) cannot; the inferior cannot apprehend the superior. For demons there is no place of repentance. Their nature excludes it; they have no flesh. They are the effulgences (ἀπαύγασμα; cf. Heb. i. 3; Rev. v.) of matter and wickedness. Matter (demon-inspired; cf. ch. xvi.) sought to gain power over the soul, and laws of death were given to men. Yet have men, even after casting away immortality, conquered death by a death in faith, and through repentance have they been called who, according to the language of Scripture (Ps. viii. 5), "were made a little lower than the Angels" (cf. Heb. i. 4). For it is possible for every one that hath been conquered (by sin) to conquer again if he reject the constitution of death—a constitution easily intelligible to all who wish for immortality.

The demons who give commands to men are not the souls of men (ch. xvi.). They have indeed the power of deluding and perverting

minds disposed to downward tendencies, so that men fail to rise to the path which leads to heaven. But, says Tatian, this is not the case with Christians. "The things in the world are not hidden from us. We can apprehend easily what is Divine if the power which makes souls immortal come to us." Terrible indeed are the demons. If they had the power, they would drag down the very heaven with the rest of creation. But they have not this power; they can only make war against matter resembling their own by means of the matter which is from beneath. If a man would conquer them, let him repudiate matter. Armed with the breastplate of the heavenly Spirit (cf. Eph. vi. 13, etc.), he will be able to save all that He encompasses. So with diseases which attack our material nature. The demons claim to be the causes, and they have indeed the power to affect the body by means of some burst of folly; but when God speaks the word of power they are smitten and depart, and the sick man is healed. Tatian opposes the heathen belief on such points in very earnest terms (ch. xvii.). "Hearken to me, O Greeks, as one calling to you from vantage-ground. Don't mock. Don't attribute your own thoughtlessness to one Who is the herald of truth." He denounces as wrong the opinion of Democritus that one disease (**πάθος**) could be destroyed by counter-disease (**ἀντιπάθεια**). He mocks at the credulity which supposed that a madman was to be cured by amulets of leather. Not that he denies that demons do attack men. Nay, men themselves, who are sick, or in love, or who hate, or wish to be revenged, take them as their helpers. And the demons' mode of helping them is this—they induce men to believe in peculiar combinations of powerless letters, roots, bones, and sinews, and then they make them their slaves. "How," asks Tatian, "can it be good to minister to adulteries? or noble to help men to hate one another? or seemly to attribute the cure of maniacs to matter and not to God?" Verily God has created everything that is good (cf. Gen. i. 31), but the demons have in their folly wrested everything for evil purposes; and this kind of wickedness is to be laid at their door and not at that of the perfect God. In proof, he adduces two popular magical superstitions:—How can a bone of mine when I am dead do any good? or how can one who has died a violent death minister to another man's punishment? (See Otto's explanation.)

Tatian finds similar fault with their views about medicine (ch. xviii.). If a man, having confidence in the medical art, is healed by matter, much more shall he be healed by waiting patiently for the power of God. Man must not make use of what is evil to secure what is good. A man may not himself be a thief, but if he be an associate of thieves he must expect to be punished with them; and similarly if a man who is not a bad man associate himself with the bad to work out some supposed good, he will be punished by God the Judge for that very alliance. "Why," asks Tatian, "is the man who believes in the power of matter unwilling to believe in God? . . . Why, when you are ill, do you not come to the more powerful Lord? Why do you rather seek to cure yourself by turning like a dog to herbs, or a stag to a viper, or a boar to fresh-water crabs, or a lion to apes? Why do you make a god of anything in the world? Why, when you have healed your neighbour, do you like to be called a benefactor? All is due to the power of the Logos. Follow that. Demons do not really heal men; rather by their craft they take them captive. Rightly did the most admirable Justin call them robbers. As reputed gods they attack the bodies of men, they convey by dreams the impression of their presence; and when their victims are brought forth in public they fly away from them and restore them to their former state."

"Learn from us, O ye Greeks," cries Tatian. "You do not understand these things, though you say that you despise death and are quite satisfied with yourselves. Your philosopher Crescens, the long-bearded Cynic, so notorious for his unnatural lust and love of money, who professed to despise death, was yet so afraid of death that he endeavoured to inflict it upon Justin and upon me, because that preacher of the truth had exposed the philosophers as gluttons and deceivers."

But perhaps you will say that men ought not to fear death. There we agree with you. Only don't seek death, like Anaxagoras, for the sake of fame among men. Despise death; yes, but through and on account of a true knowledge of God.

Now, what is divination, and why are you deceived by it? Divination simply ministers to your worldly lusts. For instance, if you want to make war, you call in Apollo as a counsellor of your slaughter. If you want to carry off a maiden, you select some deity to assist you. And you are deceived by divination. A woman drinks water, becomes frenzied, is intoxicated with the fumes of incense, and you call her a prophetess! You go to oaks and birds. Are you, then, inferior to animals and plants? Hadn't you better turn into some prophetic tree (*al.* divining rod) and grow the wings of birds! Ah, if you would be superior to your passions, despise everything in the world. "For we have attained to this," cries Tatian. "Don't despise us. Repudiate your demons. Follow God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made" (St. John i. 3).

So also (ch. xx.), if you are healed by drugs, ascribe the cure to God. The world drags us down, and through weakness we seek matter. The winged soul is the perfect spirit, and this was cast out by sin. Once there was a more perfect order of things than now. If we earnestly desire that former state we must put aside every impediment. Beyond the bounds of heaven are better worlds, with perpetual day and light unapproachable by man. Others have but conjectured descriptions of this happy land; but we have been taught by the Prophets, who, persuaded that the heavenly Spirit together with the soul shall be invested with mortality, have proclaimed things unknown to other men. This investiture is possible to all.

The thoughts of the better land and of God's revelation by the Prophets lead Tatian to another thought—God's revelation of Himself in the Incarnation. That doctrine he does not discuss, but he treats it in a manner likely to be admitted by a Greek, if very differently from the mode in which (e.g.) Justin Martyr presented such a subject to the Jews. We are not mad, he says (ch. xxi.), nor do we utter idle tales

when we say that God was made (γεγονέναι) in the form of man. The mythology of the Greeks was full of such appearances—an Athene taking the form of a Deiphobus, a Phoebus that of a herdsman, etc. etc. If the Greeks could take no higher ground, they should, at least, approve of Christians as holding myths like their own. In the next place, what did so frequent an expression as the origin of the gods imply but that they were mortal? The difficulty attendant upon the heathen belief was not removed by the tendency to resolve all myths and gods into allegory. Metrodorus of Lampsacus, in his treatise on Homer, invited men to believe that the Hera or Athene or Zeus, to whom they consecrated enclosures and groves, were simply natural beings or elemental arrangements. That, argues Tatian, was to surrender their divinity; and that surrender he freely endorses, for he will not admit any comparison between the Christian God and deities who "wallow in matter and mud."

From so grave a subject Tatian turns (ch. xxii.) to one which he lashes with ridicule—the teaching offered to and accepted by the Greeks, the teaching of the theatre and the arena. Who, he asks, would not ridicule solemn assemblies held in honour of wicked demons, and which cover men with shame? Look, first, at the actor, one thing to himself, another to the public; at times an Aphrodite or an Apollo, at times an accuser of the gods, or a slanderer of heroic deeds; sometimes raving, sometimes effeminate; the doer of murders and recorder of adulteries—that was the kind of man who was praised by all, and for whose sake they reviled all who took no part in such amusements (see also ch. xxiv.)! What a wonderful thing it was! They took their sons and daughters to see and learn shameful words, indecent gestures, and adulterous acts! Admirable places were their lecture-rooms, where vile deeds wrought under the cover of night were openly proclaimed, and the audience treated to ribald talk! Admirable, too, were their poets, liars who beguiled their listeners from what was right by their fictions! Then Tatian turns to the arena, brutal and brutalizing! Look at the athletes. Before them were laid rewards and crowns. What for? For manly virtues? Oh, no; but for good physical condition and greatest power of injury. The hardest striker was crowned! That was bad, but there was worse; men sold themselves to be killed, others were bought to kill. The men of position collected a troop of gladiators and sent them into the arena. They took their seats, and would actually grieve if anything made them miss the wholesale slaughter. Just as they slew animals to eat their flesh (κρεωφαγία), so they slaughtered men to nourish their souls with this human food (ἀνθρωποφαγία)! "I have heard," he comments, "of a thief committing murder for the sake of gain, but your rich man buys up gladiators for the sake of seeing them killed!"

It might be urged that such places were frequented and delighted in by the uncultured only. Tatian therefore places the philosophers in their turn at the bar of judgment, and his contempt for their teaching is only equalled by his ridicule of their appearance (ch. xxv.). Long-haired, bearded, men were they, with one shoulder uncovered, and with nails like wild beasts' claws, wanting special tradesmen for their various articles of dress, tuft-hunters, and gluttons, to whom philosophy was simply a means of getting money!

No two of them agreed. One followed the teaching of Plato, and a disciple of Epicurus opposed him. The pupil of Aristotle was reviled by the scholar of Democritus. Why, protests Tatian, do you who are so inharmonious fight with us Christians who are at least harmonious? "Your philosophers maintain that God has a body, I maintain that He is without a body; that the world shall be often consumed by fire, I once for all; that Minos and Rhadamanthus will be the judges of mankind, I God Himself (cp. ch. vi.); that the soul alone is immortal, I the body together with the soul." We, he continues, do but follow the Logos of God, why do you hate us? We are not eaters of human flesh; the charge is false. It is among you that Pelops the beloved of Poseidon is made a banquet for the gods, that Saturn devours his own children, and Zeus swallows Metis!

After all, the philosophers do but make a boast of language which they have taken from others (ch. xxvi.); they are like the jackdaw strutting about in his borrowed plumes. The reading of their books is like struggling through a labyrinth, and the readers must be like the pierced cask of the Danaids. Why should they affirm that wisdom was with them only? They were born in the same way as Christians, and were under the same Governor of the world. There was no special sun or stars for them, no special origin, no special death. The grammarians were at the bottom of all this folly; and philosophers who parcelled-out wisdom to this and that system-maker knew not God and did but destroy each other. "Therefore," Tatian concludes scornfully, "you are all nothing—blind men talking with deaf; handling builder's tools but not knowing how to build; preaching but not practising; swaggering about in public but hiding your teaching in corners. We have left you because this is your character. We can have nothing more to do with your instructions. We follow the word of God."

Tatian has done for the moment with the philosophers; and, once more addressing the Greeks (ch. xxvii.), he protests against the injustice of men who—claiming the liberty of adhering if they would to the teaching of such philosophers — refused a similar liberty of opinion to the Christians. Why were Christians who spoke against the gods to be denounced as "atheists" (ἀθεωτάτους), when teachers like Diagoras, Leo, Apion, had spoken quite as strongly? If he, Tatian, was bold enough to say that the assembly of many gods was nothing, he was more honest than Epicurus, who thought it but was afraid to say it. Why should he be false to his principles? Why should he trouble himself with utterly useless philosophical investigations?

Tatian rejected Greek philosophy and he rejected Greek legislation (ch. xxviii.) also. In it there were as many codes as there were cities in Greece, and what one nation counted dishonourable another approved.

Tatian then proceeds, in an interesting autobiographical passage (ch. xxix.), to explain how he had become a Christian. It was not through want of knowledge of what he was leaving.

There had been a time in his life when he had been initiated into the (Eleusinian) mysteries, and had made trial of every kind of religious worship. The result had sickened him. Among the Romans he had found the Latiarian Jupiter delighting in human gore, Diana Aricina worshipped in the same way, and this or that demon systematically urging on to what was evil. He withdrew to seek by some means to discover the truth. "As," he says, "I was earnestly considering this I came across certain barbarian writings, older in point of antiquity than the doctrines of the Greeks, and far too Divine to be marked by their errors. What persuaded me in these books was the simplicity of the language, the inartificial style of the writers, the noble explanation of creation, the predictions of the future, the excellence of the precepts, and the assertion of the government of all by One Being (τῶν ὅλων τὸ μοναρχικόν). My soul being thus taught of God I understand how the writings of the Gentiles lead to condemnation, but the Sacred Scriptures to freedom from this world's slavery, liberating us from thousands of tyrants, and giving us, not indeed what we had not received, but, what we had once received but had lost through error."

Tatian, no sooner taught better things, had put away his previous errors as the follies of childhood. He did more. With all the energy of a convert, he loudly proclaimed the truth which satisfied him. He goes on to show in the second great division of the *Oratio* (chs. xxxi.–xli.) the antiquity of the Christian religion—a "philosophy" far more ancient than that of the Greeks. For this purpose, he compares Homer and Moses, "the one the oldest of poets and historians, the other the founder of our barbarian wisdom." The comparison will prove the tenets of the Christians not only older than those of the Greeks, but older also than the invention of letters. After enumerating the numerous and various opinions as to the date, parentage, and poetry of Homer, he remarks upon such discordant testimony as proving the history untrue, and as being so different from the unanimity of opinion common among Christians. "We reject everything," he says, "which rests upon human opinion; we obey the commandments of God and follow the law of the Father of immortality. The rich among us follow philosophy, and our poor are taught gratuitously. We receive all who wish to be taught, aged women and striplings: every age is respected by us. . . . We do not test them by their looks, nor judge them by their outward appearance. In body they may be weak, but in mind they are strong. . . . What we do keep at a distance is licentiousness and falsehood." His mention of the women who received Christian instruction leads him to a digression in defence of them. The Gentiles scoffed, he says, at them, and alleged that the Christians talked nonsense among them. Tatian retorts (chs. xxxiii., xxxiv.) by pointing to the disgrace the Greeks cast upon themselves, not only for their unbecoming conduct to women generally, but by the statues they erected to courtesans and wanton poetesses. "All our women," bursts forth Tatian, "are chaste; and our maidens at their distaffs sing nobler songs about God than a Sappho." The Greeks should repudiate the lesson of immorality which their statues had immortalised and the foul practices inculcated by indecent writers, and turn to that Christianity which enjoined truth and purity of thought and life. "I do not," says Tatian (ch. xxxv.), "speak of these things as having merely heard about them. I have travelled much; I have studied your philosophy (*al.* rhetoric, cp. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 16, and Otto's note here); and your arts and inventions. At Rome I saw the multitude of statues you have collected there. And—as the result—I have turned from Roman boastfulness, Athenian exaggeration, ill-connected doctrines, to the barbaric Christian philosophy."

Tatian now returns to the subject started in ch. xxxi., after one word in deprecation of the sneer at himself: "Tatian, the man so superior to the Greeks, so superior to the numberless teachers of philosophy, has opened up a new vein of learning—the doctrines of the barbarians!" On the supposition that Homer was contemporary with the Trojan war, or was a soldier under Agamemnon, or even lived before the invention of letters, Moses yet lived at a time long before either the building or taking of Troy. In proof of this, Tatian appeals to the Chaldeans, the Phoenicians, and Egyptians. For example, Berosus, the Babylonian historian, "a most competent authority," spoke of the wars of Nebuchadnezzar against the Phoenicians and Jews which happened seventy years before the Persian rule, and long after the age of Moses. Phoenician historians, such as Theodotus, Hypsicrates, and Mochus had referred to events connected with Hiram of Tyre, whose date was to be placed somewhere about the Trojan war. Both Solomon and Hiram lived long after the age of Moses. The Egyptians, lastly, were noted for the accuracy of their chronicles. Ptolemy, the priest of Mendes, spoke of the departure of the Jews from Egypt as having taken place under the leadership of Moses under king Amosis. This king, according to him, lived in the time of the Argive king, Inachus, after whose reign, dating twenty generations, the taking of Troy was reached. Therefore, if Moses was a contemporary of Inachus, he lived some 400 years before the Trojan war. Again, it was not till after the time of king Inachus that the most illustrious deeds of gods and men in Greece were committed to writing and became known. Such records, therefore, were far less ancient than the time of Moses. Tatian, after developing these and similar points, sums up (ch. xl.) by affirming it self-evident that Moses was a person of far greater antiquity than the ancient heroes, wars, or gods (demons). Men ought, therefore, to believe the more ancient authority in preference to the Greeks, who had borrowed from Moses, as from a spring, without acknowledgment (*al.* unconsciously); and in many cases had perverted what they took. Further, Moses was not only older than Homer but older than all the writers who were before him, e.g. than Linus, the teacher of Hercules, who lived in the generation before the Trojan war, and Orpheus, who was a contemporary with Hercules. Older, too, was Moses than the wisest of the wise men of Greece, e.g. than Minos—so famous for his wisdom, shrewdness, and legislative powers—who lived in the eleventh generation after Inachus; than Lycurgus, the Lacedaemonian law-giver, who

was born long after the taking of Troy; than Draco, Solon, Pythagoras, and those seven wise men, the oldest of whom lived about the 50th of those Olympiads which began about 400 years after the taking of Troy. "These things," Tatian concludes by saying (ch. xli.), "I have put together for your information, O Greeks. Knowing as I do Who God is, and what is His work, I am ready to examine with you these my doctrines; my manner of life being that of one who will never deny God."

One general impression left upon the mind by this Treatise, is that, if it be an 'Apology' at all, it is a defence of Christianity rather than of Christians; and that, in the next place, it is not so much a defence of doctrines as an answer or oration to the laughers and scoffers who sneered at them. Tatian cares comparatively little to discover analogies between Christianity of the religion of Greece and Rome. Rather he depicts Christianity as contrasting by its goodness, wisdom, and truth, with the heathenism which revelled in vice, foolishness, and error. Unlike other Apologists, there is little care to discuss Thyestean banquets (cp. ch. xxv.), or refute want of patriotism (ch. iv.). He strikes rather than appeals; and his weapons are weapons of offence rather than of defence. In Tatian "barbaric (i.e. Christian) philosophy" dares to carry the war into the enemy's camp, and scorn is turned upon the scorners. It is a typical specimen of the class to which the *Irrisio Gentilium Philosophorum* of Hermias (see *s. n.*) also belongs.

ii. The *opinions* of Tatian may be gathered from its pages: in *doctrine* it is directly and indirectly opposed to philosophic systems he had examined and rejected. "Dogma" with him (ch. 1), as with Justin before him, is not applied solely to the practical rules of Christian life; it is a word taken from the vocabulary of the Greek philosopher and raised to describe Christian teaching. To "theologize" (and therefore "theology") is also with him (ch. x; cp. Justin M. *Dial. c. Tryph.* ch. cxiii) a term in the process of being rescued from its lower and heathen significance. The term *φιλοσοφία* is never again to be an exclusive possession of his opponents. It is even more than *παιδεία, πολιτεία*, and *νομοθεσία* (ch. xii.), to be *the* designation of Christianity.

(*a*) *God* (see ch. iv.)—Tatian proclaims Monotheism, rather than Henotheism, as the antidote to Polytheism, and *μοναρχία* as the foil to *πολυκοιρανίη* (cp. Just. *Daemon.* i.; Homer, *Il.* ii. 204). He presents God to men both in His positive and negative attributes. God is before Creation "alone" (*μόνος*), "perfect," "without bdoy," and "without flesh;" God is Spirit. Anticipating Origen's conclusions, the incorporeity of God is a proof of immateriality and an evidence of superiority to the limits of time (ch. iv). He, with Whom alone is goodness (ch. vii.; cp. St. Mark x. 18), invisible though He be to human eyes and incapable of reproduction by human art, may yet be known from His Creation and apprehended by His works. With Tatian, as with Justin, God, not contemplated as He is in His nature but as revealed in His works, is the starting-point of all Christian philosophy. Tatian's doctrine about the Creation is set forth in ch. v. In the Creation itself he recognises two stages (ch. ii.); (*α*) matter, shapeless and unformed is put forth (*προβεβλημένη*) by God; and (*β*) the world, separated from this matter, is fashioned into what is full of beauty and order, though eventually to be dissolved by fire (ch. xxv.). In the work of Creation the alone God is not alone: *ὁ δεσπότης τῶν ὅλων, αὐτος ὑπάρχων τοῦ παντὸς ἡ ὑπόστασις, κατὰ μὲν τὴν μηδέπω γεγενημένην ποίησιν, μόνος ἦν· καθὸ δὲ πᾶσα δύναμις, ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων αὐτος ὑπόστασις ἦν, σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα· σὺν αὐτῷ διὰ λογικῆς δυνάμεως αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ λόγος, ὃς ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ, ὑπέστησε.*

(*b*) *The Logos* (see ch. v.).—The relation between God (*ὁ δεσπότης*) and the Logos Who subsists in Him, *the* Hypostasis, is conceived from a different point of view, and set forth in different terms from those of Justin. With the latter the Logos begotten before all things (*γέννημα ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγεγέννητο*) is the Son, a Divine Being to be worshipped after the Father. He is, as it were, projected by the Father's will (*ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς προβληθὲν γέννημα*. Cp. the application above by Tatian of *προβεβλημένη* to matter). With Tatian the Logos springs forth (*προπηδᾷ*) by the Will of God. The process of begetting, the relationships of Father and Son, and the worship due to the Son, are not brought forward The inward communion between them which carries with it these truths is indeed expressed by the deep phrase *σὺν αὐτῷ διὰ λογικῆς δυνάμεως αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ λόγος*; but the outward exhibition of this communion—the 'springing forth'—is suggestive of emanation rather than of begetting. The distinction between the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and the *λόγος προφορικὸς*, so strongly expressed by the Apologist Theophilus (ii. 10), is more than visible. Tatian would, in fact, present the Logos as the personification of an abstraction. He may have preferred such a presentment, because if less prominent than the Sonship in the teaching of Justin, it was that specially required by the philosophers he himself had encountered. Hence, after his statements that "God was in the beginning," not so much in the sense of the beginning (*ἀρχὴ*) of time or creation, but as Himself the beginning of all things, the governing principle of all things (cp. also Theophilus i. 3; Tertullian, *Adv. Hermogenem* ch. xix.), Tatian takes this "beginning" or "governing principle" to be the *λογοῦ δύναμις* (or the *λογικὴ δύναμις*). The personality, dropped for a moment to permit the statement that, as an abstraction, the Logos springing forth is not the Only-begotten Son, but the first-born work (*ἔργον πρωτότοκον*; cp. Col. i. 15) of the Father, is resumed in the next sentence: "Him (not it) we know to be *τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἀρχήν*." This governing principle *γέγονε κατὰ μερισμόν οὐ κατὰ ἀποκοπὴν* (Justin, *ἀποτομὴν*, *Dial.* c. lxi.); and the illustration of the many fires lighted from one torch without diminution of the light of the torch, like that already employed by Justin (*Dialog.* ch. lxi.), enforces this distinction without imperilling the unity of nature. In the *οἰκονομία* it is the *αἵρεσις* of the Logos to create the world from the matter He Himself has formed (*αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τὴν ὕλην δημιουργήσας*): "The Logos begotten in the beginning begot in His turn our creation;" and His ministerial activity for the Father is by Tatian dwelt upon as His act as the Logos rather than as the Son (Justin). That activity is described in ch. vii. As Spirit of Spirit (*πνεῦμα γεγονὼς*

ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς), Logos of Logos (ἐκ τῆς λογικῆς δυνάμεως), the heavenly Logos imitated the Father Who begat Him, and made man the image of immortality (cp. Wisdom ii. 23); in order that man, receiving the Spirit of God (θεοῦ μοῖραν; see Otto's note), should have immortality. The Logos was also the Demiurgos of Angels, giving to both Angels and men free-will.

As regards free-will, Tatian is even more emphatic in his language than Justin (e.g. *Apol.* i. 43). He opposes the Scriptural (and Platonic) belief in free-will to the fatalism of philosophers (chs. viii.–x.), and while he pours scorn upon their views he can also pen a touching appeal to them as men "not created to die" (see ch. xi. end). The Logos foreknew and foretold that the free-will of Angels and men (τὸ ἑκάτερον τῆς ποιήσεως εἶδος αὐτεξούσιον γέγονε) might lead not to good but to evil; and Tatian tells the story of the fall with one detail perhaps peculiar to himself. The Tempter is more subtle than the rest (of the Angels) because he was τὸ πρωτόγονον (cp. the ancient explanation of Job xl. 19) and θεὸς (not ὁ θεὸς). He revolted against the law of God (ὁ θεὸς), and the first human beings fell in with and followed him in that revolt. Punishment fell upon both. The 'Power of the Logos' repudiated both the beginner of this folly and his adherents. Man, separated from the Spirit of God (cp. ch. xiii.), became mortal; the πρωτόγονος became a demon, and they who—in the exercise of their own freedom of choice—had imitated him, became an army of demons.

The "Power of the Logos" possessed in itself the faculty of prognosticating the future. He foretold what would happen not as a matter of fate, but as the result of deliberate free-will. And by His prohibitions He forbad wickedness, and was the panegyrist of all who should continue to be good.

(*c*) *The Holy Spirit* is evidently with Tatian a distinct personal Being. He does not, as Justin (*Apol.* i. 60), speak directly of His share in the creation; he rather leads up to His work and office as "the Minister of the suffering God" (ch. xiii.), when he would present its bearing upon the nature of man. Starting from the initial positions already mentioned, "God is Spirit," and the Logos "a Spirit born of the Father," Tatian further recognises two varieties of spirit; (α) "the spirit which pervades matter, inferior to (β) the more Divine Spirit" (ch. iv.). In ch. xii. he returns to this conception;—the inferior spirit is called the soul, the other greater than the soul ("the more powerful Spirit," ch. vii.), an image and likeness of God: both spirits existed in the first men, who were consequently both material (ὑλικοί) and superior to matter (ἀνώτεροι τῆς ὕλης). The demons are actuated by the spirit which is of matter (ἀπ' ὕλης). Spirits are everywhere. There is a spirit in the stars, a spirit in the Angels, a spirit in plants and waters, a spirit in men, a spirit in animals; yet is the spirit thus pervading matter but one and the same. In connexion with man, it is the office of the Spirit to preserve the soul (ch. xiii.). In the beginning the Spirit (the μοῖρα θεοῦ, ch. vii.) was a constant companion of the soul; but the Spirit forsook it because it was not willing to obey it (cp. also ch. vii.), desiring things inferior (ch. xx.). Recovery is, however, possible. Man must seek again what has been lost, unite (ζευγνῦναι) the soul to the Holy Spirit, and secure union (συζυγίαν) with God (ch. xv.). If the soul enter into union with the Divine Spirit, it is no longer helpless, but ascends to the regions to which the Spirit leads it. Souls that are obedient to wisdom attract to themselves the cognate Spirit. The Spirit of God takes up His abode with those who live justly; and God Himself is pleased to dwell in man's soul, as a temple, by His ambassador, the Spirit (τοῦ πρεσβεύοντος πνεύματος). Only to those in whom the Spirit dwells, and who are strengthened by Him, are the bodies of their antagonists, the demons, visible (ch. xv.). Armed with the breastplate of the Spirit a man can keep in safety all that He encompasses (ch. xvi.).

To the Spirit is attributed prophetic powers. Abiding with the just and locked in the embrace of the soul (συμπλεκόμενον τῇ ψυχῇ), He proclaims to other souls by means of prophecies that which is concealed. He uses the Prophets as His organ (cp. ch. xx.). This action Tatian has also attributed to "the Power of the Logos" (ch. vii.). Perhaps, as with Justin (cp. *s. n.* i. p. 578, col. 2), this title of the Logos, ἡ δύναμις, defines for Tatian the meaning of the πνεῦμα (cp. 2 Cor. iii. 17). The Spirit is the Divine Power of the Logos.

(*d*) *Angelology and Demonology.*—Of good Angels Tatian says nothing; but he speaks as strongly as Justin (cp. *s. n.* i. p. 579 col. 1) of evil angels, though he presents their work and ways in different language and (in some respects) from a different point of view. When expelled from heaven the fallen angels or demons lived with animals. Some of these they placed—the Dog, the Bear, the Scorpion, etc.—in the heavens as objects of worship. Through such astrology they taught fatalism; and, by the assumption of the names of gods (e.g. Zeus is represented as their leader, ch. viii.) they became "robbers of Deity," and secured for themselves worship, however contradictory to each other they were often proved to be. Further, by their foul examples they pandered to and encouraged the passions of men. Of demons, Tatian records the existence of two classes. Receiving alike their constitution from matter, and possessing the spirit which comes from it, few only turned to what was purer, the many chose what was licentious and gluttonous (ch. xii.); they became the very "effulgences of matter and wickedness" (ch. xv.). Though material, none of the demons possess flesh; their structure is spiritual like that of fire or air (do.). Visible and invisible are they: visible in their real nature only to those guarded by the Spirit of God; invisible to those who possess the soul only, and not the Divine Spirit. If to these last they are sometimes alleged to be visible, the appearances are unreal, intended to deceive "souls that are left alone." On man they work by magic and pretence of cures, by false appearances, and through their ignorance; "robbers" are they in this respect also (see chs. xvii., xviii.). Tatian accounts for their continuance as permitted by God to try the constancy of the good (ch. xii.); but their end will come. They cannot repent, being utterly abandoned by the Divine Spirit; and if for the present they do not die like men,

that very distinction will increase the severity of their punishment in their final state: "they will not partake of everlasting life" (ch. xiv.).

(e) *Man.*—In man himself Tatian recognises the three parts of body, soul, and spirit. At the fall man lost the Spirit or highest nature, which had in it immortality (ch. vii.). As the angels were cast down from heaven, so man was driven forth from earth, "yet not out of this earth, but from a more excellent order of things than exists here now." Tatian would seem to place Paradise above our earth; he describes it (ch. xx.) as one of the better aeons unaffected by that change of seasons which is productive of various diseases, as partaking of a perfect temperature, as possessing endless day and light, and as unapproachable by mortals such as we are.

Man, though deprived of the Spirit, must aim at recovering his former state. Body and soul are left to him. The soul is composite: it is the bond of the flesh; yet also that which encloses the soul is the flesh. The soul cannot appear without a body, nor can the flesh rise again without the soul. Man is not therefore, as the Stoics (*οἱ κορακόφωνοι*) affirmed, a *ζῶον λογικὸν, νοῦ καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικὸν*, but *εἰκὼν καὶ ὁμοίωσις τοῦ θεοῦ*; yet this only in so far as he has the Divine Spirit, and has advanced beyond mere humanism to God Himself. Otherwise he only acts like other animals, and differs from them simply in the possession of articulate speech. Matter is, moreover, continually striving to get the mastery over the soul; and demons give laws of death to men (ch. xv.).

In this world is man's probation carried on. God made it "for our sake" (ch. iv.): "the constitution of the world is good; but the mode of life in it is bad" (ch. xix.). The world draws men down, and through weakness they incline to matter (ch. xx.); yet it rests with men, through the power of their free-will, to choose the good and reject the evil. "We were not born to die, but we die through our own fault. Our free-will has destroyed us. We who were free have become slaves; we have been sold through sin (cp. Rom. vii. 15)." Nothing evil has been made by God: it is we who have wrought wickedness (ch. xv.). Even if there be anything harmful in the vegetable creation, that has come about through our sinfulness (ch. xix.). And then Tatian adds, "We who have wrought sin, have it in our power to reject it again" (ch. xi.); "every one who has been conquered, can conquer again if he reject that which constitutes (*τὴν σύστασιν*) death" (ch. xv.). This affirmation of man's power to gain again what he had lost; or the injunction to put aside everything that proves a hindrance (ch. xx.), does not preclude the exercise of faith. Tatian does not dwell upon faith to any extent; but a great deal both of his reasoning and of his practical advice is based upon the supposition of the acceptance of this virtue. The existence of faith underlies all his conception of God; it forms the base of his precept to strive after union with the Holy Spirit.

Faith is a necessity for knowledge of divine things; *ὁ πιστεύων ἐπιγνώσεται* (ch. xix.); and faith and knowledge together help towards the wished-for victory over sin and death. Men, after the throwing away (*ἀποβολὴν*) of immortality, have conquered death by the death which is through faith (cp. ch. xi. "Die to the world! Live to God!"); and through repentance a call has been granted to those who (according to God's word) are but a little lower than the Angels (ch. xv.). Through faith, and as the object of faith, Tatian proclaims that "God was born in the form of a man" (ch. xxi.), and speaks of the Holy Spirit as the minister of the God Who hath suffered (*τὸν διάκονον τοῦ πεπονθότος θεοῦ*, ch. xiii.). If he never mentions the names Jesus or Christ, it is because the facts of the Incarnation and Passion would commend themselves independently of names to Gentiles, to whom such facts were illustrated by their mythology (cp. Justin, *Apol.* i. 21). Faith animates the famous passage on the soul (ch. xiii.), and especially in connexion with the resurrection. "We have faith in this doctrine," he exclaims (ch. v.); let men regard if they will believers in it as triflers and babblers; but he does not rest his reasons on the resurrection of Christ (as St. Paul), but on an argument which may have suggested the more elaborate reasoning of Tertullian (*Apol.* ch. xlviii.): There was a time when as man he was not; after a former state of nothingness he was born. Again, there would be a time when he would die; and again there would be a time when he should exist again. There was nothing of metempsychosis or transmigration of souls in his conception. Though the flesh were destroyed by fire or wild beasts, or dispersed through rivers or seas, "I," says Tatian, "am laid up in the storehouses of a wealthy Lord. God the King will, when He pleases, restore to its former state that my substance which is visible to Himself alone" (ch. vi.).

Christian practice.—Though Tatian does not speak of his co-religionists as Christians, but accepts willingly the contemptuous expression—"barbarians," it is the doctrines of Christ which alone have, in his opinion, raised them above a world deluded by the trickeries of frenzied demons (ch. xii.), and wallowing in matter and mud (ch. xxi.). Where the old nature has been laid aside, men have not only apprehended God (ch. xi.), but through a knowledge of the True One have remodelled (*μεταῤῥυθμίζειν*) their lives (ch. v.). Tatian says nothing of the helps to Christian practice which Holy Baptism and membership in the Church conferred. They did not enter into his argument. A passing allusion to the Holy Eucharist perhaps underlies his indignant protest against the too frequent defamation, that Christians indulged in Thyestean banquets (ch. xxv.). He seems to prefer advancing the great help which the Scriptures had been to himself, and might be to his philosophical opponents. "Barbaric" though these Scriptures were, they were in the Old Testament portion both older and more divine, more full of humility and of deep knowledge, more marked by excellence and unity than any writings claimed by the Greeks (ch. xxix.). These "divine writings" made men "lovers of God" (ch. xii.); and men thus God-taught were helped by them to break down the slavery in the world, and gain back what they had once received, but had lost through the deceit of their spiritual foes (ch. xxix.).

The Old Testament seems to have had a great attraction to Tatian. It probably formed the

basis of the lost work προβλημάτων βιβλίον mentioned by Rhodon; and, in his attempt to collect and solve the difficulties of the Old Testament Scriptures, Tatian would be among the first, if not the first, of Christian commentators. The *Oratio* also shews that he knew well the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of St. Paul. Illustrations of this will have been noticed in the abstract already given. If reference to the Old and New Testaments is more marked in the *Oratio* by allusion than by direct quotation, the cause is to be found in the well-known fact that the Apologists, as a rule, abstain from such quotations when writing to Gentiles who had little or no acquaintance with Books counted sacred by the Christians, and would have attributed but little authority to them. In Tatian's case, however, the references to St. John's Gospel are both exceptional and indisputable; and, in their way, they testify to a wide-spread knowledge of that Gospel at the period in question. Independently of coincidences of exposition, three passages may be specified:—

TATIAN.	ST. JOHN.
Ch. iv. πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός.	Ch. iv. 24. πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός.
Ch. xiii. ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐ καταλαμβάνει.	Ch. i. 5. τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.
Ch. xix. πάντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν οὐδὲ ἕν.	Ch. i. 3. πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν. (*Westcott & Hort.*)

Of these passages the second is prefaced by τὸ εἰρημένον; and this is the expression which in the New Testament introduces the Scriptures (cp. St. Luke ii. 24; Acts ii. 16, xiii. 40; Rom. iv. 18). The change made by Tatian is described by Bishop Lightfoot as that which a writer would make who divested the saying of its context, and presented it in its briefest form. The third passage is punctuated by Tatian in the manner invariably followed by the early Christian writers (contrast the *textus receptus*, οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν). The coincidence is, as noted by Bishop Lightfoot, remarkable; because the words are extremely simple in themselves. It is their order and adaptation which gives a character of uniqueness to the expression.

Lastly, Tatian teaches that in the face of a world of temptation, sin, and danger, the Christian, however helped by Christian doctrine and practice, must expect to make but gradual progress. The constitution (σύστασις) of wickedness is like that of the smallest seeds, waxing great through but slight causes. It can only be destroyed through obedience to God's words and united action. God gains possession of us by means of a hidden treasure. As we dig for it we get covered with dust; but the treasure once acquired, we are the possessors of the most valuable wealth (ch. xxx., cp. St. Matt. xiii. 44). This will often involve separation from the world, its employments (ch. xi.), its passions (ch. xix.), its amusements (ch. xxii.), and even the rejection of earthly teaching and human opinion; but it binds all classes together in a way impossible under Gentile views and habits. Among Christians, there is a place for the poor as well as the rich, for the slave as well as his master, for woman as well as man, for youth as well as old age. Christian virgins are chaste, and at their distaffs sing divine songs; and what is true of one class is true of all: "When we speak we do not lie" (chs. xxxii., xxxiii.).

The blessedness of those who obey will be manifested, if not now, at least in the day of the resurrection after the consummation of all things. The Creator, God Himself, will be the Judge. The wicked and such as Democritus will be "fuel for eternal fire;" and they who, in their mocking superiority of wisdom, laugh at the holy things of God, will receive the same punishment as jugglers and necromancers (ch. xvii.).

B. *The Diatessaron.*

I. *History.*—The history of the recovery of this work is sufficiently romantic. In the literature of the Western Church there is no serviceable testimony to it till the middle of the sixth century; in the Eastern Church, Eusebius, the historian († A.D. 339–40), is the only Greek writer of the first four centuries who gives any information about it. It was, apparently (see *Codex Fuldensis*, ed. Ranke, 1868, pp. ix. 1), mere chance which put into the hands of bishop Victor of Capua (†A.D. 554) a Latin book of the Gospels without title or author's name, but evidently compiled from the four Canonical books. This unknown work excited his interest; and, searching in vain the Latin Christian literature of the past, he turned to the Greek, and found in Eusebius two notices of Harmonies. (*a*) In the Letter to Carpianus the harmony of Ammonius of Alexandria (3rd century) was described. Its principle was that of comparison. The Gospel of St. Matthew was followed continuously, and the passages—and only those—from the other Gospels which tallied with the text of St. Matthew were referred to or inserted in the margin or in parallel columns (τῷ κατὰ Ματθαῖον τὰς ὁμοφώνους τῶν λοιπῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν περικοπὰς παραθείς). This of necessity excluded the greater part of the Gospel according to St. John and much of that according to St. Luke. The Harmony was a work for private use and not for the public service of the Church. Whether or not the descriptive title given to it in Eusebius—τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον—was that of the church historian or of Ammonius remains undetermined. The probability is that Ammonius borrowed it from Tatian's work, even if he did not follow—and possibly had never seen—the sister-Diatessaron (cp. for the extract from Eusebius, Tischendorf's N.T. ed. crit. vii. Proleg. p. lxxiv.; and for the subject generally, Zahn, i. pp. 31–4). (*b*) In his Church history (iv. 29, 6) Eusebius—to quote only the words which bear upon this subject—refers to Tatian as having composed "a sort of connexion or compilation, I know not how, of the Gospels, and called it the Diatessaron" (συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τῶν εὐαγγελίων συνθείς. Cp. Bishop Lightfoot in the *Contemporary* for May 1877; Zahn, i. pp. 14, 15); and he adds that this work was current in his day. Its principle was amalgamation, not comparison. Victor came to the conclusion that his unknown work was sur-

stantially the Diatessaron of Tatian. This acute verdict—if to be purged of some unimportant errors (see Lightfoot *l.c.*; Zahn i. pp. 2, 3)—has survived the difficulties which a comparison of the *Codex Fuldensis* with the Diatessaron had at first presented, and has assisted in the recovery or rectification of Tatian's work.

A notice in the Treatise on Heresies, written in A.D. 453 by Theodoret († A.D. 457–8), bishop of Cyrus or Cyrrhus on the Euphrates, is the first definite evidence to the Diatessaron after the time of Eusebius. The identification of it by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xlvi. 1) with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, is an earlier testimony in point of date (Epiphanius † A.D. 403) but it is connected with a blunder, which, though capable of explanation (see below), somewhat disqualifies the evidence. Testimony to the Diatessaron comes rather from the Syriac-speaking Church of the East, than from the Greek. Theodoret says of Tatian: "He composed the Gospel which is called Diatessaron, cutting out the genealogies and such other passages as show the Lord to have been born of the seed of David after the flesh. This work was in use not only among persons belonging to his sect, but also among those who follow the apostolic doctrine, as they did not perceive the mischief of the composition, but used the book in all simplicity on account of its brevity. And I myself found more than two hundred such copies held in respect in the churches in our parts. All these I collected and put away, and I replaced them by the Gospels of the four Evangelists" (i. 20. Cp. Lightfoot, *l. c.*; Zahn, i. p. 35). Apart from other questions, this passage indicates a considerable circulation of the Diatessaron in the bishop's diocese and neighbourhood. The language of that diocese and of those parts was not Greek but Syriac (Zahn, i. pp. 39–44); therefore the book to which Theodoret refers was in Syriac and not in Greek. This simple fact helps to explain the language of Eusebius and the blunder of Epiphanius; and is itself illustrated by the fact, that the commentary on the Diatessaron was composed not by a Greek writer but by Ephraem the Syrian. Epiphanius' statement that Tatian, on leaving Rome, went into Mesopotamia, points to a visit to Edessa, the only place in the district where Christianity had secure footing (see Zahn, i. p. 282, and Excursus ii.) and a city famous for its schools. It was the same Tatian to whom rumour assigned the Diatessaron which some called "the Gospel according to the Hebrews." How did Epiphanius confound two works so essentially different? Zahn's explanation seems perfectly satisfactory. The report was current that there was a Syriac book of the Gospels, called a Diatessaron, used in the Syrian churches, in—for example—those of the diocese of Cyrrhus. Further, it was reported that there was another book of the Gospels, written in a kindred dialect and used *e. g.* at Beroea, *i. e.* in the neighbourhood of Cyrrhus, by the half-heretical Nazareans. An outsider like Epiphanius might very easily confound them and even identify them (i. p. 25. See Wace, *Expositor* for 1882, p. 165). Eusebius, in his turn, had not actually seen Tatian's Diatessaron. His language, "I know not how" Tatian composed it, is not so much an intimation of entire ignorance or disparagement of the work, as of disqualification to pronounce upon what he had not personally examined; and this disqualification was due to the fact, that non-acquaintance or non-familiarity with Syriac had excluded him, as well as the Greek-speaking churches of Asia and the churches of Rome and Alexandria, from close acquaintance with a Syriac work.

The value of Theodoret's testimony does not end here. His language implies that the Diatessaron had been current in his diocese for a very long period; and this is confirmed by an examination of the commentary of Ephraem Syrus (†A.D. 378). Dionysius bar Salibi, bishop of Amida in Armenia Major (†A.D. 1171 Mösinger and Bickell, or A.D. 1207 Asseman and Lightfoot, see Zahn, i. p. 98, n. 4) makes a statement in the preface to his own commentary on St. Mark (quoted in Asseman's Bibl. Or. i. 57; ii. 159; see Mösinger, p. iii.; Zahn, i. pp. 44, 99) to the effect that Tatian, the pupil of Justin, philosopher and martyr, made a selection from the four Gospels (*al.* Evangelists), which he wove together and made into one gospel, and called it a Diatessaron *i. e.* Miscellanies. This writing St. Ephraem interpreted. Its opening words were, "In the beginning was the word." An Armenian version (5th century) of Ephraem's Commentary was printed at Venice in 1836, but remained unserviceable until a MS. Latin and literal translation of the Armenian made by J. B. Aucher, one of the Mechitarist monks of that city, together with one of the Armenian codices, was placed in the hands of a Salzburg professor, Dr. G. Mösinger, who revised, corrected and published the Latin text at Venice in 1876.

Internal and external evidence (see it collected in Mösinger, pp. vi.-x.) combine in justifying the conclusion, that in this Latin translation of the Commentary of Ephraem is contained substantially Tatian's Diatessaron, and that from it Tatian's text may be in a great measure recovered.

Before passing to consider the character of the Commentary, the bearing of Mösinger's translation upon the corresponding portion of the *Codex Fuldensis* may be briefly summarized. Dr. Wace (*Expositor* for 1881, pp. 128 sq.) may be said to have proved that Victor of Capua's Harmony preserved in that Codex is not only a document very closely allied with Tatian's Diatessaron, but that it exhibits substantially the document on which Ephraem commented with some occasional alterations of order and some few additions; the difference being remembered that in Victor's *Evangelium* Tatian has been transferred into the Latin text of St. Jerome, whereas Ephraem commented upon him in a Syriac translation. By a process of comparison it is shown that the Mösinger text and the Codex proceed *pari passu*, and that they agree together in their order where that order is certainly remarkable. The very interesting fact is thus established, that Tatian's Diatessaron found acceptance in the West as well as in the East, and was transferred rather than translated into a Western Version. This is not surprising. Theodoret's statement as to its popularity in his diocese, in his time, may well account for its existence in a Latin form a hundred years later.

Ephraem's Commentary, composed at Edessa and conjecturally dated in the last ten years of his life, was originally delivered as a series of discourses or homilies; in this respect differing in a marked manner from his commentaries on the Old Testament (*e. g.* on Genesis and Exodus). In tone it occupies a middle position between the special characteristics of the schools of Alexandria and Antioch respectively; and it may very well have formed the nucleus of theological lectures to the students who sought the Master at Edessa (cp. Zahn, pp. 51–5; and Article EPHRAIM in this Dictionary). In the Commentary itself Ephraem never specifies any Evangelist by name, and frequently refers to a text of the Gospels other than that on which he is commenting. The Diatessaron he styles *Scriptura*, but occasionally *evangelium*; and in correcting the readings of the Diatessaron he uses occasionally a *lectio* which corresponds with the Peshito, and quotes a certain *Graecus*. Ephraem—if unequal to speaking Greek—probably understood it sufficiently to use a Greek text for critical purposes, but there is much probability in the supposition (Zahn, i. pp. 60–63) that Ephraem alludes under the title *Graecus* to an independent Syriac translation of the Gospels from the Greek text more faithful to the Greek original than the Diatessaron and the older Syriac of Cureton; and that this was the Peshito version perhaps quoted under the name Jaunâjâ. In brief, Ephraem's Commentary exhibits the Church of Edessa about the period between A.D. 364–373 as in a state of transition as regards the Gospels of the New Testament. Side by side with the Harmony (= *Scriptura*), which was used in the Churches, and which Ephraem expounded exegetically, was the Peshito version of the Gospels: this was in use among men of his own education partly on account of the acceptance of this Version in other Churches, and partly on account of a deficient acquaintance with the Gospels in Greek. Gradually the Peshito—more complete, more correct, and more in agreement with the form of the *Evangelium* used by the Greek-speaking portion of the great Church Catholic—dispossessed the Diatessaron; and Theodoret's action was one step in the process.

The homilies of Aphraates, the Persian sage, bishop and abbat of the convent of St. Matthew, near Mosul, written between A.D. 336–345, carry the evidence for the Church-use of the Diatessaron twenty-five years farther back. Lipsius and Zahn are agreed that the quotations in the *Homilies* (ed. W. Wright, 1869. Cp. Sasse, *Proleg.* in A. serm. homil. 1879) from the Gospels are made from the Harmony on which Ephraem commented. Coincidences in individual readings, and corresponding combinations of the elements of the individual Gospels place this fact beyond a doubt (see the proof in Zahn, i. pp. 72–89). Hence the only *Evangelium* which was used in the churches of the Syrian Christians in the neighbourhood of Nineveh about A.D. 330–50, was the Syrian Harmony of the Gospels upon which Ephraem afterwards commented.

Testimony to the Diatessaron is however forthcoming from a document which would tend to show that at least 100 years before the time of Aphraates a Harmony of the Gospels, and not the Gospels themselves, was in use in the Syriac churches of Edessa and its neighbourhood. The 'doctrine of Addai the apostle' (cp. *Ancient Syriac documents relative to the earliest establishment of Christianity in Edessa*, ed. W. Cureton; praef. W. Wright, 1864; *The doctrine of Addai*, Syr. and Engl. ed. G. Phillips, 1876) speaks of an *Evangelium* read day by day before the people and called a Ditouron (= Diatessaron, the reading of a St. Petersb. MS.). That this book in use in the third century was the same book which in A.D. 340 took the place of the canonical Gospels in the more eastward Churches of Syria, and was afterwards commented upon by Ephraem, may be assumed (Zahn, i. pp. 90–96). Supplementary evidence, tending to the same conclusion and independent of that of Ephraem, is to be found in the detracting glosses of Bar-Ali (c. A.D. 885), in the laudatory notices of the *nomokanon* of Ebed-jesu (200 years after Dionysius Bar Salibi); even if he and Bar-Bahlul indulge in confusions (easily explained) which identify Tatian with Ammonius, or go so far (Bar-Bahlul) as to make Tatian a bishop of the Church of Alexandria (Zahn, pp. 98–101; cp. Lightfoot, p. 1139 note).

To sum up. In the third century the Diatessaron was the only *Evangelium* in Edessa, a sway it continued to exercise in the Churches of the neighbourhood till the middle of the fourth century. In A.D. 364–373 the Peshito version of the Gospels was both known to and professed by Ephraem. In A.D. 412–453 the Diatessaron was repudiated as a book for Church-use in Edessa, and practically superseded by the book of the four Gospels: and this step was carried farther c. A.D. 450, by the action of Theodoret in his diocese. From that date its use would become limited to those to whom the book had the value so well expressed by Ebed-jesu: — "Tatianus quidam philosophus cum Evangelistarum loquentium sensum suo intellectu cepisset, et scopum scriptionis illorum divinae in mente sua fixisset, unum ex quatuor illis admirabile collegit evangelium, quod et diatessaron nominavit, in quo cum cautissime seriem rectam eorum, quae a salvatore dicta ac gesta fuere, servasset, ne unam quidem dictionem e suo addidit." (Mai, *Script. vet. nova collectio*, x. 191; see Zahn, i. p. 101, n. 1.)

It remains to indicate the manner in which the Syriac Diatessaron passed into Latin form, such as is preserved in the *Codex Fuldensis* (Zahn, i. pp. 298–328). The interesting fact comes out that this took place without the use of any intermediary Greek Diatessaron. In language and form the Latin Harmony is based upon St. Jerome's Version; and the differences between the Codex and Tatian—such as alterations in chronological order, expansions and abbreviations, coincidences and deviations—indicative as they are of dependence of the *Codex* upon Tatian, do not require the explanation which an intermediate Greek text would easily supply. The *Codex Fuldensis* is to be placed between A.D. 383 (the year in which St. Jerome put forward his revision of the translation of the Gospels) and A.D. 546 (the year in which Victor of Capua wrote down the Latin Harmony preserved in the Codex); or, more approximately c. A.D. 500 (Zahn, i. p. 310). Translations from Syriac into Greek existed in the

fourth century (Eusebius, *H. E.* i. 13; iv. 30), and the fact—with its consequence, a further translation from Greek into Latin—might be quoted in proof of a more early date than A.D. 500 for the *Codex Fuldensis;* but, independently of other reasons, the age of Victor of Capua has yielded proofs of direct translations from Syriac into Latin, which render appeals to a Greek Diatessaron unnecessary. Kihn (*Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus;* see Zahn, i. p. 311; and this Dictionary s. n. JUNILIUS) has shown that in the days of Victor of Capua, Junilius, *Quaestor sacri palatii* at Constantinople (*c.* A.D. 545–552) sent to Primasius, bishop of Adrumetum, a Latin introduction to the Scriptures (*Instituta regularia divinae legis*) which was a free rendering of a work written (c. A.D. 533–544) by the Syrian Nestorian Paul, a pupil and teacher of the school of Nisibis. Junilius merely altered, by giving to it a catechetical form, a work representative of the Syrian school of theology and founded on the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Earlier still, some few years before the controversy relative to the Three Chapters, Cassiodorius joined Agapetus, bishop of Rome († A.D. 536) in founding in Rome a theological school after the model of the schools of Nisibis and Alexandria. Of even greater value in this matter are the remarks of Gennadius of Marseilles. In his continuation (*c.* A.D. 495) of St. Jerome's *de Viris illustribus*, he comments upon and explains St. Jerome's deficient treatment of Syrian writers, on the ground that he was not acquainted with Syriac. Gennadius himself confounds Aphraates with Jacob of Nisibis, but his testimony to his writings, and to those of some pupils of Ephraem Syrus and of Isaac of Antioch, is evidence of the acquaintance with Syriac works on the part of a western writer who lived between the date of St. Jerome and that of Victor. Not many Syrians went westward, as did bishop Isaac of Amida in A.D. 404, or the monks sent to Rome by the Syrian bishops in A.D. 495: but in the East they were everywhere, in Sinai, in Palestine, and in Constantinople. There they would meet Latin Christians, and their language of intercommunication would be Greek. And it would easily happen that in the fifth or in the beginning of the sixth century some Latin scholar, who had in his hands Tatian's Syriac Diatessaron and St. Jerome's revised Latin Version of the Gospels, could have worked out the Harmony which Victor of Capua was the means of preserving for posterity.

Evidence of a similar kind, but thoroughly independent, is forthcoming with reference to (*a*) a Greek and (*b*) an Arabic Harmony:—

(*a*) In A.D. 1523 Ottmar Nachtigall, the Humanist who styled himself Luscinius, translated into Latin, published, and dedicated to Christopher, bishop of Augsburg, an epitome of the Gospel history entitled, "Evangelicae historiae ex quatuor Evangelistis perpetuo tenore continuata narratio, ex Ammonii Alexandrini fragmentis quibusdam, e Graeco versa, etc." It is much more than a merely fragmentary work; it is a complete if brief book, with carefully defined and executed plan. Zahn, as the result of a careful examination of the book and of comparison with other Harmonies (i. pp. 313–328), comes to the conclusion that it is—in spite of a diverging historical order and frequently independent treatment — connected with Tatian's Diatessaron by so many numerous points of contact and of coincidence even in deviation, that there is a decided affinity and interdependence between them. Luscinius had evidently never seen Tatian's work; nor does he appear to have known the Harmony of Victor of Capua; but his recovery of the "fragments of Ammonius," whether so called (by mistake) by himself or in the Greek MS., points to the fact that an unknown Greek had sought to do what an unknown Latin had done about A.D. 500; and that his work presupposes as little as the Latin Harmony the existence of a Greek Version of Tatian's Syriac Diatessaron.

(*b*) In the Vatican library is an Arabic MS. (No. xiv.) entitled by Asseman "Tatiani Diatessaron, seu Quatuor Evangelia in unum redacta," etc., and dated by experts between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries (Zahn, i. pp. 294–298). The materials for judgment are few and the work itself can hardly be said to have been sufficiently examined to permit more than the most general deductions; but Akerblad's opinion that it is without doubt translated from the Syriac, and its general affinity with Tatian's Diatessaron, support the opinion that the Arabic writer found in this last work the base of his own if he permitted himself to supplement it here and there with an already existing Arabic translation of the Gospels. It may be impossible to determine whether or not this Arabic Diatessaron be older or younger than the Arabic translation of the Gospels made from the Peshito between A.D. 750 and 800, but it is a testimony to the early reputation of the old Syriac Diatessaron. Syriac Christians who had unlearnt or forgotten their mother-tongue under Arabian government were unwilling, so it would seem, to dispense with the ancient Book of the Gospel of Edessa and treasured the name of its compiler in grateful remembrance.

As a general fact from the preceding paragraphs it would seem clear that Tatian's Diatessaron when banished or on the point of being banished from public use in Edessa had already received welcome and recognition from—Arabic—Greek—and Latin-speaking Christians.

II. *Recovery of the Diatessaron.*—This is due to the energetic scholarship of Zahn. By the use principally of Ephraem's commentary (ed. Mösinger) and of the quotations in the Homilies of Aphraates he has printed the text (i. pp. 113–219) in detail; comparing it throughout with the Syriac of Cureton (Sc.), the Peshito (P.), and frequently the Philoxenian text revised by Thomas of Heraklea (Hl.), with the Greek MSS. ℵ, B, and D, and with Sabatier and Bianchini's editions of the MSS. of the Itala. Verse by verse the text is reconstructed and tabulated in sections. Each section is accompanied by an exhaustive critical and expository comment, and at the end of the volume an index to all the passages incorporated in the Harmony enables the student to examine the evidence respecting any individual verse. These sections indicate the character of the Harmony and are reproduced here as they are given by Zahn, with this difference only that the references to Ephraem are omitted in favour of an English heading indicative of the contents of the section, and which are taken

principally from Fuller's *Harmony of the Gospels* (S.P.C.K.).

1. St. John i. 1–5. Preface.
2. St. Luke i. 5–79. Zecharias and Elizabeth; the Annunciation of the birth of Jesus; the songs or prophecies of Elizabeth and Mary; the birth and circumcision of St. John the Baptist; the prophecy of Zecharias.
3. St. Matt. i. 18–25. The birth of Jesus Christ.
4. St. Luke ii. 1–35 *a* (? 38). The birth of Jesus Christ; the shepherds keeping watch; the presentation in the Temple.
5. St. Matt. ii. 1–23. The visit of the wise men from the East.
6. St. John i. 6–28. St. John the Baptist. His answer to the Levites sent from Jerusalem.
7. St. Luke ii. 41–52. The child Jesus in the Temple with the doctors.
8. St. Matt. iii. 1–12 (St. Luke iii. 7, &c.). The preaching and baptizing of St. John the Baptist.
9. St Matt. iii. 13–17; St. Luke iii. 21, 23; St. John i. 29, &c., The Baptism of Jesus.
10. St. Matt. iv. 1–11 (St. Luke iv. 1–13; St. Mark i. 12, 13). The Temptation.
11. St. John i. 35–52. The calling of Andrew, Simon Peter, Nathanael, &c.
12. St. John ii. 1–11. The marriage feast at Cana in Galilee.
13. St. John iii. 22–iv. 3; St. Mark i. 14–16; St. Matt. iv. 12–17. The testimony of the Baptist; Christ begins to preach.
14. St. Luke v. 1–11, 17–39; St. Mark ii. 1–22. The calling SS. Peter and Andrew, James and John; the healing the sick of the palsy; the call of St. Matthew.
15. St. Matt. xii. 1–8; St. Mark ii. 23–28; St. Luke vi. 1–5. The reproof of the views of the Pharisees concerning the breach of the Sabbath.
16. St. Matt. v. 1–12; St. Luke vi. 20–24 (26). The Beatitudes.
17. St. Matt. v. 13–48 (St. Luke vi. 27, &c., viii. 16; xi. 33; xvi. 17). Sections of the Sermon on the Mount.
18. St. Matt. vi. Section of the Sermon on the Mount.
19. St. Matt. vii.; St. Mark iv. 24, &c. (St. Luke vi. 37–49). Sections of the Sermon on the Mount.
20. St. Luke vii. 1–10; St. Matt. viii. 5–13. The healing the Centurion's servant.
21. St. Luke vii. 11–17. The raising the widow's son from the dead.
22. St. Matt. viii. 18–34; St. Luke ix. 57–62; viii. 23–39; St. Mark iv. 36–v. 20. Christ shows how He is to be followed. He heals a man with an unclean spirit.
23. St. Mark v. 21–43; St. Luke viii. 40–56; St. Matt. ix. 16–36. The healing the woman with an issue of blood; the raising the daughter of Jairus from the dead; the healing two blind men.
24. St. Matt. x.; St. Luke ix. 1–6; x. 3–12, 16; St. Mark vi. 7–13. The sending out the Twelve Apostles.
25. St. Luke x. 38–42. Martha and Mary.
26. St. Matt. xi. 2–13 (?); St. Luke vii. 18–35. Christ answers the messengers of St. John the Baptist.
27. St. Matt. xii. 22–37 (St. Luke xi. 14–23); St. Mark iii. 20–30. The healing the blind and dumb man possessed with a devil. The rebuke of the Pharisees.
28. St. Luke vii. 36–50. The woman who was a sinner.
29. St. Luke x. 1 (2), 17–22; St. Matt. xi. 25–30; St. Mark xiv. 25, &c. The mission and return of the Seventy Disciples. Comments which followed.
30. St. Matt. xii. 38–45; St. Luke xi. 29–32, 24–28; St. Matt. xii. 46–54; St. Luke viii. 19–21. Rebuke of the Pharisees. Christ's Brothers, Sisters, and Mother.
31. St. Luke viii. 1–14; St. Matt. xiii. 1–53; St. Mark iv. 1–34. Parables. The sower, the wheat and tares, the mustard seed, the leaven, the draw-net.
32. St. John iv. 44, 45; St. Luke iv. 15 (? 14)–30; St. Matt. xiii. 53–58; St. Mark vi. 1–6. Events in Nazareth.
33. St. Matt. xiv. 1–12; St. Mark vi. 14–29. Death of St. John the Baptist.
34. St. John vi. 1–21; St. Matt. xiv. 13–33; St. Mark vi. 30–53; St. Luke ix. 10–17. The feeding of the five thousand; the walking on the sea.
35. St. John vi. 22–71. The "Bread of life" &c.
36. St. Matt. xv. 1–20; St. Mark vii. 1–23; Reproof of the Scribes and Pharisees.
37. St. Matt. xv. 21–28; St. Mark vii. 24–30. The healing the daughter of the Syro-Phoenician woman.
38. St. John iv. 4–42. Christ and the woman of Samaria.
39. St. Matt. viii. 2–4; St. Mark i. 40–45; St. Luke v. 12–14. The healing a leper.
40. St. John v. The cure at the pool of Bethesda.
41. St. Mark viii. 22–26. The healing the blind man at Bethsaida.
42. St. Mark viii. 27–ix. 1; St. Matt. xvi. 13–28; St. Luke ix. 18–27. St. Peter's confession of Christ and after-rebuke.
43. St. Matt. xvii. 1–13; St. Mark ix. 2–13; St. Luke ix. 28–36, xiii. 31–33. The Transfiguration.
44. St. Matt. xvii. 14–21; St. Mark ix. 14–29; St. Luke ix. 37–43. The healing the lunatic child.
45. St. Matt. xvii. 14–27. The payment of tribute.
46. St. Matt. xix. 1 (3)–15; St. Mark x. 1–16. Questions concerning divorce. Christ receives little children.
47. St. Luke xv. 1–10. Parables. Ten pieces of silver (and lost sheep).
48. St. Luke xv. 11–32. The prodigal son.
49. St. Luke xvi. 1–12. The unjust steward.
50. St. Matt. xviii. 1–35; St. Luke xvii. 1–4; St. Mark ix. 31–50 (?). Discourses.
51. St. Luke xiii. 1–9. Repentance necessary for all; the parable of the fruitless fig-tree.
52. St. John vii. 1 (? 2)–31 (? 36). The "doctrine" of Christ at the Feast of Passover (al. Tabernacles).
53. St. Matt. xix. 16–24; St. Mark x. 17–25; St. Luke xviii. 18–25. The rich young man and eternal life.
54. St. Luke xvi. 19–31. Parable of the rich man and Lazarus.
55. St. Matt. xx. 1–16. Parable of the labourers in the vineyard.
56. St. Matt. xx. 20–28; St. Mark x. 35–45. The request of SS. James and John.
57. St. Luke xix. 1–10. Zacchaeus.
58. St. Mark x. 46–52; St. Luke xviii. 35–43. Healing the blind.
59. St. John ii. 14–22 (St. Matt. xxi. 12, &c.; St. Mark xi. 15–17; St. Luke xix. 45, &c.). The cleansing of the Temple.
60. St. Luke xviii. 9–14. The parable of the Pharisee and the Publican.
61. St. Matt. xxi. 18–22; St. Mark xi. 12–14, 19–24; St. Luke xvii. 5, 6. The fruitless fig-tree.
62. St. John iii. 1–21 (? 15). Nicodemus.
63. St. Luke xviii. 1–8. The parable of the importunate widow.
64. St. Matt. xxi. 23–32; St. Mark xi. 27–33; St. Luke xx. 1–8. The "authority" of Christ.
65. St. Matt. xxi. 33–46; St. Mark xii. 1–12; St. Luke xx. 9–19. The parable of the unthankful husbandman.
66. St. Matt. xxii. 15–33; St. Mark xii. 13–27; St. Luke xx. 20–40. Tribute to Caesar; the error of the Sadducees on the Resurrection.
67. St. Matt. xxii. 34–40; St. Mark xii. 28–34 (St. Luke x. 25–28); St. Luke x. 29–37. The first and great Commandment.
68. St. John vii. 32 (or 37)–44 (or 52). The "doctrine" of Christ at the Feast of the Passover (*al.* Tabernacles).

69. St. John viii. 12–59. Christ the "light of the world."
70. St. John ix. The healing the man born blind.
71. St. John x. Christ the "door" and the "good shepherd."
72. St. John xi. The raising of Lazarus.
73. St. John xii. 1–11; St. Matt. xxvi. 6–13; St. Mark xiv. 3–9. Mary anoints the head of Jesus.
74. St. John xii. 12–19; St. Matt. xxi. 1–11, 14–16; St. Mark xi. 1–10; St. Luke xix. 29–44. The entry into Jerusalem.
75. St. John xii. 20–27. The Greeks desire to see Jesus.
76. St. Luke xvii. 20–25 (?). The coming of the Son of Man.
77. St. Matt. xxiii.; St. Luke xi. 39–52; St. Mark xii. 38, &c. Discourse against the Pharisees.
78. St. John xii. 37 (?)–50. Discourse of Christ.
79. St. Matt. xxiv.; St. Mark xiii.; St. Luke xxi. 5–36, xvii. 31–37, xii. 42–48. Signs of the Advent.
80. St. Matt. xxv.; St. Luke xix. 12–27, xii. 35 &c. Parables of the ten virgins, the talents.
81. St. John xiii. 1–15. The washing the disciples' feet.
82. St. Matt. xxvi. 21–25; St. Mark xiv. 18–21; St. Luke xxii. 21–23; St. John xiii. 21–30. The eating the Passover.
83. St. Matt. xxvi. 26–29; St. Mark xiv. 22–25; St. Luke xxii. 18–20. The Holy Supper.
84. St. Luke xxii. 29–34; St. John xiii. 33–38. The warning to Simon Peter.
85. St. John xiv. The heavenly mansions &c.
86. St. Luke xxii. 35–38. The swords.
87. St. John xv. The Vine and the branches &c.
88. St. John xvi. The promise of the Comforter &c.
89. St. John xvii. The prayer of Christ.
90. St. Matt. xxvi. 36–57; St. Mark xiv. 32–53; St. Luke xxii. 40–54. Gethsemane and the betrayal.
91. St. Matt. xxvi. 58, 69–75; St. Mark xiv. 54, 66–72; St. Luke xxii. 54–62; St. John xviii. 15–18, 25–27. The denial of Simon Peter.
92. St. Matt. xxvi. 59–68; St. Mark xiv. 55–65 (St. Luke xxii. 63–71; St. John xviii. 19–24). Jesus before the council.
93. St. John xviii. 28–xix. 16; St. Matt. xxvii. 1, &c., 11–31; St. Mark xv. 1–20; St. Luke xxiii. 1–5, 13–25. Jesus before Pilate.
94. St. Matt. xxvii. 3–10. The suicide of Judas.
95. St. Luke xxiii. 26–32; St. Matt. xxvii. 32; St. Mark xv. 21; St. John xix. 17. Before the Crucifixion.
96. St. Luke xxiii. 32–42; St. Matt. xxvii. 33–44; St. Mark xv. 22–32 &c.; St. John xix. 18–24. The Crucifixion.
97. St. John xix. 25–42; St. Matt. xxvii. 45–66; St. Mark xv. 33–47; St. Luke xxiii. 44–56. The commending His Mother to St. John; the death and burial of Christ.
98. St. John xx.; St. Matt. xxviii. 1–15; St. Luke xxiv. 1–43. The Resurrection &c.
99. St. John xxi. Christ at the sea of Tiberias.
100. St. Matt. xxviii. 16–20; St. Mark xvi. 15–19; St. Luke xxiv. 44–53. The last commission; the Ascension.

Before proceeding to the examination of this work, it may be well to give a few specimens in full as they are printed in Zahn's pages (reff. to notes being omitted).

(*a*) § 1. Jo. i. 1–5. (1.) In principio erat verbum, et hoc verbum erat apud deum, et deus erat verbum. (2) Hoc erat in principio apud deum. (3) Omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil. Quodcunque factum est, (4) per ipsum vita erat, et vita erat lux hominum. (5) Et haec lux in tenebris lucebat, et tenebrae eam non vicerunt.

(*b*) § 7. Luc. ii. 41–52.

(48) Ego et pater tuus dolentes et moerentes ibamus et quaerebamus, etc. ... (49) In domo patris mei oportet me esse. .... [(51) Omnia conservabat in corde suo].

(*c*) § 32. Jo. iv. 44, 45. Lc. iv. 15 (14?) –30. Mt. xiii. 53–58. Mr. vi. 1–6. .... (Mt. xiii. 54. Lc. iv. 15. Mr. vi. 1) Ideo venit in civitatem suam et docuit eos in synagogis eorum. .... (Jo. iv. 45) Susceperunt eum Galilaei. *Quia viderunt, quod in medio eorum fecit, nemo aliquid contra eum facere ausus est.* (Lc. iv. 16. Mr. vi. 2) Post haec, *ait*, intravit juxta morem suum in synagogas eorum die sabbati .... (Lc. 23) Medice, cura te ipsum .... (Lc. 24, cf. Jo. iv. 44) Non est propheta acceptus in patria (sua) .... (Lc. 25–27) Multae viduae erant .... in domo Israel .... (Lc. 28) Ira impleti sunt .... et assumpserunt eum et foras duxerunt ad praecipitium montis .... *Cum libertus eum vellet detrudere, aer se submittens alis suis eum suscepit* .... (Mr. vi. 5, cf. Mt. xiii. 58) *Non in Nazareth sed in domo Israel* virtutem aliquam facere non poterat.

(*d*) § 82. Mt. xxvi. 21–25. Mr. xiv. 18–21. Lc. xxii. 21–23. Jo. xiii. 21–30. (Mr. 18. Mit. 21. cf. Jo. 18) Unus ex vobis, qui panem mecum edit, iste est qui me tradet. (Lc. 21) et ecce manus traditoris mei mecum in mensa extensa est; (Mt. 26. Mr. 24) et filius hominis vadit ut de eo scriptum est .... Melius ei erat, si natus non fuisset .... (Jo. 22–26) *Caritas arcanum publicavit et timori revelavit, quia dum caritas in sinu domini secura jacebat, timor ei saepius annuit* .... *Ideo intinxit panem, ne cum pane etiam testamentum daret; lavavit prius panem et tunc illum ei dedit.* .... (Jo. 30) *Dominus Judam per aquam a discipulis separavit, cum panem aqua intinctum ei daret, quia non erat dignus illo pane, qui una cum vino duodecim apostolis dabatur.*

The first and second of these specimens are quotations from one Gospel only, in the former case perfect, in the latter less so. The third and fourth represent combinations from the four Gospels; and it will be at once seen how incomplete are the extracts and how eclectic is the workmanship. The words printed in italics in (*c*) and (*d*) are extracts from Ephraem and Aphraates, and give traditions sometimes very old, but always interesting.

Inferences and deductions, as numerous as they are various, may be drawn from the study, comparative or otherwise, of this Harmony. The principal only can be alluded to here:—

(*a*) *The relation of the reconstructed text to the sources from which it has been reconstructed.* Zahn (i. p. 225 etc.) collects under five heads what bears upon the connexion between the Diatessaron and the Syriac of Cureton and the Peshito. Specimens only are given here.

i. Twenty-eight passages in which T. (Tatian) agrees with Sc., but differs from P. and all, or nearly all, other traditions: e.g. St. Matt. i. 19, גברא (*ἀνήρ*) instead of בעלה (*ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς*). St. Matt. i. 25, *in sanctitate habitabat cum ea* instead of *οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτήν*. St. John i. 18, *unigenitus* (Sc. *filius*) *qui e sinu patris sui est* instead of *unigenitus deus; ille qui in sinu patris est.* St. Matt. vi. 6, *πρόσευξαι τῷ πατρί σου ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ* instead of *τῷ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ*. St. Matt. xv. 5, P. agrees with the *textus receptus;* T. and Sc. (practically) adopt a reading *et vos dicitis unicuique patrum vestrorum et matrum vestrarum:* but differing, both from

each other and still more markedly from P., in the next words thus rendered by T. *agedum, munus est quodcunque a me, utilitatem capies.* St. Luke xix. 42, אלא שלמא אתכסי לה מן עיניכי, ἀλλ' ἡ εἰρήνη ἐκρύβη κ.τ.λ. instead of *νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβη κ.τ.λ.*

ii. Fourteen passages in which T., Sc., and Western testimony (e.g. D. and Itala MSS.) agree against P.:—e.g. St. John i. 3, T. and Sc. adopt the same division as has been noted in the *Oratio* (ch. xix.) P. reads ἓν ὃ γέγονεν. ἐν αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ. St. Luke ii. 48, *dolentes et moerentes* (so cod. Gr. D. and various MSS. of the Itala), a double expression instead of the single ὀδυνώμενοι. St. Matt. iv. 10, *retro vade*, the equivalent for ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου; P. omits ὀ. μ. St. Matt. viii. 10, T. and Sc. support the reading (e.g. of Cod. Gr. B.) παρ' οὐδενὶ τοσαύτην πίστιν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ εὗρον as against that of the *textus receptus* and P., οὐδὲ ἐν τ. Ἰ. τοσ. π. εὗρον. St. John v. 15, ὁ ποιήσας με (instead of αὐτὸν) ὑγιῆ. St. Luke xxi. 11, φοβητρὰ (or φοβηθρά τε) ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ (so D., Itala); P. (and others) put ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ after σημεῖα μεγάλα. St. Luke xxiii. 39, T. and Sc. follow the text of ℵ C B L οὐχὶ σὺ εἶ instead of εἰ σὺ εἶ.

iii. Fourteen passages in which T. and Sc. agree in the form of translation but differ from P. (cp. also i.); e.g. St. Matt. i. 12, κατ' ὄναρ, Sc. and T. *in visione*, P. *in somnio.* St. John i. 14, καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, T. and Sc. ומלתא פגרא הות, P. ומלתא בסרא הוא. St. Luke viii. 31, εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον, T. Sc. *in gehennam* (לגהנא), P. לתהומא. St. John iii. 13, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, T. Sc. *qui in coelis erat*, P. *qui in coelis est.* St. Luke xxiii. 43, ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, T. Sc. *in horto Eden*, P. *in paradiso.*

iv. Thirteen passages, in which T. and P. more or less agree in matter and form, and differ from Sc.: e.g. St. John i. 4, ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, Sc. ἐ. α. ζ. ἐστιν. St. Matt. iv. 4, διὰ στόματος θεοῦ, Sc. *domini.* St. Matt. x. 34, μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον, Sc. *non veni.*

v. Fifty-two passages in which T. has a text independent of P. and Sc. In many of these passages (*) the underlying Greek text is not well attested: e.g. *St. Luke i. 28, T. omits ὁ κύριος μετά σου, but inserts εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν. St. Matt. i. 18, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτούς, T. *antequam data est viro.* *St. John i. 17, *sed veritas ejus* (sc. *legis*) *per Jesum facta est*, instead of ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ ἐγένετο. St. John iii. 34b, 35, οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου ἔδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα ὁ πατὴρ τῷ υἱῷ, ἀλλ' ἠγάπησεν αὐτὸν καὶ πάντα ἔδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ. *St. Matt. x. 37, "Qui me non magis amat quam patrem suum et matrem suam neque etiam magis quam animam suam, discipulus meus esse nequit." *St. Matt. xv. 4, The words are added, "et qui blasphemat deum, crucifigatur." *St. John iv., Between vv. 13 and 14 the statement is introduced, "mea aqua e coelo descendit." *St. John v. 14, ἵνα μὴ χρεία σοί τινος γένηται instead of ἵνα μὴ χεῖρόν σοί τι γένηται. St. Luke xvi. 22, 23, καὶ ἐτάφη ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ. καὶ ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, ὑπάρχων ἐν βασάνοις. κ.τ.λ. *St. John ix. 7, τὸ πρόσωπόν σου is added after νίψαι. *St. John xi. 9, ἐν τῷ φωτὶ instead of ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. *St. Luke xix. 38, δόξα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς instead of δ. ἐν ὑψίστοις. *St. John xiv. 30, οὐδὲν τῶν αὐτοῦ εὑρίσκει instead of οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν.

Two results are deduced from an examination of the foregoing five heads (see Zahn, i. p. 232) (a) from classes i. and iii., a close internal connexion is apparent between the Syriac Diatessaron and the Syriac of Cureton; (b) from class v., the compiler or redactor of the Syriac Diatessaron possessed a knowledge of the Greek text of the Gospels quite independent of all Syriac translations of the Gospels. The conclusion is therefore reached that the Syriac Diatessaron arose out of the oldest Syriac translation of the Gospels largely supplemented by a use of a closely allied Greek copy of the Gospels which in cases of divergence the writer preferred.

These results have been challenged, but they cannot be said to have been materially shaken. Thus, with regard to (a), the close relationship recognised has been thought to be due to the use by both of some common original text or type of text (Overbeck, in Harnack and Schürer's *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, March, 1882). The hypothesis is certainly possible, but it is unsupported by evidence, and is unnecessarily complicating. The Syriac quotations of Aphraates, who was admittedly familiar with Tatian's Diatessaron, are closely akin to the text of Sc. (Bäthgen, 'Evangelien fragmente,' *Der Griechische texte des Curetonschen Syrers*, p. 63). It is easier to believe that both Sc. and A. reverted to T., than that A., and Sc., and T. employed some otherwise unknown, if common, original text. Appeal on textual points cannot well be made to Victor's Harmony. The textual relation of that Latin work to the Syriac Diatessaron would probably be clearer were the Arabic Harmony in the Vatican, which was translated from the Syriac, more accessible.

Again, Zahn's conclusion that Tatian knew and used the Syriac of Cureton is traversed by the opposite conclusion that Sc. knew and used T., or—in other words—that Tatian's Diatessaron is older than the oldest of the Gospels in Syriac, and was in fact the first Evangelium given to the Syrians in their own language (Bäthgen, p. 58 sq. 95). The arguments adduced in support of this are more ingenious than convincing, and rest upon a multitude of minutiae distracting to all but a specialist. The superstructure reared will be felt to be more than the foundation will support. To most men it will seem more natural that a Harmony should be formed out of the several Gospels than the several Gospels recovered out of a Harmony.

Harnack (p. 213, etc.) has formulated other objections founded upon his conviction that the Diatessaron was not the work of Tatian, and was originally written in Greek. The former objection, resting upon the presumed orthodoxy of the Diatessaron in contrast with the presumed unorthodoxy of Tatian, is considered below; the latter turns mainly upon the use of a Greek title—Diatessaron—instead of a Syriac one, and upon the absence of any definite statement in antiquity that it was written in Syriac. To take the latter point first. An argument *e silentio* is always precarious, but in this case it is met by a counter *e silentio* argument. Theodoret, though holding in his hands the Syriac Diatessaron, never makes the slightest comment upon the language (see Zahn, ii. p. 299; Bäthgen, p. 91), As regards the former point the selection of a Greek title, Diatessaron, is certainly no evi-

dence against a Syriac original (cp. Zahn i. pp. 70, 104, 107, 238; ii. 299. Bäthgen, p. 89). Greek titles for Syriac books such as *Chronikon*, *Ecclesiastike*, *Oktoechos* are common; and Tatian was linguist enough to introduce a word which thoroughly expressed the original idea of an original book, even if he be considered bold in translating a technical musical term into a title. But the title is not altogether without a parallel. Such a Syriac word as τετραευαγγέλιον (=codex of the four Gospels) is another instance of the introduction into the Syrian language of composites formed from the Greek τέσσαρες.

The conversion of Lagarde and Bäthgen to Zahn's opinion, and the independent acceptance of a Syriac original by Lightfoot and Hilgenfeld, may be taken to more than countervail the opposite verdict. The gain is certainly great. Not only is an early recognition and an early origin of the four Gospels established, but a definite chronological point is attained in the history of the translation of the Gospels in the Syrian Church.

(*b*) *Object, arrangement and principles of the Diatessaron.*—Tatian's object, if the result may be summoned in proof, was to compile a book for use in the public service of the Church. It may almost excite surprise that the presentment of a single compact and brief book—containing all that was deemed essential of the life and teaching of Jesus Christ—instead of four independent narratives had not occurred to others besides Tatian and Ammonius. Nothing wrong was intended by such a method; nothing heretical was of necessity supposed to underlie it. If later on Theodoret felt it his duty to replace the Diatessaron by the Gospels themselves, his act was no disparagement of the purity of the original motives from which Tatian had acted, or of the honesty of his treatment.—*Cautissime seriem rectam eorum, quae a salvatore dicta ac gesta fuere, servasset; ne unam quidem dictionem e suo addidit* (*Ebed-jesu*).

There are proofs that Tatian did not feel himself excluded from appealing to narratives outside the Gospels, when illustrating special points. In § 94 he supplements the Gospel account of the death of Judas from Acts i. 18; and his narrative of the Institution of the Eucharist (§ 83) is evidently influenced by 1 Cor. xi. If here and there there are indications of the insertion of apocryphal narratives, the matter is easily explained. It may well have been present in a text before him, where the distinction between what was apocryphal and what was not, had not been observed. This is the origin of the tradition inserted in § 9; at the Baptism of Jesus "*lumen super aquam exortum* et vox de caelo delapsa"; a tradition preserved in Tatian's master Justin Martyr (Dialog. c. Tryph. ch. lxxxviii. ed. Otto[3], p. 320), in the Gospel of the Ebionites, and in the "Preaching of Paul" [or Peter] in the Pseudocyprian *de rebaptismate* c. xvii. (see Zahn, i. p. 125). Thus also may be explained the curious addition to § 36, "Deus dixit, Honora patrem tuum et matrem tuam, (et) qui maledicit patri suo aut matri suae, morte moriatur, *et qui blasphemat Deum, crucifigatur*" (cp. other instances in Zahn, i. pp. 241, 242). These and similar peculiarities attracted no special notice at the time, and in no way derogated from the value of the work which exhibited them.

Of the original texts and sources open to Tatian Zahn believes (i. p. 243) that Tatian found in his Syriac exemplar all that is found in Sc., and in his Greek exemplar closely allied to Sc. (i. p. 248) all that may be considered the then fixed contents of the Gospels. The nature of his work — a Harmony — precluded his utilising all he found, but his omissions do not by any means imply that the passages omitted were absent from his Syriac or Greek copies:—e.g. the Diatessaron omits the Genealogies (St. Matt. i. 1–17), Sc. contains them. Further, his practice would seem to have been to choose for himself which he would follow when the texts before him happened to differ.

Tatian's originality is perhaps most noticeable in the historical order which he has given to the contents of the Gospels. Some chronological scheme he certainly had, and the conjecture may be hazarded, that the events of Christ's ministerial life were studied and reproduced in connexion with the successive Passover festivals. In carrying out his scheme, however, he allowed himself every latitude; following first one guide, then another, trusting to St. John at one moment and turning to the Synoptists at another. This will in part explain the bold appositions, the unexpected combinations, the evident anachronisms which meet the eye in studying these sections. Compare, for example, the position assigned to the history of Martha and Mary (§ 25), or of the woman of Samaria (§ 36), or of the cleansing of the Temple (§ 59; note the text referred to), or of Nicodemus (§ 62) with the positions occupied by these events in any ordinary Harmony. A study of the sections immediately connected with these special points (and similar deviations) will generally indicate reasons for Tatian's order; but, whatever they may have been, they have not commended themselves to later Harmonists, and Tatian's originality died with him. A few illustrations of this originality may be adduced here.

(*a*) Previous to the history of the child-life of Jesus (§ 7), Tatian has recorded the visit of the priests and Levites from Jerusalem to St. John the Baptist (§ 6). It would be absurd, as Zahn points out (i. p. 249), to suppose that this sequence was followed in order that the reader might imagine that the visit took place before Jesus was twelve years old or the Baptist more than twelve years and a few months. What Tatian wished to impress was the historical truth, that St. John the Baptist was not "the true Light" to Whom the earlier verses of the Gospel of St. John (i. 7–9) referred, but a witness of the Light. Tatian therefore first collected into the same section the verses (St. John i. 19–28) which historically testified to the same truth, and then gave the history of the Holy childhood (St. Luke ii. 41–52) which first revealed Jesus to be the Light. (*β*) The deferring the cleansing of the Temple (St. John ii. 13–17) and the conversation with Nicodemus (do. ch. iii.) to the final passover (§§ 59, 62) is due to a free combination of the narratives of the fourth Gospel and of the Synoptists. In the former case he takes the language of St. John, but—apparently not considering whether

or not such an event could have occurred twice —finds for the event the more appropriate place in the position assigned to it by the Synoptists. It was to him the opening act suitable to the Feast of the Dedication of the Temple. As regards the latter event, given the permission to put it where a Harmonist liked, the position assigned to it by Tatian has the merit of great fitness. The chief priests and the scribes and elders were "sore displeased" at those outbursts in Christ's honour they were powerless to check, and they purposed demanding His "authority" (§ 64). There was one of their number, Nicodemus, who witnessed their discomfiture (e.g. St. Matt. xxi. 27) and did not share their hate. He came to Jesus by night, and that conversation was a spur to the courage which Christ's condemnation, crucifixion, and death did but embolden him to exhibit (St. John xix. 39). This position ignores St. John vii. 50, and has not been imitated. (γ) Tatian evidently thought that St. John had made a mistake in the sequence of events connected with chs. ii. 13–vi. Consequently he placed the feeding of the five thousand (§ 34) before the conversation with the woman of Samaria (§ 38) and the healing at the Pool of Bethesda (§ 40). That conversation he considers to have taken place on the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem and not vice versâ. He possibly counted it, as well as the healing of the daughter of the Syro-Phoenician woman (§ 37) and the healing of the leper (§ 39), an illustration of Christ's reproof of the Pharisaic notions of what was clean and unclean (§ 36). (δ) The reason for the position assigned to the request made of Christ by the mother of SS. James and John (§ 56) is not very evident. Possibly it was felt to be an illustration of the working in their minds of the parable of the labourers in the vineyard (§ 55) which precedes it.

As a summary of Tatian's scheme, Zahn (pp. i. 257–60) suggests the following main divisions:—

i. The Logos; the Incarnation and Childhood of Jesus (§§ 1–7).

ii. The first manifestations of Jesus (§§ 8–12).

iii. The beginning of ministerial work (§ 13).

iv. Jesus in Galilee (§§ 14–37).

v. Journey through Samaria (§§ 38–40).

vi. Sojourn in Galilee (§§ 41–51).

vii. The Feast of Tabernacles at Jerusalem (§ 52).

viii. Journey through (Peraea or) Galilee and back (§§ 53–58).

ix. Jesus at Jerusalem at the Feast of the Dedication of the Temple (§§ 59–71).

x. Events connected with the raising of Lazarus (§§ 72, 73).

xi. The entry into Jerusalem etc., and events connected with the institution of the Lord's Supper (§§ 74–89).

xii. The Passion, the Resurrection, and Ascension (§§ 90–100).

The method of procedure adopted by Tatian can be fairly gauged from the preceding paragraphs. One or two consequences of importance seem to be deducible from it:—

(*a*) Tatian affirms as a whole the historical character of the four Gospels.

(*b*) The difficulties found in the Gospel narrative are not difficulties to him. An event repeated more than once, or variously placed and related by his authorities, does not discompose him. He chooses one or other of the Gospel accounts and sets aside the rest without prejudice to their veracity. For instance, in the history of the healing of the blind (§ 58), he sets aside St. Matthew's account (who speaks of two blind men) in favour of St. Mark and St. Luke (who speak of one), and he prefers to consider (with St. Mark) that the miracle took place on the departure from Jericho rather than (with St. Luke) on the entering into it. Sections 53–56 form an admirable group of facts and teaching relative to true and false riches, true and false reward, fitly closed by the history of Zacchaeus (§ 57); but the insertion among the parables of that of the rich man and Lazarus is unexpected, though characteristic of Tatian's eclecticism.

(*c*) This freedom of selection is exhibited in another form in his use of the several Evangelists. His evident opinion that they were not infallible in their chronology, and his consequent and frequent adoption of what seemed to him a more suitable order, prevent his taking one Gospel as his sole guide. Of the four, however, St. John is his favourite. The text of that Evangelist is generally adopted, then that of St. Matthew, and at a long distance the texts of St. Luke and St. Mark (see the index to quotations in Zahn i. pp. 383–386); the passages from these two last being more often withdrawn from their original connexion than is the case with the extracts from the Gospels of St. John and St. Matthew. This principle of selection, first the Apostles (St. John and St. Matthew, then the disciples of Apostles (St. Luke and St. Mark), is recognised as in accordance with the order of those Western witnesses (Cod. D. and the MSS. of the Itala) with which the text of the Diatessaron exhibits the closest connexion.

(*d*) A similar free-hand may be discerned in the doctrinal views of the Diatessaron so far as they find expression. It is well known that these have been very variously estimated. Theodoret's action in dismissing the book from the churches was due—as he himself states—to the "mischief of the composition." He resented the omission of the genealogies of St. Matt. (i. 1–17), of St. Luke (iii. 23–38), and of "such other passages as shewed the Lord to have been born of the seed of David after the flesh." Traces of an unorthodox tendency have been by some modern critics considered evident in the use of apocryphal additions, in the dilution of passages unacceptable to heretical views, and in the general mode of selection of the Gospel narrative. For example, St. John i. 17 is quoted under the form, "Per Moysen lex (*data*) est, sed veritas ejus per Jesum facta est" (Zahn, i. p. 121); and this Hilgenfeld considers (*Ketzergesch.* p. 394) an illustration of the method already applied by Tatian to the Old Testament when explaining in his "book of questions" what "was hidden and obscure" in it (Rhodon in Euseb. *H. E.* v. 13). Zahn himself admits that the Israelitish character of the Gospels is sometimes obliterated by omissions. Thus St. Luke ii. 34 (see Zahn, i. p. 118) is given in the form, "Ecce hic stat in ruinam et in resurrectionem et in signum con

tradictionis," from which the words "multorum in Israel" after "resurrectionem" are not only absent, but appear not to have occurred at all in the Diatessaron (Zahn, i. p. 119. He alludes to other instances on p. 71). It is true, on the other hand, that undue stress should not be laid upon solitary passages in a fragmentary work; that omissions noticeable in some places are more than met by compensating statements in others (e.g. note the preference for Israelites over the heathen in the history of the Syro-Phoenician woman, St. Matt. xv. 21–28, and the charge to the Apostles not to go to the Samaritans and Gentiles, St. Matt. x. 5; see Zahn, i. p. 264 and other instances on p. 70); and that it may be a nobler, without being an exclusive or anti-catholic view, which regarded Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world rather than of the Jewish nation alone. To Theodoret's special objection—the omission of the genealogies—it has been replied (Zahn, i. pp. 264–7) that the absence of these lists from Tatian's Diatessaron was intentional; that it was done in the interests of the Catholic Church itself, and as a protest against a Christology which dwarfed the only begotten Son of God to a child of Joseph's born in the natural way. There were certainly heretical sects to whom the genealogies were not so much the record of Jesus being the heir of the house of David as the son of Joseph after the flesh; there were others to whom his title "Son of David" rested principally upon the descent of the Virgin Mary from the royal house. Tatian, it is suggested, was bent upon counteracting such opinions. He is careful to point out that the Virgin Mary did not become the wife of Joseph till after the birth of the holy child: "sancte habitabat cum ea" (St. Matt. iii. 25; see Zahn, i. pp. 116–7), and he omitted the genealogies not as indicating his own divergence of belief from the Church, but in dislike to current opinions hostile to that belief. He opposed himself to all teaching which looked upon Jesus as a mere man (ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος), and the mode in which he enforced his opposition is thought to stamp him as "a man full of dutiful affection to the Gospels of the Church Catholic, but marked also by a bold spirit which permitted his indulgence in very original and ingenious conceptions" (Zahn, i. p. 268).

This defence of Tatian does credit to the heart of the able scholar who has breathed fresh life into the scattered and dispersed fragments of the Diatessaron; but it cannot stand against the hostile consensus, direct and indirect, which runs through Christian antiquity. Error in doctrine may not, perhaps, be positively discoverable in that Diatessaron which did not propose doctrine as the primary object of its composition; but the matter is one which goes beyond the Diatessaron, and is but one factor in that wider and more general question which remains to be considered.

III. *What were the theological opinions of Tatian?* Up to the time of the death of Justin Martyr, he was considered orthodox; after that date, heterodox. The change can only be roughly sketched. In the *Oratio*, even friendly critics have had to admit that there exists a tendency to what was singular, extreme, and alien to Church theory and practice (Zahn, i. p. 276); sterner criticism finds also in it traces of the three heretical views which Irenaeus attributed to him. (1.) The allusion to Aeons (αἰῶνες οἱ κρείττονες) above the heavens (ch. xx.), carrying with it a notion of permanence (ἑστῶτα δὲ τὸν αἰῶνα, ch. xxvi.) as distinguished from what was transitory, which may very well have led on to theories akin to those of Valentinus (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* i. 28). (2.) The doctrine that the protoplast lost, with the loss of the Holy Spirit, the image and likeness of God (chs. viii., xii., xv.), would lead—were the impetus given—to the denial of the salvation of Adam which Irenaeus attributed to him (do. iii. 23, § 8). (3.) His allusion (ch. xv.) to man as distinguished from the brute—implying by contrast points of resemblance between them—makes easily possible a transition to the severer views with which he was afterwards accredited, of not only denouncing marriage as defilement and fornication in the same way as Marcion and Saturninus (Irenaeus ch. xv.: Jerome, *Commentar. loc. cit. in Epist. ad Gal.* vi.), but also the use of meats, which God had created for use (Jerome, *adv. Jovin.* i. 3), and—in the special case of women—of ornaments likely to excite the passions. (Clem. Alex. *Frag.* See the ipsissima verba of these passages, collected in Otto's Appendix to the *Oratio*, pp. 164–175.) All this is sufficient to explain why the Church seceded from Tatian, rather than why Tatian seceded from the Church:—not without pain to him, if the memories of what he has described in the *Oratio* (chs. xxxii., xxxiii.) remained in his heart. Were the heretical writings in existence which Irenaeus affirmed that Tatian had written and he himself had read (Zahn, i. p. 281), it might have been possible to judge how far they justified Irenaeus in describing him as "elated, puffed up as if superior to other teachers, and forming his own type of doctrine: vacuum loquens vacuos a fide auditores sibi praepararet" (cp. the curiously similar charge quoted above in the analysis of ch. xxxv.). It might also have been possible to trace something of his restlessness, singularity, and erroneousness in the "Problems," and—if these were confined to the Old Testament—in other lost works, such as the περὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν σωτῆρα καταρτισμοῦ ("Concerning perfection according to the Saviour;" Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 12; see Zahn, i. p. 13, 285), and in the criticisms, paraphrases, or translations of some of St. Paul's Epistles, which Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 29) had heard of, and which Jerome described as repudiations of the Apostolic works in question (*Praef. in Comm. to Titus*, see Zahn i. p. 6, n. 4). A few hints only are forthcoming on these points, and these filtered through unfriendly rather than friendly channels. But the general impression cannot be resisted. Tatian became first suspected and then denounced. He left Rome, possibly pausing at Alexandria to become for a while the teacher of others, and among them of the afterwards famous Clement of Alexandria (cp. Lightfoot, p. 1133; Zahn, i. p. 12), and then continuing his journey to the East, to Mesopotamia (Epiphanius, *Haer.* xlvi. 1. Correct his error in chronology by Lightfoot and Zahn, i. p. 282), there to live the remainder of his life, and there to die. It is more than probable that on leaving Rome he carried the Diatessaron with him, unpublished, if not unwritten. In the West he had become unacceptable. The language of

Irenaeus about A.D. 185—i.e. in all probability after Tatian's death—leaves no doubt upon this point. Men honoured and valued the *Oratio* (cp. *int. al.* Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte*, pp. 386–7); but they say nothing of the Diatessaron. In the Greek-speaking churches of the East the writer of the *Oratio* was not less valued (cp. Euseb. *H.E.* iv. 29; v. 28), and they speak of the Diatessaron; but it is by report or at second-hand only. Ugly rumours circulated. Tatian, described broadly as "connexio omnium haereticorum" (Iren. *Adv. Haer.* iii. 23), had become, in defiance of historical certainty (Zahn, i. p. 288), an Encratite (see Dictionary *s. n.*), one whose tenets had spread into Asia Minor from Antioch, and who blossomed out at last into "Encratitarum acerrimus haeresiarches" (Jerome). Had Irenaeus, Eusebius, or Jerome known the Diatessaron, would they not have examined it as they had examined Tatian's *Oratio* and other works? Would not the very compilation of a Diatessaron have been obnoxious to one who, like Irenaeus, counted the fourfold Gospels (neither more, nor less) an absolute necessity (see Dictionary iii. pp. 270–71)? But in the Syriac-speaking East he was unknown, or not followed by troublesome reflexions upon his orthodoxy, and there the teacher who was eclectic rather than heterodox, who chose in *Oratio* and *Diatessaron*, in "problems" and "metaphrases," to impress ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου, could produce and circulate that work, which commended itself to the "simplicity" of the Churches of Edessa and its neighbourhood "on account of its brevity," till a Theodoret appeared to enlighten them. The act was the act of such a man as Tatian was—a man of strong individual character and of great self-reliance; shaking himself loose of either folly or indifference in matters of religious practice, and finding strength in the severity and restraint of the sterner ascetics; holding his own theological opinions the more dogmatically and eclectically as they aroused suspicion and detraction. By his very faults he served the Church.

The date of his death is unknown, but if he left Rome about A.D. 172 or 173 he would have been about 62 years of age, and—humanly speaking—with time before him to circulate the Diatessaron before he passed to rest.

Literature.—In the prolegomena (pp. xiii–xxix) to Otto's edition (already referred to) of the *Oratio* will be found a description of the MSS., editions, etc., in existence (cp. also Harnack, *op. cit.* pp. 1–97; Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature and Doctrine*, iii. pp. 60–62). In addition to the works freely used and specified in this article, a few more are named by Möller in the article on Tatian in Herzog's R. E.[2].

[J. M. F.]

TATIANUS (2), March 12, martyr at Merus, in Phrygia, with Macedonius and Theodulus, under Julian. They were ordered to cleanse and repair the temple of the town and repaint the idols. Instead of obeying, they broke into it at night and smashed the idols. They then confessed their offence and were roasted alive. "But even in the last extremity they gave the most heroic proof of fortitude, addressing the ruthless governor thus: 'If you wish to eat broiled flesh, Amachius, turn us on the other side also, lest we should appear but half-cooked to your taste.'" (Socrat. *H. E.* iii. 15.) [G. T. S.]

TATIANUS (3), presbyter of Myra, named in 375 by St. Basil along with POLEMO (2) and others. [C. H.]

TATIANUS (4), pretorian prefect to whom Theodosius addressed the law of March 11th, 391, setting at liberty those children whom their fathers through poverty had sold into slavery. (*Cod. Theod.* lib. iii. tit. 3, leg. 1.) On March 13th, A.D. 392, he addressed another edict to him, imposing fines upon various high officials for delaying punishments upon convicted criminals (*l. c.* lib. ix. tit. 40, leg. 15). [G. T. S.]

TATIANUS (5), a deacon, who, at the end of the 4th century, was staying with Jerome at Bethlehem, and sent his salutations to Jerome's correspondent Tranquillinus (Jerome, *Ep.* 62, ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

TATIANUS (6), prefect of Constantinople, and one of the imperial commissioners who presided at the council of Chalcedon A.D. 451. Hefele endeavours to maintain that they took no essential part in the council, a view which his own statement sufficiently refutes (*Hist. of Councils*, iii. 296, ed. Clark; cf. Mansi, t. vi. p. 563). [G. T. S.]

TATION (Τατίων), martyr in Isauria in the persecution of Diocletian (*Menaea*, Aug. 24; Neale, *Patr. of Antioch*, p. 70). [C. H.]

TATON. [TASO.]

TATWIN (TATWINE, TATUINI, TADWINUS), the ninth archbishop of Canterbury (*M. H. B.* p. 616). Tatwin is described by Bede (*H. E.* v. 23) as of the province of the Mercians, and as having before his promotion been a priest in the monastery called Briudun. As Ethelbald of Mercia was far the most powerful king in England at the time of the vacancy caused by the death of archbishop Brihtwald, it may be reasonably inferred that he had some influence in the appointment of his successor; and in that case the monastery in which Tatwin was living was doubtless that at Bredon in Worcestershire, which in 716 was endowed by Eanulf, a cousin of Ethelbald and grandfather of king Offa, who was also a munificent patron (Kemble, *C. D.* 138, 140). Brihtwald died Jan. 13, 731; Tatwin was elected within a few months, and consecrated the same year, on June 10 at Canterbury, by bishop Daniel of Winchester, the two Mercian bishops, Ingwald of London, Aldwin of Lichfield, and Aldulf of Rochester (Bede, *H. E.* v. 23). He was a man remarkable for religion and prudence, and eminently well instructed in sacred literature. He probably sent at once to Rome for the pall, and, as in the only charter in which his name occurs he describes himself as *episcopus*, he probably considered that the investiture with that emblem was necessary to give him the full metropolitan power. That that belief was held somewhat later is certain; for the Canterbury monks in the 11th century brought forward a letter of pope Gregory III. addressed to the English bishops on behalf of Tatwin (Will. Malmesb. *G. P.* i. § 36; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 311, 312). In this letter the Pope states that Tatwin himself went to Rome for the pall which

he formally bestowed on him, subjecting to him all the churches of Britain. This grant, which is contrary to the scheme of Gregory the Great, and which is inconsistent with the fact that Gregory III. himself immediately after gave a pall to Egbert of York, throws doubt on the authenticity of the letter, and at the least suggests an interpolation. Bede says nothing of a journey of Tatwin to Rome; he, however, concludes his history almost immediately, and too much stress must not be laid on his silence. It is to the ancient continuation of Bede by the northern annalist (*M. H. B.* p. 288), preserved also by Simeon of Durham (*ib.* 658), that we owe the information that Tatwin certainly received the pall, and after the reception consecrated two bishops, Alwig of Lindsey and Sigfrith of Selsey.

Tatwin's episcopate was very short. The one charter which he attests is a grant of Ethelbert of Kent to abbat Dun at "Liminaee" of a small extent of land for a salt-making establishment, and a hundred waggon loads of wood annually for the same purpose, to which was added a gift of 100 acres of land at Sandtun (K. *C. D.* 77); and the only other act which later writers assign to him is the benediction of abbat Nothbald, the successor of Albinus at St. Augustine's (Elm. p. 302). The period was, however, eventful enough, for it must have witnessed the great extension of Boniface's missionary enterprise, and the revival or re-creation of the independent archbishopric in the north of England. The letter of Boniface to the English bishops (*Mon. Mogunt.* ed. Jaffe, No. 39; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 313), although Tatwin is not named in it, may have been written during his pontificate. During the same period Bede wrote the famous letter to Egbert, which stimulated him to the organisation of the church in Northumbria.

Tatwin died July 30, 734 (Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* 658; Cont. Bede, *ibid.* 288). The Canterbury writers, Thorn, c. 1772, and Elmham, p. 311, place the event a year later. He was buried at St. Augustine's, and the latter writer gives him an epitaph of four lines which contain nothing important.

A collection of forty riddles ascribed to Tatwin is preserved in the Royal MS. Reg. 12, c. 23, which is certainly very ancient, and in a Cambridge MS. in the Public Library, Gg. 5, 35, from which they were printed by Dr. Giles in his *Anecdota Bedae*, &c., 1851. They are curious but not interesting, being of the same character as the Aenigmata ascribed to Boniface and Eusebius; and they are in tolerable medieval Latin. The subjects are philosophy, Christian graces, letters, parchment, pens, ink, the altar, the cross, the lectern, the needle, the paten, pride, the five senses, arms, different pieces of furniture, &c. They are, however, not a collection of stray morsels, but written on the plan of a double acrostic. Bale assigns other poems to Tatwin, of which nothing is known. See Wright, *Biogr. Literaria*, i. 244, 245; Bale, Scriptores, ed. 1559, p. 98: see Wharton, *Ang. Sac.* i. 3, 94, &c.; Will. Malmesb. *G. P.* i. § 2. [S.]

TAURIANUS (1), a prefect and a pagan, who violated the shrine of St. Plato of Ancyra by dragging from it some debtors to the imperial revenue, and was bitterly reproved and threatened with the saint's vengeance by St. Nilus. (Nil. *Epist.* ii. 178; Ceill. viii. 218.) [NILUS (3)] [PLATO (1).] [G. T. S.]

TAURIANUS (2), a bishop, condemned by a Macedonian synod. He produced a forged letter in his behalf from pope Innocent I. The synod wrote to the pope, who disclaimed the letter in an epistle sent by Eumenius to a bishop Rufus. [EUMENIUS (3).] [Ceill. vii. 516.] [G. T. S.]

TAURINUS (1), first bishop of Evreux, has *Acta* said to be written by Adeodatus or Deodatus, a pupil and presbyter (Boll. *A. SS.* Aug. ii. 635 sq., with praev. comment., histories of his Invention and Translation, and Procession of his body in A.D. 1158). The *Acta* are generally worthless, and represent him as sent from Rome with St. Denys of Paris, and made bishop of Evreux by the latter prelate in the third century, but Tillemont (*H. E.* iv. 203 and note 24, ed. 1732) thinks he rather belongs to the end of the sixth century. His feast is 11 Aug. in the Martyrologies (Usuard. *Mart.* 11 Aug.), and the abbey church of St. Thaurin was built on his tomb, and contains his relics. (Vincent. Belvac., *Spec. Hist.* xi. 33-4, 76-9; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 564; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 96-7, xiii. 601-2). For a full list of authorities, see Chevalier, *Repert.* 2151-2). He occurs erroneously as a British bishop of York in the list of Godwin (Stubbs, *Reg. Sac.* 153). [J. G.]

TAURINUS (2), count of Africa, A.D. 348, at the time when Paulus and Macarius were sent by Constans to endeavour to conciliate the Donatists (Vol. I. p. 883). They were resisted at Bagaia by a mob of Circumcellions, with Donatus bishop of that place at their head, and when much disturbance had taken place Taurinus sent a military force to restore order. Some were killed at a place called Octavum, probably about eight miles from Cirta, and Marculus suffered death in a manner regarded by the Donatists as a martyrdom, while Taurinus was branded as a persecutor. (Optatus, iii. 4. Aug. c. *Petil.* iii. 25. 29; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 249.) [MARCULUS, Vol. III. 824.] [H. W. P.]

TAURUS (1), pretorian prefect to whom the emperor Constantius entrusted the bishops at the council of Rimini, in A.D. 359, with orders to permit none to leave till they had yielded to the imperial wishes and embraced Arian views. The emperor promised him the consulship if he succeeded. (Sulpic. Sev. *Chron.* ii. 41, 43, 44; Hefele's *Councils*, t. ii. p. 289, Clark's trans.) [G. T. S.]

TAURUS (2), a patrician to whom Theodoret wrote in 449, by the Oriental deputies, begging him not to listen to calumnious charges, but to credit his assurance of his unwavering orthodoxy. (Theod. *Ep.* 88.) [E. V.]

TAVIA, a Christian of Smyrna, saluted by St. Ignatius (*Ep. ad Smyrn.* § 13; Tillem. ii. 331). But the best reading is Gavia (Lightfoot, *Ignat.* pt. ii. vol. ii. sec. i. p. 325). [C. H.]

TAYO, surnamed SAMUEL, bishop of Saragosse, succeeded BRAULIO in A.D. 651, and was present at the eighth, ninth, and tenth councils of Toledo in A.D. 653, 655, and 656 (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 386, 405, 407), after which no bishop of Saragossa appears

till A.D. 683. He had previously been an abbat, and a letter is extant from Braulio answering some questions he had asked about the resurrection of the body (*Ep.* 42, in *Esp. Sag.* xxx. 378). Before Braulio's death he was sent by king KINDASVINTH to Rome to procure those of the works of Gregory the Great which were not to be found in Spain. He diligently sought for them, and copied them with his own hand (*Ep. ad Eugenium*). The legend in Isidorus Pacensis that the place where they were concealed was miraculously shown him by Gregory himself in a vision is of later date, and finds no support from his own writings. Among other mistakes in Isidorus, Tayo is described as being a bishop when he visited Rome, though it appears from Braulio's letter he was then still an abbat. Early in the reign of RECCESVINTH, while confined to Saragossa by the revolt of Froya, Tayo compiled five books of *Sententiae* from the works of SS. Gregory the Great and Augustin, forming a complete system of theology, and dedicated them to QUIRICUS of Barcelona. This work was first published by Risco in *Esp. Sag.* xxxi., along with his letters, and the whole is reprinted in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 723. From the letter to Eugenius we learn that Tayo also composed another work now lost, resembling that of PATERIUS, namely, a collection of the passages of scripture commented on by Gregory, arranged in the order in which they came in the Bible. Four parts comprised those from the Old Testament, and two those from the New. He sent the work to EUGENIUS II. of Toledo for his criticism and correction (*Esp. Sag.* xxx. 179; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (2) 149). [F. D.]

TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES. In the article CLEMENS ROMANUS (Vol. I. p. 557 b) has been related the discovery by Bryennius at Constantinople of a MS. containing an unmutilated text of the two Epistles ascribed to Clement. It was there stated that the same volume also contained a work called the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles"; but though Bryennius published the text of Clement in 1875, it was not until the close of 1883 that he gave to the world the work which is the subject of the present article, and which proved to be one which had not been previously published, no other copy being known to exist.

The MS. bears the heading "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" (διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων), followed by the fuller title "Teaching of the Lord by the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles" (διδαχὴ Κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). That both these titles belong to the original form of the work appears probable from the phrase "the twelve Apostles." The phrase διδαχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων occurs in Acts ii. 42; and the earliest writers who have been supposed to speak of the present work (Eusebius and Athanasius) do so merely under the name "Teaching of the Apostles"; in fact, the addition of "twelve" to the title is superfluous, when once the word Apostle has come to be limited to the Twelve. But in the work itself we find, as will be presently mentioned, the word Apostle used in a very wide sense; so that if this really represents Church usage at the time and place when the work was written, the title "Teaching of the Apostles" would be quite vague, without the addition "Twelve," to show that there were intended the "Twelve whom also our Lord named Apostles" (Luke vi. 13), and who possibly, in order to avoid the same ambiguity, are called (Rev. xxi. 14) the "Twelve Apostles of the Lamb."

The title of the present work is only intended to describe its substance, and not to assert anything as to its direct authorship. Though the work is called "Teaching of the Lord," our Lord is certainly not represented as the speaker, for we have such expressions as "concerning these things spake the Lord," "as the Lord ordered in His Gospel," "as ye have in the Gospel of our Lord." Neither, again, is the work written in the name of the twelve Apostles; for the author uses the singular number, addressing his disciple as "my child." Nor does the treatise itself contain any indication either that the author of the entire claimed to be one of the Apostles, or that the work is to be broken up into sections supposed to be spoken by successive Apostles. In this respect the present document is favourably distinguished from a number of spurious works claiming Apostolic authorship which appeared in early times. But just as in the case of the Apostles' creed, a title which apparently was originally only intended to assert conformity with Apostolic teaching of the substance of the creed, came to be understood as an assertion of authorship, and later authorities undertook to specify the clauses contributed by each Apostle, so it happened here; and later works founded on the Didaché are divided into sections supposed to be contributed by individual Apostles.

The work divides itself into two parts: the first part, which we shall refer to as "the Two Ways," forming the first six chapters of Bryennius's edition, contains moral instruction; the second part (chaps. 7–15 Bryennius) deals with Church ritual and discipline, to which is added a chapter (16) on our Lord's Second Coming. Several very early writers exhibit coincidences with the first part, such as to prove either that they used the Didaché, or that the Didaché borrowed from them, or that both drew from a common source. In the case of the second part, similar coincidences are both much later and much more scanty. The first part was intended to be put into the hands of Catechumens, or at least to be used in their instruction; for the second part, which begins by treating of baptism, directs that candidates shall first have received the preceding teaching.

Contents.—The work begins by declaring that there are two ways: one of Life, the other of Death; phrases borrowed from Jer. xxi. 8, a passage itself derived from Deut. xxx. 19. It goes on to describe first the Way of Life, which is summed up in the two precepts: first, love God who made thee; and secondly, love thy neighbour as thyself, and do not to another what thou wouldest not have done to thyself.[a]

---

[a] The maxim in this negative form is found in substance in Tobit iv. 15. It may possibly be owing to the influence of the Didaché that it is found appended in the same negative form to the instructions to the Gentiles in Acts xv., in D. and some cursive MSS., confirmed by Irenaeus or his translator (III. xii. 14), and by Cyprian

Then follow several precepts taken from the Sermon on the Mount; and the chapter concludes with a comment on the command, "Give to every one that asketh thee," in which those are severely censured who accept alms without needing them.

As the first chapter is based on the Sermon on the Mount, so is the second on the second table of the Decalogue. It will be enough to mention here that after the command thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit adultery, follows, thou shalt not corrupt boys (*οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις*). This is noted because the same feature presents itself in other writers, as will be hereafter mentioned. The third chapter instructs the disciple to flee not only from every evil, but from everything like it. We are to avoid anger, for example, because anger leads to murder; lust and filthy speaking, because these lead to fornication and adultery; divination, because this leads to idolatry; lying, because it leads to theft. The fourth chapter contains miscellaneous precepts; some of them pre-Christian; as, for instance, "Be not one who stretches forth his hands for receiving, but shuts them tight for giving" (Ecclus. iv. 31); but some having a Christian aspect, "Share all things with thy brother, and say not that they are thine own, for if you are joint partakers in what is immortal, how much more in mortal things" (Acts iv. 32; Rom. xv. 27). The way of life having been described in the first four chapters, the fifth gives an enumeration of the sins which constitute the way of death. The sixth chapter is a short exhortation to the disciple to abide in the foregoing teaching; but giving him permission if he cannot bear the whole yoke, and especially in matters of food, to be content with bearing as much as he can; provided always he abstains from things offered to idols. Here terminates the section addressed to the Catechumen. Then follow (chap. 7) directions for the baptism of candidates who have received the preceding instruction. It is to be in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; it is to take place in running water if it can be had; if not, in any water, even warm water. If sufficient water for immersion is not at hand, it will suffice to pour water three times on the head of the candidate. Both baptizer and baptized must fast beforehand; the baptized for a day or two beforehand: others, if possible, to join in the fast. This rule of fasting may be illustrated by the account given in the Clementines (*Hom.* iii. 11; *Recog.* vii. 36) of the baptism of Clement's mother. Peter directs that she shall fast one day previous to baptism, and though he knows that she has been already two days without food, he will not accept this as a fulfilment of the baptismal fast; she must fast one day more, and he himself and her sons will fast with her.

The next chapter relates to fasting and prayer. The disciples must not fast "as the hypocrites," on the second and fifth days of the week; but on the fourth and on the preparation day. Neither must they pray as the hypocrites, but as the Lord ordered in His Gospel. The words of the Lord's Prayer are given in conformity with Matthew's text with but trifling variations, but with the addition of the doxology "Thine is the power and the glory for ever." This prayer is to be used thrice daily. The next two chapters (9, 10) contain Eucharistic formulæ. In the opening words "Concerning the thanksgiving, give thanks in this manner," we can scarcely avoid giving to the word *εὐχαριστία* the technical meaning which it had as early as Ignatius (*Philad.* 4; *Smyrn.* 6 & 8; *Ephes.* 13; see also Justin Martyr *Apol.*, 66.) And this interpretation is confirmed by a direction that of this "Eucharist" none but baptized persons should partake, since the Lord has said "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs." But the forms themselves are more like what we should expect in prayers before and after an ordinary meal than in formulæ connected with the Eucharist proper. There is no recital of the words of institution; no mention of the Body and Blood of our Lord, though both Ignatius and Justin Martyr in the passages just cited so describe the consecrated food. It might perhaps be thought that we had here private prayers to be said by the communicant before and after reception; but this supposition is excluded by the direction that "prophets" should be permitted to offer thanks as they pleased, where it is plain that public thanksgiving is intended. The explanation seems to be that the celebration of the Eucharist accompanied the Agape or Love Feast, and that we have here the thanksgivings before and after that joint solemn meal. It is to be noted that in the Clementines, which in several points manifest affinity with the document now under consideration, it is not merely the Eucharist from which the unbaptized are excluded. They can take no food of any kind at the same table with the initiated. An unbaptized person is the home of the demon, and until this demon has been driven out by baptism, no Christian can safely admit him to a common table (*Recog.* ii. 71; see also i. 19, vii. 36). And all through the Clementines the language in which the benediction of every meal is described is such as to make it difficult to say whether or not a celebration of the Eucharist is meant to be described In the form given in the Didaché, the following points deserve notice. 1. The benediction of the cup precedes that of the bread (see Luke xxii. 17-19). 2. The broken bread has the technical name *τὸ κλάσμα*. 3. The thanksgiving for the cup runs: "We give thanks to Thee our Father, for the holy vine of Thy servant David which Thou hast made known to us through Thy servant Jesus." This expression the "vine of David" was known to Clement of Alexandria, who says of Christ (*Quis dives salv.* 29), "who poured forth the wine, the blood of the vine of David, for our wounded souls." Elsewhere (*Paed.* i. 5) treating of Gen. xlix. "binding the colt to the vine," he interprets "the vine" of the Logos who gives his blood, as the vine yields wine. To the question as to the source of the expression we shall return afterwards. 4. The benedictory prayer contains a petition that as the broken bread had been scattered on

(*Test.* iii. 119). The precept is found in the same form in Theophilus (*ad Autol.* ii. 34); but the context does not furnish coincidences such as would warrant us in saying that the Didaché was the source. Lampridius tells (*Alex. Sev.* 51) that Alexander Severus was fond of quoting this precept, which he had learned either from some Jews or Christians.

the mountains and had been brought together and made one, so might the Church be collected together from the ends of the earth. The inference from this phrase as to the place of composition will be discussed further on. 5. The thanksgiving prayer after reception is directed to be said "after being filled" (μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι), words answering better to the conclusion of an Agape than of a Eucharistic celebration. A quite similar phrase is found in one of the parallel Clementine passages to which reference has already been made (*Recog.* i. 19).

The next three chapters (11, 12, 13) treat of the honour to be paid to the Christian teachers, who are described under the title "Apostles and Prophets." This combination of terms reflects New Testament usage (1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; Eph. ii. 20; iii. 8; iv. 11). The word Apostle in our document is not limited to the Twelve, but is used so as to answer to our word "missionary." Every true Apostle was a prophet, but only those prophets received the name Apostle who were not fixed in one place, but were accredited by Churches on a mission to distant localities. This terminology may be regarded as a proof of the antiquity of our document (see Lightfoot's dissertation on the word Apostle (*Galatians*, p. 92)). It appears from the authorities there cited that the word was used by the Jews to denote an envoy sent by the authorities at Jerusalem to Jews in foreign places, especially the envoy charged with the collection of the Temple tribute. Our document is solicitous to provide for the due entertainment of the Christian missionaries, and yet to guard against the Church's hospitality being traded on by impostors or lazy persons. Every apostle was to be received as the Lord; but if he wanted to prolong his stay beyond two days at most, he betrayed himself as a false prophet. It is clear that the apostle spoken of is an envoy on his way to another place; for it could never have been intended to forbid a missionary to settle down in one spot for a longer period of preaching. The false apostle in like manner is said to betray himself if he asks for money, or for a larger supply of travelling provisions than will carry him on to the next stage of his journey. There are commands in a similar spirit for the hospitable treatment of ordinary Christian strangers. One who is merely passing on his way, they are to assist as much as they are able; but he is to make no stay, except in case of necessity for two or three days. If he wishes to settle among them, he must work at a handicraft if he has one; or if not, must employ himself in some other way; but if he wants to eat the bread of idleness, he is one who makes merchandise of Christ (χριστέμπορός ἐστιν). The use of this word by Pseudo-Ignatius (*ad Trall.* 6, *ad Magn.* 9) falls in with the conclusion to which we are led by other considerations, that the interpolator was acquainted with the Didaché.[b]

In like manner self-seeking is noted as a mark by which the false prophet may be discerned. There is a command in which commentators have found a difficulty, that a prophet speaking in the spirit must not be proved nor tested. "Every sin shall be forgiven, but not that." And yet the chapter goes on to give marks for discerning the false prophet from the true. But the subsequent history of Montanism casts a clear light on the subject. What at that time caused the greatest outcry was that the bishops attempted to test the Montanist prophetesses by applying to them the formulae of exorcism, in order to find whether it would not be possible to cast out an evil spirit who possessed them. This the Montanists naturally resisted as a frightful indignity. And manifestly it is such testing by exorcism which is here forbidden, involving as it did, if applied to one really inspired by the Spirit of God, the risk of incurring the penalties denounced by our Lord, in words plainly here referred to, against blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. That this precept of the Didaché does not appear to have been quoted in the Montanist disputes is one of many indications, that our document had only a very limited circulation. Hilgenfeld's notion, that the Didaché itself is as late as Montanism, is condemned both by the whole character of the document, which speaks of an earlier date, and by the fact that it is silent on the vital question in the Montanist controversy, whether true prophets lost their self-command when prophesying. To suppose that every early document which speaks of prophesying must be Montanistic is to ignore the fact that prophetical gifts were recognized in the early Church, and that Montanism was an unsuccessful local attempt to revive pretensions to them after they had generally ceased to be regarded as an ordinary feature of Church life.[c] The Didaché gives a different way of discerning the false prophet from the true, namely, by his life and conversation. If he taught the truth, but did not practise what he taught, he was a false prophet. He might when speaking in the spirit direct that gifts should be bestowed on others; but if he asked anything for himself, or if he gave commands in the benefit of which he was himself to share, he was a false prophet. But a true prophet, settling in one place, deserves his maintenance. So also does a teacher, by which apparently we are to understand a preacher who does not speak in prophetic ecstasy. To the prophets are to be given the first-fruits of all produce; "for they are your high priests." If there are no prophets, the first-fruits are to be given to the poor.

The next chapter (14) directs Christians to come together on each Lord's-day to break bread and to give thanks, having confessed their sins, in order that their sacrifice may be pure. Those who are at variance must not pollute the sacrifice by coming without having been first reconciled. And then our document quotes the

[b] Harnack says that Bryennius quotes Athanasius as having used this word, but he gives no reference; and there is no mention of Athanasius in Bryennius's note on the passage. The use of the phrase χριστέμποροι οὐ χριστιανοί is common to Pseudo-Ignatius and Basil (*Ep.* 240). Lightfoot infers that Pseudo-Ignatius borrowed from Basil, but I am more disposed to think that the obligation is the other way. I have not seen evidence of independent acquaintance with the Didaché on the part of Basil.

[c] In the epistles of Ignatius the phrase, "the Prophets," means the Old Testament Prophets, and there is no indication that there was then an order of Prophets in the Christian Church.

prophecy of Malachi (i. 10) in which so many of the fathers from Justin Martyr downwards (*Trypho*, 41, 116) have seen a prediction of the Eucharistic oblation. The document proceeds in the next chapter (15), "Elect therefore to yourselves bishops and deacons." These are to receive the same honour as the prophets and teachers, as fulfilling a like ministration. The place where this mention of bishops and deacons occurs appears to demand some explanation. In the preceding chapters where church officers are spoken of, only mention is made, as in 1 Cor., of apostles, prophets and teachers; and of these, apostles are only stranger visitors of the church, and prophets are men endowed with supernatural gifts of the Holy Ghost, who may or may not be found in any particular church. Bearing in mind then the account given by Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 66) of the share taken by "the president" and the deacons in the Eucharistic celebration, we seem warranted in inferring from the "therefore" at the beginning of this chapter that it was with a view to the conduct of the weekly stated service that bishops and deacons are described as appointed; and that although gifted men were allowed to preach and teach in the church assemblies, yet the offering of the Eucharist was confined to these permanent officers.

There is a possible explanation of the place which bishops and deacons occupy here. Reasons will presently be given for thinking the Didaché published by Bryennius to be an expansion of an earlier document. It is possible that that earlier document may have only mentioned apostles, prophets and teachers (as in 1 Cor. xii. 28); the "prophets" being men who spoke under the influence of inspiration, and the "teachers" being the ordinary uninspired officers of the church. And it is possible that the section on "bishops and deacons" may have been added when the Didaché assumed its present form; the editor feeling it necessary that mention should be made of the recognized names of the officers of the church in his time.

The last chapter (16) is an exhortation to watch for our Lord's second coming, in order to be able to pass safely through the heavy trial that was immediately to precede it. This time of trial was to be signalized by the appearance of one who is called the "deceiver of the world" (*κοσμοπλάνος*), who should appear as God's Son, and who should do signs and wonders, and into whose hands the earth should be delivered, so that under the trial many should be scandalized and be lost. (Compare 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4; Rev. xii. 9; Matt. xxiv. 21, 24, x. 22.) But then shall appear the signs of the truth: first the sign of outspreading (*ἐκπετάσεως*) in heaven (a difficult phrase which need not here be discussed), then the sign of the trumpet's voice (Matt. xxiv. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16), and thirdly the resurrection of the dead. But not of all; but, as was said, the Lord shall come and all His saints with Him. Then shall the world see the Lord coming on the clouds of heaven.

External attestation.—The sketch just given is enough to show that the document we are considering, though only newly come to light, bears marks of very high antiquity. It has next to be examined what ancient writers either expressly speak of the Didaché, or manifest acquaintance with it. We may place as the lower limit of our enquiry, the time of the appearing in its present shape of the Apostolic Constitutions, the first half of the seventh book of which contains an expansion of the Didaché. It is plain that the forger of this book of the Apostolic Constitutions was acquainted not only with the section on the Two Ways, but with the entire of the Didaché; for he goes through it from beginning to end, making changes and additions, the study of which throws interesting light on the development of church ritual during the interval between the two works. The copy is so close as frequently to serve as a commentary, showing in what sense the copyist understood his original. For example, the Didaché teaches that he who speaks the word of God is to be honoured as the Lord: and gives as a reason *ὅθεν γαρ ἡ κυριότης λαλεῖται, ἐκεῖ κύριός ἐστιν.* The Constitutions substitute for this difficult expression, "where the teaching concerning God is, there God is present." Again, the Didaché directs that those who come shall be proved, adding, "for ye shall have understanding right and left" (*σύνεσιν ἕξετε δεξιὰν καὶ ἀριστεράν*). The Constitutions have "ye have understanding and are able to know the right hand or the left, and to distinguish the true teacher from the false." On the other hand, we may assume that the author of the Constitutions did not understand the word *ἐκπέτασις*, which we have just quoted; for he substitutes the Scripture phrase, "the sign of the Son of man in heaven." Another passage in the Didaché which has much puzzled commentators (*ποιῶν εἰς κοσμικὸν μυστήριον ἐκκλησίας*) is skipped over by the author of the Constitutions altogether. Harnack has given what seem to us sufficient reasons for thinking that it was the same forger who manipulated the Didaché and the Ignatian letters, and that his work may have been as early as A.D. 350. We may conclude that the Didaché was at the time an ancient document, but one in such small circulation that it could be tampered with without much fear of detection.

We refer to the article APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS in the DICT. CHRIST. ANTIQUITIES for some account of various attempts made to promulgate ecclesiastical ordinances claiming to possess apostolic authority. But it is necessary here to take notice of the tract professing to contain apostolic constitutions, published by Bickell in 1843,[d] which is described DICT. CHR. ANT. i. 123. This is quite independent of the work commonly known under the title of Apostolic Constitutions, and is indeed an earlier work. The two forms employ some common earlier documents, but there is no reason to think that the framer of either was acquainted with the work of the other. Bickell calls this tract *Apostolische Kirchenordnung*, and in order to avoid confusion with the longer known "Apostolic Constitutions," we refer to this under the name of the Church Ordinances. It had been translated into various languages, and is the foundation of Egyptian Canon Law. It would be out of place here to enter into any discussion of this work, except so far as it bears on Bryennius's Didaché, with which it has so much in common

[d] This tract had been transcribed for Grabe, but his death prevented the publication.

that we can say with certainty that either the Church Ordinances used the Didaché, or both drew from a common source. In form the Ordinances differ from the Didaché, in that in the former the precepts are distributed among different apostles by name, of whom indeed the list is peculiar, Cephas appearing as an apostle distinct from Peter; he and Nathanael taking the place of James the Less and Matthias. This at once suggests that the author of the Ordinances was acquainted with the Didaché, and improved on the hint suggested by the title of the latter work, by making the several apostles the actual utterers of the precepts. In substance the two works to a certain extent closely coincide, but the coincidence is almost entirely confined to the section on the Two Ways. We shall return to the question how this coincidence is to be accounted for.

We have placed the *Apostolic Constitutions* first among the witnesses to the Didaché, because in this case there is no room for reasonable doubt that the work of which our witness made use was substantially the same as that which has come down to us. There are, however, earlier writers who know of a work which professed to contain the teaching of the Apostles, but concerning whom we cannot say with certainty whether the work to which they give attestation is the same as ours. The list of direct witnesses is indeed much shorter than it must have been if the work had obtained any wide acceptance in the church as containing really apostolic instruction. Earliest is Eusebius, who to his list of Canonical Scriptures (*H. E.* iii. 25) adds a list of spurious books of the better sort, recognized by church writers, and so to be distinguished from writings which heretics had forged in the names of apostles. Among these he enumerates next after the Epistle of Barnabas, "what are called the Teachings of the Apostles" (*τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι διδαχαί*). Some years later Athanasius (*Ep. Fest.* 39) adds to his list of canonical Scriptures a list of non-canonical books useful to be employed in the catechetical instruction of new converts. The books he names are the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit, the so-called Teaching of the Apostles (*διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων*), and the Shepherd. The only obstacle to our supposing Bryennius's Didaché to be here referred to is the Eucharistic formulæ which our tract contains, and which we can scarcely think Athanasius would place in the hands of the uninitiated, unless indeed he thought them so unlike the truth as to make no revelation of Christian mysteries. It will be observed that Eusebius uses the plural number (*διδαχαί*), Athanasius the singular. Unmistakable coincidences with the Didaché have been pointed out in writings ascribed to Athanasius, but rejected as spurious in the Benedictine edition, though the question of the genuineness of at least the second of these is still contested: viz. *De Virginitate* (Migne, p. 266), *Syntagma Doctrinae ad Monaches* (p. 835), and *Fides Nicena* (p. 1639). Among the spurious writings printed with the works of Athanasius is a "Synopsis Sacrae Scripturae," to which, on account of its coincidences with the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus, Credner has assigned as low a date as the 10th century. The Stichometry doubtless preserves an ancient list, and there among the apocryphal books appended to the New Testament Canon we find the *διδαχὴ ἀποστόλων*. Those that precede it in the list belong to the class of heretical apocrypha; but those that follow, viz. the Epistles of Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, and the Shepherd, are all orthodox. The number of *στίχοι* attributed to the Didaché in this list is 200; whereas 1400 are assigned to the Revelation of St. John. Calculations founded on stichometry are uncertain, so that we cannot lay much stress on the fact, that this appears to indicate a somewhat shorter work than Bryennius's *διδαχή*, which according to Harnack would make about 300 *στίχοι*, and which on a rough estimate appears to be about a quarter the length of St. John's Revelation. A list of sixty books of Scripture is appended to a writing of Anastasius, who was patriarch of Antioch in the reign of Justinian, and will be found in Westcott's *N. T. Canon*, p. 550. This gives as an appendix a list of apocryphal books; one title in which is "The Travels (*περίοδοι*) and Teachings (*διδαχαί*) of the Apostles." The absence of the Didaché from the list of the Codex Claromontanus agrees with other indications that this work possessed no authority in Africa.

Next must be mentioned that in one of the fragments, published by Pfaff, as from Irenaeus, we read, "Those who have followed the Second Ordinances of the Apostles (*οἱ ταῖς δευτέραις τῶν ἀποστόλων διατάξεσι παρηκολουθηκότες*) know that our Lord instituted a new offering in the New Covenant according to the saying of Malachi the prophet, 'From the rising of the sun to the going down, my name has been glorified in the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered to my name and a pure offering.'" This passage of Malachi is quoted in the Didaché with reference to the Eucharist; not, however, textually, as in the fragment, but very loosely. We cannot then say more than that it is *possible* that the Didaché may be the "Second Ordinances of the Apostles" referred to in the fragment. The fragment is probably ancient, but it contains a quotation of the Epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's, which proves, as Zahn and others have remarked, that Irenaeus could not have been the author.*

Western testimony to the Didaché is scanty, and rather leads to the conclusion that any book which circulated in the West, as Teaching of the Apostles, was not the same as Bryennius's Didaché. Rufinus (*Comm. in Symb. Apost.* 38) gives a list of canonical books which bears the marks of being derived from the list of Athanasius; but in the place where the Didaché ought to come, he has "qui appellatur Duae Viae vel Judicium Petri." The inference suggests itself that either the entire Didaché, or at least the first half, treating of the "Two Ways," had been translated into Latin and circulated under the

* Dr. Quarry has observed that Renaudot (*Eastern Liturgies*, i. 283) speaks of the use of the *λαβίς* or Eucharistic spoon as prescribed by a constitution "in illis quae secunda Apostolorum praecepta dicuntur." Nothing of the kind is to be found in the Apostolic Constitutions or Canons as we have them. If the authority to which Renaudot referred, and which apparently is Oriental, could be recovered, it might possibly throw light on the Pfaffian fragment.

name of the Judgment of Peter, to whom, and not to the apostles generally, the authorship would seem to have been ascribed. The existence of a Latin "Two Ways" is independently proved by the discovery of a fragment through the sagacious research of von Gebhardt. He had noticed in a Library Catalogue (Kropff's *Bibliotheca Mellicensis*, Vindob. 1747) the entry of a mutilated "doctrina Apostolorum" contained in a MS. not later than the 10th century. Failing in an attempt to trace the MS. itself, Gebhardt fell on the happy thought that Pez, who formerly had charge of the library in question, was likely to have made use of this fragment; and accordingly he found that Pez had actually printed it as an appendix to a sermon of St. Boniface, on the Baptismal renunciation, contained in the same MS. The fragment is reprinted by Gebhardt (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, ii. 277). It is so short as to leave it undetermined whether the Latin version had contained anything corresponding to what follows the Two Ways in Bryennius. The title, however, "Teaching of the Apostles," without the "twelve," affords a presumption that it did not contain the section in which the word apostle is used in a wider sense. The portion of the Two Ways given in the fragment differs so much from Bryennius as to make it certain that the Latin is not a translation of the latter form. Not to speak of minor variations, the Latin differs by defect in not containing any of the precepts from the Sermon on the Mount which, we have already said, are found in chap. i. of the Didaché; and by excess in speaking not only of two ways but of two angels, each presiding over one of the two ways; it also describes these ways as ways of light and darkness. We shall presently show that these variations are by no means accidental. Here we only mention that Lactantius (*Div. Instit.* vi. 3, etc., and *Epit.* c. 59) gives what is beyond mistake an expansion of the teaching of the Two Ways, and that he not only describes the two ways as ways of light and of darkness, but also speaks (vi. 3) of the two immortal beings (one honoured, the other condemned) who preside one over each way. In fact he contrasts the Christian doctrine, with heathen apologues which speak of Two Ways: the latter speak only of a guide to the better way; the Christian teaching knows of a guide to each. It may be concluded that our Latin version was used by Lactantius, and that it is therefore older than A.D. 310.

The treatise *De Aleatoribus*, falsely ascribed to Cyprian, contains a quotation from "doctrinae Apostolorum" (Hartel, ii. 96), "si quis frater delinquit in ecclesia et non paret legi, hic non colligatur, donec poenitentiam agat, et non recipiatur ne inquinetur et impediatur oratio vestra." There is no such sentence in the Didaché, though there is one passage (xiv. 2) which might have suggested the idea to the framer of the Latin. Again, Augustine says (*Ep.* xxxvi. 28) that he finds fasting commanded in the New Testament, but that he finds no precept either of our Lord or His apostles defining on what days one ought or ought not to fast. And it is evident not only from this sentence, but from the whole discussion of the letter, that neither Augustine nor his antagonist, who maintained that we ought to fast thrice in the week, had heard that there was a document claiming apostolic authority which prescribed a fast twice in the week. It may be added that if we can ever rely on the argument from silence, we can safely gather from Tertullian's discussion on the "Stations" (*De Orat.* 19, *De Jejun.* 2, 10, 14) that he too was unacquainted with our document. Thus, scanty though the Western notices are, they seem sufficient to prove that the Didaché, in Bryennius's form, never circulated in the West; that though there was a Latin "doctrina Apostolorum," yet that, even as regards the section on the Two Ways, it was not a translation of Bryennius's Didaché, but contained what was probably a different manipulation of a common original; and that beyond the section on the Two Ways there is no evidence that the Latin form had anything in common with the Didaché.

We come now to speak of coincidences with the Didaché in works which do not mention it by name. Far the most important of these are found in the epistle which goes by the name of Barnabas. In that letter, after the conclusion of the doctrinal teaching, the writer proposes to pass to another doctrine and discipline (γνῶσιν καὶ διδαχὴν), and adds an appendix of moral instructions. The question whether this appendix is an original part of the epistle need not here be considered, there being now no disposition to contest this point. But what we are concerned with is that this appendix agrees so completely in substance with the section on the Two Ways in the Didaché that it is indisputable there is a literary connection between the two documents. But though there is agreement in substance, there is great diversity of detail. The precepts in Barnabas are poured forth without any attempt at orderly arrangement, while on the contrary the Didaché contains a systematic comment on the second table of the Decalogue, the commandments of which are followed by prohibitions of practices tending to cause a breach of these primary commandments. Hence although Bryennius, followed by some of the earlier critics of the Didaché, considered that the Didaché had borrowed from Barnabas, it has seemed to later critics more probable that Barnabas was a borrower. On the one hand, the whole character of the Didaché makes us indisposed to think that its author was likely to have performed such a piece of literary workmanship as collecting the precepts scattered in Barnabas's appendix, digesting them into systematic order, and making to them a number of harmonious additions. On the other hand, if in what Barnabas says about the Two Ways he is but reproducing an older document, the unsystematic way in which he sets down its precepts, just as they presented themselves to his memory, is quite like his mode of dealing with the Old Testament. Accepting then the conclusion that Barnabas, in this part of his epistle, is a borrower, we have still to enquire whether he borrowed from the Didaché, or whether both Didaché and he borrowed from a common source. Now a study of the Didaché, and a comparison of it with Jewish literature, brings out very clearly that it originated among men who had had a Jewish training, and the thought presents itself, that the work from which Barnabas borrowed may have been not only Jewish but pre-Christian. For his own

letter is of so early a date that, if we suppose him to have copied an earlier Christian document, we bring that document into the Apostolic age, and can scarcely refrain from acknowledging it to possess all the authority that has been claimed for it. We are thus led, in comparing Barnabas with the Didaché, to distinguish carefully the specially Christian element from those parts which might have been written by a Jew unacquainted with Christianity. If Barnabas copied the Didaché, he would have included in his copying the Christian element, which he would have had no motive for leaving out. If Barnabas and the Didaché worked independently on an originally Jewish document, the Christian elements which they might respectively add to it would not be likely to be the same. Now when the section in Barnabas is looked at from this point of view, we are struck by the extreme meagreness of the Christian element. There is no mention of our Lord, scarcely any coincidence with New Testament language,[f] very little that might not have been written by a Jew before our Lord's coming. In the Didaché, on the contrary, coincidences with the New Testament are extremely numerous, and, as has been already stated, there is at the beginning a whole section embodying precepts culled from the Sermon on the Mount. This section is entirely absent from Barnabas. It is impossible to resist the conclusion, that Barnabas did not know the Didaché in Bryennius's form. He has elsewhere coincidences with the New Testament, and had no motive for avoiding them. It is not credible that if a book lay before him containing a number of New Testament precepts he would have studiously avoided these in his employment of the work; and granting that he wrote from memory, still passages contained not only in that work but also in the gospel would have had a double hold on his recollection. We conclude then that Barnabas was not acquainted with Bryennius's Didaché; and therefore that the coincidences beween the two works are to be explained by both having made use of a common document.

The conclusion thus arrived at is confirmed, on taking into the comparison the two documents already mentioned, the Latin "Two Ways," and the Egyptian "Church Ordinances," both of which agree with Barnabas in not recognizing that section at the opening of the Didaché which is founded on the Sermon on the Mount. Neither is this section recognised in the passages from Pseudo-Athanasius already referred to. The Church Ordinances exhibit signs of acquaintance with Barnabas; the Latin form does not. With regard to the order of the precepts, the Ordinances and the Latin agree with each other and with the Didaché against Barnabas. The Ordinances differ from the Latin almost altogether by excess; so that if we strike out of the former work all that we may suppose its adapter to have added from his own resources, what is left behind is in close agreement with the Latin. The same reasons that forbid us to think that Barnabas, if he had known the Didaché, would in copying it have expunged the Christian element, lead us to think that the Ordinances and the Latin must likewise have been independent of the Didaché. The phenomena are explained if we assume an original document in substantial agreement with the Latin: this document enlarged in the Didaché by additions from the New Testament; and afterwards independently enlarged in a different way by the framer of the Church Ordinances, who broke it up into sections supposed to be spoken by different Apostles; while Barnabas, not aiming at a literal reproduction of the document before him, worked up in his own way the materials which he drew from it. We are not in a position to say positively whether this original proceeded beyond the Two Ways. The Latin fragment breaks off too soon to give us any information as to the length of the original: the Church Ordinances cease to present coincidences with the Didaché after the section on the Two Ways; but this may be because the directions for ritual and discipline had become out of date at the time when the Ordinances were put together, and the editor therefore designedly substituted what better agreed with the practice of his own age. The quotation by Pseudo-Cyprian leads us to think that the Latin "doctrina Apostolorum" did go beyond the Two Ways. No great weight can be attached to an inference drawn from the length ascribed to the Didaché in the *Stichometry*, but this rather favours the idea that the document intended was longer than the Two Ways, but shorter than the Didaché published by Bryennius.[g]

Before parting with Barnabas it remains to be mentioned that there is a coincidence between Barnabas and the Didaché outside the section on the Two Ways. The opening of the Epistle of Barnabas and the last or eschatological chapter of the Didaché both contain the warning, that the whole time of the disciples' faith would not profit them unless they remained stedfast in the last times. There is a good deal of difference in the wording of the warning, but not more than ordinarily is found in quotations by Barnabas. The supposition that Barnabas was acquainted with Bryennius's form of the Didaché has already been excluded. There remain therefore but two other explanations: (1) that the earlier form which Barnabas did use included an eschatological chapter containing the warning in question; (2) the editor who changed the earlier form into that of Bryennius was acquainted with the Epistle of Barnabas. We prefer the second of these explanations on account of the reasons we shall presently give for thinking the document used by Barnabas to have been pre-Christian. If the editor of Bryennius's form knew Hermas he might also have known Barnabas, with whom he has a second coincidence in the passage already quoted about almsgiving,

[f] We only notice one, and that not with the Gospels. It is the precept on almsgiving which we have already quoted from the Didaché, where it is also found, and which has coincidences both with the Acts and with the Epistle to the Romans.

[g] Since this article was in type Harnack has published an enlargement of his article on the Didaché in Herzog's *Lexicon*. In this he arrives at several of the same results as in this article. He calculates that the Didaché of Nicephorus contained only 7000 letters, that of Bryennius 10,700. Leaving out the chapter on the Sermon on the Mount there would still remain 9835. On the other hand, the Two Ways alone would only make 114 στίχοι instead of 200.

which, as implying a knowledge of the Acts and of Romans, Barnabas was not likely to have found in his original. And possibly there is a third coincidence: for it is a plausible explanation of the difficult word ἐκπέτασις in the last chapter of the Didaché that it means the sign of the cross; being derived from Barnabas's interpretation of ἐξεπέτασα in Isaiah lxv. 2.

Hermas also presents coincidences with the Didaché, but in the case of some of these it is not easy to say whether there is literary obligation on either side. There is but one case where we can positively assert such obligation, and that is with respect to a coincidence between the second "commandment" of Hermas and the "Sermon on the Mount" section, which we have already seen reason to think belongs to a later form of the Didaché. In this case there is every appearance that the originality is on the side of Hermas. His instructions as to almsgiving are perfectly clear. Give to all without anxious enquiry as to whether you should give or not. God wishes His own gifts to be shared by all. The responsibility lies with the receiver. If he takes but what he really needs he is free from blame: if he receives in hypocrisy he shall suffer punishment; but the giver is blameless. The corresponding passage in the Didaché has many coincidences of language, but expresses the thought so awkwardly as to be scarce intelligible without the commentary of Hermas. It begins, "Blessed is he that giveth according to the commandment, for he is blameless: woe to him that receiveth." The words "for he is blameless," as they stand, are puzzling; for after the "Blessed is he that giveth" we should expect the "for" to introduce something stronger than an acquittal of blame which we should not have thought of imputing. By comparison with Hermas we see that the case contemplated is that of giving to an undeserving person. Then the receiver deserves the woe; the giver obtains an acquittal. We conclude then, without disputing the greater antiquity of the original Didaché, that the interpolator who brought the work to the form published by Bryennius was later than Hermas, and drew from him. When we have in one case seen reason to think that the interpolator used Hermas, we are furnished with an explanation of other coincidences, not in themselves sufficient to establish proof of obligation. The passage already referred to, which we have interpreted as forbidding the testing a prophet by exorcism, lest the sin against the Holy Ghost should be committed, is not likely to have formed part of the original document. It uses the New Testament more freely than the original document appears to have done; and it speaks of a time when genuine prophecy in the Church had come to be hard pressed by the rivalry of spurious pretensions. Hermas also finds the necessity of distinguishing the false prophet from the true, but he appears never to have heard of the mode of test condemned in the Didaché. He discriminates prophets by their life and conversation; and in what he says on this topic he appears to have furnished materials to the interpolator.

Clement of Alexandria was certainly acquainted with the Didaché in some form. He expressly quotes one sentence as Scripture (*Strom.* i. 20, p. 377) "my son, be not a liar, for lying leads to theft." This saying is not quoted by Barnabas; but the Church Ordinances attest that it belongs to the earlier form of the Didaché. Clement quotes the decalogue so persistently with the interpolation found in the Didaché οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις (*Cohort. ad gentes*, p. 85; *Paed.* ii. 10, p. 223, iii. 12, p. 305; *Strom.* iii. 4, p. 537), that we are not safe in employing this as a proof of Clement's use of the Didaché, it being possible that, earlier than the Didaché, this interpolation had found its way into Greek bibles. We may well believe even the later form of the Didaché to be considerably older than Clement; and there is no reason why he might not have met with a copy during his travels in the East. He uses (*Quis dives salv.* 20) the phrase "vine of David," which is found in one of the benedictory prayers of the Didaché. He also shows a knowledge (*Strom.* vii. 7, p. 854) of the Wednesday and Friday fasts (c. 12, p. 877), but the discussion in neither place seems to attribute to these institutions the authority which belongs to the name Scripture bestowed by him on the Didaché.

Origen was later than Clement, and he must have been well acquainted with the literature current in his time both in Egypt and Palestine; so that we might naturally expect him to be familiar with the Didaché. And yet no satisfactory proof of his knowledge of the book has yet been produced from his writings. He quotes (*De Princ.* III. ii. 4) from the section of Barnabas on the Two Ways, the passage which speaks of the angels who preside over the way of light and of darkness; but in this connection he says nothing about the Didaché, which indeed in its later form makes no mention of angels. A little further on in the same treatise (*De Princ.* III. ii. 7) a passage found in the Didaché is quoted as the teaching of divine Scripture; but since this passage is found in identical words in the epistle of Barnabas quoted a little before, and since Origen elsewhere (*Comm. in Rom.* i. 24) cites Barnabas as Scripture, we need not look elsewhere for the source of the quotation. Origen speaks of the Friday fast (*adv. Cels.* viii. 22), and of the Wednesday fast (*Hom. x. in Levit.*), which last however we have only in a Latin translation. His discussion shows no sign of acquaintance with the Didaché.

Place of Composition.—The Church Ordinances, at the basis of which lies the Didaché in some form, are with good reason regarded as of Egyptian origin; Clement, one of the earliest to quote the Didaché, wrote in Egypt, and so very possibly did Barnabas. Hence, it was natural to think that the Didaché also is of Egyptian origin. But attention was called to the petition in the prayer of benediction of the bread, that as it had been scattered *on the mountains*, and collected together had become one, so the church might be collected together from the ends of the earth into the Lord's kingdom; and it was pointed out the words "on the mountains" could not have been written in Egypt. And when the matter is considered, it will be seen that the use made of the Didaché in the Church Ordinances is unfavourable to the supposition that the former document had circulation in Egypt. An unscrupulous literary artist who chances to fall in with an ancient document

known to few beside himself, may hope with impunity to manipulate it according to his views, and to get the altered document accepted as of the antiquity of the original. But such changes could not be made without detection in a document in much circulation. The proper inference therefore from the use made of the Didaché in the Church Ordinances, is that at the time the latter work was put together, the former was almost unknown in Egypt. No contrary inference can be drawn from the fact that the book was known to Clement of Alexandria, a man who had travelled widely, and who was a greedy devourer of all kinds of literature. There is therefore nothing to contradict the inference suggested by the intensely Jewish character of the book, that it is a work which emanated from the Christian Jews, who, after the destruction of Jerusalem, had their chief settlements on the east side of the Jordan. From the same quarter emanated the travels, at least of Peter, which in the list of Anastasius are coupled with the Didaché; but the travels, as we know them, belong to a time when, in this knot of Jewish Christians, isolated by language and position from the rest of the Christian world, heretical tendencies had developed themselves, from which the Didaché is free. In particular we find in the Didaché no distinct trace of hostility to St. Paul, but, on the contrary, traces of the use of his epistles. There is little evidence that the Didaché had much circulation or influence outside its birthplace; and the document is valuable on account of its antiquity, as representing for us an early, though local, form of primitive Christian life, but not a form which we have any reason to think was at any time, however early, adopted by Gentile churches.

Time of Composition.—But how great antiquity can we ascribe to the Didaché? In answering this question we must distinguish what form of the Didaché we are speaking of, since we have already found reason to think that the form published by Bryennius is not the earliest. But on further examination we find a distinction between the form which Barnabas employed and that represented by the Church Ordinances and the Latin "Doctrina Apostolorum." Though the latter two authorities lack the copious citations from the Sermon on the Mount found in the Didaché, yet they bear the impress of our Lord's teaching in summing up the Way of Life in the two commandments, Thou shalt love God that made thee, and Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. The whole section in Barnabas, on the contrary, has, as we have already observed, only one point of contact with the New Testament, and contains scarcely anything that might not have been written by a Jew before our Lord's coming. We count in the Didaché twenty-two distinct coincidences with the Gospels. That Barnabas, if he knew the Didaché and made large use of other parts of it, should by mere accident pass over all these Gospel passages, is an improbability which, estimated by the ordinary doctrine of chances, cannot be distinguished from an impossibility. In particular, it is not credible that the comprehensive summary of duty in two great commandments could escape from the memory of Barnabas if it had ever been connected in his mind with the document he was using. If the omission could not have been accidental, it is equally incredible that Barnabas could with design have taken pains to eliminate all the Christian features which he found in a document which he employed. It follows, then, that that document must have been pre-Christian. Thus the theory suggests itself that what is at the base, alike of Barnabas and of all the forms of the Didaché, is a Jewish manual for the instruction of proselytes. It is easy to conceive that if the Palestinian Christians had been in the habit of using such a manual while still Jews, it would be natural for them to go on to make a like employment of it in the moral instruction of converts before their admission into the church; only having first improved it by the addition of some Christian elements. The document being not preserved as an interesting literary relic, but being a formula in constant practical use, was of course liable to receive accretions and modifications. Hymns in church use among ourselves often differ much from the form which their author had given them; the baptismal creeds of the early church met with many changes in process of time; and so did the Liturgies. Thus there would be nothing surprising if the Didaché received progressive development; and it seems to us that we can trace three stages in its growth.

(1) Barnabas represents for us the original Jewish manual; probably not quoting it from any written document, but from his recollection of the instruction he had possibly himself received, or else had been taught to give to others. Barnabas's quotations do not proceed beyond the section on the Two Ways, corresponding to the first five chapters of the Didaché. But it is quite possible that a Jewish manual might contain some things answering to what is found in the following chapters. Thus the direction (chap. 6) that the disciple, if unable to bear the whole yoke, should bear what he could, might well have been given by a Jewish teacher to a Gentile proselyte of the gate. Such a Jewish manual as we contemplate would probably contain directions about baptism (chap. 7), that being a rite employed by Jews in the admission of proselytes. The manual would naturally give the disciple rules for fasting and prayer; and such rules we have in the Didaché in a Christianized form; the Lord's Prayer being substituted for use three times a day in place of whatever prayer the manual had contained; and the Wednesday and Friday fasts being substituted for the Pharisaic Monday and Thursday fasts. The manual would also teach the disciple forms for benedictions of meals; and these seem to lie at the bottom of the Eucharistic chapters (9, 10) of the Didaché. The phrase "vine of David" already quoted, would in a Jewish benediction mean the Jewish people (Ps. lxxx. 8, 14; Is. v. 7), and the comparison of the collection of scattered grains into one loaf might well have been introduced into a prayer for the collection of the Jewish people out of the lands into which they had been scattered. Even the directions about the entertainment of "apostles" might have formed part of a Jewish manual, that being, as has been already stated, the Jewish name for envoys, who would of course have need of entertainment on their journeys. We are of course in the region of conjecture when we

attempt to trace to a purely Jewish source any of the later chapters of the Didaché; but we appear to be on solid ground in referring to such a source those earlier chapters, the substance of which seems to have been known to Barnabas in a form devoid of Christian elements.

(2) In the Church Ordinances and in the Latin *Doctrina* we have the manual as it was modified for use in a Christian community. It is not impossible that the Latin book may have been the first publication of this catechetical manual of Palestinian Christians, which may have been brought to the West by one himself instructed in it. It was probably called the Teaching of the Apostles, because the authorized formulary of a church which claimed to have been founded by Apostles, and to have derived its institutions from them. We are without evidence whether this manual contained more than the Two Ways, though we think it probable that it did. The only clue to the date of this publication is that the Church Ordinances contain that precept about almsgiving which we have already noted as the solitary instance of use of the New Testament in this section of Barnabas. Reasons have been already given for thinking that Barnabas was not here employing a Christian document, and we find it hard to believe that the phrases in which coincidence occur are older than the New Testament, so that we seem forced to the conclusion that the first editors of the Teaching of the Apostles knew Barnabas. And we believe that this would not be inconsistent with a date before the end of the first century.

(3) In the Didaché published by Bryennius we have the manual enlarged by further Christian additions; the precepts in the original manual being expanded, others added from the New Testament, and besides some wholly new sections. For example, in Barnabas we have "Thou shalt confess thy sins and shalt not come to thy prayer in an evil conscience." The Didaché adds, "Thou shalt confess thy sins *in the church;*" and besides in a new Eucharistic section it repeats the precept, and orders those who would communicate, first to confess their sins, in order that their sacrifice might be pure. We have already said that the "Sermon on the Mount" section, which is one of the new sections, not only largely uses the New Testament, but seems also to use Hermas. There is a strong probability that he who interpolated this section, also interpolated others in the later part of the work; but for want of an independent authority we have only conjecture to guide us as to what these interpolations are; consequently we can have no certainty in determining their date, it being possible that those parts of the work which bear marks of high antiquity may be all confined to the original sections. Yet the whole character of the Didaché, and in particular the lively expectation of our Lord's Second Coming manifested in the last chapter, disposes us to give the Didaché in its present form as early a date as we can; and since we place Hermas as early as the beginning of the second century, we have no difficulty in giving the Didaché as early a date as A.D. 120. The antiquity of the document gives it great interest; but since we believe that it never obtained any wide circulation or influence, and since the diversities between the Jewish Christians from whom it emanated, and the rest of the Christian world, soon were perceived to be so great that the former came to be regarded as a heretical sect, we cannot look on the Didaché as an authority, making known to us the practice of Gentile churches at any time however early.

Literature.—The publication of the Didaché by Bryennius produced such an enormous crop of literature that it is impossible here to give an exhaustive list of it. We therefore refer the reader to the lists in Schaff's and in Harnack's editions, which may be supplemented by an article of Harnack's *Theol. Literaturz.* 1886, p. 271. Here we only mention, of editions, those in England by De Romestan 1884, and by Spence 1885; in America by Schaff 1885, and second edition 1886; in France by Sabatier 1885; in Germany by Hilgenfeld in a second edition of part iv. of his *Nov. Test. ext. Can.* 1884, and by Gebhardt and Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. ii. 1884. The latter contains ample dissertations by Harnack, supplemented by two articles in the *Theol. Literaturz.* for 1886. Of dissertations we content ourselves with mentioning Krawutzcky's papers, *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1882, p. 359, 1884, p. 547, Bishop Lightfoot's paper read before the Church Congress of 1884 published in the *Expositor*, Jan. 1885, Zahn's discussions in his *Forschungen*, part iii. p. 278 (1884), and Taylor's Lectures at the Royal Institution, 1885, in which the Didaché is illustrated from Jewish literature. [G. S.]

TECLA, abbess of the nunnery of St. Mary, founded in the house of the deceased Felix. Gregory the Great directs the defensor Romanus to help her in her suit against Alexander, the son-in-law of Felix, and to induce him if possible to settle it amicably. (*Ep.* xi. 11.) [F. D.]

TECUSA. [SEVEN MARTYRS OF ANCYRA.]

TEILO (TEILAW, TEILYAU, ELIUD, ELIOS, MADOCUS, TELIAU, TELIAUS, TELIAVUS, TELLIAUS, THELIAUS, THELINUS), bishop of Llandaff, and one of the principal saints of Wales. He was son of Enlleu ap Hydwn Dwn and cousin to St. David. He was born at Eccluis Gunnian or Gunniau, near Tenby, co. Pembroke, and educated under SS. Dubricius at Llandaff and Paulinus at Tygwyn ar Dâf, with St. David and other celebrated Welsh saints. Under the former he opened a school near Llandaff, called Bangor Deilo, and on account of his proficiency in the Scriptures, he is said to have received the name Ἥλιος, Elios, or Eliud. The chief difficulty in his life is to define his ecclesiastical position. Though probably associated with SS. David and Padarn, his visit to Jerusalem with them, and consecration there to the episcopate, are of course only mediaeval legends given currency to for securing the independence of the see of Llandaff. His withdrawal to Armorica on the outbreak of the yellow plague in Wales is counted by Pryce (*Anc. Brit. Ch.* 163) one of the few incidents in the saint's life, which can be considered historical. That he was received there with special honour by Samson archbishop of Dôl, and afterwards returned through Cornwall to Wales, need present no special difficulty. But whether he was bishop at Llandaff or Menevia or

both, is not so easily decided. According to the *Vita S. Teliaui* (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, 101) he succeeded St. Dubricius at Llandaff only a short time before the outbreak of the pestilence; but Ussher puts Dubricius's death about A.D. 522, and the plague was the cause of Maelgwn's death in A.D. 547 (*Ann. Camb.* in *M. H. B.* 831). In the *Chron. Series of the Bps. of Llandaff* (*Lib. Landav.* by Rees, 623) he is said to have succeeded to the see of Llandaff in the year 512, so that Rees (*Welsh SS.* 243) is probably safest in saying that as to how long he continued to preside over the ancient see of Llandaff, which was co-extensive with the ancient lordship of Glamorgan, is uncertain, but ended in its first stage with the appearance of the plague. [DUBRICIUS.]

On his return from Armorica after a stay, as is said, of seven years and seven months, he found St. David dead, and the see of Menevia vacant. [DAVID (5).] If Cynog of Llanbadarn succeeded St. David, he too must have died or resigned. [CYNOG (2).] St. Teilo is said to have been elected to the vacant chair as archbishop of Menevia, but preferring his old see he consecrated Ishmael, who had been one of St. David's earliest disciples, to be his suffragan at Menevia, raised others to the same rank in different parts of South Wales, while he himself removed to Llandaff, and, carrying with him the primacy, became archbishop, with the title of the inferior see (Stubbs, *Reg.* 154, 156; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 115 sq.; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 174, 243 sq.; Pryce, *Anc. Br. Ch.* 158 sq.). Contemporary with St. Teilo, and represented in the charters of Llandaff as suffragans of that see, we find bishops Aidan, Elwystyl, Lunapeius, Arwystyl, Ufelwy, Comereg, Gwrwan, and Gwyddlon (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, 625–4); while contemporary kings, as said in his Life, were Iddon ap Ynyr, king of Gwent, Tewdrig ap Teithfallt, king of Glamorgan, Aircol Law Hir ap Tryfun, king of Dyfed, Rhun and his son Meredydd, kings of Dyfed, Tredecil Cadwgan, king of the country west of the Towy, and Maelgwn, king of Gwynedd (*ib.* 111, 624). In the *Vita S. Cadoci* (Rees, *Camb. Brit. SS.* 50 sq.) he is connected with the famous king Arthur, but Geoffrey of Monmouth speaks only of St. Dubritius. His age and date of death are uncertain, the latter being variously fixed from A.D. 563 (*Lib. Land.* 623) to A.D. 604 (Ussher): he is said to have died at a very advanced age, and is honoured in the Welsh Triads as one of the three canonised saints of Britain and again as one of the three blessed visitors of the Isle of Britain. His feast is Feb. 9, and his dedications are numerous. The legend relates how three several parishes claimed his remains (Rees, *Welsh SS.* pass.; W. J. Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* pass.). Dempster (*H. Eccl. Scot.* ii. 618) calls Thelianus a Scot, and ascribes to his pen several writings. [THELIANUS.] The bell, which he is said to have received at Jerusalem on his consecration, was preserved at Llandaff. The *Privilegium Sancti Teliani et ecclesiae suae Landaviae* is in itself probably of little value, and may belong to the 12th century, but it is curious as giving a list of the privileges and exemptions expected to belong to a monastery in the middle ages. A more valuable document is the *Liber Landavensis*, *Llyfr Teilo*, or *Book of S. Teilo*, the ancient chartulary of the cathedral of Llandaff, compiled by Urban bishop of Llandaff, who died in the year 1133 (see *Lib. Land.* by Rees, Pref.); it was first published in A.D. 1840 for the Welsh MSS. Society; but is not in all its details historically trustworthy.

The chief authority for the life of St. Teilo is *Vita S. Teliavi Episcopi a magistro Galfrido fratre Urbani Landavensis ecclesiae episcopi dicata*, belonging to the 12th century, and printed, with translation and notes, in *Lib. Land.* by Rees, 92 sq., 332 sq.; it is partly also in Wharton, *Angl. Sacr.* ii. 662 sq., and given abridged in Capgrave, *Nov. Leg. Ang.* f. 286 sq.; Capgrave's *Vita auctore anonymo*, with long comment. praev. and notes, is in the Boll. *Acta SS.* 9 Feb. ii. 303–10. For MS. and other authorities see Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. pt. i. 130–2, pt. ii. 897, app.; *M. H. B.* pt. i. 27; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 146, app. C., 159; Cressy, *Ch. Hist. Brit.* x. c. 13, translating from Capgrave.

[J. G.]

TELEMACHUS, an Eastern monk who sacrificed his life when endeavouring to separate the combatants in the gladiatorial shows at Rome, about the year A.D. 404. The spectators stoned him to death, but the emperor was so struck by his heroism that he abolished the shows and enrolled the monk among the martyrs. His name does not appear in Western martyrologies (Theod. *H. E.* v. 26) [G. T. S.]

TELESPHORUS (1), addressed in an epistle by Dionysius Alexand. (Hieron. *de Vir. Illust.* cap. lxix.). [G. T. S.]

TELESPHORUS (2), bishop of Rome, accounted the seventh from the apostles, in the reign of Hadrian. According to Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 5) he succeeded Xystus in the twelfth year of that emperor (A.D. 128), and suffered martyrdom in the eleventh year of his episcopate and the first of the reign of Antoninus Pius (iv. 10). The Liberian Catalogue assigns him an episcopate of eleven years seven months and three days, giving as the consuls of his first and last year those of A.D. 127 and A.D. 137. Lipsius (*Chron. der röm. Bischöf.*) considers his probable dates to have been 124 to 135 as the earliest, or from 126 to 137 as the latest. If so, Eusebius erred in assigning his martyrdom to the reign of Antoninus Pius instead of that of Hadrian. For the fact of his martyrdom he alleges the authority of Irenaeus; the assertion of the date is his own. Telesphorus is remarkable as being the only one of the early Roman bishops, afterwards accounted martyrs, who appears on the early authority of Irenaeus to have been one (Iren. *Haer.* iii.: cf. Euseb. *loc. cit.*). He is said in the Felician and subsequent editions of the *Liber Pontificalis* to have been a Greek, "ex patre anachorita," to have ordered the keeping of the Lenten fast, and also the celebration of mass, with the use of the *Gloria in excelsis*, during the night before Christmas day, and to have been buried by the body of St. Peter on the Vatican. A spurious letter, addressed to all the faithful, has been assigned to him, in which directions are given about the observance of Lent and the nightly mass at Christmas, and accusations of the clergy are forbidden. He is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology, as a saint and martyr under Antoninus Pius, on the 5th of January. [J. B—y.]

TELIAU, bishop of Llandaff. [TEILO.]

TENAX, African bishop in iv. Syn. Carth. *de Basilide*, A.D. 254, Cyp. *Ep.* 67; the same as the bishop of Horrea Coeliae who spoke sixty-seventh in Syn. vii. *de Bap.* iii. A.D. 256. His see is between Putput and Adrumetum in Prov. Byz., and is named only in the itineraries, and as having bishops in collation of Carthage, A.D. 411, and Conc. Carth. 419. [E. W. B.]

TEREBINTHUS, bishop of Neapolis (Shechem), in Palestine. He lived under the emperor Zeno, A.D. 475–495. He was attacked by the Samaritans, whom the emperor thereupon expelled from Mount Gerizim, where they had a temple, for which a church dedicated to the B. V. M. was substituted. (Procop. *de Aedif.* v. 7; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 647.) [G. T. S.]

TERENANUS, bishop or archbishop of Ireland, is said in the *Vita S. Laurentii* (Ussher, *Wks.* iv. 422) to have been attracted to England by the fame of the primate at Canterbury, and converted by him to the observance of the Roman Easter. He is identified by Ware (*Ir. Bps.* Armagh) with MacLaisre, bishop of Armagh in the beginning of the 7th century. (Cotton, *Fast.* iii. 5; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* iii. 61.) [J. G.]

TERENTIUS (1), Apr. 10, African martyr with companions in the Decian persecution, imprisoned, tortured, and beheaded by the ἡγεμών of Africa (Basil. *Menol.*). The Greek *Menaea*, followed by the Latin martyrologists, name the persecutor the praeses Fortunatianus. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 10 Apr. i. 851, 852 ed. 1866.) [C. H.]

TERENTIUS (2), a general of Valens. He established Para, son of Arsaces, as king of Armenia in dependence on the Romans, A.D. 368. He afterwards became hostile to Para, and instigated the proceedings which led to his treacherous murder at a feast given by Trajan, the dux of the Armenian frontier, A.D. 374. (Amm. Marcell. xxvii. 12, xxx. 1.) [G. T. S.]

TERENTIUS (3), general and count, holding the orthodox faith, under the Arian Valens, commended by Basil. He is spoken of depreciatingly by Ammianus Marcellinus (xxvii. 12, xxx. 1), with whom his Christianity overshadowed his other merits. In 372 Terentius was in Iberia in command of twelve legions (Amm. Marcell. lib. xxvii. p. 355). In that year Basil wrote a long letter to him detailing the difficulties thrown in his way, chiefly by Theodotus, in carrying out the emperor's commission to supply Armenia with bishops, which had been enforced by a private letter from Terentius himself (Basil, *Ep.* 99 [187]). We have a second still longer letter from Basil to him, written during the Antiochene schism A.D. 375, seeking to divert him from the cause of Paulinus, which had been earnestly pressed upon him, and assuring him that Meletius was the true canonical bishop, and begging him to defer the question until the Catholic bishops should have returned from exile. At this time Terentius was at Antioch, having been induced to resume his official life, which he had abandoned that he might devote himself to the care of his soul. Basil takes the opportunity of laying before him the importance of the distinction between "hypostasis" and "ousia," and denounces the tenet that the Three Persons of the Trinity are of one hypostasis (*Ep.* 214 [349]). At the same time Basil sent a letter to his friend Meletius, apprising him of his having written to Terentius to expose the frauds of the Paulinians (*Ep.* 216 [272]). Another letter of Basil's is addressed to the daughters of Terentius (erroneously written "Pherentius" in some MSS.), who were deaconesses at Samosata, expressing his regret at having failed to see them when there, praising their constancy to the orthodox faith in the midst of heresy, and warning them to hold no intercourse with those who denied the divinity of the Son, or of the Holy Spirit (*Ep.* 105 [301]). [E. V.]

TERENTIUS (4), bishop of Tomi one of those bishops named by the emperor Theodosius after the Second Synod, 381, communion with whom should be a test of orthodoxy. (Soz. vii. 9; Tillem. ix. 497.) [C. V.]

TERENTIUS (5), a presbyter sent by Chrysostom to obtain some relics from Otreius bishop of Arabissus for Rufinus the missionary in Phoenicia. (Chrys. *Ep.* 126.) [E. V.]

TERIDUS, an abbat, nephew of CAESARIUS (3) bishop of Arles, the writer of the *Regula ad Monachos* at his uncle's dictation. (Holsten. *Codex Regul.* pl. ii. p. 52; Ceill. xi. 147.) [C. H.]

TERMATIUS (TERMASIUS), according to Baronius a bishop, but according to another account a presbyter of Bastigiensium, probably Basti or Baza, in Andalusia, present at the council of Arles A.D. 314. (Baronius, ann. 314. lxvi. Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iv. 95.) [H. W. P.]

TERNAN (TARNANUS, TERRANANUS, TERUAN, TIERENANUS), archbishop of the Picts, closely connected with SS. Palladius and Servanus, but his legend does not quite satisfy chronology. [PALLADIUS, SERVANUS.] (See the learned sections of Papebrochius, considering the exact relations of Palladius and Ternanus to each other and to the Christianity of the Picts, in Boll. *Acta SS.* Jun. 12, iii. 30–2, and also Sollerius's paragraphs on Servanus in *ib.* Jul. 1, i. 50–3.) The earliest authority is John of Fordun (*Scot. Chron.* iii. c. 9, ed. Skene, i. 94, ii. 86), who calls Terrananus "a disciple of the blessed Palladius, who was his godfather and his fostering teacher and furtherer in all the rudiments of letters and of the faith." The *Breviary of Aberdeen* (Prop. SS. p. hyem. f. cv.) expands the legend in six lections. The *Aberdeen Martyrology* (*Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* ii. 264) briefly gives the same account, but has fuller information regarding his relics and miracles at Banchory. To this the later Scotch annalists (Boethius, *Scot. Hist.* l. vii. f. 128, ed. 1574; Leslaeus, *De Reb. Gest. Scot.* l. iv. f. 130; Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 607; Camerarius, *De Stat. Hom.* 217, Cat. 1627, and *De Scot. Fort.* 156, Par. 1627) add nothing, except that Dempster ascribes to his Tervanus, *Exhortationes ad Pictos; Contra Pelagianos; Homiliae ex sacra Scriptura*, and places his death at Abernethy

with (*Men. Scot.* Jun. 12) a dedication at Kinkarnia (Kincardineshire?). His feast is June 12; his date varies from A.D. 431 (Ussher) to A.D. 455 (King's *Kal.*). At Banchory Ternan, according to the *Mart. Aberd.* of about A.D. 1530, there were preserved his head with the tonsured surface still uncorrupt, and his *Gospel of S. Matthew*, being one of the "Evangelistarum quatuor voluminibus metallo inclusis, argento auro texto in superficie fabricatis." There was also preserved there the Ronecht or bell of St. Ternan, which had a hereditary keeper, with "deray croft" (*Reg. Episc. Aberd.* i. 327–8; *Spald. Misc.* iv. p. xxii.), while at Aberdeen cathedral a monstrance containing his relics was in the treasury (*Reg. Episc. Aberd.* ii. 185). He thus far has a purely local Scotch tradition (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 450–1; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 27; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 212–3; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* vi. 128).

But in the *Irish Kalendar* (*M. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 166–7), Torannan abbat of Bangor, Tulach Foirtceirn, and Drumcliffe, stands on the same day, and the Felire of Aengus (c. A.D. 800) calls him "Torandan the long famed voyager," whom the Scholiast identifies with Palladius, who (and not Torannan) "was not received in Erin, whereupon he went to Alban; he was buried in Liconium." This Torannan is accepted by Todd, Reeves, Forbes, and Skene, as the original of the Scotch Ternan, yet the ground for the inference is not quite clear beyond the resemblance of name and identity of feast (*M. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 166, n.[4]; Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 450; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 30).

The most important remains connected with the name of St. Ternan are the *Liber Ecclesiae Beati Terrenani de Arbuthnott missale secundum Usum Ecclesiae sancti Andreae in Scotia*, written by James Sybald, vicar of Arbuthnott, and finished Feb. 22, 1491–2. The original volume is in the library of the Right Hon. Viscount Arbuthnott, and is specially valuable as being the only complete missal of the Scottish Use now known to be extant. For the most part it follows the Use of Sarum. It was published at Burntisland in 1864, edited by Right Rev. Bp. Forbes of Brechin, and Rev. H. G. Forbes, with most valuable preface by the former. [J. G.]

TERNATIUS (TERNISCUS), twenty-seventh archbishop of Besançon in the latter half of the 7th century. There is extant a diploma of the year 677, by which it appears that king Theodoric III. deposed Chramlinus, bishop of Embrun, by the advice of Ternatius and other metropolitans (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 1326). He is said to have built a church in the Champs-de-Mars at Besançon in honour of the martyrs Marcellinus and Peter, which afterwards became a Benedictine abbey dedicated to St. Vincent. He died about 680, and was buried in the church of St. Paul. A chronicle composed by him of his predecessors in the see has not come down to us, but the authors of the *Gallia Christiana* think it may be indirectly the source of the information as to the early bishops of this diocese possessed by an anonymous canon of St. Paul's at Besançon (*Gall. Christ.* xv. 17, 3; Ceillier, xi. 781; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 622). [S. A. B.]

TERTIUS, deacon. [POMPONIUS (2).]

TERTULLIANUS (1), QUINTUS SEPTIMIUS FLORENS, or—simply—**SEPTIMIUS**. I. Life; II. Times (p. 819); III. Writings (p. 821). A. As Layman and Apologist (p. 822); B. As Priest (p. 828); C. In relation to Montanism (p. 840); IV. Summary (p. 862); V. Literature (p. 864).

I. *Life.*—The first of the great Latin Fathers in point of date, their chief in fire and daring, and the first to create a technical Christian Latinity—is known almost entirely through his writings. The date of his birth is as unknown as that of his death. It can only be conjectured that he was born between A.D. 150 and 160, and that he died between A.D. 220 and 240; with preference for the later dates. His birthplace was Carthage (Jerome, *Catal. Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*, 53. Cp. Tertullian's *Apologeticum*, ch. ix.), and his parents were heathen (*De Poen.* ch. i.; *Apol.* ch. xviii. 'de vestris sumus'); his father's position being that of a proconsular centurion (Jerome). As a lad, Tertullian was marked by great natural abilities, and he received a good education (*Apol.* ch. xiv.; *Adv. Prax.* ch. iii.). In after-life he recalled his school studies in Homer (*Ad Nat.* i. ch. x.); but poetry was evidently less attractive to him than philosophy, history, science, and antiquarian lore. He spoke and composed in Greek, but his Greek writings are lost. He studied the systems of the philosophers if he mocked and hated the men (cp. *De Anima*, chs. i.–iii.); and with results which made him famous:—'Quid Tertulliano eruditius, quid acutius? Apologeticus ejus et contra Gentiles libelli cunctam saeculi obtinent disciplinam' (Jerome, *Epist.* lxxxiii.). Tertullian, possibly destined for state-official life, was not less celebrated for his knowledge of Roman law (Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 2); and the legal fence and juridical style of the advocate are observable throughout his apologetic and polemical writings. In the heroes of ancient Rome—"the grave and wise Cato, the just and soldierly Scipio, the noble Pompey, the fortunate Sylla, the wealthy Crassus, the eloquent Tullius"—he found human models and examples which would bear comparison with the gods of the heathen (*Apol.* ch. xi.); and the passage perhaps helps to qualify others in which a morbid consciousness makes him represent himself as more than usually profligate and vicious, or apply to himself the self-conviction of a St. Paul (*De Resur. carnis*, ch. lix.; *De Poenit.* ch. iv.). In his Christian days he loathed to recall the scenes of the theatre and arena which, in common with his class and age, he had so much frequented (*De Spectac.* ch. xix.; *Ad Nat.* i. ch. x.; *Apol.* ch. xv.).

Tertullian was probably attracted to Christianity by complex irresistible and converging forces. As he said, 'Fiunt, non nascuntur Christiani' (*Apol.* ch. xviii.). First, he was met by facts inspired by a faith; facts such as these:—(*a*) The constancy of the Christians in times of persecution. This staggered him. He knew men who began by denouncing such constancy as "obstinacy," and who ended in embracing the belief which dictated it (*Apol.* ch. l.; *ad Scap.* ch. v.). (*b*) Demons confessed the superiority of the new faith (*Apol.* ch. xxiii.); and Ter-

tullian, in common with his heathen and Christian contemporaries, was a profound believer in demons (cp. Réville, *La Religion à Rome sous les Sévères*, pp. 44, 46, 130 sq.). From the facts he passed to the faith. This faith when examined promised to give to him—as it had given to Justin Martyr—a foot-hold, an authority, which no philosophical system furnished. It was illustrated by a life of holiness and humility—that of its Founder, the Just One—in contrast with which the life of the sensual Cynic and proud Stoic sickened him as it had sickened Tatian. The 'Assyrian Tertullian' [TATIAN] and the African were not unlike in temperament and training, as their lives were not unlike in their fitful vicissitudes. Once convinced of the darkness of that with which their early life and culture had been associated, they sprang out of it towards the light, and consecrated to the truth the energies of full manhood and the powers of ripened intellects. But also, once convinced that the Encratites or the Montanists were sounder than the teachers of the Church they had joined, they seceded from what they counted lax in practice and erroneous in tenet to die "not of the fold."

Tertullian's conversion took place c. A.D. 192, in Carthage more probably than in Rome. The former was his home and usual dwelling-place (*De Pallio*, ch. i.; *Apol.* ch. ix.; *Scorpiacc*, ch. vi.; *De Resur. Carnis*, ch. xlii.); the latter he had visited (*De Cultu femin.* i. ch. vii.), and he was well known there for his abilities (Eusebius, *l. c.*), but critics are by no means agreed whether he ever went there as a Christian (cp. Baronius, *Annal. Eccles.* ii. 476, ed. Theiner). He was married but childless (cp. the two treatises *Ad Uxorem*), and he became a priest of the Church. Probability is also in favour of his presbyterate having been exercised at Carthage and not at Rome.

It was in middle age (c. A.D. 199–203), says Jerome, that Tertullian became a Montanist (see p. 840). He was driven to it, he adds, by the envy and contumeliousness of the Roman clergy. This conduct on their part, if it had stood alone, would not have produced such a result. Tertullian was too much used to hit hard to have minded hard hits against himself. The true cause of his defection is to be sought rather in a constitution and temperament which predisposed him to a rigour opposed to the laxity prevalent at Rome; and to this the austere doctrines and practices of Montanus were perfectly congenial (Kaye, "Account of the writings of Tertullian,"[3] p. 34). He became the head of the Montanist party in Africa—a party which continued to exist till the 5th century under the name of "Tertullianists."

Tertullian lives for us in his writings. If there be but little external testimony illustrative of his life, the man's inner being is mirrored in his treatises. Tertullian threw himself, with his naturally ardent temperament, into all the questions which agitated the society of his time; and from his pages are to be gleaned valuable facts connected with the singularly interesting heathenism of his day, as well as records of the doctrine and worship of the orthodox Church. When he became a Christian, and poured the vials of his ridicule upon pagan rite and heathen culture, he rescued from oblivion much which the student of the science of religion welcomes as historically supplementary to the statements of a Dio, a Spartian, and a Herodian. Of a writer full of paradoxes, the paradoxical assertion is true that one great value of his writings arises from his errors (Kaye, p. 36). When he became a Montanist, and ruthlessly exposed what to him was faulty in the practice and discipline of the Church, he unconsciously preserved for lovers of ritual what that practice and discipline was; when he turned from the current Church doctrine and exegesis as nerveless and vapid to the impassioned utterances of the New Prophecy and its exponents, he defended his position by testimony to the then recognised genuineness and integrity of the books of the New Testament which is all the more valuable because entirely unsolicited.

II. *Times.*—A sketch of the times in which Tertullian lived will illustrate both the external history of the Church, and help to interpret that internal history which is exhibited in his writings.

The golden age of the empire died with Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 161–180), *gravissimus imperator* (*Apol.* v.); the age of iron began with his son Commodus (A.D. 180–193), "the gladiator upon the throne" (Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, ii. 151). Military despotism assumed under the soldier Septimius Severus (A.D. 193–211), "vere pertinax et severus" (Spartian, *Sever.* 14), a superiority over the civilian functionaries of the state which Dio has preserved in a saying attributed to him—τοὺς στρατιώτας πλουτίζετε, τῶν ἄλλων πάντων καταφρονεῖτε; and from his day to that of Diocletian (A.D. 284) military adventurers "flitted like shadows along the tragic scene of the imperial palace" (Milman). The golden age of the Church generally began with that iron age of the empire (Aubé, *Les Chrétiens dans l'Empire Romain*, A.D. 180–249, pp. iii., 495–8). Expiring polytheism and ancient philosophy were confronted by a new philosophy and a nascent faith. Happier times were in store for the Christians; converts were flocking to them from the highest not less than from the lowest ranks (Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 21). Under Commodus, the favourite Marcia and many high-placed officials of the imperial household secured for their Christian co-religionists elsewhere the protection (if nothing else) which was accorded to themselves; under Severus, the eclectic partiality of his wife Julia Domna (*nobilis Orientis mulier*, Lampridius), the devotion of the Christian Torpacion who had healed his master, and the labours of the Christian nurse and the Christian preceptor who trained the early life of his son Caracalla, obtained from the emperor safety for those who joined the ranks of the Christians (cp. *Ad Scapulam*, ch. iv.).

From one quarter only of the imperial dominions does the comparative peacefulness noticeable elsewhere appear to have been absent. In Africa, and in a lesser degree in Egypt, persecution sharp, short, fitful, and frequent, was contemporaneous with the reign of Septimius Severus and the most active period of Tertullian's existence. It is stamped in letters of blood upon his pages. It is not difficult to trace in them the course of an antagonism, sometimes political, sometimes religious, sometimes emanating from mob-fearing proconsuls rather than from the emperor, sometimes from

the fanatical masses rather than from the tolerant officers of law and state. It was to the Church at Carthage an age not of gold but of iron (cp. *De Cultu Feminarum* II. ch. xiii.).

The Church in Africa has no historian before Tertullian, though its foundation is placed, with much probability, at the end of the first century or at the beginning of the second. By the end of the latter century the Christians in Roman Africa were to be counted by thousands (cp. Aubé, p. 152) if not by millions (cp. *Apol.* ch. xxxvii.; *Ad Scapulam*, chs. ii. v.). They were fully organized under church-officers; they had their bishops, priests, and deacons; they had their places of assembly and their cemeteries. Immunity from the wholesale decimation which had befallen, by imperial command (cp. *Apol.* ch. v.), other Christian bodies of the East and West was signalised in Africa by growth and development, if anything accelerated by occasional suffering and martyrdom. But the tempest broke upon the African Church at last. Popular passions and heathen fanaticism had been smouldering for some years, and had been hitherto controlled or kept under by the indifference or the humanity of successive proconsuls. Premonitory symptoms were not, however, wanting. The priestesses of the Dea Coelestis, by their inflammatory vaticinations, had rallied seditious mobs round the house of Pertinax (A.D. 188–9). Allied heathen and Jew (cp. *Apol.* ch. vii.) had by their violent attacks frequently destroyed Christian houses and places of worship, rifled the resting-places of the dead, and dispersed the assemblies of the living. Ridiculous and blasphemous caricatures of the God of the Christians (cp. *Apol.* ch. xvi.; *Ad Nat.* i. ch. xiv.) were paraded in the streets amongst the howling crowds, and the vile charges so frequent elsewhere were fastened upon the Christians of Africa:—They were incestuous devourers of infants not less than pronounced enemies of state and society. Proconsuls like Pertinax and Julianus (A.D. 189–90) had observed a policy of neutrality; Cincius Severus and Vespronius Candidus (A.D. 190–192) had resented condemnation or supplied the Christians brought before them with the answer which gave them liberty (cp. *Ad Scapulam*, ch. iv.). The civil war (A.D. 193–197) had also, in its turn, distracted attention from the Christians, or confined religious hatred within the limits of individual households. But that war ended, and the partisans of Niger in the East and of Albinus in the West exterminated or suppressed by the iron hand of Severus, the smouldering fires of religious fanaticism began to burst into flame; and in Africa at least the tide of persecution ebbed and flowed for the rest of that emperor's reign.

The facts connected with these persecutions can be followed in those writings of Tertullian which critics unite in placing between A.D. 197 and 212. From the *Ad Martyres* to the *Ad Scapulam*,—from the first to the last of those impassioned and pathetic utterances which appeal, not for mercy but for justice, not for forgiveness for latent vice but for praise for open virtue, not for pardon for mistaken treason but for recognition of the truest patriotism, not for the condonation of "atheism" but for salutation of a God-given faith—the tale is told of dire suffering divinely borne, of martyrs and confessors who had taken up the Cross and were faithful unto death. In some of these treatises the language may be, and is, at times exaggerated and unrestricted. Such defects are natural when the cries of the murdered still deafened the ears, and the last words of the tortured still burned in the heart, of him who recorded them. But his writings show that passion and exaggeration dropped with persecution. Words of advice, still and calm, practical suggestions to various classes and degrees of the Christian society, counsels of holiness, consolations and encouragements animate many a paragraph of hortatory works which critics have placed in the intervals between this or that outburst of heathen fury. One may note, here and there, how the more balanced counsel of Tertullian the Churchman gave place to the unrepressed ardour of Tertullian the Montanist; but the aim of his efforts was ever one and the same.

The unnamed "army of martyrs" of the African Church in A.D. 197 was addressed by Tertullian in the *Ad Martyres*. The tract depicts men and women in prison, visited and relieved by the brethren, exhorted to unity, and prepared by fasting and prayer for the death which should be a victory for the Church. It is impossible to determine whether the Christians thus addressed were released or not. Vigellius Saturninus was the first proconsul to draw the sword against Christians (*Ad Scapulam*, ch. iii.), and his date is not apparently earlier than A.D. 198 (see Aubé, p. 191, &c.). If such a proconsul as Pudens, who tore up the indictment presented to him (*Ad Scapulam*, ch. iv.), was the immediate predecessor of Saturninus, the probability would be that tolerance and not hostility guided his action towards the "sect," and assured release. The martyrology of Africa had begun in A.D. 180. In a time of peace, the Scillitan martyrs had died at Carthage (Görres, *Jahr. f. Prot. Theol.* 1884, pts. ii. iii.); but after that, there is a blank till A.D. 198. Namphamo, a Punic name of happy omen, equivalent to Felix or Fortunatus, and as common, is the new "archimartyr" of the Church. With Miggin (or Mygdon), Lucitas, Samae, and others of humble birth and servile condition, the martyrs of Madaura sealed their faith at Carthage. And the floodgates once opened, the tide of fury swept on strong and full. The prisons were filled. Torture despatched some, the stake others. The yell was heard which consigned Christian women to a living death—*ad lenonem* not *ad leonem* (cp. *Apol.* ch. l.; *De Pud.* ch. i.). Some stood firm, some recanted, but tearing their recantations to shreds flung themselves afresh at the feet of the executioners. The Church did what prudence suggested. She withdrew her children as much as possible from open observation, if in the person of Tertullian she continued to affirm fearlessly her rights and proclaim anew her convictions. The *Apology*, the *Ad Nationes*, the *De Spectaculis*, and the *De Idololatria*, are now usually dated between the second half of A.D. 197 and A.D. 199. Their character, attacking with a boldness admissible only on the score of its justice, the manners, customs, and religious institutions of heathenism, will be seen from the brief extracts below.

A respite followed of a few months. It

was disturbed by an event which is, with some plausibility, alleged to have taken place at Carthage. A certain soldier, "more the soldier of God" than of the empire, refused the *donativum* of Severus and Caracalla. Publicly he declined the laurel crown accepted by his fellow-soldiers, and proclaimed himself a Christian. "In prison he awaited the *donativum* of Christ; he looked for a better crown; and he was promoted to honour in the ranks of heaven." The scene is described in the *De Corona*; and, as will appear, Tertullian—already affected by Montanism—made it a test case. As he had already described certain heathen customs, which made it difficult for the Christian to accept civil appointments, so now he debated the question whether the Christian could accept military service. His advice, and the conduct founded upon it, only infuriated the heathen the more. They declared it best to finish off at once men who scorned their religious ceremonies, refused to take their share in civil and military duties, and fomented opposition to gods and emperors. Under Hilarian (A.D. 202–203) persecution broke out again. It took the special form of refusing to the Christian dead their usual place of burial. In defiance of the law which secured the inviolability of such spots to the Church as a society, the cry invaded the proconsuls' tribune—*Areae non sint!* "No cemeteries for the Christians!" Just then the decree issued in A.D. 202 by Severus indirectly if not directly gave sanction to all measures of repression. As he passed through Palestine, he established several laws. As bearing upon religious controversy, one decree ran, 'Judaeos fieri sub gravi poena vetuit. Idem etiam de Christianis sanxit' (Spartian, *Severus*, 17). This decree, provoking in its brevity, at least forbad proselytising by either Jew or Christian, who were here formally distinguished and placed upon the same level in the eyes of the law. The *esse* was granted to them, the *fieri* was forbidden, as if an imperial answer to that language which, so far as Christians were concerned, had dared to say, 'Fiunt non nascuntur Christiani' (*Apol.* ch. xviii.). It was easy, were the African proconsul so minded, to read into this purely prohibitive measure a licence to persecute. The African Severus might possibly not be displeased if the country of his birth were purged of passive rebels; and the penalties and sorrows, the hunting and hounding, the "fight of martyrdom and the baptism of blood" which ensued, is perhaps to be traced in Tertullian's *De Fuga* and *Scorpiace* (between A.D. 202–212). African met African, Montanist fought Imperialist. These treatises are fierce in their scorn against the flight once counselled when persecution raged. The former denounces, not less angrily, the growing practice—purchase of immunity. The miserable tale may be there seen to work itself out: blood-money taken and the giver betrayed; such a one as Rutilius only earning his title of "saintly martyr," by "paying to the mercy of God the suffering which he had begun by shunning" (*De Fuga*, ch. v.). Of sterner mould, and of more loving faith, were the brothers Satyrus and Saturninus, the slaves Revocatus and Felicitas, and the nobly-born and nobly-wedded Perpetua. The "Acts" of their passion, by some (*e.g.* Bonwetsch and Salmon) attributed to Tertullian himself, have preserved a picture of the times in which history and legend combine to complete the details—a reluctant proconsul, all-willing martyrs, and a scoffing crowd saluting their baptism of blood with the mocking cry, *Salvum lotum* (see the "Acts" in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, iii., and Aubé's collation, *op. cit.* pp. 221–224, 509 &c.).

Again there came a respite, and again must the character of the proconsul have been instrumental in securing it. Of Julius Asper (proconsul in A.D. 205 or 206), it is told that not only did he refuse to force a Christian to sacrifice who, under the torture had lapsed from the faith, but expressed to his assessors and the advocates publicly his regret at having to deal with such cases (*Ad Scapulam*, ch. iv.). For five or six years persecution was stayed. They were years of literary activity on the part of Tertullian. In A.D. 211, for some unknown reason, the religious war broke out afresh, and its cruel if brief progress is told in the tract *Ad Scapulam.* Tertullian's last "Apology" is worthy of the Christian gladiator. Stroke upon stroke he deals his ponderous blows against the proconsul. "We battle with your cruelty," he cries: but his weapons are the "offensive" weapons which Christ had put in his hands—prayer for the persecutors, love for enemies (St. Matt. v. 44). God's judgments, he warns them, were abroad. Drought, fires, eclipses, declared His wrath; the miserable deaths of persecuting proconsuls betokened it. "This our sect shall never fail," is his triumphant shout. "Strike it down, it will rise the more. We recompense to no man evil for evil, but we warn you—Fight not against God!"

In A.D. 212, the blessing of peace rested once more upon bleeding Africa. It continued at peace for some years, unaffected by the irreligiousness of the fratricide Caracalla (A.D. 211–217), the "religious" debauchery of the Orientalising Elagabalus (A.D. 218–222), or by the syncretistic piety of Alexander Severus (A.D. 222–235).

III. *Writings.*—Tertullian's literary activity is by some confined to the years A.D. 197 to A.D. 212; by others, with far greater probability, it is extended to at least c. A.D. 223. A chronological arrangement seems only possible in a general sense, the dates given being both few and uncertain. The only work which supplies positive evidence of its date is the first book *Adv. Marcionem* (3rd ed.). In ch. xv., Tertullian says that he was writing in the fifteenth year of Severus. This is now considered to be A.D. 207 (Bonwetsch, *Die Schriften Tertullians nach der Zeit ihrer Abfassung*, p. 42). Tertullian was then a Montanist, but his pen had for some years been employed in behalf of the Church. Again, in the tract *De Pallio*, ch. ii. (end), he speaks of "the triple-power of the then existing empire," and of "many Augusti united." Who were these Augusti? With some, Severus, Caracalla and Albinus; with others, Severus and his two sons Caracalla and Geta. This difference of opinion implies a difference between A.D. 197 and A.D. 208, or more than ten years (Kaye, pp. 37–9; Bonwetsch, p. 50, n. 2, who gives other opinions). Modern criticism inclines to the later date. Further, in the *De Monogamia*, ch. iii., Tertullian speaks of "about 160 years having elapsed" since St. Paul's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians was written. If

the date A.D. 57 for that Epistle be accepted (see Introduction to this Epistle in the Speaker's Commentary on the N. T. iii. p. 242), the *De Monogamia* would be dated A.D. 217. It must, however, be admitted as possible that Tertullian was only using round numbers, just as in the *Ad Nationes;* he says (ch. vii.) that 250 years, and in ch. ix., that 300 years had not elapsed since the birth of Christ.

Tertullian's writings represent him in his various moods and offices, as layman, as priest, as schismatic; and divide themselves broadly into works written in the Catholic and Montanist periods of his life respectively. The latter works must further be subdivided into treatises in which Catholic or schismatic elements are respectively prominent. In character they are threefold; (*a*) Apologetic; (*b*) Dogmatic and polemical; (*c*) Moral and ascetic. The arrangements of Bishop Kaye and Bonwetsch have in the main suggested that which follows; though the dates attached are in almost all cases conjectural.

(1) Works written while Tertullian was still a member of the Church.

(*a*) Apologetic writings.

- *Ad Martyres* (p. 822)
- *Apologeticum* (p. 822)
- *De Testimonio Animae* (p. 827)
- *Ad Nationes*, i. ii. (p. 827)

} c. A.D. 197–8.

- *Adv. Judaeos* (p. 827).

(*b*) Other works of this period, but of less certain date.

- *De Oratione* (p. 828).
- *De Baptismo* (p. 829).
- *De Poenitentia* (p. 830).
- *De Spectaculis* (p. 830).
- *De Cultu Feminarum*, i. (p. 832)
- *De Idololatria* (p. 833)
- *De Cultu Feminarum*, ii. (p. 832)
- *De Patientia* (p. 835)
- *Ad Uxorem*, i. ii. (p. 835)

} (c. A.D. 197–9.)

- *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* (c. A.D. 199), p. 837.
- *Adv. Marcionem* (1st ed.), c. A.D. 200, i. (p. 840).

(2) Montanistic writings.

(*a*) Defending the Church and her teachings.

- *De Corona* (p. 841)
- *De Fuga in Persecutione* (p. 843)
- *De Exhortatione Castitatis* (p. 844)

} c. A.D. 202–3.

(*b*) Defending the Paraclete and his discipline.

- *De Virginibus Velandis* (c. A.D. 203–4, a transition work), p. 845.
- *Adv. Marcion.* (2nd ed.), c. A.D. 206.
- *Adv. Marc.* (3rd ed.), c. A.D. 207.
- *Adv. Hermogenem* (p. 846)
- *Adv. Valentinianos* (p. 847)
- *Adv. Marcionem* (iv.)
- *De Carne Christi* (p. 847)
- *De Resurrectione Carnis* (p. 848)
- *Adv. Marcionem* (v.), p. 849

} Between A.D. 200–7 or later.

- *De Pallio* (p. 853)
- *De Anima* (p. 850)

} c. A.D. 208–9.

- *Scorpiace*, c. A.D. 212.; *al.* A.D. 203 or 204 (p. 853).
- *Ad Scapulam*, c. A.D. 212 (p. 854).
- *De Monogamia* (p. 855)
- *De Jejunio* (p. 856)
- *De Pudicitia* (p. 859)

} c. A.D. 217; *al.* A.D. 203–7.

- *Adv. Praxean* (p. 861) } c. A.D. 223; *al.* c. A.D. 208–9.

A. *Tertullian, Layman and Apologist.*

Ad Martyres.—Probably Tertullian's earliest existing writing; and to be dated A.D. 197, if the allusion in the last chapter refer to the slaughter of the supporters of Albinus (see above, p. 820). It is a treatise full of sympathy and of encouragement to stand firm from the highest motives. There is no fanatical reverence for martyrdom, there is no gloomy Montanist severity regarding it. "Martyrs designate" are reminded that they are accompanied not to a prison but to "a place of safety" by that Holy Spirit, Who would not leave them till He led them thence unto the Lord. They on their part must be "armed with concord;"—'pax vestra bellum est illi (diabolo).' Otherwise, how could the "lapsed"—who had adopted the custom of seeking the *libellum* of peace from imprisoned martyrs in order to advance their restoration to the fold of the Church—come to seek it from them?

Two thoughts (ch. iii.) should animate them. (1) Christians were soldiers, "called to the military service of the living God," and by sacramental oath. They must be true to that oath. (2) They were Christian athletes whose prison was their training-school (*palaestra*), where 'virtus duritia extruitur, mollitia vero destruitur.'

The words of Christ (St. Matt. xxvi. 41) would help them to subject the flesh to the spirit, the weaker to the stronger; the example of the heathens, Lucretia and Mucius, Heraclitus and Peregrinus, Dido and the wife of Hasdrubal, would teach them to count their sufferings trifling if, by enduring them, they should obtain a heavenly glory and a divine reward. In their own day many persons of birth, rank, and age had met with their death at the hands of the emperor. Should Christians hesitate to suffer as much in the cause of God?

Apologeticum.—The originating cause of this Apology—the greatest of Tertullian's works—has been already named (above, p. 820). It was a cry for bare justice. In Carthage (ch. xxxv., *nunc . . . cotidie revelantur*) not less than in Rome there were persons of wealth and rank who had been followers or supporters of Niger and Albinus, "the gleaning that still remained after the gathering in of the vintage of parricides": and an indiscriminating or fanatical vengeance on the part of those who acted in direful contrast to the emperor Severus, *constantissimus principum* (ch. iv.), had turned the sword of persecution upon Christians. The *Apology* rang out to stay it. It is still a debatable question whether the *Apology* was written before the *Ad Nationes* or not. Arguments *pro* and *con* will be seen collected in Hauck (Tertullian's *Leben u. s. w.* p. 57, etc.). The opinion which places *Ad Nationes* i. before the *Apology* and *Ad Nationes* ii. after it, has been advanced by Bonwetsch (p. 19, etc.) and is adopted by many. The *Apology* should also be compared throughout with a prior work, the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix.

The following are the principal divisions of this work. I. Chs. i.–vi.; II. Chs. vii.–ix.; III. Chs. x.–xxvii.: IV. Chs. xxviii.–xxxvi.; V. Chs. xxxvii.–xlv.; VI. Chs. xlvi.–l.

I. A heading to ch. i. 'Quod religio Christiana damnanda non sit, nisi qualis sit prius intelligatur,' sums up its protest:—The rulers of Carthage were persecuting and condemning a

"sect" which forthcoming evidence proved unworthy of condemnation. Their conduct was the reverse of that enjoined by the emperor Trajan—that Christians were not to be sought out; but if brought before Pliny were to be punished ('sententia necessitate confusa!'). That conduct he tauntingly ascribes to "perversity," due to some occult power (cp. ch. xxvii., in ch. xxii. defined to be that of Satan and his angels), which influenced them to act against justice and laws, and which prompted the persecution of a Name, the deadly enemy of that hostile power, a Name yet coupled with reformation of character.

Tertullian reminds the rulers (ch. v.) that the laws against Christians had been enforced only by emperors whose memory mankind had learnt to execrate. Some of these emperors he paints in a word or a sentence. Nero, *dedicator nostrae damnationis*, was the first *gladio ferocisse* against the Christians at Rome. Domitian was *portio Neronis de crudelitate* (a semi-Nero in cruelty). Not such as these was Tiberius (cp. Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 2), in whose day Christ came into the world (cp. ch. vii.), and who had desired the Senate to admit Him among the Roman deities. Marcus Aurelius (*gravissimus imperator*) was not a *debellator Christianorum* but a *protector*. Not even Hadrian, *curiositatum omnium explorator*, nor Vespasian, *Judaeorum debellator*, nor Pius, nor Verus had put into force the laws against Christians. The men who were demanding this were those who were daily and contemptuously infringing laws of all kinds: 'Ubi religio, ubi veneratio majoribus debita a vobis? Habitu, victu, instructu, sensu, ipso denique sermone proavis renuntiastis.' In proof he draws a sad picture of the luxury and immorality of the day. Suppers cost 100 sestertia (more than £700); mines of silver were reproduced in dishes (cp. *De Pallio*, ch. v.); theatres rose everywhere and were even covered in, instead of being at once suppressed on account of the debauchery of morals they engendered (see *De Spectaculis*, chs. iii., x.). Matrons were not to be distinguished by their dress from prostitutes. The good old laws had gone which encouraged in women modesty and sobriety.

II. Chs. vii.–ix. What were the charges against the Christians? "We are called miscreants on account of our infanticidal oath, our banquet upon our victim, and our incest after it. The very dogs are said to play the part of pimps for us, overturning the lights and securing for us darkness in which to indulge our unholy lusts:"—and the evidence was only rumour! 'Fama malum, quo non aliud velocius ullum.' It was, Tertullian retorts, the existence (secret or open) of such practices among the heathen which explained their belief that similar things were wrought among Christians. In Africa children were still secretly sacrificed; and but few rulers could plead guiltless of slaying their own children by drowning, or by exposure to cold, to hunger, and to dogs. Or, as regards the banquets of blood. In their own day, blood drawn from the thigh and quaffed initiated a novice into the service of Bellona. In the arena men were to be seen who to cure epilepsy drank greedily the blood flowing from the throats of criminals slain in combat. Ought not men who did such things to blush before Christians who could not do them (cp. Acts xv. 20, 29; Lev. xi. 40; Ezek. iv. 14; *Library of the Fathers*, x. p. 107, etc.)?

Next, as regards incest. Who were offenders so foul as those who had learnt the practice from Jupiter himself? Did not the loose kind of life which so many followed, lend itself to incest? Their children, sons and daughters, were exposed or sent away; sooner or later they were forgotten, and "the race and the crime crept on together;" they rushed blindly and unconsciously into incest. And then, with a holy gladness, Tertullian exhibits the contrast: "A steadfast and faithful observance of chastity has fenced in Christians from so direful a possibility. We are safe alike from breach of the marriage vow and from incest. Some of us keep down sensual passion by a virgin continence; if men in maturity, we are boys in purity (*senes pueri*)."

III. Chs. x.–xxvii. The *crimen laesae divinitatis*. In this section Tertullian faces the first of the two great charges, "sacrilege and treason." His "apology" as regards the former consists, briefly speaking, of (a) 'demonstratio religionis eorum' (chs. x.–xvi., xxiv.–xxvii.) and of (b) 'demonstratio religionis nostrae' (chs. xvii.–xxiii.), a most valuable *evidential* passage.

(a) You Christians, said the heathen, do not worship our gods. No, said Tertullian, we don't; and we won't, because we do not recognise them to be gods. They were nothing but men who had lived long ago, and men whose merits should have plunged them into the depths of Tartarus. How much better would it have been if the *deus deificus* had waited and taken up to heaven in their place such men as Socrates, Aristides, Themistocles and others.

The images excite Tertullian's intense scorn, as "the homes of hawks and mice and spiders." Caustically does Tertullian describe the heathen treatment of their household gods. "You pledge them, you sell them, you change them. They wear out or get broken, and you turn your Saturn into a cooking-pot and your Minerva into a ladle! You put your national gods in a sale-catalogue; and the man who will sell you herbs in the herb-market, will sell you gods at the Capitol. Or what could be more insulting than the company you give them? You worship Larentina, the prostitute, together with Juno or Ceres or Diana. You erect (at Rome) a statue to Simon Magus and give him as inscription the title of *sanctus deus* (see Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 542, and Oehler's note here). You turn into a god a sodomite like Antinous" (see Kellner's note).

What then, it was asked, did Christians worship if they did not worship gods? Tertullian answers, "Take in this first of all: they who are not worshippers of a lie are worshippers of truth." From this might be deduced the whole of the Christian religious belief. But before Tertullian proceeds to do this, he refutes some very false, but common, opinions about the Christians.

(*a*.) The vulgar belief that the god of the Christians was an ass's head. That was a notion due to Tacitus ('sane mendaciorum loquacissimus'), who, tracing the history of the Jews "expelled from" Egypt, stated that when they were in great distress with thirst, they followed the wild asses till they reached the

springs; and that out of gratitude they consecrated an image of that animal. In common opinion Christians and Jews were akin; hence the supposition that the former worshipped the same image. Tertullian, passing over Tacitus's own refutation of such a supposition, retorts sarcastically (ch. xvi.)—"You in your worship of Epona (the goddess of horses, asses, etc.) worship every kind of beast of burden. Perhaps we *are* to be blamed because we are mere ass-worshippers (*asinarii*; see *Dict. of Christian Antiq.*, s.n.) to the exclusion of other beasts."

(β) Christians were blamed because they worshipped the Cross. Tertullian retorts:—The fault of the Christians (if fault it was) was that they worshipped that in its entirety which the heathen worshipped in fragments. What were the Athenian Pallas and the Pharian Ceres but plaster figures, modelled on cross-shaped stakes? What were the trophies, but wooden crosses covered with armour? What were the eagles (or standards) of the Roman camps but crosses?

(γ) Others said that the sun was the god of the Christians; an idea which had probably originated in the Christian practice of turning to the East when praying. Well, was the reply, many of the heathen observed the same practice (cp. Réville, pp. 286–90); but if the Christians did make the Sun-day their day of gladness, it was not for sun-worship.

(δ) One last objection. Lately a *bestiarius* (see Semler's and Kellner's notes) had exhibited a picture at Rome with this inscription, *Deus Christianorum ονοκοιτης*. The figure had the ears of an ass, one foot was hoofed, in his hand was a book, and he was dressed in a toga (see *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, s.n. "Asinarii"). The name and the form only made us laugh, says Tertullian; and then he retorts:—But our opponents might well have worshipped such a biformed deity: for they have dog-headed and lion-headed gods, gods with horns, gods with wings, gods goat-limbed, fish-limbed, or serpent-limbed from the loins!

(b) Tertullian turns from what Christianity was not to what it was, and the main lines of the evidences of Christianity in the 2nd century are still those of our own. No student should refuse to these chapters (xvii.–xxiii.), so valuable in the history of religious belief, the closest possible examination. The eloquence, the fervour, the humility, the devoutness of the writer will be felt to be contagious. Irony and passion are comparatively absent.

Briefly to summarise the section, it details (b_1) the nature and attributes of the Creator, (b_2) the mission of the Prophets, men full of (*inundati*) the Holy Spirit, (b_3) the character of the Scriptures, and (b_4) the history of the Lord. Under b_3, Tertullian notes two things. These Scriptures were marked, first by that *antiquity* which his opponents rightly valued. And yet the most ancient of ancient heathen writings was far less ancient than the works of Moses, the contemporary of the Argive Inachus, and (as some thought) 500 years older than Homer. Nay, the very last of the prophets was coeval with the first of the (heathen) philosophers, lawgivers, and historians. 'Quod prius est, semen sit necesse est.' Secondly, the Scriptures were marked by *majesty*. 'Divinas probamus (*scripturas*), si dubitatur antiquas.' This *internal* evidence was a proof of the antiquity of the Scriptures, while the *external* and daily fulfilment of prophecy was a reason for expecting the verification of what was not yet fulfilled.

b_4 is in answer to the questions, Why did Jews and Christians differ? Did not these differences argue worship of different gods? Tertullian's reply (ch. xxi.) is a history of the origin of the Christian sect and name, and an account of the Founder of Christianity, such as we have it in the Gospels. His account is interspersed with most interesting statements, such as (*int. al.*)—the Jewish inference from the humility of Christ that He was only man, and from His miraculous power that He was a magician, and not the Logos of God; the record of the darkening of the sun at the crucifixion preserved in the secret archives of the empire; the reason for the seclusion of the Lord after the Resurrection, viz. "that the wicked should be freed from their error, and that faith destined for so glorious a reward should be established upon difficulty;" his own opinion that Caesars (such as Tiberius) would have believed in Christ, if they could have been Caesars and Christians at the same time; the sufferings of the disciples at the hands of the Jews; and at last, through Nero's cruelty, the sowing the seed of Christianity at Rome in their blood (cp. ch. l.). He concludes—'Deum colimus per Christum.' Count Him a mere man if you like. By Him and in Him God wishes to be known and worshipped.

A digression occurs here (chs. xxii., xxiii.) on demons and the testimony they were compelled to give to the power and Divinity of Christ. The passage is characteristic of the belief of the day. Evidently Tertullian thought a great deal of this proof of the devilry of the gods. On the strength of it he summoned the heathen magistrates to give up their folly.

With a boldness born of the deepest conviction, if matched perhaps by a Finntan and a Savonarola, Tertullian proposes an ordeal (ch. xxiii.). Let some one be brought forward to a heathen judgment-seat who, it was agreed, was possessed by a demon. Tertullian pledges himself that when commanded to speak by a Christian, that spirit which had elsewhere falsely asserted itself a god would truly declare itself a demon. Or, as a second test, he asks that one of those supposed possessed with a spirit of divination be confronted with a Christian. If the Virgo Coelestis herself (Juno), if Aesculapius did not confess themselves demons, not daring to lie to a Christian, then on that very spot let that most impudent Christian be slain!

One more point remained. Romans considered their position as masters of the world to be the reward of their religious devotion to their gods, and they affirmed that they who paid their gods the most service flourished the most. Tertullian traverses this "assumption" in ironical terms, or meets it with positive denial. It was futile to attribute the grandeur of the Roman name *religiositatis meritis*, since it was after the Roman power became an empire that religion made progress. In the early days of Rome there were no images or temples. *Deus ipse nusquam*. The Romans in fact owed their greatness to their irreligion! Their conquests had been gained at the expense of the gods of

the conquered! 'Tot sacrilegia Romanorum quot tropaea.' The true conclusion (ch. xxvi.) was that He Who was ruler both of the world and of the men who ruled in it, was the dispenser of kingdoms; and that He alone it was Who exalted or put down states.

IV. Chs. xxviii.-xxxvi.—The charge *laesae augustioris majestatis* is now reached. The evil spirits stirred up the heathen to compel Christians to sacrifice *pro salute imperatoris;* and that compulsion was met by resistance not less determined. Ironically does Tertullian commend in the heathen the dread with which they regarded Caesar as more profound and reverential than that which they accorded to the Olympian Jupiter; "A living man *is* more powerful than a dead one;" but it suggested the question, Could or did the gods protect the emperor or anyone else? The gods themselves had to be protected by Caesar's guards, how could they have in their charge Caesar's wellbeing? As a matter of fact Christians did pray for the safety of the emperor; but it was to the eternal God, the very God, the living God, Whom—more than any gods—the emperors themselves would desire to have propitious to them.

Christians were counted *publici hostes*, because they would not pay to the emperor vain, lying, or unseemly honours; and because, as *verae religionis homines*, they kept the festival days not lasciviously, but as conscientious men. Truly if public joy was to be expressed by public shame, the Christians deserved condemnation. They did not hang garlands on their door-posts, nor turn night into day with lamps, not dress up their houses like brothels! And then, as usual, Tertullian retorts:—They who counted Christians enemies of the rulers of Rome were its worst enemies. Could the hearts and real thoughts of the crowd which shouted to Caesar, 'De nostris annis augeat tibi Jupiter annos,' be revealed there would be seen but a mercenary wish for Caesar after Caesar to give the royal donative. 'Sed vulgus, inquis. Nihil hosticum de ipso senatu, de equite, de castris, de palatiis ipsis spirat.' Was it so? Whence then came Cassius, Niger, Albinus? Whence the men who murdered Commodus? Were they not the very men who on the eve of their impious revolt had offered sacrifices *pro salute imperatoris*, and sworn by his "genius"?

V. Chs. xxxvii.-xlv.—This section, dealing with minor points of objection to the Christians, opens with an impassioned protest on behalf of men who, actuated by the principle 'Idem sumus imperatoribus qui et vicinis nostris,' never took vengeance for the wrongs done to them. Meb-law had attacked them with stones and fire, or with Bacchanalian fury had torn their dead from the graves to rend their bodies asunder. Had Christianity tolerated repaying evil with evil, what secret vengeance could have been wrought in a single night with a torch or two? Or, had they determined to act as open enemies, what numbers and resources would the Christians have had! "We are but of yesterday," is Tertullian's proud boast (cp. ch. i.), "and yet we have filled your cities, fortresses, towns, assemblies, camp, palace, senate and forum: *sola vobis reliquimus templa.* Should we determine to separate from you and betake ourselves to some remote corner of the globe, your loss of so many citizens would cover you with shame. The solitude, silence, and stupor as of a dead world would fill you with fear. You would have to seek subjects to govern. Your enemies would be more numerous than your citizens. At present it is your Christian citizens who make your enemies so few."

Tertullian therefore asks that Christians should be admitted *inter licitas factiones.* The "sect" was incapable of any such acts as were dreaded in forbidden societies. If they had indeed their own occupations (*negotia*), why should that give offence? For what were the *negotia Christianae factionis?* (ch. xxxix.). Tertullian's answer is a touching picture of the simple Christendom of his day. "We are a body linked together by a common religious profession, by unity of discipline, and by a common hope. We meet as a congregation and pray to God in united supplication. *Haec vis Deo grata est.* We pray for the emperors, their ministers, and those in authority, for the welfare of the world, for peaceful times, and for the delaying of the end (see ch. xxxii.). We come together to listen to our holy Scriptures (cp. Just. M. *Apol.* ii.); and by holy words we nourish faith, raise hope, stablish confidence, and strengthen discipline. Our presidents are elders of approved character, who have obtained this honour not by purchase but by desert. On the monthly day appointed each gives to the chest what he likes; the money is disbursed not in feasting and drinking, but in supporting and burying the poor, in providing for destitute orphan boys and girls, in supporting the aged, the infirm, and the shipwrecked, and in succouring those sent to the mines, or incarcerated in prisons *ex causa Dei sectae.*"

Yet in this simple course of life and duty the heathen found cause for objection and reproof.—

(*a*) The love of Christians for each other was but a proof of hatred towards all outside them; their readiness to die for each other was only significant of their readiness to slay those alien to them.

(*b*) The Christian suppers were denounced as infamous and extravagant, a denunciation which elicited from Tertullian an interesting description of the Christian meal: 'Coena nostra de nomine rationem sui ostendit.' It was an Agape (*dilectio*). Whatever it might cost, its refreshment was for the poor and needy especially. It was conducted under precise rules. Being a religious service, nothing vile or immodest was admitted. Prayer to God was the (spiritual) food tasted first. Then the Christians reclined on the couches eating and drinking simply what was sufficient for men who remembered that the night would be spent in the worship of God, and talked as those conscious that God heard their conversation. Washing of hands followed, and lights were brought in. Each man then stood up and sang to God a hymn either from the Holy Scriptures or of his own composition. Prayer closed the feast; and men passed out, not to commit deeds of violence or immorality, but to show by their modesty and chastity that they had supped upon discipline rather than upon the meats of a banquet.

(*c*) The Christians were the cause of every public disaster and every popular misfortune

If the waters of the Tiber or of the Nile failed to rise, if there was no rain, if there was an earthquake, or famine, or pestilence, straightway the cry was heard, 'Christianos ad leonem!' Tertullian points out that: Before the coming of Christ calamities without number had fallen upon the world and particular cities; and that long before Christians existed, Sodom and Gomorrah, Vulsinii and Pompeii had been overwhelmed with fire. The truth of the matter lay deeper: 'Semper humana gens male de Deo meruit.' The evils which they suffered they suffered from Him to Whom they had been ungrateful, and in Whose sight they were guilty. On the other hand, let them note that far lighter calamities had fallen on mankind since the world had received Christians from God. Their innocence had tempered the iniquity of the age.

(*d*) Christians were useless beings, of no service in the affairs of life (ch. xlii.). Tertullian assures his adversaries, with ironical amazement, that Christians were not Brahmins or Indian gymnosophists, dwellers in woods or exiles from active life. They lived in the world, and frequented the forum and the shambles, the bath and the tavern, the market and other places of commerce. They were sailors and soldiers, labourers and traders. And yet he will admit that there were some classes who had just cause of complaint—'de sterilitate Christianorum.' And who were these? Pimps, panders, and *aquarioli*; assassins, poisoners, and magicians; soothsayers, diviners, and astrologers! 'His infructuosus esse magnus est fructus.'

VI. Chs. xlvi.–l.—Accusations had been met and the case of the Christian stated. What yet remained? One last perversion on the part of unbelief: "Christianity was no Divine institution, but simply a kind of philosophy." The refutation of this closes the *Apology*. Tertullian, if frequently satirical, is at first grave and dignified, sober and patient, more than is his wont; but the smouldering fire bursts out at last, and the concluding chapter is a climax of withering scorn and impassioned appeal.

His position was this. If the virtues advocated and professed by Christians—innocence, justice, patience, sobriety, and modesty—were the virtues professed and counselled by the philosophers, why should not Christians receive the toleration extended to philosophers? They openly destroyed the gods and attacked superstitions, and were rewarded—by statues and salaries. Christians and philosophers were, however, not alike, either in respect of discipline or knowledge. On the score of chastity there was no comparison. Men had only to compare the life of Socrates, Diogenes, Speusippus and Democritus, with that of those actuated by the Christian principle, 'animo adversus libidinem caecus est,' and they could not fail to ask, 'Adeo quid simile philosophus et Christianus? Graeciae discipulus et coeli? . . amicus et inimicus erroris? . . . veritatis interpolator et integrator, et furator ejus et custos?'

Or, as regards knowledge; 'Antiquior omnibus veritas,' and the antiquity of the Holy Scriptures pointed to them as the treasure-house of all later wisdom. Poets and sophists had drunk deep of the fountain of the Prophets, even if they had perverted them through not understanding them and through dislike of their very simplicity. Platonists, Stoics, and others taught differently about God, the world, and the soul. Some perverted the Old Testament, some adulterated the New. The only *regula veritatis* which the Church recognized was that which had come down from Christ through His companions, and out of that truth the spirits of error had framed every contradiction of truth. Christians were laughed at for proclaiming that God would judge the world, that there was a Gehenna and a Paradise; but the poets and philosophers had their *tribunal apud inferos*, their Pyriphlegethon, and their Elysian fields. And whence came the resemblance? The heathen had taken their ideas from the Christian mysteries (*sacramentis*); which were thus proved to be the truer because the older.

Philosophers broached wonderful opinions, such as that a man could be made out of a mule, or a serpent out of a woman; but when the Christian promised the return of a man from a man, he was liable to be stoned without a hearing. Yet, argument which held good for the transmigration of souls was equally valid for the resurrection of the body. Tertullian answers the objection: "How can matter which has been dissolved be made to appear again?" by the defence of the resurrection so frequent among the Apologists (see Oehler's note): "What were men before they came into existence? Nothing. What would they be when they ceased to exist? Nothing. Then why might they not come into being again by the will of Him Who at first created them out of nothing?" The reason for any restoration at all Tertullian finds in the final judgment. If every man was to be judged, he must of necessity appear before God such as he had been before, in order to receive judgment at God's hands. And therefore the body as well as the soul must be restored. The soul could not suffer without the flesh (cp. *De Testim. Animae*, ch. iv.). When, therefore, the end of things temporal should have come and the millennium have ended (see *L. of the F.*, x. p. 120, sq.), then should the good or evil of the whole human race be assessed, and men—in accordance with their merits—placed, in the immeasurable perpetuity of eternity. After this there would be no more death and no more resurrection: 'Erimus idem qui nunc.' The worshippers of God would be ever with God, clothed upon with eternity (cp. 2 Cor. v. 4); the profane and those whose hearts were not wholly with God would be consigned to the punishment of that fire, which yet, by its very nature, preserved them incorruptible.

For such "presumptuous speculations" Christians were to suffer, and it was contemptuously added that they ought to be grateful to their judges for their sufferings. Yes, answers Tertullian, we are; for 'Vicimus cum occidimur, evadimus cum obducimur!' Let the heathens call them in mockery *sarmenticii* and *semaxii* when, bound to a half-axle of wood, they were enclosed in faggots and burnt. That was their attitude of victory, their robe of conquest, their triumphal chariot. "Oh, good presidents," exclaims Tertullian, "go on with your work. Rack, torture, condemn, and grind us to dust. You will stand all the higher with the people if you sacrifice the Christians to them. Yet

the more exquisite your cruelty, the greater is the attraction to our sect. The more often we are mown down by you, the more we grow in number: 'Semen est sanguis Christianorum.' The obstinacy you upbraid in us is a teacher. What man who sees it does not enquire 'quid intus in re sit?' Who, after enquiry, does not join us? and who, after joining us, does not desire to suffer, in order that he may purchase by his blood the fulness of God's grace and complete pardon? Therefore do we thank you (rulers) for your sentence. 'Cum damnamur a vobis, a Deo absolvimur.'"

Ad Nationes (i., ii.).—This treatise is practically a short form of the *Apology*. It covers the same ground, uses the same arguments, and to a great extent the same language. It has, however, this difference, that while the *Apology* was addressed to the rulers and magistrates of Carthage, this work appeals to the people. Its whole cast is consequently more popular, its arguments less prolonged, its illustrations less reserved (cp. I. chs. iv., viii., xvi.; II. ch. xi.); its anecdotes more contemptuous and coarse (I. ch. viii.; II. chs. iv., viii., ix.); and its treatment of what the heathen counted sacred is sarcastic with but little qualifying refinement. Oehler in his notes has given references to the corresponding chapters of the *Apology*. There is nothing against the supposition advanced by some that the two works proceeded *pari passu*.

De Testimonio Animae.—This was written very soon after the *Apology*, to which it refers (ch. v.). By some it has been considered the most original and acute of Tertullian's works (see Neander, *Antignosticus*, p. 259).

Many of his predecessors, says Tertullian (ch. i.), had ransacked heathen literature, and sought to discover in its pages support of the Christian efforts to expel error and admit equity. The attempt was, in his opinion, a mistake and a failure. He would not repeat it. Neither would he adduce Christian writings when dealing with heathen, for nobody consulted them unless he were already a Christian. Therefore, he will turn to another and a new testimony, that of the soul. Apostrophising it, he cries, "Stand forth in the midst of us, O soul! I appeal to thee; yet not as wise with a wisdom formed in the schools, trained in libraries, or nourished in Attic academies and porticoes; but as simple and rough, without polish or culture, such as thou art to those who have thee only, such as thou art in the cross-road, the highway, and the dockyard. I seek of thee that which thou bringest with thee into man, that which thou hast thyself learnt to think, or hast been taught by thy Creator, Whoever He may be. Thou art not, so far as I know, Christian. The soul is not born Christian (cp. *Apol.* xviii.), but becomes Christian. Yet Christians beg now for a testimony from thee, as from one outside them; a testimony against thine own that the heathen may blush for their hatred and mockery of us."

The testimony of the soul to God is first asked and found in popular phrases indicative of knowledge and fear of God. Next it is adjured to speak about immortality and the resurrection of the body (ch. iv.; cp. *Apol.* xlviii.); and again in popular sayings as well as in the natural fear of death a belief in a state of existence beyond the grave is noted. As the result, the heathen should believe what nature told them about the soul. "Of all your guides," he urges, "choose this sister of truth. You may doubt literature, God and nature never lie. And to believe in God and nature, believe in the soul." The belief would lead (*int. al.*) to a cessation of persecution.

Adversus Judaeos.—With the series of apologetic works against the heathen may be placed Tertullian's "Apology" against the Jews. This people were to him an ever-present instance of the fulfilment of prophecy and of God's judgment for their rejection of the Christ. They were dispersed throughout the world; without God or king; not permitted to enter the holy city Jerusalem or even their native land; and compelled to purchase permission publicly to exercise their worship (chs. iii., xiii.; *Apol.* ch. xxi.; *De Pudicitia*, ch. viii.).

The authenticity and integrity of the treatise, as usually printed, have both been disputed; the latter with justice, the former needlessly, and principally on account of the discredit attaching to the latter portion. The first eight chapters are certainly Tertullian's, and Tertullian's while still a Churchman. It is marked by his originality (cp. his "primordial law," ch. ii.), and that comparative sobriety of language which he knew how to employ, when dealing with God's judgments, not upon heathen and heretic, but upon His once chosen and still to be restored people. The latter chapters are different, both in character and style. The true style of Tertullian will be seen by reading them in the chapters in *Adv. Marcionem*, Bk. iii., which cover the same ground. Here they are evidently an addition, and by a not very successful imitator of the great African's manner. See Neander, *Antignosticus*, App.; Hauck, pp. 89–96. Kaye gives a summary, pp. 440–6.

The treatise was occasioned by a dispute between a Christian and a heathen converted, not to Christianity but, to Judaism. Practically, the question between them was the exclusion or not of Gentiles from the promises of God. From two passages of Scripture (Gen. xxii. 18, cp. Bp. Lightfoot on Gal. iii. 16; and Gen. xxv. 21–3), God's promise to Abraham and the issue of two nations from the womb of Rebecca, Tertullian argues that Jew and Christian were alike partakers of the privileges of grace, but that the latter had become historically the greater. God's law, he insists, was not first given in Sinai, but in Paradise; it existed successively for the Patriarchs, for the Jews, and for the Gentiles; and its precepts were reformed for the salvation of mankind, in accordance with the conditions of each age.

Applying the same principle of reasoning to such special points of the Law as circumcision, the observance of the Sabbath, and sacrifices, Tertullian affirms (ch. vi.) that the temporal or carnal application of these ordinances having been given to the people of Israel, it followed that the time might be expected to come when the precepts of the old law and of the ancient ceremonies would cease, and the new law and spiritual sacrifices and the New Testament would supervene. The light from on high

would shine on the Gentiles (*nobis*) sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death. Tertullian had therefore to prove two things: (*a*) that the old law had ceased; (*b*) that the new and promised law was then in operation.

But there was a preliminary question. Was any one expected, and if expected, had any one come, 'novae legislator, sabbati spiritalis cultor, sacrificiorum aeternorum antistes, regni aeterni aeternus dominator,' or was His advent still matter of hope? (ch. vii.). The fulfilment of prophecy rightly understood was the answer. Tertullian does not need to prove that the Christ should come. Every Jew believed and hoped it. Isaiah xlv. 1, was sufficient proof of it. [He renders the passage differently from the present Hebrew text, and with one especially interesting variation, reading, "Thus saith the Lord God to my Christ the Lord (Κυρίῳ)," etc., instead of "to Cyrus (Κύρῳ) His anointed," etc. So also in *Adv. Prax.* chs. xi., xxviii.] In the then fulfilment of this prophecy he sees the proof that the Christ had come. Upon whom but upon Christ had the nations believed?—nations such as (*int. al.*) Moors, Spaniards, Gauls, Britons "inhabiting places inaccessible to the Romans but subjugated to Christ" (in the same chapter he speaks of them as "shut up within the circuit of their own seas"), Germans and others, unknown to him, and too numerous to mention. Christ reigned everywhere; was adored everywhere: 'omnibus aequalis, omnibus rex, omnibus judex, omnibus Deus et Dominus est.'

In Daniel ix. 24–27, Tertullian (who followed Theodotion's text) finds the dates of Christ's Birth and Passion, and of the destruction of Jerusalem (ch. viii.). His calculations lead him to the forty-first year of Augustus as the date of the birth of Christ, and to the fifth of Tiberius as that of His death, and to the first year of Vespasian as the date of the destruction of Jerusalem. His interpretation is historically interesting, but critically useless (cp. Fraidl, *Die Exegese d. Siebzig Wochen Daniels*, pp. 35–9).

The rest of the book (chs. ix.–end), as usually printed, covers similar ground to that of *Adv. Marc.* iii. chs. xiii., xviii., xx., xxiii.

B. *Tertullian the Priest.*

Tertullian had written hitherto as a layman. The writings which are now to be considered indicate more or less directly that he had become a priest (cp. *De Baptismo*, chs. xvii., xviii.). The emperor Severus had quelled rebellion, and persecution was for a time suspended. There is much probability in the conjecture that about this time a synod of African bishops met at Carthage to discuss matters affecting the organisation, discipline, and teaching of the Church: and the occasion may have been used to ordain one who, as an 'Apologist,' had proved himself so fearless a champion of the Church. Questions concerning heretical baptism, and the attitude of the Church towards the heretical sects, were very probably raised and discussed at such a synod, and Tertullian's lost treatise on heretical baptism was written in Greek to circulate its decisions beyond the confines of the African Church.

Other points, however, not of a dogmatic character, but dealing rather with Christian life and ethics, came before him in his work in Carthage as a priest. There were then, as ever, simple-minded Christians who accepted all and everything that was laid before them, to whom discussion was painful and doubt unknown (*De Bapt.* ch. i.); others who were careless and indifferent; others to whom argument and doubt was the breath of life, restless, rash, and proud men (*De Poenit.* ch. v.; *De Bapt.* ch. xiii.). Many and varied were the points upon which the flock looked to their pastors for guidance:—prayer, Baptism, repentance, and the discipline connected with them; woman's dress and woman's life, married or unmarried; pleasures, amusements, how far lawful or unlawful—all were matters upon which direction was desirable, and to all does Tertullian apply himself in a tone usually gentle and persuasive. Irony and sarcasm are not indeed absent, but it is the pastor who is writing, and not the Apologist, when Tertullian addresses himself to his people.

Roughly divided, the treatises were practical and doctrinal, but the division must not be pressed too closely.

I. Practical treatises.—*De Oratione.* (a) Of the Lord's Prayer specifically (chs. i.–xi.); (b) of prayer generally,— times, places, and customs (chs. xii.–end).

(a) Jesus Christ ('Dei spiritus et Dei sermo et Dei ratio, sermo rationis et ratio sermonis et spiritus') gave to "the disciples of the New Testament a new form of prayer." It was needed as new wine in new skins, etc. (St. Matt. ix. 16); for just as what had been in former days was changed (as circumcision), or supplemented (as the law), or fulfilled (as prophecy), or perfected (as faith), so the new grace of God had fashioned anew all things from carnal to spiritual in superadding the Gospel, 'expunctor totius retro vetustatis.'

As Christ was Spirit, Word, and Reason, so His prayer was formed of three parts:—the word by which it was expressed, the spirit by which alone it had power, the reason by which it was appropriated (the reading is disputed): and the practice of prayer was recommended with three injunctions; first that it should be offered up in secret, secondly marked by "modesty of faith," and thirdly distinguished by brevity. The brevity characteristic of the Lord's Prayer did but intensify the wide interpretation possible to its words. It was in very truth 'breviarium totius evangelii.' It is reckoned as containing seven clauses, the doxology not being given; and each clause is considered separately. The comments are reflections rather than interpretations; and if unequal, and sometimes fanciful, they are very beautiful, and can never be read without profit. The "angel of prayer" (ch. xvi.) was with him as he wrote for those whom he described as 'angelorum candidati,' and whose song he found in the second petition. His own summary (ch. ix.) is a mine of spiritual thought. He approves of other prayers being used corresponding with the special circumstances of him who prays, but never to the omission of this, the regular and set form of prayer. He charges men not to go up to the altar of God with feelings of anger against their brethren; and generally to have the mind free from all which may disturb it. Prayer must be put forth from a spirit such as the Spirit to Whom it is prayed.

(b) Certain ceremonies, "empty" (*vacuae*) Tertullian calls them, but to us illustrative of many an interesting point of ritual and practice of the time, are next considered. A bare enumeration of them must suffice here:—Washing the hands before prayer; the custom of praying with the cloak taken off; sitting after prayer; the kiss of peace; the "Stations" (ch. xix.; see Oehler's note); the dress of women, and veiling or non-veiling of virgins [a point (chs. xxi., xxii.) discussed at greater length and with a Montanist tendency in the later tract *De Virginibus Velandis*]; kneeling in prayer; place and time of prayer; prayer when brethren met or parted; prayer and psalm [ch. xxvii.; on the practice of frequent repetition of the word Hallelujah in the prayers and in those Psalms (the 'Hallelujah' Pss. civ.–vi., cxiii., cxv.–xviii., cxxxv., cxlvi.–l.) which furnished that response to the congregation].

The closing chapter deals with the power and effect of prayer; and is one of the gems of Tertullian's writings. 'Sola est oratio quae Deum vincit,' and Christ had willed that prayer should never operate for ill but only for good. "Never," he cries, "let us walk unarmed by prayer. Under the arms of prayer, guard we the standard of our emperor; in prayer, await we the Angel's trump. Angels pray; every creature prays. 'Quid amplius? Etiam ipse Dominus oravit.'"

De Baptismo.—One Quintilla (*al.* quin illa) "a viper of the Cainite heresy," had made it her object to destroy Baptism. "What good could water do? Was it to be believed that a man could go down into the water, have a few words spoken over him, and rise again the gainer of eternity?" (see ch. vi.). Quintilla would seem to have been a Gnostic, and the very simplicity of the means of grace repelled her. 'Miratur simplicia quasi vana, magnifica quasi impossibilia.' Tertullian addressed himself to this mighty "foolishness" and "impossibility." What was attacked was a bulwark of the faith; 'felix sacramentum aquae nostrae!' Quintilla's sneers had corrupted some; others were disturbed by such doubts as, Why was Baptism necessary? Abraham was justified without it. The Christ Himself did not baptize. No mention was made in Scripture of the Baptism of the Apostles; and St. Paul himself was bidden not to practise it. Answers were easy, but they had to be given, lest catechumens should perish through lack of right instruction.

I. The foundation for the Sacrament (*religionem*) of Baptism he finds in (chs. i.–ix.) the history of the creation. The hovering of the Spirit of God over the waters was typical of Baptism; and water still, after invocation of God, furnished the Sacrament of sanctification. The heathen used waters, though bereft of God's Spirit (*aquae viduae*), with a similar intention. Washing was the channel for initiation into the rites of Isis or Mithra, the preparatory act for the Eleusinian games, the purification previous to murder. Demon and devil emulated in this, as in so much else, the dealings of God.

Shortly but beautifully Tertullian describes the baptismal ceremonies of the day (cp. also *De Spect.* ch. iv.), notes the types and figures of Baptism in the Old Testament, and the testimony to Baptism in the life and Passion of the Lord. Next he reviews some of the points under debate, *e.g.*—

(1) The Lord did not baptize (St. John iv. 2); to which the common-sense answer might be given (ch. xi.), 'Semper is dicitur facere cui praeministratur'; but in truth the disciples baptized with the baptism of St. John, for the Baptism of Christ could not have been given then by Himself or by His disciples, inasmuch as the glory of the Lord was not yet made perfect, nor the efficacy of the font established by His Passion and Resurrection.

(2) If without Baptism no one could obtain salvation (cp. St. John iii. 5), how could salvation be affirmed of the Apostles, of whom St. Paul alone was baptized in the Lord (ch. xii.)? Tertullian's answer is twofold. (*a*) There was nothing to show that they were not baptized with St. John's baptism; the probability rather being that if they who opposed the Lord refused it, they who followed Him received it. But whether they were baptized or not, (*b*) the privilege of being the first chosen by the Lord, and of inseparable companionship with Him, bestowed the benefits of Baptism upon those whose *faith* bade them follow Him. And no one would say that faith was altogether lacking to the Apostles.

(3) Out of this concession, the Cainites and such as they had made capital (ch. xiii.). Baptism, they said, was not then necessary for those to whom faith was sufficient. Abraham pleased God, not by a Sacrament of water but of faith. Tertullian practically answers, What was demanded of Abraham was one thing, what was demanded of the Christian was another. Granted that salvation was once attainable through bare faith; it was so no longer, since faith was a belief in the Nativity, Passion, and Resurrection of Christ. Enlargement of the Sacrament of faith had followed. The sealing of Baptism was, in a sense, the clothing of the faith which before was bare. The law of Baptism had been established and the form prescribed (St. Matt. xxviii. 19).

II. Larger questions acquiescing in the necessity of Baptism awaited consideration. To two such Tertullian now refers.

(1) *Heretical baptism.*—Christians held firmly to a belief in one God, one Baptism, one Church. This unity was, as regards Baptism, imperilled by heretical baptism. The *ademptio communicationis* (by some=deprivation of communion; by others=excommunication) stamped heretics as strangers. "We and they have not the same God, nor one—*i.e.* the same—Christ. Therefore we and they have not one—*i.e.* the same—Baptism. What (baptism) they have, they have it not rightly, and therefore have not baptism at all." On these grounds he rejected heretical baptism. On the whole subject consult *L. of the F.*, x. p. 280 sq.

(2) *Second Baptism.*—The belief and practice of the Church Tertullian states thus: "We enter the font but once; our sins are washed away but once, because they ought not to be repeated." The Christian had, nevertheless, a second Baptism, viz. the Baptism of Blood (cp St. Luke xii. 50). Two Baptisms had Christ sent forth from the wounds in His pierced side,

that they who believed in His Blood might be washed with water, and that they who had been washed with water might also drink His Blood. This was that Baptism which stood in the place of the font when it had not been received, or restored it when lost (cp. *Scorp.* ch. vii.).

III. The remainder of the treatise deals with points of Church practice and discipline as regards Baptism (chs. xvii.–xx.). Laymen as well as clerics could administer it, but only if disciples and in cases of necessity. "Layman" was not taken to include women. With such women as Quintilla in his mind, Tertullian argues that the Apostle, who would not permit a woman too much learning (cp. 1 Cor. xiv. 34), would never have permitted a woman to teach or baptize.

Baptism was not to be administered rashly (cp. St. Matt. vii. 6). Tertullian, like the teachers of Alexandria, recommends delaying Baptism in the case of children, till they had passed the "age of innocence," and in the case of the unwedded and widowed. The times most suitable for Baptism were the Passover and Pentecost; but not to the exclusion of other opportunities. When about to receive Baptism, candidates should prepare themselves by prayer, fasting, vigil, and confession of sins (cp. St. Matt. iii. 6); and after Baptism they should rejoice rather than fast. Tertullian suggests to them a prayer: "When you rise from that holy font of your new birth and spread your hands for the first time in the house of your mother Church with your brethren, ask of the Father, ask of the Lord, special grace (*peculia gratiae*) and the divers gifts of the Holy Spirit (*distributiones charismatum*). "And"—he adds with touching humility—"I pray you that when you ask, you remember in your prayers Tertullian the sinner."

De Poenitentia.—I. Repentance of sin before Baptism (chs. i.–vi.). True repentance had its measure and its limit in the fear of God. God Himself initiated repentance, when He rescinded His sentence on Adam. He exhorted men to it by His Prophets; by St. John He pointed out its sign and seal in Baptism. Its aim was the salvation of man through the abolition of sin. And what was sin? That which God forbad (*id a quo Deus arceat*). It consisted of two kinds, bodily and spiritual sins, or sins of deed and sins of will (St. Matt. v. 27, 28; cp. *De Idololatria*, ch. ii.). To all who truly repented, God had promised pardon. But men must not return to sin after repentance. Fresh sin was wilful disobedience (*contumaciae adglutinaris*) and ingratitude. To repent was to renounce the devil, the rival (*aemulus*) of God; to repent of repentance was to prefer the devil to God.

There was a tendency to say "God was satisfied with the devotion of heart and mind. Even if men did sin in act, they could do so without prejudice to their faith and fear." With an intensity of sarcasm, Tertullian replies, "You shall be thrust down into hell without prejudice to your pardon;" and with an intensity of scorn denounces such Antinomianism as a temper springing from the seed of hypocrites, whose friendship with the devil had never been broken, and whose repentance had never been real.

This temper explained another frequent and lamentable practice. The Christians of the day most firmly believed in the washing away of sins in Holy Baptism, and in the necessity of true repentance as preparatory to the reception of it; but this led "novices" (*inter auditorum tirocinia*) not to a willing and holy eagerness to receive Baptism, but to a presumptuous and unholy spirit of delay, in order that they (the soldiers of the Cross) might steal the intervening time as a furlough (*commentum*) for sinning rather than for learning not to sin. Tenderly and wisely does Tertullian plead with them. "If a man who has given himself to God is not to cease sinning till he be bound by Baptism, I hardly know whether he will not feel, after Baptism, more sorrow than joy."

II. Repentance of those who sinned after Baptism (chs. vii.–xii.). What were such to do? Though the "gate" of forgiveness had been shut, and the bar of Baptism laid across it, God had placed in the "porch" second repentance. This could open the door to those that knocked; yet only once and never again (see Pusey's note *in loco*). Holy Scripture invited men to this second repentance (Luke xv.; Rev. ii., iii.); and the Church had prescribed public "exomologesis" (confession; see Pusey's note, *L. of the F.* x. pp. 376–9). The sinner was to lie in sackcloth and ashes, to clothe his body in filthy rags and afflict his soul. His food was to be of the plainest kind. He was to pass days and nights in weeping, fasting, and praying. He was to prostrate himself before the presbyters, kneel before martyrs and confessors (*caros Dei*), and implore the brethren to pray for him. Confession of this kind would be the sinner's own act against himself in the place of God's wrath, and by temporal affliction he might discharge the eternal punishment due.

But men shunned or deferred such confession from their dislike of its conditions. Tertullian's scorn for them flashes out as he enumerates the inconveniences, and even insults to which they would subject themselves without hesitation in pursuit of some civil office, consulship, or praetorship. They must not shrink from exomologesis, if they would avoid the hell which that exomologesis would extinguish. Seven years' repentance in squalor and retirement procured pardon for Nebuchadnezzar; persistent refusal to repent brought death upon Pharaoh. "I cannot be silent, deep-dyed sinner as I am, on the subject of repentance when Adam himself is not silent. By exomologesis he was restored to paradise."

De Spectaculis.—This was written before the *De Corona*, which (ch. vi.) alludes to a Greek edition of this treatise, and before the *De Cultu Feminarum* (cp. i. ch. viii.) and the *De Idololatria* (cp. ch. xiii.). Bp. Kaye (p. xvi. n. I, p. 55) refers it to the Montanist period, Bonwetsch (p. 33) as distinctly to the pre-Montanist. The balance of arguments is in favour of the latter view (cp. also Pusey's prefatory note in the *L. of the F.* x. p. 187). A period of temporary peace after persecution (cp. ch. xxvii.) had fallen upon the church in Carthage. Spectacular shows and games were being given, possibly in commemoration of the victory of Severus over Albinus, and the grave question had to be faced —Should Christians attend them?

The work is addressed to the "servants of God," and sets before them reasons of faith, truth, and discipline why they should avoid the public spectacles, amusements, and shows. It deals both with the views of the heathen who pressed the Christians to attend them, and with the hankering of the Christians themselves after them.

The heathen urged that all things were created by God and given to man for his use; that coming from such a source they must be all good, and that therefore the spectacles and their accessories were good also. Christians had a more discriminating knowledge; and yet they asked in a petulant spirit for Scriptural warrant specifically prohibiting their attendance at places of public amusement (see also chs. xiv., xx.). Tertullian gives them one, and his method of application is worth quoting. "Plainly," he says, "we never find the words—Thou shalt not go to the circus or the theatre, Thou shalt not be a spectator of the combat or gladiatorial show —expressed as clearly as the commandments, 'Thou shalt not kill,' 'Thou shalt not worship idols,' etc.; but look at Ps. i. 1: 'Felix vir, qui non abiit in concilium impiorum et in via peccatorum non stetit nec in cathedra pestium (Vulg. pestilentiae) sedit. . . .'" If the Psalmist called a few Jews a *concilium impiorum*, how much more justly would his designation apply to a vast heathen assembly! At the spectacles men stood *in via;* for 'viae' was the name given to the passages between the seats of the amphitheatre; *cathedra* was the place where the matrons placed their chairs. Ah! not then 'felix' but 'infelix qui in quodcumque concilium . . . abierit . . . steterit, . . . sederit.'

The seal (*signaculum*) of Baptism, however, supplied *the* reason against attendance at the shows. All the preparations connected with the spectacles were based upon idolatry, and idolatry was renounced at the font. In chs. v.–xiii., Tertullian draws out in detail the origin of the spectacles, their titles, their apparatus, their localities, and their arts; and the reader can realise to the very life the places and scenes he describes in his impassioned but often one-sided invective. The spectacles bore in their names—the *Ludi*, the *Liberalia*, the *Equiria*, the *Consualia*—the brand of the idol-stamp. The circus was the home for what was idolatrous. Everywhere were images and statues, chariots dedicated to gods, their thrones, their crowns, their equipments. Religious rites preceded, intervened, and succeeded the games; guilds, priests, and attendants served the *conventus daemoniorum*. Consecrated to the sun, the solar temple rose in the midst and the solar effigy glittered on the summit. The chariots of the circus were dedicated to the gods, the charioteers wore the colours (white, red, green, and blue) of idolatry. The *designator* and the *haruspex* were two most befouled masters of the ceremonies connected with the funereal and sacrificial rites. The *theatrum* was the home of Venus and of Bacchus: and the performances there claimed the patronage of these two deities. The very artistic gifts employed in producing them were the inspiration of demons, and glozed over by a fallacious consecration.

In other respects (chs. xv.–xxiii.) the *res spectaculi* was opposed to the *res Dei*. The frequenter of the public shows would find it impossible to persevere in Christian discipline. God had charged Christians—in keeping with His gentle nature—to live in tranquillity and quietude and peace, not in fury and bitterness, anger and grief (cp. Eph. iv. 30). But every *spectaculum* roused lust after pleasure, keenness, rivalry, fury, bitterness, and all manner of feelings inconsistent with holy discipline. No one could view these spectacles unmoved; and if not, the Christian must not only avoid them but must not associate with those who frequented them.

A (Christian) lover of the games one day advanced in his hearing a new defence for his habit of attending them. "The sun," he said, "nay, God Himself, looks down from heaven (on the spectacles), and no contamination follows." Tertullian's retort is crushing: "Yes, and the sun casts his rays into the sewer and is not defiled! 'Nusquam et nunquam excusatur quod Deus damnat. Nusquam et nunquam licet quod semper et ubique non licet.'" That was a truer line of conduct than that suggested by the heathen maxim 'Alibi bonum quod alibi malum, et alibi malum quod alibi bonum.' Once a woman went to the theatre, and came back possessed with the devil. At the exorcising, when the foul spirit was asked why he had dared to attack one of the faithful, he answered boldly, "Because I had every right. I found her on my ground (*in meo eam inveni*)." In language scornful and impassioned Tertullian pleads, "Oh! may God keep from His own this great longing for deadly pleasure! It is to go from God's Church to the devil's, *de coelo in coenum*, from sky to sty! How can hands raised in prayer to God occupy themselves in clapping the actor? How can the mouth which repeats its *Amen* at the reception of the Eucharist, raise an approving shout for the gladiator, or cry ἀπ' αἰῶνος for any but God and Christ?"

Still men pleaded, "We cannot live without pleasure." Well, Christians had pleasures many and noble. What greater pleasure could be conceived than reconciliation to God and pardon of the many sins of a past life? What delight should exceed the trampling idolatry under foot, the expulsion of demons, acts of healing, a life unto God? These were the pleasures and the spectacles of Christians, holy, perpetual, and free. In the Christian circus they might behold immodesty hurled to the ground by chastity, perfidy slain by fidelity, cruelty bruised by mercy, wantonness overcome by modesty! These were the contests in which to gain the Christian crown. "Or do you wish to see blood shed? Behold Christ's!"

And then Tertullian closes his eyes to the spectacles of earth. There looms before him (ch. xxx.) *the* spectacle close at hand of the Lord coming in His glory and triumph. He depicts Angels exulting, saints rising from the dead, the kingdom of the just and the city of the New Jerusalem, the hell of the persecutor and scoffer. And there were spectacles even more glorious still. Man could not conceive them; but this could at least be said of them, that they were nobler than those of the circus, of the amphitheatre, and of the race-course.

De Cultu Feminarum, i. and ii.—The luxury and extravagance of the women of the time is matter of notoriety. Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria do not express one whit more strongly than Seneca the ambition, cruelty, and licentiousness which characterised them. Therefore, when women became Christians, and matronly and wifely virtues or virgin purity and modesty characterised them, it extorted the admiration of some and the impatient scorn of others. But by slow degrees, and by the employment of ridicule and even of argument, luxury began to creep in and overrule the daughters of the Church. Tertullian saw it, and the above works were among other efforts to recall Christian women to the Christian life. The first book leaves its argument incomplete, and is far more fantastic and violent in tone than the second. The conjecture might in fact be hazarded that Tertullian was either dissuaded from continuing the first book, or thought it best to continue its main argument in language much less likely to offend. The second book is not wanting in satire, but it is not coarse; and in its closing words rises to real eloquence. The date of these treatises is dependent upon that of the *De Spectaculis*, to which the first book refers.

Book I. Did his "best beloved sisters" but remember, argues Tertullian, their condition as Eves, they would avoid gay and glorious apparel, and dress meanly and even sordidly to expiate their share in the sin of Eve. Eve (and so woman) was to Tertullian 'diaboli janua, arboris illius resignatrix (unsealer), divinae legis prima desertrix.' Woman destroyed man, the image of God; and on account of woman the Son of God had to die. In the face of that fact, how could women think of ornaments? Yet they did; and Tertullian, following the teaching of the book of Enoch (see Kaye, pp. 289, &c.), assigns the use and encouragement of ornaments to the fallen angels who took wives of the daughters of men (Gen. vi. 2; cp. *Apol.* ch. xxii.), and taught them to wear necklaces of jewels, and circlets of gold, to dye wools for their garments, and paint their eyes with henna. The whole question of female dress was, however, independent of the persons who originated it; and Tertullian proceeds to consider it on its own merits (ch. iv.). Female dress he describes as marked by two distinctive traits, 'cultu et ornatu.' With the former he connects the crime of ambition, with the latter that of prostitution; both he considered inconsistent with the humility and chastity of "a handmaid of God." Why did women value gold and silver and jewels so highly? If it be true, says Tertullian, that gems were to be found in dragons' foreheads and precious stones in fishes' brains, what a spectacle was it that a Christian woman should set her heel on the devil's head (Gen. iii. 15), while from it she heaped ornaments on her own neck or head! Where jewels and gold were not rare they were in no esteem. So with robes of many colours (ch. viii.). Why was honour assigned to garments conspicuous for an adulteration of colours? God was not pleased with that which He had not produced. He had not produced sheep with purple or blue fleeces, and those colours ought not to be produced. They were the work of the devil, the corrupter of nature, and the rival of God. When gold, jewels, etc., had become objects of desire, they led to another vice—ambition, which in its turn developed other vices. A million sesterces might be seen suspended on a single thread (of pearls), or the neck encircled by jewels sufficient to buy forests and islands. The tender lobes of the ear would be weighted with a fortune, or the fingers of the left hand be decked with rings worth (?) as many money-bags. Wonderful was the power of this ambition!

Book II. In language conciliatory even to self-abasement Tertullian takes up the subject of modesty. Inasmuch as all were "the temple of God" through the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, modesty was the sacristan and priestess (*aeditua et antistita*) of His temple. She could admit nothing impure or profane into it, lest God Who dwelt in it should abandon it.

Very many (Christian) women, either through simple ignorance or defiant dissimulation, seemed to think that they satisfied the requirements of modesty if they did not actually give way to sins of the flesh. Hence, there was no difference in dress, ornament, or gait between them and Gentile women—women who had no conception of what true modesty was, inasmuch as they had no knowledge of Him Who was the guardian and teacher of truth. The only rule for Christian women should be to be "perfect as their Father in heaven" (cp. St. Matt. v. 48). Not that Tertullian would advocate an unkempt and wild appearance, or what was squalid and slovenly; but he would emphasise this rule: "Don't exceed simple and sufficient refinements. Don't go beyond what is pleasing to God." To rouge and paint (cp. I. ch. ii.) was to find fault with God, and to add to His work what His adversary the devil suggested. 'Quod nascitur, opus Dei est. Quod infingitur, diaboli negotium est.' Such practices were alien to simplicity, truth, and modesty. Tertullian lashes the practice of dyeing the hair, the use of false and elaborate head-gear, and ironically wonders whether it will be women thus tricked out whom Angels will carry up to meet Christ in the air. Sternly he counsels, 'Hodie vos tales Deus videat, quales tunc videbit.' He would have all "use the world as not abusing it. 'Tempus in collecto est'" (cp. 1 Cor. vii. 29–31). The Christians were they upon whom the ends of the ages had come; 'In spiritu et in carne saecularia circumcidimus.'

Christian women, who did not (or should not) go to heathen temples, or keep their festival days, or attend the spectacles, had no reasons for gorgeous array. If they went forth, it should be to visit the sick, or to communicate, or to listen to God's Word. These were grave and holy duties, and required grave and modest apparel. Or should social duties towards Gentiles, "strangers to the faith" call them out, there should be a difference between the handmaid of God and the handmaid of the devil. "The priestesses of modesty" should not be dressed and painted like the immodest. The modest mind must be reflected in the dress, the modest conscience in the whole outward appearance.

Tertullian closes with an earnest appeal that

the power of Christian faith should not be found weakened by softness and luxury in the approaching persecution. How would the hand accustomed to a bracelet bear the harsh touch of the martyr's chain; or the leg graced with an anklet endure compression by a fetter; or the neck loaded with pearls and emeralds have space left for the executioner's sword? 'Projiciamus ornamenta terrena, si coelestia optamus.' The martyrs' robes were preparing. Angels were waiting to carry them to heaven. "Go ye forth to meet them, arrayed as Apostles and Prophets have taught you. Let simplicity impart to you your whiteness, and modesty your colour. Let your eyes be lustrous with bashfulness, and your mouth be closed by silence. In your ears be the words of God, on your neck the yoke of Christ ... Clothe yourselves with the silk garment of honesty, the fine linen of holiness, and the purple of modesty. 'Taliter pigmentatae Deum habebitis amatorem.'"

De Idololatria.—This work, written after the *De Spectaculis* (cp. ch. xiii.), belongs to the same class. It is a protest against serving two masters—Christianity and heathenism. The Christians were in many cases those who in adult age had come over to Christianity from heathenism, and there were still many who made a decided effort to retain as much as they could of what they had left behind. Tertullian had exposed the inconsistency as well as impossibility of this in the case of shows and public amusements (*De Spectaculis*), and with reference to dress and ornament (*De Cultu Feminarum*); but he had left comparatively untouched questions of trade, occupations, professions, and the like. There were many Christian craftsmen who gained their living by distinctly heathen trades, and would not or could not see that they were wrong. There were many "servants of God" whose official or professional engagements, or whose private as well as public duties to the heathen society in which they had once, or still, moved, brought them perpetually in contact with heathen customs, legal forms, sacrificial acts, and social courtesies. They were unwilling to surrender them. Like the craftsmen, they appealed to Scripture in justification of the liberty they claimed; or — with less honesty — drew sophistical distinctions between what they might write but not speak, or the image they might make but not worship.

To Tertullian, the representative of the truer if sterner champions of the Church, such evasions and subterfuges, such contact and collusion, and therefore such professions and trades were radically wrong. Heathenism in all its shapes was idolatry, and this he draws out in a treatise in which the Churchman's partisanship is largely tempered by a natural and vigorous common sense.

The opening sentence is the key-note of the tract: "The principal crime of the human race, the chief guiltiness of this world, the entire cause of its judgment, is idolatry." Judged by his works, an idolater was (1) a murderer, and that of himself. (2) He was an adulterer and a fornicator, for Holy Scripture branded idolatry as "whoredom." (3) He was a defrauder and insulter of God. In idolatry Tertullian saw embodied every crime:—'omnia in idololatria et in omnibus idololatria'; and this crime above all, the service of devils and unclean spirits, to whom idols belonged. It was the devil who had introduced into the world makers of statues and images; and through him this trade (*negotium humanae calamitatis*) had acquired both name and development. It should be enough for Christians that God had forbidden by Moses (Exod. xx. 4) and by Enoch (xcix. 6, 7, ed. Schodde), by Isaiah (xliv. 8, 20) and by David (Ps. cxv. 8), both the fabrication and the worship of idols.

But the craftsman pleaded, 'Non habeo aliud quo vivam' (see also chs. viii., xi.); and some quoted Scripture (1 Cor. vii. 20, 1 Thess. iv. 11) in their defence, and pointed to God's having commanded Moses to make a serpent of brass (Num. xxi. 8). Tertullian has no difficulty in showing that they abused the Apostle's words, that there were some kinds of work and arts which "the discipline of God" had not received: and then, after explaining that the brazen serpent set upon a pole was a type of the Cross of the Lord—"which was to free us from serpents (*i.e.* the angels of the devil) while it hung up the devil" (cp. *Adv. Jud.* x. and Pusey's note here *L. of the F.* x. 226)—he points out that the God Who interdicted any likeness to be made, could—if He would—suspend that interdict. But even supposing that no law of God and no voice of Holy Spirit rebuked the maker and worshipper of idols, the baptismal vow of itself condemned idolatry (ch. vi.).

There were others who said, "I make idols but I don't worship them." "Yes, you do," retorts Tertullian, "and the victim you sacrifice to them is your own salvation!" A zealous faith groaned (ch. vii.) when it saw a Christian pass from an idol workshop into the house of God, raise to God the Father hands which were "the mothers of idols," or receive the Body of the Lord in hands which gave bodies to demons. But worse was behind. These idol-makers were admitted into the ministry of the Church, and with contaminated hands delivered the Body of the Lord to others. 'Pro scelus'! What hands ought with greater reason to be cut off (St. Matt. xviii. 8) than those by which offence was given to the Body of the Lord?

Two professions connected with idolatry were evidently very obnoxious to Tertullian. (1) The astrologer (ch. ix.). One of this class had been defending his profession, and Tertullian answers him. He considers the fallen angels "the discoverers of this curious art" (cp. *De Anima*, ch. lvii.; *De Cultu Fem.* i. ch. ii.), and declares their pupils, the astrologers, to have been expelled from heaven equally with their teachers. He meets the defence that "astrology was the science of the stars which affirmed the Advent of Christ," by affirming that if the science was permitted until the days of the Gospel, it was only in order that after Christ's Birth no one should thenceforth read a man's nativity in the heavens. So was it with that other kind of magic which worked by miracles (cp. *Apol.* c. xxiii.), and which set itself up in rivalry to Moses (cp. Exod. vii., viii.; 2 Tim. iii. 8). It had been permitted to try God's patience until the times of the Gospel. But then there had come a change. Adducing the history of Simon Magus and Elymas, he declares: 'Post evangelium

nusquam invenias aut sophistas aut Chaldaeos aut incantatores aut conjectores aut magos, nisi plane punitos.' (2) The schoolmaster (*ludimagister*) and other professors of letters (ch. x.). On two grounds Tertullian declares the occupation of the former closely bound up with idolatry: (*a*) They had to teach about the names, genealogies, honours of heathen gods; (*b*) They must keep their solemn rites and festivals because from them they derived their income. If it was argued, "How can we repudiate human learning, when without it there can be no learning what is Divine?" Tertullian answers negatively, that if literary erudition cannot in part be avoided, in part only can it be allowed: and that in his opinion to learn literature is for a believer more allowable than to teach it. The learner was not bound like the teacher to frequent the defiling solemnities, public and private, connected with the schools.

Tertullian will not condemn all trades, but his conclusion is (ch. xi.)—"No art or profession or trade which has anything to do with idols can be free from the label of idolatry"; and this alone should prevent a Christian from pleading: "I have no (other) means of living," "My work is my bread," "I have my children to provide for." Such pleas should not be advanced by those who had "sealed their faith" in Baptism. They implied forgetfulness of the Lord's sayings (*e.g.* St. Matt. vi. 25, 31), and of examples—such as those of SS. James and John (cp. St. Mark i. 19, 20) and Matthew (St. Matt. ix. 9)—which illustrated trust in God. 'Fides famem non timet.'

In Tertullian's day (ch. xiii.) Christians observed the more festal days and other extraordinary solemnities of the heathen sometimes out of wantonness, sometimes out of timidity, yet in every case in opposition to faith and discipline. He lays down the rule, that the servant of God ought to have no fellowship with the heathen on such festal days in respect of dress, food, or any form of rejoicing; and if there were special solemnities connected with (*e.g.*) the *dies munerum*, on which claims of honour were adjusted and wages paid, yet there was not the slightest reason for the Christian paying or being paid on that special day. To join in these heathen functions was to be ashamed of God, and to lead God to be ashamed of them (St. Matt. x. 32).

It is curious to read that Christians expressed the opinion (ch. xiv.) that it was pardonable for them to do as the heathen did, on the ground that their assent prevented "the Name being blasphemed" by the heathen (cp. *De Cultu Fem.* ii. ch. xi.). Tertullian retorts, "Let it be blasphemed! so long as we are keeping and not evacuating discipline. Malediction pronounced by the heathen upon observance of Christian discipline is in truth the benediction of the Name." St. Paul's rule, "all things to all men" (1 Cor. ix. 22), was an admirable one; but it did not mean that to idolaters he became an idolater, and to heathens a heathen.

Another custom was defended by reference to Scripture. On public festival-days in honour of emperors, victories, and the like, the doors of Christians were more numerously decorated with lamps and laurels than those of the heathen (cp. *Apol.* ch. xxxv.); and men quoted in defence Christ's command, "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's" (St. Matt. xxii. 21). The answer was simple: "Don't forget the context: 'Caesari quidem pecuniam reddas, Deo temetipsum.'" "The three brethren" (Dan. iii.) and Daniel (Dan. vi.) were true to their duty to their king so long as their duty to their God was not imperilled; but when their religion was in danger the one feared the royal lions no more than the others the royal fires. So with Christians. If they had renounced heathen temples, they must not make their own gate a temple.

Private and social festivals stood on a different footing (ch. xvi.). The "breath of idolatry" could taint but little the simple natural ceremonies connected with the assumption of the *toga virilis*, espousals, nuptials, and the naming of children. Even should there be sacrifices connected with these events, then the common-sense rule would be: Make a distinction between being one who participated in the sacrifice and one who was a mere spectator of it. It was a larger and more important question (ch. xvii.): What was to be the line of conduct of slaves who were believers, or of children—those, *i.e.* who had no choice but to do what their masters or parents bade them do? Or, what were officials to do who were in attendance upon their lords, patrons, or the chief magistrates when sacrificing? Tertullian answers, By neither act nor word must such a one aid a sacrificer lest he be *minister idololatriae*: but that rule observed, Christians could serve idolatrous kings, as did a Joseph and a Daniel up to the very verge of idolatry. He even seems to think that it might be an advantage to have in official posts those who would use their power well, and would not sit in judgment upon a man, bind, or imprison him, simply because he was a Christian.

From idolatry in act Tertullian passes to idolatry in word (ch. xx.), a vice brought about partly by habit, partly by timidity. His common sense exhibits itself when he observes that he does not here rebuke such common parlance as "You will find him in the temple of Aesculapius," "I live in the street of Isis," but habitual ejaculations such as "By Hercules!" "By the god of truth" (*Mediusfidius*, see Andrews' Lex. s.n. *Fidius*). Timidity, in its turn (ch. xxi.), sometimes impelled a Christian at another man's bidding to take an oath by heathen gods, and keep silent as to his Christianity. Such silence was cowardly and wrong. Whenever he allowed it to be supposed that he was a heathen he denied the Faith. 'Omnis negatio idololatria est, sicut omnis idololatria negatio, sive in factis, sive in verbis.'

Lastly, a yet subtler form of idolatry is considered (ch. xxiii.). Christians were in the habit of borrowing money from the heathen and giving bonds in security; by that means they avoided taking an oath. 'Scripsi sed nihil dixi—Lingua non littera occidit . . . Non negavi, quia non juravi.' Indignantly does Tertullian protest against such sophistry: 'non valet tacita vox in stilo, et mutus in litteris sonus.' Faults committed in mind and conscience were faults in deed (St. Matt. v. 28).

An encouragement closes the treatise. 'Nihil esse facilius potest quam cautio idololatriae, si timor ejus in capite est.' The Holy Spirit had

laid upon Christians no greater bond or yoke than to avoid idolatry (cp. Acts xv. 28, etc.). This should be their law definitely separating them from the heathen. In the Ark no animal figured the idolater; 'Quod in arca non fuit, in Ecclesia non sit.'

De Patientia.—The tract, one of the most spiritual of Tertullian's compositions, dates from about the same time as the *De Idololatria* and the *De Cultu Feminarum.* It is a sermon preached to himself quite as much as to others in favour of a virtue whose rare excellence Christ's life and teaching had immortalised. His experience as a priest had taught him the need of it every time he confronted pettiness not less than pride, frivolity not less than idolatry. The treatise is a comment upon his belief that a healthy faith and sound Christian discipline do not come easily to a man unless Patience be by his side. No one can peruse without profit the beautiful passages on the patience of God (ch. ii.) and the virtues and portrait of Patience (ch. xv.), or the warnings against impatience (ch. v.) and revenge—the "chief stimulus of impatience" (ch. x.).

Ad Uxorem i. and ii.—Among the questions discussed in, and disturbing, the Christian Church at Carthage was the question of second marriages. These were evidently numerous. Tertullian was no doubt asked to give his advice, and he has done so in a treatise in two books addressed to his wife, which he hoped might be profitable to her and to any other woman "belonging to God." In this work he does not go beyond the position taken by St. Paul. If he evidently considered celibacy the higher state, though himself married, he does not by any means absolutely forbid marriage. But second marriages were different, and he argues strongly against them. They might even be contracted between a Christian widow and a heathen; and the actual occurrence of such unions led Tertullian to write the second of his two books. Nothing can be sterner than his denunciation of these latter marriages. They were neither lawful nor expedient; and Tertullian exerts himself to prove this both by appeal to the highest motives and by the use of his characteristic weapon—irony. The second book was probably written not long after the first, and both belong to a time when he was still a member of the Church. A tone of sadness marks the first book, as if Tertullian was conscious that the day of trial was not far off. The treatise could only have been written by a childless man (cp. I. ch. v., and the entire omission of the blessedness of Christians, parents as well as married, from the description in II. ch. viii.), and by one consciously and unconsciously working his way to the sterner conclusions afterwards expressed in the *De Monogamia.*

Book I. After a few preliminary remarks, explaining his motive, and deprecating defence of second marriages by the superseded example of the Patriarchs, Tertullian examines 1 Cor. vii., affirms it "easy to be discerned that the power to marry had been conceded on the score of necessity," and argues, "what necessity grants, necessity itself depreciates." He deduces a similar depreciation from the words, "it is better to marry than to burn;" which he interprets, 'melius sit nubere quia deterius est uri,' and then concludes, "how far better is it neither to marry nor to burn." 'Felicem illum, qui Pauli similis extiterit.'

There were two kinds of human weakness, says Tertullian, which induced women to marry (*al.* re-marry). The first and the more powerful was the lust of the flesh, natural and sexual instincts, and the desire for the comfort and protection which a husband could be; the second was the lust of the world, to satisfy ambition or pride or extravagance. Both were to be repudiated.

Women sometimes gave as their reason for marriage the desire for posterity, and the "bitter pleasure" of having children (ch. v.). 'Nobis otiosum est' is Tertullian's terse comment. How could Christian women—desirous of being taken out of this most wicked world—want to bear children; when, if they had them, they could only wish to see them predecease them, considering what distress was impending? The Lord's "woe" (cp. St. Luke xxi. 23) was pronounced on those who encumbered themselves with children for that day when they would wish to be free of encumbrances. To widows that woe would not apply. But whether marriage took place for the sake of the flesh or of the world, or to procure posterity, marriage once was gratification enough. There could be no plea urged for a second marriage on the ground of necessity. A Christian widow should not count continence for God's sake a difficult thing, when Gentile women, for Satan's sake, filled sacerdotal places involving either virginity or widowhood. Such were the vestal virgins at Rome, the priestesses at Delphi, and the women who under self-imposed widowhood ministered to the African Ceres; 'Haec diabolus suis praecepit, et auditur.'

They should reflect further, that as no one was taken out of the world but by the will of God, so when by the will of God the husband died, it was God's will that the marriage should also die:—'Quid tu restaures cui finem Deus posuit?' (cp. 1 Cor. vii. 27). The 'disciplina Ecclesiae et praescriptio Apostoli' had both pronounced second marriages detrimental to faith and an obstruction to holiness. St. Paul would not allow digamists to preside over the Church (1 Tim. iii. 2; cp. *L. of the F.* x. pp. 419, 20), nor admit a widow to that order unless the wife of one man (1 Tim. v. 9, 10). 'Tota illa Ecclesiae candida de sanctitate describitur.'

Great, lastly, were the honours which widowhood enjoyed in the sight of God. If the perfect integrity and entire sanctity of virgins procured them the nearest vision of the face of God; yet the widow must not shun her harder task of turning away from what she had known and seen. The virgin might be called the happier, for she had always kept the good; but the widow the more laborious, for she had had to find the good for herself. The crown of the virgin was grace, that of the widow virtue—the virtue of continence.

Book II. Some women, neglecting the opportunity of continence offered them by divorce or by the decease of the husband, had neglected also the rule, that above all they should marry

only in the Lord (cp. 1 Cor. vii. 39) *i.e.* to a Christian; in other words they had united themselves to Gentiles. "The faithful" who contracted such marriages were, to Tertullian, guilty of fornication, and should be excommunicated from the brotherhood in accordance with 1 Cor. v. 11.

Such a woman would be trying to serve two masters—her Lord and her husband; and she would have to surrender her Christian practices for heathen ways of life and habit. For example, if a "station" (cp. *De Orat.* ch. xix.) had to be kept, the husband at daybreak would bid her to the baths; if fasts had to be observed, the husband would on that very day give a banquet; if some charitable expedition (*al.* church procession) was to be undertaken, family occupations would interfere. What (heathen) husband would allow his wife to go from street to street to strange and poor homes in order to visit the brethren? Who would tolerate her being taken from his side to attend nocturnal meetings, or endure her absence all the night long at the Easter solemnities? Who would, without suspicion, let her go to that Supper which was so foully abused (cp. *Apol.* chs. vi., vii.), or suffer her creeping into the prison to kiss the martyr's chains? Would the husband permit his wife to meet the brethren indiscriminately, to give and receive the kiss of peace (see Pusey's note *in loco*), to offer water for the saints' feet, to take food and drink to them, or long for them and have them in her thoughts? If a "stranger" brother came to her, how could she give him hospitality in an alien's house? If she wished to distribute largess to any, the barn and storehouses would be found shut!

Some women however affirmed: "Our (heathen) husbands tolerate what we do and do not molest us" (ch. v.). If that was the case, retorts Tertullian, then it was wrong that the heathen should know the ways of Christians, or that it should be due to their kindness if Christians could do any work at all. Tertullian will not allow Christian women to cast their "pearls" (St. Matt. vii. 6)—the distinctive marks of their daily life—before swine. The *insignia quotidianae conversationis* to which he alluded are interesting: "Shalt thou escape notice when thou makest the sign of the Cross upon thy bed and body (cp. *De Cor.* ch. iii.), or showest thine aversion for what is impure by blowing it away (cp. *De Idol.* ch. xi.)? Will not thy rising in the night to pray be interpreted to be some act of magic? Will not thy husband want to know what thou tastest in secret before any other food (see Oehler's and Pusey's notes)? And when he shall know that it is bread, will he not believe it to be what it is so scandalously reported to be (cp. *Apol.* chs. ii., vii.)? Or if he be ignorant of the reason and meaning of such acts, will he simply endure them without a murmur or without asking, 'Is it bread or poison?'"

If some heathen husbands did tolerate Christian practices in their wives, they did so only to trample on or mock them. The threat of bringing them to the executioner for their profession of Christianity was the expedient for making their dowries the wages of silence; and the poor women only found this out when they had lost their property or their faith. "The handmaid of God" must incur great danger in having of necessity to take part in the heathenish rites and revels of her husband. At the beginning of every year, and at the beginning of every month, the incense of the altars would meet her. She would have to go out of her house by a gate wreathed with laurel and lit with lamps (cp. *Apol.* ch. xxxv.) 'ut de novo consistorio libidinum publicarum.' She would have to sit with her husband in clubs and taverns; and she who was wont to minister to the saints would have to minister to the wicked. At the tavern would anything fitting be heard by one who supped upon God (in the Eucharist)? From (such a) hell would there be mention of God or invocation of Christ, any kindling of faith by reading of the Scriptures, any (gift of the) Spirit, any refreshment, any divine benediction? On the contrary, everything hostile to God would be there, put forth by the evil one to impair salvation!

This marriage "madness" appears to have been more prevalent among those women who wanted for their matronly dignity a more capacious house, 'ut campum in quo ambitio decurrat.' In words of stinging irony Tertullian suggests to them to ask the devil to give them a husband who could afford them their litters, their mules, and their hair-curlers of foreign extraction (cp. I. ch. iv.)! A Christian husband, however rich, would not perhaps give them these things. Then must they follow the example of their Gentile sisters, some of whom united themselves with men of ignoble rank or of moderate wealth, sought for the pleasure they could give or mutilated to serve licentious ends; while others gave themselves to their freedmen and slaves, reckless of public opinion, provided only they had husbands from whom they need fear no restraint on their own liberty!

II. *Doctrinal Treatises.*—Tertullian taught the Christians of his day and Church not only what to do but also what to believe. An 'Apology' for the Christian Faith was as necessary as for the Christian life; and Christians demanded it not as against the heathen but against the heretics. A few words upon his work as a teacher of doctrine may preface an examination of his first work dealing more specially with dogma. Christianity is to him (as to Minucius Felix) the true philosophy as distinguished from the false philosophy of Greece and Rome, and a revelation from God as distinct from the wisdom which was of men (cp. *Apol.* ch. xlvi.; *De Praescr. Haeret.* ch. vii.). He has been reckoned a pupil of the Stoic school, and his Stoic training is manifest enough in his writings (cp. *De Anima*, ch. v.); but it was a Christianised Stoicism. In the share he took in the development and establishment of Church teaching he, like Hippolytus, was a follower of Irenaeus (cp. *Adv. Val.* ch. v.). The teachers of Rome, Lyons, and Carthage followed very much the same lines; and the three positions laid down by Tertullian (*De Praescr. Haeret.* chs. xxi., xxxii., xxxvi.) (α) Apostolic doctrine, (β) Episcopal succession from the Apostles, and (γ) the Apostolic canon of Scripture were rocks on which the Church was then firmly fixed.

(α) His *Regula Fidei* (cp. *De Praescr. Haeret.*

ch. xiii.; *De Virg. Vel.* ch. i.; *Adv. Prax.* ch. ii.) is the form given by Irenaeus (*Contr. Haer.* 1 ch. x.; cp. the two in Denzinger's *Enchiridion*, pp. 1, 2), expanded upon points which had come to the front during a lapse of about thirty years. But it had become something more than a mere *regula;* it had risen to a *doctrina;* and in the brotherhood of Carthage it was the *contesseratio* (cp. *de Praescr. Haer.* chs. xx., xxxvi.) which reason and tradition united in approving. (β) The *regula* had come down to them through Bishops *per successionem ab initio decurrentem* (cp. *De Praescr. Haer.* ch. xxxii.), and those Bishops had received *cum successione charisma veritatis certum* (Iren. iv. ch. xxvi. 2). The former fact gave historical value to the *regula*, the latter dogmatic credibility. The unworthy life of many a successor of the Apostles (cp. *De Pudicitia*, ch. i.) did not annul the validity of the doctrine. For (γ) it was supported by the Scriptures. In the time of Irenaeus and Tertullian the Law and the Prophets, the Gospels and the Apostolic Epistles (cp. *De Praescr. Haer.* ch. xxxvi.), formed an undisputed canon. Tertullian's nomenclature for the Bible (see Rönsch, 'Das N. T. Tertullian's,' pp. 47–9) is alone sufficient record of the high value attached to the writings in the custody of "the one Holy Catholic Church." The sacred Scriptures contained the solution of every difficulty (cp. *De Idololat.* ch. iv. and passim). It was the armoury of weapons offensive and defensive which the Church permitted her children alone to use (cp. *De Praescr.* ch. xv., etc.), for she alone had taught them to use them aright. With such an equipment and in defence of "mother" Church (*Ad Mart.* ch. i.; *De Orat.* ch. ii. and *aliter*), Tertullian went forth to attack the "heresies" of men who, calling themselves Christians, yet abandoned the Apostolic tradition for doctrines whose parentage he attributed to the devil, and whose precepts he scorned as derived from non-Christian religious systems and speculations, or as the offspring of self-willed wickedness. He combated the Gnostic and Marcionite views of his day both by telling argument and rhetorical paradox, by legitimate irony and stinging abuse. Tertullian did not so much originate or propose theological problems as content himself with combating those which the heretical schools had circulated. He followed largely the lead of his predecessors, and in his turn supplied much to Cyprian. Even after he had become a Montanist, and his views about the Holy Ghost had undergone considerable expansion, he could still write treatises (see below) which are linked in their doctrine to the Church. The schismatic was never degraded into the heretic: and the Church has never refused her gratitude to one whose orthodoxy has supplied her with replies to the Gnostic, Trinitarian, cosmological, Christological, anthropological, and eschatological difficulties of all time.

De Praescriptione Haereticorum.—This treatise, with its title drawn from the language of jurisprudence, was certainly written while Tertullian was still a Churchman (cp. *int. al.* the prefatory note in *L. of the F.* x. p. 434; Neander's *Antignosticus*, p. 427). His language is full of devotion to the Church, not only as the depository of Christian truth, but also as the bulwark against heresy, its doctrines, and practices. He himself defines his treatise as a general work, 'adversus haereses omnes,' proposing at a later period to deal with special topics, such as those he afterwards handled in the *Adv. Marcionem*, *Adv. Valentianos*, *Adv. Praxean*, etc. For the present he wished to prevent, in accordance with certain just and necessary rules (*praescriptiones*), the appeal made by heretics to Scripture in defence of their views.

The treatise consists of I. an introduction (chs. i.–xiv.), II. the main division of the work (chs. xv.–xl.).

It is more than probable that this treatise originated in the desire to emphasise the doctrinal stability of the African Church in the face of some fresh tendency towards Gnosticism in general, and towards the views of Marcion especially. Persons of weak faith and character (ch. iii.) were unsettled by observing, that those once accounted firm in the faith were passing over to heresy; and they were evidently not sufficiently strengthened by simple reference to Scriptures, which the Gnostic teachers could apply as much as the orthodox. For the time Tertullian conceived no better way of meeting their difficulty than by positive injunction to refuse appeal to Scripture to their would-be seducers, to note the character of the heretics, and to surrender themselves entirely to the guidance of the Church.

The *Praescriptio* was probably written not long after the 'Apology' (see the parallelism of thought and method developed in Hauck, pp. 167–8; c. A.D. 199, Bonwetsch, p. 85), but is far less vehement and ironical in style. Tertullian's subject is the Church; and he expresses her views and "rule of faith" dispassionately and simply, as it were in her language, not his.

I. Heresies abounded and subverted the faith of many. This had been foretold, and should not cause offence (cp. chs. iv.–vi.). On the other hand, heresies had their value in that they were a means of trying and proving faith. Heresy was like a deadly fever. The latter existed to destroy the body, the former to destroy the soul. And just as men guarded against fever, so should they avoid heresy. There was a tendency to accredit heresy with a power inhibiting action against it: but in truth heresy was only strong in those who were not strong in faith. When two gladiators met, the result of the contest more often showed who was the weaker of the two than that the victor was a strong man. So with heresy. It was powerful when opposed to the weakness of man; it was powerless when facing a powerful faith.

The remark was sometimes made—"See that man or that woman, once among the most faithful or prudent or practised persons in the Church,—how do you explain their passing over to the other side?" "Explain!" retorts Tertullian: "I do not need to explain. Answer yourself: Ought men whom heresy has been able to pervert, ever to have been called 'prudentes' or 'fideles' or 'usitati'? It was no matter of wonder that men once approved should fall back. Let them think of Saul, David, and Solomon, of Judas the traitor-Apostle, of those who deserted St. Paul (2 Tim. i. 15; ii. 17). To the Son of God alone had it been reserved to continue to the end without sin. If a bishop, a deacon, a widow, a

virgin, a 'doctor,' a martyr did fall from the rule of faith, was heresy therefore right? 'Ex personis probamus fidem, non ex fide personas.'"

Heresies, not less than schisms and dissensions, severed men from unity. The etymology of "heresy" (αἵρεσις), indicating the "election" or choice which a man exercised when he wished either to establish or accept a doctrine, had in fact led St. Paul to call the heretic "self-condemned" (Titus iii. 10, 11), because of his choice of that for which he was condemned. The Christian rule was the very opposite:—To introduce (*inducere* al. *indulgere*) no doctrine or practice of their own will, nor choose what any individual had introduced of his own fancy. The Apostles of the Lord were their authority; men who did not determine for themselves what they should introduce but received their discipline from Christ, and faithfully transmitted it to the nations.

Heresies were to Tertullian suborned by pagan philosophy. Enumerating (ch. vii.) several of the leaders of heresy and other systems, he finds in Valentinus a pupil of the school of Plato, in Marcion a Stoic, in Lucanus an Epicurean, etc. etc. Heretic and philosopher debated the same questions, the origin of God, the origin of evil, and the origin of man. Wisely had St. Paul restrained men from such philosophy (Col. ii. 8). He had been at Athens, and spoke by experience of the wisdom of men, *affectatricem et interpolatricem Veritatis*, itself divided into many heresies through opposing sects. "What indeed," asks Tertullian, "has Athens to do with Jerusalem? What agreement can there be between the Academia and the Church, between heretics and Christians? Our instruction comes from Solomon's Porch (*i.e.* from the Apostles; cp. Acts chs. iii., v.), and Solomon himself has taught us that the Lord is to be sought in simplicity of heart (cp. Wisdom i. 1). Therefore let them look to it who have put forward a Stoic, Platonic, and dialectic Christianity; 'nobis curiositate opus non est post Christum Jesum, nec inquisitione post evangelium.' What we believe we believe; and count it a primary condition of our belief that there is nothing more which we ought to believe."

It is curious to note that the authority men advanced for their deviations from the faith was nothing less than the words of the Lord, "Seek and ye shall find" (St. Matt. vii. 7). Tertullian argues that Christ's words could bear no such interpretation; neither did they apply to Apostles who were to be taught by the Holy Ghost the Paraclete (St. John xvi. 13), nor to heathen nations to whom the Apostles were to be instructors. But even if Christ's words were applicable to all alike, they contained advice to search after definite truth and to rest content with it when found. The *rationale* of St. Matt. vii. 7 consisted in what to seek, when to seek, and how long to seek; and as the result, 'Invenisti cum credidisti.' There was safety only in the belief that 'Christus instituit quod quaeri oportet, quod credi necesse est.' Parables (St. Luke xi. 5; xv. 8; xviii. 2, 3) taught the same lesson—'finis est et quaerendi et pulsandi et petendi.' Therefore Christians were to seek "in their own, from their own, and concerning their own; and only such questions as might be deliberated without prejudice to the rule of faith."

This mention of the *regula fidei* leads (ch. xiii.) to the statement of it. This passage is therefore one of the most important in Tertullian's writings as an index to the articles of the Christian faith believed and accepted in his day (consult Pusey's notes *in loco*). This "rule" the Christians held to have been taught by Christ. Tertullian is quite willing (ch. xiv.) that it should be examined, discussed, and explained to novices by some *doctor gratia scientiae donatus*. But he gives a caution. It was not Biblical skill (*exercitatio scripturarum*) but faith which saved (cp. St. Luke xviii. 42). Faith lay deposited in this "rule"; it had a law, and in the keeping of that law came salvation. Mere skill might be a result of curious enquiry, and its glory the product of experience. 'Cedat curiositas fidei, cedat gloria saluti.'

II. Chs. xv.–xl.—Heresy was sometimes defended on the ground that heretics used and argued from the Scriptures. Of course they did, answered Tertullian; for from what other source than the records of the faith could men derive arguments concerning the faith? But their use of them was "audacious," and was not to be admitted. None but they whose were the Scriptures had a right to use them. Tertullian adopts this position not from any distrust of his cause, but in accordance with Apostolic injunctions (ch. xvi. cp. 1 Tim. vi. 3, 4; Titus iii. 10). Heretics did not deal fairly with the Scriptures; one passage they perverted, another they interpreted to suit their own purposes (cp. ch. xxxviii.). A man might have a most admirable knowledge of the Scripture, but he would make no progress with heretical disputants. Everything he maintained they would deny, everything he denied they would maintain. And as a result, the weak in faith seeing that neither side had decidedly the better in the discussion would go away confirmed in uncertainty.

Certain questions had therefore to be settled. Where was the true faith? Whose were the Scriptures? From whom, through whom, when, and to whom had been handed down the 'disciplina qua fiunt Christiani'? It might be assumed that wherever the true Christian discipline and faith was, there would be also the true Scriptures, true exposition, and all true Christian traditions (ch. xix.). In Christ, Tertullian finds Him Who first delivered the faith openly to the people or privately to His disciples, of whom He had chosen twelve 'destinatos nationibus magistros.' These twelve (St. Matthias having been chosen into the place of Judas) went forth and founded Churches everywhere; and from them other Churches derived then, and still derived, the tradition of faith and the seeds of doctrine. Hence, their name of Apostolic Churches. Though they were so many, yet they sprang from but one, the primitive Church founded by the Apostles. Thus all were primitive, all Apostolic, all one; and this unity was proved by their peaceful inter-communion, by the title of brotherhood, and by the exercise of hospitality—all of which owed their basis and continuance to one and the same sacramental faith. From this was to be deduced the first rule (ch. xxi.):—None were to be received (cp. St. Matt. xi. 27) as preachers but those (Apostles) whom the Lord Jesus Christ appointed and sent. It would be a second rule that what

the Apostles preached could only be proved by those Churches which the Apostles themselves founded, to which they preached, and to which they afterwards sent Epistles. All doctrine therefore which agreed with these Apostolic Churches (*matricibus et originalibus fidei*) was to be counted true, and to be firmly held as having been received by the Church from the Apostles, by the Apostles from Christ, by Christ from God; and all doctrine must be pronounced false which savoured anything contrary to the truth declared by the Churches and Apostles of Christ and of God. These rules and this doctrine Tertullian and his co-religionists affirmed to be held by the Holy Church to which they belonged: 'Communicamus cum ecclesiis Apostolicis, quod nulla doctrina diversa. Hoc est testimonium veritatis.'

Heretics advanced two "mad" objections to these rules:—

(*a*) The Apostles did not know all things (ch. xxii.). How any man "of sound mind" could suppose such a thing passes Tertullian's conception. The Apostles were taught by the Lord Himself (cp. St. Mark iv. 34; St. Matt. xiii. 11). He hid nothing from St. Peter, the rock on which the Church should be built (cp. St. Matt. xvi. 18, 19), or from St. John, His most beloved disciple. The exhibition of His glory at the Transfiguration, and the Scripture exposition to the disciples journeying to Emmaus (St. Luke xxiv. 27), were not the acts of One Who intended to keep men ignorant. They to whom He had promised the apprehension of all truth by means of that Spirit of truth (St. John xvi. 12, 13), Whose coming was described in the Acts of the Apostles, were ignorant of nothing.

St. Paul's rebuke of St. Peter (Gal. ii. 11) and those with him was also alleged as a proof both of the ignorance of the latter, and of a fuller knowledge having been granted to the former (chs. xxiii., xxiv.). This was to misapprehend the passage. St. Peter's fault was one of practice only—'conversationis vitium non praedicationis.' St. Paul, highly favoured though he was in revelations (cp. 2 Cor. xii. 4), did not receive from them instruction in doctrines different from those accepted. Besides, it was presumptuous to pass judgment on the Apostles. 'Bene, quod Petrus Paulo et in martyrio adaequatur.'

(*b*) Heretical teachers argued from 1 Tim. vi. 20, and 2 Tim. i. 14, that the Apostles did not reveal everything to all men. Some doctrines they proclaimed openly and to all, others secretly and to a few (ch. xxv.). Tertullian again points to the context and to other passages as quite opposed to the idea that there was any reservation or hint of secret doctrines. The injunction (St. Matt. vii. 26) to exercise discretion in communicating the Gospel, did not imply reservation or concealment of the light, *i.e.* of the word of God and of the Sacrament (*al.* mystery) of Christ. To have acted thus would have been to have acted unfaithfully to Him Who ever spake openly (cp. St. John xviii. 20). Granted that there were matters discussed among the Apostles as members of the household of faith, yet they would not be such as would bring in another "rule of faith," contrary to and diverse from that which was taught catholically.

Some heretics admitting that the Apostles had delivered their message fully and simply, insisted that the Churches, through their own fault, had received it otherwise than the Apostles had put it forth. The Galatians were "foolish" (cp. Gal. i. 6; iii. 1) and the Corinthians "carnal" (1 Cor. iii. 1; viii. 2). Tertullian's answer is condensed into a sentence: 'Cum correptas Ecclesias opponunt, credant emendatas.' Such Churches were united with those whose faith and knowledge and conversation had caused the Apostle to rejoice and give thanks (cp. opening verses of Epp. to Romans, Philippians, Thessalonians, etc.). It was utterly improbable that so many and such great Churches holding one and the same faith should have erred.

Tertullian comments ironically on the assumption that truth had to wait for Marcionites and Valentinians before it was free, that all was error before the rise of heresy (ch. xxix.). How could heresy have preceded doctrine when doctrine warned against heresies? New Apostles were they (cp. *De Carne Christi*, ch. ii.)? Where then was their sign of Apostleship, the power of working miracles such as Christ Himself had worked, and had given to those whom He made Apostles? What Tertullian was acquainted with was the very opposite to that of the Apostles: 'Illi de mortuis vivos faciebant, isti de vivis mortuos faciunt.' Or let them furnish their *origines ecclesiarum*, and point out the succession of their Bishops from the Apostles. They could not do it; but even if they could, it would not help them. For the views of *e.g.* Marcion, Apelles, Valentinus, and all impugners of the resurrection had been already condemned by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv.; Hebion's defence of circumcision etc., in Galatians (v. 2); Marcion's forbiddal of marriage in 1 Tim. i., iv. The views of Marcion and Hebion respecting Jesus Christ had been by anticipation refuted by St. John. Heresies stood condemned either by the sentence actually pronounced upon them in their rude form in Holy Scripture, or by that silence of Scripture respecting them in their more polished form, which proved the lateness of their origin.

From "apology" Tertullian turns to attack (chs. xxxvi.–xl.). He would have his opponents adapt their 'curiositas' to a better purpose by examining those Apostolic Churches in which were still the *cathedrae apostolorum* and their *authenticas litterae*;—Corinth in Achaia, Philippi and Thessalonica in Macedonia, Ephesus in Asia, and Rome in Italy, 'unde nobis auctoritas praesto est' (cp. *Adv. Marc.* iv. 5). The mention of this last city evokes Tertullian's warmest feelings (see Pusey's notes *in loco*). He notes what she had suffered, learned, and taught; and how great her friendship with the African Churches; and it pains him to think that from this Church heresies had gone forth; sprung, indeed, from the grain of truth, but become "wild" through falsehood.

Heretics had only been able to establish their divergence of doctrine by the adulteration of Scripture (ch. xxxviii.). Their *corruptela doctrinae* could only be advanced by *corruptela instrumentorum ejus*, just as with Christians *integritas doctrinae* was impossible *sine integritate eorum per quae doctrina tractatur*. And heretics had adopted two methods: 'Alius manu scripturas, alius sensus expositione intervertit.' Marcion had adopted the first method. He had

openly and vigorously used the knife not the pen; his object was *caedes scripturarum*. Valentinus had adopted the second. His plan had been to adapt the Scriptures to his matter; and this plan had been even more fatal. For he had both taken away and added; he had robbed words of their proper meanings, and had introduced systems which were not to be found in Scripture.

Against these "engines of spiritual wickedness" Churchmen must, of course, strive, but they must not be surprised at their existence (chs. xxxix., xl.). Holy Scripture lent itself more readily than any other literature to tricks of this kind; and Tertullian even ventures on the paradox that God's Scriptures were by God's will so arranged as to furnish materials for heretics. The heretical interpretation of Scripture must, however, be assigned to its right author—the devil. He who had parodied in his rivalry of God and in the interests of idolatry, holy rites, and Sacraments (cp. *De Bapt.* ch. v.; *De Corona*, ch. xiv.; *Ad Uxorem*, I. ch. vii.) was quite able to attemper to his profane and rival belief documents which dealt with Divine things and were written by holy Christian men.

Lastly (chs. xli.–xliv.) the conduct of heretics was not of a kind to commend their doctrines. They cast what was holy to dogs, and their pearls, *licet non verae*, to swine. To overthrow discipline was to them true simplicity, the Christian care of it they accounted *lenocinium*. Peace they proclaimed with all who would unite with them in besieging the one truth. Their catechumens were accounted perfect long before they were fully taught. Their women—*quam procaces!* there was nothing which they would not dare to do, teach, argue, exorcise, heal, baptize (cp. *De Bapt.* ch. i.; *De Vel. Virg.* ch. ix.). Ordinations were carelessly undertaken, lightly administered, and subject to frequent changes. Sometimes neophytes (cp. 1 Tim. iii. 6) were appointed, sometimes men engaged in secular business, sometimes apostates from the Church whom they bound to them by flattering their pride. Promotion was cheap in the rebel camp: To-day one man would be a bishop, to-morrow another. No special value seemed to be attached to Holy Orders: the deacon of to-day would be a *lector* to-morrow, the priest of to-day a layman tomorrow; and it was no unusual thing to see laymen performing sacerdotal functions.

Heretics made it their business not to convert the Gentiles, but to subvert Christians. They worked for the ruin of those who were standing, not for the raising of those who had fallen. And to secure that end, how humble and bland and submissive they could be! Men remarked, that to all appearance there was little schism among heretics. True, for schism was their bond of unity! Church-less, mother-less, home-less, creed-less, 'sua in vilitate vagantur.'

From the company they kept — magicians, mountebanks, astrologers, philosophers — explained, they said, on the principle, "Seek and ye shall find" (cp. ch. viii.); and from their manner of life might be estimated the quality of their faith. They denied that God was to be feared; they affirmed that all things were for them free and without control. Not such as this was the discipline of men mindful of the judgment to come (ch. xliv.). With Churchmen was the fear of God, and there also was to be found gravity, an honourable and "amazed" diligence, anxious care, admission to the ministry well-considered, well-weighed communion (cp. *Apol.* ch. xxxix.), promotion when deserved, religious submission, devoted service, modest going-forth, a united Church, and God in all things.

In the last chapter of the *De Praescr.* Tertullian announced his intention of dealing with certain forms of heresy in separate treatises. It was in pursuance of this intention that about this time he wrote the first draft of his treatise against Marcion. This teacher (*vide s. n.*)—"the most Christian of Gnostic heretics" (Böhringer), "the pessimist in earnest" (Hauck)—was especially obnoxious to Tertullian. He has lavished upon him an invective (*Adv. Marc.* I. ch. i.), as foulmouthed as that of Jerome against Vigilantius. The first draft of this treatise is lost. It was admittedly "hurriedly composed," and he himself replaced it by "a more complete composition." This second draft also he found it necessary to disavow. A "brother who became an apostate" (*i.e.* a Marcionite, Kaye) got possession of it, transcribed it in a most falsified form, and published it. In the form therefore in which the treatise has been preserved we have the third edition, "a new work in the place of the old," and marked by "considerable addition." Reference to the work may consequently be deferred till the date A.D. 207–8 is reached, about when, in all probability, the work was rewritten in its present form (see p. 849).

C. *Tertullian and Montanism.*

It was about the end of the second century that Montanism invaded Africa. This curious and interesting Puritanism of the East has been described elsewhere (*s. n.* MONTANUS) in its general aspect and character. Here it has to be considered briefly in its bearing on the Church of Africa, and with reference to the share taken in it by Tertullian.

In the "Passion" of Perpetua and Felicitas (ch. xiii.) the Church of Carthage is represented at this period as divided into parties. The bishop of the day, Optatus, and a presbyter Aspasius, "separated and sad," appeal 'Componite inter nos.' The Angels answer them, "If you have any dissensions between you, forgive each other," and charge Optatus, "Correct thy people. They come to thee like men mad with the passions of the circus and of faction-strife." The picture is suggestive. Heated discussions were frequent; episcopal authority was disputed, but not rejected. More discipline was demanded; there had been too much lenity; there must be more severity.

Tertullian would seem to have embraced Montanism with his whole heart and soul. It suited his temperament; it furnished the logical solutions to problems practical and theological which had been disturbing and distressing him. But his Montanism was not the Montanism of A.D. 172–7 or of Asia Minor; rather it was that which had come to him through the purifying medium of distance and time. He knew or remembered nothing of the extravagances con-

nected with the first deliverances of the "new prophets." The condemnation of Montanist views by a bishop of Rome was forgotten by him or invalidated by something of the old Punic spirit which resented Roman dictation. Scandals which asserted that the "devil-inspired" Priscilla and Maximilla had left their husbands and had successfully resisted exorcism, or that a Themiso of Pepuza had purchased release from prison by bribes, or that the Catholics in the East when imprisoned with Montanists would hold no communion with each other, must have been unknown to one who knew well how to laud Christian exorcism, to denounce the renegade, and to commend fellowship in the martyr's cell. Montanism was in truth to Tertullian little more than a name; what he accepted was the best aspect of its principle:—the restoration of what had been allowed to drop, the development of what was obscured. He would have been what was equivalent to a Montanist had no Montanus ever existed:—"We would have arisen as prophets to ourselves" (*De Jej.* ch. xii.). Hence development and restoration rather than novelty underlie the intention, and are stamped upon the thoughts, of every treatise which follows those hitherto considered. The practices Tertullian favoured and advocated, the doctrines he loved and enforced, had alike their roots in the existing practices and doctrines of the Church. It is the manner in which he has insisted upon the one which has so much discredited it; it is the juridical fence with which he has driven home the other which has angered opponents not his equals in the use of such weapons. He defended his practice and teaching as necessary for his day. New fasts, protests against second marriages, a sterner accentuation of discipline, were conceived as absolutely necessary by the man who, beginning by tightening bonds which the Church had wisely left relaxed, ended by the Pharisaic assumption that he and his were *πνευματικοί* and his opponents *ψυχικοί*. But if he drew his descriptive language from Gnostic codes, he burned in the spirit to depose Gnostic heresy. The merit he assigned to ecstasy, dream, vision, new prophecy, and special endowment by the Paraclete, will be recognised as expansions of simpler but Scriptural teaching, with something of Pharisaic lordliness, but ever directed against the Sadduceeism, the materialism, the Patripassianism, and the Monarchianism of his day.

The Christians of Roman Africa have been described as either opportunists or *intransigéants* (Aubé, p. 254, &c.). The description is clever rather than accurate, but it fairly describes some of the characters exhibited in those treatises of Tertullian which depict the special contests between the lax and the rigorist Churchmen. For those treatises take no account of the large party of moderate men who were very probably scorned by both extremes. The increasing bitterness between the opportunist and *intransigéant* can be but too plainly traced (for example) by a comparison of the *Ad Uxorem* with *De Monogamia*, the *Ad Martyres* with the *De Fuga in Persec.*, the *De Poenitentia* with *De Jejunio*, and the *De Spectaculis* with *De Corona*. It was in fact the evident impossibility of finding common ground which drove the Catholic and Montanist farther and farther apart; and this gradual severance is painfully clear in the treatises named.

The career of Tertullian, his whole being and character, left him no choice when he had to make his decision. He was bound to side with the sterner party, and he did. If at first he retained his position in the Church, and in the *De Corona*, *De Fuga*, and *De Exhortatione Castitatis* taught still as a Churchman, that position before long became intolerable. The breach took place of which the *De Virg. Vel.* gives the ostensible cause; and the passion which animated the Apologist in defence of the Church was presently employed to revile, discard, and injure her. There are few treatises more painful to read than the *De Monogamia*, *De Jejunio*, and *De Pudicitia*. It is a relief to turn from them to the treatise *Adv. Praxean*. If the heart of the ascetic has been alienated from the Church, he can still defend her faith with all his old loving energy; and, by his last existing writing, command respect from those whose affection he had lost.

As before, the works of this period may be conveniently considered under the two main headings of practical and doctrinal.

I. Practical Treatises.—*De Corona.*—The treatise is usually counted the first which indicates traces of Montanism (cp. ch. i. Hauck places the *De Virg. Vel.* before it), and it was written after the *De Spectac.* (cp. ch. vi.). Animated and vigorous, it cannot be called either happy in its tone or convincing in its argument. The childishness of much that is advanced in chs. v. and vii. is hardly counterpoised by the interesting record of early Church customs (ch. iii.) and of heathen military and civilian habits (chs. xi.-xiii.), or by the splendid language of its close (ch. xv.). It took its origin in the event (ch. i.) already alluded to (p. 821).

Opinions were divided as to this soldier's conduct. Some blamed him as rash, as eager to die, some as bringing trouble on the Christian name about a mere matter of dress. Tertullian with one word of laudation of the man—'solus scilicet fortis inter tot fratres commilitones, solus Christianus'—turns furiously upon his decriers. They were men who would refuse martyrdom as they had rejected the prophecies of that Holy Spirit which inspired it. The only part of the Scriptures they cared to remember was that which bade them flee from one city to another (St. Matt. x. 23). And as for their pastors, they were 'in pace leones, in proelio cervi'!

But, apart from opinion upon an individual act, others raised the general objection:—"Where in the Scriptures are we forbidden to be crowned?" It was to them either no sin at all or a very doubtful sin. Tertullian replies that it was more to the purpose to ask, "Where was it written, that they might be crowned?" Scripture had pronounced no opinion upon the question at issue. Then what had? Custom, answers Tertullian (ch. iii.), and "custom which flowed from tradition." This confirmed the Christian practice of refusing crowns.

The objector was not satisfied. He raised the question, "Should tradition, unless written down, be received?" In reply Tertullian, in a passage

full of description of the habits of the early Church, appeals to other customs which rested on the support not of Scripture but of tradition only (see Pusey's notes). Such was Holy Baptism. Before the Christians entered the water, they testified in the church and under the hand of the chief minister (*antistes*) that they renounced the devil, his pomp, and his angels. Then they were immersed three times in the water, reciting the creed at greater length than the Lord had put forth in the Gospel. Then, received by god-parents, they tasted the mixture of milk and honey. This Baptism they followed up by abstaining for a whole week from the bath. Next he refers to "the Sacrament of the Eucharist." This the Christians received at the meetings before daybreak and from the hands of no others than the heads of the Church. Further there were the following customs. Christians offered anniversary oblations for the dead in honour of their "birthday" (see the extracts from Cyprian in Oehler's note). They counted fasting or kneeling in worship unlawful on the Lord's Day or between Easter and Whitsunday (as one continual festival of the resurrection). They were pained if any of the (Eucharistic) bread or wine was spilled on the ground. Everywhere and at all times, in coming in and in going out, at the bath and at the table, sitting or lying down, whatever was their business, they marked the forehead with the sign of the Cross. If now Scripture authority was asked for these and similar matters of discipline, none could be given;—'Traditio tibi praetendetur auctrix, consuetudo confirmatrix, et fides observatrix.' But that such tradition, custom, and faith were founded upon reason, Christians could see from the precedent of the Jewish Church and from such passages as St. Luke xii. 27; Phil. iii. 15.

Tracing the origin of crowns to the gods, Tertullian protests: What opinion should the men of the true God have of that which had been brought in by nations, *candidatis diaboli*, and was applied to the service of idolatry? What men did to idols pertained to devils; and that was reason enough for refusing crowns. No Prophet, Levite, Priest, Ruler, Apostle, Evangelist, or Bishop had ever worn a crown. Did men say that Christ was crowned? To that there was but one answer, 'Sic et tu coronare: licitum est.' But the crown consecrated by origin and superstition to idols, the doors of their temples, their victims, their altars, their ministers and priests was unworthy of God,—'Indignum enim ut imago Dei vivi imago idoli et mortui fias.'

The military crown, however, specially suggested the definite questions, "Could Christians become soldiers? Was military service in any sense fitting for Christians?" (ch. xi. See Pusey's note, *L. of the F.* x. pp. 184–6). The difficulties felt by Tertullian and others on this point are reflected in a series of interrogations. "Can the military oath (*sacramentum*) to Caesar be superadded to that made to God (*e.g.* in the hour of Baptism)? . . . Shall it be lawful for a man to make the sword his profession when Christ has pronounced that he who takes the sword shall perish by the sword (St. Matt. xxvi. 52; cp. *De Idol.* xix.)? Shall a son of peace, to whom any litigation is unseemly, take part in war? . . . Shall (the Christian soldier) keep 'stations' (cp. *De Orat.* xiv.) for others more than for Christ? Shall he keep watch before those (heathen) temples he has renounced (cp. *Apol.* ch. xxix.)? . . . shall he bear aloft the (heathen) standard in rivalry to that of Christ? Shall he who has received his password (*signum* = the Cross in Baptism, Pusey) from God ask one from the emperor? Shall he who when dead awaits to be roused by the Angel's trump be disturbed by the clarion of the camp-trumpeter? Shall the Christian, who was forbidden to burn (incense to idols), and to whom Christ has remitted the punishment of the fire, be cremated according to camp-rule?" It was impossible, Tertullian thought, for a soldier to perform the simplest camp duties without sin. Therefore the very transfer of a Christian, 'de castris lucis in castra tenebrarum,' was a sin.

The case of the man who, while a soldier, became a Christian, stood admittedly on a different footing. Nevertheless, even such men when they had become believers and had been "sealed" in Baptism, had no alternative. They must give up their military life, 'ut a multis actum,' or they would have to resort to all sorts of evasions to avoid sinning against God. The converted soldier must be prepared to suffer for God that death which the Christian civilian did not refuse.

After all, what was this crown (ch. xii.)? Something sacred to impure gods and goddesses, something 'ubique polluta et polluens omnia.' To wear the laurel wreath at the distribution of the imperial largess (cp. ch. i.) was like selling Christ for gold as Judas had sold him for silver! Of what was the victor's triumphal crown composed—of leaves or of corpses, of ribbons or of tombs? With what was it bedewed—with ointments or with the tears of wives and mothers possibly Christian? Granted that the magistrates of Rome and Athens were crowned with gold; that the Etruscan crown of gems and golden oak-leaves was worn by those who conducted to the Circensian games the chariots containing the images of the gods; that the people wore crowns on the occasion of some imperial or municipal festival,—what had that to do with Christians? "Your orders, magistracies, and *ecclesia* are Christ's. His you are, written in the Book of Life. The Blood of the Lord is your purple, and your laticlave His Cross. You have nothing to do with the joys of this world. Christ called happy those who mourned, not those who were crowned."

Far be it then from a Christian man (ch. xiv.) to put this *munus idololatriae* upon his head—nay upon Christ Himself, since Christ was the head of the man. Far also be it from a Christian woman to wear that which would offend the crowned ones of heaven (cp. Rev. iv. 4). What kind of wreath did Christ Jesus, 'viri caput et feminae facies,' the husband of the Church, wear for both sexes? Of thorns and briers, figuring those sins which the earthy flesh brought forth in men, but the power of the Cross had taken away. If they could be crowned with thorns let them not be crowned with flowers. 'Serva Deo rem suam intaminatam. Ille eam, si volet, coronabit.' And He had willed it (ch. xv., cp. Rev. ii. 10; Jas. i. 12). To him who conquered He had promised the crown of life. The good soldier (ch. i.) chose that

crown. "Oh! blush, ye fellow-soldiers of his! He will not condemn you, but that soldier of Mithras will who, when he is initiated in the cave (*castris vere tenebrarum*), puts from him the proffered crown with the protest, 'Mithras is my crown.' Note we such wiles of the devil, who imitates the things of God. The faithfulness of his servants will put us to shame and condemn us."

De Fuga in Persecutione.—It may well have been that excitement was aroused against Christians by the conduct of the soldier specified in the *De Corona*; and with excitement would originate popular and fanatical feeling which would find vent in persecution (ch. i.). Such persecution may have only reached the threatening stage, but the very thought was dreadful through the remembrance of previous experiences (cp. *De Corona* i.). In Carthage a kind of panic had taken place (ch. iii.), and the question was anxiously and urgently debated, "May Christians flee from persecution or not?" The clergy answered "Yes," and set an example (ch. xi.), which they probably defended by Christ's words (St. Matt. x. 23), and by the practice of a Polycarp and others. A few years before (*Ad Uxor.* i. ch. iii.) Tertullian himself, while preferring constancy and probably (in consequence) martyrdom, had conceded that flight was "better" where the Christian was likely to deny the faith through the agony of torture; but now he thought differently. Montanistic severity had laid its spell upon him in this respect also. A public discussion took place between him and a Christian named Fabius on the subject. Tertullian argued strongly against flight, but the discussion was heated, and interrupted by the strong feeling of some bystanders; and therefore he proceeded to write. His work deals with the two modes in which the timid and doubtful sought to evade persecution: (*a*) by flight (chs. i.–xi.); (*b*) by bribery (chs. xii.–end).

In dealing with (*a*) Tertullian does not hesitate to give an interpretation to the words and conduct of Christ and His Apostles which reflect the influence of the Montanist school (ch. vi.); while the words of the Paraclete spoken through Montanus are placed almost on the same level as those of the canonical Books (ch. ix.).

"Brother Fabius" had asked the question, "Ought we or ought we not to flee in persecution?" The answer very much depended upon the answer to a preliminary question, "Did persecution come from God or from the devil?"

Of persecution (as of everything else) it was true, that it did not happen without God's will. Persecution was *Domini judicium.* The result and effect of it was *probatio* or *reprobatio fidei.* It was the fan (cp. St. Matt. iii. 12) which cleansed the Church, the Lord's threshing-floor, winnowed the confused heap of believers, and separated the wheat (the martyrs) from the chaff (the deniers). Persecution had its good side. When persecution broke out, 'Ecclesia in attonito est.' Faith was more earnest in preparation, more full of discipline in fast and "station," in prayer and humility, in brotherly kindness and love, in sanctity and sobriety. There was no place for aught but fear and hope. No, is his conclusion, "persecution, which makes men better servants of God, cannot be assigned (*deputari*) to the devil." Had then the devil nothing to do with persecution? Yes, for persecution was iniquity. The devil supplied it as the instrument of persecution (*ratio probationis*). But if the devil seemed to have power over those who belonged not to God, he had no power over God's family (*domesticos Dei*). The *jus temptationis* was granted him *ex causa probationis* as above, or *ex causa reprobationis* as in the case of Saul (cp. 1 Sam. xvi. 14), or *ex causa cohibitionis* as in the case of St. Paul (2 Cor. xii. 7), and in such cases as this last, only that the 'virtus tolerantiae in infirmitate perfici.' The fiery darts of the devil, the flames of persecution, could only burn by the will of God. No one could doubt this unless actuated by that frivolous or frigid faith which possessed them when they flocked in their fear to the churches, and dreaded the anger of the heathen when they thus assembled.

Some one argued (ch. v.): "I, for my part, flee in order that I may not perish by denying Christ. It is God's part, if He so will, to bring me back in spite of my flight." Tertullian asks, "Are you sure that you would deny, if you did not flee; or are you not sure? If you are sure, you have denied already—at least in intention. If you are not sure, why not presume that you will be able to make a good confession?" As a comment upon his own advice, Tertullian gives the story of Rutilius (see p. 821) and draws the moral:—'Fugiendum non esse, quia nihil fuga prosit, si Deus nolit.'

A "fugitive" pleaded (ch. vi.) that in fleeing from city to city he did but fulfil Christ's command (St. Matt. x. 23). Yes, Tertullian answers ironically, there were many who made those words of Christ a veil for their cowardice; and he then maintains that the text applied indeed to the Apostles, their times, and circumstances, but not to their own day. Arguing from the commission in St. Matt. x. 5, he affirms that the circumstances of the Apostles required them to flee; not in order to avoid persecutions (for Christ charged them to suffer them), but in order to confine and fulfil their mission to Israel. It was altogether different since the Holy Spirit had been poured out upon all flesh. The limiting command had come to an end, and so had the injunction to flee. The Apostles, when Israel had had its full measure, went to the Gentiles; then they fled not from city to city; they did not shrink from suffering (Acts xxi. 13). "What ceased with our teachers cannot continue with us." Even the Lord Himself, when He fled from violence, was actuated by the same reasons as those which He gave to His Apostles; but when those reasons had ceased to exist, He refused all means of escape, He did not pray to the Father for the help of the Angel Hosts, He even found fault with a Peter's sword. If He prayed that the *calix passionis* might pass from Him, that was a prayer which the Christian might well make his own—but always with Christ's condition, "not what I will but what Thou wilt." To flee was to take into their own hands the removal of the cup, and to do not what the Father willed, but what they willed. As was the example of Christ so was the teaching and practice of His Apostles—

secundum Deum. He quotes from the Epistle of St. Paul and St. John, and bids men consult (see Oehler *in loco*) the spirit of the new prophecy (of Montanism). That exhorted to martyrdom and not to flight. "Profess publicly thy faith" (*al.*, "Be exposed to public infamy"), said Montanus: "it is for thy good. . . . . Be not ashamed. Righteousness brings thee forth in the midst of men. Why be ashamed of winning praise? The power to win it is thine when thou art looked upon by men:" and again in another passage, "Be not willing to die in beds or in miscarriages or in fevers, but in martyrdom; that He may be glorified Who hath suffered for us."

(*b*) The main question had been answered and in the negative. Another question remained to be considered: "Might men buy off persecution?" Tertullian answers positively—"No." The counsel was the counsel of fear: and Tertullian resents it passionately. "How could a man propose to ransom with money one whom Christ had ransomed with His Blood?" Every Scripture precedent was opposed to the 'redemptio traditionis.' The Christian who gave his *denarius* to Caesar must give to God as His due the Blood which His own dear Son poured out for him: not to do so would be to deny to God the things which were God's. 'Negatio est martyrii recusatio.' Did men ask, "How shall we (in time of persecution) assemble together or celebrate the solemn service of the Lord?" Tertullian replies, "As did the Apostles, 'fide non pecunia tuti.'" The faith which could remove a mountain could remove a soldier. It was wisdom which was wanted, not a bribe. If they could not assemble by day, they had the night, which the "light of Christ" would render luminous. It might be well to abstain from large gatherings and avoid attracting attention. Only let them keep for Christ His Virgin Bride; let no one make gain of her. Did these things seem hard? Let them turn to the Paraclete. They who received Him knew nothing of either flight or ransom, for they had One Who would give them a mouth to speak when questioned, and would help them in the hour of suffering.

De Exhortatione Castitatis.—Some years had elapsed since Tertullian had written *Ad Uxorem*, and had urged that for women a second marriage was much to be deprecated. The death of the wife of a friend gave him an opportunity of urging upon men a like continence; and he did so in language declaratory of views far more exaggerated. The title is not altogether a correct description of the contents of the treatise, if the term "chastity" be understood in the ordinary sense; but it is true if it be taken as expressing the idea in the mind of the writer and the stage of conviction he had reached. Second marriages, and even first marriages (ch. ix.), were now a breach of "chastity." It was written indeed by a Churchman to a Churchman, but evidently at a time when Tertullian's attachment to the Church was being sapped, when "the holy prophetess Prisca" (ch. x. Her sayings have been collected, *e.g.* by Hilgenfeld. Cp. the index to his 'Ketzergesch. d. Urchristenthums') was already as much to him as the Old Testament and St. Paul. As a treatise, it is by no means pleasant reading. If outbursts of passion are lacking to it, its arguments where new are frequently feeble and strained, and its irony is coarse and repulsive. The line of reasoning and the Scriptures quoted are in many cases repeated from the *Ad Uxorem*. Here need be noted two points (chs. i.–v., vii.) only of special interest.

The man who had lost his wife needed to be warned against "the necessities of the flesh" which might impel him to a fresh marriage. Such "necessity" might very easily be kept in bounds, if the will of God rather than self-indulgence was consulted. That will was "our sanctification" (1 Thess. iv. 3), and this sanctification, Tertullian finds (*int. al.*) in the various forms of virginity. "The first kind of sanctification is virginity from birth; the second is virginity from the second birth, *i.e.* the font, by which purity is maintained among the married by mutual compact (cp. 1 Cor. vii. 5; *Ad Uxor.* i. ch. vi.), or in the case of widowhood by voluntary continence; the third is monogamy, all second marriage being renounced." The first kind of virginity he further describes to be *virginitas felicitatis;* the second, *virginitas virtutis;* the third, that which has the praise, not only *virtutis*, but also *modestiae* (cp. *Ad Uxor.* i. ch. viii.) or moderation, the non-desire for that which had been taken away by the Lord God (cp. Job i. 21). To renew nuptials which had been taken away by God was consequently to strive against the will of God. There were some things which God willed more, some which He willed less. Clearly it was the duty of men to follow what God had willed more; and therefore second marriage, being only permitted by God's indulgence should yield to God's discipline, inculcating continence: the *non-potior* was to give way to the *potior*.

(*a*) Monogamy seems to Tertullian the only practice sanctioned both by the original institution of marriage (Gen. ii. 24) and by the Apostolic adaptation of God's command to the spiritual nuptials of the Church and Christ (Eph. v. 31). From one marriage did men derive their origin in both respects, in Adam according to the flesh, in Christ according to the Spirit. Both nativities illustrated the one prescript of monogamy, and he who deviated from the path of monogamy was guilty of degeneracy with respect to both. Plurality of marriage owed its origin to an accursed man—Lamech. He, married to two women, was the first to join three into one flesh (cp. Gen. iv. 18, 19).

(*b*) In Lev. xxi. 14 Tertullian found the marriage of priests with widows or divorced women forbidden, and he understood it as embodying the caution, 'Sacerdotes Mei non plus nubent,' which the Church had enforced (cp. 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2; Tit. i. 5, 6) to the extent of removing digamist-priests from their office. A curious result had followed. It was argued that the prohibition laid upon priests left laymen free to marry more than once. Tertullian's answer is celebrated (cp. Kaye, p. 212), as much for what he does say as for the extraordinary deduction which some have drawn from it, that he made no distinction between clergy and laity. Affirming it to be wrong to suppose that what was not permitted to priests

was permitted to laymen, he asks, Are not laymen priests? "Christ hath made us a kingdom and priests unto God and His Father '(Rev. i. 6). The authority of the Church had indeed constituted a difference between those in orders and the laity (*ordinem et plebem*); but in places where there were no clergy, the individual Christian might celebrate (*offerre*) the Eucharist, baptize, and perform the functions of the priest. For where three, though laymen (contrast *De Bapt.* ch. vi.; *De Fuga*, ch. xiv.), were gathered together there there was a Church (cp. St. Matt. xviii. 20). But if laymen had in themselves the *jus sacerdotis* to be exercised in cases of necessity, they ought also to conform to the *disciplina sacerdotis*. If the priest who became a digamist was removed from his sacerdotal functions, was it not a much more capital crime for a digamist layman to act as a priest? Did men urge, "Indulgence must be conceded to necessity," the answer was simple: God willed that all should be in a fit state to render due obedience to His Sacraments. Laymen must therefore observe those rules by which presbyters were elected; and they must abstain from a second marriage so long as the priest could only be one who as a layman had been only once married.

De Virginibus Velandis.—The veiling of virgins was a burning question in the Christian community of Carthage. It was not unlike that which had once perplexed the Church of Corinth (1 Cor. xi.), and partisans in Carthage took sides according as they argued from what St. Paul had said or had left to be inferred. Did his term "women" include virgins or did it not? Christian married women appeared veiled everywhere, in the church as well as in the market-place: their veil was the mark of their status. The Christian virgin did one of three things: she went everywhere unveiled, or she went veiled in the streets but unveiled in the church, or she went everywhere veiled. Of these the first was the oldest and local custom—it was the mark of the virgin and the practice of the majority. But a strong minority objected to it, and had adopted the last of the three practices. This was what Tertullian approved (cp. *De Orat.* chs. xx.–xxii.). It was a custom largely followed elsewhere, for example in the Churches of Greece, and especially in Corinth (*De Virg. Vel.* chs. ii., viii.). For a long time the diverse usages of the majority and of the minority had continued side by side; each received and extended tolerance (*De Orat.* ch. xxii.; *De Virg. Vel.* ch. viii.); there was no open breach. This condition of things could not last when the Churchman was fast becoming a Montanist; and the writer of the *De Oratione* found himself impelled to write the *De Virg. Velandis.* His later treatise is that of one still a Churchman and is written to Churchmen; but imbued with a conviction that he has acquired a more "perfect knowledge" and a "better part" (*De V. V.* ch. iii.), which leave him no choice but to denounce compromise and half measures, and insist upon the veiling he had formerly been content to recommend. If the picture he draws of the conduct of the "virgins of men" as distinguished from the "virgins of God" be not exaggerated (*De V. V.* chs. iii., xii., xiv.), he was certainly justified in his insistence. Probably also he was nettled by the support accorded to the laxer habits both by the clerical body in Carthage and by the bishops of Rome—the 'quosdam' whose appeal to tradition he decries in comparison with that of Apostles and Apostolic men (ch. ii.), nay, with that of Christ Himself. But neither clerical shortcomings nor virginal eccentricities singly or combined would have urged Tertullian beyond the position he had taken up in the *De Oratione* had not the position become to him insufficient in view of the revelations of the Paraclete (ch. i.).

The Latin treatise *De Virg. Vel.* had a Greek predecessor now lost. So important did the subject seem to Tertullian that he discussed it in both languages, possibly in the hope of reaching both East and West. He bases the defence of his opinions on three grounds (ch. xvi.), the teaching of nature (chs. i.–iii.), of Scripture rightly understood (chs. iv.–viii.), and of ecclesiastical discipline (chs. ix.–xv.), and closes that defence with a passionate appeal to the women — married and virgin — of the Church. In modern days interest in such a subject may well have passed away, but interest in the manner in which Tertullian upholds principle against fashion, truth against custom, can never cease. He stands forth advocating purity and modesty, and is not silenced when the deadly word "innovation" is pronounced against his effort to impart spirituality. Sarcasm, irony, scorn, exaggeration—of which there do not lack instances—seem more tolerable in this treatise than in many another. Its closing words are at once the record of the writer's object and of his reward, "Peace and grace would abound to those who read his words with good will; for peace and grace had he found in writing them."

The treatise is usually taken as Tertullian's transition work. There is nothing in it indicative of a determination to leave the Church, but there is much which exhibits a temper unable to brook much further opposition to the reform he desired in the Church. Nothing is known for certain as to the effect of the treatise, but if those which followed are indicative of the effect, it must have produced little or none in the way of reformation; and Tertullian's descent into schism was not stayed but precipitated.

In discussing this question, Tertullian lays down the maxim that truth and not custom is to be their guide (ch. i.). Truth was superior to customs originating in time, personal influence, local privilege, and the like. The Lord called Himself Truth not custom (St. John xiv. 6). Anything therefore opposed to truth was heresy even if dependent upon ancient custom. This did not imply any hard and fast rule. The "rule of faith" being accepted as the base of belief, other matters of discipline and practice (*conversationis*) were open to correction, the grace of God operating and perfecting even unto the end. The Lord had sent the Paraclete in order that human mediocrity being unable to take in everything at once, discipline might be directed, ordained, and carried on to perfection little by little by the Vicar of the Lord (cp. *De Praescr. Haer.* ch. xiii.), the Holy Spirit; and in St. John xvi. 12, 13, Tertullian finds the *Paracleti administratio*. The progressive development of truth and discipline was in ac-

cordance with the law proclaimed by the teacher: "a time for everything" (Eccles. iii. 1). Men could see this law at work in the natural world; first the grain, then the shoot, then the shrub, then the tree; the flower and fruit followed. So was it with righteousness, *nam idem Deus justitiae et creaturae*. Its rudimentary stage was the natural fear of God; thence through the Law and the Prophets it passed into infancy; next through the Gospel it reached the fervour of youth; now through the Paraclete it was settling down into maturity. He alone after Christ was to be called and revered as Master, for He spoke what was commanded by Christ (St. John xvi. 13); He was the only *antecessor*, for He alone succeeded Christ. They who received Him set truth before custom; and they who heard Him prophesying now—not (be it granted) as He did formerly—veiled their virgins.

The supporters of the unveiled custom declared that St. Paul made no mention about virgins but about women only, when he spoke about the use of the veil (1 Cor. xi. 5–16). Tertullian's reply (chs. iv.–xv.) is practically an expansion of what he had urged in the *De Orat.* chs. xxii., xxiii. It was a mere quibble to insist upon considering the term *virgin* apart from that of *woman;* as a matter of fact the former was included in the latter, both in Scripture generally (as in the case of Eve and Mary), and in St. Paul's remarks specially. With a strong sense of ironical humour, Tertullian pleads, if the virgin was to be permitted to dispense with her distinctive veil, then was it *satis inhumanum* that men 'tot virgines, tot spadones voluntarii,' should have no mark which would point them out as illustrious. Why shouldn't the Garamantes sport their feathers, the barbarians their fillets, the Athenians their *cicadae?* Why shouldn't the Germans wear their long locks, and the Britons exhibit their tattoo-marks? (ch. x.). Tertullian most ungallantly affirms himself quite sure that the Holy Spirit would prefer to make concessions to males rather than to females, on the ground that continency in the stronger sex of the male was superior to virginity in the female. God had, however, made no concession to males, and therefore none to females.

"Glory" and vanity lay very much at the root of the whole subject (ch. xiv.). What he saw and heard compelled him to ask, "Do virgins adorn the Church and commend it to God, or does the Church adorn them, and commend them?" There was a force which the heathen called fascination. The holier the virgin, the more would she dread this force: her joy would be to be known to herself alone and to God: and this her veil secured to her.

They who shared Tertullian's (Montanist) convictions knew that the Lord "by revelations" had communicated even the requisite proportions of the veil. Once a sister had had a dream. An Angel, tapping her neck as if in praise of it, had said to her (ironically): "O beautiful neck! rightly is it bare. But unveil thy whole body. Not to do so is not to avail thyself of the liberty accorded to thy neck." And would not those women also deserve rebuke who continued uncovered whilst the Psalms were recited and the Name of God mentioned, or who in the hour of prayer put something notoriously insufficient on their heads, and considered themselves veiled? At all times and in every place they must live mindful of Him Who, if He was in their hearts, would be recognised on their heads.

II. Doctrinal Works.—The majority of these were written when Tertullian had become a Montanist. They present more or less the catch-words of the sect, and refer to the Paraclete and the new prophecy, if the doctrines inculcated and defended are those of the Church Catholic. To be a Montanist was not with Tertullian to be a seceder from the Church in points of faith, though the Church found it necessary for the sake of her unity in life and doctrine to count him and his outside her.

Böhringer ('Kirchengeschichte in Biographieen,' 1 Bd. 1 Abth. 1 Hälfte, pp. 484–739) has ranged conveniently these works under several heads, corresponding with their contents and aim:—(1) Works dealing with the general theological systems connected usually with the views of special teachers; (*a*) the 5 Books *Adv. Marcionem;* (*b*) *Adv. Valentinianos;* (*c*) *Adv. Apelliacos* (lost). (2) Works dealing with special points of theology, both those connected with some individual teacher, and with general teaching; (*a*) Trinitarian teaching, *Adv. Praxean;* (*b*) Cosmological teaching, *Adv. Hermogenem;* (*c*) Anthropological teaching, *De Anima* and the lost works, *De Censu Animae*, *De Fato*, and the *De Ecstasi*. (3) Christological works, *De Carne Christi*. (4) Eschatological works, *De Resurrectione Christi*, and the lost works, *De Paradiso* and the *De Spe Fidelium*.

This arrangement is not however to be considered chronological (see p. 822).

Two general points may now be noted with reference to Tertullian's habit as a teacher and defender of the faith. First, if his primary positions are based upon and drawn from Holy Scripture, yet, writing as a Montanist, he has no longer any doubt that his interpretation and application of Holy Scripture in disputed questions is right (cp. *De Resurr. Carn.* ch. lxiii. end). Whatever obscurity existed for others there was none for one filled with the Paraclete. The "new prophecy" had rendered misconception impossible. Secondly, while he rested the foundation of his arguments upon Holy Scripture thus rendered clear to him, he no longer refused the help which even the hateful philosophy of Greece and Rome could give him. Illuminated and quickened by the Paraclete, he felt himself able to discern between the evil and good; he can speak of a Plato and Seneca ('saepe noster') as allies and not foes (cp. *De Anima*, chs. xviii. xx. and passim); or he can put philosophy against philosophy, discomfiting one system by another, if the victor has presently to yield to One stronger than he.

Adv. Hermogenem.—The nature of the opinions of this heretical teacher and of Tertullian's treatise against him have been so fully discussed s. n. Hermogenes, that reference to that article is all that is needed here. Attention may perhaps be drawn specially to two very beautiful passages, (*a*) the eulogy of wisdom (ch. xviii.), and (*b*) the description of the development of cosmical order out of chaos (ch. xxix.).

Adv. Valentinianos.—For a review of the opinions of this school ('frequentissimum plane collegium inter haereticos') see the article VALENTINUS. Tertullian's treatise does not so much discuss these opinions as state them; it is not so much a refutation as a satire, intended to provoke mirth (ch. vi.). It claims no originality, but to be a faithful reflection of the teaching of Justin *philosophus et martyr*, of Miltiades *ecclesiarum sophista* (cp. Euseb. *H.E.* v. 17), of Irenaeus *omnium doctrinarum curiosissimus explorator*, and of our Proculus *virginis senectae et Christianae eloquentiae dignitas*. Opening with a preface (chs. i.–vi.), which likens the Valentinian mysteries to the Eleusinian—"that heresy of Attic superstition," whose secresy was a disgrace, and whose duty was silence—Tertullian accepts and defends the title "simple" mockingly affixed to Christians; 'Simplices nos omnia scimus.' It was better to be that than to be perpetually evolving something new, called a *revelatio* or a *charisma*, which led not to unity but to diversity (ch. v.; cp. *De Anima*, ch. ii.). The first division of the treatise (chs. vii.–xxxii.) deals with the leaders and their "archetypal" opinions; the second (chs. xxxiii.–end) with those of their followers, some better some worse. As may be conjectured, there is plenty of irony; and much of it wholesome and legitimate (cp. *e.g.* chs. vii., viii., xii., xxxiv.–end).

It is not, however, by irony only that Tertullian seeks to efface Valentinian errors. If ridicule would effectively kill some, an honest protest and a plain statement of facts would be more telling against others. His description of the immorality and general Antinomianism which Valentinian teaching engendered (ch. xxx.) must have been to many at once a revelation and a caution.

De Carne Christi.—This is Tertullian's principal contribution to the Christological problem of the time:—Was the flesh of Christ born of the Virgin and human in its nature (ch. xxxv.)? In his work *De Resurrectione Carnis* (ch. ii.) he himself specifies the tenets he opposes here to be those of Marcion, Basilides, Valentinus, and Apelles. These "modern Sadducees" (ch. i.; *De Praescr. Haer.* ch. xxxiii.) were apprehensive lest if they admitted the reality of Christ's flesh, they must also admit His Resurrection in the flesh, and consequently the resurrection generally. It was necessary to discuss, therefore, His bodily substance. 'Caro quaeritur. Veritas et qualitas ejus retractatur; an fuerit, et unde, et cujusmodi fuerit.' I. (1) Marcion's views are examined (chs. ii.–v.); then (2) those of Apelles (chs. vi.–ix.); then (3) the opinion of the Valentinians (chs. x.–xvi.). II. The second part of the treatise deals more especially with the single point—"Did Christ receive flesh from the Virgin" (chs. xvii.–end)?

The treatise fully responds to the intention of the writer. It examines the arguments employed and the Scriptures advanced (see especially ch. xviii.); and does so, on the whole, in a style moulded by the recollection that the subject was a grave and solemn one. There are bursts of irony (*e.g.* chs. ii. iv.); there are paradoxes (see ch. v. perhaps the most famous of Tertullian's many paradoxes) and retorts; but the total result is a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject. His line of argument and his statement of the Church's doctrine is that of Irenaeus.

Here attention need only be drawn to one or two points in the treatise. For a general view of the opinions attacked, see under the names APELLES, MARCION, and VALENTINUS.

I. (1.) Marcion rejected the Scripture account of the Nativity of Christ as both impossible and unbecoming to God. Impossibility cannot be affirmed of God, is the reply; neither was the Nativity of God unbecoming (ch. iv.). Man's estimate of what was and what was not becoming in these high and holy matters was no true estimate. The true estimate had been expressed by St. Paul (1 Cor. i. 27). The "world" in its "wisdom," as expressed by Marcion, found it easier to believe that Jupiter became a bull or a swan than that God became man. The "foolishness" of Christianity judged otherwise.

There were other things not less "foolish" (ch. v.)—"the humiliations and sufferings of God." In language—consonant with a time when it was neither misunderstood nor dangerous, if marked to modern ears by a startling and even painful realism,—Tertullian does not hesitate to proclaim a "crucified God, a dead God, a God Who rose again," as infinitely more worthy than the mere phantom whom Marcion, "the murderer of the truth," presented to them. Passionately he exclaims, "Whatever thou countest unworthy of God is to me becoming. I am saved if I am not ashamed of my Lord (cp. St. Matt. x. 33). The Son of God was crucified; I am not ashamed of what was matter of shame. The Son of God died; I believe what is so 'foolish.' He was buried and rose again; 'Certum est quia impossibile'!"

(2) Apelles, "wiser than the heretic of Pontus," conceded to Christ real flesh, but denied His Nativity (see ch. viii.). Christ had borrowed His flesh from the stars—nothing earthly being good enough—and had flesh after the pattern of the Angels. Tertullian both objects to such guess-work, and points out (ch. vi.) that parallelism with Angels was not to the point. They came not to be crucified, and die, and rise again: and therefore they came not to be born. Christ came to die, and was of necessity born; 'non mori solet nisi quod nascitur.' Tertullian notices (ch. vii.) that the deniers of the Nativity of Christ rested their denial on Christ's own question, "Who is My mother, and who are My brethren?" (St. Matt. xii. 48). His own interpretation of this passage (cp. *Adv. Marc.* iv. ch. xix.)—viz. that Christ was denying His mother and His brethren, His mother being typical of the synagogue, and His brethren of the Jews—is not happy; but he has little difficulty in showing that that of Apelles was certainly wrong. In chs. viii. and xix. he reverts to the sidereal origin of Christ's flesh and proves from the recorded history of Christ how His sufferings and the natural indications of His humanity—such as His hunger and thirst and weariness—were clear marks of earthly origin (cp. 1 Cor. xv. 47); so much so, that men marvelled at the wisdom and mighty works of the "man" (St. Matt. xiii. 54).

II. In opposition to heretical views, Tertullian

draws out the Church's belief and teaching on the flesh of Christ. He shows (ch. xvii.) from Holy Scripture (*e.g.* Isai. vii. 14) what antecedent reason there was that the Son of God should be born of a Virgin; and how appropriate it was that a Mary in her faith should destroy the evil which an Eve in her want of faith had introduced. He then asserts (ch. xviii.) that it was not becoming that the Son of God should be born of human seed, and so be nothing more than a Solomon or a Jonah, as Ebion thought Him. As before His birth of the Virgin, He was able to have God for His father without a human mother (*sine homine matre*); so when He was born of the Virgin, He was able to have a human mother without a human father (*sine homine patre*). Thus is He "man with God; man as regards the flesh, God as regards the Spirit; flesh without seed of man, Spirit with seed of God." The treatise closes (chs. xxi.–xxiv.) with the production and exposition of various Biblical passages all tending to support the doctrine of the Incarnation of Christ, conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary.

De Resurrectione Carnis.—Tertullian wrote this (ch. ii.) in fulfilment of the intention expressed in the *De Carne Christi* (ch. xxv.), against those who allowed that the soul would rise again, but refused resurrection to the flesh on account of its worthlessness. It was a logical sequence to their fundamental position that the works of the Demiurge, or the god who created the world and was opposed to the supreme God, were marked by corruption and worthlessness, and that the flesh of man was consequently corrupt and worthless. Tertullian grants that his subject was one invested with uncertainty; but it was too important to be altogether passed over. The question affected the very Oneness of the Godhead. To deny the resurrection of the flesh would be to shake that doctrine, to vindicate it would be to establish it. In contrast with the unseemly language (*spurciloquium*) of heathen and heretic, he will adopt a more honourable and modest style (cp. *De Anima*, ch. xxxii.): and he has kept his word. There are few sentences which grate upon the ear, while there are many passages of considerable beauty and profound Christian faith.

The work has two main divisions. The first (chs. i.–xvii.) he himself defines to be prefatory to the second (chs. xviii.–end) which contains the arguments from Scripture and some final thoughts.

(*a*) The opening sentence is the key-note to the treatise: 'Fiducia Christianorum resurrectio mortuorum.' The crowd might laugh and an Epicurus might countenance them; but Pythagoras, Empedocles and the Platonists were better teachers. They believed at least in the immortality of the soul; they knocked at the door of truth though they entered not when it was opened (ch. i.); and unhappily there was a Christian Sadduceeism and heresy which had contented itself too readily with this half-truth.

(*b*) Tertullian eulogises the flesh (chs. v.–x.) in contrast to the disparagement of it by the heretics. He depicts God busied in this work of forming man from the clay (*limus*) of the ground and investing it with flesh. Whatever that clay expressed, Christ was in His mind as the man of the future, when the Word should become clay and flesh. First the clay was made glorious by the hand of God, then the flesh more glorious still by His breathing upon it; and by that act the flesh both laid aside the rudiments of clay, and assumed the ornaments of the soul. With holy daring Tertullian affirms that no soul could obtain salvation except it believed while in the flesh; 'caro salutis est cardo.' That flesh must rise again which was "the work of God's own hands, the care of His mind, the receptacle (*vagina*) of His *afflatus*, the queen of His creation, the heir to His liberality, the priest of His religion, the soldier of His testimony, and the sister of His Christ."

(*c*) But men asked, was God great enough to rebuild and restore the tabernacle of the flesh so fallen and wasted? Tertullian's answer is an appeal to the analogy of nature (chs. xi.–xiii.); and the passage in which he describes those analogies which testify to a resurrection of the flesh is, in spite of its unscientific conclusion, one of the most poetical and sympathetic Tertullian has written (ch. xii. Cp. also Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. xi.). Its leading thought is the law of recurrence; 'Universa conditio recidiva est.' Day died into night; 'lux amissa lugetur; ... sordent, silent, stupent cuncta, ubique quies rerum': and then the day revived again, 'interficiens mortem suam, ... rescindens sepulturam suam.' He finds the same life out of death in the phases of the moon, in the alternations of the seasons, in the floral and arboreal recovery. The whole of this recurring order of things bore testimony to the resurrection of the dead. But were these analogies too faint Tertullian has ready 'plenissimum atque firmissimum hujus spei specimen' (ch. xiii.). In the phoenix of fable, that bird of the East famed for its singular habit of renewing its life in a voluntary death by fire, he finds (as Clement of Rome before him and Celsus after him) a most telling proof of the resurrection. With characteristic courage he renders δίκαιος ὡς φοῖνιξ ἀνθήσει (Ps. xcii. 12), "The righteous shall flourish like a phoenix" (A.V. "like the palm-tree"); and interprets the words to signify life out of death on the funeral pyre. Perfectly satisfied he asks, "Shall men perish, when the birds of Arabia are secured a resurrection?"

(*d*) Was there sufficient cause for the resurrection? (chs. xiv.–xvii.). Tertullian finds the answer in God's justice requiring the final judgment, when man would receive reward or punishment in accordance with his conduct in this life. But to be judged he must rise again, and be the same as he was when alive on earth. As the soul and body had co-operated in everything as regards this world, so would they be associated in its future weal or woe. In so far as order and sequence can be affirmed in such matters, Tertullian—taking the case of punishment alone—declares that the soul will be the first to taste of judgment as having been the first to induce the wrong deed.

II. What now did Holy Scripture teach upon this great subject? (ch. xviii.). There was a right way and a wrong way of understanding that teaching. Some, for example, interpreted the passages dealing with the subject figuratively

and allegorically. "Death" was, according to them, to be understood in a spiritual sense (cp. the Socinian view given in Pearson); "death was not the separation of flesh and soul, but ignorance of God by which a man might be counted dead to God and buried in error as effectively as in a tomb." Hence to them the "resurrection" was "the reanimation of man by the advent of truth, and his revivification by God. The death of ignorance came to an end and the new man arose out of the tomb of the old." Such a resurrection came to him in the hour of Baptism. Others held other views quite as misleading. To one and all Tertullian makes some very pertinent remarks on what was and what was not figurative and allegorical in Scripture (ch. xx.; cp. also ch. xxxiii.). The only safe code of interpretation was: 'Non semper nec in omnibus allegorice forma est prophetici eloquii, sed interdum et in quibusdam.'

Tertullian supposes an opponent claiming the concession made in these last words, and asking, "Why can we not apply this principle to the phrase, 'resurrectio mortuorum,' and understand it spiritually?" For several reasons, answers Tertullian (ch. xxi.). (1) The passages of Scripture which plainly declared a corporal resurrection were too numerous to be understood figuratively. (2) It was in itself most improbable that so great a mystery ('species sacramenti in quam fides tota committitur, in quam disciplina tota connititur') should be announced ambiguously and propounded obscurely.

Tertullian is not however content with proving inapplicable the figurative interpretation of Scripture adopted by his opponents; he has his opportunity of retorting, and he turns (chs. xxvi.–xxviii.) with evident satisfaction to the use of his well-loved weapon. The daring he dislikes in others, he does not deny to himself; and without the slightest hesitation he adduces interpretations and applications of passages of the Old Testament which do greater credit to his ingenuity than to his sobriety. He is less artificial where he proceeds to the words and acts of Christ (chs. xxxiii.–xxxviii.). After rebutting the view that the Lord had spoken everything in allegory, he devotes himself specially to prove that whenever Christ spoke of the resurrection He had in view the corporeity of the flesh without prejudice to the corporeity of the soul, "received by but few." In St. Luke xix. 10 the entire lamb (*totum pecus, caro cum anima*) was borne upon the shoulders of the Good Shepherd; and in this it was an example of man to be restored in both his natures (*substantia*). Tertullian meets the objection that the word "lost" when applied to the soul contravened its immortality, by saying that its immortality was lost not in the sense of destruction but in the sense of punishment in Gehenna. Christ's words did not imply final annihilation of body and soul. To be destroyed in hell did not mean that the body and soul should be consumed but punished. The fire of hell was declared to be eternal, and for an eternal punishment. Simply to raise the flesh in order to annihilate it would be "most absurd," when such annihilation could be suffered without a resurrection. St. Matt. xxii. 23–32 was another affirmation of the resurrection of the dead in both natures of man. It was still the answer to "Christian Sadducees."

Christ's acts were, in their turn, no ostentatious exhibition of power, or a temporary act of kindness, but in order to put in safe keeping (*sequestrare*) the belief in a future resurrection, and to prove that that resurrection would be a resurrection of both natures, soul and body. As examples only must they be considered, for they expressed but imperfectly what Christ alone expressed most perfectly. Those acts of resurrection implied another death to those raised. The resurrection of the future would be to glory and incorruption.

With a brief notice (ch. xxxix.) of the evidence of the "Acts of the Apostles" to the resurrection,—the evidence of men "who expounded the Old Testament and confirmed the New, and preached God in Christ:" and who consequently had nothing new to introduce about the resurrection save (note the exception) announcing it to the glory of Christ Himself—Tertullian passes on (chs. xl.–liii.) to the teaching of that Apostle, St. Paul, whose testimony to the resurrection was independently affirmed in the "Acts" (xxiii. 6, xxvi. 22). The passages he specially discusses are 2 Cor. iv. 16–8, v. 1; Eph. iv. 22–24; 1 Cor. xv. (his interpretation of *vv.* 29, 32, 39 is quite characteristic). Incidentally he mentions (ch. xlii.) a discovery in Carthage which furnished him with a proof that death changes, but does not destroy our mortal bodies. When they were laying the foundation of the Odeum, they disturbed some ancient graves, and the horror-stricken people looked upon bones which, after some five hundred years, were still sound, and hair which still retained its perfume (cp. Oehler's note).

In conclusion (chs. lv.–end) Tertullian expands some thoughts attesting and glorifying the great doctrine. He accepts and applies the principle that change in the condition of anything does not carry with it the destruction of the substance. Moses was changed with a brightness which none could bear (Exod. xxxiv. 29, 35), but he was Moses still. The Lord in His transfiguration had changed His raiment for a robe of light, but St. Peter could still recognise Him (St. Matt. xvii. 2–4. Cp. also Phil. iii. 21). He thought that the body, however much mutilated in this life, would in the resurrection recover its entirety and perfection.

Tertullian concludes by stating the belief which to him is the only true and well-founded belief:—'Resurget igitur caro, et quidem omnis, et quidem ipsa, et quidem integra.'

And then the Montanist spoke. Though heresy had indeed weakened this holy faith, God was checking heresy and reanimating faith. He had now removed all the ambiguities of the past. He had given an open and clear preaching of the whole truth (*sacramentum*) by the new prophecy flowing so abundantly from the Paraclete. 'Cujus si hauseris fontes, nullam poteris sitire doctrinam, nullus te ardor exuret quaestionum, resurrectionem quoque carnis usquequaque potando refrigerabis.'

Adv. Marcionem, Bks. i.–v.—The fortunes of the first two editions of this work have been already mentioned. In its present form it is assigned to the fifteenth year of Severus (Bk. i.

ch. xv.) or c. A.D. 208; and comes to us as a work touched and retouched during many years (cp. i. ch. xxii.). It was not the first time that Tertullian had felt dissatisfaction with writings of an earlier period of his life, or altered his arguments to meet the ever-altering phases of false belief. Thus in the earlier work, *De Praescr. Haeret.* cp. xix., he declines to allow appeal to the Scriptures in the discussion of heresy; in a later treatise, *De Resurr. Carnis*, ch. iii., he demands of heretics that they should support their inquiries from Scripture alone (cp. *Adv. Prax.* ch. xi.). So now, his earliest edition of this treatise, if placed (conjecturally) c. A.D. 200, would have seemed to him very defective when writing c. A.D. 208. He had separated from his old friends, now branded as the 'Psychics' (iv. ch. xxii.), to find among the Montanists the true Church (i. ch. xxi.; iv. ch. v.). To him "the new prophecy" was now the highest authority, the Paraclete the sole guide unto all truth.

The doctrinal controversy between Tertullian and Marcion turned principally on questions of anthropology and Christology. It need not be pursued here. All that Tertullian has to say upon it, as well as upon the life, discipline, and worship both of Marcion and his followers, has been summed up under the name (MARCION). It will be sufficient to give the contents of the several Books.

(*a*) The object of Book i. is to expose the absurdity of maintaining that there is a Supreme God distinct from the Creator of the World (the Demiurge). The god of Marcion had none of the attributes of the true God (chs. xxii.–end).

(*b*) In Book ii. Tertullian exposes the futility of the reasoning by which Marcion endeavoured to prove that the Creator of the World was not the Supreme God. In a passage of great beauty he points out how God's justice manifested Him as perfect Father and perfect Master (ch. xiii.): and his retort (ch. xxviii.) upon Marcion's collection of "petty and weak and unworthy" characteristics he had discovered in the Creator (ch. xxvii.) is in his most effective style. On the other hand no portion of this work shows more clearly Tertullian's failure to solve some of the questions debated. It was comparatively easy to expose errors and inconsistencies; it was another and a far more difficult matter to decide satisfactorily matters which baffled then and will ever baffle the powers of human reason.

(*c*) Book iii. commences the Christological Sections. Tertullian has to refute the notion that Jesus was not sent by the Creator, and establish the position that He was in very deed the Son of God, Who created the world. His method is to compare the prophecies of the Old Testament with the actions recorded of Jesus in the New, and show the fulfilment in the latter of the former. His argument is the same as, but more complete than, that employed in the treatise *Adv. Judaeos*. Union in antagonistic opinion of Jew and Marcionite he describes, by the proverb, "The asp borrowed from the viper." The evidence of miracles alone was not enough, that of prophecy was also requisite; and he lays down some useful principles for the interpretation of prophecy.

(*d*) Book iv. is a counterfoil to the *Antitheses* of Marcion (cp. also i. ch. xix.; ii. chs. xxviii., xxix.), in which passages from the Old and New Testament had been set down in opposition to each other, and the inference suggested that the Law and the Gospel thus disagreeing could not have proceeded from the same Author. Tertullian's aim is to show that the Old Testament is not contrary to the New, and in connexion with it to examine further the controverted points respecting Christ. Tertullian employs principally the Gospel of St. Luke as being nearest to that accepted by Marcion (see *s. n.*). Interesting and able as is, generally speaking, the discussion of passages quoted, it cannot be said that Tertullian's solution of inconsistencies is always happy or successful.

(*e*) Book v. Marcion had a decided preference for St. Paul and for those who had been his companions, such as St. Luke. The reason for this preference was the Apostle's opposition to Judaising Christians, which opposition the Marcionites expanded into a direct denial of the authority of the Mosaic Law. Tertullian desires to prove with respect to the Pauline Epistles, what he had proved with respect to St. Luke's Gospel, that far from being contrary to the Old Testament Scriptures, they were entirely in unison with them. He considers these Epistles not chronologically, but in the order which best furnished him with salient arguments against the Marcionite opinions. Thus he begins with the Ep. to the Galatians, and takes one after the other the Epp. to 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. With much profound reasoning and prolonged illustration he deduces from the unison he establishes testimony to the doctrine that the Creator was the only God, and the Lord Jesus His Christ (see Kaye, pp. 473–5).

De Anima.—In the treatise *De Testimonio Animae*, Tertullian had sought to prove that the soul of man bore natural testimony to the truth of the representations given in Holy Scripture of the unity, nature, and attributes of God, and of a future state. In the treatise *De Anima*, written some ten years or so later, he deals with the soul itself. Between these surviving treatises is to be placed one now lost, *De Censu Animae*, in which he had combated the opinion of Hermogenes that the origin of the soul was to be found in matter by the counter-opinion that it was formed by the *afflatus* of God (cp. *De Anima*, chs. i., iii., xi.; *Adv. Marc.* ii. ch. ix.). The attributes of the soul (*animae naturalia*) pointed, in his opinion, to propinquity to God and not to matter (cp. *De Anima*, ch. xxii.), an opinion supported by the views of Plato, who had taught the *divinatio animae* (cp. *De Anima*, ch. xxiv.). The discussion of its origin is followed by a general inquiry respecting the nature, powers, and destiny of the soul. The treatise consists of an Introduction (chs. i.–iii.), followed by sections upon, (1) the nature of the soul (chs. iv.–xxii.); (2) its development from one original source—the 'unde et quando et qua ratione sumatur' (chs. xxiii.–xxvii.); (3) a digression upon the Pythagorean doctrine of transmigration of souls and its cognate errors (chs. xxviii.–xxxv.); (4) continuation (chs. xxxvi.–xli.) of the subject discussed in § (2); (5) the soul, at and after death (chs. xlii.–end).

An admirable analysis has been given by Bishop Kaye (pp. 178–207; cp. also Neander, the careful analysis of Böhringer, and Hauck), and nothing is needed here but the briefest possible guidance. The treatise is directed not against Hermogenes (ch. i.) or the Valentinians (ch. xxi.) alone, but against philosophers generally, "patriarchs of heretics" (ch. iii.; cp. *Adv. Hermog.* ch. viii.). Tertullian does not deny that philosophers were sometimes right, but their success was like that of sailors who would sometimes stumble upon the harbour by a lucky kind of chance, though the storm obscured every trace of demarcation between sky and sea. What, however, was most offensive to him in their teaching, he has expressed in his sentence (cp. Col. ii. 8); —'philosophia est concussio veritatis' (ch. iii.). The philosophical treatment of the soul, for example, was to him the method of men who "mixed their wine with water." The variety of opinions reflected the variant character of the many masters—'Platonis honor, aut Zenonis vigor, aut Aristotelis tenor, aut Epicuri stupor, aut Heracliti maeror, aut Empedoclis furor.' "We will receive nothing," Tertullian says, "which is not in accordance with that true spirit of prophecy which has arisen in this present age" (cp. also ch. lviii.). All questions (between Christians and philosophers) were to be referred to God's Holy Scriptures (cp. also ch. xxviii.).

The teaching of § 1 is summed up in ch. xxii. Tertullian gives there his definition of the soul as deriving its origin from the breath of God (chs. iv., xi.). The soul is immortal, corporeal (chs. v.–viii.), and endowed with form (ch. ix.); simple in its substance (chs. x., xi.); possessing within itself the principle of intelligence (ch. xii.); working in different ways or channels (chs. xiii.–xv.); endued with free will; affected by external circumstances, and thus producing the infinite variety of disposition observable among mankind; rational (ch. xvi.); supreme over man (chs. xiv.–xv.); and possessing natural insight into futurity (ch. xix.). The Gospels, in (*e.g.*) the history of the rich man in torment (St. Luke xvi. 23, 24), proved the corporeity of the soul (ch. vii.; also a Stoic opinion), and medical science, "the sister of philosophy" in the volumes of a contemporary physician, Soranus (ch. vi.) also attested this belief. The invisibility of the soul was no disproof of its corporeity; witness St. John, who, "when in the spirit," beheld the souls of the martyrs" (Rev. vi. 9); witness also the testimony of "the sister so endowed with gifts of revelation" (ch. ix.). This latter testimony is of interest as exhibiting Montanist religious observances. Revelations used to come to her in the church on the Lord's Day. While the solemn services were being performed, she used to fall into an "ecstasy in the spirit." In that state she conversed with Angels, sometimes even with the Lord; she saw and heard mysteries (*sacramenta*); she read men's hearts; she prescribed remedies to the sick. Sometimes these visions took place when the Scriptures were being read, or when the Psalms were being chanted, or at the time of preaching or of prayer. On one occasion Tertullian thinks that he must have been preaching about the soul. The "sister" was rapt in spiritual ecstasy. After the service was ended and the people dismissed, she told him, as was her habit, what she had seen. "The soul was shown to me in a bodily form. It seemed a spirit; not, however, an empty illusion, but one which could be grasped, 'tenera et lucida et aerii coloris, et forma per omnia humana.'" Such testimony was to the Montanist Tertullian simply all-conclusive.

The soul thus corporeal was nevertheless simple and uncompounded; a view to be maintained against those philosophers who divided it into three, seven, or even twelve parts (ch. xiv.); while it did not exclude Plato's distinction between the rational and irrational parts of the soul, though Tertullian preferred to consider the soul of Adam as originally created rational, and irrational after seduced by the devil (ch. xvi.). The seat of the soul Tertullian places in the heart (ch. xv.), grounding his opinion upon quotations from Scripture, in which man was described as thinking, believing, sinning, etc., with the heart. Knowledge of things spiritual and invisible was acquired, he thought, in different ways by different souls, but that they did acquire it was to him not less certain than the knowledge of things corporal and visible acquired in the usual and well-known methods.

The main purpose of § 2 (chs. xxiii.–xxvii.) is to prove that the souls of all mankind are derived from one common source, the soul of Adam. He quotes and passes over the opinions of Saturninus, Carpocrates, Apelles, and of "the hive of Valentinus," all of whom he considers to have derived their views from Plato ('omnium haereticorum condimentarium, ch. xxiii. . . . idearum et oblitus et recordatus,' ch. xxiv.), and deals only with the argument of the last-named. Plato made the soul self-existent and almost equal with God, but was inconsistent with his own view in that he supposed the soul capable of forgetting what had passed in a previous state (ch. xxiv.). The philosophical notion, that the soul was introduced into the foetus after its birth, Tertullian considers refuted by the physiology of pregnancy (ch. xxv.) as well as by the Scriptures (ch. xxvi.). Answering his own question (ch. xxvii.), 'Quomodo igitur animal conceptum?' he argues, in language in which, as he admits, he sacrifices modesty to plain-speaking, that when God formed Adam out of clay (*de limo*) and breathed into him the breath of life (*ex afflatu Dei anima*), the seeds of body and soul were then inseparably united in him.

The subject of § 3, metempsychosis and metemsomatosis (chs. xxviii.–xxxv.), furnishes Tertullian with plenty of opportunity of ridiculing the conclusions necessitated by the opinion. One point only in the section need be noted, viz., his refutation of the theory by the testimony of advancing civilisation (ch. xxx.). Were the doctrine of metempsychosis true, the numbers of mankind would remain without increase. Facts refuted this. 'Ubique domus, ubique populus, ubique respublica, ubique vita;' and still the population increased. Its numbers were becoming burdensome; its wants were many and keen. Nature was unable to supply them. So much was this the case that pestilence, famine, wars and earthquakes had come to be considered as remedies, 'tanquam tonsura insolescentis generis humani.' Tertullian was anticipating Malthus. Yet the world, he continues, had never felt any

alarm at the idea of the thousands thus cut off being restored to life after a millennial exile, or of a possible total extinction of the human race before that exile was ended. Clearly men did not believe, nor should they believe, in the Pythagorean theory.

§ 4 (chs. xxxvi.-xli.) takes up the subject from ch. xxvii. The soul, sown in the womb at the same time as the body, received along with it its sex; its growth and development were not an enlargement of substance but of powers, and it reached maturity (*pubertatem*) at the same time and after the same manner as the flesh, which Tertullian puts in the fourteenth year. The *alimenta* of the soul were immortality, rationality, sensibility, intellectuality, and free will. Souls though thus endowed at birth were attacked and depraved by the evil spirit, and Christians were glad to remember and act upon the words of the Lord Himself (St. John iii. 5) and of His Apostle (1 Cor. vii. 14). In all the actions of human nature the soul was the motive power, the flesh was but the vessel (*calix*) ministering to the soul, or but its chattel (*supellex*), an instrument for the duties of life. Nothing was done by the flesh without the soul in operations of good, as nothing was done by the soul without the flesh in operations of evil. Two evils beset the soul; the evil which supervened from the intervention of the evil spirit, and the antecedent natural evil which was innate in its corrupt origin. Yet, notwithstanding these possessing evils, there was also innate in the soul that principle of good which was at once divine and its real nature. The fact was full of consolation. Some men were very bad, some very good; but if even in the best there was something of the worst, in the worst there was always some good. As no soul was without sin, so no soul was without the seed of good.

§ 5 (chs. xlii.-end). As a preliminary to the consideration of the manner in which the soul encounters death, Tertullian considers the subject of sleep—the image of death. He adopts by preference the Stoic definition of sleep as the temporary suspension of the activity of the senses (*resolutionem sensualis vigoris*), and limits the senses affected to those of the body; the soul being immortal neither requiring nor admitting a state of rest. While the body is asleep or dead, the soul is elsewhere. It dreams, and in dreams it travels or trades, it works or plays, it is glad or sad, it does what is right or wrong. Tertullian admits that an argument against his opinion might be derived from the fact that there were some persons who never had dreams (*e.g.* Nero); and he tells the legend of a certain Hermotimus (ch. liv.). His soul used to wander away during his sleep, and his wife told this peculiarity to his enemies, who burnt his sleeping, soul-less body. But Tertullian will only accept such a legend as intended to increase credulity in the popular belief of separation of soul and body. Christian opinion on this point (ch. xlv.) was worth more than legend or negative argument. In the very beginning sleep was inaugurated by ecstasy (Gen. ii. 21). The sleep which fell upon Adam's body brought it rest, the ecstasy which fell upon his soul was the very opposite of rest. The nature of this ecstatic or dream state is pursued at some length through the two dream-gates of Homer —"the horny (i.e. transparent) gate of truth and the ivory (i.e. opaque) gate of error"—and illustrated. Good dreams proceeded from God, bad from demons. Some dreams could be explained naturally, others were so wild and extravagant that they must be referred to the peculiar character of the ecstatic influence.

Death, to which Tertullian now turns (ch. l.), was to be the lot of all, let Epicurus and Menander say what they would. The voice of God (Gen. ii. 17) had declared death to be the debt of nature. Independent of heathen examples of this truth, Tertullian finds one in the translation of Enoch and Elijah. Their death was deferred only; "they were reserved for a future death, that by their blood they might extinguish Antichrist" (Oehler refers to Rev. xi. 3). The operation of death consisted in the separation of soul and body (ch. li.). Some did indeed teach that there were instances (which he specifies) of the souls cleaving to the body after death; and some, for that reason, would not sanction cremation: but it was more certain that not a particle of the soul remained in the body (after death). The soul was indivisible and immortal: and death could no more mix with life than night with day.

Where would the soul be when divested of the body? (chs. liii.-lviii.). Tertullian answers, In Hades; but his Hades is not that of Plato, nor his answer to the question that adopted by philosophers. To Hades, "a subterranean region," did Christ go (St. Matt. xii. 40; 1 Pet. iii. 19); therefore Christians must keep at arms' length those who were too proud to believe that the souls of the faithful deserved to be placed in the lower regions. From Hades shall men remove to heaven at the day of judgment. The patriarchs and prophets had indeed been already removed to Paradise as partakers in (*appendices*) the Lord's Resurrection: and some others were also thus highly favoured, such as the martyrs seen by St. John under the altar (Rev. vi. 9) and by the most heroic martyr Perpetua on the day of her passion. This exception, so characteristic of the Montanist, is made the text of an appeal. "Paradise shall also be yours if, as the Paraclete advises (cp. *De Fuga*, ch. ix.), you lay down your life for God, not in gentle fevers and soft beds, but in martyrdom; if you take up your Cross and follow the Lord as He commanded. The key to Paradise is your blood."

But for the generality of believers, and in the meanwhile, what would take place while the soul was in Hades? Would it sleep? No, Tertullian replies; souls do not sleep when men are alive. Full well the soul will know in Hades how to feel joy or sorrow even without the body. The "prison" of the Gospel (St. Matt. v. 25) was Hades, and "the uttermost farthing," the very smallest offence which had to be atoned there before the resurrection. Hence the soul must undergo in Hades some compensatory discipline without prejudice to the full accomplishment of the resurrection, when recompense would be paid to the flesh also. This conclusion Tertullian affirms to be one communicated by the Paraclete, and therefore accepted by all who admitted the force of His words from a knowledge of His promised gifts.

De Pallio.—This, a treatise intentionally extravagant, is a vindication of the philosopher's mantle (*pallium*) ridiculed by the people of Carthage. It might be called a juridical plea, couched in witty and forensic language, in an imaginary case of Pallium (see description *s. v.* in DICT. OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES) *v.* Toga. On its date see above, p. 822.

Some have seen in Tertullian's assumption of the *pallium* an indication that he adopted it to indicate his separation from the Church. The conjecture must stand on its own merits. There is nothing to prove or disprove it. With good-humoured banter, Tertullian congratulates the princes of Africa, the men of Carthage, 'vetustate nobiles novitate felices,' that the times were so prosperous with them that they had both leisure and pleasure to criticise dress.

Had he changed his, and did that arouse in them amusement or satire? Well, they also had changed theirs. Alas! poor Mantle! What was once the common robe of Carthage, worn by all ranks and conditions, was now only to be seen on the shoulders of the priests of Aesculapius.

In truth they were but following the fashion. Everywhere was to be noted a law of change, why not then a change of dress? In his most grandiloquent style, and always preserving the undertone of banter, Tertullian describes nature ever "changing her dress;" the changes of day and night; those of the heavens, of the "ever-restless" sea, and of earth; changes geological, ethnic, and national; and the animal creation, beasts, birds, reptiles, and man, changing that form which was their garment (ch. iii.). Through a number of marvellous phenomena believed and quoted by the naturalists of the day, and through illustrations drawn from mythological precedents, Tertullian reaches the climax, how the tailor's art had clothed ambitious humanity with various forms of garment. Not that change of dress was always nor of necessity an improvement (ch. iv.). Achilles dressed like a woman, a Hercules clothed in the silk of Omphale, and an Omphale clad in the hide of Hercules, effeminate pugilists and kings, immodest matrons and barely-clad priestesses—at such, ridicule pointed the finger. Their garments controverted nature and modesty. Was the Mantle abused by some? At least it was not by Christians. Nay, by them it had been invested with an honour never previously acquired. It had become the garment of that wisdom (Christianity) which renounced superstition and vanity; it was the priestly robe (*sacerdos suggestus*) nobler than any vestiture of the flamen. "Lower the eyes, and reverence that *pallium* which attests its wearer to have renounced error."

The Mantle had virtues of its own (chs. v., vi.). Did it not illustrate simplicity and capacity, economy and austerity, in protest against the follies and effeminacies, the gluttony and extravagance, the impurity and intemperance of the *togati*? 'Grande pallii beneficium est.' It was the garb not only of the philosopher, but also of those benefactors of the human race—the grammarian and the rhetorician, the sophist and the physician, the poet and the musician, the student of astronomy and the pupil of national history. In face of such facts, why mind the sneer, "The *pallium* ranked below the *toga* of the Roman Knight," or the indignant question "Shall I give up my *toga* for the *pallium*?" There was no indignity in the matter. "'Gaude pallium et exsulta!' Thou art honoured by a better philosophy from the time that thou didst become a Christian garment."

Scorpiace.—The title given in one edition, 'Adversos Gnosticos Scorpiacum de bono martyrii,' expresses the purport of the treatise and defines the class against whom it was written. The time was evidently one of fierce persecution (ch. i.), and subsequent to the date of Tertullian's work against Marcion (ch. v.); but so long as it is impossible to define what edition of the *Adv. Marc.* is meant, or what special persecution was raging, it must remain extremely difficult to determine the date of this treatise. Its tone, a mild Montanism, and its subject, a defence of martyrdom stronger than is found in the Montanist works of his previous period, suggest the assignment of the work to c. A.D. 211; but nothing positive can be asserted.

Scorpions were sometimes diminutive reptiles, but the evil which came from them was always great. Men had written about scorpions and how to cure their sting; the Christian practice ('nobis fides praesidium') being to sign with the sign of the Cross the part affected, adjure it in the name of Jesus, and anoint it with ointment composed of parts of the killed scorpion. But there were other scorpions than those described in natural histories. Faith had its scorpions; they were little but deadly, and especially active at the fiery season of persecution. Then Gnostics broke out, and Valentinians and the opponents of martyrdom struck, stung, and killed. Or, they dropped into the minds of the weak and wavering subtle poisons, such as doubts as to the necessity and lawfulness of martyrdom; and these doubts dulled and deadened spiritual life and faith. Crush them, says Tertullian, as you would crush the poisonous scorpion.

I. Had God willed and commanded martyrdom? Yes, because obedience to God's will in avoiding idolatry frequently implied martyrdom, and martyrdom was therefore an opportunity of exhibiting God's will. The scorpion instilled doubts upon this: How could it be the will of God? Was it not the suggestion of a false god? Or, if it was God's will, how could it be called good? Tertullian answers, God Who prohibited and punished idolatry required it. Idolatry was an evil; and to strive against and oppose evil could only be good. The opposition between idolatry and martyrdom was that of death and life. Why should men avoid martyrdoms? They were very terrible, but they issued in salvation. God healed by fire, sword, and bitter pains. Men admired the physician who killed heat with heat, bile with bitter, hemorrhage with bleeding. Was then God to be blamed for dissolving death by death, killing by killing, torture by torture? Was He wrong for conferring life by taking it away, for preserving the soul by snatching it out of this life?

II. There was another aspect of the question (ch. vi.). The martyr's contest was between one strengthened by the Lord and the devil who had once bruised Adam. Did not this show generosity in God and not harshness?

In the arena, no one ever counted a bleeding victor unhappy. His crown closed his wounds, the palm staunched his blood. Rewards, political privileges, statues, secured him an eternity of fame. How then was it unbecoming of God to bring forth His own, a spectacle to men and Angels, test the endurance of soul and body, and give His victors honour, reward, citizenship?

Martyrdom served yet another divine purpose. The faith of many even after Baptism was imperilled; very many, after attaining to salvation, were lost again. Therefore, God had appointed a second source of comfort and a last means of protection, viz. the fight of martyrdom and the Baptism of blood (cp. *De Bapt.* ch. xvi.). Nothing could any longer be "imputed" (Ps. xxxii. 1) to martyrs who laid down life in that Baptism of blood. Tertullian uses language here which his evident earnestness alone rescues from irreverent recklessness. Did the scorpion reproach him and his co-religionists with having a murderer for their God; though the source whence such a blasphemy proceeded made him shudder, Tertullian will embrace such a God, for had not God by the lips of Solomon proclaimed Himself more than murderer? "Wisdom had slain her children" (Prov. ix. 2; θύματα = *Martyrum Victimas*, Augustine), and was praised. The Apostle spoke of God not sparing His Own Son (Rom. viii. 32). If heathenism appeased Diana or Mercury or Saturn or Jupiter by human sacrifices, why should the God of the Christians be reproached if He required martyrdoms?

The language of the Old Testament (*e.g.* Isai. lvii. 1) and that of the New (St. Matt. v. 10, 44, x. 16, etc.), as well as the Lord's example taught men to live prepared for persecution, betrayal, and death; to confess Christ before men, that He might confess them before the Father in heaven. The language and testimony of the Apostles was that of "teachers of martyrdom." Had a Prodicus or a Valentinus (cp. *Adv. Prax.* ch. iii.) stood by St. Paul (Acts xxii. 11), and suggested that confession of Christ before men on earth was not needed, that martyrdom branded God as One Who thirsted for human blood, and that Christ was One Who loved to see suffering, straightway he would have heard from that servant of God what the devil heard from the Lord, "Get thee behind Me, Satan," etc. And even now should he hear it. He had poured forth his poisons; but they would hurt none of Christ's weak ones if they would but drink "this our potion."

Ad Scapulam.—It was probably at the beginning of the reign of Caracalla, A.D. 211, that the African proconsul Scapula authorised the persecution to which this work refers. He was a fierce opponent of the Christians, and permitted his fanaticism to override his sense of justice (ch. iv.). The reader will find in this treatise the arguments of the 'Apology,' but he will also notice at once the change in tone. Tertullian's passion is still strong, but it is gravely and soberly expressed. There is the same appeal for justice, but defiance has given place to prayer, and hatred of the persecutor to love for the enemy. The treatise may fairly take rank among the best and most interesting of all which have been preserved.

Scapula is told frankly that they who had joined the "sect" of Christians, were prepared to accept its conditions. The persecutions of men ignorant of what they were doing, did not alarm them or make them shrink from heathen "savagery." Against the charges usually brought against them (cp. ch. ii.; *Apol.* chs. vii.–ix.) Scapula should set one plain fact—the behaviour of Christians. Though they formed the majority in every city, yet their conduct was always marked by silence and modesty. Their "discipline" enforced a patience which was divine; if they were known at all among men, it was for their reformation of the vices which once degraded them.

Was it then right to punish such citizens? If not, was it to be expected that unjust punishment would be overlooked by God? Did not everyday facts prove that God did and would visit with His wrath unrighteous judges? When Hilarian was president (under whom is placed the martyrdom of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas), and the fanatic cry arose, "Give no burial grounds (*areae*) to the Christians," did not God withhold harvests and leave the heathen without threshing floors (*areae*)? What did the rains of the previous year, or the fires which lately hung over Carthage, and the thunders, and the eclipse at Utica betoken? What but God's wrath? Let Scapula remember what had happened to some persecuting presidents His predecessor Saturninus had lost his eyesight; Capella, when Byzantium fell into the hands of Severus, could not help lamenting, 'Christiani gaudete'; Herminianus of Cappadocia, enraged at the conversion of his wife and treating the Christians with great cruelty, had been devoured of worms, and in his anger had charged his attendants "Let no man know it, lest Christian men rejoice and Christian women take hope." God, adds Tertullian, was merciful to him and pointed out to him his error, so that he died almost a Christian. Nay, had not the illness which had attacked Scapula himself, after he had condemned Marilus of Adrumetum to the wild beasts, been meant for a warning for the future— 'Memento de cetero'?

Tertullian does not write to intimidate, but to warn—μὴ θεομαχεῖν. "Perform your duties as proconsul, but remember to be humane." Let Scapula imitate the example of such men as Cincius Severus or Candidus or Asper or Pudens (see p. 820), or follow the principles and practice of the emperor Severus (see p. 819). It was not for miscreants or false Christians that Tertullian pleaded, but for honest men, true citizens, and Christians faithful to those religious convictions, for which they were at that very moment tortured by the governors of Legio and Mauritania. The decimation of a Christ-loving crowd might prove dangerously destructive to the well-being of the state. If the Christians of Carthage resolved to repeat the act of their co-religionists in Asia, if they hurried in a body to the judgment-seat of Scapula as they had to that of Arrius Antoninus, would Scapula act as Arrius had done? Arrius had commanded the destruction of a few, and then had dismissed the rest with the sarcastic comment, "Miserable men, if you want to die you have precipices or halters!" If the Christians of Carthage should see fit to come to Scapula, how many swords and fires

would he want for the multitudes of every sex, age, and rank who should present themselves! He would have to slaughter the leading persons of the city, and decimate the noble men and women of his own rank, friends and relations of his own circle. "Spare thyself, Scapula, if thou wilt not spare us. Spare Carthage, if thou wilt not spare thyself. Spare thy province, which the mere mention of thine intention has subjected to the threats and extortions of soldiers and of private foes (cp. *De Fuga*, chs. xii., xiii.). As for us, we have no Master but God. Those whom you reckon your masters are but men, and must one day die. Our community shall never die. The more you pull it to the ground, the more it will be built up."

De Monogamia.—Some years passed, of peace from without but not from within; and a third time (c. A.D. 217) does Tertullian return to that question—marriage—which had occupied him in the *Ad Uxorem* and *De Exhortatione Castitatis*. Of these treatises the third is the bitterest. Opinions opposed to his own had been freely expressed (cp. chs. ii., x.), and this subject was evidently discussed hotly. Each party flung epithets at the other. To the Catholic the Montanist was a heretic, a Gnostic, harsh, and innovating. To the Montanist the Catholic was the heretic, the Psychic, wanton, and adulterous. Dispassionate treatment of any question would be impossible under such circumstances. It is certainly absent from the *De Monogamia*.

Tertullian now claimed for his party that they and they alone were guided by the Paraclete. From Him they had received their teaching on monogamy. He had come to supersede the teaching of St. Paul by yet higher counsels of perfection, and to that perfection Tertullian sought to bring his readers. Much of his argument—e.g. from Scripture—is a repetition of what he had said in his former treatises on the subject, and much of it may be fairly labelled by the epithets "strained" and "conjectural" he felt would be applied to it (ch. ix.): but no one will dispute Tertullian's earnestness in the cause he had so much at heart. Immorality was prevalent and contagious, and in monogamy—supposing celibacy and widowhood to be impossible—he saw a counter-acting agency. Discipline and spirituality would be at least practicable to those who would rally round the standard of monogamy.

The opening words are striking for their bitterness and assumption of spiritual superiority: "Heretics (e.g. Marcionites) do away with marriages; the Psychics accumulate them.... Among us, who by our recognition of spiritual gifts (*charismata*) have deservedly earned the title *Spiritales*, continence is religious and licence is modest as being alike the gift of the Creator. Continence honours the law of marriage, licence tempers it; 'Unum matrimonium novimus, sicut unum Deum.'" But the Psychics! They received not the Spirit and therefore were not pleased with spiritual things. They called "the discipline of monogamy" a heresy (ch. ii.), and affirmed the Paraclete to be the institutor of a novel and most grievous discipline.

Tertullian therefore feels himself called upon to defend the Paraclete against the charge of introducing (*a*) a new thing, and in that respect opposed to Catholic tradition, and (*b*) what as burdensome was opposed to "the light burden" of the Lord (St. Matt. xi. 30). In St. John xvi. 12–15, he finds the Lord's answer to both charges; while his own reply defends the Master's words from misinterpretation, and sketches the outline of Christian development:—The Paraclete, having much to teach which the Lord deferred till He came, testified in the first place to the Christ in Whom Christians believed, glorified Him and brought Him to their remembrance. Then, as a second step, He revealed many matters of discipline which commended themselves to men by the integrity of His doctrine; novel indeed because only then revealed, and burdensome because not even then endurable, but originating in no other Christ than He Who promised the Paraclete, and not less burdensome than many other things which even in Christ's days the disciples "were not able to bear."

In this particular question of marriage, the Paraclete had introduced no novelty. Had not the Lord Himself opened the kingdom of heaven to eunuchs *ut et Ipso spadone?* (cp. St. Matt. xix. 12: *De Pat.* ch. xiii.; *De Cultu Fem.* ii. ch. ix.). Had not His Apostle, following His teaching, preferred continence, *propterea et ipse castratus?* Yes, an objector was supposed to say, but this was always without prejudice to the law of marriage. Quite so, Tertullian answers, but the Apostle's preference was clearly in favour of continence; a position he once more establishes by reference to the language of St. Paul and St. John (cp. *De Exhort. Cast.* chs. ii.-iv.). Their language, or rather his own deductions from their language, were sufficiently indicative to Tertullian that the permission to marry was in the course of obliteration.

Once more he turns to the Scriptures (ch. iv.), and recapitulates the passages already adduced in the *De Exhort. Cast.* chs. v., vi. Tertullian's opponents did not like his proofs of monogamy from Adam, Noah, and Christ; they appealed to Abraham (ch. vi.). Be it so, answers Tertullian; be sons of Abraham (cp. Gal. iii. 17); but remember also that that title recalls the period of his life when he was a monogamist and still uncircumcised. It was at a later period of his life that he both became a digamist and was circumcised. Strained as this assertion and inference will be to anyone who examines the Scripture account of the life of Abraham, Tertullian does not hesitate to say to those whom he was addressing: "You must be one of two things. If you admit digamy then admit also circumcision; if you hold uncircumcision then you will keep monogamy. If you involve yourself in digamy, you are not the sons of that Abraham, whose faith was held in monogamy."

At the threshold of the Gospel narrative Tertullian finds "two high priestesses of Christian sanctity, Monogamy and Continence:" the former, modest, in the person of Zechariah, the perfect (*totum*) priest; the latter, absolute, in the person of John, the forerunner and baptizer of Christ. She also who was the mother of Christ was a virgin about to marry once after His birth, that in herself as a mother both titles of sanctity, virgin and wife of one husband, might find illustration. St. Peter was the only Apostle married (cp. St. Mark i. 29, 30);

and he was, Tertullian "presumes" to think, a monogamist; for the Church built upon him had taken monogamists to fill every grade in her orders. None of the other Apostles were, in Tertullian's opinion, married. The "wife" of 1 Cor. ix. 5 was to him simply a "woman" who in her kindness ministered unto the Apostle as women had ministered unto the Lord (St. Luke viii. 1–3). The rest of the Apostles were either *spadones* or *continentes*. Was Christ likely to set in His own chair of office successors who would enjoin but not practise the sanctity of the flesh He had Himself practised and taught? He had told them that the kingdom of heaven was for "children" (*puerorum*, St. Mark x. 13–15), that consorts with these were those who after marriage were still *pueri* (St. Matt. xix. 12); and in the hour of His revelation of His glory He had selected from among so many saints and prophets, Moses and Elias (St. Matt. xvii. 1–8)—the one a monogamist, the other an eunuch. Once only did He sup at a marriage. Many marriages took place around Him, but He was present at them only so often as He willed them to be—viz. once. From His prohibition of divorce (cp. St. Matt. xix. 3–8) Tertullian argues further that man might not join together by matrimony those whom God had separated by death.

The Psychics derived from 1 Cor. vii. 39 the permission to contract second marriages, and indeed marriages to any amount. That interpretation makes Tertullian very angry. It was the one interpretation, in his opinion, which St. Paul did not mean; it was contradicted by his language elsewhere (cp. ch. v.; *De Exh. Cast.* ch. vii.). St. Paul, he says, was dealing with phases of inexperience natural in an infant Church; and, amongst others, with that of *v.* 27 *b*. Tertullian's interpretation of St. Paul's reply (*v.* 28)—"if thou shalt have taken to thyself a wife, thou hast not sinned"—is one afterwards approved by St. Jerome (*Ep.* lxix.). St. Paul, he thinks, had in his mind only the case of a man who while still a heathen had been loosed from a heathen wife. Consequently, if such a man took a wife after he had become a Christian, that wife would not be his second wife, but his first; his reason being, "Our life only dates its beginning from the time of our becoming believers." Unions were to be "only in the Lord."

Once more (cp. *De Exh. Cast.* ch. vii.) he turns to the argument of the Psychics that St. Paul restricted monogamy to the clerical order alone;—'Quod quibusdam praescribit, id non omnibus praescribit.' That *non omnibus* was terrible to Tertullian. When men found it convenient to extol themselves against the clergy as a class, then they remembered their universal priesthood (Rev. i. 6); but when (for example) they did not wish to continue monogamists whatever might be the rule for the clergy, then they laid aside the priestly fillet, even though they still wished to retain equality of rank. Such inconsistency was unbearable. Laymen and clergy must observe but one rule. The Holy Spirit had indeed foreseen that it would one day be said, "All things are lawful to Bishops." It had come true. Adultery violated the law of the land; digamists presided over Churches, never blushing when passages condemnatory of their acts were read from the writings of the Apostles. But that was no sanction for the layman who limited the law of monogamy to Bishops to abandon at the same time those wholesome rules of discipline which St. Paul had connected with monogamy (1 Tim. iii. 2, &c.). If monogamy did not suit him, neither would those rules.

Even had St. Paul permitted second marriages to suit the circumstances of his times, that day of permission had now ended. Just as Christ had abrogated what Moses had permitted, because from the beginning it was not so, so had the Paraclete abrogated an indulgence which St. Paul had permitted; and, for the same reason, because second marriage was not from the beginning. Hardness of heart had reigned until Christ; infirmity of the flesh until the Paraclete. If the new law had taken away divorce, the new prophecy had taken away second marriage.

Tertullian "laughs" scornfully at the pleas for marriage put forward by "infirmity" (ch. xvi.). That, for example, was not *infirmitas carnis* but *summa fortitudo* ('nubere est res virium') which would marry three times, four times, seven times; 'totiens fortior quotiens infirmior.' It was based not upon Apostolic authority, but upon that of a Hermogenes who married more women than he painted (cp. *Adv. Herm.* ch. i.)! Other pleas he deals with as sarcastically as in *De Exh. Cast.* chs. ix., x.; what is fresh here in illustration or argument is steeped in the bitterest irony. His last picture (ch. xvii.) is that of this "infirmity" judged at the bar of God not by an Isaac, a John the Baptist, or a Judith, but by a Dido, a Lucretia, the Virgins of Vesta, and the priests of Apis (cp. *Ad Uxor.* i., chs. vi., vii.; *De Exh. Cast.* ch. xiii.).

De Jejunio Adversus Psychicos (al. *De Jejuniis*). — Another great subject of difference between Churchmen and Montanists had reference to fasts; and if this treatise on the subject may be in any degree taken as indicative of the feeling on these matters, that feeling must have been most intense and bitter. Tertullian's paper is a most distressing one to read: of argument there is little, of abuse there is plenty. Both sides indulged in unmeasured invective; both had lost their temper. The charges of luxury, gluttony, and immorality unhesitatingly and almost exultingly brought by Tertullian against Church ecclesiastics and laymen are so gross as almost to refute themselves by their very exaggeration. They are more than the retort of a man infuriated by unjust accusations, and meeting them by counter-charges. The ascetic has become a fanatic, and in his mad hatred besmirches and calumniates the Church he had once so tenderly loved. There is hardly a passage (see, as an exception, his testimony to Councils, ch. xiii.) which by generosity of feeling or tenderness of sympathy recalls the writer who in former days had inculcated respect for the officers of the Church, and had sought to veil what was wrong or protect what was weak in the lives of her children. His passion moreover frequently masters his juster exegetical sense. He supports many of his opinions by reference to the New Testament; but the manner in which, for example, he misapplies St. Matt. v. 6

or Rom. xiv. 17, 20, would be ridiculous were it not so manifestly sophistical and prejudiced.

The treatise was written (see ch. i.) after the *De Monogamia*, and may be roughly divided into an Introduction (ch. i.) followed by two principal sections: I. Charges against the Montanists (chs. ii.–xi.); II. Counter-charges (chs. xii.–xvii.).

I. Coarsely and scornfully Tertullian opens (ch. i.) by declaring how greatly surprised he should feel if the Psychics who were led by wantonness to marry frequently were not also led by gluttony to hate fasts. Their faith was both multivorous and multinubist. They turned against the Paraclete and rejected the new prophecies not because Montanus or Priscilla or Maximilla preached another God, or separated Jesus Christ from Him, or overturned any rule of faith or hope, but because they more often taught men to fast than to marry.

(*a*) Chs. ii.–viii., *Fasts generally*.—The Catholic position (cf. *De Orat.* chs. xviii.–xxiv.; *De Poenit.* ch. ix.), as Tertullian states it in its adversative attitude to the Montanist, was this. God had appointed definite days for fasting, *e.g.* by Moses, the tenth day of the seventh month as a day of atonement (Lev. xvi. 29, xxiii. 26–9), and in the Gospel the days (Good Friday and Easter-Eve) "in which the Bridegroom was taken away" (St. Matt. ix. 14, 15; cp. Oehler's note, and Pusey's *L. of the F.* x. p. 311). These last the Church considered the only legitimate fasts for Christians, the fasts instituted under the Law and the Prophets having been abolished. Hence the observance of other fasts was simply a matter of choice on the part of the individual Christian, not of command on the part of the Church. Apostolic practice pointed to this when they laid upon believers no yoke (Acts xv. 10) of freshly prescribed and universal fasts or of "stations," and closed prayers with the ninth hour (Acts iii. 1). Xerophagy, *i.e.* eating food not moistened by flesh, broth, juicy fruit, or vinous ingredient, was, moreover, distinctly new. It expressed by a new name a far-fetched duty, akin to the heathen superstition connected with the purificatory rites of Apis, Isis, and the Magna Mater. It was a distinct limitation of faith "free in Christ" (cp. 1 Cor. x. 25), and to insist upon it was to merit St. Paul's denunciation (cp. 1 Tim. iv. 3). In fact the Psychics applied the description in 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2 to Montanists. They were the men whose consciences were seared with the doctrines of liars (consult the original text). The charge irritated Tertullian to madness: "Seared!" he cries: "tell me by what fires?" And sarcastically he answers: "I suppose with frequent nuptials and daily banquets."

He goes to the history of Adam for his first argument in favour of fasts. Adam sold his salvation for his appetite (*gula*). Therefore He Who has shown to men the offence has left to their intelligence the remedies for the offence:—'Cibus pro veneno . . . antidotum fames.' When Israel became a people (ch. v.) disciplinary laws were instituted, because the first people repeated the crime of the first man—'pronior ventri quam Deo deprehensus' (*e.g.* Num. xi. 1–6, xx. 1–12). Angels' food—xerophagy—displeased them; they preferred garlic and onions to heaven! Their gluttony was punished and the exercise of continence enforced, that the former might be condemned and the latter learnt.

Common sense supported the same view (ch. vi.). Men were much more capable of handling divine matters when they approached them fasting. Moses, for example, with heart uplifted, not fattened up (*erectum potius quam impinguatum*), maintained for forty days and nights a fast impossible to mere human nature, but possible through the spiritual faith which gave him power. He saw with his eyes God's glory, he heard with his ears God's voice, he collected into his heart that law of God, Who taught him even then how man did not live by bread alone, but by every word which proceeded from His mouth. So also with Elijah (1 Kings xix. 1–8). "So great indeed is the prerogative of restricted food that it makes God comrade (*contubernalis*; cp. St. Matt. xvii. 4) to man, *parem revera pari*. The eternal God hungers not (cp. Isai. xl. 28, LXX., where Vulg. is *deficiet*); therefore the time when man becomes equal with God is when he lives without food."

In the New Testament Tertullian finds on the threshold of the Gospel how Anna was one who was praised not only for her long and univirate widowhood, but also for her fastings (St. Luke ii. 36–8). She illustrated in herself what should be the duties of attendants of the Church, and, yet more, how Christ was understood by none more than by those who had been wedded once and fasted often. The Lord Himself dedicated His own Baptism (and in His that of all believers) by fasts; and taught the "new man" how to bruise "the old" by the power of despising food. Fasting was commended (Acts x. 30–1) in Cornelius, and St. Paul alludes to it as his habit (2 Cor. xi. 27).

(*b*) Ch. ix., *Xerophagies*.—Tertullian's opponents labelled them *novitas* and *vanitas*. They were neither, retorts Tertullian, and proves from the histories of David, Daniel, and Elijah, that they were both ancient and efficacious. Abstinence from wine he commends highly, as in the case of Samuel (1 Sam. i. 11) and Aaron (Lev. x. 9), but he insists that it must be accompanied by a similar restriction on food: 'Qualis enim esus, talis et potus.' The man who "immolates but half an appetite to God was *aquis sobrius et cibis ebrius*"! Lastly, St. Paul's advice to St. Timothy (1 Tim. v. 23) was advice to a man who was abstaining from wine not as by rule but as a matter of devotion.

(*c*) Ch. x., *Stations*.—The Psychics objected to the Montanist mode of using these days (cp. *Ad Orat.* ch. xix.). The fast which was voluntary with the Psychic was made compulsory by the Montanist: with the former "the ninth hour" was the limit of the fast, with the latter it was continued till evening. Tertullian, dealing with the latter point first, declines to accept the alleged example of St. Peter (Acts iii. 1) as conclusive; and finds in the mention of other hours of prayer—the third (Acts ii. 1, &c.) and the sixth (Acts x. 9)—the inference, 'semper et ubique et omni tempore orandum' (cp. Eph. vi. 18), even if those three specific divisions of the day so publicly recognised in secular affairs (see Oehler's note) were also hours of special solemnity for prayer. In so speaking, Tertullian has no intention of slighting the ninth hour, an hour which had its special functions on the fourth and sixth days of the week, as the death-hour of the Lord

(St. Matt. xxvii. 45). But the same fact furnished a reason for protracting the *statio* until the evening. They should fast till a late hour, as waiting for the time of the burial of the Lord by Joseph. Tertullian finds the *statio sera* in the history of the wars against Amalek (Exod. xvii. 12), and against the five kings (cp. Josh. x. 12–14); in the injunction of king Saul (1 Sam. xiv. 24, &c.), and in the acts of Daniel (Dan. ix. 21). With a lordly superiority Tertullian states his belief (ch. xi.) that the Psychics were quite ignorant of these things, but he has stated them in order to refute the notion that they were useless and novel; while the fact that God had accepted such observances rendered them superior to the taunt of heresy or pseudo-prophecy.

II. Chaps. xii.–xvii. Countercharges.—The Psychics (to whom Tertullian applies the words of 1 Cor. iv. 8) did not attack faults by fasts, nor gain a knowledge of revelations by xerophagies, nor fear those assaults which the "stations" would help them to overcome; but the Montanists did all these things in order to secure ταπεινοφρόνησις. The prison, hunger, and thirst were before them; and Tertullian would have their prison the scene not of punishment but of discipline (cp. *Ad Mart.* ch. iii.), so that when a man issued from it to martyrdom the hooks of the instruments of torture (cp. *Apol.* ch. xii.) would find no hold on a skin bloodless and horny. In contrast with a martyr thus prepared by ταπεινοφρόνησις, Tertullian draws a picture of a Psychic martyr, or rather non-martyr, Pristinus. He describes sarcastically the prison turned into a cook-shop, lest so uncertain a martyr should miss what he was used to, and be offended at the new discipline of abstinence. On the day of trial he was drugged to that extent that he neither felt the claws of the torture nor could answer the presiding officer asking him whom he confessed to be lord. Put to the rack for his silence, he died an apostate through the drunkenness which disabled confession.

The Psychic affirmed that the solemnities of the Christian faith were laid down either in Scripture or in tradition, and that anything more was unlawful and novel. Tertullian retorts first that the Psychic was not consistent. He observed extra fasts and half-fasts ('ut cuique visum est'), on the ground that, though not commanded of God, a man might follow his own will about them. In the next place, the Pyschic was objecting to what was not opposed to the practice of the Church. Mandates for fasts were issued by the Bishops, not only to collect alms, but also for other ecclesiastical objects. If then they practised unitedly ταπεινοφρόνησις at the bidding of the Bishop, why did they blame the Montanists for their united action with regard to fastings, xerophagies, and "stations," enjoined, as they maintained, by the Paraclete Himself? The Psychics had but to examine the Jewish calendar, and they would find it no novelty that precepts committed to the fathers had been observed by their posterity with hereditary religiousness. In their own day, Councils composed of those gathered out of the whole Church were held in appointed places in Greece, discussed the deeper things of the faith, and were reverenced. Yet those assemblies observed "stations" and fasts; and thereby invested such observances with a law sacramental in its force.

The Psychics complained (ch. xiv.): "You Montanists, who observe days and months and years, galaticize (*galatizari*, see Gal. iv. 10), and are to be blamed." You would be right, retorts Tertullian, if we observed Jewish ceremonies and legal solemnities; for those the Apostle has taught us to unlearn. But if in Christ there has come a new condition of things (cp. 2 Cor. iv. 17), then should there be also new solemnities. Moreover, the Psychics, when blaming others, should first be found blameless. Many of them habitually extended the fast over the Sabbath, a practice which should never be allowed except at the Paschal season. If the Montanist did observe days &c., he did so because every day was to him in a sense holy.

The Psychic affirmed (ch. xv.) that the Apostle himself had blamed those who bade men abstain from meat (1 Tim. iv. 3). First understand the Apostle rightly is Tertullian's retort. St. Paul, enlightened by the Holy Spirit, was blaming heretics who would have enjoined perpetual abstinence, such men as Marcion (cp. *Adv. Marc.* i. ch. 29) and Tatian (cp. *s. n.* p. 803, col. 2). Then, in the next place, let them understand the Montanists rightly. 'Quantula est apud nos interdictio ciborum?' he asks. Xerophagies were appointed for two weeks in the year, and those not entire weeks, the Sabbath and the Lord's Day being excepted. During those weeks the Montanists abstained, not from what they always rejected, but from what they set on one side for a time.

The challenged becomes now in his turn the challenger. Why did the Psychics draw back (*retractatores*, al. *detractatores*) from this duty when the Apostle had charged them (Rom. xiv. 20), "For meat destroy not the work of God"? Tertullian—confiding in his own ingenuity or in the ignorance of his opponents—holds that the "work" in question was that which St. Paul describes in the words, "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine" (*v.* 20); and discovers in those "who served God in those matters (of abstinence) men acceptable to Him" (*v.* 18). Sarcastically he remarks that God, in giving to the Psychics the keys of the meat-market, and in permitting them to eat everything except food offered to idols (cp. 1 Cor. x. 25, &c.), had not with the meat-market also given them the kingdom of heaven!

Tertullian challenges in the next place the Psychic justification of their "lust" for food which they derived from the description of the Lord as One Who ate and drank (St. Matt. xi. 19). "I think," retorts Tertullian, "that He Who pronounced a beatitude on those who were hungry and thirsty (cp. St. Matt. v. 6), and not on those who were full, was certainly One Who fasted." With Him to finish the work of the Father was "meat" (St. John iv. 34); He taught others to labour for the "meat" which would endure to everlasting life (St. John vi. 27); and He commanded us to ask in prayer for "bread" (St. Matt. vi. 11), not for the riches of Attalus. God through Isaiah (lviii. 3–5) had declared what kind of fast pleased and what displeased Him; and the parable of the rich man and Lazarus depicted the feaster tortured and the faster refreshed.

The very heathen, who recognised every kind of ταπεινοφρόνησις, had a lesson to teach the Psychics. Tertullian will even admit the Psychic "blasphemy" which instituted a parallel between the xerophagies and the rites of Isis and Cybele. It was a testimony to their divine origin. The devil (*divinorum aemulator*) did but imitate: 'Ex veritate mendacium struitur, ex religione superstitio compingitur.' But this admission made, he follows it with a blow: "You Psychics are irreligious in proportion as the heathen are prompt. They slaughter their appetite to an idol god; you won't do it even to the true God! 'Deus enim tibi venter est.'" Tertullian had lost his temper, and becomes coarse as well as satirical (ch. xvii.). There was nothing the Psychic would not do. His Agape *was* the scene of gluttony and incest. Licentiousness and lust were fitting appendages to his appetite. An Apostle had accredited with "double honour" elders who were both brothers and rulers (cp. 1 Tim. v. 17); the Psychic assigned "double honour" to Bishops who could eat and drink! A man's holiness was measured among them by his banquets and cups. How could they care for spiritual things? Their constant motto was "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die!" The Montanist text should, however, be, "Brothers and sisters, let us fast, lest we die to-morrow."

De Pudicitia.—This work has been placed before the *De Monogamia* and the *De Jejunio*, but internal and negative evidence, if slight, seems to assign it a place after them. An edict (ch. i.) of the Bishop of Rome (Zephyrinus, A.D. 202–218, or Callistus, A.D. 218–223) lashed Tertullian into fury, and completely dissolved the last links of union between him and the Psychics. The treatise is marked by intense bitterness from beginning to end.

Modesty was imperilled by the evil of "the last days." Modesty was no longer reputed the abjuration of lust, but a moderate enjoyment of it! That man was to be reckoned chaste who was not too chaste! Tertullian could not look upon the destruction of modesty without an effort to check it. Very dear to him was that Christian modesty which derived its all from heaven; its nature through the laver of regeneration (cp. Tit. iii. 5), its discipline through the instrumentality of preaching, its severity through the judgments of the Old and New Testaments; and which was ever swayed by the fear of the eternal fire or the desire of the eternal kingdom. Again, what imperilled this? "I hear," says Tertullian, "that a peremptory edict has been issued by the pontifex Maximus, the Bishop of Bishops, and to this effect: 'I absolve of the sins of adultery and fornication those who have performed the requisite duties of penitence.'" In horror, he asks, "Could any man preface that edict with the usual words, *bonum factum?*" And where had this edict been affixed? On the stews? No, but in the Church—that Church which was a virgin! 'Absit, absit,' he cries, 'a sponsa Christi tale praeconium!' The Church so true, pure, and holy could make no such decree. Even her Lord Himself Who called the temple of earth "a den of thieves" (St. Matt. xxi. 13) had not contemplated such degradation as a den of adulterers and fornicators! This frightful act on the part of the Psychics was more than he could bear. Let them call him fickle, he must break off all fellowship with them. That promise to adulterers and fornicators was opposed to the primary discipline of Christianity; a discipline the strength of which the heathen had so far recognised that they knew that the cruellest punishment they could inflict upon Christian women was not torture but dishonour (cp. *Apol.* ch. 1).

What had the Psychics to say in their defence? They pleaded (ch. ii.) that God was good and merciful, that He desired the repentance and not the death of a sinner, that He was the Saviour (*salutificator*) of all men, if especially of believers. The "sons of God" should therefore be like God, merciful and peacemakers, forgiving as Christ had forgiven them (cp. St. Matt. x. 8, Vulg.), not judging lest they themselves should be judged. Tertullian brushes away such pleas as "futile," put forward to flatter God and pander to their own lusts. He opposes to them the just severity of God. God Who knew how to heal, knew also how to smite. He had not prohibited men's passing judgment, but taught them how to judge (*e.g.* 1 Cor. v. 1–5); and when He bade men forgive that they might be forgiven (St. Luke vi. 37), He referred to sins committed by man against man, not to those against God. Repentance was possible in the case of pardonable sins; impossible in the case of sins not pardonable.

Adultery and fornication were to Tertullian sins not pardonable by men; and the Old Testament, he asserted, supported such views. He examines the position of the seventh Commandment in the tables of the Law. Rightly appreciating the significance of the order of the commandments, he sees in the position occupied by adultery—between idolatry preceding it and murder following it—the position of a vice between "the two poles of crime," and completely filling up the blank space between them. He hears as it were idolatry and murder conversing and protesting against severance from adultery; he sees at the church-door on one side an idolater, on the other a murderer, and between them an adulterer; all wearing the same penitential garb of sackcloth and ashes; all weeping, praying, and kneeling together; and he demands of discipline to be to one and all such the same. "Canst thou condemn the idolater and murderer but except the adulterer? That were respect of persons!"

An objector insisted that pardon conceded to adultery in former times was a reason for conceding it still. Tertullian turns upon him with his usual weapon—irony: So the reward of the more perfect discipline of their day was to be indulgence in greater sensuality! At the time when men pardoned to the flesh the sin of adultery it did not bear the names of *corpus Christi*, *membra Christi*, *templum Dei*. It did now, and with the name had come changed conditions, the conditions of those who "baptised into Christ had put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 27), and were redeemed with a great price—"the blood of the Lord and of the Lamb."

The Psychics adduced the parables of Luke xv. in favour of their view; but while they found in the lost and prodigal the picture of a

Christian sinner, Tertullian saw in it only that of a heathen; and this difference enabled him to exclude the parables from the question before him. No warrant, according to him, could be deduced from them for receiving back into Church communion those who *within* the Church had committed adultery and fornication. His interpretation has been so generally rejected (cp. e.g. Trench "On the Parables;" *The Prodigal Son;* Neander's *Antignosticus*, p. 400), that it is unnecessary to dwell upon these chapters, characteristic though they are of Tertullian's best and worst style, of his earnestness and his passion, of acute thoughts and not less acute quibbles, of tenderness and sarcasm. Two slight points only need be specified: (a) his incidental mention of the practice of painting the figure of the "good shepherd" upon the chalice (chs. vii. and x.), a practice which, lending itself to the Psychic interpretation of the parable, makes him profanely indignant; (b) his rejection here of the "Shepherd" of Hermas as "adulterous," "apocryphal and false" (cp. also ch. xx.), in contrast with the almost studied moderation with which he alludes to this work in *De Orat.* ch. xvi.

Did the actions of the Lord threw any light upon this matter? Tertullian, identifying Mary of Bethany with the "woman who was a sinner" (cp. St. Matt. xxvi. 1; St. Luke vii. 37), argues that Christ's permitting Himself to be touched by her, was permissible to the Lord only. He alone could pardon such sinners; His doing so was no precedent for Psychics. Christian discipline dated from the Passion of the Lord (cp. *De Corona*, ch. xiii.). No one was a Christian till Christ had returned to heaven, no one was holy till the Holy Spirit came down from heaven and determined the character of discipline. To that inspired discipline he appeals (ch. xii.). He declares that the Psychics could point to no Apostolic authority for affirming that carnal sins after Baptism could be washed away by penitence. The action of the Council of Jerusalem contradicted the supposition that a more lenient discipline than the old was to be introduced with respect to adultery. Referring to the terms of the decree then issued (Acts xv. 28, 29), he quotes it, as Irenaeus had done before him (*Adv. Haer.* iii. 12), in the order—abstain from sacrifices and from fornication, and from blood (cp. Acts xv. 20); and, understanding under the term "blood," human as well as animal blood, he alleges that adultery and fornication retained in this decree "the post of honour" which he had observed assigned to them in the Decalogue (ch. v.). The Council, by declaring such sins not remissible, evidently intended to make the yoke of discipline permanent with regard to those crimes if they relaxed it in all else. Not so, answered the Psychic, if St. Paul's treatment of the incestuous person at Corinth was considered (1 Cor. v. 6; 2 Cor. ii. 6). The Psychic identified the person readmitted to communion (2nd text) with the person previously excommunicated (1st text), an identification usually accepted. Tertullian will not admit the identification. It is to him incredible that Psychics could have conceived the Apostle of Christ—'doctorem nationum in fide et veritate, vas electionis, ecclesiarum conditorem, censorem disciplinarum'—so fickle as to be able to condemn rashly the man he was presently to absolve, or absolve rashly the man he had deliberately condemned. How could "the teacher of every kind of holiness, the execrator and expiator of every kind of impurity, have restored to the Church a person guilty of incest!" Such a mode of interpretation, he sarcastically declares, was only possible with "perverse and foolish heretics and all Psychics." He rains upon his foes passages from the letters to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, Ephesians, and Colossians, and bids them yield their one text to so many which taught the opposite lesson.

A Psychic is now introduced (ch. xviii.) as saying:—Granted that all these passages forbad immodesty and enjoined modesty, they might do this without prejudice to pardon. Pardon could not be said to be denied, even though the sins were condemned. Tertullian replies by another selection of texts intended to exhibit the refusal of ecclesiastical communion to cases of this kind from ancient times. Proverbs, Psalms, Isaiah, and the letters of St. Paul furnish on this point the deliberate counsel of Christ in His love for His Church which He would have so glorious and stainless (Eph. v. 26, 27). But he does not silence the Psychic who again protests;—If communion was denied to sinners, especially to those polluted in the flesh, yet was it only for the present. It would be restored in response to penitence, and in accordance with the clemency of God. This was too much for Tertullian: and he does not hesitate to declare that it was not competent for God's mercy to make any such demonstration to those who had lapsed. Granted that the Lord did not desire the death of a sinner, but rather that he should repent, yet the repentance referred to was that before believing and before Baptism into Him Who once for all suffered death for sins; it was not penitence for post-baptismal sin. Tertullian found in 1 Tim. i. 16 a warrant for his view; and pressing St. John's distinction between a sin unto death and a sin not unto death (1 John v. 16), affirms that for such sins as murder, idolatry, fraud, denial of the faith, blasphemy, adultery, fornication, and any other "violation of the temple of God," Christ would not plead (*exorator*) and they must not plead. Tertullian's general conclusion from the discipline of the Apostles was therefore (ch. xx.) that it was the duty of every Bishop to eradicate from the Church every sacrilege of modesty without any mention of restoration. He draws a similar conclusion from the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 1, 4–8), a work which he attributes to St. Barnabas (see Salmon's Introd. to the New Testament, p. 517), "a man accredited to God," and "a companion of the Apostles specially fit by right of proximity to confirm the discipline of his masters."

But the practice of the Church was defended not only upon general exegetical grounds, but also upon special delegation of power transmitted through St. Peter (ch. xxi.). Tertullian, as a Montanist, has much to say against such delegation. He demands that not only the discipline, but the power admitted in the Apostles, and which God gave them, not man, must be seen repeated in their successors, if they were

to be placed upon the same footing; and then he turns passionately upon some special Psychic offender—possibly the Bishop of Rome—whose decree had given him such dire offence (ch. i.): "Thou, neither prophet nor Apostle, hast not the power to pardon!" "We don't claim this as individuals," the Psychic answered; "it is the Church which has the power to forgive sins." "That I grant, even more than you," Tertullian replies with alacrity, but only to give to his concession the curious disclaimer, "I hear the Paraclete speaking in the new prophets, and saying 'The Church can forgive sins; but I will not do it lest they commit others.'" "That is the language of a pseudo-prophetic spirit," retorted the Psychic. "No," is the reply; "a subverting spirit would have recommended mercy and smoothed the course of sin." But, continues Tertullian, I want to know from what or whence you usurp the right to be the Church. Quoting the famous text, St. Matt. xvi. 18, 19, he affirms that the power of the keys was given to St. Peter personally, not to the Church; and that the binding and loosing had reference to the Law (he quotes in proof Acts xv. 7–11), not to the capital sins of believers. Fortified by this interpretation, Tertullian protests that the passage has nothing to do with the Church of the Psychics. Such power would be fitting to the *Spiritales*, not to Psychics, to men like St. Peter personally, and to such as Apostles or Prophets. And then he explains what he means by the Church. The Church is properly and primarily the Spirit Himself, in Whom is the 'trinitas unius divinitatis,' Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. He gathers together the Church which the Lord had affirmed to consist of three. And therefore from that time forth, all, whatever their number, who shall have agreed together in this faith, are counted a Church by the Author and Consecrator of the Church. The Church therefore will forgive sins; but it will be the Church of the Spirit speaking by a *Spiritalis*, not a Church which consists of a mere number of Bishops.

Lastly, it was most objectionable to Tertullian that the Church assigned so lavishly to martyrs the power of forgiving sins (ch. xxii.). He draws a picture of one whom he calls a martyr in prison "by arrangement and wearing *vincula mollia*." Around him came adulterers and fornicators praying and weeping; and most infamous practices ensued. Under cover of darkness men and women were violated; and peace was sought at the hands of those who imperilled their own. Tertullian hears a Psychic interpose, "Who living on earth and in the flesh, is without fault"? and he answers, There are martyrs and martyrs. Which was the true martyr, the man who held out his hand and sold forgiveness, or the man who died under the sword or on the Cross, by the lion or the flame? The latter was in the very possession of martyrdom; yet who would permit him, a man, to pardon what was reserved to God? 'Sufficiat martyri propria delicta purgasse.' The Son of God alone had redeemed another's death by His own; in the hour of His Passion He set the robber free; He the only-pure, the only-holy came to undergo death for sinners. Tertullian proposes a test. If, as was asserted, Christ was in the martyr absolving adulterers and fornicators, then let the would-be martyr prove his power to absolve as Christ had proved His (cp. St. Mark ii. 9–11) by telling publicly the secrets of the heart. That would be a proof that he was Christ and could forgive sins.

Further, this appeal to martyrs for pardon for adulterers and fornicators, was a tacit admission that their crimes were not to be washed away except by actual martyrdom even if vicarious. Martyrdom was then a second Baptism (cp. St. Luke xii. 50). But surely if a man could be freed from sin by the second Baptism, it should also be possible for him to be freed by the first: and that would lead to this conclusion; whatever authority or reason there was for restoring the peace of the Church to the adulterer and fornicator, the same must hold good in the case of the penitent murderer and idolater, certainly also of the apostate and of him who denied the faith under the infliction of torture. Unworthy would it be of God and of His mercy Who desired not the death, but the repentance of a sinner, if return into the Church were made more easy for those who had fallen through indulgence in lust than for those who had died fighting.

Adversus Praxean.—The history of the teacher combated in this treatise and the nature of his views are given under his name (v. PRAXEAS), where also will be found a sufficient record of Tertullian's answer to render it unnecessary here to do more than specify a few points of interest. The treatise was written after the death of Pope Callistus in A.D. 222 (see MONTANUS, p. 940, col. 1).

(*a*) Tertullian wrote (ch. iii.) for the edification of the "simple ('ne dixerim imprudentes et idiotae') who always constituted the majority of believers." They were startled at the doctrine of the Trinity, thinking that it divided the Unity; they expressed their desire to maintain by preference the *monarchia* or sole government of God. Tertullian's aim is therefore to remove the current popular fears and objections as well as to refute the teacher himself.

(*b*) It is evident that Tertullian felt himself as a Montanist far more competent to cope with the difficulties before him than had been the case at an earlier period of his life. As a "scholar of the Paraclete and not of men," as one "better instructed by the Paraclete Who leads men into all truth," he proclaimed himself better versed in and better fitted to expound the holy doctrine of Christianity (see Neander's *Antignosticus*, p. 511). Thus the beautiful illustrations (not arguments) of the Three Persons of the Trinity standing to one another in the relation of the root the shrub and the fruit, of the fountain the rivulet and the river, of the sun the ray and the terminating point of the ray (ch. viii.) were, he says, revealed to him by the Paraclete. His estimate of his illumination must be received with caution. If his teaching respecting the Trinity coincides essentially with the doctrines of the Church, it must not be forgotten that he uses expressions which, in his zeal against one form of error, were capable of being wrested—as they have been wrested—in favour of another Orthodox writers of later times, when controversy defined the necessity of greater precision of language, have carefully avoided (see Kaye,

pp. 505, etc.) much that Tertullian found it possible to say.

(c) Tertullian was the first who, in the controversy against the Monarchians, introduced prominently the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Praxeas did not touch it. Hence the value of such chapters in the treatise as chs. viii., ix., xxv., xxx. He fully maintains the personality of the Third Person of the Trinity (cp. also *Ad Mart.* ch. iii.) if his language is occasionally ambiguous (cp. ch. xii., his comment on Gen. i. 26).

(d) Tertullian bases as usual his arguments and proofs on Holy Scripture (chs. xxi. to end), and if he is not always free from his well-known tendency to find in them or read into them what he wants [*e.g.* Ps. xlv. 1 (in ch. xi. cp. *Adv. Marc.* ii. ch. iv.): the references to two Gods in Ps. xlv. 6, 7; Isai. xlv. 14, 15; Gen. xix. 24 (cp. ch. xiii.)], the passages adduced are as a rule well and wisely handled either in defence of the Catholic position or in refutation of that of Praxeas. He gives (ch. xx.) the three texts especially valued by this teacher in support of his heresy (Isai. xlv. 5; St. John x. 30, xiv. 9, 10), and refutes his views at length (chs. xxi.–xxiv.). As passages, appealing both for their beauty and truth to the testimony of Scripture, attention may be drawn to the *regula fidei* in chs. ii., ix.; to the illustration of the procession of the Son or Word of God by the operation of human thought and consciousness (ch. v.); to the work of the Word of God as the Wisdom of God in the creation of the universe (ch. vi.); and to the spirited protest against the blasphemous conclusions which were too easily deducible from the premisses of Praxeas (ch. xxix.).

IV. *Summary.*—The brief sketch here presented of these powerful writings will have indicated the investigation of many a doctrine and the record of contemporaneous practices heathen and Christian, as well as illustrated the mind, character, and style of their writer. A few words may sum up his position.

(a) *Tertullian and Heathenism.* On its moral side, extravagance, luxury, immorality, and cruelty were to all external appearance as rampant in his day as ever. Tertullian knows heathenism only in its coarseness and repulsiveness. And yet a reformation was proceeding, religious in origin and intention, which must not be forgotten in any true estimate of the age. Tertullian lived at a time when old pagan traditions and new tendencies were co-operating together; when there had risen that religious movement which, owing its impulse to the eclecticism of a Julia Domna, passed through the striking and stirring phases successively represented in the Neopythagoreanism of her *salon*, in the subordination by Elagabalus of every other cultus to that of the Oriental sun-god, and in the equalisation by Alexander Severus of all worshipful beings in his common cultus of the heroes of humanity. That movement was the product of a real awakening. Men from the crowd as well as the patrons of culture had ceased to be satisfied with a scepticism which respected forms and ceremonies while it laughed at the credulity of those who used them. Scepticism, incredulity, formalism, had alike yielded to a spirit of religiousness which dominated classes and masses. Emperors, courtiers, soldiers, philosophers, artists were vieing with priests, women, and burgesses in developing pagan syncretism. It was, moreover, no movement on the part of an expiring paganism intended to counteract the advance of a growing Christianity. It proceeded from those who had little polemical feeling against Christianity. It was rather due to a real feeling of disgust and discontent with the religious *pabulum* hitherto provided, and to an eager craving for some new ideal and some new principle of spiritual life which should affect the highest and the lowest alike. And to bring about this result, the ancient beliefs were invested with modern forms; the paganism which had been national, or local, or exclusive, blossomed out into what was cosmopolitan, universal, and all-inclusive. With one hand the heathen held fast by his old gods (cp. *Minuc. Fel.* v.), with the other he invested them with titles, attributes, and worship, Egyptian and Phoenician, Oriental and Mithraic.

The main centre of these changes and developments was Rome, but Tertullian's writings against heathenism prove that Carthage at least felt the effects of this great tidal wave of religiousness. They are as full of attack as of defence. He strikes at a vigorous paganism fully as much as beats off the charges alleged against Christianity. Every page teems with allusions which reflect without effort the firm foothold acquired by every form of heathen cultus. Ridicule of the worship of the ancient deities of Greece and Rome, of the cultus of the emperors, of the 'genius,' and of demons is found allied with contempt of the gods of Alexandria — Isis and Serapis, of Phrygia — the Magna Mater and Bellona, of Syro-Phenicia —the Dea Syra, and of Carthage—the Juno Coelestis. The very fierceness of his invective and scorn against the polytheistic revival, the ridicule he pours upon *galli* and *flamines*, priests and priestesses, itinerant and mendicant propagators of this or that cultus, guilds, processions, festivals, is an evidence of the success and popularity of heathenism. The "Apology" of Apuleius (end of 2nd century) is illustrated by the "Apology" of Tertullian, and the statements of Dio, Spartian, Herodian, Lampridius, &c. remain to be compared with those of our writer. Were those heathen works lost, it would be almost possible to reproduce from the pages of Tertullian, shorn of their extravagance, a picture of the religiousness of the age such as they have given.

Archaeological discovery (cp. the *Compte Rendu* of the French Acad. of Inscriptions, 1885, p. 112, &c.) has come forward to attest the "great religiousness" of Carthage. The excavator's spade has unearthed in the Capitol of the city three isolated but contiguous temples. The central one was dedicated to Jupiter Optimus and Maximus, and the inscription of the second century describes the decoration to have been carried out under the direction of the priest Aesculapius (cp. *De Pallio*, ch. iv.). The other temples were dedicated to Juno Coelestis and Minerva. All three are mentioned together in the *De Testimonio Animae* (ch. ii.). Juno was the patron goddess of Carthage (cp. *Apol.* ch. xxv.); her *peplum* was the consecration-garment of her

princes; her cultus was the last to be eradicated. So late as the 5th century Salvian complains that there were many who professed Christianity, and yet preferred the worship of Juno Coelestis (*Afrorum daemonem*) to that of Christ (*De Gubernatione Dei*, Bk. viii.); even in her day of ruin her temple remained majestic.

It is more than probable that Tertullian was acquainted with the subordinating piety of the emperor Elagabalus (A.D. 218–222) when he married the Dea Coelestis of Carthage to the Baal enthroned at Rome. He was still living and still writing; but the act which robbed the city for a time of her goddess would but little affect one whose writings had then long ceased to be directed against heathenism, and whose Montanist mind was agitated by the worldliness of Churchmen and the heresy of a Praxeas. It is also more than probable that he lived on during some of the years of the reign of Alexander Severus (A.D. 222–235); and if so, sweeter to the old man than the shouts of the multitudes receiving back their goddess must have been the notification of the decree, 'Christianos esse passus est.' The imperial acknowledgment of the justice of the demand for liberty, which he and others had so often and so fruitlessly made (cp. *Apol.* ch. iv.), had come at last. Whether he discerned or not in the fantastic follies of an Elagabalus or in the levelling syncretism of Alexander Severus that which if intended to advance paganism would eventually advance Christianity, is doubtful. Though that was the actual result, its forecast cannot be said to be clearly indicated in the writings of Tertullian.

(*b*) *Tertullian and Christianity.* In passing from heathenism to Christianity, Tertullian believed himself to be passing from darkness to light and from corruption to purity. He embraced it with all the strength of a matured mind and life. All the more intelligible, therefore, is his vehement anger with any form of Christian precept and practice, whether at Rome or Carthage, which fell short of his ideal. The Church was to him the Virgin and spotless Bride of the Ascended Lord, and her children, Bishops, priests, and people must worthily reflect her purity and faith. He would permit no shortcomings because he would admit no failure. A writer of the 4th century has left on record that the Africans as he knew them were "faithless and cunning. There might be some good people among them, but they were not many" (quoted in Mommsen, 'The Provinces of the Roman Empire,' ii. p. 340). This estimate is reflected a century earlier in Tertullian's pages. It is a summary of his opinion of the spurious devotion which marked the Christian fop (*De Poenit.* ch. xi.; cp. *De Cultu Fem.* ii. ch. viii.), the would-be penitent (*De Poenit.* ch. ix.), the rich Christian lady (*De Cultu Fem.* i. ch. ix.; *De Cultu Fem.* ii. chs. v.–vii.; *De Virg. Vel.* ch. xvii.), the fashionable virgin (*De Virg. Vel.* ch. xii.; in contrast with her holy sister, *De Virg. Vel.* ch. xv.), the drugged and petted martyr (*De Jej.* ch. xii., in contrast with the willing and happy martyr, *Ad Martyres*, chs. i.–iii.); and it explains that final revulsion of mind which, spurning every kind of compromise, heaped indiscriminate abuse on what was best as well as what was worst in the life of the Christians of the Church, and turned to find in asceticism and Montanism a seriousness and elevation impossible to him elsewhere.

Paradoxical as it may seem, it was the same impulsive spirit which kept him staunch to the faith of that Church whose discipline and ritual he abjured or carried with him to a schismatic body. Gnosticism was to Tertullian the embodiment of theological corruption, darkness, and falsehood, and he fought it with all his natural vehemence. His theology, if developed by Montanism, is in substance that which the Church accepted, and accepts. The admiration felt for his writings by his countryman Cyprian (A.D. 200–258), Bishop of Carthage, should never be forgotten. Cyprian, says St. Jerome, never passed a day without reading a portion of Tertullian's works; he frequently asked for him with the words, 'Da mihi magistrum'; and it is in fact impossible to read the Bishop's existing treatises without seeing how largely the thoughts of Tertullian have been absorbed by his contemporary, if the language has been softened and deepened. In our own country Bishops Bull ('Defensio Fidei Nicenae') and Pearson ('On the Creed') have used many an argument which the Montanist of Africa had prepared for them, and Bishop Kaye's illustrations of the Articles of the Church of England from Tertullian's writings (pp. 246, &c.) concur in establishing the force of Möhler's description of his dogma as 'so homelike' ('Patrologie,' i. p. 737). It is based on the teaching of Christ as handed down by Apostles and Apostolic men, and formulated in the 'regula fidei una, sola, immobilis et irreformabilis' (cp. *De Praescr. Haeret.* chs. viii. ix.; *De Virg. Vel.* ch. i.). Theology owes practically to him such words (*int. al.*) as *Trinitas*, *satisfactio*, *sacramentum*, *substantia*, *persona*, *liberum arbitrium*, transferred (some of them) from the Latin law courts to take their definite place in the language of Latin divinity (cp. the index verborum at the end of Oehler, vol. ii.).

(*c*) *Tertullian, the man.* Of no one, says Ebert is Buffon's saying truer, "the style is the man," and the best illustration of his style he finds in the 'Apology' ('Geschichte der Christlich-Lateinischen Literatur,' pp. 34–37). Tertullian cared nothing for form save as it best expressed his thought. He said right out from his heart what he had to say about friend or foe, without attempt to clothe his speech with the graceful charm of the Greek or with the dignified periods of the Roman. Abrupt and impetuous, eloquent and stern, his sentences follow one another with the sweeping, rushing force of storm-waves. The very exceptions which occur do but prove the rule. Such tender or beautiful passages as those which depict the life of Christ on earth (*De Pat.* ch. iii.; *Apol.* ch. xxi. Were these written with any acquaintance with the life of the pagan Christ, Apollonius of Tyana, edited by Philostratus at the command of Julia Domna?), the power and effect of prayer (*De Orat.* ch. xxix.), the virtues and portrait of patience (*De Pat.* ch. xv.), contemporary civilization (*De Anima*, ch. xxx.), the happy marriage (*Ad Uxor.* ii. 8), and Faith, the barque of the Church (*De Idol.* ch. xxiv.):—or the impressive analogies of the resurrection he finds in nature (*De Resurr. Carnis*, ch. xii.), and

the illustrations of the Trinity (*Adv. Praxean*, ch. viii.),—come upon the reader as a surprise, as something so unlike one who is more in his recognised element when describing the place-hunter (*De Poenit.* ch. xi.), the traitor (*Apol.* ch. xxxv.), and the knowing Valentinian (*Adv. Val.* end); or paints that ghastliest of his portraits, Murder and Idolatry crooning over adultery (*De Pud.* ch. v.). His paradoxes are characteristic:—To him the unity of heretics was schism (*De Praescr. Haeret.* ch. xlii.); and heresy itself 'tantum valeat quantum si non fuisset' (*De Praescr. Haeret.* ch. i.). "God is great when little" (*Adv. Marc.* ii. ch. ii.); "Lie to be true" (*De Virg. Vel.* ch. xvi.), contain thoughts only a shade less startling than the 'Mortuus est Dei Filius; prorsus credibile est quia ineptum est; Et sepultus resurrexit; certum est quia impossibile est' (*De Carne Christi*, ch. v.), or the well-known "the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church" (*Apol.* ch. i.). His right appreciation of the methods of Scripture exegesis (*De Pud.* ch. ix.; cp. *De Res. Carn.* ch. xxi.) is found side by side with such signal examples of perverse interpretation as those which disfigure the *De Jejunio* and the *De Pudicitia*, or such fanciful expositions as his view of the Cross (*Adv. Marc.* iii. ch. xviii.; cp. *Adv. Jud.* chs. x., xiii.), St. Peter and the sword (*De Idol.* ch. xix.), God's Voice to Adam (*Adv. Marc.* ii. ch. xxv.), and the phoenix (*De Res. Carn.* ch. xiii.). Such paradoxes, contrasts, and contradictions are characteristic indications not so much of a want of comprehensiveness, as of a determinate tendency to occupy himself with but one idea or but one aspect of a great truth, and subjugate to that one aspect the wider bearings of the question. His great acuteness, power, eloquence, and causticity are concentrated for the time being upon a single principle; and whatever will illustrate it, prove it, and drive it home is drawn into its service, often regardless of its fitness (see this drawn out in Pusey's Preface to *L. of the F.*, vol. x.). Tertullian's style is strongly marked by the early training of his life: it is juridical in thought, language, and exposition; a fact which explains so much of its difficulty. The advocate is always present. His conduct of the contest between Christianity and heathenism is that of a law-court contest, God *v.* the devil; his conception of the contest between Montanist and Churchman is that of one who asserted and developed Christianity *v.* one who surrendered it or left it defective. Tertullian was often wrong, and the Church has so adjudged him and sorrowed in adjudging; but the character of the man quite explains everything.

What that character was, he has himself told in two sentences:—(*a*) 'Miserrimus ego, semper aeger caloribus impatientiae' (*De Pat.* ch. i.). The sentence, caught up by Jerome, explained to him the man ('homo acris et vehementis ingenii'), as it explains his secession to Montanism, and his intellectual and moral defects. It was written at a time when if ever Tertullian had gauged his own fault to the full: when the layman had become the priest, and the deep self-abasement of the man is reflected in the calm subdued tone of the pastor. Compare the two or three writings of this period with those later Montanist works which deal with similar subjects, and the change is painful. The arrogance and self-confidence, the irritation and violence which mark the latter tell but too sadly how patience had taken its flight and impatience once more reigned supreme. (*b*) 'Perversitas, quam putas, ratio est; quod saevitiam existimas, gratia est' (*Scorp.* ch. v.). Tertullian, using paradox as his weapon, had affirmed martyrdom to be salvation, and God to be justified in killing death by death: and then he bursts forth, "What you call perversity I call reasonable; what you call cruelty, I call kindness." The sentence is a revelation. Tertullian would have insisted that there was reason, cause, method in his perverse uncompromising antagonism to any breach of what was to him God's revealed will and word. It was, he would have said, kindness not cruelty to be stern both to himself and to others, to be bold in rebuking sin and proclaiming the truth. Perverse in the sense of wrong-headed he often was in his narrow estimate of the one and the other, but he was never wrong-hearted. His life and work, full of the shades and contrasts of one who loved well and hated well, was after all a life and work from which more has been gained than has been lost. If Hilary can regret that his "later error took away from the authority of what he had written," Vincentius can remind us that those writings were "thunderbolts;" they were hurled forth in defence of faith and practice. It will be to his earlier life or less polemical treatises that the reader will turn with Cyprian by preference, and in the perverse impatience of his later life see at once "the fire which kindles and the beacon which warns" (Pusey).

V. *Literature.*—Oehler's edition of Tertullian is on the whole the best extant (see some remarks and improvements upon the text in the 'Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft. Theologie,' 1860, pp. 82–100, 363–393; and in Klussmann (F.) 'Liber de Spectaculis,' Leipz. 1877); in the Preface to vol. 1 will be found a full account of the MSS. and edd. existing and used, lost treatises, &c. His collection of Latin Dissertations (in vol. iii.), giving the views of Pamelius, Allix, le Nourry, Mosheim, Centner, Noesselt, Semler, and Kaye is most serviceable in the elucidation of many points connected with the life, era, teaching, and style of Tertullian. In addition to the works of Kaye, Pusey, Kellner, Böhringer, Hauck, Ebert, Rönsch, Bonwetsch referred to already, and which contain references to earlier works, may be mentioned, Woodham's 'Apology,' Schulz's 'Gottheit Christi,' Harnack's 'Dogmengeschichte,' Kolberg's 'Verfassung, Cultus u. Disciplin der Christlichen Kirche nach den Schriften Tertullians' (from a Roman Catholic point of view), papers by Barth (T. and St. Paul and the Apostles), Nöldechen (T. and Clem. Alexandr.) in vols. viii. and xii. of the 'Jahrbh. d. Protest. Theologie,' and by the latter on various points re Tertullian in 'Zeitschr. f. Kirchl. Wissenschaft,' i., ii., vi. Translations into English of some of Tertullian's apologetic and practical treatises will be found in the vol. of the 'Library of the Fathers' already alluded to, and of almost all his works in vols. ii., vii., xi., xviii. of the Ante-Nicene Library; but the translations are very unequal and should in no way supersede the study of the Latin text. [I. M. F.]

TERTULLUS (1). A presbyter of Carthage or a bishop of Africa, who appears with Cyprian, *Ep.* iv., giving judgment on the discipline to be used towards virgins *subintroductae* and suspected of incontinence. A principal adviser of Cyprian's first retirement in the Decian persecution A.D. 270, Cyp. *Ep.* 14. During the persecution he was very good to the Carthaginian martyrs in prison, and communicated regularly to Cyprian the days of their deaths or executions, in order that he might keep their commemorations with oblations and sacrifices, Cyp. *Ep.* 12. [E. W. B.]

(2) Perhaps the same as (1), a bishop in second Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. *de Pace lapsis danda*, Cyp. *Ep.* 57; in fifth Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. *de Bap. Haer.* 1, Cyp. *Ep.* 90. [E. W. B.]

TERTULLUS (3), Priscillianist. [JOANNES (555).]

TESTAMENTA XII. PATRIARCHARUM. This apocryphal work consists, as its name implies, of the last dying utterances of the twelve sons of Jacob to their children, and it furnishes an instance of the tendency in early Christian times to connect writings of a more or less apocalyptic character with Old Testament rather than New Testament names.

1. *History of Document.*—We proceed first to speak of the external history of our document. The earliest certain reference to it by name is by Origen, who apparently holds it in considerable respect, "in . . . libello, qui appellatur Testamentum duodecim patriarcharum, quamvis non habeatur in canone. . . ." (*Hom. in Josuam*, xv. c. 6, vol. ii. 435). There seems, however, to be a reference to the *Testaments* in Irenaeus (*Frag.* 17; p. 836, ed. Stieren): further, Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* v. 1) has too marked a coincidence with a striking passage in *Test. Benj.* c. 11, where St. Paul is spoken of as the wolf of the tribe of Benjamin, to be treated as accidental. (See also *Scorpiace*, c. 13.) To the attempt made to treat this passage as an interpolation, we shall subsequently refer. Like many another similar writing in the early church, as time goes on, our document drops comparatively out of sight. Jerome is possibly thinking of it in his contemptuous allusion to 'fictas revelationes omnium patriarcharum et prophetarum" (*adv. Vigilantium*, c. 6, vol. v. 393). Procopius Gazaeus, a writer of the 6th century, in a work of which unfortunately only the Latin version has been printed, possibly supplies us with another reference (*Comm. in Genesin*, c. 38: cf. *Test. Jud.* c. 12). Moreover, in the *Synopsis Sacrae Scripturae*, which is appended to the writings of Athanasius (§ 75, vol. ii. p. 201), and in the *Stichometria* of Nicephorus of Constantinople (*Patrol. Gr.* c. 1060), on which the foregoing is *probably* based, there occurs among the ἀπόκρυφα τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης, a mention of πατριάρχαι. Whether, however, the reference is to our document, or to a writing τῶν τριῶν πατριαρχῶν condemned [φθοροποιὰ καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθρά] in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vi. 16), must remain doubtful.

A *Decretum de libris recipiendis*, attributed to a council held at Rome in the episcopate of Gelasius (A.D. 494), but not improbably of somewhat later date, rules, "Liber qui appellatur Testamentum Job, apocryphus" (*Patrol.* lix. 163). For *Job*, *Jacob* is read by some MSS. according to Grabe (*Spicil.* i. 138, ed. 1), who suggests, with some show of reason, that the proper name may have sprung from a mistake of a Latin copyist, who misunderstood the numeral ιβ' for an abbreviation of the name. The second Council of Braga in Spain (A.D. 563) condemns those who read heretical writings "sub nomine Patriarcharum, Prophetarum vel Apostolorum" (*Conc. Bracar.* ii. can. 17, Labbe, v. 839). It will be noticed that these references subsequent to the time of Origen, are all more or less doubtful.

Vague, however, as they are, they seem to be all that is forthcoming in the period; and after them a blank ensues, till the reappearance of the *Testaments* in the middle of the 13th century. Of this event the account must be given in the words of the contemporaneous chronicler, Matthew Paris. "At this same time, Robert, bishop of Lincoln, a man most deeply versed in Latin and Greek, accurately translated the 'Testaments of the XII Patriarchs' from Greek into Latin. These had been for a long time unknown and hidden through the jealousy of the Jews, on account of the prophecies of the Saviour contained in them. The Greeks, however, the most unwearied investigators of all writings, were the first to come to a knowledge of this document, and translated it from Hebrew into Greek, and have kept it to themselves till our times. And neither in the time of the blessed Jerome nor of any other holy interpreter, could the Christians gain an acquaintance with it, through the malice of the ancient Jews" (*Historia Anglorum*, A.D. 1242: vol. iv. p. 232, ed. Luard.) Again, when speaking of the death of John de Basingstokes, he remarks, "This Master John had mentioned to Robert, bishop of Lincoln, that when he was studying at Athens he had seen and heard from learned Greek doctors, certain things unknown to the Latins. Among these he found the 'Testaments of the XII Patriarchs,' that is to say, of the sons of Jacob. Now it is plain that these really form part of the Sacred Volume, but have been long hidden through the jealousy of the Jews, on account of the evident prophecies about Christ, which are clearly seen in them. Consequently, this same bishop sent into Greece, and when he obtained them, he translated them from Greek into Latin, as well as certain other things" (*op. cit.*, A.D. 1252, vol. v. p. 285).

The Robert of the foregoing extracts is Robert Grosseteste or Greathead (bishop of Lincoln, 1235–1253), the valiant assailant of the ecclesiastical abuses that disgraced his time, who dared even to brand Innocent IV. with the title of Antichrist. The translation thus made by, or under the auspices of, Grosseteste, became at once exceedingly popular. Almost on its first appearance it was largely quoted by Vincent of Beauvais, in his *Speculum Historiale* (lib. i. cc. 115 sqq.), numerous copies of it were soon spread over Europe, and in course of time translations were made from it into a large number of modern languages.

Object and date of work.—It cannot be doubted that the *Testaments* are the work of a Jewish Christian, writing mainly, if not exclusively, for Jews. It would be natural to utilize the supposed utterances of the fathers of the

nation as a means of conveying instruction to their descendants; the book being likely to win a welcome from so attractive a title. Of the three elements of the book, historical, ethical, prophetical, it is clear that the last is the most important in the writer's mind. He lived evidently in evil times, as we may see from the constant predictions of calamities put into the mouths of the patriarchs. They look forward beyond the troubles to the happy days of the coming deliverer; so doubtless the writer's aim was to show the true purpose of those evil times, how by adversity the Jews may be brought to acknowledge the Messiah, whom, though they had rejected him, their fathers foretold. Thus aiming at the conversion of the Jewish nation to the Christian faith, the writer bases his appeal not on the law of Moses, but on the earlier patriarchal covenant, underlying which were latent the first germs of Christianity. Grabe, indeed, the first who treated of the *Testaments* at length, assigned the work to the period shortly before our Lord's time, and got rid of the Christian passages *en masse* as interpolations (*Spicilegium*, vol. i. p. 153, ed. 1). These, however, as a rule at any rate, are, in our judgment, too obviously an integral part of the original work, for such a theory to hold.

Granting then the Christian origin of the work, a difficulty arises at our finding in a book of markedly Jewish characteristics a passage speaking of St. Paul in terms of the highest respect, which some have thought could not have come from a Jewish hand. This difficulty has been got rid of in various ways. Some have maintained that the author was a Christian of Pauline tendencies (Ritschl, ed. 1; Vorstman): others have got rid of the difficulty arising from the liberal views of the writer by maintaining the passage referring to St. Paul to be one of a series of interpolations. This theory of interpolation will be referred to below, and we shall trust to show how little real evidence there is for such a view. The difficulty, however, as to the passage about St. Paul rests on an assumption, that a Jewish Christian was necessarily anti-Pauline, and that in fact all Judaeo-Christianity was of the perverted type of the Clementines.

It may be pointed out that one element in Judaeo-Christianity, the so-called Nazarenes, while holding firmly in their own practice to the Jewish ceremonial, in no way sought to impose this on Gentile incomers. We shall endeavour to show, that there are reasonable grounds for believing the author to have been one of this body. Moreover, besides this liberality of view as regards the Mosaic code, it is important to note that, differing from so-called Ebionites, they held high views as to the nature of Christ, and showed a frank recognition of the mission of the apostle Paul among the Gentiles.

As regards the former, they believed in an hypostasis of the divine nature in Christ, either from His birth or His baptism; apparently the latter, though this is by no means clear. Dorner (*Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, vol. i. p. 194; Eng. trans.) thus sums up on this point. It seems probable that they "regarded the Divine in Christ as personal—not, indeed, as a proper power, but that God Himself, in so far as He is *fons omnis Spiritus Sancti*, abides and rests in Him. . . . Moreover, this entire elevation of Christ dates only from His baptism; so that His human personality, wonderful indeed, and proceeding from the Holy Ghost, was already there before it became participant by baptism of that highest indwelling of God." There would appear to be a certain vagueness in the Nazarene belief as to the hypostatic existence of the Holy Ghost, and perhaps there is some reason to suppose that their doctrines on this point had a *tendency* towards Patripassianism. Moreover from a passage of Jerome (*Comm. in Hab.* iii. 3, vol. vi. 1311), we might infer that they identified God who gave the law on Sinai with Christ who was born at Bethlehem. Still, they certainly distinguished Christ personally from God, and, as opposed to the Patripassians, attached great importance to His death on the cross.

As regards the friendly view taken by the Nazarenes of St. Paul, it will be sufficient to cite such a passage as their exposition of Isaiah viii. ix.:—"Postea autem per Evangelium Apostoli Pauli, qui novissimus Apostolorum omnium fuit, ingravata est, id est, multiplicata praedicatio et in terminos gentium et viam universi maris Christi Evangelium splenduit" (*Apud* Hieron. *in Isa.* ix. 1, vol. iv. p. 125).

Now a careful study of those passages of the *Testaments*, from which the Christological views of the writer can be deduced, gives a result quite in harmony with the above. It is true that, as we said above, an attempt has been made to get rid of some of them as interpolations, which we shall speak of subsequently, as well as the passage respecting St. Paul (*Benj.* 11).

In favour of the Nazarene origin of the *Testaments*, further points may be noted. The author clearly sees in the Christian dispensation no abrogating of the older law, but a legitimate development of it. He dwells on the duty of benevolence to the poor, on the blessedness of poverty, and the danger of covetousness. He insists, too, on the danger of female attractions and of wine, and on the importance of fasting, both as a means to escape temptation, and as an atonement for actual sin.

Other evidence clearly connecting the book with a Jewish source, may be derived from the mention of the seven heavens, of the Ἐγρήγοροι, the angelic watchers, and from the ethics of the book generally, especially its doctrines as to the nature of sin.

Not all, however, who are convinced of the Jewish origin of the book have acquiesced in the Nazarene theory, and some (*e.g.* Kayser) have attempted to show that the writer was an Ebionite. The arguments brought forward to prove this seem, as a rule, strangely inconclusive. Such are, *e.g.* the inferences deduced from *Naph.* 3, that the writer implies a demon origin of the Gentiles (see Kayser, p. 111), the priority assigned to Israel as a Shemite race, and the destruction of certain non-Shemite races (*Sim.* 6), the reference to Israel as a light of the Gentiles (*Levi* 14), the allusion by Judah to the Canaanitish origin of his wife, and to the non-Canaanitish origin of Tamar, through whom the line of Judah was carried on; or the prohibition against revealing certain mysteries to those outside the pale of Israel (*Jud.* 16, *Gad* 6). Kayser further

maintains that Christ and Moses are spoken of as holding equal rank, and that in one passage they are identified (p. 119, cf. *Levi* 8, 17). In the command of Levi (c. 9) to bathe, he sees (p. 126) a trace of the Ebionite ritual, remarking that it is the constant habit of Peter in the Clementines to combine with the *Agapae* the practice of bathing, and citing on this point *Recog.* iv. 3, v. 36. He sees also in the command in the same passage to salt the Eucharist, an allusion to the Ebionite Eucharist (cf. *Hom.* xiv. 1).

Against all these details it is sufficient to urge the broad features which characterize the work as a whole. No Ebionite (in the restricted sense of the word) could maintain the doctrine of the salvation of all the heathen, set forth so fully and freely by the author of the *Testaments*. Very suggestive, too, in this connection is his reference to the tearing of the temple-veil at Christ's death as the act in which the spirit of God went over to the heathen. Ritschl (p. 172) well sums up the case: "The recognition of Gentile Christians, in connection with the pressing expectation of the conversion of the whole Jewish people, characterizes the Judaeo-Christian author of the book as a Nazarene, and with this agrees immediately his view of the person of Christ. Now this is no other than the Nazarene view that Jesus was man, and at His baptism the Holy Ghost came down to rest upon Him, and wrought in Him holiness, righteousness, knowledge, sinlessness."

Date.—As regards the date when the *Testaments* were written, we see that they must be assigned to a time anterior to Origen, and most probably to Tertullian, and even Irenaeus. Our work was also undoubtedly written after the destruction of Jerusalem. Further, the Gentiles now apparently formed a majority in Christendom, the sacred books of the New Dispensation had been collected into a volume,[a] the doctrine of the Incarnation was now expressed by many formulae. All this points to the end of the 1st or the beginning of the 2nd century.

Important evidence towards fixing a posterior limit to the date may be derived from the language used with reference to the priesthood. Christ is both High Priest and King, and His former office is higher than the latter. Hence the author continually insists that Christ is pre-eminently our High Priest, and to Him, therefore, the old priesthood must resign its rights. Now such language as this would be well nigh meaningless after Hadrian's destruction of Jerusalem, consequent on the revolt of Bar-Cochba (A.D. 135); since then all power of Judaism for acting directly upon Christianity was gone, and the old ceremonial system had come to an end; and, indeed, on the hypothesis of a later date, we might fairly have looked for some allusions to the revolt and its suppression. We thus believe that the writing of the *Testaments* may be placed in a period ranging from late in the 1st century to the revolt of Bar-Cochba. For a discussion of the views of others as to the date see Vorstman, pp. 13–22.

Language.—As regards the language, there can be no doubt that the *Testaments* were originally written in the Hellenistic Greek, in which we now possess them, though it is of course possible that a "Hebrew" work existed, on which the present is based.

That the present Greek is the original, may be urged (1) from the title of the book, *αἱ διαθῆκαι τῶν ιβ' πατριαρχῶν*, where *διαθήκη* is clearly used not in its Hellenistic meaning of *covenant* (answering to the Hebrew בְּרִית, for which it stands in the LXX. no less than 270 times), but in its ordinary classical meaning of *testament*. Now it is not easy to see for what Hebrew the present Greek title could be equivalent, and for such a Hebrew title as we might *à priori* have expected, *ἐντολαί*, *εὐλογίαι*, or *μαρτύρια* might rather have been looked for: (2) from the frequent instances of paronomasia, hardly possible on the hypothesis of a Hebrew original. Such are *ἀθετεῖν*, *νουθετεῖν* (*Benj.* 4); *ἀφαίρεσις*, *ἀναίρεσις* (*Jud.* 23); *λιμός*, *λοιμός* (*ibid.*); *ἐν τάξει*, *ἄτακτον* (*Naph.* 2); *τάξις*, *ἀταξία* (*Naph.* 3): (3) from the frequent use of the genitive absolute, of the verb *μέλλειν*, and of various expressions appertaining to the Greek philosophy, such as *διάθεσις*, *αἴσθησις*, *φύσις*, *τέλος*. (4) The apparent knowledge and use of the Septuagint also points to the same result.[b] (5) Such expressions too may be cited as *θυμὸς* in the double sense of mind and anger (*Dan* 3), *δικαιοπραγία* (*Dan* 1), *καινόσπουδος* (*Naph.* 1), *γενόμενοι τῆς βουλῆς* (*Jud.* 9) and the like. (6) Other arguments have also been urged which seem to us to carry much less weight. Thus it is pointed out that we have the spelling Βελίαρ, whereas Βελίαλ would represent the Hebrew spelling. But to this it is sufficient to answer, that the word also occurs in Syriac with the former spelling. Nor is the presence of such phrases as *πόλεμον πολεμεῖν* (cf. 1 Sam. xxv. 28, 2 Chron. xxxii. 8), and the like, of any moment, when the same are found occurring in the LXX.

The Apocalyptic element of the Testaments.—Before proceeding to discuss the nature of the historical tradition embodied in our document, it is worth while to refer briefly to its distinctly apocalyptic element. It is in connection with this that we find the book of Enoch so frequently referred to. Seven out of the twelve allude to it as *γραφὴ Ἐνὼχ* (*Sim.* 5, *Levi* 14, *Naph.* 4), *βίβλος* [*βιβλίον*, *βιβλία*, *λόγοι*] *Ἐνὼχ τοῦ δικαίου* (*Levi* 10, 16; *Jud.* 18, *Dan* 5, *Benj.* 9), *γραφὴ νόμου Ἐνὼχ* (*Zeb.* 3), and other similar expressions. Most of these citations, however, are not to be found in the book of Enoch in the form in which we now possess it. Unless, therefore, we refer them to some other book bearing the name of Enoch, not now existing, which is not very probable, we must conclude that they are general appeals to the spirit and substance of the book, regarded as a great fount of prophecy. This idea, that the appeal is of a general nature, is rendered more likely by such references as those to the *γραφὴ*

---

[a] That is, if the reference to St. Paul (*Benj.* 11) be not treated as an interpolation.

[b] Thus in *Jud.* 24 there seems a clear allusion to Balaam's prophecy (Num. xxiv. 17), where the LXX. translates the שבט of the original by *ἄνθρωπος*. Again, in *Jos.* 13, the name of Potiphar is spelt Πετεφρίς, suggestive of the LXX. spelling, Πετεφρῆς. In *Jos.* 2, however, we have also the spelling more nearly the Hebrew, Φωτιμάρ, perhaps a trace of a composite documentary source for the Testament of Joseph.

πατερῶν by the patriarch Zebulun (*Zeb.* 7), and to αἱ πλάκες τῶν οὐρανῶν (*Levi* 5; *Asher* 2, 7). Not being prophets themselves, the patriarchs, when they wish to declare the future, require some fount of prophecy to draw from, such as the books of the fathers who lived before them, especially of Enoch. Thus without hesitation the author of the *Testaments* appeals to books that may have been assumed to have once existed, but are now no longer in circulation.[e]

Of the "Heavenly Tablets" spoken of above it is impossible to speak with certainty, save that the general idea of it is that of a book which contains what is foreknown and foreordained in heaven as to the course of the future (Dillmann, p. 245). It is several times referred to in the book of Enoch (cc. 71, 93, 103, 106), and in the book of *Jubilees* (cc. 5, 6, 19). In the *Testaments*, the "Heavenly Tablets" are thrice appealed to: Levi (c. 5) speaks of the slaughter of the Shechemites as foretold thereon. Asher (c. 7) refers to the future unbelief of his children as recorded in the Tablets. The same patriarch, in speaking of the concurrence of good and evil in a man, draws an illustration from the unclean beasts of the old Mosaic code, and adds "for God hath spoken thus in the Heavenly Tablets" (c. 2).

Another document which, though not cited by name, was evidently well known to the author of the *Testaments*, is the book of *Jubilees*, as is evident from a comparison of their common historic details, of which we shall afterwards speak.

It will thus be seen that the *Testaments*, though not an apocalypse in form, contain a considerable apocalyptic element. The author was familiar with and made large use of writings of this class, the apocalypses of Daniel and Enoch, and the book of *Jubilees*. Indeed Lücke goes so far as to see traces due to the Revelation of St. John, though this may fairly be questioned.

So far as the apocalyptic element in the *Testaments* is occupied with definite Messianic prophecies, we shall speak of them under a separate heading. Of the more striking visions recorded in the book, are two vouchsafed to Levi. In one of these (c. 3), the patriarch passes from the first heaven into the second, and beholds the third heaven of surpassing brightness. The angel who accompanies him mentions that there are seven heavens in all, each with its proper inhabitants; and finally opens to him the gate of the highest heaven, where he sees "the Holy Temple and the Most High upon a throne of Glory" (c. 5). In another vision (c. 8), Levi sees seven men in white raiment, who severally bestowed upon him the seven insignia of the priesthood.

Besides these, two visions of Naphtali are recorded; in one he sees, when standing on the Mount of Olives, the Sun and Moon stand still (c. 5), and in the other he sees Joseph escaping in a storm at sea (c. 6).

The Historical Element in the Testaments.—Wrought up with the exhortations of the various patriarchs is a large amount of historic narrative. We need not have much hesitation in considering that many of the details here given are historically true, when it is remembered that the New Testament itself shows traces of a knowledge of historical facts, not recorded in the Old Testament. Such details, traditionally handed down, have been doubtless alloyed with further particulars from some well-meaning inventor, whether with the idea of making the Old Testament picture yet more graphic; or of finding some support for his own dogmatic views.

As regards the historic details in the *Testaments*, not derived from the Old Testament, it may be noted that *as a rule*, they are, whether true or not, at any rate reasonable; and further, that many of them are supported by similar statements in various other writings, Josephus, the Targums, and especially the book of *Jubilees*.

Speaking generally, the historical statements of the *Testaments* range from the time of Jacob's sojourn with Laban, to the descent of the patriarchs into Egypt. There is, however, one allusion to the earlier period of Abraham, when there is an attempted outrage on Sarah, and violence done to Abraham's servants on the part of the Shechemites (*Levi* 6). Several of the patriarchs give details as to their birth and the giving of their names (*Sim.* 2, *Jud.* 3, *Zeb.* 1). Issachar (c. 1) gives a long story of the incident of the mandrakes, in connection with which the asceticism in regard to marriage, which was characteristic of the Nazarene sect, is strongly marked. Naphtali tells of the parentage of Bilhah and Zilpah, who are made out to be daughters of Rutheus, brother of Deborah, Rebekah's nurse (*Naph.* 1: this differs from the Targ. Ps. Jon. on Gen. xxix. 24, 29, according to which, Bilhah and Zilpah are daughters of Laban).

To the subsequent history—the flight from Laban, the covenant at Gal-Ed, the wrestling with the angel at Peniel, or the meeting with Esau—we find no allusion till the time of Jacob's sojourn at Shalem in Shechem, when the treacherous slaughter of the Shechemites by Simeon and Levi is not merely excused but commended (*Levi* 2, 5), as done under the authority of a divine command. After this they journey to Bethel, where Isaac sets forth to Levi the law of God (*Levi* 9, cf. *Jubilees* 31, 32). On this journey occurred Reuben's act of unchastity with Bilhah (*Reub.* 3), and against the sin of unchastity most of his exhortation is directed. In this he refers to the fall of the Ἐγρήγοροι, the heavenly watchers, who, allured by the beauty of earthly women, left their first estate (*Reub.* 5, cf. *Jubilees* 33). On this same journey also, Rachel died in giving birth to Benjamin (*Benj.* 1).

They reach Hebron in time to see the aged Isaac before his death. To this period we must assign the victorious wars waged with the Canaanitish kings, in which Judah is made to fill the most prominent part (*Jud.* 3; cf. *Jubilees* 34, where we find a very close connection between the two passages). The dark incident in the life of Judah, related in Genesis xxxviii., his marriage with a wife of the race of Ham, and the story of Tamar, are gone into at great length (*Jud.* 8, 10, sqq.). Much stress is

---

[e] See on this point Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, p. xli., cf. p. lv., where he calls attention to the tacit employment of the book of Enoch, without special acknowledgment, by the author of the *Testaments*.

laid upon the fact, that Tamar was not of Canaanite, but of Shemite race (cf. Targ. Onkelos and Targ. Ps. Jonathan on Gen. xxxviii. 2). The minute chronological details which the *Testaments* give show that to this period must be assigned the war with Esau (*Jud.* 9).

It is, however, in connection with Joseph that we find the most elaborate story. We meet with several allusions to the jealousy felt against him by his brethren, especially Simeon, which may doubtless be connected with the fact of Simeon's detention in Egypt (*Sim.* 2; cf. Targ. Ps. Jonathan on Gen. xxxvii. 19; xlii. 24; *Breshith Rabba*, § 91, fol. 91, 4). Zebulun, who refers (c. 1) complacently to his own conduct in the case of Joseph, dwells on the action of Simeon, with whom he associates Gad. The latter, however, seeks to exculpate himself by accusing Joseph of having slandered him to their father (cf. Targ. Ps. Jonathan on Genesis xxxvii. 2).

It is naturally in the *Testament* of Joseph himself that the fullest details are given; and here we find two distinct accounts, which in certain parts cover the same ground, not necessarily due to interpolation, but more probably to a double documentary origin. The second account dwells more especially on the earlier history, from the sale of Joseph to the Ishmaelites, and is much the more elaborate of the two accounts, entering largely into details. It may be noted again that the name of Potiphar is differently spelt in the two accounts, *Φωτιμάρ* in the former, and *Πετεφρίς* (Cod. Cant.), or *Πεντεφρῆς* (Cod. Oxon.) in the latter.[d]

A few notices of the later history are to be met with in several of the *Testaments*. Thus, for example, Levi gives minute details as to the birth of his three sons, whose children also are mentioned (c. 11). Curiously enough, although the marriage of Amram and Jochebed is spoken of, there is no reference to the birth of Moses. Each patriarch is said to have been buried at Hebron, in the cave of Machpelah, like Abraham, Isaac and Jacob before them, and in the case of several of them it is added that they were placed in a coffin prior to burial, a practice naturally suggested by their sojourn in Egypt (*Reub.* 7, *Sim.* 8, *Levi* 19, *Zeb.* 10, *Benj.* 12). In the *Testament* of Benjamin (*l. c.*), it is added that the bodies were secretly carried away, and the *Testament* of Simeon (*l. c.*) notes that this was done during a war with the Egyptians.

Attention has been already called to the great amount of chronological details embodied in the *Testaments*, which, in spite of occasional gaps, yield on the whole harmonious results. A single instance may be given by way of illustration. Benjamin tells us (c. 1) that he was born when his father was 100 years old, and that Joseph was born twelve years previously. This fixes the date of the birth of Joseph relatively to Jacob's life taken as our standard of reference, and therefore the date of the death of Joseph (whom we know from Genesis l. 26 to have lived 110 years, which coincides with the statement of *Test. Levi*, c. 12, that he died in the 118th year of the patriarch Levi) relatively to the same standard. It is not necessary to give further instances, the above will serve as an example of the way in which the system is built up.

[d] Πεντεφρίς, Codd. Rom. et Patm.

As regards the source whence our chronological and other more general historical details have been derived, one document may especially be named, the book of *Jubilees* already referred to. The amount of coincidence between the two writings is too great to allow of any other supposition, than that the writer of the later document was acquainted with, and made free use of the earlier. Dillmann, in his remarks, appended to his translation of the Ethiopic version of the *Jubilees* (in Ewald's *Jahrbücher des Biblischen Wissenschaft*, for 1850, pp. 91 sqq.), cites a long list of instances of this agreement. Thus we find in both writings the account of Jacob's visit to Isaac, the story of Bilhah's bath and her dishonouring by Reuben during Jacob's absence (*Reub.* 3; cf. *Jubil.* 33); Levi's dream respecting his priesthood (*Levi* 2, 4, 5, 8; cf. *Jubil.* 32), and his consecration to the priesthood by Isaac (*Levi* 9, cf. *Jubil.* 31); the name of Levi's wife Melcha (*Levi* 11, cf. *Jubil.* 34); the battles of Jacob and his sons against the Amorites (*Jud.* 3–7, cf. *Jubil.* 34, 38); the wars of Esau and his sons against Jacob and his sons; how Esau maintained his ground on the hill of Adoram, and how the sons of Jacob pursued after the Edomites and imposed tribute upon them (*Jud.* 9, cf. *Jubil.* 37); the story of Bathshua, Tamar, Er and Onan (*Jud.* 10, cf. *Jubil.* 41); Judah's penitence and humiliation (*Jud.* 19, cf. *Jubil.* 41); the burial of the sons of Jacob during the war of the Egyptians (*Reub.* 7, *Sim.* 8, etc., cf. *Jubil.* 46).

Besides the above, Dillmann also refers to other points, which, though not strictly speaking historical coincidences, imply a close connection between the books, such, for instance, are the mention of the "Heavenly Tablets," to which we have already referred (*Levi* 5, *Asher* 2, 7; cf. *Jubil.* 5, and often); the praise of Simeon and Levi for their deed to the Shechemites (*Levi* 5, 6; *Jubil.* 30); the reckoning according to Jubilees and weeks (*Levi* 17); the expression "slept the eternal sleep" (*Iss.* 7, *Dan* 7, *Jos.* 20; cf. *Jubil.* 36); the mention of the "writing of the fathers" (*Zeb.* 9), and of the *γραφὴ νόμου* (*Zeb.* 3). In Isaac's instruction to Levi as to the priestly office, he lays stress upon the same points as Abraham in his instruction to Isaac, such, according to the *Jubilees*, as the necessity of bathing before and after sacrifice, the employment of salt in the sacrifices and the like (*Levi* 9).

There is, further, a large amount of coincidence in chronological details in the two works. Such are the following:—Levi came into Canaan at eight years of age, he slew the Shechemites at eighteen, became a priest at twenty (*Levi* 12): at twenty Judah warred with the Amorites (*Jud.* 7), at forty with the Edomites (*Jud.* 9), at forty-six he went down into Egypt (*Jud.* 12): Gad died at the age of 125, and after the lapse of five years was buried in Canaan (*Gad* 8): Benjamin was born when Jacob was 100 years old (*Benj.* 1).

There would seem indeed to be but three passages in which the chronology of the two documents is at variance, and in these it is likely that the difference may be due to a slip on the part of the author of the *Testaments*.

Thus (1) it is said (*Levi* 9) that Levi went down into Egypt at the age of forty: this cannot harmonise with the statement (*Jud.* 12) that at the time of this event, Judah, a younger brother, was aged forty-six. Nor can we suppose here a mere error of the MSS., for Judah says that he "went into Egypt at the age of forty-six, and lived there seventy-three years." Thus Judah died at the age of 119 years, which agrees with the definite statement of another passage (*Jud.* 26).

Again (2), it is said (*Benj.* 12) that the bones of the patriarchs were carried to Hebron, *ἐνενηκοστῷ πρώτῳ ἔτει τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου.*[e] If we interpret this literally, the *Testaments* are found inconsistent with themselves (*Gad* 8). If, however, following the Latin version, we supply *πρὸ* before *τῆς ἐξόδου*, the *Testament* is at variance with the *Jubilees* (c. 36). Dillmann therefore proposes (*op. cit.* p. 93 n.) to alter the text into "the ninetieth year of their entry into Egypt."

Lastly (3), it was at the age of thirty that Reuben committed incest with Bilhah (*Reub.* 1), differing by one year-week from the statement of the *Jubilees.*

Besides the above three points of chronology, there is a further variation in a simple historical statement. In the *Testaments*, Joseph (c. 20) bids his children to carry up Zilpah[f] out of Egypt and bury her in Canaan, but according to the *Jubilees* she died in Canaan. Dillmann sensibly remarks on this, that because a writer largely employs an earlier authority, he need not therefore follow it in everything.

In the presence of so great a mass of agreement, and so few variations, we cannot doubt a very extensive employment of one document by the author of the other; and considering that in the *Jubilees* the history is given in a continuous and connected form, and in the *Testaments* in merely broken fragments, and further, that in the *Testaments* some of the stories seem to have received a large amount of development, we cannot doubt that the *Testaments* are the later work.

Many details, it need hardly be said, are found in the *Testaments*, which are not derived from the *Jubilees*, and doubtless a large number of similar books existed in which the current historical tradition was minutely worked up. (See Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. i. p. 289 n., ed. 3.)

Christology of the Testaments.—If the obvious intention of our book be considered, namely, the conversion of the Jews, and that by means of a narrative cast in popular form, it will follow that we cannot with any reasonableness look for an elaborately worked out theological system. Thus in the passages which bear on the subject of the Nature of our Lord, there is much which seems almost contradictory, and thus that most convenient, but most dangerous tool, a theory of interpolation, has been freely applied; though it seems to us at least as sensible to explain the difficulty by remembering that we have here not a theological code, but a religious essay in a popular form.[g]

We find in the *Testaments* two distinct sets of references to the Messiah, the one speaking of Him as man alone, the other as God coming into the world in the likeness of man. It seems to me that there is no inherent improbability in the idea that the writer, having a practical object in view, dwells now on one aspect of our Lord's nature, now on the other. Kayser, however, who maintains the Ebionite origin of the work, condemns the whole of the latter set of references as interpolations, thus bringing down the resulting idea of the Messiah to one purely human (*op. cit.* p. 113; cf. Ritschl, p. 173 n.).

The passages in which the *Testaments* refer to the Messiah in His human aspect, are *Levi* 16, *Jud.* 24, and *Naph.* 4. The exceeding fewness is suggestive, as showing that the Humanity of Christ, merely as such, was not a point which the writer had specially set before him to inculcate on his readers. Moreover, in all three passages the writer shows that he sees in the Humanity of Christ more than in human nature generally. Thus Levi, while calling him *ἀνήρ*, adds, "ye will slay Him, as ye suppose, not knowing His resurrection, . . . and because of Him shall your holy places be desolate." Judah's words are still stronger, "upon Him shall the heavens be opened to pour forth the spirit and blessing of the Father . . . This is the offspring (*βλαστός*) of the most high God, and this is the fountain unto life to all flesh." Naphtali, though calling him *ἄνθρωπος*, also styles him significantly *σπλάγχνον κυρίου.*[h] To these three passages may be added the reference to the Messiah's baptism, "The heavens shall be opened, and from the temple of glory the consecration (*ἁγίασμα*) shall come upon Him with the voice of the Father, as from Abraham the father of Isaac" (*Levi* 18: see Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, vol. i. 156, Eng. trans.).

We shall now collect the references to Messiah as God, or as in some sense Divine. Dan (c. 6) bids his children "draw near to God, and to the Angel that intercedeth for you;" where the context clearly shows that by the "Angel" is meant the Messiah. (See however, Ritschl, p. 174.) He is the "only-begotten" of "the Most High" (*Benj.* 9), the "Son of the Lord" (*Levi* 4). An important passage is *Simeon* 4, ". . . the Lord, the great God of Israel, shall appear upon the earth as man, and shall save by Him Adam. . . . Then will I arise in joy. . . . because God hath taken a body and eateth with men, and hath saved them."[i] Simeon also (c. 7) bids his children obey Levi and Judah, "For from them shall arise unto you the Salva-

[e] This is the reading of Cod. C. In O is read *καὶ ἐν τῷ ϙ ἔτει.* Codd. R, P, omit the whole passage. For the names of these MSS. see below.

[f] This holds of Cod. C. only. The whole passage is omitted in OP, and in R for *Ζελφὰν* is read *Ἀσυνέθ*, which looks like the emendation of a copyist, who remembered that Zilpah had no special connection with Joseph, Bilhah having been Rachel's handmaid.

[g] For a careful and elaborate statement of the case in favour of the interpolation theory, reference may specially be made to the monograph of F. Schnapp, to be mentioned below.

[h] A paragraph of some length, including the above passage, is omitted in Cod. O. It is found in the other three MSS. Vorstman (p. 70) argues on grammatical grounds, which do not seem at all conclusive, for the omission of the clause *ἄνθρωπος . . . . ἐγγύς.*

[i] The genuineness of this passage has been attacked by Kayser and Vorstman. Cod. O omits the words *ὡς ἄνθρωπος.*

-tion of God. For the Lord shall raise up unto you from Levi as it were a priest, and from Judah as it were a king, God and man." There seems to be no argument for rejecting these words, except that such an omission is necessary for the theory of the Ebionite origin of the book. The next passage on our list (*Levi* 4) is perhaps somewhat more doubtful. Here Levi refers to the "passion (πάθος) of the Most High," while men persistently abide in unbelief. Here a paragraph is introduced by the plural γινώσκετε—, as though the patriarch were addressing his children, though the context, both before and after is clearly the address of the angel to Levi. If the whole passage be genuine, the reference to the "passion of the Most High" may perhaps illustrate the *tendency* to Patripassianism in the Nazarene theology, to which we have already referred. Again (*Levi* 5) we read, "And [the Most High] said to me, Levi, I have given to thee all the blessings of the priesthood, until I shall come and dwell in the midst of Israel." Vorstman objects that this statement of the coming of the Most High as the term of the priesthood of Levi, takes a different ground from former passages (*Reub.* 6, *Levi* 4), where it is said that the priesthood of Levi shall endure till "the times of Christ, the High-Priest," "till the Lord shall visit all the nations in the tender mercy of His Son." Still, in the New Testament itself, our Saviour is viewed both in the special aspect of the Minister (παῖς) of the Father, and as Himself Very and Eternal God. Further, if we accept Vorstman's view, we must omit either from καὶ εἶπέ μοι, or from ἕως οὗ to Ἰσραήλ. In the former case, the narrative is obviously deficient, for surely Levi's vision of the Holy temple and the Most High would call for some further narrative: in the other case, we might fairly look for a second clause to balance the first.

Judah (c. 22) speaks of the "appearing (παρουσία) of the God of righteousness to give quietness in peace to Jacob and all nations." Vorstman (p. 75) urges that the clause ἕως . . . δικαιοσύνης can be omitted without any dislocation of the text, a rather slender argument for doubting its genuineness; and attempts, without any show of reason, to distinguish "Deus justitiae" and "Deus Altissimus." Zebulun, in language borrowed from the prophecy of Malachi, tells his children (c. 9), "And after these things, shall the Lord Himself rise up unto you, the light of righteousness, and healing and compassion on his wings . . . And ye shall see God in the fashion (σχήματι) of a man, whom the Lord will choose, Jerusalem is his name."[k] Vorstman objects to this passage that it speaks of the appearance of Messiah as followed by man's rejection of Him till "the time of consummation," whereas in *Levi* 10, Messiah's appearance is itself referred to the "consummation of the ages." Still, while it is possible there may be some corruption of text, there seems little difficulty in associating the word συντέλεια with either advent of our Saviour.

[k] The texts of Codd. O, R, are much more concise than that of Codd. C, P. The last clause in the former pair runs καὶ ὄψεσθε κύριον ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.

Dan (c. 5) speaks of the Lord being in Jerusalem, walking with men. Naphtali (c. 8) says that "God shall be seen dwelling among men on the earth." Against these no valid objective argument is brought. The words in the *Testament* of Asher (c. 7) are perhaps not free from the suspicion of being an interpolation. Asher tells his children that they should be dispersed through the world till "the Most High should visit the earth, Himself coming as a man (ἄνθρωπος) eating and drinking with man . . . He shall save Israel and all the Gentiles, God speaking in the person of a man (εἰς ἄνδρα)."[l]

Lastly, Benjamin (c. 10) tells his children "We also shall rise, each one in our tribe, and worship the King of heaven who appeared upon earth in the form of a man of humility . . . And the Lord shall judge Israel first, even for the wrong they did unto Him; for when He appeared as a Deliverer, God in the flesh, they believed Him not. And then shall He judge all the Gentiles, as many as believed Him not when He appeared upon earth." It is certainly strange that in this passage we should have an instance of the verb πιστεύειν governing an accusative, though immediately before and after it we find it with a dative.

Taking then this series of quotations, we find Christ spoken of as "God and man," "God in the fashion of man," "God of righteousness," "the Lord, the great God of Israel, appearing on the earth as man;" and it may be reasonably maintained that though one or two passages may be corrupt, there are no sufficient grounds for doubting the genuineness of the mass of them. Most are found in all the known MSS., and few can be struck out without seriously dislocating the text. Further, we must repeat what has been already said that in those passages where the author of the *Testaments* refers to the human nature of Messiah, his language in every case implies a belief in the existence of something beyond, something more or less divine.

One more point in connection with the nature of Messiah may be briefly noticed, His birth from a virgin. This is dwelt on in a vision in the *Testament* of Joseph (c.19), where from "a virgin wearing a linen garment" goes forth "a Lamb without spot." The virgin is of the tribe of Judah (*l. c.*); but she is seen in Joseph's dream wearing a linen garment which implies a connection with the priestly tribe.[m] In accordance with this, Christ is several times spoken of in the *Testaments* as coming forth from the two tribes of Judah and Levi. Various traces moreover of a tradition connecting the new royalty of Messiah with the old sacerdotal tribe are found in patristic writings.

It remains now that we should refer to the view taken in the *Testaments* as to the work

[l] The last clause is not found in Cod. O. Vorstman (p.70 n.) calls attention to the unusual construction with ὑποκρίνομαι, which, in the sense of acting the part of any person, governs a simple accusative. Curiously, Cod. R. reads ἐπικρινόμενος, and Cod. P. ἀποκρινάμενος.

[m] See *Protev. Jacobi* (cc. 6, 7, 9), where Mary, though not said to be born of the tribe of Levi, yet by dedication and residence in the temple acquired something of the priestly character. It may be added that St. Luke (i. 36) distinctly tells us that Mary was the kinswoman of Elizabeth, who was "of the daughters of Aaron."

and office of Christ. We have already noticed that Christ is frequently spoken of as both King and High-Priest (*Sim.* 7, *Gad* 8, *Dan* 5, *Jos.* 19); and since these two offices were originally divided between Judah and Levi, it is continually remarked that Christ is sprung from the tribe of Levi as well as from that of Judah. Hence, Levi and Judah are themselves often spoken of as the representatives of Messiah in these His two capacities; and as Christ's priestly office is higher than His kingly office, so is Levi higher in rank than Judah. In one respect, the analogy of Levi's representative functions fails: to Levi is assigned the whole circle of priestly offices (*Reub.* 6, *Levi* 2, 4); but Christ, the new High Priest, is in no place said to offer sacrifices as His predecessors had done; that is, although the Levitical priesthood finds its fulfilment in Christ, yet the special function of that priesthood, the offering of sacrifices, was to come to an end. When the fullness of time shall have come, then shall Christ, "the Lamb of God, and the Saviour of the world" be "given up, spotless for the wicked, and sinless shall He die for the impious" (*Benj.* 3).

It must be noted, however, that but slight stress is laid upon the benefits accruing to man from the death of Messiah. Besides the foregoing passage, Reuben's words may be cited, "For you shall He die in wars seen and unseen, and shall be among you an everlasting king" (*Reub.* 6). In both the above passages it will be noticed that the victory over the kingdom of evil forms an essential part of the work of Messiah. The paucity of passages of this kind, and the fact that they are not connected specially with the priesthood of Christ, have led Ritschl (*op. cit.* p. 176) to consider that "the author does not seem to have referred the priesthood of Christ to His self-immolation." He argues that in the view of the writer of the *Testaments* the highest heaven where God dwells is the real temple, the Holy of Holies (*Levi* 3, 5); that the analogy is maintained, by placing in the fifth [sixth] heaven the angels of the presence of God, who offer before Him for the sins of the righteous offerings of incense and bloodless sacrifices (*Levi* 3); and since so high a position is assigned to Christ that He is ascended from earth to heaven (*Benj.* 9), that through His priesthood all sin may be blotted out, therefore we may infer the author's views to be that the priestly office of Christ is really to be found in His exaltation to heaven, and in the offering of intercession there performed.

We have already spoken of the language used of the mediating angel, the Messiah in His pre-existent state, before He actually assumed the functions of Messiah (*Dan* 6; see Dorner, *op. cit.* p. 15). Ritschl speaks of this angel as "the mediator for pre-Messianic times;" but, more than this, it would seem also that this angel is identified personally with the Messiah, and is not merely a representative of His functions.

Besides being High Priest, the Messiah is also King, in which capacity He is spoken of as springing from the tribe of Judah (see *e.g.* *Sim.* 7). His it is to wage war and to triumph over Beliar, the personification of the kingdom of evil (*Levi* 18, *Dan* 5, 6, *Benj.* 3).

The Messiah is a Saviour (*Levi* 2, *Dan* 5, *Jos.* 19, *Benj.* 3), and the salvation wrought by Him is continually referred to as bestowed on the condition of faith: the kingdom of evil is to come to an end "on the day on which *Israel shall believe*" (*Dan* 6). In two passages (*Levi* 16, 18) there is even an allusion, though not very definite, to baptism in this connection.

We have already spoken of the comparatively slight stress laid on the doctrine of the atonement. Our Lord's sufferings are, however, several times referred to, though not in their vicarious character (see *e.g.* *Levi* 4, 10, 14, 16, *Benj.* 9). The rending of the temple veil is spoken of as the act in which the Spirit of God went over to the Gentiles (*Benj.* 9, cf. *Levi* 10). In the former of these passages is a possible reference to the descent of Christ into hell, but in the absence of any allusion to a "preaching to the spirits in prison," it seems more likely that the words refer to the resurrection of our Lord from the grave.

There are two references to our Lord's ascension and triumphant reception into heaven (*Levi* 18, *Benj.* 9); but there seems to be but one passage, and that far from definite, of the Saviour's return for judgment (*Levi* 16), though the *Testaments* abound with expressions relating to the eternal kingship of Christ after His work on earth has been performed (see *e.g.* *Reub.* 6, *Levi* 18, *Jos.* 19). We may add here a remark as to the views of our author as to the resurrection of mankind. That the righteous shall rise again and rejoice with Messiah is insisted on strongly; and the resurrection of the wicked also, though less stress is laid upon it, is definitely alluded to (see especially *Jud.* 25, and cf. *Sim.* 6, *Levi* 18, *Zeb.* 10, *Benj.* 10).

The references in the *Testaments* to the nature and office of the Holy Spirit are but few and vague (see *e.g.* *Levi* 18, *Sim.* 4, *Jud.* 24, *Benj.* 9). It must be admitted that in these we can find no trace of any definite belief in the Holy Ghost as a distinct person of the Godhead; indeed, in none of the passages except the last is the Spirit spoken of in a personal aspect at all, and in the last there is but an approach to this idea.

Reference to St. Paul.—It may be well to add a few remarks here as to the reference to St. Paul in *Benj.* 11, which some critics have maintained to be an interpolation. It must be remembered, however, that of the four Greek MSS. at present known, only one, the Roman MS., omits the essential element of the passage (from φῶς γνώσεως to the end of c. 11), and that frequent omissions are very characteristic of this MS. The Oxford and Patmos MSS., which both display the same tendency, have the passage with trifling variations. Moreover, the much greater antiquity of the Cambridge MS. must, in a matter of this kind, be allowed reasonable weight.

The only independent version of which as yet anything is known, the Armenian, may indeed be said to be an adverse witness; only, it must be remembered, there is as yet only forthcoming the evidence of one MS. of this version, that at Vienna (*vide infra*), from which a German rendering of this and another passage is given in my *Appendix* (pp. 26, 27). Moreover, it is rather dangerous to rest a case on the evidence of a single MS., from which three whole *Testaments*, those of Reuben, Naphtali and Dan, are altogether wanting.

On the other hand, the passage of Tertullian already cited possesses considerable weight, as rendering it extremely probable that the disputed passage here was known to that writer.

Various objections of detail have also been brought against the passage, which do not seem to be at all convincing. The following are urged by Kayser (p. 139):—(i.) Some of the patriarchs (*Zeb.* 10, *Asher* 7, *Jos.* 20) conclude their predictions by declaring the reception of Israel within God's kingdom. This would also be the case with *Test. Benj.* if the suspected passage were removed. We fail to see, however, why all the *Testaments* should conclude in the same way; and further, seeing that there is no reason for disputing the first sentence of c. 11, the *Testament* would in this case end most abruptly. (ii.) If the writer could say of St. Paul that he should be ὡς μουσικὸν μέλος ἐν στόματι πάντων, it is strange that the same idea should also be used as expressing reproach, for Judah in his warning says (c. 23) τὰς θυγατέρας ὑμῶν μουσικὰς καὶ δημοσίας ποιήσετε. Clearly, however, the allusion here is not to music generally, but to women publicly professing the art, who in ancient times bore, as a class, a bad reputation. (iii.) Kayser asserts that συναγωγή (*bis*) and συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in the *Testaments*. The former, however, occurs in *Levi* 11, and the latter in *Levi* 10. Vorstman (p. 35 n.) justly remarks that the use of the word for a Christian assembly (cf. James ii. 2) is, as far as it goes, in favour of the earlier date of the *Testaments*. (iv.) After the author had made Benjamin say, "I will no longer be called a ravening wolf..." (cf. Gen. xlix. 27), it seems strange that he should then speak of St. Paul as ἁρπάζων ὡς λύκος the light of knowledge from Israel to give it to the Gentiles. We can only suppose that the author was not altogether consistent in his use of the metaphor. This anyhow is safer than with Vorstman to cut away the ground from Kayser by supposing the words φῶς ... τῶν ἐθνῶν to be interpolated.

Thus we cannot but feel that the evidence is decidedly in favour of the genuineness of the assailed passage.

The importance of the passage, if genuine, is very great in its bearing on the Canon. The words καὶ ἐν βίβλοις ἁγίαις ἔσται ἀναγραφόμενος καὶ τὸ ἔργον καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ are in this case doubtless the oldest extant testimony [n] to the Acts and Pauline epistles, and to their association with the Old Testament scriptures.

Materials for the text.—As we have already said, the original language of the *Testaments* was certainly Greek. Of Greek MSS., four are at present known: (1) A MS. of the 10th century (Ff. i. 24) in the University Library of Cambridge, from which there can be no doubt that Grosseteste's Latin version was made. Transcripts of this MS., all of about the end of the 17th century, exist in the University Library at Cambridge (Oo. vi. 91), in the Gale collection in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge (O. 4. 24), and in the Library of Queen's College, Oxford (214). We cite this as C. (2) A MS. of the 14th century in the Bodleian Library at Oxford (Barocci 133), brought with the rest of the Barocci collection from Venice in 1629. Transcripts of this MS. are in the Bodleian (Cod. Smith. 117), and in the Library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge (1. 3. 10). We cite this as O. (3) A MS. of the 13th century in the Vatican Library at Rome (Cod. Graec. 731). This was long ago mentioned by Montfaucon (*Bibliotheca Biblioth.* p. 14), and some account of it was given by Vorstman (*Godgeleerde Bijdragen*, 1866, pp. 953 sqq.) We cite this as R. (4) A MS. of the 16th century in the Library of the Monastery of St. John the Evangelist at Patmos (Cod. 411), first noted by the late Rev. H. O. Coxe, Bodley's Librarian. (*Report to Her Majesty's Government on the Greek MSS. yet remaining in the Libraries of the Levant*, 1858.) We cite this as P.

Besides these four MSS., the only version yet known which has an independent value is the Armenian.[o] The *Testaments* are regarded by the Armenian church as a document worthy of much respect, but it is not admitted either into its canon or its ritual. The actual date of the translation is unknown, but it is certainly later than the Armenian translation of the Bible in the fifth century. The style, however, is said to be "classical." John the Deacon, one of the most learned doctors of the Armenian Church (circa A.D. 1100), seems to have regarded it, if not canonical, at any rate worthy of being copied with the rest of Holy Scripture. A homily of unknown authorship, in a MS. dated A.D. 1224, cites the *Testaments*. Six MSS. of the Armenian version of the *Testaments*, with dates varying from A.D. 1220 to A.D. 1656, are in the Library of the Mechitarists of St. Lazare, one of A.D. 1388 in that of the Mechitarists at Vienna, and one of the 14th century in the library of Lord de la Zouche, Parham Park. [These details as to the Armenian version I owe to the Rev. Léon Alishan, Librarian to the Mechitarists of St. Lazare, and to the late Dr. P. Paul, Librarian to the Mechitarists at Vienna.]

The Latin version [p] is of no independent value to the criticism, being, as we have said, undoubtedly made from the Cambridge MS.; for not only does this MS. contain marginal notes in English writing of the 13th century, but the amount of curious verbal coincidence is far too great to be accidental.[q] Still the Latin has an interest, as being the parent of almost all the versions into modern European languages, which

---

[n] Except the reference in 2 Pet. iii. 16.

[o] To this may perhaps be added an old Bulgarian version mentioned by N. Tichonrowow, *Denkmäler der altrussischen Apocryphen Literatur*, S. Petersburg u. Moskau, 1863. There is also a fragment of a Syriac version consisting of *Levi* c. 12 (cod. DCCCLXI. 80: Wright, *Cat. of Syriac MSS. in the British Museum acquired since* 1838).

[p] It is possible that there may have been a Latin version anterior to that of Grosseteste; but no trace is known of any such version.

[q] A few examples may suffice:—*quoniam* for ὅτι (*Reub.* 1), the omission of the clause καὶ κρύπτειν λόγους (*Reub.* 2), the omission of οὐκ before ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν (*Sim.* 5); the errors μετὰ τὸν πατέρα for μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς and μή for μοι (*Levi* 9); the rendering *stare faciet* (*Levi* 18); the error *Jacob* for *Reuben* (*Iss.* 1); the agreement in the numerals (*Zeb.* 1); the rendering *in vultum* for the questionable εἰς εἰδέαν (*Dan* 4); the error μεθ' οὗ for μετ' οὐ (*Benj.* 5).

we shall briefly cite:—The English version by A[rthur] G[olding], first printed by John Day, London, 1577, and subsequently reprinted very frequently. The French version, first printed by Martin Lempereur at Antwerp in 1540 and also by Jaq. Bogard, Paris, 1548, and by Gerard Salenson, Gand, 1555: German, first printed at Basel in 1539 by Lux Schonber: Dutch, without place of printing or printer's name, 1538: the Danish version is due to Hans Mögensson, and was first printed at Copenhagen in 1579. The Bohemian, however, appears to have been the earliest of those made from the Latin, as it is referred to by Thomas Stitny about A.D. 1376. Of several editions of the printed text (1545, 1548, etc.), only two imperfect copies now survive, an unsparing warfare having been waged against the native literature by the Romish priests.

An Icelandic translation, existing in MSS. in the British Museum and elsewhere, has also been made; and also a Welsh version, evidently taken from the English, first printed at Bala in 1700.

The Greek text of the *Testaments* was first printed in Grabe's *Spicilegium* (Oxford, 1698), professedly from the text of the Cambridge MS., but in reality from a very inaccurate transcript of it; to this were appended a few of the variations of the Oxford MS. This was followed by Fabricius in his *Codex Pseudepigraphus Vet. Test.* (Hamburg, 1713), who adds but slightly to the criticism of the subject. In Grabe's second edition (1714), the true text has been restored in several passages, but in many places Grosseteste's Latin version, which witnessed to the true reading, was altered to suit Grabe's incorrect text. Fabricius's second edition (1722) is perhaps, on the whole, less accurate than his first. Since then, the text and notes, as given in Grabe's second edition, have been reprinted, with but few additions, by Gallandi, in his *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, vol. i. pp. 193 sqq. (Venice, 1765). This last has been reprinted in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. ii. (Paris, 1857). The present writer has edited the text of the Cambridge MS. with a full statement of the variations of the Oxford MS. (Cambridge, 1869); together with an appendix (1879) containing a collation of the Roman and Patmos MSS., the former furnished by the kindness of Dr. Ignazio Guidi, and the latter taken from a transcript of the Patmos MS. in the possession of the writer.

The first edition of the Latin version bears neither date (but probably c. 1510–1520), printer's name or place of printing. The text is strangely inaccurate, and as all subsequent ones have been copied from it (modified only so far as Grabe in the second edition of his *Spicilegium* corrected the text by two Latin MSS. in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge), a very large number of errors still remain.

There are numerous reprints, Hagenau, 1532, Paris, 1549, etc.

Literature.—J. E. Grabe's *Praefatio* to his edition of the text of the *Testaments* in his *Spicilegium* (vol. i. Oxon. 1698: ed. 2, 1714). This has been reprinted by Fabricius, Gallandi and Migne (*ut supra*). Nitzsch, *Commentatio Critica de Testamentis XII. Patriarcharum, libro V. T. Pseudepigrapho*, Wittenberg, 1810. Dorner, *Die Lehre von der Person Christi*, vol. i. pp. 255 sqq. Stuttgart, 1845. Lücke, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Joh.*, vol. i. pp. 334 sqq. ed. 2, Bonn, 1848; A. Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der Altkatholischen Kirche*, pp. 322 sqq. Bonn, 1850; ed. 2, 1857, pp. 171–177: A. Kayser, in Reuss and Cunitz's *Beiträge zu den theolog. Wissenschaften* for 1851, pp. 107–140, Jena, 1851; J. M. Vorstman, *De Test. XII. Patriarcharum origine et pretio*, Roterodami, 1857; the same, *Eene nieuwe Uitgave van de twaalf Patriarchen* in the *Godgeleerde Bijdragen* for 1866, pp. 953 sqq. A. Hilgenfeld in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* for 1858, pp. 395 sqq., for 1871, pp. 302 sqq. Leipzig. W. A. van Hengel, *De Testamenten der twaalf Patriarchen op nieuw ter sprake bebragt.* Amsterdam, 1860. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. i. p. 289, vol. vii. pp. 363 sqq. ed. 3, Göttingen, 1864–66; Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi*, pp. 140–157, Freiburg, 1866. Sinker, *The Test. of the XII. Patriarchs. An attempt to estimate their Historic and Dogmatic Worth.* [With this is given the text of the Cambridge MS. and the various readings of the Oxford MS.], Cambridge, 1869. The same, *Appendix, with a collation of the Roman and Patmos MSS., and Bibliographical Notes*, Cambridge, 1879. A. Geiger, in *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft u. Leben*, for 1869, pp. 116–135, Breslau. Ronsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, pp. 325, 415, etc. Leipzig, 1874. F. Schnapp, *Die Test. der zwölf Patriarchen untersucht.* Halle, 1884. E. Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.* vol. ii. pp. 662–669, ed. 2, Leipzig, 1886. [R. S.]

TETERIUS, an author who wrote an account of the miracles performed by the bones of the martyrs St. Cyricus and St. Julitta, which had been brought into France at the beginning of the 5th century by St. Amator, bishop of Auxerre. He is believed to have written about the close of the 6th century (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 404). Only his preface survives, which the Bollandists have printed twice (*Acta SS.* Mai. i. 51–2, Jun. iii. 20–1). In it he calls himself Sophista, *i.e.* professor of eloquence and philosophy, and the servus of these martyrs, whence it is argued that he was one of the clergy of their church at Auxerre (*Hist. Litt.* ibid.; Ceillier, xi. 400). [S. A. B.]

TETHGHAL, bishop of Lynally, King's Co., died Apr. 16, A.D. 709. (*M. Doneg.*, *Four Mast.* by O'Don. i. 309.) [J. G.]

TETRADITES, heretics mentioned by John of Ephesus (*H. E.* tr. by Dr. R. Payne Smith, p. 359) along with Arians, Samosatenians, Manichaeans, and Marcionites. Dr. Payne Smith thinks the Nestorians are intended, and that they are called τετραδῖται from being charged with believing in a quaternity, τετράς, instead of the Holy Trinity. Domenico Magri, as noticed by Dr. Payne Smith, in his *Hierolexicon*, applies the term to the Manichaeans. [C. H.]

TETRADIUS, sixteenth archbishop of Bourges. His date is fixed by his subscriptions to the canons of the council of Agde, held in 506, and the first of Orleans, in 511. Gregory of Tours, who calls him "benedictus episcopus," and "gloriosae memoriae," twice makes mention of a "villa" left by him to the church of St.

Julian in Auvergne (*Hist. Franc.* iii. 16; *De Mirac. S. Juliani*, xiv.). It has been suggested that the Tetradius addressed by Sidonius Apollinaris, in 473 or 474 (*Epist.* iii. 10), was the same person in his pre-episcopal days (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 11). [S. A. B.]

TETRICUS (1), ST., seventeenth bishop of Langres (A.D. 539–572), was present at the fifth council of Orleans, in 549, at that of Toul, convened by Nicetius of Trèves, about 550, at the second of Paris, held in 551, or, according to some about 555, and was represented at that of Lyons, held in 567 (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 520). He was at Dijon when Chramnus, in arms against his father, Clotaire I., invaded Burgundy, and made an ineffectual attempt on that city (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 16). During his episcopate he built an apse to the church of St. John, at Dijon, to receive the body of his father, for the greater convenience of the crowd of people who came to pay their devotions at the tomb (*Vitae Patrum*, cap. vii.). Tetricus was rendered helpless by apoplexy before his death, and the choice of a suffragan and ultimate successor was the cause of much disturbance at Langres (see Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. 5). He was buried near his father, after an episcopate of 33 years, as we learn from a laudatory epitaph of Venantius Fortunatus (*Misc.* iv. 3, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 154), but his body was afterwards removed to the church of St. Benignus. His cult seems to have commenced at once, Gregory of Tours speaking of him both as sanctus and beatus (see too the stories of his appearances in visions to his unworthy successor, and to king Guntram, *Hist. Franc.* v. 5. sub fin. viii. 5). A chapter of the *Liber de Glor. Confess.* is headed *De Tetrico episcopo*, but the body of the chapter is missing (cap. cvii.). His day is March 18 (Boll. *Acta SS.* Mart. ii. 633–5). [S. A. B.]

TETRICUS (2), ST., and martyr, twenty-third bishop of Auxerre (circ. A.D. 694–709). According to his *Acta*, to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. ii. 95, he was originally abbat of St. Germain's at Auxerre, and in the first year of his episcopate held a synod to regulate the order in which the abbats and priests of his diocese should conduct service in the cathedral church, and their remuneration, which is thought to imply that the staff of clergy at Auxerre was insufficient at this time (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 269). He gave a villa, called Maximiacum, to his church, and his subscription is found to two *privilegia* (*ibid.*). After an episcopate of fifteen years and three months, he was murdered by his archdeacon, Ragenfredus, while asleep on a bench. This constitutes his only claim to the honour of martyrdom. The Bollandists mention him on April 12, but he is also commemorated March 16 and 18, the former being the day of his death. [S. A. B.]

TETTA (TUTTA), sister of Ine king of Wessex, and abbess of Wimburn, under whom St. Agatha and St. Lioba were educated (Mabillon, *Acta SS. O.S.B.* Saec. iii. pt. 2, p. 223). Haddan and Stubbs (iii. 343) think she was probably the Eta of the letter of abbat Aldhun, which they print (*Monast. Angl.* ii. 88). [C. H.]

TEWDRIG (THEODORIC), son of Teithfallt king of Morganwg or South Wales, probably belongs to the 6th century, as contemporary with Teilo and St. Oudoceus, but Rees (*Welsh SS.* 184) would prefer a century earlier. He was a great benefactor to the church of Llandaff, and is classed among the Welsh saints, being in the Triads one of the three canonised kings of Britain. He appears to have resigned his throne to his son Meurig, and devoted himself to religion at Tintern, Monmouthshire, when the Saxons marched across the Severn, and were overcoming Meurig. To stem their progress the aged monarch left his retreat and led the forces of Glamorgan to victory, but was himself slain at Merthyr Tewdrig, now Mathern, near the confluence of the Wye and the Severn; his son afterwards erected a church on the spot where he fell. The date of this battle is much disputed; Prof. Rees names A.D. 470 (*W. SS.* 183), Wakeman, A.D. 527 (Rees, *Cambr. Brit. SS.* 608 n.), Ussher, A.D. 577 (*Wks.* vi. 90–1, A.D. 577), and Lappenberg after A.D. 610 (*Hist.* ed. Thorpe, i. 160–1). His feast is Jan. 3. (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, 133 sq. 383, 625; Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 353 et al.) [J. G.]

THADDAEUS. In the list of the Apostles given by Mark (iii. 18), Thaddaeus occupies the tenth place. In Matthew, according to the testimony of Origen (*Praef. Comm. in Epist. ad Rom.* iv. 460, ed. Delarue) with whom *Cod. D* agrees, the original reading, instead of Thaddaeus was Λεββαῖος, though the majority of the MSS. read Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος, or exactly as in Mark simply Θαδδαῖος. Luke writes in both passages Judas Jacobi (Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13). The most ancient tradition of the church does not yet identify Thaddaeus with Judas Jacobi, although even Origen does so. (*Praef. in Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.*) The older legend of Edessa, on which the later accounts of the Greek fathers are founded, regard Thaddaeus as one of the Seventy (or rather Seventy-two) disciples, and identifies the apostle Judas with Thomas. As early as the middle of the third century the tomb of the apostle Judas Thomas, according to a notice in the Latin *Passio Thomae*, was shown at Edessa (*Suppl. Cod. Apocr.* ed. Bonnet, p. 159), and his remains were said to have been translated to Edessa in the reign of Alexander Severus. In the legend about Abgarus it is related that after the ascension of our Lord, the apostle Judas Thomas sent Thaddaeus, one of the Seventy disciples to Edessa, to king Abgarus the Black. (*Acta Edessena*, in Eusebius, *H. E.* i. 13; *Doctrina Addaei*, ed. Phillips, p. 5, Engl. transl.) The name of this apostle of the Edessenes, however, is called by the Syrians Addaeus (Addai), and it is possible at all events that Eusebius first changed the name Addai, which was unknown to the Greeks, into Thaddaeus. This Addai, according to the legend of Edessa, is said to have been a native of Paneas (Caesarea Philippi). After Judas Thomas had sent him to king Abgarus, he cured the king of a serious illness, converted him with all his people to Christianity, and died a natural death at Edessa, after many years of successful labours. (*Doctrina Addaei*, p. 21, Engl. transl.; compare also the fragment from the *Cod. Add.* 14601, fol.

164, in the British Museum, in Cureton's *Ancient Syriac Documents*, p. 109; *Assemani Bibliotheca Orient.* i. 317, sq. iii. 1. 302, 611.) The legend originated at a time when Judas Thomas was not yet looked upon as the chief apostle of the East, for otherwise the people surely would have honoured the great apostle Judas Thomas, whose remains the Edessenes boasted of having possessed ever since the time of Alexander Severus, instead of the less celebrated Addaeus. The *Acta Thomae* written in the Syriac language were afterwards turned into Greek; their scene is laid in India, and they likewise already know of the translation of the relics of the apostle into Mesopotamia, or "to the East" (Suppl. *Cod. Apocr.* ed. Bonnet, p. 94). This settles the hypothesis of Zahn (Tatian's *Diatessaron*, p. 381 sq.), who assumes that Addai was not the apostle of Edessa, but the first historical bishop of that city, whom the later tradition erroneously dated back to the apostolic age. The first historical bishop of Edessa was Palut, consecrated not by his reputed predecessor Aggai, whom the legend represents as the successor of Addai, but by Serapion of Antioch (A.D. 190–210) in the time of Abgarus VIII., the first Christian king of Edessa. At that time the Edessenes felt a sort of necessity to trace the beginnings of the Christianity of Edessa to the days of Christ and the apostles, *i.e.* to the reign of Abgarus V. Accordingly the legend of Addai, the apostle of Edessa, must have originated at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century. It is only at a much later period that the gross anachronism can have arisen, which we find in the *Doctrina Addaei*. According to this all the subsequent bishops, Palut, Abschelama, and Barsamja would have been made converts by Addai himself—in the time of Abgarus V.—and been received among the clergy of Edessa. (*Doctr. Add.* pp. 33, 39 of the Engl. transl., compare the *Acta* of Scharbil and Barsamja, ap. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents*, pp. 45, 63). Barsamja however, as is reported in his *Acta* (p. 71, compare *Acta* of Scharbil, pp. 61), in contradiction to the chronology placed at its own head, was a contemporary of bishop Fabianus of Rome (A.D. 236–250). Hence it follows that the anachronistic statements of the *Doctrina Addai* cannot have been made till a long time after Fabianus.

The Armenian legend also claims Addai for Armenia. According to the Armenian translation of the *Doctrina Addaei* (in Langlois's Collection, t. 1, p. 324 sq.) Thaddaeus is said to have undertaken more missionary journeys from Edessa into Mesopotamia and the whole of the East, and at last to have suffered martyrdom at the hands of the unbelievers. Even Faustus of Byzantium, in the third book of his Armenian history, continued down to the year 392 (in Langlois's Collection, t. i. 210), speaks of Addai as having suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Armenian king Sanatruk, a son of the sister of Abgarust V. According to Moses of Khorni, Thaddaeus with letters of Abgarus proceeds to Sanatruk and converts him, but afterwards is put to death by the apostate king in the province of Shavarshan, now called Ardaz, Jardaz (*Moses Choren.* ed. Whiston, ii. p. 30–31). Barhebraeus also (*Chron. Eccles.* ed. Abbeloos and Lamy (t. iii. col. 11)) makes Addai with his disciples Aggai (Aggaeus) and Mares travel from Edessa to the East for the purpose of proclaiming the gospel there, but adds that afterwards he returned to Edessa. The more recent Syriac sources represent him as having gone to Nisibis, Mosul (Assyria), Haza (Adiabene), and Bagerma (Mares, son of Salomo, about A.D. 1235, in Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* iii. 2, p. xi. sq., comp. *Elias*, bishop of Damaskus in Assemani, *l. c.* p. iv.; *Ebed Jesu*, ap. Assemani, *l. c.*; *Amrus*, ap. Assemani, p. xiii.; comp. also Assemani, iii. 1, 611). Incidentally his labours are extended to Soba, the whole of Arabia, and the adjacent countries (*Ebed Jesu Sobensis* in Assemani, p. x.). Amrus the epitomator of Mares represents the apostles Thomas and Addaeus as having personally met at Edessa, and Mares, as having ordained one of the Seventy disciples, patriarch of Babylon, Irak (Chaldaea) and in the East (Assemani, p. xiii.). The death day of this Addai is celebrated by the Syrians on the 14th of May, and by the Armenians on the 23rd of December (the discovery of his relics on the 30th of May).

This Addaeus or Thaddaeus, who is said to have been one of the Seventy disciples is distinguished only by later Syriac writers from Judas Thaddaeus, one of the Twelve, who likewise preached in Syria and Mesopotamia, but at last is said to have been stoned to death, according to some at Berytus, and according to others at Aradus. (The former by Barhebraeus's *Chron.* i. c. 33; Amrus, Assemani, p. xiv. sq.; the latter by Barhebraeus in *Horreum mysteriorum*, Assemani, p. xiv. sq.) The day sacred to this Judas Thaddaeus among the Syrians is the 18th of October, and among the Armenians the 18th of February, and in common with that of Bartholomaeus the 8th of December. This Judas Thaddaeus is the same as Judas Jacobi, also called Labbaeus, and he is in no way whatever connected with the Addai of the Edessenian legend. He is said to have preached the gospel at Laodicea in Syria (*Transitus Mariae*, ap. Wright, *Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Testament*, p. 18 sq.), but besides also, as Amrus (*l. c.*) mentions, in a large number of other Syriac and Phoenician towns, as at Antaradus, Palmyra, Raka (Kallinikos), Kirkesion (Karkemish), and Theman. When we are told that subsequently the same accompanied by Thomas undertook a journey to India (Amrus, *l. c.*), we here have probably already a confusion of the two legends about Judas Jacobi and the Edessenian Addai. The former elsewhere appears sometimes accompanied by Simon Petrus, sometimes by Simon Kananites (Simon Zelotes). The former statement is found in the Arabic Synaxar, from which some extracts are given by Assemani (*l. c.* p. xiv.), in a Sahidic fragment ap. Zoëga (cod. 627, in catal. codd. copt. p. 228), as well as in the martyrium of Judas in the Aethiopian certamen apostolorum (Malan, *The Conflicts of the Holy Apostles*, p. 221 sq.). Thaddaeus there obtains Syria and Mesopotamia for his province; at last he suffers martyrdom in the town of Aradus, where he was stoned and overwhelmed with arrows (this last statement about his martyr's death does not occur in the Aethiopic text). The latter statement is found in the Latin *passio Simonis et Judae*, in the so-called Abdias collection (Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr.* ii.

p. 608 sq.). According to this Simon Kananaeus and Judas, also called Thaddaeus and Zelotes, preached in Babylon and in the twelve provinces of the Persian empire; at last they die the death of martyrs at Suanir (said to be in Persia, but was probably in the country of the Borporani), by the hands of the pagan priests. A work in ten books by Crato, supposed to have been a disciple of the two apostles, is said to be the source of the *passio Simonis et Judae;* the historian Africanus is reported to have translated it into Latin.

The legend about the joint labours of Judas Thaddaeus and Petrus in Syria and Phoenicia contains nothing peculiar, except that it localises their operations in the countries named, and that it mentions the martyrium of the apostles at Aradus in Phoenicia. But we there find simply transferred to Judas Thaddaeus that which is related in a fragmentary way in the Greek, and fully in the *Acta* of Petrus and Andreas preserved in the old Slavonic language (Lipsius, *Apokryphe Apostelgeschichten*, i. 554 sq., ii. 2, 177). On the other hand the statement of the martyrium of Thaddaeus at Berytus is found also noticed by later Greek writers (Πράξεις Θαδδαίου in Tischendorf, *Acta app. apocr.* p. 265; Pseudo-Hippolyt. ed. Combefis. *auctar. nov.* ii. 831 sq.; Pseudo-Epiphanius in Cod. Paris. gr. 1115; Dorotheus Text A, in cod. Vindobon. th. gr. 40, and in the Latin translation of Musculus, ap. Grynaeus, Eusebii Pamphili, Rufini, etc. *Eccles. hist.*, Basil. 1570, p. 662 sq.; and in *Biblioth. Patr. Max.* Lugd. iii. 426 sq.; Scholion ap. Lagarde, Constitut. App. p. 282; *Menaea Graecorum* at Aug. 21, p. 117 of the Venetian quarto edition of 1684); in Latin writers who place "Veritus," *i.e.* Berytus in Armenia, it is already confounded with the Armenian local tradition to be discussed hereafter. (*Breviarium Apostolorum* in D'Achery, *Spicileg.* ii. 25 sq. and in Martene et Durand, *Thes. nov. Anecd.* iii. p. 1549; Pseudo-Isidorus, *De vita et obitu Sanctorum* in the Basle Orthodoxogr. ii. 597 sq.; in Cod. Paris. lat. 9562.)

The Babylono-Persian legend about the joint labours of the apostles Simon and Judas Thaddaeus, which lies at the foundation of the text in the Abdias collection, must have arisen at a time when the history of the Parthian empire was still sufficiently known. The legend itself is original; the story of the contests of the apostles with the two sorcerers Zaroës and Arfaxas points to the times of the struggles of the church with Manichaeism, whose doctrines are assigned to those sorcerers. A further extension of this legend is clear, partly from the fact that Moses of Khorni betrays an acquaintance with it (Gutschmid, *die Königsnamen in den apokryphen Apostelgeschichten* in the Rheinisches Museum für Philol., Neue Folge, vol. xix. p. 381 sq.) partly from its being made use of in the Latin *passio Thomae*, in which the story of the temple of the Sun at Suanir is repeated with few modifications (Bonnet, *Suppl. cod. apocr.* p. 156 sq.).

The Armenian *Vita Bartholomaei* (edited in Latin by Mösinger, Insbruck, 1877) likewise distinguishes Thaddaeus (*i.e.* Addai), the first apostle of Armenia, from the apostle Judas, one of the Twelve, who is likewise said to have visited Armenia and to have met Bartholomaeus at the hill of Ardasha (p. 15 and 18). He is also treated of in the short vita in the Armenian Calendarium for the 18th of February. The scene of his martyrium was transferred by the Armenians from Syria to Ararat. The same tradition migrated from Armenia to the Greeks and Latins. While some later Latin writers state that he first preached in Mesopotamia and Pontus (in interioribus Ponti), and at last died at Veritus (Berytus) in Armenia (*Breviarium l. c.*; Pseudo-Isidor. *l. c.*); some of the later Greeks relate that he was pierced with arrows by the infidels in the town of Arat (*Menaea Graec.* at June 19, ed. Venet. 1683, p. 74; Menologium Basilii, on the same day, ed. Albani, iii. 137 sq.; σύναξις τῶν ἀποστόλων in the *Men. Graec.* at June 30.) A statement, which isolated also appears in an Abyssinian Hagiologium, says that he was pierced with red-hot nails (*Acta Sanctorum*, June, tom. iii. p. 804). It is however clear that the town of Arat (or as the printed *Menaea* have it Ἀραράτ) in Armenia was mentioned only through a confusion with Aradus in Phoenicia.

Most of the later Greek and Latin writers know of only one Thaddaeus or Lebbaeus, who is said to have been one of the Twelve, and to be identical with the apostle Judas Jacobi. It is only exceptionally, as in the lists of the Seventy disciples in Dorotheus (Text B in Du Cange, *Chron. Pasch.* ii. p. 120 sq. ed. Bonn) in the reputed Chronicle of Symeon Logothetes in Cod. Paris. gr. 1712, and in the Pseudo-Hippolyt. (*l. c.*) that Thaddaeus is mentioned as Θαδδαῖος ὁ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν Αὐγάρῳ κομίσας, and is still distinguished from Judas Jacobi. The Greek *Menaea* also distinguish the two, and celebrate the memory of Judas or Thaddaeus on the 19th of June and that of Thaddaeus of Edessa on the 21st of August. In the same way Nicephorus (*H. E.* ii. 40) knows two different Thaddaei. But what is related about Judas Jacobi, even where the two Thaddaei are distinguished, is essentially referable to the Edessenian Addaeus legend. But whenever only one Thaddaeus is mentioned, the place of Addaeus, who is said to have been one of the Seventy, has simply been assigned to Thaddaeus or Judas Jacobi, one of the Twelve. Even Hieronymus therefore (*in Matth.* 10, 4. *Opp.* vii. 57, ed. Vallarsi) can mention as the tradition of the church, that the Apostle Thaddaeus, whom Luke calls Judas Jacobi, was elsewhere called Lebbaeus, and was sent to Edessa to Abgarus, king of Osrhoene. Agreeing with this are the texts of Dorotheus, the Pseudo-Hippolytus, and the Pseudo-Epiphanius.[a] The Paris codex of the πράξεις Θαδδαίου, published by Tischendorf, gives a minute account, stating that the Apostle Lebbaeus, surnamed Thaddaeus, was one of the Twelve, and a Hebrew native of Edessa, who was baptized by Joannes, and afterwards admitted among the disciples of Christ; and that after the ascension of our Lord he was sent to Abgarus at Edessa, where he converted many Hebrews and Hellenes, Syrians and Armenians, that then he travelled to Amida on the Tigris,

[a] As to Edessa and Mesopotamia, as the places where Judas Thaddaeus is said to have preached, comp. also the Versus memoriales of the *Lat. Cod.* Paris. 8069.

[Nicephorus

where for five years he preached to the Jews, that then he visited the towns of Syria, and at last is said to have died a peaceful death at Berytus in Phoenicia.[b] The same statements respecting the native place and the adventures of Thaddaeus are found in the Greek *Menaea* at August 21, which date is probably the original one also in the Πράξεις Θαδδαίου, instead of August 20. On the other hand it is said that the saint of the 19th of June, who is likewise reported to have gone to Abgarus and to have cured him, did not die peacefully at Berytus, but was pierced with arrows, ἐν Ἀράτ (or Ἀραράτ τῇ πόλει). The "peaceful end" goes back to the Edessenian local tradition, and the martyrium sometimes placed at Berytus and sometimes at Arat (Aradus) must be traced to the Phoenico-Syrian legend. The assigning of Arat as the scene of death to the saint of the 19th of June, and of Berytus to the saint of the 21st of August, is justified, inasmuch as the former statement does not originate directly from the Syriac, but must have reached the Greeks through the intervention of the Armenian legend concerning the apostle Judas. But the later Greeks mention neither Berytus nor "Arad," but Edessa as the place where the apostle Judas Thaddaeus died (Dorotheus, Text B, *l. c.* and ap. Lagarde, *l. c.* p. 283; Nicephorus, *H. E.* ii. 40; Nicetas Paphlago, *Encom. in S. Judam*, in Combefis *Auctar. Noviss.* i. p. 420). It is quite an isolated statement of the Pseudo-Hippolytus in the text apud Lagarde (*l. c.* p. 283) that Judas Thaddaeus, after having preached to the Edessenes, was crucified and buried at Ostrakine in Egypt. This is founded on a confusion with Simon Zelotes. We have further to mention the statement in the chronicle of the reputed Symeon Logothetes (*l. c.*), according to which Judas Thaddaeus was hanged and pierced with arrows by the Blemmyes at Rebek (Raphaka) in the peninsula of Sinai. The manner of his death is also described in other passages; the scene of his death probably likewise arose from a confusion with Simon Zelotes.

The fictitious correspondence between king Abgarus and Christ is most intimately connected with the legend of Thaddaeus's mission to Edessa. This correspondence is preserved in its most ancient form, in connection with the Thaddaeus legend, in Eusebius (*H. E.* i. 13), who gives a literal translation from the Syriac; it is also found, though more or less altered and enriched with additions, in the *Doctrina Addaei* (ed. Phillips), and in its Armenian translation (ed. Langlois, *l. c.*, and in Alishan (*Labubnia Lettre d'Abgar*, Venice, 1868). Detailed repetitions and modifications are found in Moses of Khorni (*Hist. Armen.* lib. ii. ed. Whiston, ii. 29–32), in the Greek πράξεις Θαδδαίου (ed. Tischendorf, *l. c.*), the ἐπιστολὴ Αὐγάρου τοπάρχου Ἐδέσσης in the *Cod. Vindob.* th. gr. 315; shorter notices and quotations are found in a number of Greek and Syrian authors after the 4th century, as *e. g.* in Ephrem, *Evangelii concordantis expositio*, ed. Mösinger, p. 287; in the *Comes Darius Ep. ad Augustinum* (in *Augustini Opp.* ed. Antwerp, ii. 635); in Procopius (*de bello Persico*, ii. 12), Evagrius (*H. E.* iv. 27), Josua Stylites (*Chronik*, ed. Martin; *Abhandlungen zur Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vi. 1, 1876, p. xiii. of the French translation), Mar Sarug in the *Epistle to the Homeritae* (ap. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents*, p. 154), and others.

The story, according to Eusebius, is briefly as follows. King Abgarus of Edessa is suffering from an incurable disease, when he hears about the person and the miraculous works of Jesus. He sends a courier of the name of Ananias to Jerusalem with a letter to invite Jesus to come to Edessa. In the letter he appeals to the information which has reached him of the wondrous deeds of Jesus; he declares him to be a god sent down from heaven or a son of a god, and he justifies his invitation partly by his desire to be cured, and partly by his intention to afford Jesus a place of refuge against the persecution of the Jews. The answer of Jesus which Ananias carries back in writing blesses Abgarus, because he has shown his faith in him without having seen Jesus; but he declines the invitation on account of the necessary duties devolved upon him, promising however after his ascension to send him one of his disciples, who will free him from his sufferings and give life to him and his people. After the ascension Judas Thomas sends Thaddaeus, one of the Seventy, to Abgarus at Edessa. On his arrival he puts up at the house of Tobias, the son of Tobias, and is beginning to excite attention by his miraculous cures. On being invited by the king he goes and cures him of his disease without any medicine or magic herbs. In like manner he cures Abdos, the son of Abdos, and many others. On the following day the king, on the advice of the apostle, orders all the citizens to assemble, and Thaddaeus preached to them about the mission of Christ, his works, his death, his descent into Hades, and his ascension. Abgarus offered him gold and silver, but Thaddaeus refused the offer with the words: "Seeing that we have abandoned our own, how shall we take what belongs to others?" The conclusion of the narrative in Eusebius is formed by the chronological statement: "This happened in the year 340 (*aerae Seleucid.* = A.D. 28–29)."

The correspondence and the legend are found in an extended form in the *Doctrina Addaei*. The letters themselves contain only few additions, the most important of which is the one occurring at the end of the letter of Jesus to Abgarus: "Thy city shall be blessed, and no enemy shall ever overpower it." This prophecy, which some have vainly pretended to be attested by Ephrem, cannot have arisen till considerably later than the original correspondence, probably soon after the Persian war concluded in 363, which during the last quarter of the 4th century broke out afresh. In that war the siege of Nisibis by Sapores, the enemy of the Christians, is said to have been frustrated by the prayer of Mar Ephrem and Mar Jakob. During that war Edessa too might easily fall into danger, and for the encouragement of its Christian inhabitants such a promise may have been formed. However, the belief in the impregnability of Edessa

Nicephorus (*l. c.*) represents both Thaddaeus, the one of the Twelve and the one of the Seventy, as having preached the gospel at Edessa.

[b] The *Cod. Vindobon.* gr. 45, describes, in the superscription, correctly Thaddaeus as one of the Seventy, but in cap. 1 quietly retains the words ἐξελέξατο αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς δώδεκα.

did not become effective till the year 503, when Khavadh appeared before the town. (Comp. Noeldeke, *Jahrbücher für Protest. Theologie*, 1881, p. 188.)

Larger additions appear in the legend of Abgarus and the labours of Thaddaeus in the *Doctrina Addaei*. Even the introduction is much enlarged in the *Doctrina Addaei*. On the 12th of October, 343 = to 31 of our era, Abgarus sends an embassy—consisting of two Edessenian nobles, and Hanan (Ananias) the tabularius (keeper of the archives and private secretary of the king)—to the Roman governor Sabinus on business of his kingdom. On their return the ambassadors hear from pilgrims who are on their way to Jerusalem, of the wondrous deeds of Christ; they accompany the pilgrims, and see Christ, but also hear of the enmity of the Jews against him. Hanan writes down accurately what he hears and sees of the doings of Jesus, and after the return of the ambassadors communicates it to Abgarus. The latter wishes to see with his own eyes the deeds of Christ. But as from fear of the Romans he does not himself venture to go beyond the borders of his kingdom, he writes a letter to Christ, and sends Hanan to present it to him. Hanan starts on the 14th of Adar (March), and on the 12th of Nisan in the year 32 arrives at Jerusalem. He finds Christ in the house of Gamaliel, gives him the letter of Abgarus, and receives Christ's answer, which here is not in writing, but oral. The story in the *Doctrina Addaei* even here shows that it is an amplification of a more simple narrative; even the repeated sending of Hanan points to this, inasmuch as the first presupposes an acquaintance with the works of Jesus—a reason for which had to be devised—and assigns to him a far more conspicuous position. Add to this further the unreasonable cause of the fear which Abgarus feels of the Romans. According to Eusebius the king wishes to undertake a warlike expedition to Jerusalem in order to chastise the Jews for their persecution of Jesus, but is afraid of violating Roman territory. Here, on the other hand, he only desires to see Jesus, but considers it impossible without a violation of the Roman frontier; but why should he have been afraid of going to Jerusalem as a simple traveller?

After the reply given by Jesus to Abgarus, there follows in the *Doctrina Addaei* the statement that Hanan, the secretary and painter to the king, painted a portrait of Christ and presented it to the king. Abgarus on seeing it, accepted it with great joy, and placed it with high honours in one of his palaces. Hanan, however, gave him an accurate report of everything he had heard from the mouth of Jesus, as he had carefully written down his words. Eusebius knows nothing of this story about the portrait. In the *Doctrina Addaei* it still appears quite unconnected, and the same is the case in the narrative of Moses of Khorni, where we read the words: "Hanan, the courier of the king, brought him the letter as well as the portrait of the Saviour, which still exists in the city of Edessa." According to both texts the cure of the king is not effected by the portrait, of the miraculous power of which not a word is said, but later on by Addai, the messenger of Christ sent by Thomas to Edessa. A further sign of the later embellishment of a simpler narrative is the statement of the *Doctrina Addaei*, that Hanan the courier, as he is still called in Eusebius, is not only tabellarius and sharir (commissary) of the king, but is also said to have been a painter. It is only the later legend that describes the cure of the king as effected by the image of Christ. According to the Paris text of the πράξεις Θαδδαίου, it only remains for Thaddaeus to baptize the king after he has already been cured. According to the Vienna text, the image commences the cure which is completed by Thaddaeus. According to the narrative of Constantine Porphyrogenneta (in the story ascribed to him about the portrait of Christ and its removal to Constantinople) Thaddaeus himself brings the miraculous image, and then completes the cure by baptizing the king. This image was celebrated at Edessa, and at any rate enjoyed high veneration ever since the middle of the 4th century, but probably even much earlier. The *Doctrina Addaei* already knows it, though as a painting made by a human artist; the later legend describes it as not made by human hands (as an εἰκὼν θεότευκτος or ἀχειροποίητος; comp. Evagrius, *l. c.*; Gregorii II. papae, *Epist. II. ad Leonem*, ap. Mansi, *Collectio Conciliorum*, xii. 963; *Acta Concil. Nicaeni II.* ap. Mansi, xiii. 192; Georgii Syncelli, *Chron.* p. 622, ed. Bonn.). Subsequently the story of the portrait was put in connection with the correspondence between Abgarus and Christ. Other legends, probably likewise of Edessenian origin, either connected it with a Christian woman Hypatia, who is said to have found it in a well of her garden, and then after it had been impressed on her kerchief (φακεόλιον) to have placed it in a temple specially built for it (Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, iii. 324, Germ. transl. by Noeldeke, in the *Jahrbücher für Protest. Theologie*, 1881, p. 189 sq.), or with Berenike (Veronika), who at the beginning of the 5th century is called princess of Edessa by Macarius Magnes (*Jahrbücher für Protest. Theol.* 1882, p. 192). In Macarius (i. 6, p. 1, ed. Blondel) this Berenike is identified with the haemorrhagic woman, who is said to have set up a bronze statue of Christ at Paneas (Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 18; comp. also *Acta Pilati*, ap. Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.* ed. ii. p. 239), while the Latin legend (first published in the work *Mors Pilati*, ap. Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.* ed. ii. p. 456; comp. also *Cura sanitatis Tiberii*, ap. Schoenbach, *Anzeiger für das Deutsche Alterthum*, ii. 173 sq., *Vindicta Salvatoris*, ap. Tischendorf, p. 471 sq.) speaks of a kerchief which Veronica offers to Christ, on which he impressed his face. The more recent form of the Abgarus legend which connects the story of the image, like the *Doctrina Addaei* and Moses of Khorni, with the cure of the king, also relates that the painter sent by Abgarus (according to the πράξεις Θαδδαίου Ananias), was unable to make a portrait of Christ, whereupon the Lord himself impressed his face on a cloth (or a painter's canvas). So also, besides the πράξεις Θαδδαίου, Joannes Damascenus (*De Fide Orthodoxa*, iv. 16, tom. i. p. 281, ed. Le Quien; comp. also the appendix to the first speech *De imaginibus*, tom. i. p. 320, and the *Epistola ad Theophilum*, ascribed to Damascenus (tom. i. p. 631), Georgius Hamartolus (p. 237, ed. Muralt), Constantine Porphyrogenneta (ap. Combefis, *Origg. rerumque*

Constantinop. manipulus, Paris, 1664, p. 75 sq.), Cedrenus (*Histor. Compend.* p. 308 sq. ed. Bonn.), Nicephorus Callistus (*H. E.* ii. 7). The fully developed legend makes the image share the fate of the letter of Christ to Abgarus. Both are said to have been placed over the city gate; to both was ascribed the power of guarding the city against all enemies; and both together were removed, in the year 944, under the emperor Romanus I. from Edessa to Constantinople.

In the text of the Thaddaeus legend, of which Eusebius, as he assures us, has given a literal translation, the narrative concludes with the sermon of the apostle before all the people, and the refusal of every reward which the king offers to him. The *Doctrina Addaei* here also tells us much more. In the first place, the refusal of the present of money by Thaddaeus is more given in detail. There in a long discourse the substance of the sermon before the king, his mother, his wife, and the princes and nobles is touched upon. In this sermon is inserted a long episode about the discovery of the cross of Christ by the empress Protonike (or Patronike, p. 9–16, ed. Phillips). Next follows the narrative of the conversion of the king, his whole house and all his nobles; after this there comes a second sermon delivered by Abgarus's command before all the assembled people of Edessa and numerous strangers (p. 16–30). The result of this sermon is a general conversion, the erection of a church, the institution of a regular service, and the ordination of the clergy who are instructed by Addaeus about the administration of their clerical office. Even the pagan priests are converted and tear down the altars of Nebo and Bel, with the exception of the great altar which stands in the centre of the city (p. 30–33). From Edessa Christianity is carried by oriental converts, who had come to see the miracles of Addaeus, into Assyria. King Nerseh inquires of Abgarus about the apostle, and receives from him a minute report (p. 33–36). Then follows a correspondence between Abgarus and the emperor Tiberius, and the account of the punishment of the Jews for having crucified Christ, a punishment desired by Abgarus, and actually inflicted by Tiberius after the close of the Spanish war (p. 36–38). The last part contains the account of Addai's illness, the installation of Aggai as his successor, the apostle's leave-taking from the assembled princes, his death and burial; also the actions and the martyrdom of his successor Aggai (p. 38–50). Labubna, a royal scribe, is mentioned as the author of the work; Hanan, the king's tabularius and sharir is said to have attested its authenticity, and to have deposited it in the archives of Edessa.

The principal interest of this enlarged account consists in the didactic speeches of Addaeus, fully occupying one-half of the work, hence the name *Doctrina Addaei*, and in the very minutely described state of the ecclesiastical affairs at Edessa. We here already find reference to the Syriac Doctrina Apostolorum (ap. Cureton, *Anc. Syriac Documents*, pp. 24–35 of the Engl. transl.). In the first sermon, which is the longer, we find inserted the legend of Protonike, which, in any case, cannot be more ancient than the discovery of the holy sepulchre in the reign of Constantine (326). A further addition must be recognised in the correspondence between Abgarus and the emperor Tiberius, which has been manufactured out of the earlier correspondence of Abgarus and Jesus; it is accordingly repeated by Moses of Khorni and in the *Transitus Mariae* (ap. Wright in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, January–April, 1865; Cureton, *l. c.* p. 111). It is a sign of the amplification of the original legend that constantly new letters were added to the earlier ones. Thus Moses of Khorni adds to the two letters of Abgarus to Tiberius, and of Tiberius to Abgarus, yet a third letter of Abgarus to Tiberius, and two letters of the same Abgarus to Nerseh, the king of Assyria, and to Artashes, king of Persia. The origin of the *Doctrina Addaei* as well as of the kindred *Acta* of Sharbil and Barsamja, must be assigned to the second half of the 4th century. Moses of Khorni, who wrote his history of Armenia about A.D. 470, probably already knew the Armenian translation. The latter, however, as we have seen, is not a mere translation, but at the same time an enlargement of the *Doctrina Addaei* by the addition of the narrative about the Assyrian mission, and the martyrdom of the apostle. Relying on these accounts, Moses of Khorni has related the last fortunes of Thaddaeus, except that instead of Assyria he describes his own country Armenia as the scene of the later labours of the apostle, and has added his experiences in Armenia under king Sanatruk, a son of Abgarus's sister, and his martyrdom.[c]

We may here safely pass over the later, especially the Greek amplifications of the legend. It is of more importance to determine its original form and the time of its origin. It has been shown that the *Doctrina Addaei* is a transformation and enlargement of the earlier narrative, such as was suited to the times. We possess the earlier verbatim account in Eusebius. The correspondence between Abgarus and Jesus, together with the history of the mission of Thaddaeus (Addai) to Edessa and his missionary work there, form in Eusebius a consistent and closely-connected whole, while the additions in the *Doctrina Addaei* even by their motley nature and their slender connection, show a distinct difference from the original text.

Now we have already seen that the legend of Thaddaeus's mission to Edessa owes its origin to the desire of the Edessenian Christians to trace their Christianity back to the time of Christ and the apostles. Abgarus VIII., the first Christian king, according to the corrected chronology, reigned A.D. 176–213; Bardesanes and the chronicler Julius Africanus lived at his court. As early as the 2nd century the first Christian school is said to have flourished at Edessa. The beginnings of Christianity at Edessa must therefore be assigned to a time before the reign of Abgarus VIII. Whether the quondam goldsmith Aggai, whom Addai is said to have appointed his successor in the episcopal office, is an historical personage, can no longer be said with certainty; he was perhaps the first Christian missionary, the remembrance of whom still continued fresh, when they ascribed to a direct disciple of Christ

[c] It may be remarked by the way that Moses of Khorni does not call the disciple and successor of Thaddaeus by the name of Aggaeus, but calls him Adde. The Armenian translator of the *Doctrina Addaei* calls both by the same name, Ate.

the honour of having been the apostle of Edessa, and who has therefore with some consistency been made a disciple of the apostle. However, the first Christian bishop, as has already been remarked, was not Aggai, but Palut, who was consecrated in 190 by Serapion at Antioch.

Accordingly, the correspondence between Abgarus V. and Jesus, together with the story about the mission of Addai, must have been manufactured about the year 200. The genuineness of the correspondence was disputed even in the ancient church. In the *Decretum Gelasii de libris recipiendis* (vi. 57, 58, ap. Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanon*, p. 223), the "*Epistola Jesu ad Abgarum apocrypha*" and the "*Epistola Abgari ad Jesum apocrypha*" are expressly mentioned among the writings rejected by the church. Augustinus also (*contra Faustum Manichaeum*, xxviii. 4) and Hieronymus (in *Ezech.* 44, 29) assure us that Christ had left behind nothing written. Catholic writers have generally disregarded this statement, and the genuineness has been defended with special zeal by Tillemont (*Memoirs*, i. 615 sq., of the Paris quarto edition of 1701), yet the contrary opinion also has been maintained within the Catholic church (comp. *Fabricius Cod. apocr. N. T.* i. 320). Most protestants have declared against their genuineness. Defenders of their genuineness are Cave (*Hist. Literar.* Oxford, 1740, vol. i. p. 2), Mountague (*Orig. ecclesiast.*, London, 1740, i. 2, p. 61 sq.), Grabe (*Spicileg.* i. p. 1 sq., 313 sq.), and among more modern writers Rinck (*Zeitschrift für die histor. Theologie*, 1843, 2 p. 3 sq.), Cureton (*Anc. Syriac Doc.* p. ii.) and Phillips (*Preface*, p. iv. sq.). The two last-mentioned scholars also regard the *Doctrina Addai* as a genuine work of the scribe Labubna, a real contemporary of Addaeus.

Compare also Jak. Chifflet, *De linteis sepulcralibus Christi, &c.*, Antwerp, 1624; M. F. Reiske, *Exercitat. historicae de imaginibus Jesu Christi*, Jena, 1685; W. Grimm, *Die Sage vom Ursprung der Christusbilder. Philol. und histor. Abhandlungen der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1844, pp. 121–175; Lipsius, *Die Edessenische Abgarsage kritisch untersucht*, Braunschweig, 1880, with two supplements *Zur Edessenischen Abgarsage* in the *Jahrbücher für Protest. Theologie*. 1881, pp. 187–192; 1882, pp. 190–192; Th. Zahn, *Tatians Diatessaron*, Erlangen, 1881, pp. 350–382; Matthes, *Die Edessenische Abgarsage auf ihre Fortbildung untersucht*, Leipzig, 1882; Lipsius, *Die Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, vol. ii., *Abtheil.* ii., Braunschweig, 1883, pp. 154–200. [R. A. L.]

THADIOCENUS (THADIACUS), British bishop of York [CADIOCENUS, THEONUS].

THAÏS, ST., Oct. 8, a penitent courtesan of Egypt, who was converted about A.D. 344 by Paphnutius of Sidon. Her story illustrates her age. Her fame reached to Paphnutius' monastery, whereupon he determined to make a great effort to convert her, though she was evidently a nominal Christian. He assumed a secular dress and put a single coin in his pocket, which he offered to Thaïs on his arrival at her house. She led him into her chamber, but he desired a still more retired spot. She told him such would be useless, no uninvited person ever entered where they were, and if he desired to escape God's eye that would be useless, as it was everywhere. Do you then, said the disguised monk, believe in God? Indeed I do, she replied, and in a future life, and in hell. And yet, said he, you continue in sin and refuse to repent? Whereupon, recognising his true character, she cast herself at his feet, destroyed all her precious dresses, and entered a female monastery, where Paphnutius shut her up in a cell for three years, sealing the door, and leaving no opening save a small window, through which she received food. After three years he sought out St. Antony, to learn whether her penance was sufficient. Antony called a synod of his brethren, and exhorted them to spend a night in prayer, if perchance God would reveal his will on the matter; which took place. Paul, an abbat [PAULUS (74)] saw a vision, signifying that the repentance of Thaïs was sufficient. She died fifteen days after receiving absolution. (*Vit. PP.* in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. col. 661.) [G. T. S.]

THALASSIA, abbess of the nunnery of St. Mary at Autun. Gregory the Great wrote to her in A.D. 602, granting various privileges to the nunnery, at the request of queen Brunechilde and her grandson Theodoric. (*Epp.* xiii. 9.) [F. D.]

THALASSIUS (1), a famous solitary, remarkable for his simplicity, gentleness and humility, the head of an ascetic brotherhood on the mountain sides near Tillima in Syria. He was frequently visited by Theodoret, who speaks of him in terms of great admiration. He was the teacher of the still more celebrated ascetic Limnaeus, who having planted himself on the summit of a mountain near the village of Targala, enclosed himself with a wall, unprotected by a roof, the door being blocked up with clay, and opened for the visits of Theodoret alone. A small religious colony had grown up round Limnaeus's place of abode, attracted by the fame of his sanctity and his miraculous gifts. (Theod. *Hist. Relig.* c. 22.) [E. V.]

THALASSIUS (2), priest and archimandrite, opponent of Nestorius [JOANNES (491)]. [C. H.]

THALASSIUS (3), at first prefect of Illyricum and then, about the year 439, ordained bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, by Proclus of Constantinople. His consecration seems to have been per saltum, as reported by Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 48. He seems to have at first favoured the party of Eutyches. He was one of the heads of the robber-synod of Ephesus, A.D. 449. He retracted his opinions at the synod of Chalcedon, was pardoned, and was named a member of the commission for drawing up the formula of faith. Mansi, *Concil.* t. vi. pp. 601–606 pass.; Hefele's *Councils*, Clark's ed. t. iii. 301–345. [G. T. S.]

THALASSIUS (4), a reader and monk who, with his archimandrite Basil, visited Nestorius, as a deputation from the monks, to protest against his teaching. They were imprisoned for a time in the episcopal prison, and then released. They then presented a formal protest to the emperor. (Mansi, iv. 1102; Ceill. viii. 396.) [G. T. S.]

THALASSIUS (5), an abbat of Constantinople, who sided with pope Felix III. in his quarrel with Acacius [FELIX (3)]. His epistles 11 and 14 are addressed to Thalassius (cf. Mansi, vii. 1068, 1103; Ceill. x. 416, 418). [G. T. S.]

THALASSIUS (6), an abbat of a Libyan monastery and a writer of the 7th century. We still possess a collection of four hundred moral maxims, addressed by him to a presbyter named Paul. (Migne's *Patr. Graeca*, *t.* xci. 1423–1470.) St. Maximus dedicated to him his work on difficult passages of Scripture [MAXIMUS (23)] (Fabricius, *Bib. Graeca*, xi. 112, cf. ix. 639, ed. Harles; *Opp. S. Max.* ed. Combefis. i. 674). [G. T. S.]

THALELAEUS (1), congratulated by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. ep. 143) on his having devoted himself to Christian studies. [C. H.]

THALELAEUS (2), a celebrated ascetic, a Cilician by race, a contemporary of Theodoret, who describes his mode of life from personal knowledge. He fixed his residence on the summit of a hill not far from the small city of Gabala, in Syria, crowned with a heathen temple, resorted to by the pagan inhabitants of the district. The violent thunder-storms and hurricanes incident to so elevated a position were regarded as evidences of the anger of the deities of the place, and their desire to drive the holy man away. He persevered in his design, building himself a hut, and devoting himself to the instruction of his heathen neighbours, many of whom were converted. In the hope of escaping the torments of the life to come by self-inflicted torments in this life, Thalelaeus contrived a kind of tumbril suspended on poles, in which he had passed ten years, without any shelter, his head bowed down to his knees and his tall body bent, when Theodoret visited him. By his influence the heathen temple was overthrown, and a martyry erected on the site by the converts (Theod. *Hist. Relig.* c. 28). Tillemont thinks him probably the same with Thalelaeus, an abbat of Cilicia, recorded by Moschus (*Prat. Spirit.* c. 59, p. 1079), who passed 60 years in a monastic life, never ceasing to weep for his sins and to implore the gift of penitence (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xv. 242). Thalelaeus is commemorated in the Greek Church on Feb. 27. (Bolland. p. 680.) [E. V.]

THARSICUS, ST., Aug. 15, an acolyte, who suffered about A.D. 256. He was carrying the Eucharist with him. Some soldiers attacked him, demanding to see what he was preserving so carefully. He refused to display it, whereupon they slew him, and were greatly disappointed when they could find no treasure on his person. He was buried in the cemetery of Callistus. Aringhi, *Rom. Subterran.* t. i. p. 456, gives the inscription erected by pope Damasus over his tomb, which likens Tharsicus to St. Stephen. (Baron. *Anal.* A.D. 260, § 5; *AA. SS.* Boll. Aug. iii. p. 201.) [G. T. S.]

THARSILLA, paternal aunt of Gregory the Great. She with her sisters, Aemiliana and Gordiana, had together taken vows and lived a monastic life, though remaining in their own house. Gregory relates how she was warned of her approaching end by his great-grandfather, pope Felix III., in a vision. He also describes her death-bed, and mentions that when her body was being prepared for burial, it was found that the skin of her knees had grown hard like a camel's from her constant prayers (*Hom. in Ev.* 38; *Dial.* iv. 16, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvi. 1291; lxxvii. 347). [F. D.]

THEA, ST., July 25, a virgin identified with a martyr of Gaza, whose sufferings Eusebius recounts in *Mart. Palest.* cap. viii. She suffered with her sister Valentina and with one Paulus; see an elaborate commentary on her case in *AA. SS.* Boll. Jul. vi. 163–166. [G. T. S.]

THEANUS (THEONUS), first reputed bishop of London, where, assisted by Cyranus, the pincerna of king Lucius, he is said to have constructed the church of St. Peter in Cornhill, as the seat of his archbishopric (Godwin, *De Praesul.* 169, ed. 1743). On the authorities see art. OBINUS and Stubbs's *Registrum Sacrum*, i. 152. [C. H.]

THEASIUS, bishop of Memblosa, probably the same as Membro of Antoninus (*Itin.* 22, 2) and Membione of the Peutinger Table, 6 m. from Utica. He was associated with St. Augustine and Evodius in the affair of Equitius, and with Evodius in the mission from the African bishops to Honorius, in executing which they appear to have visited Paulinus at Nola. He was also engaged in the subsequent negotiations with the Donatists [EVODIUS (3) Vol. II. 429]. He was one of the bishops whom Maurentius, bishop of Thubursica, named as umpires in his controversy with the seniors of Nova Germania, A.D. 407. (Bruns. *Conc.* i. 185, 186; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 34.) He appeared at the conference A.D. 411, and declared that his diocese was exempt from schismatical disturbance. (Carth. Coll. i. 133.) He also joined in the letter about Pelagianism sent to pope Innocent by the council of Carthage, A.D. 416 (Aug. *Ep.* 175, 181), and in one to Pope Celestine, about the affair of Apiarius, A.D. 424. (Bruns. *Conc.* i. 186. 200. 202.) [COELESTINUS I., Vol. I. p. 585. URBANUS (6), of Sicca.] [H. W. P.]

THEBACULUS, monk, accompanied St. Regulus to Scotland, A.D. 369, and is said by Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 616) to have written *Conciones ad populum*, and *Epistolae ad Ecclesiae patrias.* [J. G.]

THEBAN LEGION. [LEGIO THEBAEA.]

THEBUTHIS, stated by Hegesippus (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22) to have been the first to introduce heresy into the Church of Jerusalem, being moved thereto by disappointment at not having been himself made bishop. [G. S.]

THECLA (1), the heroine of a romantic story which from a very early date has had a strong hold on the imagination of the Church, and which, though under the form in which it is now extant it can only be received as a fiction, yet has enough appearance of a foundation in fact to warrant us in treating of her as a real person. She was, as we read in the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, a contemporary of St. Paul, a virgin of Iconium, daughter of a woman of rank (apparently a widow) named Theocleia, and affianced to Thamyris, a youth who was first among the nobles of that city. At the time when the narrative opens, St. Paul is represented as being

on his way to Iconium, after having been driven from Antioch of Pisidia; but whether his flight from Antioch, related in Acts xiii. 15, is meant by the author, and consequently whether the ensuing events are to be taken as belonging to his first visit to Iconium, is not easy or perhaps possible to determine. One Onesiphorus of Iconium, whose house adjoined that of Theocleia, hearing of his approach, went forth to meet him, accompanied by his wife and sons, and recognizing him by a description of his person which he had received from Titus, invited him to his house and received him there with rejoicing. Two persons, named Demas and Hermogenes, who, under a hypocritical guise of seeking instruction in the gospel, had attached themselves to the apostle on his journey, were, at their urgent request, admitted along with him by Onesiphorus (though not without demur) to the like hospitality. In this house Paul began at once to preach "the word of God concerning temperance and the resurrection;" his discourse consisting of a series of beatitudes, in form like those with which the Sermon on the Mount opens, but in substance taken up with the commendation of asceticism and celibacy. Thecla, as she sat at a window in her mother's house, heard his words, and became filled by them with passionate faith and zeal for virginity. Being restrained from satisfying her longing to see him and hear from him his doctrine face to face, she remained listening, fixed at her window, despite of her mother's remonstrances. The tender entreaties of her betrothed Thamyris, whom Theocleia summoned to interfere, proved equally unavailing. The lover, thus repulsed, hurried into the street, and watched the house where the stranger was preaching, whose eloquence had cast this deplorable spell over Thecla. Observing Demas and Hermogenes among those who were going in and out, he questioned them, invited them to a rich banquet at his house, and offered them money for information concerning the preacher. In reply, they disclaimed personal knowledge of Paul, but represented him as urging on the young abstinence from marriage, under the threat of forfeiting their part in the resurrection, which (they said) he promised to the celibate only; whereas the true resurrection (as they professed themselves ready to explain) was already past for those that have children in whom they live anew; and men rise again when they fully know the true God. They also advised him to bring Paul before Castelius the governor, on the charge of teaching "the new doctrine of the Christians," which (they assured him) would ensure his execution. Accordingly, next morning Thamyris, with other magistrates, and a great multitude, repaired to the house of Onesiphorus and compelled Paul to come with them before the tribunal of Castelius the "proconsul": where, however, he accused him merely of dissuading maidens from marriage; though Demas and Hermogenes were at hand prompting him, "Say that he is a Christian, and thus shalt thou procure his death." Paul being then called on by the governor for his defence, delivered a speech in which he made no answer to the specific charge advanced by Thamyris, but declared his gospel message and pleaded his mission from God. The governor, without delivering any judgment, ordered him to be committed to prison until it should be convenient to hear him more attentively. Thecla made this imprisonment her opportunity. That very night, by bribing her mother's doorkeeper with her bracelets and the jailer with her silver mirror, she effected her egress from her home and her entrance into Paul's cell; and there, after a night spent at his feet in hearing his doctrine, she was found next morning by her mother and lover. At their instance, Paul was immediately dragged again before the governor, pursued by the multitude with the cry, "He is a sorcerer, away with him!" Thecla was summoned likewise, and followed him exultingly to the tribunal. Castelius was at first disposed to listen favourably to Paul, as he declared the works of Christ; but afterwards, finding that Thecla would give no reply to his interrogations, but remained silent with her eyes fixed on Paul, and being wrought on by her mother who demanded that her daughter should be burnt alive as an example to warn other women, he scourged Paul and cast him out of the city, and sentenced Thecla to the stake. She was hurried forthwith to the theatre, where, as she stood seeking Paul with her eyes among the thronging multitude, her faith was rewarded and her courage sustained by the appearance among the spectators of Paul, as she thought;—but, as it proved, of the Lord Himself, who, as she gazed, went up to heaven. Even the Roman magistrate who had condemned her was moved to tears by her doom, but other human sympathy she found none: her fellow-citizens, even the young girls, were busy in carrying fuel and building the pyre. When it was ready, she mounted it with undismayed spirit, making the sign of the cross; and it was forthwith kindled. Immediately there was heard a subterranean rumbling; a thick cloud darkened the place and poured down a deluge of hail and rain; the fire was quenched, the people fled, and Thecla escaped.

Meantime Paul, with Onesiphorus and his family, on their way to Daphne, had taken refuge in a tomb, where he continued instant in prayer for Thecla. Their supply of food running short, the apostle took off his outer garment, and sent one of the lads back to Iconium to sell it and buy bread. The youth, while doing his errand, met Thecla, who was seeking Paul, and brought her with him to the hiding-place. There they found Paul on his knees in the act of praying for her deliverance, and a scene of joyful thanksgiving ensued. The apostle then sent the rest back to their city, and himself, with Thecla, went on his way to Antioch; forbidding her, however, to cut her hair short so as to pass for a man, as she proposed to do. He also refused her request for immediate baptism, encouraging her, however, to "be patient, and she should receive the washing."

As they entered into Antioch, her beauty caught the eye of Alexander the Syriarch (the introduction of this personage seems to prove that the city here meant is the capital of Syria[a]),

[a] This is expressly affirmed by Basil of Seleucia, who, however, describes Alexander merely as Σύρος. The Syriac version, however, omits the designation altogether, and also the mention of Daphne, so as to leave it undetermined whether the Syrian or the Pisidian Antioch is intended.

who sought to obtain possession of her by offering money to Paul. The apostle evaded these advances by disclaiming all right to dispose of her, and even professing to know nothing about her; and Alexander then attempted to force her to his will. She, however, though forsaken as it appears by Paul, defended herself vehemently with cries and struggles, and finally drove Alexander away with his chlamys rent and his crown torn off. Baffled and enraged, the Syriarch brought her before the Roman governor, who, when she admitted the acts charged against her (which it appears were held to be sacrilege), condemned her to be cast to wild beasts; notwithstanding the outcries of the women of the city, who sympathized with her and exclaimed against the sentence as cruel and iniquitous. At her urgent entreaty, however, he granted her protection foi her chastity in the interval between the sentence and its execution, by committing her to the care of Tryphaena, a widow lady (afterwards described as a queen, and kinswoman of the emperor), who having lately lost her daughter Falconilla, found comfort in the charge of the condemned maiden. When the appointed day came, a procession of wild beasts was exhibited to the citizens at the expense of the Syriarch; and Thecla, accompanied by her protectress, was brought forth and bound on the back of a ferocious lioness. To the amazement of the spectators, the maiden was seen to sit unharmed while the lioness licked her feet. She was then suffered to return for the night to the care of Tryphaena, who cherished her tenderly, not merely through womanly pity, but now under a yet stronger influence. Her lost Falconilla had appeared to her in a dream, saying, "Mother, let Thecla be to thee in my stead, that through her prayers I may pass to the place of the righteous." The bereaved mother now accordingly asked and obtained the intercession of Thecla; and it was therefore with twofold anguish that next morning she saw Alexander arrive to summon to so terrible a doom the maiden who had become to her as a second daughter. Her violent lamentations drove him from the house, and it was not until a written order from the governor reached her that she gave way, and led Thecla to face her martyrdom. The expectant multitude received them with divided clamours, the men demanding her punishment for her act of sacrilege, the women crying out against it as an injustice that would bring down calamity in their city. Forthwith she was stripped, and with no covering save a loin-cloth, was cast into the arena, where there were let loose against her bears, lions, and the lioness of the previous day. This lioness, gentle as before, crouched at her feet; and then defended her against the assault of a she-bear, which she encountered and rent asunder, amid the applause of the sympathizing women; which, however, soon turned to lamentation, when the faithful beast facing the onset of a lion, which had been specially trained to fight with men, in killing him was killed by him. Many more beasts were then set upon her; all hope of escape seemed at an end, and she stood praying and awaiting her end. Suddenly, however, she perceived close at hand a pond filled with water in which seals were kept; and (calling to mind, no doubt, Paul's promise) she cried, "The time is come for me to wash myself," and cast herself in, exclaiming, "In the name of Jesus Christ on my last day I baptize myself." A cloud of fire encompassed the maiden, protecting at once her modesty and her life. The seals were struck dead with lightnings, the other beasts lay around, torpid as in a trance, while the women flung spices and perfumes. At the instance of Alexander, Thecla was then bound, and exposed to the onset of fierce bulls goaded into fury by heated irons: but the supernatural fire consumed her bonds, and she moved away free and unharmed once more. At this point her prolonged ordeal was cut short. Tryphaena, overcome by the horrors of the day, fell into a deadly swoon, and the governor thereupon put an end to the scene. The people, supposing Tryphaena to be dead, were dismayed, and Alexander himself entreated that Thecla should be released; submitting to be baulked of his revenge not through pity, but through fear on behalf of himself and the city, lest the emperor, hearing of his kinswoman's death, should avenge it on them. Thecla then, being interrogated by the governor, made profession of her faith (of which up to this point no question seems to have been raised) in the following terms: "I am a handmaid of the living God, and I believe in His Son in whom He is well pleased; and therefore it is that none of the beasts hath touched me; for He is the limit [ὅρος, *al.* ὁδός, way] of salvation, and the substance [*or*, ground] of immortal life, for to the storm-tost He is a refuge, to the troubled repose, the shelter of them that had despaired: and in a word, whoso believeth not on Him shall not live for ever." Her clothing was then restored, and amid the jubilations of the women she was released, and returned to her house of refuge. Tryphaena, who had meantime recovered from her swoon, welcomed her back, professed herself convinced of the truth of the resurrection and of the life beyond death, and offered to make her heiress in her daughter's stead of all that she had. Thecla nevertheless abode with her but eight days; in which time, however, she so effectually declared the gospel to the whole household, that most of the maids, with their mistress, were converted. To rejoin Paul was her first thought; and accordingly, hearing that he was at Myra in Lycia, she disguised herself in man's attire and set out for that city with a train of attendants, male and female. There she found him preaching the word, and seeing him she exclaimed, "I have received the washing, O Paul; for He that wrought with thee towards the gospel, hath wrought with me also that I should be washed." Then after relating to him and his disciples in the house of Hermaeus (*or* Hermes) the wonderful story of her trials and deliverances at Antioch, she proceeded to Iconium, leaving with him large alms for the poor out of bounty bestowed on her by Tryphaena, and receiving from him the parting charge, "Go and teach (δίδασκε) the word of God." Arrived at Iconium, she first visited the house of Onesiphorus, and there prostrating herself on the spot where Paul had sat and taught, she gave thanks to God and the Lord Jesus Christ for her conversion and for her preservation in her twofold martyrdom. There was no longer anything to fear from the importunities of Thamyris, who had died in the

interval; but she found her mother still living, and offered to share with her the wealth she had received from Tryphaena, and endeavoured also, but apparently without success, to bring her to believe in the Lord. Finally she departed to Seleucia, where she "enlightened many and died in peace." Thus the story ends in its oldest form, as preserved in ancient Syriac and Latin versions; but the four extant Greek copies represent her as living an anchorite's life in a cave, on herbs and water, and they subjoin a marvellous account (certainly of more recent composition) of her latter years. Some heathen physicians of Seleucia, being jealous of miraculous cures wrought by her, sent hired ruffians to violate her virginity, hoping thereby to deprive her of the favour of Artemis, to whom they ascribed her gifts of healing. But the rock opened miraculously and gave her an asylum from the attempted outrage. She then (according to three of these copies, A, B and C) proceeded to Rome[b] to see Paul once more, but was too late to find him alive. She died there soon after, and was buried near his tomb, at the age of ninety, having survived her martyrdom seventy-two years.

Though the story of which the above is an outline was undoubtedly written originally in Greek, the oldest Greek MS. of it is not earlier than the tenth century. But ample proofs of its high antiquity are forthcoming. The framer of the so-called *Decree* of Gelasius, *De Libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, which though not of the sixth is probably of the early years of the seventh century, found it needful formally to exclude (c. vi.) from the list of "scriptures received by the church" the "book which is called the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*." The Syriac version of it above referred to, extant in four MSS., one of which is of the sixth century, contains (as will be shown) internal evidence that the Greek text had been long in existence and frequently copied before the Syrian translator did his work. We have also an enlarged and expanded *Life of Thecla*, composed before the middle of the fifth century by Basil, bishop of Seleucia (in Isauria), which professedly is framed on the lines of a previous work, then ancient. A comparison of our *Acts of Paul and Thecla* with this *Life* leaves no doubt that the former is the basis of the latter. These *Acts*[c] then were "ancient" early in the fifth century, and can hardly therefore be of later date than the year 300. In the fourth century, Hilary (the Ambrosian) has several clear references to these *Acts* (in his *Commentary* on 1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Tim. i. 15; iv. 14; cp. *Acts* 1:—also on 2 Tim. ii. 18; cp. *Acts* 14); and even (as it seems) cites them in connexion with the last passage, as "*alia Scriptura*." Jerome, writing about the same time or a few years later, mentions (*De Viris Ill.* c. 7) but rejects, a book called Περίοδοι Παύλου καὶ Θέκλης, which he says was discredited by a monstrous incident of a lion being baptized. This may have been an edition of our *Acts*, heightened by additional and more startling marvels: but it is more probable that Jerome is here inaccurately describing the book as we have it, which he seems to have known only by a hasty glance at it, or possibly by hearsay. But the very early currency in Christendom of a written narrative of the life of Thecla is proved by the much earlier, more exact, and more authentic evidence of the writer whose authority Jerome here appeals to, Tertullian, in his treatise *De Baptismo* (c. 17), written about A.D. 200. In this passage Tertullian refuses to admit the authority of certain writings falsely assuming the name of Paul ("Pauli perperam scripta;" *al.*, "Paulo perperam adscripta") which some alleged in support of the claim of women to teach and baptize after "the example of Thecla:" for these (he says) were the production of a certain "presbyter of Asia," who was on his own confession proved to have composed them "through love of Paul" (as he said), and who for this fraud was degraded from the presbyterate. Jerome repeats this account of the presbyter's degradation; but represents it as occurring in St. John's time, which seems to be merely an addition of his own, and is inconsistent with our *Acts*, for they, in the age to which they prolong Thecla's life, imply that she survived St. John. Now we may confidently assume that Tertullian did not find in the work he thus rejected the absurdity of the baptism of a lion; for if he had, he would not have failed to urge a point so fatal to the authority of the work on the matter of baptism. It follows, therefore, that this monstrous feature does not belong to the original form of the tale, but is due either to subsequent embellishment, or (which is more likely) to Jerome's careless reproduction of Tertullian's statement. This passage of Tertullian is our earliest evidence that a story of Thecla existed; but whether the extant book of her *Acts* is identical with the Asian presbyter's production, is a question. On the one side Baronius, who (*Annals*, s. a. 45; *Martyrolog. Rom.*, note, 23rd Sept.) upholds these *Acts* as authoritative and of primitive antiquity,—and Stilting (*Acta Sanctt.* 23rd Sept.) who discredits them as a worthless production not earlier than the fourth century, are both alike compelled, the former by his estimate of their worth, the latter by his opinion about their date, to regard them as distinct from the work of the pious but unhistorical imagination of this second-century *falsarius*. Critics who agree in this judgment usually assign for it two chief reasons, both of which are insufficient. One is (1) that our *Acts* do not profess to be written by Paul; the other (2) that they do not represent Thecla as authorized to baptize or teach. But as to the former argument (1), it is uncertain what is the proper title of the extant narrative, which in different versions and MSS. is variously headed: "*Acts of Paul and Thecla*, (Greek A)," "*History of Thecla, Paul's Disciple* (Syriac)," "*Martyrdom of Thecla*" (Greek BCG), "*Passion of Thecla*" (Latin D). And the fact may therefore be that the original title has disappeared, because it represented Paul as the author and was struck out as false and offensive when the true writer was convicted; and that his work survives in our *Acts*, circulated under divers titles given to

---

[b] It is usually taken for granted that Thecla is represented in this story as making her way underground to Rome! But the Greek does not say so.

[c] For the sake of brevity and distinctness, the Acts of Paul and Thecla will, throughout this article, be designated the *Acts* (in italics).

it by its various transcribers, editors, and translators in lieu of the omitted one. Dr. Schlau in his copious treatise *Die Acten des Paulus und der Thecla* (p. 15), understands Tertullian's "*Pauli scripta*" to mean merely "writings *concerning Paul;*" but this interpretation seems hardly admissible. That Paul, though represented as the writer, should be made to speak of himself (as in these *Acts* he is spoken of) in the third person, is nothing unusual, and cannot be alleged as an objection against this explanation. The description of his person (s. 1), and the laudatory terms in which he is spoken of (*passim*), are ill suited to a composition professing to be his, but these are (on this view) to be accounted for merely as marks of the author's deficiency in literary skill and tact,—if they are not rather to be suspected as later (though early) interpolations. And in reply to the second argument (2), the absence of any assertion in these *Acts* of Thecla's right to baptize and teach,—it is enough to point out that the accounts of her self-baptism, and of Paul's last words to her at Myra and of her teaching in Tryphaena's house and afterwards at Seleucia, would furnish apparent authority for those who claimed for women those rights. But at the same time it is to be said that the writer seems to have intended nothing of the sort; for the self-baptism, as he tells it, is clearly an exceptional act which he views as forced providentially on Thecla in her extremity of peril; and the "teaching" and "enlightening" he ascribes to her need not be taken to mean public or official ministrations, but rather such work of Christian instruction as women have done naturally and without question in all ages of the Church, beginning from the time when Priscilla took part in "expounding the grace of God" to Apollos (Acts xiii. 26). On the other side, the arguments in favour of the identity of our *Acts* with the work referred to by Tertullian, are not slight. (1) The appearance of Paul's name (as has been mentioned above) in the oldest form of the *title* of the extant book counts for something, as a trace of the title implied in Tertullian's account. (2) The *contents*, as already shown, are such as might readily though not fairly be construed into precedents for women exercising the office of baptizing and teaching. Then farther, (3) the *falsarius* in Tertullian was "a *presbyter;*" and these *Acts* are apparently the work of an ecclesiastic, showing as they do a knowledge of doctrine (of a certain sort), and a command of New Testament language, such as would not probably be found in a layman. (4) He was "*of Asia*," that is, Asia Minor: and in Asia Minor, accordingly, the scene of the *Acts* is laid chiefly (exclusively, if the Antioch of Thecla's second martyrdom was the Pisidian Antioch):—and the amount of local knowledge shown in the narrative concerning the places named, the familiarity with names of cities together with imperfect acquaintance with geographical details, is such as a man writing in Asia Minor, but not in the region of it where the scene of the story is laid, might be expected to possess. Again (5), the "love of Paul," pleaded by the presbyter as his motive in his work, appears throughout this narrative as we have it, in the ascription of irresistible influence to Paul's words and presence, and in the almost divine attributes with which his aspect is invested (c. 3); "full of grace" (cp. St. John i. 14), with "the face of an angel." To these arguments, which are borrowed partly from Schlau (pp. 15–19), it may be added (6) that the very mistake (to be noticed presently) made in styling the magistrate at Iconium "proconsul" is characteristic of a dweller in *proconsular* Asia: and (7) that the presbyter's attempt to pass off his work as an apostolic production, for which he was punished, corresponds with the remarkable fact that the *Acts*, though abounding with New Testament phrases, never once cites any New Testament book; an omission which is most probably a mark of the author's desire to make his work appear coeval with the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists. Thus it seems that, on the whole, the balance of probability is distinctly in favour of the identification of our *Acts* with the book known to Tertullian. If so, it is to be regarded as the oldest of the extant New Testament *Apocrypha*.

The story which we have thus traced back, certainly as regards its substance and probably as regards its existing written form, to the second century, has been widely current in the Church, eastern and western, in the centuries that followed. It has already been shown to be nearly certain that one writer of the fourth century, and absolutely certain that Basil, a fifth-century bishop of the city of Seleucia where Thecla is related to have lived and died, knew and used the *Acts* that we now have. Farther, Nicetas towards the end of the ninth century, and Simeon Metaphrastes in the tenth, have both of them written of Thecla on the basis of these same *Acts* (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* t. cv. col. 301; t. cxv. col. 821); as have also many martyrologists, Ado, Usuardus, and Notker, and the compiler of the Greek *Menologium* (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* tt. cxxiii., cxxiv., cxxxi.; *Patr. Gr.-Lat.* t. cxvii.). But though mention of her and her story is frequent in the writings of Fathers, before as well as after this Basil's time, it is noteworthy that none of them cites our *Acts* or any written narrative. At the same time, of all the references to Thecla in ecclesiastical writers, not one (except that already noticed in Jerome) lies distinctly outside the range of the incidents which the *Acts* relate: so that a history of Thecla reconstructed out of the references to her in early Christian writers, would be in fact an abridgment of these *Acts*, containing nearly all its chief points and adding nothing to them. Of these writers, the first in order of time[d] seems to be Methodius, of whose *Symposium Decem Virginum* (written about A.D. 300; see Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* t. xviii.) an account has been given above, in Vol. III. (p. 909). This dialogue is further notable as the only work (not definitely based on our *Acts*) in which Thecla is treated of directly, and not by way of mere passing allusion. Of the ten virgins introduced into it as contending in presence of Arete, which shall pronounce the most eloquent panegyric on

[d] Cyprian of Antioch (see vol. i. p. 755) is perhaps earlier; and in two of the *Orations* ascribed to him—*Or. pro Martyribus, Or. sub die sacrae Passionis*—there is reference to Thecla's ordeal of fire. But his date and very existence are uncertain. (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* t. iv. col. 905.)

virginity, Thecla, whose oration is the longest and most elaborate, is declared victress, and winds up the festivity by a triumphal hymn. In inviting Thecla to speak, Arete designates her a disciple of Paul (col. 137): in her oration she speaks of those who "set little by *wealth*, distinction, *race*, or *marriage*, and are ready to yield their bodies to *wild beasts* and to the *fire*, because of their yearning and enthusiasm (*πόθον . . . ἔκπληξιν*, cp. *Acts*, c. 7, *ἐπεπόθει . . . ἀκούειν τὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον*, and c. 10; *αὐτῆς τὴν ἔκπληξιν*) for the things that are in supermundane places" (col. 140): in her hymn she directly speaks of her escape from the fire and the wild beasts, and her willing abandonment of her country, mother, and family (col. 208): and one of the interlocutors clearly intimates (col. 176) that though ready to endure martyrdom she had not actually undergone it. Similar allusions to her twofold ordeal, on the pyre and in the arena, occur repeatedly in the writings of Gregory Nazianzen; who also speaks of her as a virgin who had escaped the "tyranny" of her betrothed husband and her mother (*Orat.* xxiv. p. 443, t. i.—another reading is "*father*"). See also his *Or. in Julianum*, i. (p. 108, t. i.); and his Hymns, *Praecepta ad Virgg.* 190 (p. 348, t. ii.); *Exhort. ad Virgg.* 87 (p. 383, t. ii.),—in which last place he connects her escape with Paul's suffering hunger (cp. *Acts*, c. 23). Gregory of Nyssa (*Hom.* xiv. *in Cantt.*) speaks of her as Paul's virgin disciple; and elsewhere (*Life of Macrina*) as a virgin martyr (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* t. xliv. col. 1068; t. xlv. col. 961). The incident of her sacrificing her ornaments to purchase access to Paul is turned to account by Chrysostom, "Thecla, for the sake of seeing Paul, gave her jewels: but thou, for the sake of seeing Christ, wilt not give an obolus" (*Hom.* 25 *in Acta App.* 4). Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. *ep.* 87) extols her as a pattern of triumphant chastity, and is apparently the first to style her by the glorious title, ever since appropriated to her, of protomartyr,—that is, as Basil of Seleucia explains (p. 232), first among women, as Stephen among men. Theodore of Mopsuestia is stated by Solomon of Bassora, a thirteenth-century Nestorian (cp. Assemani, *B. O.*, iii. p. 323) to have composed an oration on Thecla, in which it appears that her prayer for Falconilla was mentioned. Epiphanius (*Haeres.* lxxviii. 16; lxxix. 5) praises her for sacrificing under Paul's teaching her prospects of prosperous marriage, and reckons her near to Elias, John the Baptist, and even the Virgin Mother. In the West, her name is similarly joined with that of Agnes, as a virgin worthy to rank with Mary herself, by Ambrose (*De Lapsu Virg.*, p. 307); and by Sulpicius Severus (circ. 400), who relates (*Dialog.* ii. 13) how St. Martin of Tours was favoured with a vision, in which Mary, Agnes, and Thecla appeared and conversed with him (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, t. xx. col. 210). Ambrose in like manner associates her with Mary the Lord's mother, and Miriam Moses' sister (*Ep.* 63, *Ad Vercell. Eccl.*, t. ii. pt. 1, p. 1030); and in this passage and elsewhere *De Virginibus* (ii. 19, p. 166) dwells on her deliverance from the wild beasts; in this last place describing her also as taught by Paul. But an oration, *De S. Agnete*, formerly ascribed to him (t. ii. pt. 2, p. 458), in which her deliverance from the flames is introduced, is now assigned to Maximus of Turin, nearly a century later. If the treatise *De Timore* is a genuine work of Zeno of Verona, it belongs to a still earlier time than the writings of Ambrose above cited; and it may at all events be admitted as a very ancient witness to the currency of the account of Thecla's Antiochian martyrdom as told in the *Acts*, giving as it does the particulars of the bulls goaded to attack her, her peril from the seals, and the fiery cloud which covered her nakedness (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* t. xi. p. 76). Even Jerome, though as we have seen he rejects the written narrative of her life, in two passages (written, however, before the treatise *De Viris Ill.*) attests the traditional prevalence of her fame by adducing her as an example of saintliness. In one of his *Epistles* (22, p. 125) he associates her, as Ambrose does, with Mary and Miriam, promising that they shall welcome Eustochium, to whom he writes, into the virgin choir of heaven. And in his *Chronicle* (s. a. 377) he tells of one Melania, a Roman lady who by her sanctity earned the name of Thecla. But the *Ep. to Oceanus*, once reckoned as his, in which it is told that Paul avoided taking Thecla to journey with him from Antioch, is to be assigned to a fifth-century hand (Migne, t. xxx. p. 290). Augustine also so mentions her as to imply that she was the type of a Christian virgin and martyr (*De sancta Virginitate*, c. 45); and in the record of his controversy with Faustus (*Contra Faust.* xxx. 4), where he states the argument advanced by his adversary on the ground of Paul's preaching of virginity, and Thecla's consequent repudiation of her betrothal, he does so without demurring to it (as Tertullian had done in like case) on the ground that the story was a fiction. Leaving the West, and coming down to later writers, we find Joannes Moschus, early in the seventh century, acquainted with the alleged appearance of the Lord vouchsafed to Thecla (*Prat. Spir.*, 20); and a century later Joannes Damascenus enforces the duty of prayer for the dead by the example of Thecla in the case of Falconilla (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* tt. lxxxvii. pt. 3, col. 2868; xcv. col. 253). Another writer, who seems to have been overlooked by all collectors of patristic testimony to the celebrity of Thecla, is Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem (circ. 630). He indeed ought to have been mentioned with Basil of Seleucia and those who have unmistakably used the *Acts*; for the *Anacreontic Hymn* (13) in which he celebrates her (Migne, t. lxxxvii. pt. 3, col. 3795) is simply a metrical summary of the extant book, reproducing it point by point, with the remarkable exception that neither Iconium nor Antioch is mentioned, and the whole action is made to pass in Seleucia (which he takes to be the Syrian Seleucia, against the authority of Basil, p. 255), Thecla's journeys being thus altogether made to disappear. This omission is probably due to a sense of the indecorum involved in her accompanying Paul, as related in the *Acts*, from Iconium to Antioch; and perhaps also of its inconsistency with the passage where he asserts that he has never used "the right" to lead about *ἀδελφὴν γύναικα* (1 Cor. ix. 5, 12). A like description may be given of the summary of her story contained in the Latin poem *De laudibus Virginum*

of Aldhelm of Sherborne (circ. 700), which, however, gives no note of place whatever (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. lxxxix., col. 272).

In this ample collection of authorities[e] it will be observed that all the more considerable incidents in the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, and several minor ones, are touched on; and no new incidents are added. Some have indeed imagined that they can detect references in this or that author to details that go beyond what these *Acts* relate. But the traces alleged are of the slightest. The only one of any importance is contained in a fragment of a *Homily* printed in the works of Chrysostom (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* t. l. p. 745), which, though not his, is certainly ancient. In this we read of Thecla as opposed by her *parents* (not her mother only), and as pursued while following Paul by her betrothed, who is represented as striving to bring her back by violence. There is here an apparent divergence from the narrative of the *Acts*[f]; but it is probably to be accounted for by oratorical inexactness and amplification, and hardly suffices as evidence of the writer's knowledge of a different story. The same may be said still more decidedly of the touch added by Methodius (col. 137) to his picture of Thecla, whom he describes as a learned maiden, proficient not only in Christian doctrine, but in the φιλοσοφία ἐγκύκλιος καὶ παιδεία; in which account he is confirmed by Basil of Seleucia, who characterizes her as φιλόλογος καὶ φιλόμουσος (*De Vita Th.* ii. 24). In like manner Aldhelm's description of Thecla, "purpureo perfundens *sanguine* corpus," which expression looks like evidence that an account existed of her actual death by violence, is probably due to his ignorance or carelessness in assuming that because she was styled martyr, she must have shed her blood. From phrases of Gregory Nazianzen, who classes her as martyr with the Baptist, Peter, Paul, and Stephen (*Orat. in Julian.*, i.),—and of Ambrose (*De Virginit.* vii. 40), who says she was "proved not by old age but by virtue," — and of Augustine, who in a passage above referred to contrasts her as virgin martyr with Crispina, a matron who died by the sword, the inference has similarly been extorted, that these Fathers believed her not to have died, as the *Acts* state, a natural death at a great age. Setting aside these imaginary exceptions, it remains that we have a chain of writers from the second to the tenth century, and later, some mentioning Thecla by way of incidental allusion, some rewriting her life, each according to the taste of his day,—yet all (with but one real exception, in case of Jerome) conforming to the lines of the narrative as laid down in our *Acts*. It seems unreasonable, therefore, to reject the view which naturally results from and explains these facts, namely that these *Acts* are the source whence, directly or indirectly, all these writers, from Tertullian down, have derived their belief concerning Thecla's life and sufferings. The very fact that Cyprian makes no mention of her even in those works when he might naturally be expected to adduce her as a supreme example of virginity and martyr-spirit, may be taken as a negative evidence in the same direction: for the natural explanation of his silence is, that our *Acts* being unknown to him and the church of Africa at large, or possibly known but to be rejected in consequence of their condemnation by his master Tertullian, there was no other source, oral or written, whence he could learn her story, though it was unquestionably current in his time in the church elsewhere. We are thus warranted in assuming with some confidence that the book, as we have it, is substantially the production of Tertullian's Asian presbyter, though with a new title (or titles), and possibly with some modifications, additions, and omissions, here and there. Yet it seems certain that if such changes have been introduced into it, they cannot have been considerable in degree or amount. The very points which in Tertullian's time were pleaded by heretics as in their favour—Thecla's self-baptism and her work as a teacher—have been suffered to remain: though orthodox readers considered the former at least to need apology, as is shown by the comment made on the incident by Basil of Seleucia, "If any choose to call this a mystic baptism, in the case of the martyr in her moment of peril, so let him call it, and let not the ancient author be blamed for this novel use of the word" (p. 264); while Nicetas goes farther in the same direction, by inserting a statement that she had been previously baptized by Paul (col. 320). In the matter of her teaching also, Basil guards against its being drawn into a precedent, by representing it as a special "apostleship" conferred on her (p. 274); no doubt meaning, what Nicetas after him distinctly lays down, that to her alone of women could this prerogative pertain. So too as regards the obtrusive exaltation of virginity over marriage, strongly savouring of an Encratic tendency, on which the whole story in the *Acts* turns, Basil leaves it substantially as he found it, but feels it needful to put into Paul's mouth the assurance that the married, if chaste, "are not inferior in purity to virgins" (p. 234). These points, moreover, are of value as internal evidence of the early date to which we assign these *Acts*, in identifying them as the work known to Tertullian. They carry us back into the second century; for a writer of a later day, claiming orthodoxy, would not have ventured to make his heroine baptize herself, nor would he have gone so near to disparaging the married state. It may also be urged that the prayer of Thecla for the salvation of a deceased heathen could not have been invented by a third-century writer; but inasmuch as Basil accepts this incident without demur, it seems hardly safe to rely on this point. Other marks of very early date have been noted in the book, and perhaps justly; such as, the simple formula of baptism, "in the name of Jesus" (c. 34), not of the Trinity; the primitive character of the ritual,

[e] Of the Fathers who do not mention her in their extant works, Eusebius shows knowledge of her story when he (*De Martyr. Palaest.* iii.) distinguishes another martyr from her as ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς Θέκλα. (See below, THECLA (6).) And the Παύλου Πράξεις, to which he refers (*H. E.* xxv. 4), may perhaps be our *Acts*, as Hilgenfeld suggests (*N. T. extra Canon. recept.*, pt. iv. f., p. 69). Athanasius appears to have written a Life of her, said to be extant in a MS. of the library of the Escurial (Baronius, *Martyrol. Rom.*, 23rd Sept.).

[f] May it not be that the μνηστήρ whom the Pseudo-Chrysostom represents as pursuing Thecla is not Thamyris, but Alexander? If so, the divergence disappears.

consisting in "kneeling and the breaking of bread and preaching;" and the gathering for worship in private houses (c. 5). But it is to be remarked that all these points are to be found in the canonical Acts; and it may well be that the author of these spurious *Acts* is not in these touches indicating the practices of his own day, but has borrowed them, in order to give an apostolic colour to his production, from St. Luke's narrative, with which he was certainly very familiar. The like argument may be advanced, subject to the same doubt, as to the use of the name "Christian" in these *Acts*, which appears here as in the New Testament, rather as one applied by heathens to Christ's disciples than as one adopted among themselves. But it seems fair to argue that the idea of making the accusation of Christianity a capital charge, when taken in conjunction with this limited use of the word "Christian," belongs naturally to the time when the profession of Christianity had but recently been made penal; that is, to the reign of Trajan (A.D. 98–117) or soon after. Yet at the same time the tone of the speeches addressed to the Roman magistrates by Paul and Thecla (cc. 17, 37) is that of persons not apprehending a severe or biassed judgment against their religion; nor does the story represent them as punished for their religion alone, but on accessory charges: as Schlau (p. 78) justly points out, the relations implied in it as subsisting between the accused Christians and the magistrates are such as Justin Martyr indicates in his *Apologia*, and savour of his time rather than of days (before him or after) when persecution was rife. There is justice also in the remark of the same critic that, in general, the dogmatics and Christology of these *Acts*, even in the speeches just referred to where doctrinal statement is essayed, are less developed than we should expect to find in a work of the third century, but belong rather to an earlier period. And though, in assigning the work thus to the second century, we are not warranted (as has already been admitted) in assuming that it has come down to us exactly as it first issued from the author's hand, the arguments just adduced in favour of its early date, tell with nearly equal force against the notion that it has undergone anything like a recension—least of all a doctrinal recension. It is therefore difficult to admit as probable the view recently put forward by Dr. Lipsius (*Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*, 1887, vol. ii., pt. 1, pp. 448 ff.), that the work as we have it is a third-century catholic recension of a Gnostic original which was the work known to Tertullian. The tinge of Encratism which is undeniably traceable in these Acts, is of course *prima facie* in favour of this; but, as will be shown farther on, it does not really amount to evidence of Gnostic origin. And Dr. Lipsius's theory seems condemned *ab initio* by the fact, that Tertullian gives no hint that the book he knew was heretical in doctrine, but merely rejects it as an authority on a question of discipline, because it was a spurious document; and accordingly represents the author as punished not for any heterodoxy contained in it, but for fraud in attempting to pass it off as apostolic. There is no reason, external or internal, for supposing it to have undergone any changes, except such alteration of title and the like as should divest it of all claim to an authority to which it was not entitled. On the other hand, the almost opposite view previously put forward by Schlau, and adopted by Harnack, is hardly more tenable, that in our *Acts* we have the deliberate attempt of a Catholic writing in the second century to represent Paul in antagonism to the Gnosticism of the writer's own day (which Schlau (p. 59) assumes to be something intermediate between the rudimentary Gnosticism of the apostolic age, and the fuller developments of later heretics), represented in the persons of Demas and Hermogenes. No doubt this view has a real foundation of fact, for these persons are represented as teaching the very heresy "that the resurrection is passed already," and in the very same words, which St. Paul denounced in the Second Epistle to Timothy (ii. 18). But it is clear that such an attempt, if it ever was deliberately present to the writer's mind, must have been forgotten by him after the earlier chapters, and passed away along with the personages in question, who disappear from the story after c. 16. The truth is, that his leading purpose, so far as he had one beyond the glorifying of Paul and Thecla, was to extol virginity. This appears distinctly, first in his narrative of Thecla's first ordeal at Iconium, to which he represents her as condemned not because she had embraced the gospel, but because she contumaciously repudiated her contract of marriage; and again, yet more signally, in her second ordeal at Antioch, in which she was cast to the wild beasts not as a punishment for her Christian profession (for the governor does not even learn that she is a Christian until after her deliverance), but for the "sacrilege" involved in the indignity offered by her to the Syriarch, whose official "crown" she plucked off while struggling to defend her chastity against his violence, as a virtuous heathen maiden might have done. This purpose then, together with the motive, which according to Tertullian, the writer himself pleaded, and no doubt truly, the "love of Paul," gives the simplest and only sufficient account of the origin of the work. The writer attempted to effect a pious fraud, for the glory (as he conceived) of the great Apostle, by taking up a story no doubt traditionally current in Asia Minor in his time, of a virgin martyr, whose life as a disciple of St. Paul he strove to work up to the best of his skill into such form as to fit it to be an episode in St. Paul's history as recounted in the Acts of the Apostles, or perhaps a supplement to it. If we are to take the opening incidents of the *Acts* as belonging to St. Paul's first visit to Iconium, they find place in Acts xiv.; and the manner in which he is represented as received there, as if he had been previously unknown personally, is in favour of this view. But, on the other hand, he is supposed to be welcomed on his arrival by what seems a Christian congregation already existing in Iconium, which is quite inconsistent with what St. Luke describes in the chapter just referred to; and besides, it is hardly conceivable that a writer meaning to indicate the time of that first visit, and knowing the canonical Acts so familiarly as the author of our *Acts* evidently knew them, should have forgotten the presence

of Silas with Paul, their resort in the first instance to the Jewish synagogue, the opposition on the part of the Jews which marked their sojourn, and the manner of their final expulsion from the city; all of which, as recorded by St. Luke, not only appear nowhere in these *Acts*, but are entirely incompatible with the course of events therein related. It seems much more probable that the author wishes to be understood as narrating the incidents of a second visit to Iconium, at a subsequent time which he has not attempted to define, and that in fixing on that city as the abode of Thecla, and the scene of the first trials shared by her with Paul, he has taken the hint from a verse in another book of the New Testament with which, as will presently be shown, internal evidence proves him to have been well acquainted, the Second Epistle to Timothy (iii. 11), "the *persecutions*, the sufferings, which befel me in Antioch, in *Iconium*." He does not (it must be owned) give any intimation that a previous visit had taken place, except in so far as that is implied by the description of him as preaching immediately on his arrival, not to unconverted Jews or Gentiles, but to a Christian church gathered to hear him in "*the house of Onesiphorus*"; the mention of which (it is to be noted) seems also to be suggested by the same epistle (i. 16; iv. 19); whence, moreover, he apparently derived the names of the Apostle's adversaries, Demas (iv. 10) and Hermogenes (i. 15). And here it is to be added that the appearance of Demas in this character cannot properly belong to the time of Acts xiv., for we know him to have been still in St. Paul's company while he was imprisoned at Rome, nearly twenty years after. But the author's failure (which all will admit) to give distinct notes of the time to which his story is to be supposed to belong, is no doubt due to his lack of historic sense and of literary skill. And the same account is to be given of certain breaks, hitches, and repetitions in the narrative, which Dr. Lipsius (pp. 443 ff.) adduces as traces of the "working over" which he supposes our *Acts* to have undergone, or as signs that they have not come down to us in their integrity. The disappearance (already noted) of Demas and Hermogenes,—the want of all account of Thecla during the six days which are made (c. 23) to intervene between her escape from the pyre and her rejoining Paul (in which interval Dr. Lipsius supposes the original narrative to have introduced her flight, and the pursuit of Thamyris, referred to by the pseudo-Chrysostom)—Paul's sudden vanishing from the scene after denying all knowledge of Thecla at Antioch—the incredible reiteration of detail in the piled-up horrors of the wild-beast conflicts of the second ordeal, all these are undeniable defects. Yet they by no means prove that the *Acts* have come down to us mutilated or interpolated, but merely that the author was wanting in constructive power or unpractised in narrative. The same literary deficiency shows itself in a graver form, when we consider his presentation of Paul's character, conduct, and doctrine. An obvious instance is his passive submission to scourging at Iconium (c. 21), without any such protest as he addressed to the duumvirs of Philippi (Acts xvi. 37), and to the centurion at Jerusalem (xxii. 25). So, too, the story of his hiding in a tomb after his expulsion from the city, is quite unlike any real incident recorded of his life. His journey with Thecla as companion has already been noticed as contrary alike to his custom as declared by himself, and to decorum. A more striking point still is the falsehood and cowardice which our author (without any hint of moral misgiving) attributes to him in the scene at Antioch just referred to, when he is made to deceive the Syriarch, and basely abandon Thecla to his violence. But more signally unworthy (if possible) of the Apostle than the conduct thus imputed to him, is the doctrine put into his mouth. And herein we observe how, with a large and verbally exact knowledge (characteristic of one who had a "love of Paul") of the parts of the New Testament whence a knowledge of Paul's life and teaching is to be gathered—his Epistles and the Acts,—the author combines an utter want of faculty to appreciate or reproduce their spirit. This fact shows itself most conspicuously in the exaggerated estimate of virginity which has been above noted as the *motif* of the *Acts*. The real St. Paul commended celibacy in a limited aspect and under special circumstances (1 Cor. vi. 1, 35 ff.): he glorified marriage absolutely and to the uttermost in showing it as the type of the eternal union of Christ with His church (Eph. v. 25–32). The Paul of this fiction makes celibacy so fully synonymous with chastity, that in his eyes marriage cannot be pure unless man and wife live on the terms of practical celibacy which the Apostle allows only as occasional, and for devotional ends, and forbids (as unsafe because unnatural) as a permanent mode of married life (1 Cor. vii. 5). It is to be added that such skill as the author possessed, appears chiefly in the ingenuity with which he now and then works in a Pauline phrase, to give colour to a speech in itself of utterly un-Pauline character placed by him in the Apostle's mouth. Good examples of this are to be found in the address supposed to be spoken by him in the house of Onesiphorus, which begins with a string of beatitudes, in form moulded after those of the opening of the Sermon on the Mount, but studded here and there with phrases borrowed from the genuine words of St. Paul, all of them in some degree turned from their proper bent, one (1 Cor. vii. 29) entirely perverted in application. "Blessed are they that *keep* the flesh *pure*, for they shall be made *a temple of God*" (c. 5; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Cor. iii. 16, &c.) "Blessed are *they that have wives as though they had none*," for they shall *inherit God* (*ib.*; 1 Cor. vii. 29; Rom. viii. 17). "Blessed are they who for the love of Christ have gone forth from *the fashion of the world*, for they *shall judge angels*" (c. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 31; vi. 3). This failure to enter into the mind of Paul or assume his personality, unavoidably leads to inconsistencies between this spurious work and the genuine documents which proceed from the Apostle's pen or record his words and acts: and that alike in the general conception of the Christian life and character as taught or exemplified by him, and in definite particular points, where the contradiction is more striking. Some such instances have been already adduced; many others have been noticed by other writers; and some, as it seems, perhaps

unduly emphasized. Thus, it has been pointed out (Schlau, p. 83; Lipsius, p. 462) that in the First Epistle to Timothy alone (an epistle of which our author admittedly shows knowledge) St. Paul appears as condemning three distinct precepts or practices which in our *Acts* he is made to countenance by word or example:—(1) "forbidding to marry" (1 Tim. iv. 3); (2) "abstaining from meats" (*ib.*); (3) women teaching (ii. 12). These contradictions Schlau, apparently holding this Epistle not to be St. Paul's, accounts for as designedly introduced by the author, who on his theory is an orthodox Gentile Christian of the second century, dissatisfied with the teaching given in the Epistle as from Paul, and desirous to credit the Apostle with teaching more in accordance with the taste of those for whom these *Acts* were composed. Dr. Lipsius has no difficulty in showing (p. 463) that this explanation of the matter is inadmissible, as attributing to second-century Gentile Catholics views which there is no reason for supposing them to have held. And it is to be added that it farther labours under a special improbability, in that it requires us here to suppose the Paul of these *Acts* to be an embodiment of second-century orthodox opposition to the teaching of the *First* Epistle to Timothy, whereas in the early part of the work Paul is introduced as preaching, in opposition to second-century Gnosticism, doctrine distinctly derived from the *Second* Epistle; a fact which Schlau, as has been shown above, had previously pointed out and even exaggerated. Schlau's theory can therefore only be adopted by one who is prepared to believe, that the orthodox of the second century admitted the second of this pair of Epistles as genuine, and rejected the first. But the account which Dr. Lipsius himself offers instead is, if possible, less worthy of acceptance,—that the alleged contradictions are due to the original Gnostic author of the *Acts*, who desired to set up against the Paul of the First Pastoral Epistle, "a Paul made after the taste of those who shared *his* (the author's) belief." It is incredible that points thus designedly introduced into the *Acts* to favour Gnostic practices, in opposition to what is so emphatically laid down in this Epistle, in order to check such practices, could have escaped the expunging hand of the orthodox third-century reviser (who would certainly have held 1 Timothy to be a book of canonical authority) whom Lipsius supposes to have moulded the work into the form in which we now have it. It is far simpler to receive, in accordance with the general view above put forward, as the true explanation of these inconsistencies between our *Acts* and the epistle in question, the facts of the author's deficient conception of the mind of the man of whom he wrote, and his inadequate grasp (which Schlau himself animadverts on, §§ 5, 6) of Pauline doctrine;—and not to suppose that there was any deliberate purpose on his part of opposing, on whatever ground, the teaching of any part of the New Testament. Nay, though it is evident that he has thus failed completely in making his Paul speak or act as the real Paul spoke and acted, it may well be questioned whether the distinct contradictions alleged to be found between the example of his Paul and the teaching of 1 Timothy, really deserve to be so called. It has been already shown that the example of Thecla in the *Acts* gives no such countenance to (1) the assumption by women of the office of teaching, as would be inconsistent with the pointed prohibition against suffering a woman to teach (1 Tim. ii. 12). So, too, as to (2) St. Paul's fasting in his hiding-place. Even if we admit it to be a voluntary fast, and with religious purpose (which is by no means evident), it is no more incompatible with his condemnation of those who commanded to "abstain from meats" (iv. 3) than are the authentic records of his fasts (Acts ix. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 5; xi. 27); while the account of Thecla's lifelong diet of herbs is supposed to belong to her life after her final parting from Paul, and is represented as part of her austerities as an anchorite in a cave, not as a general rule for Christians. It seems to be only on the remaining point (3), the exaltation of celibacy as the highest state of life, that the contradiction is real. And even on this point, the teaching of the Paul of the *Acts* can hardly be said to come within the scope of the condemnation of those who "forbid to marry" (iv. 3): for there is no express disparagement of marriage in the *Acts*, it is only indirectly to be inferred from the exaggerated laudation of celibacy; and the view of the married state thus implied is rather that it falls short of Christian perfection than that it is definitely to be forbidden as contrary to Christian purity. That Paul forbade the young to marry on pain of forfeiting their part in the resurrection, is stated not as his true teaching, but as the misrepresentation of it by his enemies, Demas and Hermogenes. It is easy to understand how a writer possessed with the passionate enthusiasm for virginity which prevailed in the early Church, and went to insane and heretical lengths in the sects, would fix on the well-known passages of St. Paul's writings where the religious advantages of a single life are dwelt on, and forget or ignore alike the Apostle's presentation of the married state in the supreme holiness of its ideal, and his one brief though express denunciation of those who would prohibit marriage. Dr. Salmon (*Introd. to N. T.*, 2nd ed., p. 420), though strongly impressed by the Gnostic affinities of our *Acts*, has well pointed out how naturally an orthodox writer in the early church, in his zeal against the abominations of heathen impurity, might fall into "extravagance of statement," wearing a "heretical aspect," while asserting the Christian duty of restraining the indulgence of the flesh. Moreover, it is to be observed (against Schlau and Lipsius alike) that even were the alleged contradictions between the *Acts* and Timothy ever so marked, they would by no means warrant the inference that the author, orthodox or heretic, was consciously or otherwise disowning the authority of this Epistle. Many examples might be cited of pious Christians in many ages of the Church, who have exalted austere abstinence from marriage, and from animal food, more highly than our author can be alleged to do,—and, again, of devout women who have taken upon them the teacher's office, with the full approval of devout men, and under circumstances of publicity far beyond what he attributes to Thecla's teaching,—and who all the while had no thought of going against the authority of St. Paul, or of questioning the authenticity of any Epistle received by the church as his.

The relation which these *Acts* bear to the New Testament Scriptures is an element of importance in approximately determining their date. On the positive side, the author's extensive and familiar employment of New Testament diction stands in marked contrast to the usage of the writers of the sub-apostolic age, who wrote before sufficient time had elapsed for an accurate and verbal knowledge of the New Testament Scriptures to be possible, and approaches more closely to that of the writers of the middle or even the latter part of the second century,—of Justin Martyr or the writer of the Epistle to the Churches of Lyons and Vienne.[s] On the negative side, his utter failure to grasp or imitate the spirit of the sacred writers whose language he so freely employs, betrays a mind alien to theirs, and separates him from them by an interval for which a century is hardly too large a measure to assign. With one document which is usually assigned to the period thus indicated, the earlier part of the latter half of the second century, the so-called second *Epistle* of Clement of Rome—these *Acts*, as Schlau has pointed out (p. 58), have considerable affinity. Dr. Lipsius places the *Acts* later than Marcion's time (p. 463), because of the knowledge they show of the Pastoral Epistles which were not in Marcion's canon. Having rejected his assumption, which is implied in this argument, that our *Acts* are of Gnostic origin, we cannot admit his reasoning; but the conclusion he thus draws as to the date of the work agrees with that which we have seen to be probable on other grounds. Schlau has shown, as it has already been stated, that Trajan's reign apparently fixes a superior limit to the age of the work; and it is obvious to remark that a simpler determination of the same is given by the fact, that the beginning of Thecla's story cannot be placed before St. Paul's first arrival at Iconium (Acts xiii.), which was in A.D. 45, and that her death is related by her biographer as occurring 72 years after her second martyrdom, therefore not earlier than 117, the year of Trajan's death. And an inferior limit is furnished by the mention of it in Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, the date of which treatise is about 200,—at which time the *Acts* had attained currency and authority, and cannot well have been less than thirty years in existence. The work thus falls into the interval between 120 and 180 (more probably 130 and 170), and the reasons already given dispose us to assign it to the latter rather than the earlier part of that interval. A more exact determination of its date does not seem to be possible.

That the book as we have it is a fiction, few will doubt; but it is a fair question whether it has been formed on a nucleus of fact; and if so, how far it may be possible to distinguish the fact from the accretions of invention. The incidental reference to Thecla made by Eusebius proves that he regarded her as a real person; and if Athanasius wrote her life, he is also to be reckoned on the same side. Tertullian, even in rejecting her written history, raises no doubt as to her existence, as he certainly would have done if he suspected that she was a creature of the Asian presbyter's imagination. Jerome, while he is still more emphatic in his condemnation of the book, expressly names her as a virgin saint. It is hardly likely that if Thecla existed only as we see her in the pages of this romance, a vague and colourless embodiment of the enthusiasm of virginity, her history and example could have so powerfully impressed themselves on the mind of Christendom for so many ages, and been had in honour by so many generations of the devout faithful, including some of the foremost intellects of the church. The monastery that marked her place of retreat and bore her name, which, as we learn from Gregory of Nazianzum (*Orat.* xxi. p. 399, t. i.; *Poemata Hist.* s. i. 11, p. 703, t. ii.), had made Seleucia a place of pilgrimage before he retired there (circ. 375), is not only a farther evidence of her reality, but also serves to confirm the localization in that city of the traditions concerning her. It thus appears to be a probable account to offer of the genesis of our *Acts* that they have grown out of a true tradition, handed down from the later apostolic age, of a maiden of Asia Minor who was converted to the Gospel, and for its sake renounced all and braved death, that she might remain a chaste virgin for Christ, and who having escaped martyrdom, lived and died in sanctity at Seleucia. The Asian presbyter whom Tertullian makes known to us, casting about to find materials for a story in exaltation of virginity, would naturally turn his eyes to St. Paul, as not only an unmarried apostle (as St. John also was), but the only New Testament writer in whom the doctrine of the superiority of the celibate over the married state could claim to find any show of countenance,—and would fix on him for his hero. The tradition which we have supposed to be current in the Church, of a Christian virgin who incurred the peril of martyrdom for virginity, and ended her days as an anchorite near Seleucia, would supply his heroine and leading incidents. Her name was probably part of the traditional story; for our author, if left to invent a name, would no doubt have pitched either on a Scriptural one or on one of obvious Christian significance. A verse of 2 Timothy, as pointed out above, would suggest the scene, "at *Antioch*, at *Iconium*." Being of no critical turn himself, and writing for no critical readers, he would not enquire to what stage of St. Paul's course this Epistle belonged, or which Antioch was meant in the verse referred to; nor would he care to determine, as in point of fact he has not clearly determined, either of these points in his narrative.

[s] An ample, yet not exhaustive, list of the instances in which the language of the New Testament is reproduced in our *Acts*, has been industriously collected by Schlau (pp. 80–82), showing the author to have been familiar certainly with many, probably with most, of the books. The Epistles of St. Peter seem to be almost the sole exception of consequence. Thus the *Acts*, assuming their second-century composition to have been satisfactorily established, are of value as evidence of the early reception of the New Testament canon nearly as it is now accepted in the church. This is important, especially in the case of the Epistles to Timothy above referred to. For the absence of express citation of any book, and for its explanation, see above, p. 886 (7). In contrast with this large use of the New Testament, it is to be noted that no trace of the Old Testament appears in the *Acts*. This fact, and also the omission of all mention of Jews at Antioch or Iconium (so unlike what we find in the canonical Acts), seems to indicate that the author was a Gentile Christian.

That his other *dramatis personae* in the early part of his work, Demas and Hermogenes, Titus and Onesiphorus, are derived from the same Epistle, has also been already shown. Of the other names introduced into the narrative, that of Theocleia the mother is probably a form of Thecla's own name (whether the former is an Asian name graecized, or the latter an Asian contraction of a Greek name), while those of Thamyris the suitor and Alexander the Syriarch seem alone to be arbitrarily chosen.[h] It has been shown by von Gutschmidt (*Die Königsnamen in den apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*, in *Rheinisch. Mus.* 1864, pp. 177–179, 396, 397) that Castelius the governor is not improbably a real person, and that the "queen Tryphaena" may very likely be identical with a repudiated wife of Polemon II. King of Pontus, who is proved by the evidence of a coin to have been certainly living in St. Paul's time, and who was probably cousin (by descent from Mark Antony) to the emperors Claudius and Nero.[i] But to draw any presumption in favour of the historical character of the book from the fact that historical characters are brought into it, is manifestly unsafe. We do not receive the *Heart of Midlothian* as an authentic chronicle, because Queen Caroline and John Duke of Argyll appear in its narrative; and it is on grounds quite independent of the mention of these personages that we believe the heroine of the story to have really existed, and its leading incidents to be true in the main. The manner of the death to which Thecla was exposed may probably have been part of the traditionary story, but the twofold ordeal of the pyre and the arena, is plainly an amplification of the author's fancy. Of the two, the exposure to wild beasts, a more familiar and probable form of martyrdom, seems to have the best claim to be regarded as belonging to the original tradition; and the tale of the previous trial by fire no doubt was added by the writer in his desire to combine in his Thecla's history the two deliverances recorded in the Book of Daniel, of the three youths from the fiery furnace, and of the prophet himself from the lion's den. This parallelism between the narrative in Daniel and that of our *Acts* appears to have struck Basil of Seleucia (p. 263).

The history of Thecla as we have it, whether this account of its origin be accepted or not, whether it be mere fiction or a true tradition worked up into a religious romance, is by no means without merit as a literary work. It has many touches of pathos, its incidents are striking and effectively told, and here and there the speeches (which are never of tedious length) rise nearly to the height of eloquence. Defective as we have seen it to be in structure, yet even here, as well as in interest of narrative, it compares advantageously with the clumsy dulness of the Clementine literature; its marvels, however startling, are less extravagant than those of the apocryphal Gospels and Acts; and on the whole it is distinctly above the level of the class of writings (most if not all of them of later date) to which it is usually referred. Its great defects have been already dwelt on, the chief being the failure to realize and reproduce the spirit and personality of Paul: and it has also been pointed out how it is wanting even in the minor matter of indicating distinctly the time and place of the occurrences related, though the author's aim is presumably to connect his work with the canonical narrative. Schlau's opinion (p. 17), that the local knowledge displayed in the work is such as might naturally belong to a resident in Asia Minor, is not to be accepted without qualification. It might on the contrary be said with justice, that if the author had more carefully studied the canonical Acts with a view to local and chronological knowledge, he might have assigned the scene and date of his narrative with much more definiteness and accuracy than he has succeeded in doing. As an instance of his vagueness it may be observed that he seems uncertain how Lystra lay relatively to Iconium (cc. 1, 3), and that his idea of the position and distance of Daphne seems equally indistinct (c. 23.). So too in his records of Thecla's journeys, he is content to name the starting-point and the terminus, never venturing to commit himself by noting any place passed through on the way. Again, his knowledge of political geography is shown to be lacking when he represents the chief magistrates of Iconium (c. 16) and of Antioch (c. 33) as addressed by the title of proconsul (ἀνθύπατε), thus betraying that he supposed these cities to belong to proconsular provinces, whereas Iconium, though territorially included in Lycaonia, was in St. Paul's time extra-provincial, as the head of an independent tetrarchy (Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* v. 25); and Antioch was the capital of Syria, an imperial province governed by a propraetor. Or even if we regard Iconium as of Lycaonia, and the Antioch meant to be the Pisidian, it is

[h] The names of the wife and sons of Onesiphorus are so variously written in the MSS. that it is not possible to decide whether they are meant for New Testament names.

[i] The name Tryphaena, borne by a queen, points to the Ptolemies, among whom (and in no other reigning family) it is known to have been hereditary. Now the last recorded survivor of that family, Selene, daughter of Antony and Cleopatra, was the wife of Juba II. King of Mauretania. Tryphaena, wife of Polemon, may therefore be presumed to be a daughter of this marriage; and if so, she was cousin-german of the emperor Claudius, his mother Antonia (*minor*) being half-sister of Selene. Tryphaena may probably have been repudiated by Polemon, who is known to have married Berenice (Acts xxv. 23) in or after the year 48. Gutschmidt supposes her to have then retired to the Pisidian Antioch, which he takes to be the scene of Thecla's θηριομαχία, and to have been living then at the time of that event, which he sets down as occurring soon after St. Paul's first visit to Iconium in 46, under the reign of Claudius. But the repudiation of Tryphaena, if effected in order to make room, in 48, for Berenice, is not likely to have been so early as 46. The year 47 or 48 would suit better in point of chronology; and as to locality, the Syrian Antioch is as probable a refuge for Tryphaena as the Pisidian. Moreover, if we suppose the story to belong to the latter part of St. Paul's life, Nero, who was then reigning, would be a kinsman of the grand-daughter of Antony, though two degrees farther removed than Claudius. We may therefore accept Gutschmidt's ingenious identification of Tryphaena, without at all adopting his view of the time and place of the θηριομαχία; for the theory lends itself as well in point of place, and better in point of time, to the views preferred in this article,—that the writer intends for his story a later date than that of St. Paul's first visit to Iconium, and that he sends Thecla to the wild beasts at Antioch of Syria, not of Pisidia.

evident that in neither city would so high an official as the proconsul of Asia be resident, as the *Acts* represent. The author, being of Asia, that is of the Roman province, supposed a proconsul to be found at Iconium and at Antioch, because he had himself been accustomed to see a proconsul at Ephesus or Smyrna: and thus in fact Tertullian's statement that he was of Asia (taken in that limited sense) is borne out, not by his exact knowledge, as Schlau supposed, but by his mistake. He has such knowledge of places and political arrangements, and only such, as would naturally belong to an untravelled ecclesiastic of the Roman province of Asia, possessing a familiar but far from critical or precise knowledge of the New Testament in general and the Book of Acts in particular. It is superfluous to point out how all this vagueness and inaccuracy contrasts with the definite assignments of time and place, the clearly-marked itineraries, the numerous and detailed statements of incidents, which are characteristic of St. Luke's work, and which, the more rigorously they are tested, stand out so much the more conspicuous in absolute and unerring truthfulness. Thus the contents of these *Acts of Paul and Thecla* serve indirectly to confirm the authenticity of the canonical Acts by showing how difficult, it may safely be said how impossible it would be for a *falsarius*, even if writing at no great distance in place or time from the scene and date of his fictitious narrative, to avoid betraying himself by mistakes such as the author of our *Acts* has fallen into. And the history of the reception of his work proves further that such attempt to palm off pseudo-apostolic documents for genuine was not difficult of exposure, nor passed over as a light offence. The Asian church of the second century was quick to detect the pious fraud, and severe in punishing it; and in her dealing with the case there is no trace of uncritical promptitude to receive whatever offered itself as apostolical, or of the lax morality that would accept as true whatever seemed edifying,—such as modern writers are apt to impute to the early generations of Christians. Dr. Lipsius, indeed, maintains (p. 460) that the work and its author were condemned, not because of the fraud attempted, but because of the Gnostic doctrine which he supposes it to have originally embodied. But this is mere conjecture; and not only so, but a conjecture which, while professedly based on Tertullian's authority, not merely ignores his express statement, but substitutes for it another and an essentially different one. Tertullian, writing of a matter concerning which he appears to have been well informed, and which was recent, is surely a competent witness; and his testimony is express, that the author of the *Acts* was deposed from the presbyterate, not because the teaching of his book was heretical, but because its narrative was an imposture.

The work, such as it is in itself, and poor as it appears when compared with the canonical record of the life of St. Paul, has had undoubtedly a wide and lasting success. To it chiefly, if not altogether, are due the celebrity of Thecla as evinced by the long chain of testimonies above cited, and the high place held by her in the hagiology of the Church. Of her fame a solemn attestation is given by the Roman Office for the Dying, where Thecla, alone of saints not recorded in Scripture, is named, and her deliverances recited, in the commendatory prayers. It is confirmed too by the record of convents and churches of St. Thecla. The earliest of these was no doubt the παρθενὼν at Seleucia,[j] visited in the fourth century (as already mentioned) by Gregory of Nazianzum, with its altar standing (according to Basil) on the spot where she passsed miraculously from life into the earth that opened to receive her. Theodoret (*Hist. Relig.* xxix.) records the pilgrimage of SS. Marana and Cyra to the same shrine, early in the following century; and from Seleucia the repute of the saint went abroad, as a worker of miracles, thirty of which are recounted by Basil in the second book of his work. A great church was dedicated to her in the same city, as we learn from Evagrius (*H. E.* iii. 8), by the emperor Zeno, himself an Isaurian, to whom she had appeared in a vision and promised him victory over his rival Basiliscus (476–7). Another church, perhaps of earlier date, in the Syrian Antioch, marked the place of the virgin's triumphant struggle against the violence of the Syriarch (Basil, p. 257); a fact which, whether regarded as evidence of the great and early popularity of our *Acts*, or as due to a previous tradition, serves in either case to confirm the claim of this city rather than its Pisidian namesake to be regarded as the scene of Thecla's exposure to the wild beasts. Justinian, early in the sixth century, built a church in her honour in Constantinople, and before the end of the seventh that city contained three churches of the same dedication, to which in the eleventh another was added by Isaac Comnenus as a thank-offering for his escape from a great storm and flood which overtook him on her feast-day (Anna Comnena, *Alexias*, p. 90). Other churches of St. Thecla arose in many parts of Europe, claiming in many cases to possess relics of the saint. One in Milan, afterwards demolished, from an early date treasured her skull, since transferred to the Duomo; but Tillemont is mistaken in stating that the latter great church is dedicated to her. The cathedral of Tarragona, however, at one time bore her name, and she is reverenced as tutelary of that city, now the main centre of her *cultus*, because of another relic, her arm, which was translated thither in 1320, the gift of Oscinus king of Armenia to James II. of Aragon, and which is still shown in a side chapel called St. Thecla's. It is related that Pedro IV. of Aragon ("the Cruel"), who had ventured to seize the property of this church, was visited in a dream by the saint, who dealt him such a buffet that he took ill and died in consequence (1387), after having on his deathbed ordered restitution to be made of his sacrilegious spoils.[k] (*Acta SS.*, ut supr.) Relics of her are preserved in many other parts of Europe: in France, at Chartres and Riez and elsewhere; in Germany, in the ossuary church of

[j] Possibly the tradition that the *Codex Alexandrinus* was written by Thecla, may mean that it was produced in or belonged to this or some other monastery, dedicated to her. But see below, THECLA (11).

[k] Ford (*Handbook of Spain*, i. p. 446) remarks that the saint failed to save the treasures of her church from being plundered, some centuries later, by Napoleon's general, Suchet, in 1813.

St. Gereon at Cologne. It is remarkable, however, that though there was in Rome an ancient church of St. Thecla near that of S. Paolo fuori le mura (Wilh. Malmesb., *Gesta Regum Angliae*, iv. 352), and another built by Clement VIII. in 1600, no relic of her is recorded as existing there, nor is there any tradition of her having visited the city. The story, therefore, of her death and burial at Rome, as told in the appendix attached to the *Acts*, in three of the four Greek copies, cannot be of Roman invention; as indeed appears from the vague localization of her grave as there described, "*two or three stadia* from the tomb of Paul." Another evidence of her high repute in the Church is the place her name occupies in the calendar. In the East, and at Milan, she is commemorated on the 24th September, the day assigned for her death in the Greek appendix to the *Acts*; elsewhere in the West, on the 23rd. Many other days bear her name in the calendar, no doubt as commemorating translations of her relics, as at Tarragona of her arm (May 18). Finally, a proof of the prevalent veneration for her person, is found in the wide use of Thecla as a Christian name throughout Christendom. From her doubtless some if not all of the *Theclas* whose records follow this article derived their name. Gregory of Nyssa (above cited) tells us how his sister Macrina, in consequence of a dream her mother had before her birth, was called also Thecla. Early in the ninth century the name was borne by the eldest daughter of the emperor Theophilus (Theophan. Continuat. iii. 5, 44). It seems to have been specially in vogue among Slavonic races,—a fact which has been supposed to arise in some measure from a confusion between the saint and a goddess of fortune, who in the Slavonic mythology bore a name nearly the same. (See Miss Yonge's *Christian Names*, vol. i. p. 231.) But the use extends far beyond Slavonic limits. Schiller's Thekla in *Wallenstein* is indeed an imaginary person, but the name is frequent among women in Germany, and likewise in other European countries; though not usual at any time in Great Britain or Ireland, except as the name of a "religious." [See below, THECLA (12) and (13).][1]

These *Acts* were first printed by Grabe (*Spicilegium*, p. 81), who in 1698 issued the Greek text with a Latin version of his own, together with an old Latin text, both from MSS. in the Bodleian library. Many other editions have since appeared, of which the last and best is Tischendorf's (in his *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, p. 40; 1851), being a text founded on a collation of Grabe's MS. (G) with three Parisian copies, A, B and C. Of these MSS. an account will be found in his *Prolegomena* (p. xxvi), and a very complete study of them and their affinities has been given by Schlau (p. 4). The oldest is not earlier than the tenth century. The appendix to the story which these MSS. give, as above mentioned, is found in G in a form quite distinct from what the other three give, and very much fuller,—yet omitting Thecla's journey to Rome and her death there. Many MSS. of the Latin version are said to exist, but none of them except Grabe's (the Bodleian), known as D, seems to have been edited. This text approaches more nearly to that of G than of A, B and C, which form a closely related group, distinct from G. The Latin, however, has no trace of the Greek appendix, but makes Thecla end her days in peace at Seleucia; agreeing herein with the Syriac. The account of her end given in this appendix is unknown to Basil, and cannot have been contained in the Greek copy used by him; and moreover is contradicted by the local tradition as embodied in the convent which, as he tells us, marked her resting-place at Seleucia; but his story of her miraculous disappearance into the earth is probably the germ whence the Greek addition was developed. The appendix is therefore later, probably much later, than the fifth century.[m] Of the Syriac version, four copies exist, all in the British Museum, Add. 14652, 14447, 14641, 12174,—the first being of the sixth century and therefore establishing the fact, that this version is the oldest form in which the *Acts* have reached us.[n] It is remarkable, however, that this MS. (distinguished as Syr. A) gives a text evidently less pure than that of the later copies, in many instances showing marks of amplification, and even of conflation. The latter fact is of special importance as proving that the Syriac translator, who cannot well have been later than the fifth century, had for the basis of his work two divergent Greek texts, or else a Greek text formed out of two divergent texts,—in either case confirming our estimate of the high antiquity of the original document, which must have been very long in existence before such divergences could have arisen. This MS. moreover yields evidence of the high esteem in which the name of Thecla (though she does not appear in the Syriac Martyrology), and her *Acts*, were held in Syria. In Syriac Old Testaments the Books of Ruth and Esther, and the deutero-canonical Judith and Susanna, are usually placed together and classed as the four books of the "Book of Women." Syr. A (as well as Add. 14447), is a "Book of Women" with our *Acts*, under the title of *History of Thecla*, subjoined as a fifth. The Syriac text, with a translation into English, has been published by Dr. Wright in his *Apocryphal Acts* (t. i. p. 127; ii. p. 116), from a full collation of the MSS. above named (1871). An Arabic version also is extant (Assem. *B. O.* iii. p. 286), and another in the ecclesiastical Slavonic (Lipsius, p. 430). A translation of the *Acts* into English forms part of Hone's *Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 83; and another is to be found in

[1] The "Legend of St. Thecla" stands first in Aubrey de Vere's recent *Legends and Records*, where the details, if not the theology, of our *Acts*, are reproduced with much poetic grace, and with general fidelity, except that the journey to Antioch and the self-baptism disappear. The story has likewise been retold by the German poet, Paul Heyse, who omits the θηριομαχία also, and replaces Paul by a fictitious Trypho.

[m] The Latin *Martyrologies*, even the latest, are ignorant of this appendix; but its substance is found in the Greek *Menologium*.

[n] In some instances, the divergences of the Syriac text from the present Greek, are confirmed by the authority of Basil; as, *e. g.*, the softening down of the account of the malignancy of the women of Iconium against Thecla, and the obliteration of the sharp contrast between the disposition shown towards her by the men and by the women of Antioch.

Clark's *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. xvi. p. 279.

The principal authorities on which this article is based, have been specified above. To Dr. Schlau's work it is largely indebted for its materials, and in some cases for the conclusions drawn from them. Further discussion of the story of Thecla will be found in Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. ii. p. 60 (2nd ed.); Spanheim, *Hist. Christiana*, i. 11; Ittig, *De Bibliothecis*, c. xx. p. 700; Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkath. Kirche* (2 Aufl.), pp. 292–294; Harnack, *Zeitschrift f. Kirchengeschichte*, ii. pp. 90–92.

[J. Gw.]

THECLA (2), according to the Roman Martyrology, was daughter of Valentinian, a noble of Aquileia, in the reign of Nero; and with her sister Erasma, and their cousins Euphemia and Dorothea (daughters of Valentinus, her father's brother), was converted to the gospel, and was baptized in her father's presence by the bishop Hermagoras. A slave denounced them to Valentinus, who gave them over for punishment to the prefect. They were scourged and tortured, but refused to give up their faith. Valentinus voluntarily undertaking the task of executioner, beheaded all four and threw their bodies into a river. They were, however, recovered and buried by Valentinian and Hermagoras. Valentinus and his followers were killed in an earthquake, and the treacherous slave was possessed by a devil and drowned himself in the same river. This Thecla is commemorated on 3rd September (*Acta SS.*).

[J. Gw.]

THECLA (3) daughter of St. Isidora, a devout virgin of Leontini in Sicily, in the third century. She was cured of palsy by the prayers of St. Alphius and others, and showed her thankfulness by sheltering Agatho, bishop of Lipari, and other persecuted Christians, and burying the martyrs' bodies. By means of Agatho, and with the aid of her kinswoman Justina, she did much for the spread of the gospel in Sicily, built two churches, got possession of a heathen temple and gave it for Christian use, and endowed the bishopric of her city. Her commemoration is on the 10th January (*Acta SS.*, from Ferrarius, *Catal. SS. Ital.*; also under 10th May, pp. 513 ff.). [J. Gw.]

THECLA (4) or THEOCLA, an Egyptian virgin, belonging to a religious community, who with her sister Andropelagia, another woman, four ecclesiastics, and six laymen, was tortured and finally beheaded for refusing to offer to idols, at Alexandria in the year 250, under the reign of Decius, by order of Valerian the Governor. They are commemorated on 6th September (*Acta SS.*). [J. Gw.]

THECLA (5). SS. Boniface and Thecla, man and wife, of Adrumetum in Africa, were parents of twelve sons, all of whom were martyred under Maximian, circ. 300. Commemorated on 30th August (*Acta SS.*).

[J. Gw.]

THECLA (6), the Palestinian martyr, whom Eusebius (*De MM. P.*, 3) distinguishes as ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς Θέκλα from her more famous namesake. He relates that she was condemned to the wild beasts at Gaza, along with Agapius, in the second year of the persecution of Diocletian (304). She met her death accordingly, but Agapius was reserved for further tortures at Caesarea (*ib.* 6). In the *Menaea Magna* she is said to be a native of Byzia [*qu.* Bizya in Thrace, or Bethshan?];—

> ἔμοιγε κλῆσις Θέκλα, πατρὶς Βυζίη,
> Γάζης τόπος θέατρον, ἆθλος θὴρ διώκων [*read* δάκνων].

Her commemoration is on 19th August; but the Syriac version of Eusebius's *Martyrs*, *ap.* S. E. Assem. *Acta M. O.* t. ii. p. 184, assigns her to 21st May. [J. Gw.]

THECLA (7) a martyr, of Apollinopolis Parva (now Kuss) in the Thebaid, beheaded along with her brother Paesi in the time of Diocletian (304). In a Thebaic fragment of *Acts of Thecla* it is related that they were both brought before Armenius the governor, who called on Paesi to sacrifice to Apollo, offering him secure enjoyment of his property and remission of tribute if he would comply. Thecla encouraged her brother in refusing, and tauntingly asked the governor why Apollo, if he were a god, did not cure him of a malady under which he laboured? The narrative here breaks off, but in another fragment, containing part of the Memphitic *Acts of St. Anub*, it is mentioned that Anub, when he reached Touphot on his way to Alexandria, found the governor at that place sentencing the brother and sister to be beheaded. Both these fragments were discovered and published by Augustinus Ant. Georgius at Rome; the former in 1789 in his *Fragmenta Evangelii S. Joannis, Gr.-Copt. Theb.* (p. xcvii), the latter in 1793 in his *Martyrium S. Coluthi* (p. cxxx). He supposed this Thecla to be the scribe of Cod. A, overlooking the fact [see THECLA (11)] that that MS. contains matter which cannot have been in existence at the date assigned for this Thecla's death. He identifies Paesi and Thecla with the "Esi and his sister Thecla" of the Aethiopico-Coptic Calendar (*pa* being the præpositive article).

[J. Gw.]

THECLA (8). One of five virgin martyrs of Persia, the others being Mariamna, Martha, Mary, and their handmaid Ami or Enneim, residing as "*Canonicae*" under the rule of one Paul, a presbyter of Aza, in the time of Sapor II., who persecuted the church circ. 326, and more severely in 343. At the suggestion of Narses Tamsapor, the chief magician, Sapor threatened them and the presbyter with spoiling of their goods unless they would abjure their faith. Paul under this pressure apostatized, and was induced to advise them to do likewise, which counsel they indignantly rejected. They were then scourged, and when they remained firm, were finally beheaded by Paul (A.D. 346), after warning him that the fate of Judas was in store for his treachery. Not long after Narses seized the property which Paul had vainly tried to retain by his crimes, and had him secretly strangled, thus fulfilling the prophecy of the martyrs. They are commemorated on 9th June. (*Acta SS.* from a MS. *Synaxarium* of Paris. Another of Moscow sets them down as martyrs under Diocletian, but with the incompatible date 315.)

(See also Maruthas, *Hist. Martt.* ap. S. E. Assem., *Acta Martt. Or.* t. i. p. 123, and Assem., *B. O.* i. p. 191.) [J. Gw.]

THECLA (9). One of twenty who suffered martyrdom with Narses, bishop of Seleucia in Mesopotamia, under Sapor II., in 343. The Roman Martyrology and the Greek Menologium fix the 20th of November as the day of their death; but according to Maruthas (ap. S. E. Assem., *Mart. Or.* t. i. pp. 96–101) the 9th is the true day. [J. Gw.]

THECLA (10). A lady to whom Gregory Nazianzen addressed four Epistles (*Epp.* 56, 57, 222, 223), the first being in reply to a postscript added by her to a letter addressed to him by another correspondent whom he does not name. She was living in religious seclusion, and was sister of Sacerdos, a presbyter whom Gregory strove in vain to restore to the favour of Helladius (*Epp.* 220 ff.). Gregory visited her; and afterwards wrote the Epistles 222, 223, to console her for the death of this brother. She appears to have sent him gifts,—on one occasion a supply of wine (*Ep.* 57). He speaks of her as offering her children to God, but as he styles her *κόρη*, it is probable she was the head of a sisterhood, a family of her spiritual children. Grabe (*Prolegg. in* LXX., c. i. § 4, supposes this to be the *παρθενὼν* of Thecla at Seleucia which Gregory visited (see above, THECLA (1)); but this is improbable, unless we suppose his correspondent to be superior of the convent dedicated to the protomartyr in that city, and to have borne the name of her patroness. That the Seleucian convent was so dedicated is implied in Gregory's description of it as *παρθενὼν τῆς ἀοιδίμου κόρης Θέκλης*, and is expressly stated by Basil of Seleucia. It is possible that this Thecla may have been the scribe of Cod. A, as Grabe conjectured. The patriarch Cyril seems to have been of this opinion: a fact apparently unknown to Grabe, for he wrote in 1707, several years before Sir Thomas Roe's letters were published (see THECLA (11)). [J. Gw.]

THECLA (11), a noble Egyptian lady, who according to the tradition of the church of Alexandria, as preserved in a memorandum written by the patriarch Cyril Lucar at the beginning of the *Codex Alexandrinus*, was the transcriber of that MS. "shortly after the Nicene Council." He adds that her name appeared in a subscription appended to the MS., which had been destroyed long before his time. Sir Thomas Roe, through whom this MS. was sent by Cyril to King Charles I., states (no doubt mistakenly) in a letter to Lord Arundel (*Negotiations in Embassy to Ottoman Porte*, p. 335, letter 241, 30 Jan. 1625) that the patriarch described it to him as "written by Thecla the protomartyr in the time of St. Paul;" but in a subsequent letter (448, p. 618, 27th Feb. 1627) to archbishop Abbot, he gives a different account. "The patriarch doth testify under his hand that it was written by the virgin Thecla, daughter of a famous Greek called Αβγιεριενος, who founded the monastery in Egypt upon Pharoas [*sic*] tower, a devout and learned maid, who was persecuted in Asia, and to whom Gregory Nazianzen hath written many epistles . . . She died not long after the council of Nice." For the correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen see THECLA (10). The MS. is certainly not earlier than the Nicene council, for it contains the *Epistle to Marcellinus* of Athanasius, and the Canons of Eusebius; but on palæographic grounds it is usually assigned to the middle of the fifth century. The scribe was therefore probably of later date than Cyril supposed. Moreover, if she died at so early a date as he indicates, she can hardly have been in correspondence with Gregory Nazianzen. There is also an Arabic note of the 13th or 14th century prefixed to the MS., stating that it was "said to be written by the hand of *the martyr* Thecla." This ill agrees with the account given by the patriarch, and the date, which is not a likely one for a martyr; and it is probable that the Arabic writer confused Thecla the scribe with Thecla the protomartyr (as Roe did); or with Thecla (8), the Persian who is said to have been honoured at Alexandria; or with Thecla (7) of the Thebaid. Dr. Tregelles (Scrivener's *Introduction*, 3rd ed. pp. 94–98) supposed that the tradition of the MS. being of Thecla's writing arose from the fact that its New Testament volume, having lost some leaves, begins at St. Matthew xxv. 6, which is part of the lesson for St. Thecla's Day (Matt. xxv. 1–13). But this ingenious conjecture has been shown by Mr. Maunde Thompson, in his preface to the first volume of the phototyped facsimile of the MS., to be untenable; for it appears that at the time when the leaves of the MS. were numbered with Arabic figures, coeval or nearly so with the Arabic note, the leaves now lost were extant, and that the New Testament was then continuous with the Old, and not a separate volume as now. (See Walton's *Prolegomena, in Bibl. Polygl.* ix. 34; Grabe, *Prolegg. in LXX.* t. i. c. i. § 4 (1st ed.); Tischendorf, *Prolegg. in LXX.*, s. xxvi.) [J. Gw.]

THECLA (12) otherwise Etha, one of the companions of Breaca, an Irish saint (a younger contemporary of St. Patrick), who formed a religious settlement in Cornwall: commemorated 27th October (*Acta SS.*) [J. Gw.]

THECLA (13), a lady bearing the title of "Countess" (ܩܘܡܝܛܝܣܐ), to whom Severus of Antioch addressed a letter, extant in Syriac (Wright, *Catal.* p. 569). [J. Gw.]

THECLA (14), virgin abbess of Kitzingen in Franconia, one of the religious women sent by St. Boniface from England, under the headship of St. Lioba her kinswoman, to introduce the Benedictine rule into Germany (circ. 748). She was probably a nun of Wimborne, and perhaps originally of Barking; but a Thecla who is named as a nun of Barking seems to have been of an earlier generation. In Germany she spent some time under Lioba in the convent of Bischofsheim. She afterwards was placed over the convent of Kitzingen, where she probably succeeded Hadeloga, the first abbess, in 766. (*Acta SS.* 15th Oct.) [J. Gw.]

THECLA (15), otherwise Theodola, a virgin martyr of Rome, of doubtful date and genuineness, commemorated on 26th March. [J. Gw.]

THECLA (16), one of a group of ten African saints, male and female, of uncertain date, said, on the authority of some copies of the *Hieronymian Martyrology*, to have suffered martyrdom on 10th May, on which day they are commemorated. (*Acta SS.*) [J. Gw.]

THECLA (17), a martyr of a similar group, also assigned to Africa by the same authority, and commemorated on 13th June. (*Acta SS.*) [J. Gw.]

THEGRI. [SEGRI.]

THELIANUS SCOTUS, disciple of St. David, flourished about A.D. 562, and wrote *Vita Magistri Davidis; Epistolae ad varios; Conciones piae ad populum* (Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Scot.* ii. 618). Probably St. TEILO. [J. G.]

THELIAUS, bishop of Llandaff. [TEILO.]

THELICA, martyr with DATIVUS (3).

THELYMIDRES, bishop of Laodicea in Syria Prima, c. 250–260 (Gams), mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria in his letter to the Christians of Laodicea (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 46; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 791). [E. V.]

THEMISON (1), a 2nd century leader of the Montanists. See Vol. III. p. 939. [G. T. S.]

THEMISON (2), archdeacon of Alexandria, sent to Rome by Cyril, along with HERMOGENES (7) and LAMPETIUS (3) (cf. Tillem. xiv. 511, 512). [C. H.]

THEMISTIUS (1), a deacon of Alexandria and a Severian of cent. vii., surnamed Calonymus, who wrote against Joannes Philoponus. He composed an apology for the Agnoëtae, his own division of that sect, under the title of Apology for Theophilus. In fact he is regarded as the founder of the Agnoëtae. He there maintained the ignorance of our Lord concerning many things. He wrote several other treatises, which are noted in Photii *Cod.* xxiii, cviii; cf. Cotelerii *Mon. Ecc. Graec.* iii. 641; Fabric. *Bib. Graec.* vi. 794, gives a minute account of Themistius and the writers who have treated of him. Joann. Damasc. *Haer.* lxxxv. calls his followers Themistiani [AGNOETAE; JOANNES (564); PHILOPONUS] (cf. Ceill. xi. 652, xii. 928). [G. T. S.]

THEMISTIUS (2), the distinguished philosopher and rhetorician of Constantinople. Though a pagan, he was a friend and correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen, who styles him the king of eloquence (βασιλέα λόγων, *Ep.* 140). Gregory wrote to him recommending to his notice his nephew Nicobulus (*Ep.* 139), and his young friend Amphilochius, afterwards bishop of Iconium, when he was called to Constantinople to answer some charge (*Ep.* 140). (THEMISTIUS, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, vol. iii. pp. 1024–1026.) [E. V.]

THEMISTIUS (3), bishop of Adrianople in Pisidia, one of the witnesses to the will of Gregory Nazianzen (Greg. Naz. *Testam.*) [E. V.]

THENEW (TANEU, THAMELIS, THANES, THANEY, THEMIS, THENIS, THENNA, THENEWE, THENNAT, THENNOW, THENOG), mother of St. Kentigern, and included among the saints in the Scotch kalendars [KENTIGERN]. Her feast is July 18, and her legend is given in *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. SS. p. hyem. f. xxxiv.) from the *Vita S. Kentigerni.* Her church in Glasgow was St. Theneukes, which has been corrupted into St. Enoch's. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 451–2 et. al.; Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. 18, iv. 422–3, *De S. Thenna seu Thenew matrona matre S. Kentigerni in Scotia*, by Sollerius.) [J. G.]

THEO [THEON].

THEOCATAGNOSTAE, heretics who censured some of Christ's actions and words (Joan. Damasc. *de Haer.* in Migne's *Pat. Graec.* t. xciv. col. 758). [G. T. S.]

THEOCRATOR, father of SS. Apater and Iraï, Egyptian martyrs, whose sufferings and confession are told, together with those of St. Macarius of Antioch, and St. Eulogius, a military officer, in *Les Actes des Martyrs de l'Egypte tirés des MSS. Coptes de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, par H. Hyvernat, t. i. p. 73, Rome, 1886. This is a very valuable work, and gives the genuine acts of many Egyptian martyrs hitherto unknown. It is full of notices of persons who figured in the Diocletian persecution, as the prefect Armenius [MARMENIA], SS. Coluthus and Paphnutius, and constitutes a valuable supplement to the Coptic works of Georgius, published in the last century. [G. T. S.]

THEOCRITUS (1) (2). Two bishops of this name are invented by "Praedestinatus." One (i. 17), a bishop of Chalcedon, who in company with an equally imaginary bishop of Nicomedia, publicly confuted the Ophites, came upon their secret meeting, turned out their guests, and killed their serpents; the other (i. 35) a Cappadocian bishop who confuted the disciples of Bardesanes. [G. S.]

THEOCTISTA (1), virgin and martyr at Alexandria in the persecution of Diocletian, with her mother Athanasia, her sisters Theodota and Eudoxia, St. Cyrus, and St. John. She was only fifteen years of age when she suffered. [JOANNES (537).] [G. T. S.]

THEOCTISTA (2), daughter of Gurdia and wife of Christodorus, is mentioned in a letter of Gregory the Great. (*Epp.* vii. 30.) She was not the emperor's sister of that name, as his mother's name was Joanna. The name of Gurdia's husband was Marinus, so she was probably also different from the emperor's sister of that name, who was married to Philippus. (T. Simocatta, viii. 13.) [F. D.]

THEOCTISTA (3), sister of the emperor Maurice. Three letters are addressed to her by Gregory the Great (*Epp.* i. 5, vii. 26, xi. 45). In the first, written immediately after his consecration, he deplores being dragged from the contemplative life into the distractions of worldly affairs. In the second he expresses his joy at her devotion to the study of the Scriptures, exhorts her to pay special attention to the morals of her nephews, the emperor's sons, who

were under her care, and thanks her for her present of thirty pounds of gold, sent through his apocrisiarius at Constantinople, Sabinianus. Half he had applied towards the ransom of the prisoners taken by the Lombards at the capture of Croton, and half for purchasing bedding for the nuns, of whom there were 3000 in Rome. He sends her, as a present, a key from the body of St. Peter, with regard to which he narrates a miracle. In the third, a very long one, he again expresses his satisfaction at her manner of life, and consoles her under the unjust calumnies of the people from which she was suffering. He advises her to summon the leading men among her slanderers, and before them to brand with anathema the erroneous doctrines which she is charged with holding, and if they require it to confirm her anathema with an oath. He mentions that when he was apocrisiarius at Constantinople he found that many persons, with whom he was well acquainted, were unfoundedly charged with holding the same doctrines. These appear to be four in number; that marriage might be dissolved on the ground that either party wished to enter religion; that sins committed before baptism were not thereby completely done away; that a person who had performed three years penitence for his sins, thereby acquired a license to sin with impunity, and that a renunciation of a doctrine extorted under compulsion was not binding. Gregory then proceeds to demonstrate the erroneousness of these opinions. [F. D.]

THEOCTISTUS (1), ST., Sept. 6, martyr at Nicomedia with Cyprian and Justina under Diocletian. Some sailors stole his relics and carried them to Rome, where a church was built over them, near the forum of Claudius (see Eudocia, *in Cyprianum Mart.* lib. iii. in Phot. *Biblioth.* cod. clxxxiv.). [G. T. S.]

THEOCTISTUS (2), bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, one of the most influential prelates in the early part of the third century, the patron and ordainer of Origen. On Origen's visit to his old friends in Palestine Theoctistus gladly received him at Caesarea, and like Alexander of Jerusalem, permitted him, though still a layman, to preach before him, *πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν ἐνεχείρισε τοῦ διδάσκειν* (Phot. *Cod.* 118), and on the remonstrance of Origen's bishop, Demetrianus, he joined with Alexander in a letter defending their conduct (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19) [ALEXANDER]. At a later period, c. 230, Theoctistus and Alexander took the less easily defensible step of ordaining Origen, though belonging to a different diocese and province (*ibid.* vi. 8, 23). We learn from the letter of Dionysius of Alexandria to Cornelius of Rome, A.D. 251, that Theoctistus had united with Helenus of Tarsus and Firmilianus of Caesarea in inviting Dionysius to a proposed synod at Antioch on the Novatian schism; which through the death of Fabian, bishop of Antioch, whose sympathies were rather with the Novatians, appears not to have been held (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 46). Theoctistus is mentioned in a letter of Dionysius to Stephen of Rome (*ibid.* vii. 5). He probably died when Xystus was bishop of Rome 257–259, and was succeeded by Domnus, (*ibid.* vii. 14.) (Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, i. 245, 271, 287, No. 83; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 541.) [E. V.]

THEOCTISTUS (3) PSATHYROPOLA (Ψαθυροπώλης), or the cake-seller, the head of a sect among the Arians of Constantinople about the year 390. His followers were called, from his occupation, Psathyrians. They, led by a certain Marinus from Thrace, maintained that the first person of the Trinity was, in a proper sense, Father, and so to be styled before the Son existed; while their opponents, the followers of the Antiochene Dorotheus, maintained that he was only a Father after the existence of the Son. A large party of the Arian Goths, taught by Selena their bishop, adopted the view of the Psathyrian party, which continued to divide the church of Constantinople for thirty-five years, till the reign of Theodosius Junior, when a reconciliation was effected (Socrates, *H. E.* v. 23). [G. T. S.]

THEOCTISTUS (4), a Novatianist priest and ally of Sabbatius in a schism among the Novatians about A.D. 390. [SABBATIUS.] (Socrates, *H. E.* v. 21.) [G. T. S.]

THEOCTISTUS (5), friend of Euthymius, abbat in Palestine [EUTHYMIUS (4)]. [G. T. S.]

THEOCTISTUS (6), bishop of Beroea in Syria, 438–458, on the death of Acacius in 438. He took part in the synod at Antioch, in 445, which deposed Athanasius of Perrha (Labbe, iv. 644, 727, 732), and in the council of Chalcedon, in 451 (*ibid.* 82, 328, 376, &c.). He signed the reply of the bishops of Syria Prima to the encyclical of the emperor Leo, in 457. We have two letters of Theodoret to Theoctistus; one (Ep. 32) commending to his charity the Carthaginian senator Celestiacus reduced to extreme want by the incursions of the Vandals, who was making a begging round among the Christians of the East; the second (Ep. 134) written after his recall from banishment by Marcian, in 451, complaining of his unfeeling behaviour towards him, though an old friend, when in distress, regarding only his own safety. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xv. 298, 303; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 783.) [E. V.]

THEOCTISTUS (7), bearer of Leo the Great's letter of July 20th, A.D. 451, to Pulcheria (Leo, *Ep.* 95, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 942). He is styled *magistrianus*, a synonym for *agens in rebus* (Ducange, q.v.). [F. D.]

THEOCTISTUS (8), kinsman of the emperor Maurice. Gregory the Great, in October A.D. 596, wrote asking him to protect the priest JOANNES (471). (*Epp.* vi. 17.) [F. D.]

THEODAHADUS, the son of Theoderic's sister, Amalafrida, by her first husband, lived till a mature age on his vast estates in Tuscany. He was acquainted with Platonic philosophy, and versed in Latin and ecclesiastical literature (Procop. i. 3; Cassiod. *Var.* x. 3), but his character was cowardly and grasping. His encroachments on his neighbours' lands drew down on him the reproofs of his uncle Theoderic, and of the regent Amalasuentha, which caused him to conceive a deadly hatred of the latter, and through two Eastern bishops, who visited Rome on ecclesiastical business in A.D. 533 [HYPATIUS (8)],

to propose to Justinian the betrayal of Tuscany to him. On the death of Athalaric, however, in A.D. 534, Amalasuentha, to strengthen her tottering throne, invited him as the last surviving male Amal to share it, on condition that the real power was to remain in her hands. He soon broke his word, imprisoned her on an island in the lake of Bolsena, and put her to death. A sufficient account of his short reign, his deposition and his death, is given under JUSTINIANUS I. Vol. III., 540.[a] He sent pope Agapetus on an embassy to Constantinople in February 536, in a vain attempt to avert the coming war, and in return, it was said, for a bribe appointed his successor Silverius by his own authority without election (Anastasius, *Lib. Pont.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 552, 563). [F. D.]

THEODARDUS, ST., bishop of Maestricht, in the 7th century. He was a monk of Stavelo, or Malmédy, in the Ardennes, and may probably have represented his predecessor, Remaclus, who was bishop and abbat at the same time, in the government of these two foundations, but it appears from a consideration of the three *diplomata* to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. i. 234–5, that, notwithstanding a common opinion, he was never titular abbat himself (cf. Boll. *ibid.* Sept. iii. 583; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 557). The third of the *diplomata*, above mentioned (p. 235), granted by Childeric II. in 666, speaks of a charge laid upon Theodardus, now a bishop, to mark out and settle the bounds of the possessions of the two monasteries. An anonymous biography was published by the Bollandists (Sept. iii. 588–93), which they are inclined to think may be older than the middle of the 8th century (p. 580), but it is probably a good deal later (cf. Rettberg, p. 558). But neither this nor the *Acta* by Sigebert of Gemblours (p. 593), contain much of interest, except the story of his fate. St. Theodardus met with a violent death in the service of the church, and is therefore numbered among the martyrs. Making his way to Alsace to complain to the king of wrongs done to his church, he was waylaid by robbers in the forest of Biwalt, near Spires, and murdered, circ. A.D. 670 (Boll. Sept. iii. 590). He was buried on the spot where he fell, but his disciple and successor, St. Lambert, carried the body to Liège, whither the see had then been removed. His day is Sept. 13. For his cult, see Boll. *ibid.* 587–8. [S. A. B.]

THEODAS, alleged disciple of St. Paul, by whom the Valentinians asserted that their master had been taught. (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 17.) [VALENTINUS.] [G. S.]

THEODEBERT (1), I. king of the Franks (A.D. 534–548), the most capable and ambitious of the Merovingian line after Clovis, was already grown up when his father Theodoricus I. acceded to his kingdom in 511 (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iii. 1). In 515 he was entrusted with the command of the army which defeated a Danish raid upon the country between the Maas and Rhine. He is said to have killed the leader with his own hands (*ibid.* iii. 3). In 531 he accompanied his father and uncle Clotaire on their victorious Thuringian expedition (*ibid.* iii. 7), and in the following year entered upon a successful campaign against the Ostrogoths in those parts of Aquitaine and Septimania, where they still defied the Frankish power (*ibid.* iii. 21, 22), to be summoned hastily back from before the walls of Arles, in 533, by the news of his father's last illness (*ibid.* iii. 23). His first task after Theodoric's death was, with the loyal co-operation of his leudes, to defeat an attempt on the part of his two uncles, Childebert and Clotaire, to rob him of the succession. His prudence and firmness preserved his inheritance, and even won so upon the childless Childebert that he, formally adopted him as his heir (*ibid.*) For the extent of the kingdom he inherited from his father, see THEODORICUS I. It was increased in 534 by a portion of the now finally conquered Burgundy (Marius, *Chronicon* ad ann. 534). The contest between the Romans and Ostrogoths in North Italy next afforded to his ambition a tempting opportunity. Justinian in 535, preparing for war with the Ostrogoths, applied to the kings of the Franks to assist him. Tempted by his promises they eagerly agreed, but the following year, seduced by Theodatus the Ostrogothic king, and after his death by Vitiges, his successor, with the bribe of the Ostrogothic possessions in Provence (which the Franks had hitherto tried in vain to conquer), and 2000 pounds of gold, they made a secret treaty against the emperor, the result of which was, that in 538 an army of Theodebert's Burgundian subjects entered Italy with his connivance, and assisted the Goths in the conquest of Milan (Procopius, *De Bello Gotth.* ii. 12; Marius, *Chronicon* ad ann.). The following year Theodebert himself invaded Italy at the head of 100,000 Franks or more, and seizing the passage of the Po at Pavia, regardless of his pledges attacked almost simultaneously the hostile camps of the Romans and Goths, and defeated them both. A great part of Venetia, Liguria, and the Cottian Alps was overrun by his army, till hunger and disease decimated the ranks, and drove the remnant back to France (Marius, *Chronicon* ad ann. 539; Marcellinus, *Chronicon* ann. 539; Procopius, *De Bello Gotth.* ii. 25. The account of Gregory of Tours in *Hist. Franc.* iii. 32, of the Italian events is fabulous, see Richter, *Annalen*, pp. 55–7; Gibbon, cap. xli.; Mascou xii. 18). This retreat was construed by Justinian into a victory entitling him to the style of Francicus (Φραγγικός), a boast which drew from Theodebert the threat to march through Thrace upon Constantinople itself and chastise the arrogance of the emperor (Agathias, *Hist.* i. 14). Death however, the result, according to Gregory (iii. 36), of a fever, but according to others of injuries received in the chase, cut short his ambitious projects in 548. Fauriel attributes to him the deliberate design of betraying Roman and Goth to mutual destruction, that he might add the whole of Italy to his possessions, and even carry his arms into the East itself (*Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 140, sqq.).

Theodebert was perhaps the best of the Merovingian kings. Though the barbarian was still present in him (cf. Agathias, Bouquet, ii. 49), he was comparatively free from those outbreaks of

[a] According to Agnellus (*Lib. Pont.* 62), who probably copied the Ravenna Fasti, the dates of these events were, Death of Athalaric, Oct. 2 (534), Imprisonment of Amalasuentha, April 30 (535), Death of Theodahad, December (536).

savagery and lawlessness that characterized his race. Marius calls him "the Great" (*Chron.* ad ann. 548); and according to Gregory of Tours, whose praise is outspoken, even so early as his father's accession in 511, he was elegans atque utilis (*Hist. Franc.* iii. 1), and when he had come to the throne "he shewed himself great and very good, governing with justice, honouring the priests, doing good to the churches, succouring the poor and distributing benefits charitably and liberally" (*ibid.* iii. 25, see too, iii. 36). Instances of his good qualities appear in his protection of his relative and god-son Givald from Theodoric's attempt to kill him (iii. 23), and subsequent generosity to him (iii. 24), his liberality to the churches of the Auvergne, which his father had plundered (iii. 25), and his generosity to the impoverished city of Verdun, at the suit of their bishop (iii. 34). See too, Aimoin, ii. 25, and the letter of Aurelianus, archbishop of Arles, in Bouquet, iv. 63. There has been discerned in him a leaning towards Roman culture, which manifested itself in his connexion with the Gallo-Roman Deuteria, in whose favour he would have repudiated Wisigarda, the barbarian Lombard princess, to whom his father had betrothed him, but for the indignant remonstrances of his Frank subjects (iii. 20, 22, 23, 27; Paulus Diaconus, *De Gest. Langob.* i. 21); in the choice of his counsellors, Asteriolus and Secundinus of the same race, and particularly in his establishment, at the instance of Parthenius, another Gallo-Roman, of the Roman and anti-German idea of a tax upon land of Franks and natives alike (see Fauriel, *Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 135 sqq.; Michelet, *Hist.* ii. chap. i.). [S. A. B.]

THEODEBERT (2) II., king of the Austrasian Franks (A.D. 596–612), son of Childebert II. by a concubine, was ten years old at the death of his father. His share of the realm was Austrasia, with Metz for a capital, while his younger half-brother Theodoricus II. was raised to the throne in Burgundy (Fredegarius, *Chron.* xvi.), the grandmother Brunechilde constituting herself Theodebert's guardian. By the death of Childebert, Brunechilde was left face to face with her foes the Austrasian nobles, she representing the idea of absolute monarchy, and they striving to regain the old German independence, which had been continually trenched upon since the conquest of Clovis (cf. Fauriel, *Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 393 ff.). The struggle which ensued presented an opportunity to the ambition of Fredegund, who was governing Neustria, as protector of her infant son Clotaire II. and without even a declaration of war, she invaded Austrasia. A battle was fought at Lafaux, between Laon and Soissons, resulting in a severe defeat of the united Austrasian and Burgundian armies (Fredegar. xvii.) and the victorious Neustrians were only arrested by the death of Fredegund in 597 (Fredegar. *ibid.*). Brunechilde was now left free to pursue her centralizing aims in Austrasia. For a short time she appears to have been successful, as may be gathered from the execution of the duke Wintrio, in 598 (Fredegarius, xviii; Fauriel, ii. 394; Richter, *Annalen*, p. 99), but the following year a coalition expelled her from Austrasia, whence she retired to the court of her other grandson, Theodoric (Fredegar. xix.), to pursue her old policy in a new field, and in addition revenge herself upon Theodebert and the Austrasians for her exile. The latter design, however, was not to be carried out for some years. In 600, Theodebert and Theodoric joined in an invasion of Neustria, to revenge their defeat at Lafaux, and recover their lost territory. The armies engaged near Dormelles, on the Orvanne, with the result that Clotaire was disastrously defeated, and obtained peace only by the cession of the greater part of his possessions, Theodebert received for his share Soissons, Meaux, Senlis, and a territory lying between the Seine, the Oise and the sea, which Fredegarius calls the Ducatus Dentelini (Fredegar. xx; cf. Martin, *Hist. de la France*, liv. x. and Fauriel, ii. 395 sqq.). The friendship between the two brothers lasted through 602, when they successfully made a joint expedition against the Gascons (Fredegar. xxi.) and down to 605, when Brunechilde's intrigues were at length so far successful that Theodoric and her creature Protadius, the mayor of the palace in Burgundy, marched towards Austrasia with an army, but the Frank nobles refused to fight, fell upon and slew Protadius, and compelled Theodoric to make peace (Fredegar. xxvii.). It was not till 610 that Brunechilde's hopes were fulfilled, when Theodebert lawlessly invaded Alsace, his brother's property by special bequest of their father, and by a treacherous employment of superior force, compelled Theodoric to sign away both that and more territory (Fredegar. xxxvii.). The brothers were now declared enemies, and in May of the following year, Theodoric, having obtained the aid of Clotaire, marched into Austrasia with a large army and defeated his brother at Toul. Theodebert fled across the Vosges to Cologne, where he summoned to his aid Saxons, Thuringians, and other trans-Rhenane peoples, and advanced to Tolbiac. Here was fought one of the bloodiest battles even of that age. Theodebert, again defeated, fled across the Rhine, but was captured, divested of the ensigns of royalty, and sent in chains to Châlons. Delivered into the hand of Brunechilde, he was first tonsured and, a little later, put to death (Fredegar. xxxviii.; Jonas, *Vita Columb.* 57, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 1042).

Perhaps the sole meritorious action of Theodebert's career was his reception of St. Columban, when exiled from Luxeuil by Theodoric, and proceeding on his mission to the heathen Alamanni, on the lakes of Zurich and Constance (Jonas, *ibid.* 51 sqq.). For a contemporary judgment of him see Fredegarius, xxxviii., who represents the bishop of Mainz as "odiens stultitiam Theodeberti." [S. A. B.]

THEODECHILDIS (1), a queen in France, whose praises and epitaph were written by Venantius Fortunatus. She is extolled for her noble birth, courtesy, generosity to the poor, and munificence in church building (Venant. Fort. *Misc.* iv. 25, vi. 5). She may be identical with the queen Teudichilda, mentioned by Gregory of Tours in the *De Glor. Conf.* xli. Some think she was the daughter of Clovis, others, the wife of Theodoric king of the Franks, and mother of Theodebert; others again, the daughter of Theodoric and sister of Theodebert. She must not be confounded with Charibert's queen of the same name. (See Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 169 n. and lxxi. 290 n.) [S. A. B.]

THEODECHILDIS (2), queen of Charibert, king of the Franks. She was the daughter of a shepherd and the last of a succession of wives. Her one child did not survive its birth. Upon Charibert's death in 567, she made overtures of marriage to his brother Guntram, who bade her come to him without fear and bring her treasure with her, promising to make her great and honoured. But once in his power she was insulted, robbed of the greater part of her wealth and immured in a monastery at Arles. An unsuccessful attempt to escape to Spain, in company with a Goth, brought upon her punishments and close confinement in a cell where she died (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 26). She is not the queen of the same name, the subject of the two odes of Venantius Fortunatus (*Misc.* iv. 25, vi. 5). [S. A. B.]

THEODELINDA, queen of the Lombards, was daughter of Garibald king of the Bavarians. Paulus Diaconus (iii. 30) tells the story of the visit of king Authari to Bavaria in disguise, and how he made himself known to his bride. The marriage took place on May 15th, probably in A.D. 589. On September 5th, A.D. 590, king Authari died. (Gregorius, *Epp.* i. 17.) Theodelinda had so completely won the hearts of the Lombards that they asked her to continue to be their queen, choosing for her husband whomsoever she pleased, provided he was qualified to reign. Taking counsel with her wise men she chose in November Agilulf, or Ago, the duke of Turin, a kinsman of her late husband (P. D. iii. 55); and in the following May he was accepted by all the Lombards as king in Milan. The Lombards, like the other Teutonic nations, except the Franks, had received Christianity under an Arian form, to which they still adhered. Authari had even forbidden the Lombards to have their children baptized as catholics. Further, nearly all who held the orthodox creed in the territories conquered by the Lombards, were in schism from their refusal to accept the Fifth General Council which had condemned the Three Chapters. In this complication the position of Theodelinda was peculiar. By her influence king Agilulf became eventually a catholic, though apparently not till after A.D. 603 (Gregorius, *Epp.* xi. 4, xiv. 12), gave munificently to the church, and restored the orthodox bishops to the position to which they were entitled (P. D. iv. 6). On the other hand she continued to support the Three Chapters, threatened to withdraw from communion with Constantius the archbishop of Milan, and refused to accept the Fifth Council (Gregorius, *Epp.* iv. 2, 3, 4, 38, 39). As late as A.D. 613 Agilulf and Theodelinda continued to support the Three Chapters, nor is there any evidence to show they ever abandoned them (Columbanus, *Epp.* 5 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 274). Notwithstanding this difference, on which Gregory touches most delicately, he was on the most friendly terms with Theodelinda. It was mainly by her influence that Agilulf was induced to make peace (P. D. iv. 8, Gregorius, *Epp.* ix. 42, 43), and after her son Adaloald was born in 602, Gregory wrote to congratulate her, and sent him a cross containing a piece of the true cross and a lection from the gospels, and three rings to his sister Gundiperga. Theodelinda built and endowed the basilica of St. John Baptist at Monza, and also built a palace there. After the death of Agilulf in A.D. 616, Adaloald succeeded with Theodelinda as regent, under whom many churches were restored and large donations given for religious purposes. The date of Theodelinda's death is unknown, but as she is not mentioned in the account of the deposition of her son in A.D. 626 (P. D. iv. 41), she was probably then dead.[a] Her crown, the most ancient in existence except the Iron Crown, her fan, her comb, the golden hen and chickens she gave to the church, and the cross sent by Gregory are still preserved in the treasury of the cathedral at Monza. The crown and fan are described with illustrations in the DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES, i. 509, 677. [F. D.]

THEODEMAR (THEUTMAR), twelfth abbat of M. Cassino, succeeded Poto in A.D. 777. According to the anonymous author of the Life of St. Liudger (quoted in *Vita S. Liudgeri* in Pertz, *SS.* ii. 410 n.), he was a kinsman of the saint, and therefore of Frankish or Frisian descent. He built a magnificent church, near that of St. Benedict, in honour of the Virgin Mary (*Chron. Cas.* i. 11 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* clxxiii. 506). In 787, Monte Cassino was visited by Charles the Great, who confirmed its possessions and privileges (Sickel, *Acta Kar.* ii. 48). At his request Theodemar afterwards sent him a copy of the Rule of St. Benedict, with a letter written by PAULUS DIACONUS. (Paulus Diaconus, *Ep.* in *Patr. Lat.* xcv. 1583.) Theodemar died Jan. 5, 797, after an abbacy of nearly twenty years. (Mabillon, *Ann. Ben.* xxiv–xxvi.) [F. D.]

THEODEMIR, a Gothic noble of Spain at the time of the conquest. He was the first to attack Tarik on his landing. After the defeat and death of Rodericus he endeavoured to defend his own district, but being beaten in the open field, retired to the strong town of Orihuela, and succeeded by a stratagem in obtaining an advantageous treaty from Abdul-aziz, the son of Mousa, in A.D. 712 or 713, by which he was left practically independent, subject only to the payment of a tribute. His principality, called by the Arabs Todmir after him, corresponded roughly with the present province of Murcia. He was succeeded by his son Athanagild. Isidorus Pacensis praises Theodemir highly for his devotion to the faith, his knowledge of the Scriptures, and his eloquence. The caliph himself, to whose court he repaired, admired his wisdom, and confirmed the treaty Abdul-aziz had made. He is the Theodemir who won the mysterious naval victories over the Greeks in the reigns of Egica and Wittiza. [RODERICUS.] (Isidorus Pacensis, c. 38, 39; Dozy, *Recherches*, i. 49; Gayanos, *History of the Mohammedan Dynasties*, i. 268, 281.) [F. D.]

THEODERICUS. [THEODORICUS.]

THEODORA (1), April 28, virgin and martyr at Alexandria, in the Diocletian persecution, under a prefect variously called Proculus

[a] According to a late inscription at Monza, she died on Jan. 18th, A.D. 628, and according to a 12th century necrology of Monza on Jan. 22nd, A.D. 627 (Frisi, *Mem. di Monza*, iii. 211, 106).

(Ruinart), and Eustratius (*Mart. Rom.*). She was brought before the magistrate, confessed her faith, and was then consigned to outrage, but delivered by the device of a Christian soldier named Didymus, who contrived to change garments with the virgin, and thus enabled her to escape. Her Greek acts bear the marks of authenticity, and meet all the tests proposed by Le Blant in his *Actes des Martyrs*, p. 146. They are interesting specimens of Roman criminal trials. Didymus and Theodora were afterwards beheaded together. Several similar escapes will be found noted in Ruinart as below, and in the Bollandists on Alexander and Antonina of May 3rd. Such escapes explain quite naturally the angelic interventions so often introduced in the acts of martyrdom. Theodora's acts expressly call Didymus an angel sent by God. A controversy has arisen about Theodora. Some maintain that she is the same as an anonymous virgin, concerning whom Ambrose tells a similar story in lib. ii. *de Virginibus*, cap. 4. Ruinart (*AA. Sinc.* p. 426) takes one side, Baronius (*Annal.* A.D. 309, num. 32) and Papebrochius (in *AA. SS.* Boll. 28 April, p. 572) just the opposite (*Mart. Vet. Rom.*; Adon., Usuard). [G. T. S.]

THEODORA (2), Sept. 17, a matron who devoted herself to the service of the martyrs in the Diocletian persecutions. When the cemeteries were confiscated she buried the martyrs in her estate, on the Flaminian way, at the twenty-sixth milestone from Rome. There she buried Abundius, Abundantius, Marcianus, and JOANNES (547). De Rossi has identified the catacomb she constructed there in the *Bullett. di Archeol. Crist.* 1883, pp. 134–159. It still exists near Rignano (*Mart. Rom.*). De Rossi discusses at great length, from p. 152, the critical value of the acts of Abundius, in connexion with a lately discovered inscription in honour of a priest and martyr of that name. [G. T. S.]

THEODORA (3), a canoness, to whom Basil addressed an excellent practical letter, setting forth very plainly the rules of the evangelical life she had adopted, and warning her of its difficulties. He apologizes for not writing more frequently; but he fears his letters are intercepted, opened, and read. (Basil, *Ep.* 173 [302].) [E. V.]

THEODORA (4), a lady of Constantinople, to whom Chrysostom writes from Caesarea on his road to Cucusus a somewhat querulous letter complaining that she must have completely forgotten him, since he had only received one letter in reply to the three or four he had written to her during the early stages of his journey. He begs her to make appeals to his powerful friends at the capital to obtain for him a less savage place of exile (Chrys. *Ep.* 120). We have a second later letter to her from his pen earnestly pleading the cause of one Eustathius, a member of her household, whom she had turned out of doors for some unspecified offence. (*Ep.* 117.) [E. V.]

THEODORA (5), a lady of Baetica, in the end of the 4th century, widow of the wealthy and learned Lucinius (q. v.). She had lived in continence with her husband, who had kept up correspondence with Jerome, at Bethlehem, and on the death of Lucinius, in 399, Jerome writes a letter to his widow, which is an epitaphium of her husband. He commends her to the teaching of the blind presbyter, Abigans (Jerome, *Ep.* 75, 76, ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

THEODORA (6), an Egyptian solitary, spoken of as Ἀμμᾶς or "mother," a title corresponding to Ἀββᾶς for a male. She was contemporary with Theophilus patriarch of Alexandria, and several of her sayings are recorded in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (Coteler. *Mon. Gr. Ecc.* i. 465; Tillem. x. 474). [C. H.]

THEODORA (7), one of the eminently pious women whom Palladius had known. She was a tribune's daughter, and so impoverished herself by her charities that she had to live on the alms of others, and died in poverty (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 128). [C. H.]

THEODORA (8), a virgin lady of Minorca, mentioned by Severus in his letter about the wonderful conversion of Jews in that island, A.D. 425, as having seen a vision (*Ep.* Sev. 7; Aug. *Op.* vol. vii., *App.* p. 824, ed. Migne). [H. W. P.]

THEODORA (9), ST., Sept. 11, a penitent of Alexandria in the reign of Zeno, c. 474. She had fallen into adultery, and having disguised herself as a man, entered a male monastery eighteen miles from Alexandria, where she passed above eight years (Niceph. Call. *H. E.* xvii. 5; *Menol. Graec.* Sirlet., Sept. 11; Baron. *Mart. Rom.* Sept. 11; Tillem. xvi. 165). [C. H.]

THEODORA (10) I., empress, wife of Justinianus I., the most striking woman of antiquity, notable alike for her beauty, her ability, her iron will, her profligacy, and the marvellous change of her fortunes. Acacius, a bear-keeper at the amphitheatre at Constantinople, died in the reign of Anastasius, leaving three daughters, Comito, Theodora, then seven years old, and Anastasia. The manager of the Prasini or Green faction refused to appoint in Acacius's place the man with whom his widow cohabited after his death, but her supplications and those of her children procured him a similar post from the opposite faction of the Veneti or Blues. Theodora never forgot the different behaviour of the two factions. When she was old enough, she appeared on the stage, where her elder sister had preceded her. Small in stature, but with beautiful features and figure, pale in complexion with brilliant eyes, her wit, and powers of repartee fascinated the populace. The indescribable details of her life at this period, as related by Procopius, must be sought in the *Anecdota* by those who wish to learn them. Though from the whole animus of the work, the absolute silence of all other writers even after the death of Justinian, and the fact that in the Nika sedition, though the rioters did not spare Justinian himself, apparently not one word was said against the empress, we may infer that Procopius exaggerates, yet there must have been some foundation for such a superstructure, and from the condition of the stage at that time we may well believe that her life was an abandoned one, without necessarily giving credence to every scandalous story of Procopius. Having returned to Con-

stantinople after visiting the Libyan Pentapolis as the mistress of the governor Hecebolus, and having been reduced to great distress, she in appearance or reality changed her mode of life, and supported herself by spinning wool. Justinian, then a middle-aged man of studious and abstemious habits, nephew of the reigning emperor Justin, fell madly in love with her, notwithstanding the opposition of the empress Euphemia, and after her death induced his uncle to issue a law (*Codex* 5, iv. 23) abolishing all restrictions on the marriage of women connected with the theatre, and married her. On the 1st of April, A.D. 527, Justin associated his nephew with himself in the empire, and died four months afterwards. Justinian caused Theodora to be crowned with him, and treated not merely as Empress Consort but Empress Regnant, but it was not till after the Nika sedition in A.D. 532, when her resolution prevented Justinian seeking safety in flight, that she appears to have exercised a preponderating influence on public affairs, which thenceforth increased steadily during the rest of her life, as the emperor devoted himself more and more to theological studies. She died of cancer in June A.D. 548, after having for many years the chief power in the empire. In religious as in worldly matters her influence was great. Unlike her husband, she was an ardent Monophysite. Some people indeed supposed that they purposely took different sides to avoid entirely estranging both parties, and to learn the secrets of both. She was the friend of Severus of Antioch, whose recall from exile she procured, and the translation of ANTHIMUS from Trapezus to Constantinople was her work. Her alleged part in the deposition of pope SILVERIUS and the elevation of pope VIGILIUS is narrated under those articles and JUSTINIANUS I., Vol. III. 547. After her marriage her character appeared to have changed completely in all but energy. The malignant Procopius can find but one charge of unfaithfulness against her, and that resting only on gossip, and unsupported by evidence (*Anec.* 16). The former courtesan, the associate of the vilest of mankind, was transformed into the haughtiest of empresses, who delighted to keep the highest dignitaries of the church and state dancing attendance in her ante-chamber, and to allow them to kiss her feet. Her influence was unbounded. If anyone rashly accepted office from the emperor without her consent, he was fortunate if, disgraced and deprived of office, he escaped with his life. The most powerful ministers could not prevail against her influence. Her cruelty was implacable and insatiable, and she used her power to avenge herself on the Green faction and to protect the Blue. For instance, the governor of Cilicia had executed two of the latter party who had attacked him and murdered his groom. The indignant empress ordered him to be impaled on the grave of the murderers. No sanctuary however holy was a protection from her anger. She assumed an especial jurisdiction over the marriages of her subjects, giving the daughters of her former associates to men of high rank, and marrying noble ladies to the lowest of the people. Her influence was invariably on the wife's side; she shielded the adulterous Antonina, and nearly caused a revolution by compelling Artabanes to take back his repudiated wife.

She was as energetic in works of piety as in everything else. Associated with her husband in his building churches and hospitals, her special foundation was a penitentiary into which 500 women of the class to which she had belonged were swept, though Procopius maliciously hints that some preferred suicide to the rigour of the discipline there.

Her portrait in the mosaics at St. Vitale at Ravenna has been engraved in Ducange, *Hist. Byz.*, in Alemanni's notes to the *Anecdota*, and in Mr. Hodgkin, *Invaders of Italy*, vol. iii. 606, the last being the best.

Sources.—The three works of Procopius, especially the *Anecdota*; Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 10, 11; Victor. Tun. *Chron.*; Liberatus, *Breviarium*, 20-22; *Liber Pontificalis, Vitae Silverii et Vigilii.*

Literature. — Gibbon, chaps. 40 – 41, Dahn, *Prokopius von Cäsarea*; Hodgkin, *Invaders of Italy*, iii.–iv.; Professor Bryce, in *Contemporary Review*, February 1885; M. Debidour, *Thesis* published in 1877, who tries to make out the best case he can for Theodora. [F. D.]

THEODORA (11), widow of the defensor SABINUS, complained in A.D. 601 to Gregory the Great that by the fraud of her son, and his father-in-law Aligern, she had been induced at the time of the marriage to make over to him all her property, and that they now refused to allow a bare maintenance. Gregory directed the subdeacon, Anthemius, to inquire into the matter and to assist her. (*Epp.* xi. 17.) [F. D.]

THEODORA (12) II., empress, wife of JUSTINIANUS II., and sister of the Khan of the Chazars, disclosed to her husband her brother's plot against his life. When Justinian had in consequence to fly from Phanagoria, he sent her back to her father; but when he recovered his throne, he sent for her, and crowned her as empress. (Nicephorus; Theophanes.) [F. D.]

THEODORETUS (1) (THEODORUS), Oct. 23, presbyter of Antioch and martyr at the hands of count Julianus, uncle of the emperor Julianus. He had charge of the treasures of the church, and kept up the services when the rest of the clergy had fled away. He reproached count Julianus for his apostasy, was tortured and beheaded. The emperor was very angry with his uncle for his violence, recognising that the church was only strengthened by martyrdoms. Count Julianus soon after perished by a terrible death. (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 658–662; Soz. *H. E.* v. 8; Theod. *H. E.* iii. 12, 13.) Chrysostom often refers to count Julian's conduct on this occasion. (Cf. Homil. iv. *de Laud. S. Pauli. Exposit. Psal.* cx., Homil. iv. in St. Matth.) [JULIANUS (102).] [G. T. S.]

THEODORETUS (2), bishop of Cyrrhus, or Cyrus, in the province of Euphratensis, one of the most conspicuous of the theologians of the fifth century, "'facile princeps' among his brethren for varied learning and persuasive church oratory of a richly versatile type" (Dr. Bright, *Later Treatises of St. Athanas. Libr. of Fathers*, p. 149). He presents himself to posterity as at the same time "a great and holy bishop," an accomplished man of letters, an acute and ac-

curate scientific theologian, a sound and skilful controversialist,—a commentator on Holy Scripture, if not distinguished by originality, which indeed he modestly lays no claim to, yet remarkable for terseness, good sense, and appreciation of his subject,—a church historian learned, and generally impartial,—an eloquent and persuasive preacher, almost rivalling in his celebrity and his power over his hearers his great fellow-townsman, John Chrysostom, with "a place of his own in the literature of the first centuries, and a place in which he has no rival." (Newman's *Hist. Sketches*, vol. iii. p. 326. Lightfoot, *Ep. to Galatians*, p. 220.) He also exhibits a large loving human heart, which draws out not only our interest but our affection for one who found it so hard to believe anything but what was good of friends he had long known and loved, or to give them up when theological consistency demanded it of him, and, in Dr. Bright's appreciative words, "enables us to feel towards him as (St. Augustine excepted) we can hardly feel towards any of his contemporaries in east or west" (*l. c.*). Deeply as we must regret the polemical bitterness which disfigures some of his undisputed writings, and his toleration of pious fraud, there is on the whole no name in ecclesiastical history which more commands at once our admiration, our respect, and our affection, than that of "the Blessed Theodoret." From his lower rank in the hagiology of the church, in claims to real saintliness, he towers above many canonized saints, especially his own mighty rival and antagonist St. Cyril of Alexandria.

Theodoret was born at Antioch, towards the end of the fourth century. The exact date of his birth is nowhere given, and is only to be gathered from internal evidence which admits of different conclusions. Garnier places it in 386, Ceillier about 387. This, however, appears too early, and Tillemont is probably nearer the truth in placing it about 393. The arguments for and against the earlier date are carefully marshalled by Tillemont (note ii.), and his conclusions in favour of the later year appear convincing. Theodoret's parents, whose names are nowhere mentioned, were persons of wealth and high position at Antioch. His maternal grandmother was a lady of landed property (*Relig. Hist.* p. 1191, vol. v. ed. Schulze, Halae, 1771). Of his father nothing is recorded save in general terms, his piety, and the ardent desire he felt for children, which caused him (πάντοσε περινοστῶν) to beset the solitaries, who abounded in the neighbourhood of Antioch, with his entreaties for their intercessions for the gift of the blessing of offspring (*Relig. Hist.* p. 1213). His mother was married at seventeen. Being young, beautiful, rich, and gay, and unencumbered with nursery cares, she lived the life and adopted the habits of a young lady of fashion, fond of dress and jewellery and indulging in the use of cosmetics, living to the world without any profession of piety. After six years of marriage, at the age of twenty-three, she was attacked by a malady in one of her eyes, which resisted all the aid of medical science. Hearing from one of her lady friends of a certain holy man named Peter, a Galatian by race [PETRUS (64) GALATA], then living in an unoccupied tomb at Antioch, who had cured the wife of Pergamius, the governor of the east, of a like disease by his prayers and the sign of the cross, Theodoret's mother, without laying aside a single ear-ring or necklace, her face glowing with rouge, and her limbs clad in transparent silk, climbed the ladder which formed the only way of access to the saint's abode, and requested the same boon. The holy recluse having first upbraided her with the impious attempt to improve upon the handiwork of the Divine Artificer by the adornment of her person, and by his words awakened in her breast a desire for a higher life, consented, though reluctantly, to apply the same remedial sign to the diseased eye, which speedily recovered its soundness (*Rel. Hist.* pp. 1881, 1190). The cure confirmed the wholesome power of Peter's exhortations. She at once laid aside all her jewels and fine clothes and embraced an ascetic life, which she maintained with increasing severity to her death. But though cured of her bodily and spiritual maladies, still Theodoret's mother remained barren. The intercessions of the hermits failed to obtain the blessing of a child for her and her husband. They could only exhort submission to the Divine will. At last, at the expiration of "another weary course of years—as many as seven,"one of these recluses, Macedonius by name (MACEDONIUS), boldly promised the birth of a son (*Rel. Hist.* 1214). Three years having elapsed without any appearance of the promise being fulfilled, Theodoret's father visited Macedonius, again reproaching him with the delay. The saint bade him send his wife to the cell. On her arrival he told her that their desire would be granted, and a son given, but on the condition that, Hannah-like, she would devote the still unbegotten child to the service of the Almighty Giver. The condition was joyfully accepted by the eagerly expectant pair. Macedonius spent whole nights in prayer for the satisfaction of their desire. Four months after the visit she conceived, and in due time—a threatened danger in the fifth month of pregnancy having been averted by a visit of Macedonius—a son was born to the almost hopeless parents, by whom in perpetual memory of the circumstances of their child's birth and of their promised devotion of him to God, he was named Θεοδώρητος, Theodoret, "the gift of God." The vow was strictly performed. From his cradle (ἐκ σπαργάνων, *Ep.* 81) he was devoted to a life of religion, for which he was carefully trained by his mother, drinking in from her lips as soon as he had quitted her breast the apostolical faith according to its Nicene expression (*Ep.* 88), and receiving the weekly blessing of Peter of Galatia, as well as the exhortations of Macedonius, to frame his life in a manner worthy of one who had been specially given to prayer, and had been set apart before his birth to God's service. "Well do I remember his words," writes Theodoret, when narrating Macedonius' life, "well was I taught the Divine gift given to me, but little have my words answered to his lessons: May God, through his intercession, help me by His grace to live the rest of my life according to his admonitions." (*Relig. Hist.* p. 1215.) Theodoret narrates how, in his weekly visits to Peter in his tomb, the old man would take him on his knees and feed him with raisins and bread, and as the most precious thing he could bestow, presented him with half his linen girdle. This was

long preserved in the family and lent to others as a sovereign remedy against all diseases, until one of the borrowers forgot to return it and the wonder-working relic was hopelessly lost (*u. s.* 1188, 1195). His mother also gained for him the benediction of another ascetic, Aphraates, a Persian by birth (*u. s.* 1185), and he obtained that of another named Zeno, "when the youthful down was first appearing on his face" (*u. s.* 1203). At an early age, indeed while still a boy, Theodoret was made a "lector," and read the Scripture publicly (*ibid.*). We only know of his education by its results. His writings indicate a well trained and highly cultivated mind, enriched by the perusal of all the best classical authors whether orators poets or philosophers, with whose works he indicates complete familiarity. But being devoted to a religious life his chief study was naturally given to the Holy Scriptures and the works of commentators upon them in several languages. He was master of Greek, Syriac and Hebrew, but he was unacquainted with Latin. His chief theological teacher, to whom he never refers without deserved reverence and admiration, was Theodore of Mopsuestia, "the great commentator," as he was called, the luminary and pride of the Antiochene school, but who undoubtedly prepared the way for the heretical teaching of Nestorius by his desire to provide, in Dorner's words, "for a free moral development in the Saviour's manhood." He speaks also of Diodorus of Tarsus as his teacher, but this can only have been through his writings.

The parents of Theodoret were both dead by the time he had reached his twenty-third year. He was their sole heir. He immediately proceeded to divest himself of his inheritance, which he distributed among the poor. (*Ep.* 113.) He then took up his abode in a monastery, one of two founded in a large village called Nicerte, three miles from Apamea, and about seventy-five miles from Antioch (*Ep.* 119), which he made his home for about seven years, until his reluctant elevation to the episcopal office, which took place about the year 423. His residence at Nicerte may be regarded as one of the happiest periods of his life. Dr. Newman says of it "he was then in his youthful fervour, and there he laid deep within him that foundation of faith and devotion, and obtained that vivid apprehension of the world unseen and future which lasted him as a secret spring of spiritual strength all through the conflicts and sufferings of the years that followed" (*Historical Sketches*, iii. p. 313). He employed his leisure in making excursions into the country round, far and near, for the purpose of visiting other religious houses, profiting by the words and the example of the devout men who either as solitaries or as cenobites abounded in those regions. Of one such visit to the monastery of St. Eusebius, near Teledân in the diocese of Antioch, he gives an account with his own pen. (*Relig. Hist.* c. iv. p. 1157.)

After some seven years passed calmly and contentedly in the Apamean monastery, Theodoret was drawn from the congenial life of continued study and devotion he there enjoyed to assume the cares, labours, and trials of the episcopate. Of the circumstances of his ordination we are entirely ignorant. We know neither when he was ordained, nor who was his ordainer, nor whose influence was powerful enough to overcome his disinclination to so onerous a charge, which he tells us he assumed reluctantly (*ἄκων ἐδεξάμην*) (*Ep.* 81, p. 1140). Garnier, starting from the erroneous hypothesis that he must have been ordained by the patriarch of Antioch, wastes much learning and labour in determining whether this patriarch was Theodotus or his predecessor Alexander. He also assumes, without any proof, that Theodoret had previously been ordained "reader" at the age of twenty-two by Porphyry, and deacon by Alexander, while still an inmate of the Apamean monastery. The baselessness of this piece of fictitious history is shewn by Tillemont (*notes* i. iii.), who remarks that in accordance with canonical precedent the ordination must have been conducted by the metropolitan of the province in which his future diocese was situated, *i.e.* by the bishop of Hierapolis. The see with which the name of Theodoret was thenceforward to be inseparably connected, deriving its sole claim to distinction from that connection, was that of Cyrus, or more properly Cyrrhus, the chief city of a district of the province of Euphratensis called after it Cyrrhestica, an extensive plain of great fertility lying between the spurs of the Amanus and the river Euphrates, intersected by mountain ranges, some wooded and some bare, watered by three streams, and possessing "a rich loamy soil as fine as garden mould, in which it is difficult to find even a pebble." The diocese was forty miles long by as many broad, and contained the very large number of 800 distinct parishes, each with its church (*Ep.* 113, vol. vi. p. 1190). The diocese was also singularly rich in monastic houses for religious persons of both sexes, some of them containing as many as two hundred and fifty inmates, and it boasted of a large number of solitaries. All of these enjoyed Theodoret's unremitting and affectionate solicitude in the frequent visits he paid them. Never perhaps was he happier than when laying aside for a while his episcopal state and sojourning among these holy solitaries, whose strange penances and self-torturing asceticism, and lives detached from all contact with the world, had so inexpressible a charm for his devout nature, and in whose miraculous powers he exhibits such easy credence, or as "moderns would say large credulousness" (Newman, *u. s.* p. 314); "men of solid virtue and worthy of the Christian name; men who mortified themselves with the distinct purpose of thereby becoming gentle, spiritual, unostentatious, modest, meek, and holy, and who succeeded in their object" (*ib.* 316). With such kindred souls Theodoret knew a happiness he was a stranger to in the rush and turmoil of the episcopal work of his diocese. This was severe and trying. Cyrrhus was not more fertile in ascetics than in heretics. The East has ever been the nursery of heresy. In a diocese such as his, lying as it were in a corner of the world, not reached by the public posts, isolated by the great river to the east and the mountain chains to the west, peopled by half-leavened heathen, Christianity assumed many strange forms, sometimes hardly recognizable caricatures of the truth. Eunomians, Arians, Marcionites, and the adherents of other still wilder distortions of the pure religion of Christ, abounded. "Old-world heresies were the popular religion of peasants" (Bright, *u. s.*, p. 149). To the recovery of these Theodoret devoted his

youthful ardour and still undiminished strength, and this he did at his own personal risk. "Often," he writes, "have I shed my blood; often have I been stoned; nay, brought down before my time to the very gates of death" (*Epp.* 81, 113, 1141, 1190). Nor were his labours fruitless. Eight villages polluted by Marcionite errors, with their neighbouring hamlets comprising more than a thousand souls, one village filled with Eunomians, another with Arians, were brought back to the sound faith. He could boast with all honesty to pope Leo in 449, that by the help of his prayers not a single plant of tares was left among them, and that his whole flock had been delivered from heretical errors. (*Epp.* 81, 113, 116, pp. 1141, 1190, 1197.) He carried his campaign against error, which embraced Jews and heathen as well as misbelieving Christians, beyond the limits of his own diocese. "He who surveys all things knows how many stones hurled at me by abominable heretics my body has received; what contests I endured in most of the cities of the East, with Gentiles, with Jews, with every form of heretical error" (*ib.* p. 1190). He was unwearied in preaching, and his acquaintance with the Syrian vernacular gave him access to the ears and hearts of the poorest and most ignorant of his flock. Conspicuous as was Theodoret's zeal for the spiritual welfare of his diocese, his care for its temporal interests and material prosperity was no less remarkable. The city of Cyrrhus, though the winter quarters of the tenth legion, could boast of little dignity or architectural beauty. He calls it "a small and desolate city," with but "few inhabitants, and those poor," whose ugliness he had done his best to redeem by costly buildings erected at his own expense (*Ep.* 183, p. 1231). From his own ecclesiastical revenues, —which must therefore have been far from small,—he erected public porticos, built two bridges on the largest scale, provided baths for the people, and finding the city without any regular water supply he constructed an aqueduct, so that water was as abundant as it had been scarce before, while at the same time, by the formation of a catchwater drain, he guarded it against inundation from the marshes (*Ep.* 79, 81). The erection of these public buildings and hydraulic works attracted architects and engineers to the city, and afforded remunerative employment to a large number of the population, for whose benefit he also secured the help of presbyters skilled in medical science (*Epp.* 114, 115). Finding his diocese unduly burdened with state imposts, the severity of which had caused many tenants to throw up their farms, leaving the civil authorities to make good their deficiency, a liability which they were seeking to avoid by flight, he wrote to the empress Pulcheria, entreating her to lighten so intolerable a burden (*Ep.* 43, p. 1102) as well as to the patrician Anatolius (*Ep.* 45, 1104). In accordance with the belief of his age he took considerable trouble in obtaining from Palestine relics of prophets apostles and martyrs, for the greater glory of a church he had caused to be built in his episcopal city (*Relig. Hist.* c. xxi. p. 1251; *Ep.* 66). So great was his zeal for orthodoxy that, having discovered in the churches of his diocese more than two hundred copies of the Diatessaron of Tatian (what would we not give for one of them?) which he regarded as tainted with heresy, he destroyed them all, and substituted the ordinary text of the four gospels (*Haeret. Fab.* lib. i. c. 20). His life as a bishop differed as little as possible from that he had pursued in his monastery. The necessary state and official routine were very distasteful to him, and he avoided them as far as possible, devoting himself to the spiritual side of his office (*Epp.* 16, 79, 81, 145). He boasts in his letter to Nomus that, during the quarter of a century that he had been bishop, he had neither had a suit brought against him nor summoned anyone to the law courts, to which his clergy were equal strangers. Bribes and presents were unknown to him; "not a cloke nor a halfpenny have I accepted from anyone; not a loaf of bread, not an egg has anyone of my household ever yet accepted" (*Ep.* 81, p. 1140). At the same time, averse as he was to secular employments, he never shrank from them when duty called. In his commentaries on the Canticles he takes opportunity to refer to the infinite press of business, the petty conflicts and ignoble troubles that came upon him in connection with the city and the country, the police and the court, of which he had to bear the weight unaided (*In Cant.* tom. iii. p. 2). Nor were his extra-diocesan labours small or light. He made frequent preaching visits to his native city of Antioch, to Beroea, and other cities on the sea-board of Phenicia, in all of which his popularity as a preacher was great. At Antioch the very men who afterwards became his slanderous enemies, after his sermons "folded him in their arms, kissed his head his breast and hands, nay some of them his very knees, declaring that his teaching was worthy of the apostles" (*Ep.* 147). John the patriarch of Antioch felt such delight in his preaching that "he used to applaud with both hands, and often rose on his seat" (*Ep.* 83). These visits, however, were never made on his own initiative, but reluctantly, after repeated invitations, five or six times over. So celebrated a preacher, however, was not allowed to decline. The Antiochenes felt that they had a claim on him as one of themselves, and with their neighbours in other cities persisted in their importunity until they had secured their object. "We find that to Antioch he paid as many as twenty-six preaching visits year after year out of the thirty years which he numbered in his episcopate, and though reiterated refusals on his part were the preliminary to his preaching there at all, yet preach he did, and for twenty-six seasons, giving clear evidence thereby both that he was fitted for the work, and that he knew his fitness" (Newman, *Hist. Sketches*, p. 327). His enemies charged him with restlessness, and a love of notoriety and a too great fondness for attending synods (*Ep.* 82, p. 1142). He could truly reply that unattractive as Cyrrhus might be to one of his cultured intellect and sympathetic temperament, it was his home and the centre of the work to which he had been called of God; that he left it reluctantly and returned to it gladly; that his attendance at the councils of the church was a plain duty, and that if he found a pleasure in addressing crowded earnest and sympathetic audiences, it was because he was thus doing his Master's work, and making the best use of the talents He had entrusted to his care. The church

would have been much the richer if any of these discourses, so eagerly listened to and so warmly applauded, had come down to us. All have unhappily perished, and the fame of Theodoret as a preacher rests alone on the verdict of his contemporaries, given, however, in no uncertain manner. The interests of the church beyond his own immediate province were also earnestly cared for by Theodoret. The Christians of Persia, and the provinces subject to Persia, being called to suffer a severe persecution, in 420 and onwards, we find Theodoret writing to two bishops of Armenia, Eulalius and Eusebius, about the year 440, exhorting them to do all in their power to hold up the feeble and restore the fallen, and themselves exhibit examples of strength firmness and courage (*Epp.* 77, 78). An example of his tender heartedness towards those in distress is afforded by the zeal with which he took up the cause of Celestiacus, a man of high rank of Carthage, who had been stripped of his all by the invasion of the Vandals, and with his large family of children and domestics was dependent on charity for existence, in whose behalf he wrote a number of still extant letters to various friends (*Epp.* 29–36).

We now come to the critical period in the life of Theodoret in connexion with the Nestorian controversy, through which he is chiefly known to us. Though he fought on the losing side, unequally matched with the most commanding spirit of his age, and one of the most clear-headed constructive theologians the Church has ever produced, and had eventually to acknowledge himself beaten and to confess the substantial justice of his defeat; though he made many mistakes, and lost his temper and called his adversary hard names, and allowed himself to be unduly biassed by private friendships and personal antipathies, we cannot but feel that, as regards temper and spirit, Theodoret had the best of it, and that the moral victory remains with him rather than with his great antagonist. We may accept the assurance that, in regard to the chief verities of the faith, Cyril and Theodoret were substantially in agreement. But, as Dr. Bright has said, like too many combatants, "each looked mainly at his own side of the shield." "The mystery of the Incarnation has two aspects, one relating to Christ's single Personality, the other to the distinctness of His manhood from His Godhead. Cyril emphasized the former, while really acknowledging the latter; Theodoret reversed the process. Cyril specially dreaded a 'severance,' Theodoret a 'confusion,' . . . yet Cyril had a true belief in our Lord's Manhood, and Theodoret was not less sound as to his Personal Divinity. Thus each of the two men did that sort of work for which his antecedents and habits of thought had fitted him, and thereby gave in his appropriate contribution to the ultimate settlement of the twofold question raised." (*Later Treatises of St. Athanas.* pp. 149, 150.) Theodoret's personal share in the controversy began in the closing months of 430 with the receipt by John, the patriarch of Antioch [JOANNES (31)], of the letters of Celestine and Cyril, relative to the condemnation of the doctrines of Nestorius promoted by the Western bishops in the preceding August. Referring for details to the article just mentioned as well as those on the other leading personages of the controversy [COELESTINUS, CYRILLUS (7), NESTORIUS], it is enough to say, that this high-handed behaviour on the part of the patriarchs of Rome and Alexandria towards the bishop of the New Rome, himself a personal friend of long-standing to both of them, was no less offensive to Theodoret than to John. When these documents arrived Theodoret happened to be at Antioch with other bishops of the province, probably for the ordination of Macarius, the new bishop of Laodicea. The admirable letter, characterized by mild persuasiveness, despatched in the name of John and his suffragans to Nestorius, exhorting him to give up his objections to the term "Theotokos," seeing that the true sense of that term was part of the Church's faith, and entreating him not to throw the whole of Christendom into confusion for the sake of a word, which Tillemont describes as "très belle, très bien faite, et très digne de la réputation qu'avait ce prélat" (*Mém. Ecclés.* xiv. 34), has been, with great show of probability, ascribed to the practised pen of Theodoret (for this letter see Labbe, iii. 390 sq.; Baluz. col. 445, c. xxi.). The controversy was speedily rendered much fiercer by the publication of Cyril's celebrated twelve "Anathematisms" or "Articles." Designed to crush one form of heretical teaching as regards our Lord's Personal Nature, these "articles" (detached, against Cyril's intention, from the letter on which they were based) hardly escaped falling into the opposite error. The Godhead of Christ was asserted with such emphasis, that to some readers the truth of His manhood might seem obscured. John was shocked at what he, and those who thought with him, deemed the positive affinity to Apollinarian doctrine in some of these articles, and applied first to Andreas of Samosata [ANDREAS SAMOSATENSIS] and then to "the more accomplished controversialist" Theodoret to confute them. Theodoret readily undertook the task assigned to him. He replied to the anathematisms seriatim, in a bitter tone which evidenced that he had not yet attained to clearness or consistency of view on the subject of controversy. So completely at variance with orthodoxy did Theodoret regard the articles, that in the letter to John (reckoned as *Ep.* 150) prefixed to his observations upon them, he expresses a suspicion that some "enemies of the truth" had been sheltering themselves under Cyril's name. If they were really his, they proved how unworthy he was of the office of chief shepherd, who not only was diseased himself, but sought to infect those whom it was given him to feed and tend with deadly disease. under the name and figure of piety breaking forth into heretical and blasphemous language, seeking to revive the impious teaching of Apollinaris, long since dead, and branding with anathemas those who refused to join in his blasphemies (Labbe, iii. 889–944). Cyril replied to his objectors in his "Apology for the twelve anathematisms addressed to the Oriental bishops" (Labbe, iii. 827–887; Cyril, ed. Pusey, i. 384–496, vi. 382), and in an elaborate letter addressed to Euoptius, bishop of Ptolemais, containing Theodoret's objections to the anathematisms and his own replies to them, seriatim (Labbe, iii. 888–943). For the nature of these documents, as well as of the objections urged by Theodoret and his friends, which, with much that is illogical and inconsistent, contain no little that

is *prima facie* Nestorian, the article CYRILLUS may be referred to (Vol. I. p. 767. a). These documents, it should be noticed, were prior to the council of Ephesus and the formal condemnation of Nestorius which was then passed. At that famous ecclesiastical gathering Theodoret, accompanying his metropolitan, the inflexible Alexander of Hierapolis, was among the earlier comers, anticipating his tardy Oriental brethren, whose arrival he, with sixty-eight bishops, vainly urged should be waited for before the council opened (Baluz. c. vii. 697–699). On the arrival of John and his Oriental brethren, he at once united himself to them, and gave his voice for the deposition and excommunication of Cyril and Memnon and their adherents (Labbe, iii. 597–599). He took part also in the miserable proceedings which ensued, when the "concilium" and the so-called "conciliabulum" were each launching the thunderbolts of their ecclesiastical artillery against each other, mutually deposing and excommunicating their rival leaders. On the two warring parties sending their respective deputies by his desire to the emperor at Constantinople, Theodoret was one of the Oriental commissioners, as the representative of his metropolitan, Alexander (*ib.* 728). Previously to this, Theodoret had written two letters, preserved to us in the Acts of the Fifth General Council (the Second of Constantinople). One of these is addressed to Andrew of Samosata, in which he describes Cyril as the Egyptian who was raging against God and warring with Moses and Aaron and His other servants, while the greater part of Israel was siding with the adversaries, and playing a wretched farce under the name of a synod (Labbe, v. 506; Theod. ed. Schulze, vol. iv. *Ep.* 162). The other letter, addressed to "the monasteries," probably those of his own diocese, charges Cyril in most violent language with participating, by his impious anathemas, with the heresies of Arius, Eunomius, Apollinaris, &c., and blaspheming against the Holy Ghost (*ib.* 505). The deputies not being allowed to enter Constantinople, the successive audiences with the emperor were held at Chalcedon, Sept. 431. Theodoret's name appears in the letters and other documents continually passing to and fro between the Oriental party at Ephesus and their representatives in Chalcedon, in which much was said and written in a bitter and uncharitable spirit, which we are glad to believe that Theodoret at least was sorry for afterwards. These wearisome and painful documents appear in Labbe (vol. iii. 724–746; Theod. ed. Schulze, vol. iv. pp. 1336–1354). Of the five sessions held at Chalcedon the proceedings of the first alone are recorded. We have also a few scanty fragments of speeches and homilies of Theodoret delivered at this period, characterized by distressing acrimony, and a free use of opprobrious epithets (Theod. ed. Schulze, vol. v. pp. 104–109). We have also a letter of his to Alexander of Hierapolis, whom he was representing, informing him how matters were going on at Chalcedon, telling him of the popularity of the deputies with the people, who, in spite of the hostility of the clergy and monks by whom they had been repeatedly stoned, flocked in large numbers to hear them, assembling in a large court surrounded with porticos, the churches being closed against them, but lamenting their ill-success with the emperor, on whom all their urgency and eloquence had produced no effect, although they had even sworn to him that it was impossible for them to agree with Cyril and Memnon, and who absolutely refused to hear Nestorius's name mentioned, while his senators trusted only in gold, and asserted that the nature of the Godhead and the Manhood was one and the same. He and his companions, however, would not relax their efforts in behalf of their friend and their father, knowing that injustice was done him (Labbe, iii. 732; Theod. ed. Schulze, *Ep.* 169). The sudden decision of Theodosius, despairing of a compromise, in favour of the orthodox party; his mandate that another bishop should be ordained in place of Nestorius; the memorials in consequence addressed to him by the Orientals; the Imperial order for the dissolution of the synod at Ephesus; the ordination of Maximian as bishop of Constantinople; the return home of Cyril while still under sentence of deposition;—all these are matters of history. Before the deputies finally left Chalcedon, the Orientals delivered addresses to the adherents of the deposed Nestorius who had crossed the Bosphorus from Constantinople, of which we possess considerable fragments. The first of these was delivered by Theodoret. He and his companions, he said, were shut out from the royal city, on account of their fidelity to Christ, but the Heavenly Jerusalem was still open to them. His hearers had braved the terrible waves of the Propontis to hear his voice because in it they realized an echo of the voice, of their pastor, Nestorius, the shepherd whom his brother shepherds had, as they imagined, slain with their reeds. He closes with a vehement and impassioned declamation against those who asserted that the Godhead was capable of suffering, an impiety surpassing that of the heathen (*ib.* 733 sq.; ed. Schulze, v. 106). The council having broken up, the deputies returned to their respective dioceses. On their way home, the Orientals, and Theodoret among them, held a synod at Tarsus, where they renewed the sentence of deposition on Cyril in conjunction with the seven orthodox deputies to Theodosius, which they published in a circular letter. They engaged at the same time never to abandon Nestorius. This promise and these anathemas were repeated at the synod held at Antioch by John at the close of the year (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 34; Liberat. c. vi. p. 26; Mercat. tom. ii. p. 357; Baluz. c. 39, 741). Either shortly before or soon after this Antiochene synod, Theodoret accompanied John and other bishops on a visit to the aged and much venerated Acacius of Beroea, to acquaint him with what had happened at Ephesus, which caused the old man extreme pain (Baluz. c. 41, 746). Theodoret returned to his diocese, where he devoted himself to the composition of a fresh work assailing the obnoxious anathematisms, entitled "Pentalogus," from its division into five books. Of this only a few fragments remain. Other treatises which he wrote at this time are also lost. But we have, in a Latin version, a long letter addressed to the followers of Nestorius at Constantinople, in which he declares his own adherence to the orthodox faith, although he had felt himself unable to acquiesce in the condemnation of Nestorius, not believing that the doctrines ascribed to him were actually held by him (Baluz. *Synod.* c. 40, 742). In 432 another

council was held by John, in the interests of peace, either at Beroea or some other city of Syria, attended by Acacius, Alexander, Andrew, Macarius of Laodicea, and Theodoret, at which six propositions were drawn up, in the hope of putting an end to the unhappy dissensions. These articles were probably framed by Theodoret himself. They were made purposely short, to render their meaning clearer. Only one of them is preserved (*ib.* c. 53, 756; c. 60, 766). This asserts the acceptance of the Nicene faith as well as of Athanasius' "Letter to Epictetus," without any additions "by letters or chapters," the reference being clearly to the twelve articles, which it was thus hinted Cyril had better withdraw. From a letter addressed by the synod to Helladius of Tarsus (*ib.* c. 54), we learn that the six articles were so framed that the reception of any one of them might be regarded sufficient for admission into church communion. The synod, on their side, expressly guard themselves from recognizing the deposition of Nestorius. Cyril found it impossible to accept the terms proposed in Theodoret's articles. He explained the grounds of his objections in a long letter to Acacius, which however opened a way for pacification by interpretations of some questionable points in his anathematisms which he refused to withdraw. This letter Theodoret regarded as orthodox but at the same time as irreconcileable with the anathematisms, which he still regarded as heretical. He was, however precluded from accepting the terms of peace which John and others were increasingly inclined to acquiesce in, by the demand that he should anathematize the doctrine of Nestorius and Nestorius himself. To do this, he writes to his friend Andrew of Samosata, would be to anathematize godliness itself. He professes himself ready enough to anathematize all who assert that Christ was mere man, or who divide Him into two Sons, or who deny His Godhead. But if it was required that they should anathematize a man of whom they were not constituted the judges, and his doctrine which they knew to be sound, *en bloc*, "indeterminatè," he and they would act impiously in obeying such a demand (Baluz. 766, c. 61). Other letters, couched in similar terms, were written by him to Acacius (c. 60), and to the violent Nestorian partisans, Alexander of Hierapolis (769, c. 66), Helladius (772, c. 70), Himerius (773, c. 71), and again to Alexander (775, c. 72). Alexander was impracticable. The others Theodoret sought to win over to his more peaceful view that the new explanations of Cyril might be accepted, but not his demand that they should anathematize Nestorius. He required also that all the bishops who had been deposed for adherence to Nestorian doctrine should be restored before Cyril could be received into communion. At this epoch, as Hefele remarks (*Hist. of Councils*, vol. iii. p. 127, Engl. transl.), the Orientals were divided into two great parties; the peace-seeking majority, with John of Antioch and the venerable Acacius at their head, ready to meet Cyril half-way, and the violent party of irreconcileables, with Alexander of Hierapolis as their leader, opposed to all reconciliation as treason to the truth, while a third or middle party was formed by Theodoret and Andrew of Samosata and their sympathisers, anxious for peace, but on terms of their own. Not being able perfectly to agree with either of the two great parties, Theodoret and his scanty band of adherents failed to secure the confidence of either. His inflexible metropolitan, Alexander, was vehement in his denunciation of such treason to the truth as was involved in any approach to reconciliation with Cyril. Against this reproach Theodoret sought to defend himself, as well as against the suspicion that he had given in to escape persecution, or to secure a higher place for himself (*ib.* c. 72, 775).

Theodoret, though still holding back from reconciliation with Cyril, was virtually the instrument of bringing about the long-desired peace between the two contending sections of the church. The declaration of faith presented to Cyril by Paul of Emesa, as representing the belief of John, and accepted by Cyril, had been originally drawn up by Theodoret at Ephesus with the view of its presentation to the emperor. The paragraphs directed against Cyril's twelve articles were slightly modified. A new heading was given to the document, and a few lines were added at the foot, on the testimony of the Fathers to the doctrine of the two natures; but the main body of it was unaltered (Cyril. ed. Pusey, vi. 44. Baluz. c. 96, 97, 804; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xiv. 531; Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, iii. 130 ff.). The reconciliation, however, in which he had had so influential though unintentional a part, was by no means acceptable to Theodoret. For it demanded the acceptance of the deposition of Nestorius, and to this he could not bring himself, any more than to the other two points insisted on, the anathematizing of Nestorius' doctrines and the giving up the four metropolitans of his party who had been deposed at Constantinople. These last, he maintained, must be restored to their sees, or the peace would be dishonourable, and one which he could not accept. John must use his influence with the ruling power at Constantinople to secure their restoration as the terms of complete reconciliation. Theodoret's urgency was in vain. Not only were the terms he insisted on refused, but Theodosius proceeded to insist on the deposition and expulsion of all bishops who continued opposed to union. These menaces, however, by no means moved Theodoret. He wrote to Nestorius himself, whom he designates as "the most holy father, most beloved by God according to the truth," exculpating himself from the charge of accepting the orthodoxy of Cyril's letters which had been sent him by John, for the sake of preserving his episcopal dignity; he detested their author as much as any living man, but on repeated perusal he had found the letters entirely free from all heretical taint. At the same time he would rather have both his hands cut off than subscribe the condemnation of Nestorius's doctrine. He tells Nestorius that he had sent him a copy of his reply to those who demanded his subscription, that he might be assured that he was no chameleon, changing colour with his place and surroundings, but remained constant in the same faith (Baluz. c. 120, 822, 823). The long and exceedingly violent denunciation of Cyril's letters to John of Antioch that follows in the *Synodicon* (*ib.* c. 121) cannot be regarded as the composition of Theodoret, to whom it is ascribed by Lupus.

It may more probably be ascribed to Alexander of Hierapolis, or some other leader of the irreconcileable party (cf. Tillemont, xiv. p. 553; *Note* lxxviii.). Theodoret wrote about the same time to console the adherents of Nestorius at Constantinople under their present persecution (Mercat. p. 335) and to a certain Theosebius, bishop of Cium in Bithynia, expressing his hope that, as God had made known the truth by the confession of Cyril, so He would reveal the injustice done by the condemnation of Nestorius (Baluz. 796, c. 88). In his increasing difficulties, finding his growing isolation more and more intolerable, Theodoret invited the chiefs of the fast-lessening band of his sympathisers, Alexander, Andrew, and others, to a conference at Zeugma, to take counsel as to what should be done in reference to the union with Cyril, which had been accepted by John and earnestly pressed upon them by the combined weight of the ecclesiastical and civil power. Alexander replied evasively, but ultimately refused to attend the Synod except on his own terms. The bishops who met, as Theodoret informed John (Baluz. c. 95, 662, 801), accepted the orthodoxy of Cyril's letter and regarded it as a recantation of his obnoxious twelve articles, but they could not yield to him in pronouncing an anathema on Nestorius. John, now hopeless of peace in any other way, applied to the secular arm. His method proved generally effectual. One by one the recalcitrant prelates yielded, with the exception of Alexander and some others obstinate in their resolution not to accept the orthodoxy of Cyril or to abandon Nestorius. Theodoret was one of the last to yield. The coldness which had arisen between him and John after the latter's reconciliation with Cyril, had been much increased by John's uncanonical intrusion into the province of Alexander in the ordination of bishops. Theodoret with the other bishops of the province on this withdrew from communion with John, and published a synodical letter charging him with ordaining unworthy persons (Baluz. 831, 850). The long and painful controversy which ensued, which was only crushed at last by John's appealing to the imperial power to expel the malcontents, has been fully detailed elsewhere. [ALEXANDER OF HIERAPOLIS, ANDREW OF SAMOSATA, HELLADIUS OF TARSUS, IRENAEUS OF TYRE, JOANNES OF ANTIOCH (31).] All eventually yielded to combined entreaties and menaces save Alexander and a small but stubborn band of irreconcileables, who were expelled from their sees and banished. Theodoret was assailed on his tenderest side by harassing his diocese. Dionysius, a "magister-militum," the commissioner for the collection of the taxes and other imposts, took care to execute his duties in the most offensive manner, and to represent to the imperial authorities that the disturbances against the leviers of the taxes through the district had been instigated by Theodoret himself. Theodoret wrote a long letter to Dionysius, partly defending himself from these groundless charges and partly complaining of the violent conduct of his opponents, who had tried to set fire to his basilica of St. Cosmas and St. Damian, and had ill-treated several honoured bishops, intruding unworthy persons in their room (Baluz. c. 133, 834 sq.). All remonstrances, however, were in vain. Theodoret and the other remonstrants were given to understand, that they must make their choice between submission and expulsion (*ib.* c. 146, 847). Theodoret, who had shewn himself proof against all menaces and was eager to retire to the quiet of a monastic life, was unable to withstand the entreaties of the faithful of his diocese unwilling to lose their beloved bishop, backed by the earnest remonstrances of James of Nisibis and the other solitaries of the district who entreated him to come to terms with John, holding him responsible, "ut culpantes," if he refused, for the continuance of the miserable divisions which were rending the church (*ib. u. s.*). A conference with John was arranged at Antioch (Gindarus had been the place first suggested, *ib.* c. 146, 847), which terminated in a complete reconciliation. Theodoret was satisfied on finding that John had not in express terms passed an anathema on Nestorius, but only on "whatsoever he had taught or thought against apostolic doctrines" (*ib.* c. 148, 850). Theodoret in vain endeavoured to bring Alexander to submission. A stern "non possumus" was the old man's only reply. Peace was concluded between John and Theodoret. The latter, in the interview between them, had satisfied himself of John's orthodoxy and simple desire for the peace of the Church, while John had, on his side, waived the necessity of Theodoret's assenting to the deposition of Nestorius (*ib.* c. 160, 859). The peace thus outwardly restored to the Church was not destined to last long. A friendly correspondence, it is true, took place between Theodoret and Cyril with regard to the latter's remarks on Julian the Apostate's work against Christianity, and his book on the "Scapegoat," which, at Cyril's request, had been shewn to Theodoret by John. Here, happily, as Dr. Bright has said, "was common ground on which these men, zealous Christians both, could meet and forget old quarrels" (*Later Treatises of St. Athanas.* p. 176). The truce, however, was but hollow and temporary. Cyril's denunciation in 438 of the teaching of Diodorus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, which he had learnt from Rabbulas [RABBULAS] was the real source of the Nestorian heresy, unhappily brought the two once more into collision. Cyril required that all bishops should be compelled to repudiate Nestorian doctrine in express terms. John rebelled against the imposition of new tests, and begged Proclus, the new bishop of Constantinople, to interpose with the emperor to save the Church from these perpetual harassings (Baluz. c. 197, 892). Cyril was greatly exasperated on discovering, through a certain presbyter named Daniel, that Theodoret, with whom he had been engaging in friendly theological correspondence and who he hoped had wiped away all heretical Nestorian taint, still adhered to his former opinions and openly boasted, that he had never joined in the anathema on Nestorius or assented to his deposition. Cyril wrote an indignant letter to John, telling him that if "what he had heard was true, that most pious person ought to be made to experience the severity of his anger" (Theod. ed. Schulze, v. 1361. *Ep.* 179). Whatever steps John may have thought it reasonable to take in this matter Theodoret remained unmoved, nor was it, indeed, till the eighth session of the council of Chalcedon, full

ten years later (Garnier places this letter in 439, Tillemont a little earlier), that he assented to the condemnation of Nestorius. The unhappy renewal of strife, concerning the doctrines of Diodorus and Theodoret, as has been already remarked, brought Theodoret and Cyril once more into collision. For the details of the conflict other articles may be consulted [CYRILLUS OF ALEXANDRIA, Vol. I. p. 771, 772; PROCLUS, RABBULAS, IBAS]. Cyril vehemently denounced Theodore's doctrines, which were as eagerly defended by Theodoret. Of his work in defence of Theodore we have only a few fragments, preserved in the Acts of the Fifth Council. The language used against Cyril is painfully violent, but, unhappily, only in keeping with the spirit of the age and with the proverbial "odium theologicum." The long and bitter controversy in which both parties did and said many things they must have had cause deeply to regret, was closed by the death of Cyril, June 9 or 27, 444. With Baronius, "the cautious" Tillemont, Cardinal Newman and Dr. Bright, we should be glad to "utterly scout" the idea, that the "atrocious letter" on Cyril's death, ascribed to Theodoret by the Fifth Oecumenical Council (Theod. ed. Schulze, *Ep.* 180; Labbe, v. 507) which he was said to have delivered by way of pæan (Bright, *u. s.* 176) and the "scarcely less scandalous" sermon (*ib.*) can have been written by him. "To treat it as genuine would be to vilify Theodoret." "The Fathers of the Council," writes Dr. Newman, "are no authority on such a matter." (*Hist. Sketches*, p. 359).[a] A painful suspicion of their genuineness, however, still lingers and troubles our conception of Theodoret. The documents may have been garbled, but the general tone too much resembles that of undisputed polemical writings of Theodoret's to allow us entirely to repudiate them. We wish we could. Neander (vol. iv. p. 213, note, Clark's tr.) is inclined to accept the genuineness of the letter, the arguments against which he does not regard as carrying conviction, and to a large extent deriving their weight from Tillemont's "catholic standpoint." That Theodoret should speak in this manner of Cyril's character and death cannot, he thinks, appear surprising to those who, without prejudice, contemplate Cyril and his relations to Theodoret. The playful description, after the manner of Lucian, of a voyage to the Shades below, is not to be reckoned a very sharp thing even in Theodoret. The advice to put a heavy stone over his grave to keep Cyril down is sufficient proof that the whole is a bitter jest. The world felt freer now Cyril was gone; and he does not shrink from telling a friend that he could well spare him. "The exaggeration of rhetorical polemics requires many grains of allowance." (Neander, *ib.*)

The succession of Dioscorus to Cyril's patriarchal throne was the signal for the commencement of fresh trials for Theodoret. The new patriarch was a violent, rapacious, unscrupulous, and scandalously immoral man, whose profuse briberies had secured the favour of the imperial court, and especially of Chrysaphius the reigning eunuch, who held sway over the feeble mind of Theodosius. Dioscorus had an extensive correspondence with the monks in Syria and elsewhere, who were ill-affected to their bishops. One of the first to suffer from the ill-disguised enmity of Dioscorus against those who opposed his autocratical spirit, was Irenaeus, bishop of Tyre, a former friend and lay partizan of Nestorius, and united to Theodoret by many close ties. Theodoret interested himself very warmly in his friend's behalf, but to no purpose. As is told in another article [IRENAEUS (7)], his ruin had been resolved upon by Dioscorus and the faction of Chrysaphius and the Archimandrite Eutyches, who was beginning to acquire an ill-starred celebrity as the representative of the monastic and ultra-Cyrilline party; and all remonstrances against the monstrous injustice of his condemnation were of no avail. The order for his deposition is dated Feb. 17, A.D. 448. Theodoret had previously excited the illwill of Dioscorus by his acceptance of a synodical letter of Proclus, by which Dioscorus asserted he had compromised the rights of the patriarchal see of Alexandria as well as that of Antioch, by recognizing the primacy of Constantinople (Theod. *Ep. ad Flav. Ep.* 86, p. 1157). Dioscorus was resolved to bring about Theodoret's overthrow, which his influence over the feeble emperor, through Chrysaphius and Eutyches, enabled him to accomplish, at least, temporarily. Dr. Newman reminds us that Theodoret was one of the first to discern and discover "the nascent heresy of Eutyches" (*u. s.* p. 338), and he directed the powers of a well-trained intellect and great theological learning to exposing and crushing it. To Dioscorus and the party of which he was the acting head, Theodoret was therefore a man by all means to be got rid of, or at least suppressed. The ear of the emperor was gained, and he was represented as a turbulent busybody, restless and meddlesome, constantly to be found at Antioch and other cities, taking part in councils and public assemblies when he ought to have been attending to the business of his diocese; a troublesome agitator, stirring up strife wherever he moved (*Ep.* 79, p. 1135, etc.). Besides these personal charges, he was also accused on theological grounds. Dioscorus, who seems to have regarded himself as "the lawful inheritor of Cyril's guardianship of anti-Nestorian orthodoxy," wrote to Theodoret's patriarch, Domnus, who about 442 had succeeded his uncle John in the see of Antioch, informing him that he had heard on undeniable authority that Theodoret was making himself a centre of unity for Syrian bishops of doubtful orthodoxy, holding conferences at Antioch and doubtless creating a crypto-Nestorian party, practically teaching Nestorianism under another name and striking at "the one Nature of the Incarnate." Whatever may have been thought of these accusations where Theodoret was well known and his character could speak for itself, they were accepted at court, and Dioscorus succeeded in obtaining an imperial edict, that as a disturber of the peace of the church he should confine himself to the limits of his own diocese. This is dated by Tillemont March 30, 449. This edict in the imperial autograph (*Epp.* 79, 80, pp. 1134, 1137) was conveyed by Count Rufus to Theodoret, who was then at Antioch preparing for the approaching synod relating to the troubles in Osrhoene. Theodoret at once submitted, and left

[a] On the genuineness of these documents, see Tillemont's Note lxxx. vol. xiv. p. 784.

the city without even saying farewell to his friends, who were anxious to detain him (*Ep.* 80, p. 1137). A week later, Euphronius, a "magister militum," was sent to Cyrrhus to demand from him a written acknowledgement of the receipt of the edict (*ib.*). Theodoret yielded to all the emperor's requirements with calm dignity, but deeply sensible of the injustice of thus condemning him unheard and feeling that his character was at stake and the truth endangered in his person, he wrote in his defence to several leading bishops and high state officials, to Anatolius the patrician (*Ep.* 79), to Eutrechius the prefect (*Ep.* 80), to Nomus the consul (*Ep.* 81), and to Eusebius, bishop of Ancyra (*Ep.* 82). These letters, particularly that to the consul Nomus (*Ep.* 81), are peculiarly interesting, from the details they offer of his early life and the clear statements as to his theological tenets. We find in them also a list of his commentaries on Holy Scriptures, and the other works which had proceeded from his pen (*Ep.* 82). The whole series deserves careful perusal, and will be found greatly to raise the character of this much maligned and most sorely-tried servant of God. Previously to this, c. 446, 447, Theodoret had composed a work, consisting of three dialogues, to which he gave the names of "Eranistes" and "Polymorphus," in which he retorted the charge of heretical teaching on his adversaries, maintaining that the supporters of the then rising Eutychianism "were but, in fact, collectors of scraps from multiform theories, more or less Gnostic in character" (Bright, *u. s.* p. 177). To defend himself categorically from the heretical accusations launched at him by Dioscorus in his letter to Domnus, he wrote a letter to his accuser clearly defining his orthodox position (*Ep.* 83). His belief, learnt from Holy Scriptures and the Fathers, was that Christ, the one Lord, possessed both Deity and Humanity. Those who denied the distinction between His Flesh and His Godhead, or who affirmed that either had been converted into the other, he had endeavoured to bring to soundness of faith by the medicines of the admirable Theophilus and Cyril. He concludes by a solemn imprecation, "Whoso denies the Holy Virgin to be Theotokos, or calls our Lord Jesus Christ mere man, or divides the one only Begotten, the firstborn of every creature, into two Sons, may he be driven from all hope in Christ, and let all the people say Amen, Amen." He requests that Dioscorus will pray for him and reply to his letters (*Ep.* 83, p. 1152). Dioscorus received the letter with contemptuous silence, and with all his old bitterness assumed the truth of the charges against Theodoret, "as if he had carefully investigated the truth of each of them, and proved it by torture" (*Ep.* 86, 1156). Theodoret's second reply, in "gentle terms," had no better reception. Dioscorus even suffered the calumniators of Theodoret to anathematize him openly in church, and rose himself from his episcopal throne and seconded their anathemas with his own voice (*ib.*). Domnus warmly espoused the cause of his suffragan, and despatched envoys to Constantinople in his favour, by whose hands Theodoret sent the letters already mentioned to leading personages, in which he cleared himself of all heretical complicity, asserting his belief in One Christ, truly God and truly man, in whom the Godhead and the Flesh are distinct; the union being without confusion. The issue of this deputation was unfavourable, and Theodoret remained a prisoner to his diocese. Worse, however, was in store for him. The condemnation of Eutyches exasperated his powerful adherents, who left no stone unturned to reverse the condemnation, and to avenge themselves on him who was the acknowledged leader of the attack. Come what might, Theodoret must be silenced. Through the influence of Dioscorus, to whom both Eutyches himself and his supporter with the Court, the eunuch Chrysaphius, had appealed for assistance, the emperor was induced to summon "the Council of evil memory," known in history by the name given it by pope Leo, as the "Latrocinium" or "Robbers' Synod," for the purpose, though not expressed yet generally understood, of reversing the judgment of Flavian's synod, rehabilitating Eutyches, and crushing Theodoret. This ill-omened council met at Ephesus Aug. 8, A.D. 449. Theodoret was expressly excluded from the council by an imperial edict of March 4, and forbidden to appear unless expressly summoned by the unanimous voice of the council itself (Labbe, iv. 100). The prohibition was repeated in more stringent terms, on the ground of his having written against Cyril's doctrines, in a second edict two days before the opening of the synod, Aug. 6 (*ib.* 109). We cannot fail to remark, that Theodoret's condemnation was the chief object aimed at in summoning this infamous synod. He was "the bugbear of the whole Eutychian party, and consequently condemned in advance" (Martin, *Brigandage à Ephèse*, p. 192). From his "internement" at Cyrrhus, Theodoret calmly watched the proceedings of his enemies. In common with Flavian and pope Leo he anticipated no happy results from the synod, which he only too justly believed the unscrupulous Dioscorus would take advantage of to secure the authorization of Cyril's anathematisms, of the orthodoxy of which Theodoret had not yet been able to satisfy himself, and to obtain sanction for the heretical doctrines already condemned in the person of Eutyches (*Epp.* 16, 112). He had not long to wait for the confirmation of his worst fears. Dioscorus and his partisans, having by brutal violence obtained the acquittal of Eutyches and the deposition of Flavian, Ibas, Irenaeus and other sympathisers with Theodoret, proceeded on the third session to deal with him. The indictment was formulated by a presbyter of Antioch, named Pelagius, a Syrian by race and a solitary by profession, who describes himself as one who had devoted himself to the study of Scripture and to the collection for the benefit of the faithful of doctrines in accordance with the truth. "Theodoret, whom all the world knew as an adversary of God, and Domnus, regarded as equally impious by all who loved Christ at Alexandria, moved by affection for the impious and criminal teaching of Nestorius, had made war upon him in spite of his tranquillity, and had threatened him with great dangers and condemned him to silence against his will. They had drawn up symbols of faith containing horrible impieties, and had pressed them upon him and other reluctant persons, and looked with suspicion on everybody who regarded the teaching of Nestorius as erroneous" (*Actes du Brigandage*,

pp. 96–99). In language of the most atrocious violence, Pelagius proceeded to demand of the council to take the sword of God, and, as Samuel dealt with Agag, and Elijah with the priests of Baal, pitilessly destroy those who had introduced strange doctrines into the church. Those who adhered to the poisonous teachings of Nestorius were worthy of being committed to the flames. "Burn them, burn them," he cried. They must not be content with lopping off the branches, but must hew down the trunk and tear up its roots (*ib.* 101–102). This infuriated harangue was not needed to secure what was already a foregone conclusion. Pelagius, however, was allowed to lay before the synod the proofs of his accusation, contained in "a tome, written by Theodoret against the synod of Ephesus and the writings of the blessed Cyril," together with extracts from various writings of his, and, above all, Theodoret's elaborate letter written in 431 to the monks in the Euphratensis and Osrhoene (*Ep.* 151: see Tillemont, xv. 247), which was read in full (*Actes du Brig.* 113–119). This letter bore, as its subscription, "The Apology of Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus, in behalf of Diodorus and Theodorus, champions of God." On the conclusion of the letter, the council exclaimed that they had heard enough to warrant the immediate deposition of Theodoret, as the emperor had already ordered. Any one who questioned his deposition might also support Nestorius (*Actes*, xi. p. 120). The reading of the "pièces d'accusation" being over, Dioscorus, with the view at the same time of intimidating those who were to vote after him and of indicating to the undecided in what way they were to formulate their opinion, led the way in voting. His language was most violent. Theodoret is described as an impious wretch, whose impiety was of long standing and had never been renounced by him. He had persevered in his blasphemies to such a point that he had offended the ears of the merciful emperors and the friends of Christ, and forced them to turn away from him through detestation of his evil doctrine. He had devoted himself to the destruction of innumerable souls by sowing perverse beliefs and drawing the simple to join in his impiety, and had not shrunk from conceiving and writing things contrary to the books of the blessed Cyril. The sentence pronounced was that Theodoret should be deposed from the honour and rank of the priesthood, and deprived of even lay communion, as one whom it would be a sin for which they would have to answer before God, to receive, visit, or even to sit at table with. His books were to be committed to the flames (*ib.* 125, 126). This sentence having been ordered to be communicated to Domnus, whose deposition was to follow the next day, the officer proceeded to take the votes, beginning with Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, and ending with Eustathius, bishop of Berytus. All followed suit in terms of greater or less violence, joining unanimously in the cry "This is a just sentence. Drive away the heretic. We all agree. We all consent to the deposition of Theodoret" (*ib.* 129; *le Brigandage*, pp. 193–195).

Dioscorus was now master of the whole Eastern church; "il règne partout." Theodoret, like all really good men, shining in adversity, bore his new troubles with a beautiful union of meekness and dignity. He knew that deposition was as a rule followed by exile and he was prepared for the worst. He wrote to his friend Anatolius, the patrician, begging him to obtain from the emperor permission to repair to the West, to be judged by the bishops of that portion of the church, declaring his readiness, if he should be proved to have departed ever so little from the rule of faith, to be drowned in the depths of the sea. If that was not granted, he prayed to be allowed to retire to the monastery near Apamea in which he had been brought up and had passed so many years (*Ep.* 119, p. 1202). He cannot have felt much surprise that his determined enemy, Theodosius, should have refused his first request, and in granting the second should have taken all the grace out of it by making him feel his residence in the monastery as an imprisonment, which could only be relaxed at the emperor's pleasure. But for the zealous care of his many friends, especially bishops, who undaunted by the frowns of those in authority vied with one another in their testimonies of reverential affection for one who was suffering for his fidelity to the truth, Theodoret might have even lacked the necessaries of life (*Ep.* 127, p. 1277). It was not his enemies' fault if it were not so. Most of the gifts, "eulogiae," however, which were showered upon him he declined, not, as he says, from any want of appreciation of the kindness which prompted them, but because, his wants being small, he needed very little to satisfy them, and "the God who so plentifully supplied the ravens with food, gave him all he required" (*Ep.* 123, p. 1207). The series of letters written at this time to these friends gives us a very pleasing idea of the real beauty of Theodoret's character. They exhibit a gratifying absence of the bitter language regarding his opponents which distresses us elsewhere. The appeal in person to the West, forbidden by the weak and prejudiced Theodosius, was prosecuted by letter. He despatched three appeals; one, a document of great value, to pope Leo himself, a second to the presbyter Renatus, who had represented the see of Rome at the Latrocinium, and a third to Hilarus, the archdeacon of Rome (*Epp.* 113, 116, 118). Tillemont justly remarks that, though Theodoret's language to Leo seems addressed to him individually, his appeal was really made in general to the bishops of the West assembled in the synod, which he begs may be convened to judge his cause (*Mém. Ecclés.* xv. 294). "In this remarkable letter," writes Dr. Bright (*Hist. of Church*, p. 395), "he traces the primacy of Rome to her civil greatness, her soundness of faith, and her possession of the graves of the apostles Peter and Paul. He eulogises the exact and comprehensive orthodoxy with which the Tome of Leo conveys the full mind of the Holy Spirit. He dilates on his own wrongs and his exertions as a bishop, entreating Leo not to despise his old age in its affliction, but to decide whether he ought to submit to the recent sentence. He awaits his decision. He will acquiesce in it, whatever it be, committing himself to the judgment of his God and Saviour." The issue of this long and miserable struggle belongs to general church history. Theodosius continued to refuse to pay any heed to the remonstrances of Leo, asserting that everything had been decided

at Ephesus with complete freedom and in accordance with the truth, and that the prelates there deposed merited their fate for innovations in the faith. The interposition of Pulcheria and of the Western princesses was employed in vain. At last, July 29, 450, a fall from his horse brought the life and reign of Theodosius to an end, and the imperial dignity passed from the feeble and obstinate brother to the resolute hands of the orthodox Pulcheria and her soldier-husband Marcian. All was now changed. Eutychianism became the losing cause, and the orthodox sufferers for the truth were speedily re-called from their banishment, though their return to their sees was deferred until the termination of the synod about to be held, when their restoration could be authoritatively declared by the representatives of the Church. It is evident, from his correspondence, that Theodoret was regarded as no ordinary personage, but as one in whom it was not unbecoming that the leading authorities of the State should manifest an interest. He appears to have been mentioned by name in the edict of recall, and such great persons as Caspar, the patrician, Arian though he was, and Vincomalus, the "magister officiorum," warmly interested themselves with Marcian in his behalf (*Epp.* 138, 139, 140). The stigma of heterodoxy was speedily removed from him. Though the authority for it is not a very early one, there is no reason to doubt that Theodoret was one of the bishops who signed the Tome of Leo, and transmitted the signed copy by the hands of the legate Abondius, prefixing a short résumé of his own faith regarding the Incarnation, and that on this, Leo recognized him as a Catholic bishop (Tillemont, xv. 304; Baron. 450, § 22–24). Though now at liberty to go where he pleased, Theodoret, always a lover of studious repose, preferred to remain in his monastery, where he saw as few visitors as possible (*Ep.* 146). His chief desire was to witness the complete triumph of truth over error, and to convince others of the purity of his own teaching by shewing the groundlessness of the calumnies which had been so industriously circulated with regard to his doctrines. This desire he saw in part fulfilled, and he saw it with exceeding joy. But for his complete satisfaction an oecumenical council was necessary, and to bring that about he laboured with all his might. When that council should have been held, and he had seen the peace of the Church restored and the purity of his faith justified, it was his hope to return to rest in solitude, and end his days with joy in some place to which God might please to call him (*Epp.* 133, 134, 137, 138).

On the meeting of the council of Chalcedon on October 8, 451, Theodoret presented, though not in his own person, a memorial to the emperor detailing the wrongs he had undergone, and also one to the Papal legates which appears to have contained an anathema of the doctrines both of Nestorius and Eutyches (Labbe, iv. 101 and 619, 623). The records of the "Latrocinium" were then read. On coming to the letter of Theodosius forbidding Theodoret to appear at that council, the commissioners stopped the reading to order that Theodoret should take his place among the prelates in accordance with the desire of Marcian, his deposition having been annulled by Leo. His entrance was the signal for outrageous violence on the part of the adherents of Dioscorus. The hall re-echoed with cries and counter cries which interrupted all proceedings. Taking advantage of a momentary silence Theodoret calmly stepped forward and requested that his memorial to Marcian might be examined. On this the outcries demanding his expulsion were renewed. With difficulty the commissioners stilled the clamourers by an appeal to the self-respect due to themselves as bishops, and compelled them to consent to the reading of the Acts being proceeded with, declaring "that no one should be prejudiced by the presence of Theodoret, who entered as one of the accusers" (Labbe, iv. 101). Theodoret sat down "in the midst," ἐν μέσῳ, not among his brother bishops. He continued to attend the sessions of the council, but without voting, and taking no part in the deposition of Dioscorus. His own cause came on at the eighth session, October 26. Although his orthodoxy had been acknowledged by Leo, and his restoration was required by the emperor, the anti-Nestorian section would not hear of his recognition as a bishop until he had in express terms anathematized Nestorius. This step he had again and again declared he would never take, and he now tried to satisfy the remonstrants with something short of it. He begged to be allowed to read a profession of his faith. He declared that he rejected not Nestorius only and Eutyches, but everyone who was not of orthodox opinions; that the recovery of his bishopric was as nothing to him compared with the re-establishment of his orthodoxy. He came to prove that he was orthodox, and that he anathematized Nestorius and Eutyches, and everyone who like Nestorius believed in two Sons. Nothing, however, would satisfy the turbulent malcontents but the unequivocal condemnation of Nestorius by name, and they continued to yell forth, "he is a heretic; a Nestorius; turn the heretic out." Wearied out at last he yielded to the clamour and pronounced the test words, "Anathema to Nestorius, and to everyone who denies that the Holy Virgin Mary is the mother of God, and who divides the one Son, the Only Begotten, into two Sons," and went on to declare that he had subscribed the definition of faith drawn up by the synod in the Tome of Leo. The imperial commissioners now declared, that all doubt regarding Theodoret had been removed and that nothing remained but that he should receive back his bishopric. The whole assembly raised the cry, that Theodoret was worthy of his throne and that the church must receive back her orthodox teacher. The voting then commenced, and when the legates and the patriarchs and leading bishops, including Juvenal and others who had with equal readiness voted for his deposition two years before, had pronounced for his restoration, the rest signified their assent by acclamation and the commissioners gave sentence, that by the decree of the holy council Theodoret should receive again the church of Cyrrhus (Labbe, iv. 619–624).

But few years remained to Theodoret, and of these very little is known. It is not even certain whether he returned to his episcopal duties at Cyrrhus or remained in the quiet Apamean monastery, devoting himself to literary labours. The latter is asserted by Dr. Newman, who says

that "he made over the charge of his diocese to Hypatius (one of his chorepiscopi, who had been entrusted with his appeal to pope Leo), and retired into his monastery," and that "there he regained that peace which he had enjoyed in youth and had ever coveted, and passed from the peace of the church to the peace of eternity." For this pleasing picture, however, there appears to be no sure warrant. Tillemont contradicts it altogether, remarking that such a statement cannot be accepted without strong proofs, and that not a single proof can be found (xv. 311). The only fact absolutely certain with regard to Theodoret subsequently to the council of Chalcedon is that Leo wrote him a long and highly complimentary letter, claiming his aid in carrying on the struggle against the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches, urging him to shew equal zeal against both forms of error to disarm the suspicion his former relations to Nestorius might give rise to. (Leo. Magn. *Ep.* 120). He requests him also to write to him from time to time and inform him of the progress of the truth in the East, and thus "makes him, as if officially, his informant and adviser as to the course of theological thought in that part of Christendom" (Newman, *u. s.* p. 362). The date of his death is uncertain. Tillemont regards it as probable that he did not survive the year 453. But if the statement of Gennadius (c. 89) be true, that his death took place under the emperor Leo, he must have lived till 457 or 458.

The writings of Theodoret may be divided roughly into classes. I. *Exegetical*, on the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. II. *Controversial*, dealing with the anathematisms of Cyril, the Eutychian heresy, and, in a work written towards the end of his life, with heresies in general. III. *Theological*, including the *Graecarum affectionum Curatio*, *Orations on Divine Providence* and sundry orations and lesser treatises. IV. *Historical* and V. *Epistolary*.

I. *Exegetical*. These include works on (1) the Octateuch, (2) the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, (3) the Psalms, (4) the Canticles, (5) the Major Prophets, (6) the Twelve Minor Prophets, (7) the Fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, including that to the Hebrews. We will speak of these separately. (1) The work on the Octateuch, i.e. on the Five Books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Joseph, and Ruth, does not form a continuous commentary on the whole text of the books, but consists of a series of questions relating to difficult points and their successive resolution. This character of the work is shewn in the title εἰς τὰ ἄπορα τῆς θείας γραφῆς κατ' ἐκλογήν, or *Quaestiones in Octateuchum.* It was composed in the latter years of his life at the request of a certain Hypatius, whom he styles "the dearest of his sons," at a time when he was in bad health. He deals with Genesis in 110 questions and answers, and Exodus in 72, some of greater some of lesser importance, several of them comprising only a few lines. They are for the most part characterized byl the sound common-sense literalism of the Antiochene school, with but little tendency to allegory. He often forbears to give his own opinion, citing that of his great masters Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Origen. In the 38 questions on Leviticus and the 51 on Numbers, he naturally adopts more of the allegorical method, regarding the whole of the Levitical ritual and the moral ordinances as typical of the sacrificial and mediatorial work of Christ, and of the new law He came to inaugurate. He treats Deuteronomy in 46 questions in a similar manner, his explanations bearing usually the stamp of a clear insight into the real meaning of the passage and of sound common sense. In dealing with the three historical books he attaches more importance to the literal sense, though by no means overlooking the typical meaning. Thus in Joshua he sees a type of Jesus Christ making his people inheritors of the kingdom of heaven, Rahab is a type of the Gentile church, the twelve stones taken up out of Jordan signify the twelve apostles on which the church of Christ is built, Gideon's fleece first alone wet and then alone dry, typify the people of Israel, the first receivers of the grace of God, and after their rejection of Christ deprived of that grace while the nations of the earth became partakers of it. Jephthah's daughter was really sacrificed to teach us that vows made to God must be paid. The worth of these solutions of scriptural difficulties is very various, and, as may be anticipated, many of them are completely out of date, but the whole may be read with interest, and many of them even now with advantage. (2) The books of *Samuel*, *Kings*, and *Chronicles* are explained at the request of the same Hypatius in a similar manner, "passing over what is clear, and making clear the passages which require interpretation." The whole form, as Ceillier has remarked, a literal and historical commentary of very great service for the right comprehension of the text. It is characterised by honesty and common sense, and seldom strains or evades the meaning to avoid dangerous conclusions. These fourteen books of questions and answers form the first volume of Schulze's edition of Theodoret (Halae, 1769). (3) The second volume contains Theodoret's commentary on the Book of Psalms. Here he drops the form of question and answer and furnishes a continuous commentary, in which he says he has sought to avoid the prolixity of older commentators, from whom he has drawn all that he deems most useful. He remarks that chronological order is not observed in the Psalms, and regards the question of their authorship as comparatively unimportant, since it is of little moment whether they are all the work of David or not, as they were all written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. No one he holds ought to take offence at the imprecatory Psalms, since David lived before the promulgation of the new law which bids us love our enemies. He regards, however, the imprecations of Ps. cix. as prophecies, turning the optatives into futures. The whole book will reward a careful perusal. (4) The commentary on the *Canticles* (which opens vol. iii. of Schulze's edition) was Theodoret's earliest exegetical work, undertaken at the request of his friend, John of Germanicia, at a time when the innumerable occupations devolving on him as bishop forbade his having sufficient leisure to deal with so profound a subject adequately. He controverts the opinion of those who hold that this book contains the story of the earthly loves of Solomon either with Pharaoh's daughter or with Abishag, or that it is a political allegory, in which the bridegroom represents the monarch and the bride the people,

and adopts the spiritual interpretation by which the bridegroom stands for Jesus Christ and the bride for the church. From one passage in the very interesting prologue we learn that Theodoret held the then current opinion, that the whole of the books of the Old Testament having been burnt under Manasseh and other godless kings, or destroyed during the captivity, Ezra was divinely inspired to rewrite them word for word on the return from the Captivity. (5) The commentary on the Canticles is followed by those on *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah*, including *Baruch* and the *Lamentations*. His commentary on Isaiah is not complete, being merely a collection of passages made up by the editor, Sirmond, from the Greek Catenae, the original having been lost. It is somewhat surprising to find that he regarded the writings of Jeremiah so plain as to require no interpretation, and that he only consented to undertake that commentary because he was told that many persons missed the true sense of the prophecy. He studied brevity, passing quickly over the easier parts, and devoting greater pains to the more difficult. Unlike the preceding works Theodoret's commentary on Ezekiel is divided into 16 books and that of Daniel into 10. In his prologue to the former he asserts that if the prophecies are still obscure to some it is only to those who remain in wilful blindness, since they have been so fully accomplished that it is now only necessary to read them to understand them. In his preface to *Daniel*, which is highly praised by Photius (*cod.* 203), he tells us that he undertook the difficult task at the request of his friends, with the design of perpetuating what he himself, who had been brought up from a child in the study of the Scriptures, had learned from the holy fathers. He descants at considerable length on the iniquity of the Jews, who had excluded Daniel from the prophets and placed his book among the Hagiographa, because no prophet had so clearly predicted the advent of Jesus Christ, and the very time of His appearance. (6) His commentary on the *Minor Prophets* was also undertaken at the instance of others, in the belief that with the Divine help, although many had already written commentaries upon them, his own work, however insignificant and inadequate, would not be altogether in vain. Although these prophecies formed but a single volume they were not all written at one time, but were scattered over a long period, and were brought together into one book, in consequence of being too small singly to form separate volumes. (7) The only portions of the New Testament commented on by Theodoret are the *Epistles of St. Paul*, including that to the Hebrews. Of these Bishop Lightfoot writes, "His commentaries on St. Paul are superior to his other exegetical writings, and have been assigned the palm over all patristic expositions of Scripture. For appreciation, terseness, and good sense they are perhaps unsurpassed, and if the absence of faults were a just standard of merit, they would deserve the first place; but they have little claim to originality, and he who has read Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia will find scarcely anything in Theodoret which he has not seen before. It is right to add, however, that Theodoret himself modestly disclaims any such merit. In his preface he apologizes for attempting to interpret St. Paul after two such men who are 'luminaries of the world,' and he professes nothing more than to gather his stores 'from the blessed fathers.'" (*Ep. to Galatians*, p. 220.)

II. *Controversial.*—(1) *The Refutation of the twelve Anathematisms of Cyril*, written at the request of John of Antioch about the beginning of 431. In the very convenient form adopted in Schulze's edition (tom. v. pp. 1–68) we have in succession first the anathematism, then its further elucidation (ἐπίλυσις) by Cyril, and finally its refutation (ἀνατροπή) by Theodoret. It is observable that Theodoret never mentions Cyril by name, in the charitable hope, as he wrote to John, that these heretical articles were falsely attributed to him. (2) *Eranistes* or *Polymorphus*, "a work of remarkable interest and of permanent value for theological students to be read in connection with the" "Tome of Leo and the definitions of Chalcedon" (Bright, *Later Treatises of Athanas.* p. 177). It consists of three dialogues between the "Mendicant" Ἐρανίστης, who represents Eutychianism, and Theodoret himself as Ὀρθόδοξος. Their respective titles indicate the line adopted in each. These are Ἄτρεπτος, *Immutabilis*, Ἀσύγχυτος, *Inconfusus* and Ἀπαθής, *Impatibilis*. The general title was intended to indicate that the Eutychians sought, like beggars, to pass off their doctrines gathered in scraps from many heretical sources in many shapes. To these dialogues, which form the most valuable of Theodoret's controversial works, are appended a series of proofs of the three propositions, cast in a syllogistic form, ἀποδείξεις διὰ συλλογισμῶν (ed. Schulze, *u. s.* 263–279). (3) Αἱρετικῆς Κακομυθίας ἐπιτομή, *Haereticarum Fabularum compendium*, a work directed against heresies in general, in five books, composed at the request of Sporacius, one of the Imperial Commissioners at Chalcedon. In his preface Theodoret tells us that in his *first* book he proposed to deal with those who held two principles, denying that all things were created by One God, and regarded the Incarnation as a mere semblance, beginning with Simon Magus and ending with Manes. The *second* book is devoted to those who denied the Divinity of Jesus Christ, such as Ebion, Cerinthus, Paul of Samosata, Sabellius, and Photinus. The *third* contains less known heresies, which it was difficult to class exactly, the Nicolaitans, Montanists, Noetus, Tessarescaidecatitae, Novatian, and Nepos. The *fourth* book, the most important of the whole, as treating of matters with which he was more or less personally acquainted, begins with the heresies of Arius and Eunomius and comes down to those of Nestorius and Eutyches. The disgracefully violent language adopted by him with regard to his former friend Nestorius, whom he stigmatizes as an instrument of Satan; a man who by his pride had plunged the church into disorders; who under the cloke of orthodoxy introduced at the same time the denial of the Divinity and of the Incarnation of the only begotten Son, and who at last met with the punishment he deserved, a sign of his future punishment—would warrant the charitable hope that this chapter of the work has been erroneously ascribed to Theodoret. Of this, however, there is no evidence, and we are, though most reluctantly, compelled to accept it as his work, together with the equally atrocious letter to Sporacius on the Nestorian heresy. It is accepted

both by Photius (*cod.* 56) and Leontius of Byzantius (*Art.* 4, *de Sectis*) (cf. Neander, iv. p. 246, note, Ceillier, *Aut. Ecclés.* x. 84). The *fifth* book presents, as the best bulwark against heresy, the chief articles of faith and moral laws of the church under 28 heads, under the title of Θείων δογμάτων ἐπιτομή.

III. *Theological.*—The chief of the works that may be thus classified is an apologetic treatise, intended to exhibit the confirmations of the truth of the Christian faith contained in the Philosophical systems of the Gentiles, under the title Ἑλληνικῶν θεραπευτικὴ παθημάτων, *Graecarum Affectionum curatio, seu Evangelicae Veritatis ex Gentilium Philosophia cognitio.* It is divided into twelve discourses, and furnishes a very able and eloquent defence of Christianity against the ridicule and the ignorant accusations of pagan philosophers, which he had very frequently to meet and reply to. Its composition may be probably placed before 437. This important work was followed by another of a similar character, in ten orations, on *Divine Providence*, which is regarded by the best critics as exhibiting Theodoret's literary power in its highest form, as regards the careful selection of thoughts, the nobility of his language, the elegance and purity of his style, and the force and sequence of his arguments (Ceillier, p. 88, s. 10). To the above may be added a *discourse on Charity*, περὶ θείας καὶ ἁγίας ἀγάπης (Schulze, 14, 1296 sq.) and some fragments of sermons, etc., given by Garnier in his *Auctarium* (*ib.* tom. v. p. 71 sq.).

IV. *Historical.*—This class contains two works of very different character, and far from being of equal value: (1) the *Ecclesiastical History* and (2) the *Religious History.* (1) The former, in five books, was intended to form a continuation of the History of Eusebius. It commences with the rise of Arianism under Constantius and closes with the death of Theodore of Mopsuestia, A.D. 429. From his opening words, τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς, ἱστορίας τὰ λειπόμενα συγγράψαι πειράσομαι, he has been thought to have had in view the histories of Socrates and Sozomen, and to have written with the object of supplying their omissions and correcting their mistakes. This, however, which is accepted by Valesius, is questioned by others, and must be regarded as doubtful. As instances of errors corrected by him, Valesius refers to the history of Athanasius and of Paul of Constantinople (*Annotat. in lib.* ii. pp. 18, 19, ed. Par., 1673). Writing from the neighbourhood of Antioch, and intimately connected with that church and province he supplies much which the earlier historians writing from Constantinople omitted, e.g. the account of Meletius, Flavian and his successors in the see of Antioch, Eusebius of Samosata, Pelagius of Laodicea, Acacius of Beroea, and others. He also gives more original documents than either of his brother historians. But he is very chary of dates, and writes generally without sufficient chronological exactness. Photius also finds fault with his too great fondness for metaphor, while he praises his style as "clear, lofty, and free from redundancy" (*Cod.* 31). The history is also to be praised for its learning and general impartiality, "though it is occasionally one-sided and runs off into a theological treatise." (2) The *Religious History*, φιλόθεος ἱστορία, is devoted to the lives of thirty celebrated hermits and ascetics, his contemporaries, and is written from his own personal knowledge and from popular report. It was written before his Ecclesiastical History. Theodoret refers to it more than once in the course of the work (cf. iv. 25, 27, 28) and in his letter to Eusebius of Ancyra (*Ep.* 82). This work, which is principally devoted to the extraordinary penances and extravagant miracles attributed to these solitaries, excites our wonder at what Dr. Newman calls the "easy credence, or as moderns would say large credulousness" respecting them, which appears more astonishing when we bear in mind that he had been brought up in the most matter of fact, prosaic and critical school of ancient Christendom. "What," writes Dr. Newman, "made him drink in with such relish what we reject with such disgust? Was it that, at least, some miracles were brought home so absolutely to his sensible experience that he had no reason for doubting the others which came to him second-hand? This certainly will explain what to most of us is sure to seem the stupid credulity of so well-read, so intellectual an author." (*Hist. Sketches*, iii. 314.) The whole subject presents a very curious intellectual problem.

V. *Epistolary.*—No portion of Theodoret's literary remains exceeds in interest and value the large collection of his letters. Whether as throwing light on his own personal history and character, or as helping us to understand the perplexed relations of the principal actors in the stormy period of theological strife in which his lot was cast, and the various shades of theological opinion which separated them, their importance cannot be over-estimated. We rise from them with a heightened estimate of Theodoret himself, his intellectual power, his theological precision, his warm-hearted affection for his friends, and the Christian virtues with which, notwithstanding some weaknesses and an occasional bitterness for which, however distressing, his persecutions offered some palliation, his character was adorned. It is much to be regretted that an English translation of this remarkable series of letters, arranged according to date and subject, has never yet appeared.

In addition to the above the Auctarium of Garnier contains the following works; (1) *Prolegomena and extracts of Commentaries on the Psalms*, probably derived from *Catenae.* (2) A *short extract from a commentary on St. Luke.* (3) *Sermon on the Nativity of S. John Baptist.* (4) *Homily* spoken at Chalcedon in 431. (5) Additional *letters* of Theodoret, 15 in number. (6) Seven dialogues composed a little before the council of Ephesus, two against the *Anomoeans*, three against the *Macedonians*, and two against the *Apollinarians.* The authorship of these dialogues is doubtful, and they have been ascribed to Athanasius and to Maximus, but Garnier claims them for Theodoret.

Lost Works.—The following works attributed to Theodoret now no longer extant are enumerated by Cave (*Hist. Lit.* i. 405 ff.). (1) *Pentalogus*, five books on the Incarnation, directed against Cyril and his adherents at Ephesus. Of this work compromising fragments are given by Theodoret's bitter theological enemy, Marius Mercator, and are to be found in Garnier and Baluze's editions. (2) *Opus mysticum, sire mysteriorum fidei expositiones, libr.* xii. (3) Several

books *De Theologia et Incarnatione*, identified by Garnier with the three dialogues *against the Macedonians*, and two *against the Apollinarists*, erroneously attributed to Athanasius. (4) *Opus adversus Marcionem.* (5) *Opus adv. Judaeos*, perhaps identical with the Commentary on Daniel. (6) *Responsiones ad quaesita Magorum Persarum.* (7) *Sermones V. in laudem S. Joannis Chrysostomi*, quoted by Photius, *cod.* 273. (8) Two *Allocutions against Cyril*, spoken at Chalcedon in 431. Some fragments exist in the Acts of the Fifth Council. (9) *A Sermon at Antioch before Domnus on the death of Cyril.* Also given in the Acts of the Fifth Council, and in Marius Mercator. (10) Two lengthy fragments, one *against Sabellius*, the other *concerning the Trinity*, are given by Baluze, *Miscellan.* tom. iv.

Editions.—The editions of the separate works of Theodoret, especially of his Ecclesiastical History, are too numerous to be specified. We confine ourselves to the collective editions of his writings. The earliest of these by Paulus Manutius (in Latin translation only, Romae, 1556) was followed by that of J. Birckman, fol. Colon. Agripp. 1573, also in Latin, with the title "Opera in duos tomos distincta nunc iterum excusa." Another edition of the Latin version also appeared at Cologne, in 1617, in two volumes, "Opera omnia quae ad hunc diem Latine versa sparsim extiterunt." There are two editions of the complete works of Theodoret in Greek and Latin. The first in 4 vols. folio, Paris 1642, by the Jesuit Jac. Sirmond, to which a fifth volume was added after Sirmond's death by his fellow Jesuit, J. Garnier, Paris, 1684, containing an auctarium, comprising fragments of commentaries and sermons and some additional letters, together with Garnier's five learned, but most one-sided dissertations on (1) the life, (2) the writings, (3) the faith of Theodoret, (4) on the Fifth General Council, and (6) the cause of Theodoret and the Orientals. This was succeeded by another edition based upon it, with additions and corrections by Lud. Schulze, and J. A. Noesselt, Halae Sax., 1769–1774, in 5 vols. and in 10 parts. [N.B.—This is the edition to which the references in the foregoing article have been made.] At Halle, also about the same time, 1768–1778, an edition of the Greek text only, was issued by Eugenius Diaconus, Bulgarensis, in 5 vols. 4to., "for the use of Greek literati alone."

Authorities. —Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xiv. xv. Cave, *Hist. Lit.* vol. i. pp. 405 sq. Garnier, *Dissertationes*, vol. v. ed. Schulze. Ceillier, *Aut. Ecclés.* tom. x. pp. 19, 142. Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* tom. vii. pp. 429 sq.; tom. viii. pp. 277 sq. Schulze, *de Vit. et Scr. B. Theod.* vol. i. ed. 1769. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. iv. pp. 141–247, Clark's edition. Schröckh, *Christl. Gesch.* xviii. Dupin, *Nouv. Bibl.* tom. iv. Newman, *Hist. Sketches*, vol. iii. 307–362. Bright, *Later Treatises of S. Athanas.* pp. 148, ff. [E. V.]

THEODORICUS (1) I. (THEODERICUS, THEUDEREDUS), chosen king of the Visigoths on the death of Valia, A.D. 419. He was the real founder of the West Gothic kingdom. On his accession the Visigoths held nothing in Spain, but occupied in Gaul Aquitania Secunda, the region lying, roughly speaking, between the Loire and the Garonne, with some neighbouring cities, of which Toulouse, their capital, was the most important. This territory had been ceded to Valia as the price of the "foedus" with Rome. The history of Theodoric's reign consists of a series of endeavours to extend this territory when the Romans were otherwise occupied, with intervals of renewal of the foedus, the Goths however retaining what they had won. In 422 Gothic auxiliaries appear in the unsuccessful Spanish campaign of Castinus against the Vandals, but Theodoric the next year took advantage of the disturbances on Honorius' death to occupy several Roman towns on his frontier, and even pressed the siege of Arles vigorously, which in A.D. 426 was relieved by Aetius, the besiegers being routed with great slaughter, and their commander Aonulf taken prisoner. The "foedus" was then renewed; hostages were given by the Romans for its observance (Sid. *Carm.* vii. 215), and a Gothic force the next year joined in driving the Vandals out of Spain (Cassiod. *Chron.*). In 436 war broke out again, the Goths occupied many towns adjoining their own lands and besieged Narbonne, which was on the point of surrendering from famine, when it was relieved by Litorius in A.D. 437. The next year the war continued under Aetius and Litorius, the former of whom won a great victory, in which 8000 Goths fell. The next year Litorius, aided by a contingent of Huns, besieged and almost reduced the Gothic capital, Toulouse, but imprudently heading an attack in person was taken prisoner and executed. Notwithstanding this the Goths did not gain a decisive victory and were glad to renew the foedus, partly owing to the diplomacy of Avitus. Accordingly Gothic auxiliaries served in 446 against the Suevi in Spain, but in 449 a marriage took place between Theodoric's daughter and Rekiar the Suevic king, and Gothic troops formed part of his army that took Lerida and ravaged Tarraconensis and Carthaginensis. When Attila's invasion was expected, A.D. 451, Avitus was again sent to Toulouse to negotiate a coalition against the common enemy. The task was a difficult one. Attila had endeavoured to sow discord between the Goths and Romans, Theodoric remembered the siege of his capital by the united Romans and Huns, and he intended to await the attack behind the Garonne, but thanks to Avitus' skill and thanks also to the wrong done by Genseric, the ally of Attila, to Theodoric's daughter, his son's wife, Theodoric, with his two eldest sons, united his forces with Aetius and marched against the Huns. In the great battle of the Mauriac plains Theodoric, who was advanced in life, fell from his horse and was trampled to death by his own troops. Salvian (*de Gub. Dei*, vii. 154) praises him for his piety, to which he attributes the defeat of the boastful and self-confident Litorius. Though like the rest of his race an Arian, he did not persecute the Catholics. (Prosper and Idatius *Chronica*; Jordanes, *Get.* 34–40; Isidorus, *Hist. Goth.*, *Hist. Suev.*, Dahn, *die Könige der Germanen*, v. 71.) [F. D.]

THEODORICUS (2) II. (THEODERICUS), second son of the preceding, succeeded, in 453, his brother THORISMUND. He was on good terms with the Romans and in A.D. 454 sent, at their request, an expedition under his brother to put down the Bagaudae in Tarraconensis.

MAXIMUS, on his accession in 455, appointed Avitus, a *persona grata* with the Goths, magister utriusque militiae, and sent him to Toulouse to negotiate a renewal of the foedus with Theodoric. There on the news of the death of Maximus, an alliance was concluded between Theodoric and Avitus, who was declared emperor; and the choice was ratified by the army and nobles of Gaul at Ugernum (Beaucaire), and Avitus was crowned three days afterwards. (Sidonius, *Carm.* 7.) Probably Theodoric's support was purchased by permission to act in Spain as he pleased. At any rate the Suevi ravaged Carthaginensis which they had given up to the Romans, and they were so far from attending to the remonstrances of a joint embassy sent by the Romans and Theodoric that they treated Tarraconensis in the same way. Rekiar, the Suevic king, defiantly replied to Theodoric's second embassy that he would answer him at Toulouse. Theodoric then entered Spain with the approval of Avitus at the head of a mighty army, including two allied kings of the Burgundians. On the fifth of October, A.D. 456, Rekiar was totally defeated on the Urbicus, twelve miles from his capital Astorga, and on the 28th Theodoric entered Braga and sacked it. Though no blood was shed the inhabitants were plundered of everything they possessed, great numbers carried off as prisoners, and the churches profaned. Rekiar was taken prisoner at Oporto and put to death in December, and Theodoric then marched into Lusitania. In the midst of his successes a messenger arrived with presents from his ally Avitus, and news of a great naval victory won by Rekimer over the Vandals. Theodoric then captured Merida, but for the sake of St. Eulalia forbore to plunder it. There he heard of the deposition and death of Avitus, and returned to Gaul soon after Easter (March 31) 457, leaving an army to hold Gallicia. His generals sacked and burnt Astorga, and carried off two bishops with their clergy and a great number of both sexes as prisoners, and Palencia shared the same fate. One fort alone, thirty miles from Astorga, held out. In the meantime, the Suevic remnant in the northwest was divided under Franta and Maldra, the rival kings, Aiulf, the governor Theodoric had appointed, also aspiring to the throne. In 458 Baetica was invaded by a Gothic army under Cyrilla, who was recalled the next year to Gaul and replaced by Sunieric. Theodoric was now obliged to defend himself against the attack of MAJORIAN, the nominee of Rekimer, who represented the party opposed to Avitus and the Gothic alliance. Majorian crossed the Alps in the winter of 458–9. What followed is most obscure, but we hear of a defeat of the Goths from Idatius, and from Sidonius (*Carm.* v. 571) of the recapture of Lyons by Majorian from an unnamed enemy. Then peace was renewed and Sunieric and Nepotian the magister militum sent to announce it to the Suevi, against whom they led a Gothic army the next year, to avenge the slaughter of some Romans at Lugo at Easter. For the next three years the Suevi were divided between the rival kings FRUMARIUS and Remismund, of whom the latter was supported by the Goths, and Idatius mentions numerous embassies between him and Theodoric. At last, in 463 or 464, by Frumarius's death Remismund became sole king, and this event was followed by the conversion of the Suevi to Arianism, which was probably due to political motives, in order to strengthen the bond between them and the Goths. After Majorian's death the Roman dominion in the West rapidly went to pieces. Narbonne, for more than twenty years the aim of the Goths, was in 462 betrayed to Theoderic by the Gallic count Agrippinus, the enemy of Aegidius, an old officer of Majorian's, who intended marching on Italy to avenge him, but the next year Aegidius inflicted a great defeat near Orleans on the Goths, killing Frederic the king's brother. Negotiations for Vandal help next year were broken off by the death of Aegidius, and the Goths then occupied the regions he held for Rome, extending their frontiers to the whole course of the Loire. In 466 Theoderic perished by the hand of his brother Euric. Sidonius (*Ep.* i. 2, translated in Gibbon, c. 36 and Hodgkin's *Invaders of Italy*, ii. 350) gives a minute description of Theodoric's person and of the daily routine of his life.

Authorities.—The primary is Idatius, a contemporary and eye-witness of some of the events he records; Sidonius, ubi supra; Isidorus, *de Reg. Goth.*; Priscus, *Frag.* 30; Jordanes, *Get.* 44; Dahn, *die Könige der Germanen*, v. 82; vi. 563. [F. D.]

THEODORICUS (3) (THEODERICUS), the Ostrogoth, king in Italy. The second is the spelling of all inscriptions (Mommsen, *Jordanes*, 144). He was the son of Thiudimer by his concubine ERELIEVA, and was born between A.D. 453 and 456, probably in 454. His father was the second brother of Valamir, king of the Ostrogoths, Vidimer being the third. The three lived in amity, occupying Northern Pannonia, the part of the tribe under Thiudimer being settled near Lake Pelso at Theodoric's birth. In his eighth year he was sent as a hostage to the emperor Leo and spent ten years at Constantinople. Notwithstanding his long residence there he never learnt to write, and when he had to sign any document, a golden plate, through which the first four letters of his name were cut, was placed on it, and he drew his pen through the openings. (*An. Val.*). Before his return his father had become king, Valamir having been slain in battle. He succeeded his father in 474 or 475. It is unnecessary here to give in detail his relations with the imperial court. He assisted in A.D. 477 in Zeno's restoration, but afterwards invaded Thrace and Illyricum, penetrating to Thessalonica and taking Dyrrhachium. After the peace of 483 he was made patrician and consul for 484, but the reconciliation was not lasting. In 486 he was again in arms and ravaged Thrace, and the next year penetrated to Rhegion, twelve miles from Constantinople. Zeno in alarm sent back his sister Amalafrida, who was living at Constantinople, with rich presents, and thus persuaded him to retreat (*Ant. H.*). In the following year Zeno induced Theodoric to undertake an expedition to Italy, for the purpose of overthrowing Odovacar. Theodoric willingly consented; his people, who, in the course of their wanderings, had mostly settled in Lower Moesia, Nova near Rustchuk being his capital, were discontented with their

settlements; and in the autumn of 488 they started. It was not the march of an army, but the migration of a whole people. Their progress by Sirmium and Pannonia was slow, they were impeded by the winter weather, and the opposition of the Gepidae and Sarmatians, and it was not till the summer of 489 that they forced their way through the Julian Alps to Italy. The events of the war, which was terminated in March 493, by Theodoric's complete victory, are narrated under ODOVACAR. After Theodoric had shut up Odovacar in Ravenna in the autumn of 490, he sent Faustus, the chief of the senate, and Irenaeus (Gelasius, *Ep.* 8) to Zeno to ask his permission to assume the royal robes. Zeno died in April 491, and, no answer having come from his successor Anastasius, on the fall of Ravenna the army proclaimed Theodoric king (*An. Val.* 53, 57). Already king of the Ostrogoths, he was thus recognised as king over his new conquests. It should be noticed, however, that, like Odovacar, he assumed simply the title "King," with no territorial definition, such as "King of Italy." Gregory of Tours (iii. 31) indeed styles him "Rex Italiae," but this is merely a description, not a formal title; compare the parallel of ODOVACAR and Victor Vitensis. This independent assumption was regarded at Constantinople as a usurpation and it was not till 498 that a recognition was grudgingly obtained by the embassy of the senator Festus, and the imperial ornaments were returned which Odovacar had sent to Constantinople. (*An. Val.* 64, Theodorus Lector, ii. 16, 17, in Migne, *Patr. Graeca*, lxxxvi. 1, 189). Theodoric maintained a deferential attitude to the emperor, and, while really independent, was ready to pay him marks of respect, such as submitting for approval the name of the consul he nominated. But there was no real cordiality between the two powers. At Constantinople, Theodoric was regarded as *de jure* but the lieutenant of the emperor who had commissioned him to recover Italy, and the Byzantine claims were kept in abeyance only for a convenient opportunity. Once the smouldering discord broke into open war; Theodoric had recovered from the Gepidae the important post of Sirmium and the rest of Pannonia. Mundo, a robber chief of Hunnish descent, had established himself on the Danube, and, to save himself from the Byzantine commander Sabinian, submitted to Pitzia, Theodoric's commander at Sirmium. The result was a battle (A.D. 505) on the banks of the Margus in which Sabinian was routed with great slaughter (Jord. *Get.* 58, Marc. *Chron.*, Enn. *Pan.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 178). Three years later, when Theodoric was engaged in Gaul, a fleet from Constantinople made a piratical descent on and ravaged the coasts of Apulia. To guard against such attacks, Theodoric ordered a fleet of a thousand light vessels to be constructed and the work was completed with wonderful rapidity. An impressment was ordered to supply the crews. (*Var.* v. 16–20.)

His first care after the overthrow of Odovacar was to arrange the settlement of his followers in Italy. A third part of the lands was distributed to them. Liberius, the faithful adherent of Odovacar to the last, presided over the commission charged with this difficult and delicate duty, which appears to have been performed with as little inconvenience as possible to the former inhabitants. (*Var.* ii. 16; Ennodius, *Epp.* ix. 23.) No doubt it was facilitated by the fact, that much land had been left vacant by the three years' war, and that the lots of Odovacar's soldiers were available. The Goths were very unequally distributed. In Calabria and Apulia there were none (Procop. i. 15); they began to appear in Samnium, and then increased to the northward and eastwards, the settlements being thickest in the Aemilia and Venetia. Not only from the probability of the case, but from the example of the Rugians, who, fifty years after the conquest, formed a distinct tribe, intermarrying only with themselves (Procop. iii. 2); it appears that the Goths were settled by families and tribes. There are traces that the old Teutonic organization by hundreds and thousands continued (*Var.* v. 27). But the Goths did not, like the Vandals, clear out and occupy the whole of a continuous province; still less, like the invaders of Britain, did they exterminate the previous inhabitants. Their dispersion had many important consequences, the most important perhaps being the increase of the royal power. In the original Gothic, as in other Teutonic constitutions, this, though great and indefinite, was subject to the control of the people; but this control, in the absence of representation, could only be exercised when a compact people occupied a limited area; the direct consequence therefore of the scattering of the Goths was a great extension of the royal power, which was likewise increased by the fact, that Theodoric united to his hereditary kingship the derelict prerogatives of the western emperor. He governed the two nations—the Romans and the Goths—who lived side by side without intermingling, in a twofold capacity; the former as the successor of the emperor, the latter as the king of immemorial antiquity. The Roman forms of government were kept up; the senate still met, and Theodoric submitted his appointments of patricians, consuls, &c., for their ratification. The Roman systems of taxation and administration were also maintained. The Goths, like the Romans, had to pay taxes, but their special obligation was that of military service, to which they were liable, till they obtained their discharge. Inquiry was made as to their conduct in battle, and from time to time they were summoned to Ravenna that they and their king might become personally acquainted, and that they might receive their annual presents (*Var.* v. 26–28). A special class of officials, the Comites Gothorum, were charged with the decision of cases to which only Goths were parties. If one was a Goth and the other a Roman, a Roman lawyer sat with the comes; whilst cases to which only Romans were parties were left to Roman officials and decided by Roman law (*Var.* vii. 3). Theodoric's care for the welfare of his dominions is shown by the multifarious subjects of the *Variarum*—such as drainage of marshes, regulations of the posting service, repairs of harbours, roads, and public buildings, such as Pompey's theatre and the cloacae at Rome, fortifications, searches for mines, &c. Under his firm rule Italy enjoyed for thirty-three years a peace and prosperity to which she had been a stranger for nearly a century, and was not to know again for generations. A prudent administration filled

the empty treasury without oppressing the taxpayers. The gates of the cities were left open day and night, and the abundance was such that sixty bushels of wheat were sold for a solidus, and thirty amphorae of wine for the same price.

Theodoric endeavoured to strengthen his position by foreign alliances. Early in his reign he made a peace with the Vandals, to protect from their ravages Sicily, which had been brought over to his side by the influence of Cassiodorus, even before the final defeat of Odovacar (*Var.* i. 3), and afterwards confirmed it by giving his sister Amalafrida to their king Thrasamund in marriage, with Lilybaeum as her dowry. Her daughter he married to the king of the Thuringians, while he himself married Audofleda, the sister of Clovis. The two daughters he had by a concubine in Moesia he gave in marriage to Alaric, king of the Visigoths, and to Sigismund, the son of the king of the Burgundians. Another part of his policy was to surround Italy, the kernel of his power, with a ring of dependencies as her bulwarks. The conquest of Pannonia has already been mentioned. Southern Rhaetia and Noricum protected the north, where he sheltered the fugitive Alamanni after the defeat of Tolbiac.

The state of affairs in Gaul after 507 demanded his interference. When his negotiations failed to prevent a breach between Clovis and his son-in-law Alaric, and when the rout and death of the latter threatened that all Gaul, and perhaps Spain, would pass into the hands of the Franks, he was compelled to interpose. His army under Ibba relieved Arles, which had been gallantly defended by Tulun (*Var.* viii. 10), raised the siege of Carcassonne, the treasure city of the Visigoths, and put down GESALIC, the bastard son of Alaric, who had seized on the crown, placing on the throne in his stead Amalaric, Theodoric's grandson, under the guardianship of his armour-bearer Theudis. Thirty thousand Franks are said to have fallen in this war, the result of which was the preservation of Spain and the district of Narbonne or Septimania for the Visigoths, and the acquisition by Theoderic of a territory corresponding with the modern Provence, including Arles and Marseilles. He was thus placed in immediate communication with the Visigoths, among whose kings he is reckoned by Spanish historians as guardian of his infant grandson. In 523, by his interposition in the war between the Franks and the Burgundians, he acquired without fighting some additional Transalpine territory.

Though, like the rest of his countrymen, an Arian, Theodoric for the greater part of his reign acted not only with impartiality but favour to the Catholics, some of whom held high offices under him. On his one recorded visit to Rome, in A.D. 500, where he spent six months (*An. Val.*, Cassiod. *Chron.*), he gave magnificent presents to St. Peter's, as if he had been a Catholic himself; he was on friendly terms with the most eminent bishops of his time, such as EPIPHANIUS (13), whom he employed on an embassy to the Burgundians to obtain the release of the prisoners they had taken in their inroads into Northern Italy, during the war with Odovacar, and in his interference in the troubles that followed the disputed election of SYMMACHUS and LAURENTIUS (of which a sufficient account is given under those names), he seems to have acted solely with a view to the benefit of the church. Nor did he object to the nullification by the synod, under Symmachus, of Odovacar's law against the alienation of ecclesiastical property [FELIX (3)], on the ground that it rested only on lay authority. He was careful also not to infringe on the privileges of the church. The sentence of a murderer, who had taken sanctuary, was commuted to banishment, and the case of the clergy who had falsely accused the bishop of Turin or Aosta of treason, was left to the decision of the metropolitan, the archbishop of Milan (*Var.* iii., 46; i. 9). In accordance with his golden maxim, "religionem imperare non possumus, quia nemo cogitur ut credat invitus," he extended his protection to the Jews. Their rights to their synagogues at Genoa and Milan were confirmed (*Var.* ii. 27, v. 37), and when towards the close of his reign the synagogues at Rome and Ravenna were attacked and burnt, the rioters were severely punished and compelled to make good the damage (*Var.* iv. 43, *An. Val.*).

During the greater part of his reign the difficulties of his position were much lightened by the schism between the Eastern and Western churches. To the pope and the orthodox party a Eutychian emperor was as hateful as an Arian king. But when in A.D. 518 Anastasius was succeeded by Justin and the thirty-seven years' schism was ended by the complete triumph of HORMISDAS, whose negotiations with the East had been conducted with Theodoric's permission (*Vita Hormisdae*), the obstacle to the desires of the orthodox Romans for reunion with the empire was removed. On the Eastern side the breach was widened by the persecution of heretics, commenced by Justin in A.D. 523. By the law of that year (*Cod.* i. v. 12), heretics were subjected to many civil and religious disabilities. The Goths serving in the army (*foederati*) were indeed exempted from its provisions; but they must, like the rest of their co-religionists, have felt the next measure, the seizure of all the churches belonging to heretics. At this juncture, Cyprianus, a Roman who held high office at the court, accused (probably falsely), the patrician Albinus of treasonable correspondence with the emperor, and BOETHIUS coming forward in defence of his friend was involved in the same charge, tried by the senate, condemned unheard, and placed in strict confinement at Pavia. After his cruel execution in 524, pope John, who had succeeded Hormisdas, notwithstanding his reluctance was despatched to Constantinople to obtain a repeal of the laws against heretics, and to induce Justin to persuade or compel those who became Catholics to recant (*An Val.*, *Vita Joannis*). He did not return till the spring of 526 and in the meantime Boethius's father-in-law SYMMACHUS had shared his fate. The result of the embassy is obscure, but it is certain that Theodoric on his return threw him into prison at Ravenna, where he died on May 18. [JOANNES (346).] The see had remained vacant nearly two months, from what cause is unknown, when Theodoric perhaps fearing similar contests to those at the election of Symmachus, or to whom perhaps the decision had been referred by the partisans of the rival candidates, nominated Felix as pope. The senate and clergy acquiesced in the choice, which seems to have been an excel-

lent one (*Var.* viii. 15). [FELIX (4).] The hostile attitude of the Romans caused Theodoric to order a general disarmament, and he appears to have intended to occupy the churches of the Catholics and hand them over to the Arians as reprisals for the similar treatment they had experienced in the East, when he was seized with illness aggravated, it was said, by remorse for the deaths of Symmachus and Boethius, and died on August 30th, 526. The history of these events is exceedingly obscure and perplexed, but we have given what appears to be on the whole the most probable account.

Theodoric apparently never had a son. His two eldest daughters pre-deceased him; his youngest, Amalasuintha, he had given in marriage in 515 to Eutharic, a descendant of the Amals, whose consulship in 519 was celebrated with great magnificence at Rome. He died before Theodoric, leaving one son, Athalaric, whom his grandfather, shortly before his death, declared king, under the regency of his mother.

Theodoric was a great builder. He restored the aqueducts at Verona and Ravenna, built baths at Pavia, Verona, and Ravenna, and palaces at the last two cities which were his usual residences. But his greatest works are both at Ravenna, his own mausoleum, with its marvellous dome, formed of one block of Istrian stone, and what is now S. Apollinare nuovo, the church he built for his Arian fellow-worshippers, which remained in their possession till the time of bishop Agnellus (Agnellus, *Lib. Pont.* in *Rerum Script. Lang.* 334).

Laws of Theodoric on various subjects are preserved in the *Variarum*, and also one of his edicts, which is printed in Lindenbrog's *Codex Legum Antiquarum*, 241. Dahn (iv. 1–122) has an analysis and commentary on it, and gives a list of the various editions (6 n.). No less than 138 of its 154 paragraphs are taken from pre-existing sources, such as laws and writings of jurists, the Theodosian Code and the *Sententiae* of Paulus furnishing the largest contributions.

Like Charles the Great, Theodoric passed into the domain of fable and legend. Regarded by the orthodox as an Arian persecutor, according to one version, he was borne bound hand and foot by his victims—the pope and Symmachus—and flung down the crater of Lipara (Greg. *Dial.* iv. 30); according to another, he was carried off by a spectre steed (Grimm, *Deut. Heldensage*, 39). But more widespread were the legends which celebrated him as Dietrich of Bern, the Verona which was his favourite home, and the scene of his crowning victory. In his lifetime his fame had extended to the Baltic, and the tribes of Esthonia brought presents of amber to his court (*Var.* v. 2). After his death his true history was forgotten, and he appears as a contemporary of Hermanric, and as a guest of Attila, who had respectively died eighty and two years before his birth. He is represented in these legends as a mighty but a prudent warrior. His most glorious exploit is when, in the closing scenes of the *Nibelungen Lied*, he overcomes and binds the two last survivors of the heroes.

The sources for the history of Theodoric are scanty and fragmentary. The most valuable are the fragments of Valois (*An. Val.*) and Jordanes (52–59). For his early life Malchus gives most information. John of Antioch (in Müller, *Frag. Hist. Graec.* iv. and additional fragments in *Hermes*, vi. Ant. *H.*), Cassiodorus *Chron.* and the chronicle known as Anonymus Cuspiniani, are sometimes useful. Almost our only source of information as to his internal administration is the *Variarum* of Cassiodorus.

Of modern writings, Dahn's *Könige der Germanen*, ii.–iv. is the most valuable. Du Roure has published a life of Theodoric, and there is a brilliant sketch in Gibbon, ch. 39, of his rule in Italy. See also Mr. Hodgkin's *Preface* to the *Variae* of Cassiodorus. [F. D.]

THEODORICUS (4), the youngest son of Genseric, king of the Vandals, was the leader of the persecutions of Armognst. [GENSERIC, Vol. II. 636.] After his father's death he was banished by his brother Hunneric, who hoped to secure the throne to his own children, his property was confiscated, and his wife and his eldest son were put to death, with many others supposed to be his partisans. After his death in exile the rest of his family were banished by Hunneric. [HUNNERIC.] (Victor Vitensis *de Pers. Vand.* i. 14, ii. 15, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 195, 205.) Procopius is therefore mistaken in stating (*de Bell. Vand.* i. 5) that Theodoric, whom he calls Theodorus, died childless in his father's lifetime. [F. D.]

THEODORICUS (5) I. (THIERRY, THEUDERICH), king of the Franks (511–533), one of the four sons of Clovis, by a concubine. He was considerably older than his three half-brothers, the sons of Clotilda, and had a grown-up son, Theodebert, at the time of his father's death (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 28, iii. 1).

In his war against the Visigoths (507–8), Clovis had entrusted Theodoric with the command of a separate army, operating in the Auvergne, which reduced all the territory between the Goths and the Burgundians (*ibid.* ii. 37). In 511, Clovis died and the four sons divided his kingdom, nominally into equal portions, but really Theodoricus, owing probably to his greater age and capacity, obtained the largest portion. His capital was Metz and his kingdom comprised the Ripuarian Frankish territory, Champagne, the eastern portion of Aquitaine and the old Salian Frankish possessions to the Kohlenwald (see Richter, *Annalen*, p. 46, and authorities there referred to. Fauriel says that besides Frankish Germany, he had so much of Gaul as lies between the Rhine and the Meuse and, as his share of Aquitaine, the Auvergne with the Velai and Gévaudan, its dependencies, the Limousin in part or whole, and certain other cantons of less importance (*Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 92). The principal events of his reign were an incursion of Danes by sea into the lower Rhine, and the Maas, which was defeated by an army and fleet commanded by his son Theodebert, circ. A.D. 515 (*ibid.* iii. 3), the conquest of Thuringia, where Theodoric first obtained a foothold in 516, through the internal dissensions of the two kings Hermenefridus and Badericus (*ibid.* iii. 4), and which was completed in the year 531, when with his half-brother Clotaire, and aided by the Saxons, he invaded the country and decisively defeated the Thuringians under Hermenefridus, on the Uns-

trut (*ibid.* iii. 7, 8; Richter, 48 sqq.), and the savage revenge taken upon the Auvergne in the following year, for suspected disaffection during his absence on the Thuringian campaign (*ibid.* iii. 11–13. See Fauriel, ii. 109 sqq. for this revolt). In the conquest of Burgundy, to which his half-brothers were stirred by Clotilda, he took a subordinate part. The fact that he was married to Sigismund's daughter was perhaps the reason for his abstention from the first campaign in 523 (*ibid.* iii. 6). Sigismund's murder left him free to join in the second, in the following year, when Clodomir came by his death at Véséronce (*ibid.*), but in the final subjection of Burgundy by Clotaire and Childebert in 532–3, despite the invitation extended to him and the murmurs of his warriors, he took no part according to Gregory (*ibid.* iii. 11); but probably his son, if not he himself, joined in before the close, since, on the superior authority of Marius Aventicensis, we know that Theodebert came in for a share of the conquered territory (*Chronicon* ann. 534). Theodoric died in 533, Theodebert hastening back from a victorious campaign against the Goths in Septimania on the news of his illness (Greg. Tur. iii. 23).

Theodoric was a strong and capable king, but to the ferocity and lawlessness of his race he added an unscrupulous cunning of his own (*ibid.* iii. 7). Gregory gives several instances—his treacherous attempt upon the life of his brother Clotaire during the second Thuringian campaign (iii. 7), and the successful traps he laid for the lives of the Thuringian king Hermenefridus (iii. 8), the pretender Mundericus (iii. 14), and his own relative Givaldus (iii. 23). His attitude towards the church seems to have been one of indifference, influenced neither by fear nor superstition. Orthodoxy had been so useful a political weapon to his father, that the son was presumably a professing Christian, though he is not mentioned among the members of Clovis's family who were baptized by St. Remigius. He did not, however, shrink from involving the churches in the pillage and destruction wrought by his army in the Auvergne (iii. 12), and though he exalted St. Quintianus, bishop of Clermont, it was not as a priest, but as a partisan, who had suffered in his cause (iii. 2), while he bitterly persecuted Desiderius, bishop of Verdun (iii. 34).

Theodoric has the credit of reducing to writing and amending the laws of the Franks, the Alamanni, and the Bavarians (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1163). [S. A. B.]

THEODORICUS (6) II. (THIERRY, THEUDERICH), king of Burgundy (A.D. 596–613) and of Austrasia (A.D. 612–613), son of Childebert II. by Faileuba, was scarcely nine years old at his father's death. His share of the realm was Burgundy, with Orleans for his capital, and, by special bequest of his father, Alsace. His elder half-brother Theodebertus II. was raised to the throne in Austrasia (Fredegarius, *Chronicon*, xvi. xxxvii.). This division followed the lines of the treaty of Andelot. Warnacharius was mayor of the palace in Burgundy, while the grandmother Brunechilde struggled with the Austrasian nobles for the guardianship of Theodebert. The accession of two minors, and dissensions between Brunechilde and the chiefs, tempted the ambitious Fredegund, who, as protector of her infant son Clotaire II., was ruling Neustria, to invade Theodebert's dominions. The troops of Theodoric went to the assistance of the Austrasians and shared in their defeat at Lafaux, and the victorious career of the Neustrians was only arrested by the death of Fredegund in the following year, 597 (Fredegarius, xvii.). In 599 Brunechilde, expelled by her enemies from Austrasia, took refuge at the court of Theodoric (Fredegar. xix.; THEODEBERTUS II.). The following year the two brothers, to revenge the defeat of Lafaux, invaded Neustria. A victory was gained at Dormelles near Montereau, and Clotaire was shorn of the greater part of his dominions, the country between the Seine and Loire up to the ocean and the frontiers of Brittany falling to the share of Theodoric (Fredegar. xx.). To retain these acquisitions, however, he was compelled to fight again in 604, when he overthrew Clotaire's forces at Etampes, and entered Paris in triumph (*ibid.* xxv—xxvi.). Meanwhile Brunechilde was continuing in Burgundy the intrigues which had been cut short in Austrasia. She worked for a twofold object, to increase the royal power at the expense of the nobles and to revenge herself upon Theodebert, whom she held in part responsible for her exile (cf. Fauriel, *Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 397 ff.). Her efforts to set the brothers at variance were for long unsuccessful, but in 605, with the aid of her creature Protadius, whom she had made mayor of the Palace, she induced Theodoric to declare war. The army marched with the greatest reluctance, and when it had got as far as Cerizy on the Oise, the Burgundian nobles, having remonstrated in vain with Theodoric, fell upon and killed Protadius, and the expedition collapsed (Fredegar. xxvii.). It was not till 610 that the brothers actually fell out, owing to the lawless greed of Theodebert. In that year he seized Alsace, and treacherously taking his brother at a disadvantage, obtained a formal concession of it and some other provinces, only to be repudiated at the first opportunity (Fredegar. xxxvii.). The following year Theodoric bought the alliance of Clotaire, and the next May invaded Austrasia and defeated his brother at Toul. The latter, flying to Cologne, collected a new army from across the Rhine and returned to meet Theodoric, who had pressed on over the Ardennes. The second battle was fought at Tolbiac, or Zülpich, and Theodoric was again victorious in the bloodiest conflict men had ever known, the story going that the combatants were so closely interlocked that the dead remained standing wedged in with the living. Theodebert fled, but was captured, and, deprived of the insignia of royalty, was tonsured and shortly afterwards killed (Fredegar. xxxviii.). Theodoric was now king of Burgundy in addition to Austrasia. He next found a pretext for turning on his ally Clotaire, but on his way to attack him fell ill and died at Metz in 613 (Fredegar. xxxix.), leaving four infant sons, of whom Sigebertus II. was the eldest.

The influence of Theodoricus on the church was baneful, owing apparently rather to the weakness of character, which made him a tool in the hands of his ambitious grandmother, than to active malevolence. Brunechilde, to retain power in her own hands, sought to distract

the young king's attention from affairs of state by encouraging him in the grossest debauchery. (Fredegar. xxx., xxxvii.; Jonas, *Vita S. Columb.* 31, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 1029.) Desiderius, archbishop of Vienne, was banished. and ultimately killed (Fredegar. xxiv., xxxii.), and the great Columban was persecuted and at last driven from his monastery of Luxeuil (Fredegar. xxxvi.; Jonas, *ibid.* 32 sqq.). His fearless rebukes of the queen's crimes are the reasons assigned for Columban's expulsion, but it seems probable that the political warfare being waged between queen and nobles was not without its influence in the matter. For an opposite view of Theodoric's character, see Fredegarius, xxxviii., where Leonisius, bishop of Mainz, contrasts the "utilitas" of Theodoric with the "stultitia" of his brother. [S. A. B.]

THEODORICUS (7) (TURLOUGH), king of the Dalcassians in Munster, and father of St. Flannan bishop of Killaloe [FLANNAN]; he left his throne and became a monk under St. Colman at Lismore, after amply endowing his son's church, where he himself was afterwards laid. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 154, c. 5; O'Flaherty, *Ogyg.* ii. pt. iii. cc. 80, 82, 83.) [J. G.]

THEODORICUS (8), first bishop of the Sclaves, ordained by Arno, successor of the Irish bishop and missionary Fergil or Virgilius in the see of Salzburg (Ceill. xii. 477; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxxi. 1269–1272). [VIRGILIUS.] [G. T. S.]

Bishops whose Sees are not named.

THEODORUS (1), a bishop present at the council of Antioch, held against Paul of Samosata (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30). [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (2), a bishop, who consulted St. Augustine about receiving clerical persons from Donatism, and to whom he replied saying that they ought to be treated with gentleness, that in receiving them the church received not their dissidence but their attachment, that their baptism and orders, and profession of continence or virginity should be recognised, and authorising Theodorus to show his letter to others as expressing his opinion (Aug. *Ep.* 61). [H. W. P.]

Bishops in alphabetical order of Sees or Countries.

THEODORUS (3), Jacobite patriarch of Alexandria in succession to Theodosius. The circumstances and date of his consecration are here presented with some detail, as they are of importance (though the man himself is of none) in the history of the Monophysite sect. It has been usual to assume that he succeeded Theodosius at once, and therefore in 567, but the narrative of John of Ephesus, brought to light in recent years, shows that there was an interval between. His consecrator-in-chief was Longinus bishop of the Nobadæ or Nubians (John of Eph. transl. by Dr. R. P. Smith, pp. 77, 256). Now Longinus was made bishop of the Nubians at Constantinople immediately upon the death of Theodosius (*i. e.* in 567), but was prevented from sailing for his diocese for three years (p. 257). He had been in Nubia "five years more or less" (258) when the event about to be related took place, *i. e.* in or very close to 575. While in that distant country he received a request from Theodosius the archpresbyter of Alexandria and Theodorus his sister's son, the archdeacon, to visit the suburbs of Alexandria and consecrate a pope for them. Longinus at once set out, and on his road called on Theodore bishop of Philae in Thebais (259), whose written sanction he obtained, but whose age and infirmities prevented his accompanying him. On reaching Mareotis, not far from Alexandria, he found two bishops, John of the monastery of Marbas, and George Eurtoyo, sent by the Monophysite eastern synod to consult Longinus and Theodore of Philae respecting the reception that ought to be given to Paul the patriarch of Antioch, after his temptation and flight. Longinus took them with him to the monastery of Rhamnis in the desert of the hermits beyond the church of St. Minas, and in its abbat Theodore, a Syrian by birth, they found the very man to suit. Much against his will, and almost with violence, they consecrated him patriarch. They then drew up a letter to the Alexandrian brethren, acquainting them with what had been done and apologizing for the privacy of it on the ground of the opposition to be feared from government. The clergy of Alexandria were surprised and indignant, more especially as they had heard that Paul himself, whose own position was in such grave suspense, had assisted in the clandestine affair. One report was that when Longinus reached Mareotis Paul was found travelling in disguise and induced to take part in the proceedings (p. 259); another that he took a journey to Nubia, and there with Longinus consecrated Theodore; but Longinus gave his solemn written denial of Paul's presence at the consecration (p. 272). It should be remarked that it was eight years after this double election when John of Ephesus was writing his account of it (p. 267) and he was writing it in 583 [JOANNES (160) p. 372], so that we again arrive at 575 for our date. Theodore continued to reside in his own monastery. He was humble and peaceable in his demeanour, and the Alexandrians left him unmolested; but he was a mere shadow as a patriarch, Peter alone being acknowledged, and after Peter's death Damianus was elected, although Theodore still lived (p. 313). Theodore's great supporters were Paul and Longinus, who however were obliged by their own pressing affairs to lose sight of him. He bitterly complained of their neglect (p. 314), and especially of Paul's silence for four years (Paul being then in concealment at Constantinople). Theodore took a voyage to Cyprus, in the vain hope of finding him there (p. 328). He was probably living when Paul died in 382. [C. H.]

THEODORUS (4) SCRIBO, orthodox patriarch of Alexandria, succeeded to the see A.D. 607, murdered by his opponents in 609. (Eutych. *Annal.* ii. 215; Le Quien, ii. 445; Neale, ii. 51; *AA. SS.* Boll. Jun. v. 67.) [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS, bishop of Anastasiopolis; *vid.* of Dares. [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS, bishop of Ancyra [THEODOTUS (6)]. [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (5), patriarch of Antioch. According to Theophanes (*Chronograph*, p. 358)

he was son of the vicar of Lower Armenia, but was born in the land of Moab (*ib.* p. 361), and was made bishop on the death of Theophylact, A.D. 750. He was suspected by the Arabs of keeping Constantine Copronymus informed of all their movements; they therefore drove him from Antioch and compelled him to take refuge in his native country of Moab. He had returned from his banishment A.D. 764 when he joined in a synod with Theodore of Jerusalem and Cosmas of Alexandria and their suffragans, at which Comanites, bishop of Epiphania, was convicted of having made away with the sacred vessels of the church. Being unable to replace the vessels he went over to the Iconoclasts, and was anathematized by the synod (Theophan. p. 364). Eutychius (ii. 399) assigns twenty-three years to his episcopate. [E. V.]

THEODORUS (6) ASKIDAS (ὁ Ἀσκιδᾶς), archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, the chief supporter of Origen's views in the first half of cent. vi. and the originator of the celebrated controversy concerning the THREE CHAPTERS. The general history of his life belongs to that subject; we therefore now give merely a brief outline thereof. He was first a monk of the convent of Nova Laura in Palestine, and then was made, about A.D. 537, archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, under Justinian. He supported the views of Origen when they were persecuted in Palestine. He secretly favoured the Monophysite views, and, when Justinian condemned Origen, he saw a chance of condemning the great authorities on the Nestorian side, Theodoret, Theodore and Ibas. Working, therefore, through the empress Theodora, he persuaded Justinian to turn his attention to the reconciliation of the Monophysite party. With this end in view, Justinian at his suggestion issued his celebrated edict which gave rise to the great controversy concerning the Three Chapters. At the general council of Constantinople archbishop Theodore subscribed the condemnation of Origen on the one hand, and of Theodoret, Theodore, and Ibas on the other. He died probably about A.D. 558 at Constantinople. The *Testimonium* of Theodore and of Cethegus the patrician, concerning the contradictions of pope Vigilius on the subject of the Three Chapters, is in Mansi, t. ix. col. 363 (Ceill. xi. 327, 865, 881; Hefele's *Councils*, sec. 258). [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (7), a native of Tarsus, the seventh archbishop of Canterbury. This great man, whose life forms in many respects an important link between ancient and medieval church history, and between eastern and western culture, was born at Tarsus in Cilicia, in or about the year 602 (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 1, v. 8). He was thus two years old when St. Gregory and Augustine died; eight years old at the accession of Heraclius; twenty at the date of the Hegira; and thirty-five when Jerusalem fell finally into the hands of the Mahometans. Tarsus, his native place, in all probability still retained some remains of the wealth, learning, and culture, for which it had been long preeminent, and perhaps even a philosophic school which may have escaped the rigour of Justinian, and in which Theodore earned the reputation marked by his surname "philosopher." Theodore's youth, however, if it were spent there, must have witnessed little else than the alarms, ever recurring, of Persian aggression; and he may not unlikely have suffered some peril when Asia Minor was overrun by Chosroes. Unfortunately neither the early career of the archbishop, nor the expiring prosperity of Tarsus, has been chronicled. Such education as he began at Tarsus he completed at Athens, a centre of light of which at this period scarcely more is known than of Tarsus, but where, notwithstanding the expulsion of the philosophers in 529, some remains of culture, and some educational machinery, must have continued to subsist. According to a letter addressed by pope Zacharias to St. Boniface (*Ep.* Bonif. ed. Würdtwein, No. 77; *Monumenta Moguntina*, ed. Jaffé, p. 185), Theodore owed some part of his erudition to Athens: "Graeco-Latinus ante philosophus et Athenis eruditus," seems to imply that he was educated there, but may mean no more than that he studied there in later life, or when on his way to the West. By such training as Tarsus and Athens afforded, he became a sound Greek and Latin scholar, a philosopher, a thorough adept in secular and divine literature, and, as appears from his whole history, a man of much tact and varied experience. The first ascertained fact of his life is his appearance at Rome in the year 667. It is not impossible that he followed the emperor Constans on his journey to the West. Constans had spent the winter of the year 661 at Athens, and reached Rome in 663.

Theodore's reputation as a philosopher may have brought him to court. But conjecture on such a point is useless, for, although pope Vitalian seems to have had some misgivings about his orthodoxy, and a few years later pope Agatho thought it necessary to send the Acts of the Lateran Council of 649 for his acceptance, there is no reason to suppose that he had anything to do with the *Ecthesis* (638) or the *Type* (648), or with the doctrinal tumults which they were intended to allay. In the year 667 he was at Rome, being then sixty-five years old, a monk of the Eastern or Pauline tonsure, possibly of the rule of St. Basil, and, if in orders at all, not yet advanced to the subdiaconate (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 1). His character and accomplishments had recommended him to the abbat Hadrian, to whom pope Vitalian had just offered the archbishopric of Canterbury. The English church was in a sadly crippled condition, and the kings of Kent and Northumbria had sent an English priest, Wighard, to the pope for consecration. [WIGHARD.] Wighard died at Rome; and Vitalian, having found Hadrian unwilling to accept the promotion, selected Theodore, by his advice, for the post. It was made a condition of the arrangement that Hadrian should accompany him to Britain, having some experience of the risks of travelling through Gaul; and that he should keep a strict watch over him lest, after the manner of the Greeks, he should introduce anything contrary to the faith; but whether this condition was to satisfy Theodore's own misgivings or the pope's suspicions, does not appear.

Theodore accordingly was ordained subdeacon, and, after waiting for four months until his tonsure could be completed in the Roman fashion,

he was rapidly advanced to the higher orders, and consecrated by the pope himself on the 26th of March, 668. Two months after this, on the 27th of May, he started for Britain, accompanied by Hadrian, and also by Benedict Biscop, who was on his second pilgrimage to Rome [BENEDICTUS BISCOP], and consented to return home as companion of the new archbishop, and to be his interpreter and instructor in the English tongue. The party sailed to Marseilles, where they landed, and then passed on to Arles, where they presented to John the archbishop the commendatory letters they had received from Vitalian. John applied to the mayor of the palace, Ebroin, for leave for his guests to pass on their way. Ebroin suspected that Hadrian was acting in the interests of Constans, who was now dying at Syracuse, but whose residence in the West had fluttered the Frank kingdom; it was possible that an alliance was in contemplation between the English kings and the emperor. Theodore, as the least suspicious of the band, was allowed to go on to Paris; Hadrian, after visiting Sens and Meaux, was detained for some time longer. At Paris, Theodore was entertained by Agilbert the bishop, who had, from 650 to 664, been bishop in Wessex, and who, in 664, had consecrated Wilfrid as head of the Northumbrian church. From Agilbert, the archbishop no doubt learned the difficulties of West Saxon politics, which had driven him away from Britain, and which, so long as Theodore lived, prevented the division of the kingdom into smaller dioceses. The archbishop must have stayed for some months at Paris, and, during his visit, Egbert, king of Kent, was informed of his approach. Raedfrith, the prefect, or high reeve of Egbert, was sent to meet him; he conducted him to Etaples, where, after a stay prolonged by fatigue and illness, Theodore embarked for Britain. He reached Canterbury exactly a year after he had set out from Rome, and was received in his church on the 27th of May, 669 (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 2).

It was no easy task that lay before a man of sixty-seven, accustomed to the climate and culture of Southern Europe, a scholar and an ascetic. The great controversy on the Paschal question which had divided the missionary energies of the Scottish, foreign and native, clergy, had been reconciled five years before, but the personal jealousies that originated in it subsisted in full force. The succession of Augustine had nearly, if not entirely, died out; the sees of Rochester and East Anglia were, it would appear, vacant; Wilfrid, who had been consecrated for Northumbria, was officiating in Kent (Eddius, *c.* 14), his seat in the north being occupied by Chad, a bishop of questionable orders; Wina, who had been instrumental in the expulsion of Agilbert, and who had consecrated Chad with the assistance of Celtic bishops, had been in turn expelled from Wessex, and entered by simony on the church of London (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 7); the diocesan system, so far as it could be said to have existed in the age of the conversion, when the missionary bishop of the capital was the one bishop of the nation, was perishing in the confusion of vacant sees and conflicting royalties. Of the kings, Oswy and Egbert were friendly to the new mission, but Wessex under Coinwalch, and Mercia under Wulfhere, were apparently cool or dilatory; the latter, if under any influence, was inclined to listen to the Scots; the former to recall his Frank adviser (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 7). All the kingdoms were too large to be dioceses, even if they had had bishops; as a matter of fact, Theodore, with Wilfrid, Chad, and Wina, formed the whole episcopate of the English church. As Wilfrid and Chad were rivals, claimants of the same see, and Wina a simoniac, Theodore had before him a fair field for reform, organization, and administration.

His first measure was to make a tour of the English portion of the island (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 2). He seems to have left Benedict Biscop at the monastery at Canterbury, and, in company with Hadrian, to have set out forthwith on a journey of inspection. He was everywhere welcomed and listened to attentively; he attempted to enforce the recognised monastic rule and the accepted Easter, and was readily obeyed, although the Irish clergy, as we learn from the letters of Aldhelm (*Ep. ad Eahfridum*, Aldhelmi, *Opp.* ed. Giles, page 94) were in some minor respects contumacious and rebellious; but their opposition was probably confined to the schools, where the merits of Scottish scholarship seem to have been recognised by the archbishop without grudging. As soon as possible, Theodore began to settle the episcopate; in Kent he had no difficulty; bishop Putta was consecrated to Rochester (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 2). East Anglia about the same time received bishop Bisi, as continuing a succession which had been regularly drawn from Canterbury (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 5). Wilfrid too, with the hearty co-operation of Oswy, took his seat at York and Lindisfarne; Chad returning to Lastingham (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 3; Eddius, *V. Wilfr.* c. 15). Wulfhere deigned to ask for a bishop for Mercia, and Theodore, admiring the humility, and anxious to find scope for the energies of Chad, completed and confirmed his episcopal character and settled him at Lichfield; Wina, however, continued to hold London. Lastly, Coinwalch, after in vain inviting Agilbert to return to Winchester, prevailed on him to send over his deacon and nephew Leutherius, whom Theodore consecrated at Winchester for the whole kingdom of Wessex (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 7). Something like a diocesan framework was thus restored, and when, in September 673, the archbishop ventured to summon a synod, he found himself at the head of a body of bishops, whose jurisdictions covered the whole of the English part of Britain. In 670, however, he had lost his two principal supporters, Oswy and Egbert; Egfrith, the new king of Northumbria, was a very different man from his father, and Kent, under the divided authority of Hlothere and Eadric, was losing the strength and renown which it had in the earlier half of the century. Theodore by this time had gained a position which set him beyond the need of seeking royal help.

The council of 673, the first important gathering of the English church, took place at Hertford on the 24th of September. The record of its proceedings is preserved by Bede (*H. E.* iv. 5). The bishops present were Theodore himself, Bisi, Putta, Leutherius, and Winfrith, the successor of S. Chad. Wilfrid sent agents to represent him; no reason is given for the absence of Wina. The archbishop opened the synod with a request for common action in the

maintenance of the faith, and of the decrees and definitions of the fathers, urging, moreover, the importance of unity and charity. The bishops agreed to receive the canons and observe them, and the archbishop produced a book of canons, probably that of Dionysius Exiguus, and having selected ten particular articles, proceeded to discuss, confirm, and adapt them to the use of the English church. These articles concern the paschal custom, the distinct jurisdiction of diocesan bishops, the freedom of monasteries from episcopal interference, the restriction of monks to their own monasteries, of clergy to their own dioceses, and of bishops and clergy as to the exercise of their functions in other dioceses. The seventh article orders the annual assembling of a synod, if possible twice, certainly once, on August 1, at Clovesho. The eighth determines the precedence of bishops in the order of consecration; the tenth embodied several rules on marriage, and prohibited the marriage of the divorced. The ninth is a resolution for the increase of the number of bishops, which had to be waived because of the necessities of the times. When the articles, each of which was framed on an ancient model of a definition of the apostolic canons, or of those of Nicaea, Antioch, Sardica, Chalcedon, or Africa, had been formally drawn, they were signed by each bishop, promulged by a formal notarial sentence, and sanctioned by the archbishop on pain of excommunication. This act, which seems to be a formal acceptance on the part of the English churches, of the common diocesan system of the church at large, is of the highest historical importance as the first constitutional measure of the collective English race; no act of secular legislation can be produced parallel to it before the reign of Alfred, or rather of his son Edward. (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 5; *Councils*, Wilkins, i. 41–43; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 118–122.) Nor was it a dead letter. The monasteries which were rising in both north and south, on the somewhat indiscriminate liberality of the newly-converted princes, certainly required organization; the diocesan system needed consolidation as well as expansion, and the law of marriage in the English, as in every young church, required enforcement as well as definition. Theodore had an early opportunity of subdividing the East Anglian diocese, substituting two new bishops for the aged and infirm Bisi, the same year (Flor. Virg. A.D. 673). Between 673 and 675 he probably made an attempt to subdivide Mercia; Wulfhere, with whom he had never had very cordial relations, died in 675, and Ethelred, his successor was, if not at first, within a short period after his accession, a devoted adherent of the archbishop; it is possible that the deposition of bishop Winfrith, for alleged disobedience, may have been caused by his resistance to the measure which Theodore had at heart (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 6). In his place the archbishop consecrated Saxulf, in or about 675; in 676 Putta retired from Rochester to Hereford, where, with Saxulf's permission, he executed his episcopal office and laid the foundation of another diocese; but the further division of Mercia was still delayed. In 675 also S. Erkenwald was consecrated to London; Wina was dead; Ethelred's participation in the measures of organization was secured, and the diocese of the East Saxons was reformed. At London, in the following year, Heddi was consecrated to the see of Winchester, no opening having been as yet found for the division of Wessex, and the national see being now settled at Winchester, whither the remains of S. Birinus were now, or soon afterwards, translated.

Having done as much as he could in the south, Theodore, in 678, turned his steps northwards. The changes of persons and policies in the greater kingdoms were producing much risk of disturbance. Kent itself was the scene of division between Eadric and Hlothere; Ethelred, of Mercia, was hostile to the Kentish house, or took part in its struggles, and devastated the country in 676; and between him and Egfrith, of Northumbria, his brother-in-law, there was a bitter enmity, in which the energetic and ambitious Wilfrid had a share. Theodore, who regarded himself as superior to, and a proper arbiter in, the tribal quarrels, seems to have thrown himself with an animosity curiously characteristic of his vigorous old age, on the side of Egfrith against Wilfrid; or perhaps he saw in the quarrel an opportunity for subdividing the huge Northumbrian diocese, which was too good to be neglected. He went down to York, and in the absence or disgrace of Wilfrid, consecrated three bishops. Wilfrid, after an interview with Egfrith and Theodore, in which he questioned, argued, threatened, and prophesied, appealed to the apostolic see, and went into exile which was not altogether voluntary. (Eddius, c. 24; Bede, *H. E.* iv. 12.) The diocese which he had ruled was divided into two, the sees being fixed at Lindisfarne, and at York; whilst a third was set up at some place undetermined in Lindsey, a province which was for the moment under Northumbrian rule.

It was possibly in this journey that Theodore consecrated the new church which had been built at Lindisfarne (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 25); he certainly went as far north as York, where he consecrated the new bishops, possibly, as Eddius says, irregularly and without assistant prelates (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 12; Edd. c. 24). Wilfrid protested very naturally against the uncanonical character of the proceeding, and against the confiscation of his property, on which Egfrith forthwith laid hands. He carried his appeal to pope Agatho, and in a council held in October 679, at Rome, to which Theodore sent the monk Ceonwald as his envoy, the affairs of the English church were examined and discussed. The history of this council is obscure. It appears, from a report printed by Spelman (*Conc.* i. 158), that complaints about Theodore's proceedings had reached Rome before Wilfrid arrived or was allowed an audience. The jurisdiction of the archbishop had been brought in question, and in a formal sentence the episcopate was declared to consist of twelve bishops, including the archbishop; at the same time the use of arms, and the practice of secular music and amusements by the English clergy, were prohibited. A further direction was issued to Theodore to assemble the prelates and princes to carry the necessary reforms into execution. John, the arch-cantor of the Roman church, was to be sent to see that it was done (*Councils*, &c., Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 131–136). In this act no mention is made

of Wilfrid; but in another document, preserved by Eddius, his biographer, a session of council is described in which Wilfrid was allowed to plead his cause; and a decision given which restored him to his see, but allowed a division of his diocese to be made by a council which was to be held on Wilfrid's own proposal. Theodore's intrusive bishops were to be expelled, and Wilfrid, with the consent of the council, was to select their successors (Eddius, c. 29; *Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 136–140). Wilfrid, having obtained this very problematical success, did not hurry home; when, in the course of the year 680, he reached England, he was arrested and imprisoned; the decree of the pope was rejected by the Northumbrian Witenagemote, and the bishops retained their sees. In 681 Theodore consecrated two more, Tunbert for Hexham, and Trumwin for the Picts; the bishop of Lindsey, after the re-conquest of the province by Mercia, settled down at Ripon. In 684 Theodore was again in the north, presiding at a council of bishops at Twyford on the Alne, in Northumberland; he had to depose bishop Tunbert, whose see, after having been offered to Cuthbert, was filled by Eata, and on the 26th of March, A.D. 685 (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 28), the aged archbishop, assisted by seven bishops, consecrated Cuthbert to the see of Lindisfarne; Wilfrid's exclusion seeming to be permanent. This was done at York on Easter day, and marks the highest point of authority which Theodore reached in Northumbria. (See WILFRITH.)

We must now return to the south of England, where, during these years, Theodore was effecting greater changes. He had, in 679, made peace between Egfrith and Ethelred, with whom, henceforth, he seems to have acted without misunderstanding: and the same year is assigned by the earliest authorities we possess (Florence of Worcester, Appendix, *M. H. B.* 622, who, however, only reproduces much earlier material found in the regnal and episcopal lists) to the division of Mercia into five dioceses. If this date be correct, it is possible that the design for the sub-division of Mercia, as well as that for Northumbria, was within the view of the Roman council just mentioned. Our authority, however, states that it was carried into effect by Theodore at the request of Ethelred, and with the consent of his principes or Ealdormen. We know from Bede (*H. E.*, iv. 23) that Theodore consecrated bishops for Dorchester and Worcester; that Putta was settled at Hereford (*H. E.* iv. 12), and Ethelwin in Lindsey (*H. E.* iii. 27, iv. 12), while Saxulf was still ruling at Lichfield. It is most probable that the division was effected by a single legislative act, and the dates at which the several bishops of the new sees emerge into the light of history, converge towards the year assigned by Florence. His account may therefore be accepted as probably historical. According to it, the four new sees were Worcester, Leicester, Sidnacester in Lindsey, and Dorchester: of these Leicester, and possibly Dorchester also, were within a generation re-incorporated with Lichfield, that great diocese being not finally broken up until 737.

Before the close of the year 680, then, Theodore had raised the number of dioceses at least beyond the number defined by the Roman council, and originally designated by S. Gregory, whose plan for creating two provinces he seems steadily to have ignored. In 680 he held the second of his great historical synods. Pope Agatho at Easter of this year held a council at Rome, in preparation for the general council of Constantinople, called in the following autumn against the Monothelites. It was attended by 125 bishops, among whom Wilfrid appeared and subscribed the proceedings as legate of the synod of Britain. It appears, however, from the letter of the pope to the council of Constantinople, which was read in the fourth Actio of the council, that Theodore had been himself expected at Rome, and that the council had been delayed in consequence. Theodore is described as "famulum atque coepiscopum nostrum magnae insulae Britanniae archiepiscopum et philosophum," an account of him which serves to show in how high estimation he was held at Rome. (*Concilia*, Mansi xi. 292; Labbe and Cossart, vi. 685, 697.)

It is probable that the archbishop's desire to declare the faith of the Church of England in conformity with the declaration of the Roman council induced him to bring the matter before his own synod, which met at Hatfield on the 17th of September. Bede has preserved for us a part of the proceedings of this assembly, at which the archchantor John was present, on pope Agatho's message of peace. According to this authority the chief purpose of the gathering was to commit the English church to the catholic determination of the Monothelite controversy, to secure the reception of the decrees of the council held at Rome in 649, and to report the national adhesion to the faith (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 17, 18). The names of the bishops who attended and subscribed are unfortunately omitted from the record. If we suppose the council of Hatfield to be the assembly summoned in consequence of the mission of John the Archchantor, it may have completed the organisation of the new dioceses. The *Codex Wintoniensis* (MS. Br. Mus. Add. 15,350), preserves a charter (K. C. D., No. 991; *Councils*, &c., iii. 152), according to which the direction of S. Gregory for the constitution of the two provinces is confirmed in the synod of Hatfield by the four kings and the archbishop. This charter is certainly spurious, but it proves the existence of an early notion as to the connexion of the council with the scheme of subdivision. Another obscure but curious reminiscence is preserved by Rudborne, the Winchester chronicler (*Anglia Sacra*, i. 193), a decree of Theodore, issued on the occasion of the translation of S. Birinus, forbidding the division of Wessex during the life of the existing bishop Heddi, and referred to the year 679. If this contains any germ of truth, it suggests the possibility of a bold attempt made by Theodore to subdivide the three great kingdoms, which was successful in Mercia, unsuccessful in Wessex, and in Northumbria gave rise to the troubles of Wilfrid. It would, however, be too hazardous a speculation to harmonise these documents, which are of very various authority, on such a theory.

The year 686 is remarkable for the restoration of peace to the national church by the reconciliation of Wilfrid. It was brought about possibly by Theodore's apprehension of his own

approaching end, and partly by the mediation of Erkenwald, bishop of London. Egfrith, Wilfrid's enemy had, however, fallen in battle against the Picts in 685, and the way was opened in Northumbria for Wilfrid's return. According to Eddius (v. Wilfr. c. 42) Theodore confessed with great humility his injustice to Wilfrid, and offered to appoint him as his successor, writing to the kings Ethelred and Aldfrith to restore him to his dignity and estates. The story is highly coloured, but the fact of the reconciliation is proved. Wilfrid obtained the see of York, as it had been held after the division of 678 by Bosa, and the church of Ripon which he himself had founded. These he retained until the year after Theodore's death, when, in 691, in consequence of an attempt to recover his original status he was required by king Aldfrith to obey the decrees of Theodore, and on refusal was sent into exile. [WILFRID.]

The reconciliation with Wilfrid is the last known act of the life of Theodore, and the completed diocesan system of the whole church of the English nation under his hand, which that pacification substantially secured, is the greatest and most permanent result of his administration. He was the first of the archbishops whom all the nations recognised, and in their recognition of him was contained the germ of the unity which was not realised in secular matters for nearly three centuries to come. He therefore takes an important place in the creation or development of the idea of English nationality. In the history of the church his position is even more significant, for he succeeded in organising a united ecclesiastical body out of the provincial churches of the several kingdoms which, converted by distinct agencies, Roman, Frank, Burgundian, Italian, and Celtic, became one under his hand; and he succeeded in dividing the whole of Southern Britain into well-defined dioceses, establishing the rule of Canterbury over all the suffragan sees. This he did on lines which were not the lines which Gregory and Augustine had drawn, but which notwithstanding the emancipation of the archiepiscopate of York, itself the result of centuries of struggles, have continued to be the main outlines of the territorial system of the church to this day.

To the church thus arranged in dioceses, under his primacy and metropolitical authority, he secured all the advantages of position and organisation which had been reached by the most favoured churches of the West. The power of synodical action was claimed, and provision made for its exercise in the council of Hertford; the episcopal jurisdiction over persons and things, touching sacred or moral questions, was claimed by his dicta in the *Penitential and canons*, and recognised in the legislation of the kings and witenagemots of the following ages. We know, for instance, from his *Penitential* that the right of enforcing justice on the murderers of monks or clergy was in the hands of the bishop (I. iv. 5); that he had full authority over immoral clergy (I. ix. 1); and that he could determine the causes of the poor, up to the value of fifty shillings (II. ii. 4). His jurisdiction was indeed in a mixed and nascent state, depending partly on consensual obedience and partly on the assistance of the royal authority; but recognised and fairly well defined. The same may be said of the custom of tithe, as it appears in the *Penitential*, already a definite payment; compulsory only so far as the informed conscience of the payer was subject to the direction of the church; not yet apportioned exclusively to the maintenance of the clergy, but a payment incumbent on all but the priests (II. ii. 8), and not to be diverted from the poor or pilgrims or the churches to which it was the duty of the laity to devote it (II. xiv. 9, 10) according to the custom of the province. Over marriage, and the laws for restriction and for the annulling or enforcing of marriage rights, the bishops have full power, so far as it can be exercised by ecclesiastical discipline. Over churches, their ministers, offices and furniture, the right of ecclesiastical jurisdiction is equally ascertained. The submission of the wild kings and untutored tribes to the fully developed law of the religion to which they adhered, is strikingly complete, and it could have been by no weak or impolitic hand that the new rule was so wisely tempered. In some points, indeed, the archbishop's moderation allowed the continuance of national customs which he would rather have forbidden, as, for example, in relation to public penance (I. xiii. 4); the government of monasteries of men by women and *vice versâ* (II. vi. 8): the eating of horse flesh (II. xi. 4); and in consequence of the greatness of the need he allowed the ordination of persons recovered from heresy, contrary to the decision of the Roman see which had declared them perpetually disqualified (*Poen.* I. v. 2; cf. I. ix. 12).

That Theodore arranged the parochial system of the ancient church is an idea which is anachronistic, to say the least, however firmly he may have laid the foundation of it (Elmham, *Hist. S. Aug. Cant.* p. 285). The basis of parish organisation already existed in the organisation of the township; but the ecclesiastical element was as yet in solution: the clergy were scarcely parish priests, rather missionaries or monastic evangelists on the one hand, and chaplains of the great men on the other; nor were tithes, as we have seen, formally apportioned to the church of the township, however strong the claim which religious obligation involved. It was not for a century after Theodore's time that the duty of tithe paying was enforced by secular law, and still longer before the strict apportionment became universal. Notwithstanding that, the section of the *Penitential* cited above, embodied the principle of later practice on this point. The monastic element in the church constitution had not yet reached the stage at which it may be said to have crystallized. The missionary work was still carried on to a great extent by monks and monastic agency, and the greater churches were attached to monasteries; but although some of the alleged papal privileges of the time are spurious, it is clear from the recognition of privilege, which appears both in the *Canons of Hertford* and in the *Penitential*, that the monastic establishments were withdrawing from the immediate superintendence of the bishops, and gaining an independence which involved the necessity of finding other agencies for proper pastoral work (II. vi.). The growth of monasteries in England under Theodore was very considerable; in fact, the most important of the Anglo-Saxon houses, Peterborough, Ely,

Malmesbury, and the like, as well as the locally famous monasteries of Kent and Northumbria, were founded in his time; but their creation was the result of a devotion which was just then almost universal, and which was probably guided rather than originated or stimulated by Theodore. His name appears in few charters, and those very questionable; belonging to Glastonbury (*K. C. D.* n. 7); Abingdon (*ib.* 31), St. Augustine's (*ib.* 8, 9, 10, 14, 27); Malmesbury (*ib.* 11, 22, 23); Worcester (*ib.* 12, 13, 21); Christ Church, Canterbury (*ib.* 16); and Peterborough (*ib.* 999). It is to Benedict Biscop, for instance, and men like him, that the church owed the better side of the monastic agencies at work in the seventh century, rather than to Theodore, who in this respect seems to stand in close analogy with his great successor Lanfranc, in whom also monastic zeal was regulated by sound policy and practical wisdom. In the promotion of learning by schools, monastic or other, Theodore had a great share. His friend and coadjutor, Hadrian, ruled the monastery at Canterbury during the whole of Theodore's episcopate and for several years after his death; but the archbishop himself took his part in the teaching. He had a share in the education of Albinus, the successor of Hadrian (*H. E.* pref.). Oftfor, afterwards bishop of Worcester, studied at Canterbury under his teaching (*H. E.* iv. 23); bishop Tobias of Rochester was his disciple as well as Hadrian's (*H. E.* v. 23); Aldhelm, who was likewise a pupil at Canterbury (W. Malmesb. *G. P.* lib. v. § 18) describes him as surrounded by a class of Irish students (whom however he treated as a wild boar does the hounds) learning grammar, chronography and the practice of logic and philosophy (ep. ad Eahfrid. *Opp.* ed. Giles, p. 94). Bede (*H. E.* iv. 2) in more intelligible and trustworthy language, mentions among the studies of the school, the art of metre, astronomy, ecclesiastical arithmetic (the *Chronography* of Aldhelm), and music, as well as theological reading; and especially the Latin and Greek languages which the scholars of Theodore knew as well as their mother tongue, although, if Aldhelm's Greek is a fair specimen, they hardly learned the discreet use of the latter. Theodore himself was in a small way an authority on medicine also; Bede heard from abbat Bercthun (*H. E.* v. 2) how Theodore had said it was a bad thing to be bled when the moon was waxing and the spring tide approaching; the comparative wholesomeness of different sorts of animal food is allowed to affect penitential discipline; it is lawful to eat the flesh of the hare, and it is good for dysentery, whilst the gall mixed with pepper is good "pro dolore" (*Poen.* II. xi. 5). It is however in ecclesiastical learning and canon law, as it may be called, that Theodore's reputation has been most general and lasting. Archbishop Egbert of York, in the preface to his *Penitential*, mentions Theodore, in company with Paphnutius, Jerome, Augustine and Gregory, as an authority on ecclesiastical discipline. Pope Zachary in the year 748 names him as one of the great men whose name gave authority to the synodical acts of the English church (*Mon. Mogunt.* p. 185); and his decisions were incorporated, under his name, in the collection of Irish canons which belongs to the same century (Wasserschleben, *Irische Canonen-Versammlung*, pp. 247, 248). That he was the author of a *Penitential* was known to the writer of the *Liber Pontificalis* (ed. Vignol. i. 270); Paul Warnefrid (*Hist. Langob.* lib. v. c. 30); Rabanus Maurus (Canisius, ed. Basnage, II. ii. 310); Regino of Prüm (ed. Wasserschleben, p. 26), and a long array of writers on the same subject, "de synodalibus causis" (Wasserschleben, *Bussordnungen*, pp. 15, 16) and there is no reason to doubt that in the existing *Penitential* known under his name, we possess a collection of his decisions drawn up possibly under his own superintendence.

Bede has not recorded many traits of the personal character of Theodore; in fact the story of his overcoming St. Chad's objection to ride on his mission journeys, by lifting him on horseback with his own hand (*H. E.* iv. 3), is almost the only record of his action outside his episcopal and educational work. From Eddius, who, however, was scarcely an impartial witness, we gather that he was somewhat impetuous in temper, and even inclined to subordinate strict justice to politic expediency, for we need not accept his insinuation that in his treatment of Wilfrid, Theodore was blinded by the gifts of Egfrith (*V. Wilfr.* c. 24). Against the haste and harshness apparent in his conduct we must set both the provoking assumptions of Wilfrid, and the extreme importance of the work of organization to which he had devoted himself. His hand was strong and versatile, his activity marvellous, his accomplishments very numerous, and his influence, with this solitary exception, unbounded. His piety and religion, although always mentioned with reverence, do not seem to have been of the type which recommended itself to the monastic hagiographers, for no life of Theodore seems ever to have been written, nor were miracles worked at his grave.

Theodore died on the 19th of September 690, at the great age of eighty-eight; a wonder which is especially noted by Bede, who tells us that he had been long before warned in a dream that his life should be thus prolonged. He was buried in the church of St. Peter, in the monastery of St. Augustine. An epitaph was written over him in thirty-four elegiac verses, of which Bede has preserved unfortunately only eight; his name is said to be in the "lingua Pelasga," and his teaching described as "limpida dogmata." His remains were translated with those of the other archbishops on Sept. 6, 1091, and when his tomb was opened his body was found with the metropolitical pall and monastic cowl, lying just as it had been buried (Gotselinus, *de Transl.* ii. c. 27; cited by Smith on Bede, *H. E.* v. 8).

The venerable historian briefly records his own belief that, under Theodore's presidency, the churches of the English achieved a progress beyond anything they were able to compass before. The durability of his work attests the zeal, wisdom, and faithfulness with which it was undertaken, and the blessing that has rested upon it.

The *Penitential*, of Theodore, which has been several times cited and mentioned above, is a collection of his decisions in cases of discipline, and rules laid down by him for church management; contained in two books, and, according to the contemporary editor, who describes himself as "discipulus Umbrensium," gathered chiefly

by a priest named Eoda, from the archbishop's oral answers to questions proposed to him. The general character of the work may be gathered from the citations given above: it contains, like all works of the disciplinary character, much that is repulsive, and is redolent of the heathen and other abominations, against which early Christian teaching had to contend. Painful and disgusting as it is, it shows the church attempting to struggle against the moral and social evils which the Roman satirists and epigrammatists regarded either as matters of jest or matters of course; and it was certainly never meant for common reading. The Penitential has a literary history of its own: no less than nine editions of four different works having been published or discovered under the name. The genuine book was first published entire by Dr. Wasserschleben, at Halle, in 1851, among the Buss-ordnungen der Abendländischen Kirche, pp. 182–219; it was republished in 1871, with fresh collations and from a more ancient MS. (C.C.C.C. 320) in the Councils and Ecclesiastical documents (Haddan and Stubbs), iii. 173–213. The previous attempts to recover it were these: (1) In 1639, Spelman in the *Concilia*, i. 154, printed the headings of 78 chapters from a C.C.C. MS. 190, in the belief that it was Theodore's *Penitential*; (2) In 1669 D'Achery printed in the *Spicilegium* (tom. ix. p. 52) 120 *capitula*, subsequently arranged by Wasserschleben in 171 articles, of which all but 17 are found in the genuine *Penitential*; (3) These were reprinted by Labbe and Cossart in the *Concilia*, vi. 1875, in the year 1671; (4) In 1677 Jacques Petit printed, in 14 chapters, the second book of the genuine *Penitential*, with 60 other capitula of later date, ascribed to Theodore by mistake; (5) In 1723, De la Barre, in the new edition of D'Achery's *Spicilegium* (tom. i. p. 486), republished the 120 capitula, increased to 168 by adding 20 from Adamnan and rearranging the rest; (6) In 1840, Benjamin Thorpe published for the Record Commission the work contained in the MS. C.C.C.C. 190, which contains a great part of the genuine work broken up and incorporated with much later material; this was (7) in 1844 reprinted with notes by G. Friedrich Kunstmann at Mainz; and (8) Migne in vol. 99 of the *Patrologia*, republished Petit's *Penitential* (No. 4), with a good deal of illustrative matter.

The genuine work exists in MSS. at Vienna, Paris, Würtzburg, Darmstadt and Cambridge, the last being the most ancient, and of the eighth century. It is, as has been said already, probable that the work was drawn up under Theodore's own eye; a short epilogue being addressed in the archbishop's own name to Heddi, bishop doubtless of Winchester, with a petition for his prayers.

The so-called capitula of Theodore, which are not contained in the *Penitential*, are arranged in the "Councils and Documents," iii. 211, 212. There exists a chapter on Commutation of Penance, wrongly ascribed to Theodore, in several *Penitentials*; and a form for the Benediction of an Abbess, more probably drawn upon Theodore's rule (Pœn. II. iii. 4) than edited by himself (Collier, *Church Hist.* ii. app. p. 23 and elsewhere). Rudburn, the Winchester chronicler of the fifteenth century, professes to give a decree of Theodore, forbidding the division of the diocese of Winchester during the life of Heddi, which may preserve the memory of something genuine, (*Ang. Sac.* i. 193; *Councils*, etc., Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 126, 127); and Elmham, the Canterbury writer of the same century, who assigns to Theodore the foundation of the parochial system, adds that he obtained from the kings a concession, nowhere else recorded, "ut si qui sufficientes essent super proprium fundum construere ecclesias earundem perpetui patronatu gauderent: si inter limites alterius alicujus dominii ecclesias facerent, ejusdem fundi domini notarentur pro patronis" (p. 285).

It is difficult, if not impossible, to overstate the debt which England, Europe, and Christian civilization owes to the work of Theodore. He was the real organizer of the administrative system of the English church, and in that work laid the foundation of English national unity. He brought the learning and culture of the Eastern empire into the West, and with the aid of Hadrian and Benedict Biscop established schools from which the scholars and missionaries of the following century went out to rekindle the light of Christian culture in France and the recently converted parts of Germany; and thus, as has been said already, formed a most important link between ancient and modern life. His work was, to a great extent, one of unwearied and unpretentious industry; his culture was, for the time, enlightened and tolerant, and, although he has never been canonised or even beatified, both his character and his work seem to place him among the first and greatest of the saints whom God has used for the building up of the Church and development of the culture of the world.

Authorities: Bede, *Hist. Eccl. passim*; Eddius, *Vita Wilfridi*, ed. Raine; Will. Malmesb. *Gesta Pontificum*, lib. i.; Gervase of Canterbury, *Acta Pontificum*, *Opp.* (ed. Stubbs) ii.; Mabillon, *Acta SS., O. S. B.* sæc. ii. pp. 983–993 (ed. Ven. 1733); Bollandist, *Acta SS.* September, vol. vi., pp. 73–82; Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, i. 145–175; Haddan and Stubbs, *Concilia*, iii. 114–226; Bright, *Chapters of Early English Church History*, pp. 219–229, 364. [S.]

THEODORUS (8) I., bishop of Capitolium in Palaestina Secunda, was present at the three synods held in Palestine against Anthimus by Peter, patriarch of Jerusalem, in 536 (Labbe, v. 285; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 717). [E. V.]

THEODORUS (9), a bishop of Cappadocia or Isauria, who appears to have been previously a shepherd. Though having only recently received the episcopate and become personally acquainted with Gregory Nazianzen, he took on himself to urge him to undertake the charge of the Catholics at Constantinople. Gregory writes to him (*Ep.* 222, p. 909) to acquaint him with his resolution to do this. At the same time he refers to an insult he had been subjected to at the hands of the bishops of the province, making excuses for Theodorus on the ground of his being new to episcopal responsibilities. [E. V.]

THEODORUS (10), bishop of Claudiopolis in Galatia. He was present at the Robber Synod of Ephesus and at the council of Chalcedon, whereat THALASSIUS of Caesarea in Cappa-

docia relied upon him as a witness. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1028; Mansi, vi. 601–606; Hefele's *Councils*, iii. 302, ed. Clark.) [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (11), bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, who, according to the petition of the bishops of Cyprus presented at the council of Ephesus, 431, had been maltreated and even scourged by the clergy of Antioch for refusing to acknowledge the subjection of the church of Cyprus to the bishops of Antioch (Labbe, iii. 788; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1046). [E. V.]

THEODORUS (12), the 39th patriarch of Constantinople, who succeeded CONSTANTINUS (1) in Sept. or Oct. A.D. 676. He had been syncellus, and keeper of the ornaments of the cathedral. From the letter of the emperor Constantine V., Pogonatus, to pope Donus dated August 12th, A.D. 678 (Mansi, xi. 195), it appears that Theodorus on his accession to the patriarchal see did not send the customary synodical letter to Rome, as those of his predecessors had not been received there, but that he had written a letter to the pope exhorting him to take steps to re-establish harmony between the Eastern and Western churches. That Theodorus was a Monothelite is shown by the statement in the same letter, that he had joined MACARIUS (10) in pressing the emperor to remove from the diptychs the name of Vitalian, the only pope since HONORIUS (15) that had been inserted in them. This the emperor refused, on the ground of the services Vitalian had rendered to him on his Sicilian expedition against the usurper Mizizius. It appears however from the proceedings at the eighth session of the council of Constantinople (Mansi, xi. 346) that Theodorus and Macarius ultimately succeeded. Theodorus was deposed or resigned, for what cause is uncertain, soon after the letter of Constantine, for at the council of Constantinople which began in November A.D. 680, GEORGIUS was in the third year of his patriarchate. (Theophanes 301, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* cviii. 736). In A.D. 684, after the death of Georgius whose patriarchate lasted six years, Theodorus was restored, and continued patriarch till his death in A.D. 687. (Theophanes, 300, 302, 303; Nicephorus, *Chron.*, in *Patr. Gr.* c. 1048; *AA. SS.* Aug. i. 84.*) [F. D.]

THEODORUS (13), bishop of Damascus, the successor of JOANNES, 140), who accompanied John of Antioch to the council of Ephesus, 431. His predecessor's death must have occurred very soon after the council, for mention is made of Theodorus's ordination to the episcopate in the letter of John of Antioch to Proclus (*Trag. Iren.* c. 197; Baluz. 894). He attended the council at Antioch concerning Athanasius of Perrha, in 435 (Labbe, iv. 728), and the "Latrocinium" at Ephesus in 449, where he declared for the orthodoxy of Eutyches and his restoration to the presbyterate (*ib.* 260), and pronounced all who disagreed with the decisions of the synod worthy of anathema (*ib.* 302). At Chalcedon he again followed the majority, and reversed his former votes (*ib.* 79, 328, etc.; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 835). [E. V.]

THEODORUS (14), SICEOTES, ST., Apr. 22, bishop of Daras, or Anastasiopolis, c. 590, until his death in 613, a prelate celebrated for the sanctity of his life, to whose honour the chief church in Daras was dedicated. His biography was written in Syriac by George the Deacon, and translated by Metaphrastes. (Blasius, *Syria Sacra*, c. 94; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 998.) [ELEUSIUS (7).] [E. V.]

THEODORUS (15), bishop and martyr in Egypt about A.D. 306 (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13). He was one of the four bishops who first protested against the conduct of Meletius of Lycopolis [MELETIUS (2)]. Their protest will be found in Routh's *Reliq.* iv. 91, 103, printed from a MS. discovered in the last century by Scipio Maffei in the Chapter Library of Verona. (Cf *Pat. Gr.* viii. and x., where two letters of Phileas to Meletius will be found; Ceill. iii. 52 note 4.) [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (16), bishop of Esbus in Arabia, the ancient Heshbon, c. 649, an orthodox prelate, a vigorous opponent of the Monothelites. Pope Martin I. wrote to him (*Epist.* vi.) in the name of the Lateran Council, to thank him for his defence of the orthodox faith, offering him his congratulations on the suppression of Monothelitism in Arabia and Palestine, and desiring him to render canonical obedience to John, bishop of Philadelphia, whom he had appointed his vicar apostolic in the provinces of Antioch and Jerusalem. (Labbe, vi. 30; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 864.) [E. V.]

THEODORUS (17), fourth bishop of Fréjus. On the death of St. Leontius, about 432, the people elected St. Maximus (then abbat of Lerins) as his successor, but he fled to the woods to escape the unwelcome honour, and thereupon Theodorus, an abbat in the neighbouring group of the Stoechades (Hières), was chosen in his place. He was at the councils of Riez, in 439, Orange, in 441, and the third of Arles, summoned about 455, to settle the controversy between him and the abbat and monks of Lérins as to jurisdiction. The matter was virtually decided in favour of the monastery (Mansi, xii. 907; Ceillier, x. 420–1). Upon his death the date of which is unknown, he was succeeded by Victorinus. The 108th letter of Leo the Great, treating of various points of doctrine and practice, is addressed to him (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 1011; Ceillier, x. 225), and the 66th to him with other bishops (Migne, *ibid.* 883). While still abbat, he was, with three others, addressed by Joannes Cassianus in the dedication of his last seven *Collationes* (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xlix. 1087; *Gall. Christ.* i. 422). [S. A. B.]

THEODORUS (18), bishop of Heraclea in Thrace. He was eminent as a leader of the Semi-Arian party at the council of Antioch (In Encaeniis) A.D. 341. He was joined with Mark of Arethusa and two other bishops in an embassy from Constantius to Constans to explain the exile of Athanasius, about A.D. 343 (Soc. *H. E.* ii. 18). On this occasion Socrates (*l. c.*) tells us they drew up a creed different from that which they had published at Antioch, and thereby sought to deceive the emperor. Cf. Hefele's *Councils* (Clark's ed.), t. ii. pp. 58, 80, 226. He was deposed at the synod of Sardica, and died about 355. He is described by Jerome (*de Vir.*

Illust. c. 90) as a clear and elegant writer, and the author of commentaries on St. Matthew, St. John, the Epistles, and the Psalter. Balthasar Corderius published a commentary on the Psalter in Greek and Latin, at Antwerp in 1643, which he supposed to be that of Theodorus. Garnier however proved it to be a compilation; cf. *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* for a fuller account of this matter, and references there given. Fragments of his other writings are in Combefis.; *Biblioth. Concionat.*; cf Montf. *Palaeog. Graec.* p. 317; Fabricius, *Bib. Graec.* s. v. [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS, Arian bishop of Heraclea, and afterwards of Antioch. [DOROTHEUS (6).]

THEODORUS (19), bishop of Iconium in cent. vi. He wrote the Acts of Cyricus and Julitta [JULITTA (1)]. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* i. 1071; *Analecta Bollandiana* 1882, t. i. p. 193.) [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (20), alleged bishop of Lauriacum (Lorch) on the Enns, addressed in a spurious letter of pope Symmachus (A.D. 498–514). Symmachus declares he is sending him the pall as archbishop in token that Lauriacum should be the metropolis of Pannonia (Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.* p. 934, *Lit. Spur.* ccv.) [F. D.]

THEODORUS (21), bishop of Lilybaeum in A.D. 593. Gregory the Great wrote to him, commending his watchful supervision over the lives of his clergy, and exhorting him to continue it. (*Epp.* iii. 50.) From two other letters of Gregory, it appears he died about the end of the next year. (*Epp.* v. 27, vi. 13.) [F. D.]

THEODORUS (22), ST., 9th bishop of Marseilles, between St. Honorius, or Emeterius, if he belonged to this diocese, and St. Serenus (circ. A.D. 575–594) was, according to Gregory of Tours, who was personally acquainted with, and goes so far as to ascribe miraculous power to him, a man of eminent sanctity, and assiduous in prayer. His episcopate, however, was a very troubled one. During a considerable portion of it, the possession of Marseilles was being contested by king Guntram and his nephew Childebert. Theodorus sided with the latter, and in consequence suffered much persecution from Guntram and his agents, and from a turbulent and rapacious body of clergy, who took advantage of their bishop's enforced absence to plunder the church property. He was several times dragged from his diocese and imprisoned, and once at least loaded with chains. The king's wrath against him culminated when in 582 Gundovald the pretender landed at Marseilles, and was assisted in his attempt by Theodorus. Three years later, in spite of the intercession of Childebert, he was forcibly brought before the 2nd council of Mâcon to answer for his conduct towards Guntram. Apparently, however, he was not condemned, probably owing to the illness which seized Guntram, and his name appears amongst the subscriptions. He was allowed to return, and henceforth appears to have led a more peaceable life in his diocese, where he was beloved by the people for his charity and the devotion he manifested during a pestilence. There is a tradition that he discovered the bodies of St. Defendens and his companions, a portion of the Legio Thebaea, supposed to have suffered martyrdom at Marseilles, and built a church in their honour (cf. Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. i. 80). He lived till at least 591, in which year Gregory the Great wrote to him and Vigilius of Arles forbidding the forcible baptism of the Jews, who were numerous at Marseilles, and directing that they should be led to receive Christianity by gentle means. His day of commemoration is Jan. 2, and a modern church bears his name at Marseilles. (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* vi. 11, 24; viii. 12, 13, 20; ix. 22; Greg. Magn. *Epist.* i. 47. *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 509; Mansi, ix. 957, 960; Ricard, *Evêques de Marseille*, 22, 23; Magnan, *Vies des SS. de Marseille.*) [S. A. B.]

THEODORUS of Martigny; *vid.* of Sion.

THEODORUS (23), bishop of Melitene in Armenia. He presented a petition to the sixth General Council—praying them not to condemn either the Monothelites or their opponents. This petition was rejected, as he was illiterate, and evidently only the tool of Peter of Nicomedia, Stephen, abbat of Antioch, and some other friends of Macarius (Mansi, xi. 339; Hefele's *Councils*, sec. 317; Ceill. xii. 948–950). [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (24), bishop of Milan, c. 480–490, is the last of the twelve bishops beginning with St. Ambrose, in praise of whom Ennodius wrote epigrams (Ennodius, *Carm.* ii. 88, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 351). [F. D.]

THEODORUS (25) I., bishop of Mopsuestia. He attended the council of Antioch, at which Paul of Samosata was deposed in 269 (Labbe, i. 891, 901), and may therefore probably be identified with a bishop of that name, who joined in the encyclical against Paul's heresies and immoralities (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30). [E. V.]

THEODORUS (26), bishop of Mopsuestia: also known from the place of his birth and presbyterate as Theodore of Antioch (Ἀντιοχεύς, Phot. *bibl.* codd. 4, 38, 177 [in 177 the margin of the oldest MS. adds, ὁ Μοψουεστίας ἐστιν, ὡς ἀπό τινων ἐπιστολῶν ἐμάθομεν]: so the *catenae*, *passim*); by the Nestorians commonly styled "the interpreter" (ܡܦܫܩܢܐ); the most prominent representative of the middle Antiochian school of hermeneutics.

I. *Life and work.* Theodore was born at Antioch in or about the year 350 (Fritzsche, *de Th. M. vit. et scr.* p. 1–4, where the chronology of his life is fully investigated; cf. Kihn, *Theodor u. Junilius*, p. 39, n. 1). His father, whose name is unknown, held an official position at Antioch, and the family was wealthy (Chrys. *ad Th. laps.* ii. in Migne, *P. G.* xlvii. 209, *φροντίζεις πραγμάτων πατρῴων*: *infra*, *οὐκ ἀξίας ἣν μνηστεύσαι πατρικῆς, οὐ πλοῦτον ἐν τῷ νῷ λαβεῖν*). Theodore's cousin, Paeanius, to whom several of Chrysostom's letters are addressed (*Epp.* 95. 193, 204, 220, in Migne, lii.) held an important post of civil government; his brother Polychronius [POLYCHRONIUS (3)] became bishop of the metropolitan see of Apamea. Young Theodore first comes to light as the early companion and friend of John, afterwards known as Chrysostom, Theodore's fellow-townsman, his equal in rank, and but two or three years his

senior in age. Together with their common friend Maximus, afterwards bishop of Isaurian Seleucia [MAXIMUS (12)], John and Theodore attended the lectures of the sophist Libanius (*συμφοιτητὰς ὄντας παρὰ τῷ σοφιστῇ Λιβανίῳ*, Socr. vi. 3, cf. Soz. viii. 1), who had returned to Antioch a few years before, and was then in the zenith of his fame. Theodore may also have shared with Chrysostom the instructions of the philosopher Andragathius (Socr., Soz., ll. cc.; Phot. cod. 96; cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xii. 434; Kihn rejects this inference as baseless); we have at any rate the assurance of Sozomen, that he enjoyed a philosophical education (*l. c.* *παιδείας ῥητόρων τε καὶ φιλοσόφων ἱκανὸς ἐπιστήμων*). Chrysostom credits his friend with great attention to these studies (*ἡ περὶ τὴν ἔξωθεν σοφίαν σπουδή*); but the luxurious life of polite Antioch seems to have received an equal share of his thoughts (*ἐδεσμάτων τρυφή, πολυτέλεια ἐσθῆτος, πᾶς τύφος*). When Chrysostom himself had been reclaimed from the pleasures of the world by the influence of Basil, he succeeded in winning over Maximus and Theodore to the same mind. The three friends turned their backs upon Libanius, and sought a retreat in the monastic school (*ἀσκητήριον*) of Carterius and Diodorus [CARTERIUS (5); DIODORUS (3)], to which Basil was already attached. Whether Theodore had been previously baptized is doubtful; Chrysostom however speaks of him shortly afterwards in terms which seem to imply his baptism (*ad Th. laps.*: *ὁ ναὸς* [*τῆς σῆς ψυχῆς*] . . . *τῇ τοῦ πνεύματος ἀπέστιλβε πνεύματι*). In any case he gave himself to the new learning with characteristic energy. His days, as his friend testifies, were spent in reading, his nights in prayer; he fasted long, he lay on the bare ground, he practised every form of ascetic self-discipline; he was full withal of light-hearted joy, as having found the service of Christ to be perfect freedom (Chrys. *l. c.*: *ὅλαι μὲν εἰς ἀνάγνωσιν ἡμέραι, ὅλαι δὲ εἰς εὐχὰς ἀνηλίσκοντο νύκτες . . . νηστείας τε συνεχεῖς καὶ χαμευνίας καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἄσκησιν . . . οἶσθα πόσης εὐφροσύνης ἀπέλαυες καὶ χαρᾶς· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐλεύθερος ἀλλ' ἢ μόνος ὁ τῷ Χριστῷ ζῶν*). His conversion was speedy, sincere, and marvellously complete (*τίς γάρ σου τὴν ὀξεῖαν καὶ εἰλικρινῆ καὶ ζέουσαν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀγαθὰ μετάθεσιν οὐκ ἐθαύμασεν;*); but it was followed by a reaction which threatened to bring about an utter collapse of the young man's new-found life. He had but just resigned himself to the life of a celibate (Chrys. *l. c.*: *ἅμα τῷ πρὸς αὐτὸν* [sc. *τὸν πονηρὸν*] *ἀποδύσασθαι ὑπεσκέλισε . . . ἄρτι γάρ σοι ἐκπλέοντι . . . ὁ δεινὸς ἐπέθετο πειρατής . . . τὸν βραχὺν ἐκεῖνον χρόνον ἀνακύψαι τῶν κυμάτων ἠθέλησας*), when he was fascinated by the beauty of a girl named Hermione (Chrys. *ad Th. laps.* i., Migne, xlvii. p. 297: *οἶδα ὅτι θαυμάζεις τὴν Ἑρμιόνης ὥραν νῦν καὶ τῆς εὐμορφίας ἐκείνης οὐδὲν ὅμοιον κρίνεις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἶναι*), and contemplated marriage, at the same time returning to his former manner of life (Soz. viii. 2). His "fall," for so it was regarded by his brother ascetics, spread consternation through the little society. Many were the prayers offered and the efforts made for his recovery. "Valerius, Florentius, Porphyrius, and many others," laboured to restore him; and the anxiety of the moment drew forth from Chrysostom the earliest of his literary compositions—two[a] letters "to Theodore upon his fall." The second letter reveals at once the strength of John's affection, and the greatness of the character[b] in which at that early age he had already found so much to love. Theodore was not yet twenty (*οὔπω εἰκοστὸν ἄγεις ἔτος*), when the prospect of his being lost to the church excited such deep and general grief.

The prayers and tears of his friends or the eloquent appeal of Chrysostom prevailed, and Theodore remained constant to his vows (Soz. *l. c.*), although it may be that the disappointment left its traces in his after-life. His writings are characterized by a certain coldness and dryness of manner, such as might naturally proceed from an early blighting of the affections; and his subsequent attitude upon the vexed question of second marriages (cf. *Comm. in* 1 Tim. iii. 2, iv. 3, v. 15) betrays a marked sympathy with those of his brethren who preferred the married state.

For the next ten years of Theodore's life we have no materials beyond the statement of Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 39: *οὗτος τῆς μὲν Διοδώρου τοῦ πάνυ διδασκαλίας ἀπήλαυσεν, Ἰωάννου δὲ τοῦ θειοτάτου γεγένηται κοινωνός τε καὶ συνεργός* [one MS. has *συμφοιτητής*]· *κοινῇ γὰρ τῶν πνευματικῶν Διοδώρου ναμάτων ἀπήλαυον*. Chrysostom's connexion with Diodore was probably broken off in the year 374, when he plunged into a more complete monastic seclusion; Theodore's seems to have continued until the elevation of his master to the see of Tarsus A.D. 378. It was doubtless during this period that the foundations were laid of Theodore's acquaintance with holy scripture and ecclesiastical doctrine. It was then that he was imbued for life with the principles of scriptural interpretation which Diodore had inherited from an earlier generation of Antiochians; and with the peculiar views of the Person of Christ into which the master had been led by his antagonism to Apollinarius. The latter years of this decade witnessed Theodore's first appearance as a writer. He began with a commentary on the Psalms, in which the method of Diodore was exaggerated, and which he lived to repent of (Fac. iii. 6, x. 1; v. infra, § III.). The orthodox at Antioch, it seems, resented the loss of the traditional Messianic interpretation, and if we may trust Hesychius, the young successor of Diodore was compelled to promise that he would commit his maiden work to the flames, an engagement from which he contrived however to escape (Mansi, ix. 284: "igni sua commentaria simulans tradere malitiose abscondere illecebram conabatur").

Gennadius (*de viris illustr.* 12) represents Theodore as a presbyter of the church of Antioch; and from a letter of John of Antioch (Fac. ii. 2), we gather that forty-five years elapsed between his ordination and his death ("xlv. annos clara in doctrina praefulsit"). It seems therefore that he was ordained priest at Antioch A.D. 383, in the thirty-third year of his age, the ordaining bishop being doubtless Flavian,

---

[a] With regard to the reference of the first of these letters to Theodore of Mopsuestia, which was denied by Tillemont, see Fritzsche, p. 8, n. 3.

[b] Cf. *ad Th. laps.* i. *τὸν γὰρ κόσμον τῆς διανοίας τῆς σῆς . . . εἴ τις ὅτε ἔλαμπεν ᾔδει καλῶς οὐκ ἂν ἐστέναξε, κ.τ.λ.*

Diodore's old friend and fellow-labourer, whose "loving disciple" Theodore now became (John of Antioch, *ap.* Fac. *l. c*). The epithet seems to imply that Theodore was an attached adherent of the Meletian party; but there is no evidence that he mixed himself up with the miserable feuds which, for some years after Flavian's consecration, continued to distract the Catholics of Antioch. His literary and theological instincts may have saved him from this kind of controversy. His mind was given to the more serious task of expounding scripture and refuting heresy. Theodore's great treatise on the incarnation (Gennad. *l. c.*) belongs to this period of his life, possibly also more than one of his commentaries on the Old Testament. As a preacher he seems to have attained some eminence at this time in the field of polemics (Fac. viii. 4: "agebat Theodorus frequenter . . . sermonibus in populum contra Synusiastas"); but from A.D. 386 the pulpit of Antioch must have been chiefly in the hands of his friend John Chrysostom, who was ordained priest in that year, and at once rose to the full height of his oratorical powers. Whether it was that he felt himself eclipsed by the rise of this greater light, or that the visit of Diodore to Antioch in the same year revived his old affection for his master, Theodore appears to have left Antioch while yet a priest and betaken himself to Tarsus. So at least we are informed by Hesychius of Jerusalem (Mansi, ix. 248). At Tarsus he remained till 392, when the see of Mopsuestia falling vacant by the death of its bishop, Olympius, he was consecrated to it, probably through the influence and by the hands of Diodore. In this position he spent the thirty-six remaining years of his life (Theodoret. *l. c.* ἓξ δὲ καὶ τριάκοντα ἐν τῇ προεδρίᾳ διετέλεσεν ἔτη). A story is told by Leontius of an attempt made by Theodore to get himself translated to Tarsus upon the death of Diodore, which followed within a year or two after his appointment to Mopsuestia; and how the design was frustrated by the intervention of Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria (Migne, lxxxvi. 1364: τοῦτον . . . φασὶν ἁρπάσαι θελήσαντα τὸν τῆς Κιλίκων ὀφθαλμὸν τὴν Ταρσόν, ἐπειδὴ . . . Διόδωρος τὸν τῇδε μετήλλαξε βίον, ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων Θεόφιλος κωλύει τοῦ τολμήματος· πρὸς αὐτὸν γὰρ ἐστείλαντο πρεσβείαν οἱ τυραννούμενοι). But it will be observed that Leontius does not venture to vouch for the truth of this tale, which indeed bears upon its face the marks of improbability.

Mopsuestia (Μόψου ἑστία [cf. Μόψου κρήνη], Strab. xiv. 5; Phot. *codd.* 176, 186 [Mopsos, Plin. v. 22]; Μοψόυεστία, or Μομψουεστία; Syr. ܡܘܦܣܘܐܣܛܝܐ [Cowper, *Anal. Nic.* p. 11], or ܡܘܦܣܘܝܣܛܝܐ [Assemani, i. 400]; Lat. *Mompsuestia*, *Mampsuestia*, *Mamista*, *Mapsista*; in Mercator, or his MSS., the adjectives are *Mamsuestinus*, *Mansuestenus*, *Mamsistenus*, but Facundus has uniformly *Mopsuestenus*) was a free town (Pliny) upon the Pyramus, between Tarsus and Issus, some forty miles distant from either, and twelve from the sea. It belonged to the ecclesiastical province of Cilicia Secunda, of which the metropolitan see was Anazarbus. In the 4th century Mopsuestia was a place of some importance, and famous for its bridge, which had been thrown over the Pyramus by the emperor Constantine. It is now an insignificant town under the name of Mensis, or Messis. (DICT. OF GEOGR. II. 370).

Theodore's long episcopate was marked by no striking incidents. His letters, long known to the Nestorians of Syria as the "Book of Pearls," and doubtless invaluable as a treasure of materials for the history of his life, are lost, or inaccessible; his friends and followers have left us few personal recollections. In the year 394 he was present with Flavian at a synod held at Constantinople to decide a question which concerned the see of Bostra in the patriarchate of Antioch (Mansi, iii. 851; cf. Hefele, ii. 406). It was probably on this occasion that Theodore preached before the emperor Theodosius I., then on the point of starting for his last journey to the west, where he died in the January of 395. The fame of the bishop of Mopsuestia had preceded him, and the emperor desired to hear him. The sermon made a deep impression, and Theodosius, who had sat at the feet of St. Ambrose and St. Gregory of Nazianzus, declared that he had never met with such a teacher ("nec arbitratus est alterum se talem comperisse doctorem," John of Antioch, *ap.* Fac. ii. 2). The younger Theodosius inherited his grandfather's respect for Theodore, and often honoured him with correspondence (*ib.* "jam vero et a vestro imperio . . . ei saepius testatum est, et vestris litteris honoratus est"). Another glimpse of Theodore's episcopal life is supplied by a letter addressed to him by Chrysostom when the latter was an exile at Cucusus (A.D. 404–7). The letter, which exists both in the original (Chrys. *ep.* 212; Migne, 52, 668) and in the Latin of Facundus (vii. 7), shews that neither the successes nor the troubles of his old friend had diminished the strength of Theodore's regard for him, and that Chrysostom retained to the end his early affection and admiration for Theodore. The exiled patriarch expresses his eager desire to cross the mountain barrier which separated him from Cilicia Secunda, and his words seem to imply that he had received an invitation from Theodore to do so. He "can never forget the love of Theodore, so genuine and warm, so sincere and guileless, a love maintained from early years, and manifested but now." Chrysostom had sought through Paeanius the aid of Theodore (*ep.* 204), probably his intercession with the emperor, and he thanks him profoundly for frequent though ineffectual efforts to obtain his release. No titles of honour, no terms of affection, seem too strong to be lavished on his friend. Finally, he assures Theodore that, "exile as he is, he reaps no ordinary consolation from having such a treasure, such a mine of wealth within his heart[e] as the love of so vigilant and noble a soul." Higher testimony could not have been borne, or by a more competent judge; and so damaging was it felt to be to the cause of Theodore's enemies that at the fifth council efforts were vainly made to deny the identity of Chrysostom's correspondent with the bishop of Mopsuestia.

It seems to be beyond doubt that, notwithstanding his literary activity, Theodore worked

[e] Fac. *l. c.* "in Cilicia," as if he had read ἐν Κιλικίᾳ for ἐν καρδίᾳ. Cf. Migne, *P. G.* lvi. 517.

conscientiously and zealously for the good of his diocese. The famous letter of Ibas (Mansi, vii. 247; Fac. vii. 7) testifies that he converted Mopsuestia to the truth (τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν ἐκ τῆς πλάνης εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπιστρέψαντα), *i. e.* that he extinguished Arianism and other heresies there. Several of his works are doubtless monuments of these pastoral labours, *e. g.* the catechetical lectures, the ecthesis, and possibly also the treatise on Persian Magic.[d] Yet even in his lifetime the episcopal work of Theodore was by no means simply that of a diocesan bishop. Everywhere he was regarded as "the herald of the truth and the doctor of the church;" "even distant churches received instruction from him." So boasts Ibas to Maris, and his letter was read without a dissentient voice at the council of Chalcedon (Fac. ii. 1, sq.). Theodore "expounded Scripture in all the churches of the East," says John of Antioch (Fac. ii. 2), with a touch, perhaps, of Oriental exaggeration. The latter writer adds that in his lifetime Theodore was never arraigned by any of the orthodox (*ib.* "nullum alicubi detractionem ab orthodoxis in vita suscipiens."). Even Leontius writes of Diodore and Theodore, Οὐδεὶς ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτῶν ἐπελάβετό τινος αὐτῶν. But as far as Theodore is concerned these statements are inexact, John and Leontius themselves being witnesses. In a letter to Nestorius (Fac. x. 2) the former begs him to retract, urging the example of Theodore, who, when in a sermon at Antioch he had said something which gave great and manifest offence, for the sake of peace and to avoid scandal after a few days as publicly corrected himself. Leontius tells us (Migne, lxxxvi. 1363) that the cause of the offence was a denial to the Blessed Virgin of the title θεοτόκος. So great was the storm raised by this incident that the people threatened to stone the preacher (Cyril. Alex. *Ep.* 69; Migne, lxxvii. 340). The heretical sects who were attacked by Theodore showed their resentment in a way less overt, but perhaps more formidable. They tampered with his writings, with the view of involving him in heterodox statements (Fac. x. 1). His greatness was thus not without its drawbacks, and he seems to allude to them when, commenting on Phil. i. 15, 16, he remarks: "No one will wonder to find St. Paul thus dealt with, if he has himself suffered from the envy of others."

Theodore's last years were perplexed by a new controversy. When in 418 the Pelagian leaders found themselves deposed from their offices and exiled from the West, they not unnaturally betook themselves to the East, and sought the sympathy of the chief living representative of the school of Antioch. The fact is recorded by Marius Mercator, who makes the most of it: *praef. ad Symb. Th. Mop.* 72. "Julianum ... secutum esse Theodorum, ad quem peragratis terris et exarato mari atque oriente lustrato cum sociis et participibus et συνταλαιπώροις suis magno nisu tamquam ad Christianorum dogmatum praedicatum magistrum tetendit." With Theodore they probably remained till 422, when Julian returned to Italy. Julian's visit was doubtless the occasion upon which Theodore wrote his book "Against the defenders of original sin." Mercator lays Theodore under the odious charge of having turned against Julian as soon as the latter had left Mopsuestia, and anathematized him in a provincial synod (*ib. praef.* 3). The synod can hardly be a fabrication, since Mercator was a contemporary writer; but it was very possibly convened, as Fritzsche suggests, without any special reference to the Pelagian question. If Theodore took advantage of the occasion to clear himself from the suspicion of heterodoxy by reading his ecthesis, the anathema with which the document ends might have been represented outside the council as a synodical condemnation of the Pelagian chiefs. Mercator's words, in fact, point to this explanation.

A greater heresiarch than Julian visited Mopsuestia in the last year of Theodore's life. It is stated by Evagrius (*Hist. Eccl.* i. 2; Migne, lxxxvi. 2425) that Nestorius, on his way from Antioch to Constantinople (A.D. 428), took counsel with Theodore and received from him the seeds of heresy which he shortly afterwards scattered with such disastrous results. Evagrius makes this statement on the authority of one Theodulus, a person otherwise unknown. We may safely reject it, so far as it derives the Christology of Nestorius from this single interview. The germ of the Nestorian doctrine had existed in the teaching of Diodore, and in the earliest works of Theodore; it could not have been new to Nestorius, as a prominent teacher of the church of Antioch.

Toward the close of the year 428 (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 39) Theodore died, worn out by fifty years (Fac. ii. 2) of literary and pastoral toil (Hesychius: "senectute cana debilitatus"). He had attained the age of 78, and had been all his life engaged in controversy, and more than once in conflict with the popular notions of orthodoxy; yet he departed, as Facundus (ii. 1) triumphantly points out, in the peace of the church, and in the height of a great reputation. The storm was gathering, but it did not break till he was gone. *Felix non vitae tantum claritate, sed etiam opportunitate mortis!*

II. *Posthumous History.*

The popularity of Theodore was increased by his death. Meletius, who succeeded him at Mopsuestia, protested that his own life would have been in danger if he had uttered a word against his predecessor (Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xii. p. 442). "We believe as Theodore believed; long live the faith of Theodore," was a cry often heard in the churches of the East (Cyril. Alex. *Ep.* 69). "We had rather be burnt than condemn Theodore," was the reply of the bishops of Syria to the party who were eager for his condemnation (*Ep.* 72). The flame was fed by leading men who had been disciples of the Interpreter; by Theodoret, who regarded him as a "Doctor of the Universal Church" (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 39); by Ibas of Edessa, who in 433 wrote his famous letter to Maris in praise of Theodore; by John, who in the year following Theodore's death succeeded to the see of Antioch, and whose unbounded admiration for the great Antiochian has been noticed more than once. Yet Theo-

[d] A *madrascha*, or hymn occasionally sung in the night office of the Nestorian churches, relates that Theodore converted the pagans of his diocese from idolatry (Bickell, *consp. rei Syr. liter.* p. 102).

dore's ashes were scarcely cold, when in other quarters men began to hold up his name to obloquy. As early perhaps as the year 431 Marius Mercator denounced him as the real author of the Pelagian heresy (*Lib. subnot. in verba Juliani, praef.*, Migne, *P. L.* xlviii. 110); and not long afterwards he prefaced his translation of Theodore's ecthesis with a still more violent attack on its author as the precursor of Nestorianism (*ib.* pp. 208, 1046, 1048). The council of Ephesus however, while it condemned Nestorius by name, contented itself with condemning Theodore's creed, without mentioning Theodore; and the Nestorian party consequently fell back upon the works of Theodore, and began to circulate them in several languages as affording the best available exposition of their views (Liberatus, *Brev.* 10). This circumstance deepened the mistrust of the orthodox, and even in the East there were not wanting some who proceeded to condemn the teaching of Theodore. Hesychius of Jerusalem, about A.D. 435, attacked him in his Ecclesiastical History; Rabulas, bishop of Edessa, who at Ephesus had sided with John of Antioch, now openly anathematized Theodore in the church (Ibas, *Ep. ad Marin.*). Proclus demanded from the bishops of Syria a condemnation of certain propositions supposed to have been drawn from the writings of Theodore. Cyril, who had once spoken favourably of some of Theodore's works (Fac. viii. 6), now under the influence of Rabulas took a decided attitude of opposition; he wrote to the synod of Antioch (*Ep.* 67) that the opinions of Diodore, Theodore, and others of the same school, had "borne down with full sail upon the glory of Christ"; to the emperor (*Ep.* 71), that Diodore and Theodore were the parents of the blasphemy of Nestorius; to Proclus (*Ep.* 72), that had Theodore been still alive, and openly approved of the teaching of Nestorius, he ought undoubtedly to have been anathematized; but as he had gone to his account (ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀπεδήμησε πρὸς Θεόν), it was enough to condemn the errors of his books, having regard to the terrible disturbances which more extreme measures would excite in the East. At the same time he collected and answered a series of propositions gathered from the writings of Diodore and Theodore (Migne, xxvi. 1438, sq.), a work to which Theodoret replied shortly afterwards. The ferment then subsided for a time, but the disciples of Theodore, repulsed in the West, pushed their way from Eastern Syria to Persia. Ibas, who succeeded Rabulas in 435, restored the school of Edessa, and it continued to be a nursery of Theodore's theology till it was suppressed by Zeno, A.D. 489. At Nisibis Barsumas, a devoted adherent of the party, held the office of bishop from 435 to 489. Upon the suppression of the school of Edessa, Nisibis became the seat of the Antiochian exegesis and theology. The Persian kings favoured a movement which was distasteful to the empire; and Persia was henceforth the headquarters of Nestorianism. Among the Nestorians of Persia the writings of Theodore were regarded as the standard both of doctrine and of interpretation,* and the Persian church ventured to return the censures of the orthodox by pronouncing an anathema on all who opposed or rejected them (cf. Assemani, iii. i. 84; and for a full account of the spread of Theodore's opinions at Edessa and Nisibis, see the investigations of Kihn, *Theodor u. Junilius*, pp. 198–209, 333–336). At a later period the school of Nisibis reacted on the West, and the influence, though not the name, of Theodore appears in the *Instituta Regularia* of Junilius Africanus, and in the *De Institutione Divinarum Literarum* of Cassiodorus (Kihn, p. 209 sq.).

The 6th century witnessed another and final outbreak of the bitter hatred which had pursued Theodore into the grave. One hundred and twenty-five years after his death the fifth general council, under the influence of the emperor Justinian, pronounced the anathema which Theodosius had refused to sanction, and which even Cyril shrank from uttering. A *brutum fulmen* as far as the offender was concerned, it was by no means such in reference to the peace of Christendom. The condemnation of Theodore and his two supporters shook the fabric of the Catholic church. It had another effect. This is not the place to enter upon the history of the "Three Chapters," which has been dealt with in these pages already [JUSTINIAN I.; CO. OF CONSTANTINOPLE (27) in DICT. OF CHRIST. ANTIQ.] But we may stop to point out one result of Justinian's policy. The West, Africa more especially, rebelled against a decree which seemed to set at nought the authority of the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and at the same time violated the sanctity of the dead. It was from no particular interest in Theodore's doctrine or method of interpretation that the African bishops espoused his cause. Bishop Pontianus plainly told the emperor, that he had asked them to condemn men of whose writings they knew nothing (Migne, *P. L.* lxvii. 997). But the stir about Theodore led to enquiry; his works, or portions of them, were translated and circulated in the West. It is almost certainly to this cause that we owe the preservation in a Latin dress of at least one-half of Theodore's commentaries on St. Paul. Published under the name of St. Ambrose, the work of the condemned heretic passed from Africa into Europe, found shelter in the monastic libraries of the West, was copied into the compilations of Rabanus Maurus, and others, and both in its fuller and in its abridged form supplied the Middle Ages with an accepted interpretation of an important part of Holy Scripture. The name of Theodore, however, disappears almost entirely from Western Church literature after the 6th century. It was scarcely before the present century that justice was done by Western writers to the importance of the great Antiochian as a theologian, an expositor, and a precursor of later thought.

III. *Literary Remains.*

Facundus (x. 4) speaks of Theodore's "innumerable books"; John of Antioch, in a letter quoted by Facundus (ii. 2), describes his polemical works as alone numbering "decem millia" (*i.e.* μυρία), an exaggeration of course, but based on fact. A catalogue of such of his writings as were once extant in Syriac translations is given by Ebedjesu, Nestorian metropolitan of

* For the judgment of the Nestorians upon the expository worth of Theodore's commentaries, see the extracts in Assemani, III. 2, pp. 235, 342, 448.

Soba, A.D. 1318 (J. S. Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* iii. i. p. 30 sq.). These Syriac translations filled forty-one "tomes." Of this mass of literature only a single work remains in its integrity; the rest have perished or have reached us in a more or less fragmentary form.

We divide Theodore's reputed works into four classes — (A) exegetical, (B) controversial, (C) practical, pastoral and liturgical, (D) spurious and doubtful.

(A) Exegetical Writings.—i. *Old Testament.*

(*a*) *Historical Books.* — A commentary on Genesis is cited by Cosmas Indicopleustes, John Philoponus, and Photius (*Cod.* 3, 8: *οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ ἑρμηνεία τῆς κτίσεως*. It occurs, also, in Ebedjesu's list (ܦܘܫܩ ܗܘܝܐ ܕܒܪܝܬܐ). Fragments of the Greek original survive in the catena of Nicephorus (Lips. 1772), and in the Burney MS. 34. Latin fragments are found in the Acts of the second council of Constantinople ("ex libro viii. commenti de creatura"), and in the *Constitutum* of Vigilius (58–61); and an important collection of Syriac fragments from the Nitrian MSS. of the British Museum has been published by Dr. E. Sachau (*Th. Mops. fragmenta Syriaca*, Lips. 1869, pp. 1–21.)[f]

Photius criticizes the style of this work in words more or less applicable to all the remains of Theodore: *τὴν φράσιν οὔτε λαμπρὸς οὔτε λίαν σαφής . . . ταυτολογεῖ τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ ἄχαρίς πως καὶ ἀηδὴς εἶναι δοκεῖ.* He notices the writer's opposition to the allegorical method of interpretation (*φεύγων τὸν δυνατὸν αὐτῷ τρόπον τῆς ἀλληγορίας καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ποιούμενος*). Ebedjesu was struck by the care and elaboration bestowed upon the work (ܥܡܠܐ ܪܒܐ ܘܬܘܪܐ).

The catenae contain fragments attributed to Theodore upon the remaining books of the Pentateuch and the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings (Mai, *Scr. Vet. Nov. Coll.* i. *praef.* p. xxi.). Some of these (on Exodus and Leviticus) are in the published catena of Nicephorus (pp. 603, 821, 834, 843, 857, 163). Ebedjesu mentions only a "tome" on Samuel. Theodore is stated by Leontius (Migne, lxxxvi. 1368) to have rejected the two books of Chronicles, and there is no trace of any comments upon them bearing his name.

(*b*) *Poetical Books.*—We learn from Ebedjesu that Theodore's commentary on Job was dedicated to St. Cyril of Alexandria. Of all his works it seems to have been the least worthy of this dedication. Leontius with more than usual justice describes it as *τὴν κατὰ τοῦ Ἰὼβ βίβλον.* Only four fragments survive (Mansi, ix. p. 223 sq.),[g] but they are sufficient to justify the censure pronounced upon the work by the Fifth Council. Theodore holds fast by the historical character of Job, but regards him as traduced by the author of the book, whom he considers to have been a pagan Edomite. He gives his reason for this strange theory, one of them being the name assigned to Job's third daughter, קֶרֶן־הַפּוּךְ, which the LXX. render *Ἀμαλθείας κέρας.* Accepting this rendering without enquiry, although both Aquila and Symmachus, who transliterate *Καρναφούκ*, might have taught him better, the Interpreter sees in it a vain display of pagan learning, which marks the non-Israelitish origin of the writer.

The Book of Psalms was the earliest field of Theodore's hermeneutical labours, as we learn from his own testimony (ap. Fac. iii. 6; cf. Hesych. Hierosol. in Mansi, ix. 248). The printed fragments, Greek and Latin, are considerable, filling some twenty-five columns in Migne. The Latin are from the acts of the Fifth Council (Mansi, ix. 212 sq.), and from Facundus (ix. 1); the Greek were first collected by Corderius in his *Catena Patr. Graec. in Psalmos* (Antwerp, 1643) and Mai (*Bibl. Nov. Patr.* Rom. 1854; t. vii. 390 sq.). Others possibly survive in MS. catenae; see Mai, *l. c.* and Fritzsche, p. 21.[h]

That his first literary adventure was hasty and premature was frankly acknowledged by Theodore himself; Fac. *l. c.*: "Non autem quantam oportuerat habuimus circa istam rem diligentiam; passi enim sumus quaecunque incipientes, ut evenit, in imperitia scribendi constituti." His zeal for the historical method of interpretation led him to deny the application to Christ of all but three or four of the Psalms which were usually regarded as Messianic. The case is over-stated by his enemies; Leontius (Migne, lxxxvi. 1266) says: *τοὺς πάντας ψαλμοὺς Ἰουδαϊκῶς τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ζοροβάβελ καὶ Ἐζεκίαν ἀνέθηκεν τρεῖς μόνους τῷ κυρίῳ προσρίψας*, a charge which is thus amplified by Hesychius of Jerusalem (*l. c.*): "codicem in prophetiam Psalmorum conscripsit, omnes de Domino praedictiones abnegantem." But it appears to be true that Theodore allowed a directly Messianic application only to Ps. ii. viii. xlv. cx.;[i] the rest he treated as either (*a*) simply historical, or (*b*) ethical, or (*c*) prophetical of events in the Jewish history of the Maccabean period (cf. Fritzsche, pp. 32–35). Leontius adds that Theodore rejected the titles of the Psalms, and Theodoret (*praef. ad Pss.* *τὰς ἐπιγραφὰς τῶν ψαλμῶν ψευδεῖς τινες ἀπεκάλεσαν*: cf. his remarks on the heading of Ps. xxvi.) hints as much. The statement seems to be further verified by the fact, that his comments are often at issue with them (v. Fritzsche, p. 32).

No fragments have hitherto been discovered

[f] Khayyath (*Syri orientales*, p. 144) mentions a MS. which contains *scholia* from various sources, including Theodore, on the whole of the O. T.

[g] A few jottings from this commentary have recently appeared in Hoffmann's *Opusc. Nestor.* p. 118.

[h] A Syriac MS. now in the possession of Dr. Sachau professes to give, *inter alia*, a translation in full of this commentary; but upon being submitted to examination it has been found to consist partly of brief excerpts from Theodore, partly of an original exposition. The MS. commentary is moreover based upon the Peshito, not upon the LXX., as Theodore's work had been. A full account of the MS. and of its contents will be found in the *Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft*, 1885 (1), pp. 53–101.

[i] Comp. the words of his follower Cosmos Indicopleustes (Migne, 88, 258): *ἰδικῶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ δεσπότου τοὺς τέσσαρας τούτους ψαλμοὺς* [*sc.* *τὸν β′ καὶ τὸν η′ καὶ τὸν μδ′ καὶ τὸν ρθ′*, *supr.* p. 249.] *ἠξιώθη προειπεῖν καὶ συντάξαι· τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους πάντας εἰς ἑτέρων προσώπων ἢ πραγμάτων ἢ ἱστοριῶν, κοινωφελῆ διδασκαλίαν τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐκτιθέμενος.*

of the commentary on Ecclesiastes, which Ebedjesu counts among the Syriac translations. From the remains of the commentary on Job, it appears that Theodore expressly denied the higher inspiration of both the sapiential books of Solomon (fragm. 1 in fol.: "Proverbia et Ecclesiastica . . . ipse ex sua persona ad aliorum utilitatem composuit, cum prophetiae gratiam non accepisset, prudentiae vero gratiam"). Of the Canticles he writes in terms of positive contempt (Mansi, ix. 225). No commentary on this book is assigned to him by Ebedjesu, and the extracts preserved in the acts of the Fifth Council (Mansi, ix. 225 sq.), are possibly taken from a letter to a friend who sought information as to the character of the Song (Fritzsche, pp. 61, 62): compare, however, the statements of Leontius (Migne, lxxxvi. 1366), and of pope Pelagius II. (*Ep.* 3). If an exposition was written it was probably suppressed by the influence of Theodoret, who without naming the author promptly rebuked the outrage which had been committed upon Christian feeling (*praef. in Cant.*). Theodore's view of the Book is sufficiently expressed in the fragments already referred to. On the one hand he endeavours to guard it from imputations of immodesty, on the other he expressly denies its spiritual character. It is merely the epithalamium of Pharaoh's daughter (cf. *μέλαινα . . . μεμελανωμένη*, *Cant.* i. 5, 6), a relic of Solomon's lighter poetry, affording an insight into his domestic life. For this reason, he adds, it had never been read in public, either by the synagogue or by the church.

(c) *Prophetical Books.*—A commentary on the four greater prophets is in Ebedjesu's list; but one or two inedited fragments alone remain to us. On the other hand, the commentary on the minor prophets has been preserved and published in its integrity. It was first printed from two Vatican MSS. by Mai, *Scr. Vet. Nov. Coll.* I. ii. 41–104; VI. i. 1–293 (Rome, 1825–32); and shortly afterwards by Wegnern from two Vienna MSS. of greatly inferior age, and apparently derived from the older of the Vatican copies, but occasionally supplementing or correcting the latter (Fritzsche, p. 50).[k] Fritzsche complains of the carelessness of both editors, and supports his charge by examples; cf. Klener, *Symb. Liter.* pp. 10–11.

The exegetical value of this commentary is diminished by Theodore's absolute confidence in the LXX., excessive independence of earlier hermeneutical authorities, and reluctance to admit a Christological reference, as well as by the defects of style which characterize all his literary work. It is, nevertheless, a considerable monument of his expository power, and the best illustration we possess of the Antiochene method of interpreting Old Testament prophecy. See the whole matter lucidly discussed by G. C. K. toe Water, *de Th. Ant. xii. Proph. Min. Interprete*, Amsterdam, 1837; cf. Mai, *Scr. Vet.* vi., p. xvi. sq.

ii. *New Testament.* (*a*) *The Gospels.* Ebedjesu recounts commentaries on St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John; and Leontius agrees, enumerating *τάς τε εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ μέντοι γε Λουκᾶν τεθολωμένας ἐξηγήσεις.* Theodore himself (on Col. i. 17, 1 Tim. 1, 5, iii. 16) refers to his work on the Gospels, with special reference to the three Gospels just named. The fragments of these works, with the rest of the New Testament fragments, were collected and edited by O. F. Fritzsche (Turici, 1847), and have been reprinted by Migne. The fragments on St. Matthew consist of Latin extracts from the Constantinopolitan acts and from Facundus, and of copious Greek scholia collected in the *catenae* of Corderius (Antwerp, 1628) and Possinus (Rome, 1673). Those upon St. Luke, with the exception of one Latin excerpt from the acts of the Fifth Council, were first printed by Frid. Münter (*Fragm. Patr. Graec.* fasc. i. Hafniae, 1788), who referred them to a polemical work directed against Julian (cf. Fritzsche, *de V. et Scr.* pp. 66–81). Mai (*Scr. Vet.* vi., *praef.* p. xxii. *n.*) has added a fragment from an unpublished *catena*, and a few more scholia may still lie hid in Paris and Vienna MSS. (Fritzsche, p. 65). The commentary on St. John is happily more fully represented;[1] the *catena* of Corderius yields up numerous extracts, which are supplemented in c. xx. by a few important passages preserved in the records of the Fifth Council.

A few fragments, attributed to a commentary on St. Mark, are possibly derived from other works of Theodore (Fritzsche, p. 84). Assemani, (iii. i. p. 323) has a Syriac fragment ascribed to the commentary "on the Gospels"; internal evidence seems to assign it to the exposition either of St. Matthew or of St. Luke.

(*b*) *Acts and Catholic Epistles.*—One fragment only remains of the commentary on the Acts; we owe it to the zeal of Theodore's opponents at the Fifth Council.

Notwithstanding Mai's assertion of the contrary (l. c. p. xxi.), it is more than doubtful whether Theodore wrote upon the Catholic epistles. With the rest of the Antiochians he probably followed the old Syrian canon in its rejection of 2 Peter, and 2 and 3 John. Leontius tells us that he also refused to acknowledge the authority of the Epistle of St. James (Migne, lxxxvi. 1366: *τοῦ μεγάλου Ἰακώβου τὴν ἐπιστολὴν καὶ τὰς ἑξῆς τῶν ἄλλων ἀποκηρύττει καθολικάς*); comp. Westcott *On the Canon*, pp. 409–11.

(*c*) *The Epistles of S. Paul.*—Ebedjesu distinctly states that Theodore wrote on all the Pauline epistles (ܘܦܘܫܩܐ ܫܠܝܚܐ ܦܘܫܩܗ ܠܦܘܠܘܣ ܕܟܠܗ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ) including among them the Epistle to the Hebrews. Leontius (Mai, vi. 299) mentions commentaries on Hebrews, Corinthians and Galatians. The commentary on Hebrews is cited by the Fifth Council, Vigilius and Pelagius II.; the commentary on Romans by Facundus

[k] Two Latin fragments, cited by the Fifth Council (Mansi, ix. 211) as from this commentary, have nothing to correspond to them in the Greek text. Mai was disposed at first to refer these to the commentary on the Psalms, but afterwards thought that they belonged to a lost preface (Klener, *Symb. Liter.* p. 10.)

[1] A Chaldee version of the whole commentary is said to be preserved in MS. at the monastery of S. George on the Tigris near Mausul (Khayyath, *Syri Orientales*, p. 76, n.)

(iii. 6). Beyond these notices antiquity contributes nothing to our knowledge of this important work. One or two copies of it appear however to have lingered in the Greek monasteries down to the age of the catenists, and a few of the bolder spirits ventured to transfer to their pages considerable portions of Theodore's Pauline commentary. There they lay almost unnoticed[m] until, in 1840, Mai published in his *Spicilegium Romanum* (t. iv. 499 sq.) all the fragments he could gather from the Vatican MS. 762, of the commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. He was closely followed by J. A. Cramer, of Oxford, who, in 1841–4, issued *catenae* on all the Pauline epistles, including copious excerpts from Theodore. Cramer's collections were derived from MS. Bodl. E. ii. 20 and the Munich MS. 23 (Romans), and from the Paris MS. Reg. 227 (1 Corinth.); for the rest of the Epistles he drew upon the valuable Corbie MS. 204. Mai subsequently added from Vatican MSS. a few scholia on 2 Corinthians.

Nothing has been contributed to these remains by the Syriac MSS. which have been recently poured into the great libraries of Western Europe. But a fortunate discovery has now placed within our reach a complete Latin version of the commentary on Galatians and the nine following epistles. In 1852 Dom (now Cardinal) Pitra published in his *Spicilegium Solesmense*, a Latin commentary on Galatians, Ephesians, and Philemon, derived from a Corbie MS. preserved at Amiens, together with a collation of the MS. commentary upon the intervening epistles with the printed compilation of Rabanus Maurus which was known to contain this commentary from Philippians onwards. Both by Rabanus and by the Corbie scribe the work was ascribed to St. Ambrose; Pitra persuaded himself that it came from the pen of St. Hilary of Poitiers. His view was contested in 1854 by Professor Jacobi, of Halle, and in 1859 by Mr. (now Professor) Hort of Cambridge, who independently proved by internal evidence, and by a comparison of Pitra's text with the Greek fragments published by Mai and Cramer, that the commentary in question was a version of Theodore's lost work. A second MS. was subsequently detected by Prof. Hort in the Harley collection at the British Museum, and from these two MSS. the Latin text together with the fragments of the original has been edited by the writer of the present article. The Latin, which is apparently the work of an African churchman who lived at the time of the Fifth Council, abounds in colloquial and semi-barbarous forms; the version is not always careful, and sometimes it is almost hopelessly corrupt. But the substance of Theodore's interpretation of St. Paul is now within our reach; and we henceforth possess a typical commentary from his pen on a considerable portion of each Testament.

To this list of commentaries it will be convenient to add a notice of treatises bearing upon hermeneutics. Such were probably the tracts (1) *On obscure language* (Ebedjesu: ܕܡܟܣܝܢܐ ܐܘܡܩܐ) i.e. on the obscurities of the language of Scripture—a favourite subject with the Antiochians, treated also by Chrysostom and Polychronius; and (2) *On the Giving of the Law* (Ebedjesu: ܥܠ ܣܝܡ ܢܡܘܣܐ). Such was certainly the book in "five tomes" *Against the Allegorizers* (ܠܘܩܒܠ ܡܐܠܠܓܪ̈ܝܐ, as Ebedjesu entitles it, or Περὶ ἀλληγορίας καὶ ἱστορίας κατὰ Ὠριγένους, as the title probably ran; comp. Fac. iii. 6, who quotes a single paragraph taken apparently from the preface or dedication, and throwing no light upon the character of the work. It is probably to these "tomes" that Liberatus refers when he traces the condemnation of Theodore to the circumstance of his having written "multa opuscula . . . contra Origenem."

(B) Controversial Writings.

(*a*) Chief amongst these, as well as first in point of time, was the treatise, in fifteen books, on the incarnation (Περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως: cf. Fac. ix. 3 "de Incarnatione aut . . . sicut a Graecis dicitur, de Inhumanatione Filii Dei." According to Gennadius (*de Viris ill.* 12) it was directed against the Apollinarians and Eunomians[n] and written while the author was yet a presbyter of the church of Antioch, i. e. within the limits A.D. 382–392. Gennadius adds an outline of the contents. Setting out with a logical and scriptural demonstration of the truth and perfection of each of the natures in Christ, Theodore proceeded to deal more at length with the doctrine of the Sacred Manhood—"hominem duabus tantum substantiis constare, id est, anima et corpore, sensumque et spiritum . . . officia esse animae." In the 14th book the writer approached the mystery of the Holy Trinity and the relation of the creature to the Divine Nature; in the 15th, the work was concluded, if we may believe Gennadius, with an appeal to authority—"citatis etiam patrum traditionibus." Large fragments of this treatise have been collected from various quarters, the Acts of the Fifth Council, the works of popes Vigilius and Pelagius II., of Facundus and Leontius, and lastly from the Syriac MSS. of the British Museum, which Sachau has ransacked in search of Theodorean matter. They will be found collected with more or less fulness in a 'programma' by O. F. Fritzsche (Zürich, 1847), in Migne's Patrologia, and in an appendix to the Camb. edition of the Commentaries on St. Paul (vol. ii. p. 291 sq.). None of the remains of Theodore throw such important light upon his Christology.

(*b*) Books against Apollinarianism. We have the authority of Facundus (viii. 2) for saying that Theodore wrote several distinct treatises against Apollinarius. One such, entitled *De Apollinario et ejus haeresi* was written, as Theodore himself states in the only surviving fragment, thirty years after the treatise on the Incarnation (Fac. x. 1). Ebedjesu mentions a book,

[m] So lately as 1836 Klener writes: "Est vero quod doleamur fere nihil horum scriptorum ad nostram memoriam esse delatum."

[n] Theodore himself describes it as written against Arius, Eunomius, and Apollinarius (Fac. x. 1).

entitled ܕܢܣܘܒܐ ܘܢܣܝܒܐ (Περὶ τοῦ εἰληφότος καὶ τοῦ ληφθέντος?) which he distinguishes from the ܕܡܬܒܪܢܘܬܐ. Lastly, a number of important fragments are preserved in the Constantinopolitan Acts, and in the writings of Facundus, Justinian, Leontius and others, which are referred to the 3rd and 4th books "Against Apollinarius." Fritzsche regards these fragments as belonging to the 3rd and 4th books of the treatise on the Incarnation, which (as he points out) are otherwise unrepresented; but the inference is insecure.

(*c*) Theodore also wrote a separate polemic against Eunomius, and a single characteristic fragment has survived (Fac. ix. 3). The work professed to be a defence of St. Basil, whence Leontius with his somewhat trite irony describes it as τὰ ὑπὲρ Εὐνομίου κατὰ Βασιλείου. Ebedjesu recounts 'two tomes against Eunomius and one in defence of Basil,' the treatise being very possibly dismembered in its Syriac form (cf. Fritzsche p. 97). In the original it reached the prodigious length of 25 (Phot. *cod.* 4) or even of (*cod.* 177) 28 books. Photius complains bitterly of the faults of style, and doubts the orthodoxy of the writer; but he admits that the work was remarkable for clearness of argument and for its wealth of scriptural proof (ταῖς δὲ διανοίαις καὶ τοῖς ἐπιχειρήμασι λίαν πυκνός, καὶ ταῖς γραφικαῖς ἄριστα πλουτῶν μαρτυρίαις . . . ἔοικε δὲ φιλοπονώτερον περὶ τὴν ἱερὰν ἡμῶν καὶ θείαν γραφὴν διατεθῆναι, εἰ καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς παρασύρεται τῆς ἀληθείας).

(*d*) Ebedjesu includes in his list "two tomes on the Holy Spirit"; and as Leontius (Migne, lxxxvi. 1221) states that Diodore and Theodore wrote against Macedonius, and Diodore is known to have written a book with this title (Phot. *cod.* 102), it seems likely that Theodore's work, if a distinct treatise, was directed against the heresy of the Pneumatomachi. See, however, Klener, *Symb. Liter.* p. 76.

(*e*) Three books on "Persian Magic" (περὶ τῆς ἐν Περσίδι μαγικῆς καὶ τίς ἡ τῆς εὐσεβείας διαφορά, Phot. *cod.* 81)—Leontius less accurately entitles them κατὰ μαγουσαίων: Ebedjesu, "Against Magic"—seem to have been directed against the Zoroastrian dualism, which in Theodore's time was shewing itself in Western Asia and Persia, and assuming an offensive attitude towards the Gospel (cf. Fritzsche, p. 106). We learn from Photius that the first book was taken up with the exposure of the Zoroastrian system; the second and the third contained a comprehensive sketch of the history and doctrines of Christianity, beginning with the Biblical account of the Creation. In this portion of the work, and especially in the 3rd book, Theodore not only betrayed his 'Nestorian' views, but even advanced the startling theory of a final restoration of all men (ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ἀποκατάστασιν τερατεύεται). One cannot but regret the utter loss of so remarkable a volume, especially as it seems to have been written in the interests of Christian missions, an earnest of the missionary spirit which afterwards manifested itself in the history of the Nestorian church.

(*f*) According to Ebedjesu, Theodore wrote "two tomes against him who asserts that sin is inherent in human nature" (ܠܘܩܒܠ ܡܢ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܣܝܡܐ ܚܛܝܬܐ). A longer title to the same effect is mentioned by Photius (*cod.* 177): Θεοδώρου Ἀντιοχέως πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας φύσει καὶ οὐ γνώμῃ πταίειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. The heading as given in Marius Mercator, who published Latin excerpts from this book shortly after Theodore's death, is merely an *ex parte* description of its contents: "Contra S. Augustinum defendentem originale peccatum et Adam per transgressionem mortalem factum catholice disserentem." It was natural that Mercator, himself a friend and disciple of S. Augustine [MARIUS MERCATOR], should imagine Theodore's work to be directed against the great western assailant of Pelagius; but as a matter of fact, Theodore seems to have selected Jerome rather than Augustine as the representative of the principles he attacks. He described Jerome under the *sobriquet* of Aram (i. e. Syria, Jerome's adopted country): Phot. *l. c.*: Ἀρὰμ . . . εἴτε ὀνομάζει εἴτε ἐπονομάζει. Photius gives a serviceable sketch of the work, and his outline is here and there filled in by the translations of Mercator. Such as they are, the remains of this book form our best guide to the anthropology of Theodore.

Under this head we may conveniently place two extracts from Theodore's letters, preserved by Facundus and Leontius respectively, each being of a dogmatic or polemical character. Ebedjesu tells us that the "letters" were circulated among the Nestorians of his day in a single volume, which was known as the "Books of Pearls," a title doubtless given to it by the Nestorian collector or translator. One other work may possibly claim a place here. The Fifth Council cites in Latin, and Maximus Confessor in the original Greek, a single fragment from a treatise "On the Miracles" (τὰ εἰς τὰ θαύματα). The tract against Julian to which Münter supposed certain fragments to belong is perhaps an imaginary work; cf. *supra*, A. ii. *a*.

(c) PRACTICAL, PASTORAL, AND LITURGICAL WRITINGS.

Ebedjesu mentions a treatise "On the Priesthood," an address "to monks," and a tract which he entitles ܕܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܘܩܢܐ [περὶ τοῦ καταρτισμοῦ τῆς πολιτείας? cf. Eph. iv. 12, ii. 12], and which may be supposed to have been of kindred character. There is also in Ebedjesu's list a "Book on the mysteries" (ܟܬܒܐ ܕܐܪ̈ܙܐ—cf. however, Assemani, iii. 1. 563, where it is cited by a Nestorian writer as ܕܥܘ̈ܡܩܐ "On deep things"). Faeundus quotes (iii. 2) a sentence from the 13th book of this treatise, under the title of "Codex Mysticus;" Hesychius, who censures it as heterodox on the doctrine of the Incarnation, calls the collection "Sermones mystici." Whatever the title may have been, the work, which seems to have been an extensive one, probably unfolded the doctrine of the

Sacraments as based upon the doctrine of the Incarnation. It was written, Hesychius tells us, in Theodore's old age.

A more popular treatment of the same subject seems to have been attempted in the Catechetical Lectures ("Catechismus," according to Marius Mercator; the Fifth Council calls it "Allocutiones ad baptizandos," Facundus (ix. 3) less correctly, "Liber ad baptizatos;" Ebedjesu possibly refers to this work under the title ܕܥܠ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ, "On the Faith"). The fragments, which are chiefly from the eighth book, refer almost exclusively to the doctrine of the Incarnation. Fritzsche thinks that to some at least of the copies of these lectures Theodore appended (1) an explanation of the creed of Nicaea (ἑρμηνεία εἰς τὸ ἐν Νικαίᾳ σύμβολον, Niceph. *catena* i. prologg. p. ιη'), a fragment of which, preserved by the Fifth Council, suggests that its object was to interpret the creed in harmony with the bishop's teaching upon the Person of Christ; and (2) the ecthesis afterwards produced at the Third Council by the Philadelphian presbyter Charisius, and condemned, but without mention of the author's name (Mansi, iv. 1347 sq.). Facundus (iii. 2) refuses to allow that Theodore was the author of this creed, but his denial rests on insufficient grounds; the document corresponds closely with Theodore's teaching, reveals his style in both its weakness and its strength, and was attributed to him by his contemporary Mercator who makes it the backbone of his attack upon Theodore's Christology, as well as by less trustworthy witnesses of a later date (Conc. CP., Mansi, ix. 227; Leont. Byz., Migne, xliii. 1367). The ecthesis was probably composed in good faith, and with the purpose of serving the interests of the Catholic doctrine; compare the remarks with which Epiphanius introduced his longer creed (*Ancor.* ad fin., Migne, xliii. 234).

Lastly, we have it on the authority of Leontius that Theodore wrote a portion of a liturgy; "not content with drafting a new creed, he sought to impose upon the church a new Anaphora:" τολμᾷ καὶ ἕτερον καινὸν οὐ δεύτερον· ἀναφορὰν γὰρ σχεδιάζει ἑτέραν παρὰ τὴν πατρόθεν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις παραδεδομένην (Migne, lxxxvi. 1367). A Syriac liturgy ascribed to "Mâr Teodorus the Interpreter" is still used by the Christians of Assyria for a third of the year, from Advent to Palm Sunday.[o] The proanaphoral and post-communion portions are supplied by the older liturgy "of the Apostles" (so called), the *anaphora* only being peculiar. A Latin version of this *anaphora* may be seen in Renaudot, and it has been published in English by Dr. Neale (*Hist. H. E. Ch.*, *Gen. Intr.* ii. 531 sq.) and more recently by Dr. Badger (*Eastern Ch. Assoc.*, occasional paper, xvii., Rivingtons, 1875); compare Bickell, *Conspectus rei Syror. liter.* p. 61 sq. Internal evidence confirms the judgement of Dr. Neale (i. 335), who regards it as a genuine work of Theodore; both thought and language bear the impress of his mind. We must add that the beauty and fervour of the devotion presents the religious character of the writer in a light which goes far to explain the love and reverence entertained for him by men such as Chrysostom and Theodoret.

o Cf. Assemani, III. ii. p. ccxxvii.

(D) Spurious or Doubtful Works.

An answer to Chrysostom's letters *ad Theod lapsum* is rightly rejected by Montfaucon (Migne, 48, 1063–4).

The Syriac hymn ascribed to Theodore (Sachau, pp. iv. 58) and sung at mattins by both Nestorians and Maronites (Bickell, p. 94) is more probably a composition of St. Ephraem.

The Vatican contains two MSS. of a Syriac work entitled "Questions on Holy Scripture," or "Questions and answers," which bears the name of Theodore of Mopsuestia. But the subject-matter appears to be little in accordance with the genius of the Interpreter; see the extracts printed in the introduction to the *Commentaries on S. Paul* (i. p. xii. notes).

A MS. history of the Nicene Council by Theodore of Mopsuestia is said to be preserved in the library of the American Mission at Beirût (Laurie, *Account of Dr. Grant*, Edinb. 1853). It may possibly be a fragment of the catechetical lectures (v. supra).

A few fragments of Theodore's interpretations, worked up by a Nestorian hand, may be seen in Hoffmann's *Opuscula Nestoriana*, pp. 118, 121, 123, 124, 148, 159.

IV. *Doctrine.*

It will be convenient to consider the peculiarities of Theodore's teaching under the three heads (A) Anthropology, (B) Christology, (C) Soteriology.

(A) Theodore's whole doctrinal system hinges, as Neander and Dorner have rightly judged, upon his conception of man's relation to the Universe and to God. (1) The Universe (ὁ κόσμος = ἡ σύμπασα κτίσις) is an organic whole (ἓν σῶμα), consisting of elements partly visible and material, partly invisible and spiritual. Of this organism Man is the predestined bond (φιλίας ἐνέχυρον, σύνδεσμος, συνάφεια, *copulatio*).[p] With this end he has been made a composite creature, his body derived from the elements into which the material creation resolves itself, his spiritual nature akin to pure spirits, the νοηταὶ φύσεις.[q] He was further designed to be the image of God, *i.e.* His visible representative, and as such to receive the homage of all creation. Hence all things minister to him, and even angelic beings are charged with the office of superintending the movements of the physical world for his benefit. Man is thus the crowning work of the Creator, and the proper medium of communication between the Creator and the creature.[r] (2) In the history of all intelligent created life, Theodore distinguishes two stages (καταστάσεις), the first a state of flux, exposed to conflict, temptation and mortality; the second immutable, and free from all the forms of moral and physical evil.[s] From the beginning it was the purpose of God that the second of these conditions (ἡ μέλλουσα κατάστασις) should be

p *Comm. in* Rom. viii. 19, Eph. i. 10; Sachau, p. 5.
q Sachau, p. 15; Joh. Philip. vi. 9, 10, 17
r Sachau, p. 18.
s *Comm. in Gen.* (Migne, lxvi. 654.)

revealed through the Incarnation of His Son.[t] Man was created in the former state, his nature being from the first liable to dissolution. "Earth to earth"—the human body naturally returns to the element from which it was taken. (3) The Fall therefore did not introduce mortality, but it converted the liability into a fact. It was not said "Ye shall become mortal," but "Ye shall die."[u] As a matter of fact, "death came by sin"; and the dissolution of soul and body was followed by the still more serious dissolution of the bond which in the person of man had hitherto knit together the visible and invisible creations (*ἐχωρίζετό τε . . . ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ὁ μηχανηθεὶς διὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σύνδεσμος τῆς κτίσεως διελύετο*).[v] Moreover the fall of the first man gave sin a foothold in the world (*ἡμαρτηκότος . . . τοῦ 'Αδὰμ . . . ἡ ἁμαρτία πάροδον ἔλαβεν εἰς τοὺς ἑξῆς*).[w] The same result was realised in the case of each descendant of Adam who followed in the steps of Adam's sin; and since all followed, death "passed upon all men, for that all sinned." And death in its turn ministered to the increase of sin, for a condition of actual mortality with its attendant infirmities cannot be dissociated from a constant tendency to moral evil (*τοῖς θνητοῖς ἕπεται τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν*).[x] (4) As our mortality was no afterthought with God, so neither was the sentence of death a vindictive punishment. The present life, with its vicissitudes and probationary trials, is a wholesome discipline, affording room for the exercise of free will and for the attainment of goodness, which without such efforts on our own part would have been destitute of moral worth.[y] (5) Although human nature is free, yet in its present condition of mortality and mutability, it is insufficient to conquer the forces of evil and to attain to perfect virtue without supernatural aid.[z] A new creation is needed to abolish sin and death.

(B.) We are thus brought to Theodore's doctrine of the mission and Person of Christ.

(1) The mission of Christ is, primarily, to restore the shattered unity of the *κόσμος*, and to gather up all things to Himself, by realizing in His Person the position of man as the visible Image of God and the head of the whole Creation;[a] secondarily, to restore mankind by union with Himself as the Second Adam and the Head of the Church to a condition of perfect deliverance from sin and death.

(2) To fulfil this mission it was necessary that God the Word should become perfect man, and should pass through the perfect experience of human life.[b]

The perfection of His manhood required Him to possess a rational human soul, with the human *αὐτεξούσιον* (cf. Dorner, p. 35 sq.), capable of exercising a real choice between good and evil, although persistently choosing good (*χρὴ δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας ἣν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὸν δεσπότην [illegible] Χριστὸν οἰκονομίᾳ ὁ δεσπότης ἐξετέλεσεν θεός, . . . εἰδέναι ὅτι ὁ δεσπότης θεὸς λόγος ἄνθρωπον εἴληφεν τέλειον . . . τὴν φύσιν ἐκ ψυχῆς τε νοερᾶς καὶ σαρκὸς συνεστῶτα ἀνθρωπίνης*). Furthermore, to attain the perfection of human experience it was necessary for Him to take human nature in its mutable state, to pass through a period of growth, to enter into conflict not only with the Evil One, but with the passions of the human soul (*πλέον γὰρ ὠχλεῖτο ὁ κύριος καὶ ἠγωνίζετο πρὸς τὰ ψυχικὰ πάθη ὑπὲρ τὰ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τῷ κρείττονι λογισμῷ τὰς ἡδονὰς ἐχειροῦτο . . .*[c] "Carnem et animam adsumens per utraque pro utrisque certabat, mortificans quidem in carne peccatum et mansuetans ejus libidines"[d]). Without temptation and conflict He could not have been proved sinless, or have delivered sinners.

(3) But though perfect man, the man Christ surpassed all other men both in quickness of moral discernment, and in the strength of His natural inclination to moral good and hatred of evil, from which indeed He never swerved. Though not without human passions, He was absolutely free from sin, and His life was a continual progress from one stage of virtue to another, a meritorious course of which the end was victory over death and an entrance into the immortal and immutable state.[e] If it be asked, whence this superiority, this sinlessness and ultimate perfection, of the manhood of Christ? the answer is twofold: it was due (*a*) to His supernatural Birth (*οὐ κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν φύσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐτέτεκτο ἐκ συνδυασμοῦ ἀνδρός τε καὶ γυναικός, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς θείας τοῦ πνεύματος ἐνεργείας διέπλαστο*), and subsequent Baptism of the Spirit, which He received in a manner peculiar to Himself, *i.e.* in the fulness of His grace (*ἠξιώθη ταύτης οὐχ ὁμοίως τοῖς λοιποῖς· οὗτος μὲν γὰρ ὅλην τὴν χάριν τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐδέξατο, κ.τ.λ.*); but yet more (*b*) to His union with the Person of the Divine Word (*εἶχεν τε καὶ ῥοπὴν οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν πρὸς τὰ κρείττω τῇ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν λόγον ἑνώσει*). This union he had indeed received as the reward of His foreseen sinlessness and virtue, for with Him as with the rest of mankind Divine gifts depended upon the action of the human will. The union, however, necessarily reacted on the Man, with whom the Word was made one; the co-operation of the Indwelling Godhead rendered it morally impossible for him to fall into sin (*ἀνάλογον τῇ οἰκείᾳ προθέσει καὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου συνέργειαν δεχόμενος, ἄτρεπτος λοιπὸν τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον μεταβολῆς διετηρεῖτο, τοῦτο μὲν αὐτὸς οὕτως ἔχων γνώμης, τοῦτο δὲ τῆς προθέσεως οὕτως διατηρουμένης αὐτῷ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου συνεργείᾳ*). The event proved the man Christ to be worthy of the Divine indwelling; and by the Resurrection and Ascension he attained a state in which the union is perfectly revealed and consummated (*ἀκριβῆ λοιπὸν καὶ τῆς ἑνώσεως παρέχεται τὴν ἀπόδειξιν, οὐδεμίαν ἔχων κεχωρισμένην καὶ ἀποτετμημένην ἐνέργειαν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου, ἔχων δὲ ἅπαντα ἐν ἑαυτῷ διαπραττόμενον τὸν θεὸν λόγον διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἕνωσιν*).[f]

(4) But after what manner did the Word unite

[t] *Praef. in Jon.* (Migne, 217.)
[u] *Contr. def. pecc. orig.* (Migne, 1005, sq.)
[v] *Comm. in Rom.* viii. 19, Eph. i. 10.
[w] *Comm. in Rom.* v. 13.
[x] *Comm. in Gal.* ii. 15, 16; *Eph.* iv. 22, *et passim.*
[y] *Comm. in* Gal. *l.c.*; *in* Gen. (Migne, 634, 640.)
[z] *Comm. in Eph.* ii. 10.
[a] *Comm. in Ps.* viii. (Corder. *caten.* p. 164); *in Eph. l.c.*; *Col.* i. 15, 20. Cf. Joh. Philop. *in Gen.* vi. 10.
[b] Sachau, p. 38; *c. Apollinar.* (Migne, 995, sq., 1017.)

[c] *De Incarn.* xv. (Migne, 991-2.)
[d] *Comm. in Luc.* vii. (Migne, 720.)
[e] *De Incarn.* vii. (Migne, 977.)
[f] *De Incarn.* (Migne, *l.c.*)

Himself to the Man whom He assumed? *A priori* there are three conceivable modes of Divine indwelling; it might be essential, effectual, or moral (κατ' οὐσίαν, κατ' ἐνέργειαν, κατ' εὐδοκίαν). But an essential indwelling of God is excluded by every adequate idea of His Nature (οὐσίᾳ μὲν οὖν λέγειν ἐνοικεῖν τὸν θεὸν τῶν ἀπρεπεστάτων ἐστίν); for in His essence God cannot be limited or circumscribed. Again, in His operations God is everywhere present, and such a presence constitutes no peculiar privilege. The special indwelling of God in man must therefore consist of that co-operation which He vouchsafes to those whom He regards with complacency (Pss. xxxiv. 19; cxlvii. 10, 11; cf. Luke iii. 22). It is a moral approximation, a moral union of the Divine Nature with souls which possess a moral affinity to His own mind and will (τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ καὶ τὴν ἐνοίκησιν ἀποτελεῖ, οὐκ ἐν τούτοις μὲν τὴν οὐσίαν περιγράφων ἢ τὴν ἐνέργειαν, τῶν λοιπῶν κεχωρισμένος . . . κεχωρισμένος δὲ τῶν ἀναξίων τῇ σχέσει τῆς διαθέσεως). In this sense God dwells in His Saints (2 Cor. vi. 16), and in this sense He dwelt and dwells above all in the man Christ. But whilst the indwelling of God in Christ and in the saints is *generically* the same, there is an all-important *specific*[g] difference, by which Theodore strives to retain the conception of a true incarnation of God. "I am not so mad," he says, "as to affirm that the indwelling of God in Christ is after the same manner as in the saints. He dwelt in Christ *as in a Son* (ὡς ἐν υἱῷ); I mean that He united the assumed man entirely to Himself and fitted him to partake with Him of all the honour of which the indwelling Person, who is Son by nature, partakes."[h] Further, the union of the Word with the man Christ differs from the Divine indwelling in the Saints in two other important particulars. It began with the first formation of the Sacred Manhood in the Virgin's womb ("a prima statim plasmatione . . . Creator . . . occulte eidem copulatus existens non aberat cum formaretur, non dividebatur cum nascebatur").[i] And once having taken effect, the union remains indissoluble (ἀχώριστον πρὸς τὴν θείαν φύσιν ἔχων τὴν συνάφειαν).[j] So close was the union, so ineffable, that the Word and the man He assumed may be regarded and spoken of as One Person, even as man and wife are 'no longer two but one flesh'; or as 'the reasonable soul and flesh are one man.'[k] Hence in Scripture things are often predicated of one of the natures which belong to the other.[l] Hence the question whether the Virgin is rightly called ἀνθρωποτόκος or θεοτόκος is an idle one; for she was both. She was the mother of the Man, but in that Man when she gave Him birth there was already the indwelling of God.[m] On the other hand, every idea of the Incarnation which tends to a confusion of the natures is to be jealously excluded.[n] When St. John says that "the Word was made flesh," we must understand him to speak only of what the Word apparently became; not that the flesh He took was unreal, but that He was not really transformed into Flesh (τὸ 'ἐγένετο' . . . κατὰ τὸ δοκεῖν . . . οὐ γὰρ μετεποιήθη εἰς σάρκα).[o]

(5) One point remains. The man who has been taken into this perfect union with the Eternal Son shares the name and privileges of sonship.[p] The man Christ became Son by adoption at the baptism in accordance with the voice which said, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, words which Theodore held that it would be madness to interpret in reference to the Divine Word. But even this secondary sonship of Christ is unique in rank and privilege. The man who is one with the Eternal Son is the image of the Invisible God, the firstborn of every creature, *i.e.* he takes precedence of the whole creation and is entitled to and shall receive the homage and adoration of the whole universe (τὴν παρὰ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως δέχεται προσκύνησιν, ὡς ἀχώριστον πρὸς τὴν θείαν φύσιν ἔχων τὴν συνάφειαν, ἀναφορᾷ θεοῦ καὶ ἐννοίᾳ πάσης αὐτῷ τῆς κτίσεως τὴν προσκύνησιν ἀπονεμούσης).[q] Yet there are not two Sons in Christ, for there are not two Christs; the unity of the Person must be as carefully preserved as the distinction of the Natures (εἷς υἱὸς ὁμολογεῖται δικαίως, ἐπείπερ ἡ τῶν φύσεων διαίρεσις ἀναγκαίως ὀφείλει διαμένειν, καὶ ἡ τοῦ προσώπου ἕνωσις ἀδιαστάστως φυλάττεσθαι);[r] the Man is Son only by virtue of his indissoluble union with the Divine Word; when we call Christ the Son of God, we think principally of Him who is truly and essentially Son, but we include in our conception the man who is indissolubly One with Him, and therefore shares His honours and His Name.

(C) Lastly the question arises, What are the elements, the conditions, the ultimate results of the restorative work which the Incarnate Son came to do?

(1.) Theodore placed the redemptive virtue of the death of Christ chiefly in this, that it was the transition of the Second Adam from the mutable state into the immutable, the necessary step to the resurrection-life, in which death and sin are finally abolished (δέξεται τὸ πάθος οὐκ ἐπὶ τιμωρίᾳ ὡς οἱ λοιποί, ἀλλ' ὡς πολὺ λαμπρότερος ἐξ αὐτοῦ φανῆναι, ἀθάνατος καὶ ἄφθαρτος γεγονώς . . . ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θάνατος τὴν ἀνάστασιν χαρισάμενος καὶ ἕτερον ἀντὶ τοῦ παρόντος ἐπεισαγαγὼν βίον).[s] (2.) Baptism, which represents the Death and Resurrection of the Lord, unites us to the risen Christ by a participation of His Spirit, so that in it we pass as by a second birth into the sphere of the future life ("fide autem quasi jam translatos nos in futura vita videmus, et maxime atubi baptisma percoperimus, quod baptisma formam habet mortis et resurrectionis Christi, simul accipientes et Spiritum sanctum qui in

---

[g] Dorner, II. i. 43; Neander, iv. 117.
[h] Migne, 776.
[i] *Contr. Apoll.* (Migne, 994); *ad bapt.* (Migne, 1013).
[j] *Symb.* (Migne, 1017).
[k] *C. Apoll.* iv.; *ad bapt.* viii.
[l] *Comm. in Phil.* ii. 8; Col. i. 16, 17; 1 Tim. iii. 6
[m] *De Incarn.* xv. (Migne, 991).
[n] *C. Apollin.* iv. (Migne, 1000).

[o] *De Incarn.* ix. (Migne, 981).
[p] *De Incarn.* viii. (Migne, 980); in Matth. vii. 17; Gal. iv. 5; Col. i. 13.
[q] *Comm. in Col.* i. 14, 15; *De Incarn.* xiv. (Migne, 991–2); *in* Phil. ii. 10, 11; *Symb.* (Migne, 1017).
[r] *De Incarn.* xii. (Migne, 985); *ad bapt.* viii. (Migne, 1015).
[s] *In* Gen. xlix. (Migne, 66, 645).
[t] *In* Eph. ii. 13.

baptismate datur").[u] (3.) The regenerate occupy middle ground between the two worlds, living in the present yet belonging to the future, potentially sinless and immortal, actually liable to sin and death.[v] It is their business, by the aid of the Holy Spirit, to mould their present lives into conformity with the life of the risen Christ, and the conditions of the future state.[w] Living thus they are justified by faith, *i.e.* their faith enables them in some sort to anticipate their future sinlessness.[x] (4.) But actual and final justification can only be obtained at the resurrection. The Parousia is therefore the great hope of the Church, as bringing with it the two great results of the Incarnation, the *ἀναμαρτησία* and the *ἀφθαρσία* of the Body of Christ. Nothing short of the final state of perfection which will be then inaugurated can exhaust the meaning of such terms as "redemption," "forgiveness of sins" and "salvation."[y] (5.) Although the Second Advent will bring these blessings only to those who have in some degree responded to their baptismal calling, and co-operated with the Spirit of Christ, Theodore is far from pronouncing the case of the unprepared to be hopeless. The punishments of the condemned will indeed be in their nature eternal, being such as belong to eternity and not to time ("non ad tempus, sed aeterno sunt"[z]); but both reason and Scripture lead us to the conclusion, that they will be remissible upon repentance. "Where (he asks) would be the benefit of a resurrection to such persons, if they were raised only to be punished without remedy or end?[a] What would, then, be the meaning of such texts as Matt. v. 26, Luke xii. 47, 48?[b] Moreover, Theodore's fundamental conception of the mission and Person of Christ compels him to believe that there will be a final restoration of all creation: "Omnia...recapitulavit in Christo quasi quandam compendiosam renovationem et adintegrationem totius faciens creaturae per eum...hoc autem in futuro saeculo erit, quando homines cuncti necnon et rationabiles virtutes ad illum inspiciant, ut fas exigit, et concordiam inter se pacemque firmam obtineant."[c]

V. *Method of Interpretation.*

As the scholar and successor of Diodore (cf. Socr. vi. 3, Soz. viii. 2) Theodore inherited the Antiochian system of grammatical and historical interpretation, and denounced the licence of the Alexandrian allegorizers. The remark of Photius upon his exposition of Genesis has been quoted already; it is more or less applicable to all his commentaries, so far as we can judge from the published remains. Of the grounds of Theodore's opposition to the Alexandrian exegesis a fairer estimate might have been formed had his five books *περὶ ἀλληγορίας καὶ ἱστορίας* survived; but something has been gained in this direction by the recovery of the commentary on Gal. iv. 24. It appears from this passage that Theodore convinced himself that the allegorical method was essentially rationalistic, undermining the historical truth of the Old Testament narrative. St. Paul's use of *ἀλληγορία* was different in kind, since it presupposed the facts of the history and employed them only by way of illustration.

In his own interpretation of both the historical and prophetical Scriptures it was a first principle with Theodore to ascertain the intention of the writer, and to refuse to admit a secondary and more subtle meaning when the words were capable of a literal and practical sense. But the application of this principle was checked by several considerations, such as (i) the usage (*ἰδίωμα*) of Scripture or of the individual writer; (ii) the guidance of the context; (iii) in the case of Old Testament writers, the general purpose of the older covenant.

The third point requires careful examination.

(*a*) Theodore was deeply convinced of the propaedeutic character of the Old Testament. He saw that the Divine purpose which runs through the whole of its course culminates in the Incarnation and the Gospel of Christ. His commentary on the minor Prophets appears to have been written to counteract the allegorists (*prooem. in Ose. εἰς ἔλεγχον τῶν ἀβασανίστως ἐπιβάλλειν ταῖς προφητικαῖς ἐπιχειρούντων φωναῖς*); yet he starts with the principle, that the entire Jewish history was preordained with a view to the coming of Christ—(*εἰς προπαρασκευὴν τῆς τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ δείξεώς τε καὶ παρουσίας*). The God of both Testaments, being one and the same, worked out His purpose with a single aim. Hence the events of the Old Testament were so ordered as to be typical of those which were to follow (*prooem. ad Jon.*: *εὑρίσκετο κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον τύπος τις τὰ παλαιὰ τῶν ὑστέρων*: cf. *prooem. ad Amos*). Consequently the histories and prophecies of the older revelation are susceptible of an application to the facts and doctrines of the Gospel, to which they offer in fact a divinely foreseen and instinctive parallel. The words of the Psalmists and Prophets are constantly Christological, because the events to which they relate find a perfect counterpart in Christ (*in Psalm.* xvi., xxii.). Their language is often hyperbolical or metaphorical, if viewed in reference to its original object; exhausting itself only in the higher realities of the kingdom of Heaven (*in Joel* ii. 28: *ὑπερβολικῶς εἰρῆσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ πράγματα εἶχεν . . . μεταφορικῶς ἤτοι ὑπερβολικῶς λέγει*: *in Jon. prooem.*: *ἡ δὲ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀλήθεια ἐπὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν δεσπότην Χριστὸν οἰκονομηθέντων ἐδείκνυτο λαβοῦσα τὸ πέρας*: cf. *in Zach.* ix. 9: *πολλὰ τοιαῦτα εὕροι τις ἄν . . . ἃ πρότερον μὲν ὑπερβολικῶς ἐλέγετο, οὐκ ἔχοντα τοῦ λεγομένου τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀκριβῆ, εὑρίσκεται δὲ οὕτως ἔχοντα . . . ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ*).

(*b*) Excepting some few passages in which he recognises direct prophecies of the Messiah and his times, Theodore holds that the language of the Old Testament is applied to Christ and the Christian dispensation only by way of accommodation (*in Rom.* iii. 12 *τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ οὐχ ὡς προφητικῶς εἰρημένῃ ἐχρήσατο ἀλλ' ὡς ἁρμοζούσῃ τοῖς ἀποδεδειγμένοις*: *in Eph.* iv. 8: "utitur hoc testimonium non quasi prophetice dictum, sed sicut nos in ecclesinstica allocutione

[u] *In* Gal. ii. 15, 16. Cf. *in* Eph. iv. 24; Col. ii. 12, &c.
[v] *In* Gal. *l.c.*
[w] *In* Rom. vi. 12 sq.
[x] *In* Gal. *l.c.*
[y] *In* Eph. i. 7, 8; Col. i. 14; Rom. viii. 24.
[z] *In* 2 Thess. i. 9.
[a] Cf. Mar. Merc. (Migne, *P.L.* 48, 232).
[b] Cf. Assemani III. i., p. 323.
[c] *In* Eph. i. 10.

scripturalibus frequenter solemus uti testimoniis"). This accommodation is however amply justified by the fact, that in the Divine foreknowledge the earlier cycle of events was designed to be typical of the later. Thus the 22nd Psalm, Theodore says, is clearly a narrative of David's conflict with Absalom; yet it is rightly used by the Evangelist to portray the Passion of Christ, in which the words found a complete, and even to some extent a literal fulfilment. Again, the words of Joel ii. 28 cannot possibly have been a prediction of the coming of the Holy Ghost, since the writers of the Old Testament knew nothing as yet of a personal Spirit of God; "I will pour out of My Spirit" meant only "I will extend to all the Divine favour and protection." Yet St. Peter rightly quotes the prophecy as finding its accomplishment in the Pentecostal effusion; for its fulfilment to the Jews of the Restoration was a pledge and type of the descent of the Spirit upon the universal Church. This view (so Theodore argues) at once secures for the prophecy a historical basis, and magnifies the Christian economy as that which converted into sober fact the highest imagery of the ancient Scriptures (ὡς ἂν καὶ ἡ τῶν τότε πραγμάτων ἱστορία φαίνοιτο μὴ πεπλασμένη, καὶ τῶν νῦν τὸ μέγεθος ἐκ παραθέσεως ἐκείνων ἐλέγχοιτο μᾶλλον).

If Theodore's New Testament exegesis is less characteristic, it is certainly more satisfactory than his interpretation of the Hebrew prophecies. His mind and education were Greek; in expounding the Old Testament he trusted entirely to the guidance of the LXX.; in commenting on the Evangelists and St. Paul, he found himself face to face with an original which he was competent to handle upon his own principles. In the remains of his commentaries of the Gospels we notice the precision with which he adheres to the letter of his author (cf. e.g. on Matth. xxvi. 26), his readiness to press into the service of the interpreter those minor words which are commonly overlooked (John xiii. 33, ἄρτι), his attention to the niceties of grammar (John iii. 21) and punctuation (John ix. 27), his keen discussion of doubtful readings (John i. 3), his acuteness in seizing on the ἰδιώματα of Scripture (John i. 14), and in bringing out the points of a parable or discourse (Mark iv. 26; John iii. 5, x. 1 sq., xv. 4, 26). On the other hand we become conscious of a want of spiritual insight (John xi. 21, ὁ δὲ λέγει κ.τ.λ.) and feeling (John xi. 35), and we detect an occasional departure from the author's own first principles, under the pressure of theological prejudice (John xx. 22, 28). The commentary on the Pauline epistles, now that it can be read in a form more nearly approaching to its original fulness, seems to us on the whole worthy of its author's great name. It manifests in yet greater measure the care and precision which have been observed in the fragments of Theodore's commentary on the Gospels; and in addition, an honest and unceasing effort to trace the sequence of St. Paul's thought. Its principal fault is the continual introduction of theological disquisitions, which break the course of the interpretation, and not seldom carry the reader into speculations entirely foreign to the mind of the Apostle. But even these digressions have their value as expositions of Antiochian theology, and as admitting us to watch the process by which so acute an intellect as Theodore's could elicit that theology from the epistles of St. Paul, or reconcile the two systems where they appear to be hopelessly at variance.

The worth of Theodore's contributions to the exegesis of Scripture has been very variously estimated. It may be well to sum up the grounds on which his commentaries may claim the earnest attention of future students.

(1) He is for ourselves the best exponent of Antiochian exegesis. Diodore has left too little to be the representative of his school; Chrysostom was a homilist rather than a scientific expositor; Theodoret is little else than a judicious compiler from Chrysostom and Theodore. Theodore is at once an independent writer, and yet penetrated more deeply than either Chrysostom or Theodoret by the traditions of the Antiochian school. He had no audience to propitiate, no council to dread; and he treads with the firmness of a man who is conscious that he represents a great principle and is fully convinced of its truth. (2) His expositions, especially those of the New Testament, possess intrinsic value of no common kind. Except when he is led astray by theological prepossessions, his firm grasp of the grammatical and historical method, and a kind of instinctive power of arriving at the drift of his author's thought, have enabled him often to anticipate the conclusions of the most recent exegesis. (3) Besides being deterred by the unwieldy style which everywhere makes the wheels of Theodore's expositions drag somewhat heavily, the reader misses the devotional and spiritual tone which recommends most of the Patristic commentaries. Neither the theological discussions nor the moral teachings which abound in his pages, compensate for this loss. Yet after making every fair deduction on these and other grounds, we may still assign to Theodore a high rank among commentators proper, and a position in which he stands among ancient expositors of Scripture almost alone—that of an independent inquirer, provided with a true method of eliciting the sense of his author, and considerable skill in the use of it.

VI. *Literature.*

(*a*) Life and writings. *Ancient authorities.*—Chrysost. *Epp. ad Theod. lapsum* (Migne, *P. G.* xlvii.); Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 39; Socr. vi. 3; Sozom. viii. 2; Cyril. Alex. Epp. (Migne, *P. G.* lxxvii.); Hesych. Hieros. *Fragm.* (Mansi, ix. 248 sq.); Evagr. i. 2; Marius Mercator (Migne, *P. L.* xlviii.); Gennad. *De Vir. Ill.* 12; Facund. Herm. (Migne, *P. L.* lxvii.); Liberatus, *Breviar.* (Migne, *P. L.* lxxxiii.); Leontius Byzant. (Migne, *P. G.* lxxxvi.); Joh. Philoponus *De Creat. Mundi* (Galland. *Bibl. Patr.* xii.); Photius, *Biblioth.* codd. 4 (cf. 5, 6), 38, 96, 177 (Migne, *P. G.* ciii.); At. Conc. CP. ii. (Mansi, ix.); Vigil. *Constit. Epp.* (Migne, *P. L.* lxix.); Pelag. P. ii. *Epp.* (Migne, *P. L.* lxxii.).

Modern authorities.—Leo Allatius, *de Theodoris* § LXV. (Mai, *Patr. Nov. Bibl.* vi. p. 116 sq.); Cave, i. 217; Dupin, iii. 91; Oudin. i. 895; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xii. 433 sq.; Schröckh, xv. xviii.; Noris. *De V. Syn.*, *Hist. Pelag.*; Renaudot, *Liturg. Orient.* ii. 622; Fabricius (ed. Harles) x. 346 sq.; Walch, *Hist. der Ketzer.* v.; J. S.

Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* iii. 1, 30, 36; A. Mai *Scr. vet. Nov. Coll.* vi. (Rom. 1832) *praef.*; Klener, *Symbolae liter. ad Theod. Antioch. Mops. ep. pertinentes*, Goth. 1836; O. F. Fritsche *de Theod. Mops. vita et scriptis commentatio hist. theologica*, Halae, 1836; J. L. Jacobi in *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christl. Wissenschaft*, 1854; F. J. A. Hort in the *Journal of Class. and Sacred Philology*, iv., Camb., 1859; Bickell, *Conspect. rei Syror. Liter.* Monast., 1871; H. Kihn, *Theodor v. Mops. u. Junilius Africanus*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1880.

(*b*) Doctrine and method of interpretation. R. Simon, *Histoire Critique des Commentateurs du N. T.* (1693), c. 31; Budaeus, *Isag. Hist. Theol.* (1730); J. A. Ernesti, *Opusc. Theol.* (1792). p. 450; J. G. Rosenmüller, *Hist. Interpr.* iii. (1807); Münter in *Ständlin u. Tzschirner's Archiv*, (1813), I. i. p. 17; p. 17; Sieffert, *Theod. Mops. V. T. sobrie interpretandi vindex* (Regim., 1827); G. C. H. toe Water, *de Theod. Antioch. xii. prophet. interpr.* (Amstelod. 1837); Neander, *Allgem. Geschichte*, II. iii.; Dorner, *Lehre v. der Person Christi*, II. i.; article in *Ch. Quarterly Review* (Oct. 1875) entitled *Theodore and Modern Thought*; Prof. Sanday in the *Expositor* (June, 1880).

VII. *Editions.*

The commentary on the Minor prophets was published by Ang. Mai in his *Script. vet. Nova Collectio*, t. vi. (Romae, 1832); and more fully in the *Biblioth. Nova Patrum*, t. vii. (Romae, 1854); also by A. F. V. de Wegnern, *Th. Antioch. Mops. episc. quae supersunt omnia*, vol. i. (Berolini, 1834). In 1847 all the fragments of the commentaries on the New Testament then available were published at Zurich by O. F. Fritzsche, and in the same year he printed in an academical programme the remains of the *De Incarnatione*. The Abbé Migne's useful but uncritical edition of all the published works and fragments followed in 1864, forming part of the sixty-sixth volume of his *Patrologia Graeca*. Next came in 1869 the publication by Dr. E. Sachau of the inedited Syriac fragments scattered through the Nitrian MSS. of the British Museum, with a reprint of the Theodorean matter already collected by P. de Lagarde in his *Analecta Syriaca* (Lips. 1858). The ancient Latin version of the commentaries on the minor epistles of St. Paul, with a fresh collation of the Greek fragments, was issued by the Cambridge University Press in 1880–2. A complete critical edition of all the literary remains of Theodore is still a desideratum.

[H. B. S.]

THEODORUS (27) III., bishop of Mopsuestia, a Galatian, who died three years before the assembling of the synod summoned at Mopsuestia, in 550, by order of Justinian, to take into consideration the doctrines of his great predecessor and namesake (Labbe, v. 495; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 894). [E. V.]

THEODORUS (28), bishop of Myra. He was originally an Iconoclast. He retracted his opinion at the first session of the second Nicene council (Mansi, t. xii. p. 1008; Hefele's *Councils*, see 348). [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS of Octodurus; *vid.* of Sion.

THEODORUS (29) (DOROTHEUS), bishop of Oxyrynchus in Egypt. He was orthodox at first, but afterwards communicated with George of Alexandria. The Luciferian portion of his flock then seceded, and procured the ordination of Heraclides as bishop. Theodorus seems to have retained his see, and to have made his peace with Athanasius, as his name appears to a Confession of Faith made by Marcellus of Ancyra in 372, and accepted by Athanasius. He is supposed to have been identical with Dorotheus, who signed the decrees of C. P. 381, as bishop of Oxyrynchus; cf. *Libell. Prec.* of Marcellinus and Faustinus in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xiii.; Ceill. v. 154.

[G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (30) (31), an imaginary bishop of Panormus in Sicily, invented as an opponent of HERACLEON, by Praedestinatus (i. 16), who in this section has been particularly unfortunate in his chronology (see Vol. II., p. 900 b). Praedestinatus has invented another bishop of the same name (i. 36) whose see he has placed at Antioch, and whom he makes confute the Cainites. [G. S.]

THEODORUS (32), bishop of Paphos in Cyprus, the reputed author of a biography of S. Spiridon of Trimithus, which, according to Lambecius, is preserved in the Imperial Library at Vienna. (Allat. *de Simeonibus*, p. 89; Bolland. Mai, tom. i. p. 55, 2; Fabr. *Bibl. Graec.* x. 326; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* vii. 693.) [E. V.]

THEODORUS (33), bishop of Pavia, became bishop about A.D. 742. He is said to have kept his diocese free from Arianism, which had broken out afresh in Italy. He was banished by Desiderius, the last of the Lombard kings, after whose defeat he was restored to his see by Charles the Great. He died in A.D. 778, on May 20th, on which day he is commemorated (*AA. SS.* Mai, v. 239). There is a letter of somewhat doubtful genuineness to him from pope Zacharias, forbidding the marriage of a man with a woman, to whom his father had been godfather, on the ground of the spiritual affinity thus created between them (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxix. 957).

[F. D.]

THEODORUS (34), bishop of Petra, c. 536 (Gams); the disciple and biographer of the Archimandrite S. Theodosius, who died in 529. He attended the synod at Jerusalem against the three leading monophysites, Severus, Petrus, and Zoaras, in 536 (Labbe, v. 286). He compiled a Canonicon. (Allat. *de libr. Eccl. Graec.* p. 24; *de Simeonibus*, pp. 7, 95; Fabr. *Bibl. Graec.* x. 337, 420; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 726.)

[E. V.]

THEODORUS (35), bishop of Pharan in Arabia Petraea, c. 640, the reputed author of the Monothelite modification of the Monophysite doctrine, and its most conspicuous and eloquent advocate. He accepted the Henoticon and anathematized the decrees of Chalcedon and the tome of Leo (Labbe, vi. 839). He visited Constantinople, where he was honourably received by Sergius. The patriarch afterwards wrote to Theodore, communicating a document, which Sergius is accused of having forged, professing to be a letter of Mennas of Constantinople to pope

Vigilius, in which it was dogmatically laid down that Christ had only one will and one operation. Theodore accepted the definition, and declared that such was his doctrine also (Labbe, v. 1814, 1817, *Disput. Maxim. cum Pyrrho*). Theodorus's tenets came under review at the Lateran Council, under Martin I., in 649. At the third session, Oct. 17, passages from his writings declaring his own views and explaining away apparently opposite statements of the fathers, were brought forward by Sergius of Tempse, at the request of that earnest champion of the orthodox faith, Stephen of Dor, and having been publicly read, were condemned by the pope (Labbe, vi. 163–174; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclés.* viii. 453), and anathematized by a special canon (Labbe, vi. 355, can. xviii.; Fleury, *u. s.* 463). Theodorus's teaching was again formally condemned in the Sixth General Council of Constantinople in 680, when passages from his various writings were read (Labbe, vi. 341, 955–960, 1023, 1117). The following works are ascribed to Theodore,—(*a*) a treatise addressed to Sergius, bishop of Arsinoe, *de Operationibus Christi*, passages of which are found in the third action of the Lateran Council (Labbe, vi., 164–166), and the 13th action of the council of Constantinople (*ibid.* 955–966); (*b*) another treatise in which he puts his own interpretation on passages of the fathers on the same subject, passages of which were read at the same time, and are to be found in Labbe (*u. s.*); (*c*) *Epistola ad Paulum*, anathematizing Chalcedon, the tome of Leo, and all who asserted two natures in Christ and denied the one operation, of which a fragment is found in Labbe (*u. s.* 839). Theodore held the single will of Christ in combination with His double nature. He was at the same time a Monothelite and a Dyophysite. He regarded the deity alone of Christ as active, assigning to the humanity at the utmost a passive position, thus reducing the doctrine of the two natures to a dead impotent proposition. He held that all the mental and physical activities of Christ proceeded alone and undividedly from one divine principle, ἀρχοειδῶς, μοναδικῶς, καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως, the power, wisdom and goodness of the Logos coming into being through the medium of the rational soul and of the body. Sleep, weariness, hunger, thirst, motion, rest, etc, were to be attributed to the energy of the Logos as one and undivided. In Christ there was but one will, and that will was divine. Body and soul were no more than the organs of the Logos, which, with its divine nature, occupied the place of the personality, and were simply the medium for the evolution of His divine ἐνέργεια. He thus reduced the humanity to the rank of a mere garment enveloping the Logos, or a means of evolution and revelation of the μία θεοῦ ἐνέργεια, standing in a completely passive relation to the divine nature, of which it was in every respect the dependent or passive organ. (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Clark's trans., Div. ii. [vol. i. pp. 165–169, 174, 187; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 585; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* x. 428; Theophanes, p. 274 c.; Labbe, vi. *l.c.*; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* viii. 330, 453, 463; ix. 43, 46, 48.) [E. V.]

THEODORUS (36), Jacobite bishop of Philae in the Thebais, known to us from the account in John of Ephesus of the consecration of Theodore to the patriarchal see of Alexandria (Dr. R. Payne Smith's transl. 255, 259), the date of which has been fixed at 375. He and Longinus were at that time evidently the two leading bishops of the Jacobites in Egypt. Longinus visited him on his journey from Nubia, but found him from the infirmities of age unable to accompany him. He had been, he said, a bishop nearly fifty years, having been consecrated by Timothy, who must have been Timothy.) [C. H.]

THEODORUS (37), bishop of Rhosus in Cilicia Secunda, who, according to Moschus (*Prat. Spirit.* c. 100), had been previously a monk in the monastery "Turrium" at the Jordan. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 908.) [E. V.]

THEODORUS (38), bishop of Rome after John IV., from the latter part of November, A.D. 642 to the middle of May, A.D. 649, during six years and a-half nearly; a Greek by race, the son of a bishop of Jerusalem of the same name (Anastasius). His time was that of the Monothelitic controversy, in respect to which, together with all the popes except Honorius, he steadfastly maintained, against the emperor and the East generally, the doctrine of two wills and two operations of will in Christ, which was finally declared orthodox by the sixth general council A.D. 680. At the time of his accession, Constans II. (*Acc.* 641) was emperor. Paulus occupied the position of patriarch of Constantinople in place of Pyrrhus, who had abandoned his see for political reasons after the death of the previous emperor Constantine. The Monothelite document called the *Ecthesis*, which had been issued by the emperor Heraclius under the advice of the patriarch Sergius, and which Pyrrhus had supported, but which the popes Severinus and John IV. had protested against, was still in force, and posted in the churches at Constantinople. [JOANNES (349) IV.] Paulus, the new patriarch, sent, as was usual, to the pope synodical letters announcing his promotion, with a profession of his faith, which appears to have been so worded as to imply that he held with Rome in doctrine. Theodore, in his extant reply, declares himself not entirely satisfied. He rejoices, on the one hand, that the new patriarch professed orthodoxy, but, on the other hand, he asks why, if it were so, he had allowed the *Ecthesis* to remain posted at Constantinople, and why the bishops who had consecrated him had, in their letters which had been sent with that of Paulus, described the deposed Pyrrhus as "sanctissimus," and spoken of his deposition as owing only to political disturbances. Further, he hesitates to recognise Paul as patriarch, till Pyrrhus should have been canonically deposed. Paul's first duty was, he says, to assemble a synod of neighbouring bishops, who, in concert with the Roman apocrisiarii, should judge Pyrrhus on the ground of heresy, for which purpose the presence of the accused was not necessary, since they would have sufficient proofs before them. If, however, the state of parties at Constantinople should be in the way of getting the case properly adjudicated there, he suggests that the emperor might be induced to send Pyrrhus to Rome to be judged, saying that he has already written to him on the

subject. With this letter was sent the pope's definite sentence of anathema against Pyrrhus and the *Ecthesis*, on the ground of heretical novelty in contravention of the council of Chalcedon. He sent also a reply to the bishops who had consecrated Paulus to the same effect as his letter to the latter. But no effect was thus produced at Constantinople. There, as well as in the patriarchal sees of Alexandria and Antioch, the *Ecthesis* continued to be accepted, and the Monothelitic doctrine to prevail. Elsewhere, however, the resolute attitude of Theodorus had important results. He rallied round him, not only the Westerns, but also in some parts of the East a considerable number of adherents, who had recourse to him as the champion of the true faith with more deference and submission than might perhaps in other circumstances have been accorded from all quarters to the see of Rome. Sergius, primate of Cyprus, addressed to him a synodical letter in the name of all the bishops of the island, expressing their entire agreement in the faith as defined by pope Leo, and as now taught by Theodorus, and their determination to uphold it in spite of any persecution, and whatever might be done in the imperial city. The pope, whose support they confidently implore, is in this letter addressed so as to satisfy the most advanced theory of papal authority—as the most holy and most blessed lord archbishop, the father of fathers, the universal pope, the sacred head, the putter down of profane heresies, the prince and teacher of the orthodox and immaculate faith, having the keys of heaven committed to him, with power to bind and to loose. (*Concil. Lateran. sub Martino; Secretar.* 2. [MARTINUS (3).]) From Palestine also, though occupied at that time by the Saracens, the orthodox sought the support of Theodore against their Monothelite fellow-Christians. After the death of Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem, who had been a prominent supporter of the doctrine of two wills [see HONORIUS (15)], one Sergius, bishop of Joppa, a Monothelite, had usurped the patriarchal throne. Stephen, bishop of Dora, being the first suffragan of Jerusalem, went thereupon in person to Rome, to solicit the pope's support. Theodore delegated him as conservator of the Jerusalem patriarchate, with power to depose heretical bishops who had been promoted by Sergius; or, if possible, to bring them back to orthodoxy. He appeared afterwards at the first Lateran Council under pope Martin, pleading that he had fulfilled his commission faithfully (*Concil. Lateran.*, *Secret.* 2). The bishops of Western Africa, stimulated by the exhortations of Maximus, abbat of Chrysopolis (*Scutari*), who had come there *circ.* A.D. 640 [see MAXIMUS (23)], were prominent in supporting the pope, or rather in urging him to more resolute action than he might have taken of his own accord. There also, through the influence of Maximus, even the ex-patriarch Pyrrhus, who had resorted thither when he fled from Constantinople, was for a time converted to orthodoxy. A public disputation, in the presence of Gregorius, the prefect of Africa, having been held between them, Pyrrhus avowed himself convinced, and at the instigation of Maximus went to pope Theodore at Rome (A.D. 645), recanted his heresy before him, and was honourably received by him as patriarch of Constantinople. It was subsequently represented at Constantinople that Pyrrhus had been forced, against his will, into this visit to Rome and his recantation there, and that violence had been used towards him. But this story pope Martin, who was examined with respect to it when a prisoner at Constantinople, repudiated as an utterly baseless calumny [MARTINUS (3)]. But the patriarch's profession of orthodoxy did not last long. Summoned from Rome to Ravenna by the exarch Plato, he was induced to recant his recantation, and was consequently excommunicated by Theodorus at Rome in a peculiarly solemn manner, the sentence being signed on the tomb of St. Peter, and a portion of the contents of the consecrated chalice being mixed with the ink (Theophanes, ad ann. xx Heraclii).

Meanwhile, Paul at Constantinople having taken no steps to get the *Ecthesis* withdrawn, the bishops of Africa, stimulated (as may be supposed) by the aforesaid Maximus, assembled synods to remonstrate with him and the emperor, and to move the pope to action. Our knowledge of their proceedings is derived from the Acts of the 1st Lateran Council under pope Martin [MARTINUS (3)], at which all previous events were reported with great fulness. It thence appears that synods were held in the several provinces of Byzacena, Numidia, Mauritania, and Carthage, and that letters were prepared to be sent to both Paul and the emperor; two of which are preserved, viz. from the synod of Byzacena to Constans, and from that of Carthage to the patriarch. Owing, however, to some political hindrance, such letters were not sent direct to their destination, but transmitted to Rome, with earnest requests to Theodore that he would support them by sending his own apocrisiarii with letters to the imperial city. Two synodical letters sent with this view from Africa to Rome are preserved. The first is from the bishops Columbus, Stephanus, and Reparatus, in the name of all the bishops of the three provinces of Numidia, Mauritania, and Byzacena. They address the pope in this letter with full acknowledgement of his supreme authority, as father of fathers, and pontiff of all prelates; they adopt the language that had been used by pope Innocent I. in writing to the African bishops of his time (A.D. 417), who with a like zeal for orthodoxy with that of their successors had urged him, with some apparent doubt of his being sufficiently willing, to declare against Pelagianism. The language thus quoted is to the effect, that Rome was the one unfailing fountain of truth from which all the streams throughout the world should flow, and that nothing ought to be done, even in the most remote provinces, without the knowledge and authority of the apostolic see. The Africans of Innocent's day had shown themselves by no means ready to acknowledge to this extent the paramount authority of Rome [INNOCENTIUS (12)]; but circumstances had changed, and certainly on the occasion before us Theodore had no reason to complain of any want of submission and allegiance on the part of the African bishops. The purport of their letter is to urge him to take action, some disappointment being respectfully intimated at his having

delayed to do so: they implore him "with tears" to send their own remonstrances to Paul, and himself to admonish him, and in the event of his contumacy to excommunicate him. In this address to Theodore the bishops of the province of Carthage had not joined, the reason apparently being that the see of Carthage was then occupied by Fortunatus, a Monothelite. But Victor, who shortly succeeded Fortunatus, at once made up for the defect by sending, in behalf of himself and his suffragans, a letter similar in purport to that already spoken of.

Thus urged, Theodore sent his messengers to Constantinople with a letter to Paul, which is no longer extant, though the reply to it is. In this reply, after enlarging at length on the duty of charity and on his own resolution not to return evil for evil by using such language as the pope had used, the patriarch expounds his faith, asserting in the end distinctly the doctrine of one Will, as being alone consistent with the teaching of the Fathers, and, as he does not omit to add, that received by pope Honorius. Having thus avowed himself a persistent Monothelite, he was formally condemned by Theodore, and his deposition pronounced, probably A.D. 648. Paul is said to have retaliated by overthrowing the altar in the pope's chapel at Constantinople, and persecuting his envoys. It was apparently after this, though in the same year, that Paulus persuaded the emperor to replace the *Ecthesis* by the *Type*; a document in which all future discussion of the doctrine of one or two Wills, or one or two Operations, was prohibited under severe penalties. It was issued, we may suppose, in view of the resolute opposition to the *Ecthesis* in the West, where it now seemed impossible to get it accepted; and it was probably in accord with the disposition of the patriarch himself, who may not have had very strong views of his own on the points at issue, though he had been compelled to take a side. For we have seen how at the time of his accession he had expressed himself so as to appear orthodox; and how, in his last letter to the pope, he had been at great pains to inculcate charity, and refrain from strong language. Intended to afford a *modus vivendi* between the contending parties, the *Type* proved an utter failure, as was likely to be the case. For to forbid the teaching of a doctrine which was held by so many to be essential to the faith, and to treat it as of no importance, would be no less offensive and intolerable than the assertion of the contrary view. Accordingly the *Type* was condemned in the Lateran Council, under Martin, as being at least quite as bad as the *Ecthesis*. But it does not appear that any judgment was passed upon it at Rome during the life of Theodore.

This pope is said by Anastasius to have been compassionate and liberal to the poor, to have built and enriched churches and oratories in Rome, and to have been buried in St. Peter's on the 14th of May, A.D. 649. The ancient authorities for the life above given are Anastasius, *Lib. Pontif., et Collecton., ed. Sirmondi;* Theophanes Confessor, *Chronograph.; Disputatio S. Maximi cum Pyrrho*, apud Labbe, f. vi. p. 1537; and especially the Acts of the first Lateran Council under pope Martin.

[J. B—Y.]

THEODORUS (39), elected by a party in Rome as pope after the death of Conon, A.D. 687, in opposition to Sergius. [SERGIUS (16).]

[J. B—Y.]

THEODORUS (40), bishop of Scythopolis, probably succeeded Theodosius, c. 540. During the rising of the Origenistic monks which followed the death of St. Sabbas, Theodore united himself to them, and, through the influence of Theodore Ascidas, he obtained the see of Scythopolis. Subsequently, under pressure, he recanted, and wrote a retractation of his Origenistic opinions in a "libellus," addressed to the emperor Justinian and to the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, containing twelve anathematisms directed against as many errors of Origen, winding up with an anathema on Origen himself, "cum detestandis et maledictis ejus dogmatibus," and on everybody who agreed with him (Galland. *Vet. Patr. Bibl.* xi.; Migne, *Patrol.* lxxxvi. pars 1, 231 ff.; Fabr. *Bibl. Graec.* x. 433; Cyrill. Scythop. *Vit. S. Sab.* No. 89 in Coteler. *Mon. Graec.* iii. 373; Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coislin. Praefat.* No. 7; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 692).

[E. V.]

THEODORUS (41) I. (THEODULUS), ST., first bishop and patron of Martigny (Octodurus), whence the see was in later times transferred to Sion. Tradition, which has been busy with his life, makes him the apostle of the Valais, and even extends his missionary efforts to the Burgundians, but the facts which are certain about him are very few. In 381, he was present at the council held at Aquileia, and in 390 he was at that of Milan, and subscribed the letter addressed by that synod to pope Siricius. From the *Liber de Laude Sanctorum* (2, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 441) of Victricius, bishop of Rouen (circ. A.D. 385–410), we learn that a Theodulus had sent him some much prized relics. Lebeuf, however, doubts his identity with this bishop (*ibid.* col. 439–40). The most interesting reference to his name is in the dedication of the *Passio Agaunensium Martyrum* of St. Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, which makes Theodorus the authority for the narrative. Eucherius says he obtained the details from people to whom Isaac, bishop of Geneva, had related them, Isaac having heard them, he believed, "a beatissimo episcopo Theodoro, viro temporis anterioris" (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* l. 827). As to the credibility of the story of St. Maurice and the Thebaean legion, see LEGIO THEBAEA. Eucherius also asserts in this treatise that, according to tradition, the position of the bodies of the martyrs had been revealed to Theodorus, bishop of the place, who built a church and dedicated it in their honour (*ibid.* 832). The date of this dedication is given as about 352, and Theodorus's death about 391. He is marked on both the 16th and 26th of August (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 734; Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. iii. 273–80; Aug. v. 814–5). [S. A. B.]

THEODORUS (42) II., ST., eighth bishop of Sion, in the Valais, is named among those present at the council said to have been held at Agaunum, in 516, by the order of Sigismund for the dedication of the new church of St. Maurice. Theodorus is said to have assisted Ambrose, the abbat, in building the monastery. He is com-

memorated Aug. 27 (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 735; Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. vi. 43). [S. A. B.]

THEODORUS (43) I., bishop of Tarsus, c. 325 (Gams), said to have been the younger brother of the celebrated Arian Auxentius, bishop of Mopsuestia, and to have been educated at the university of Athens (Suidas *in Auxent.* p. 492). He succeeded Lupus as bishop of Tarsus, and attended the council of Nicaea (Labbe, ii. 52). Tillemont questions the authenticity of the list in which his name appears, deducing, from Athanasius's words, that Lupus was at Nicaea. (*Mem. Eccl.* vi. 640, 806, note iii.) The Anomoean Aetius was one of Theodorus's hearers at Tarsus. He was one of the electors of Eusebius, of Caesarea, to the see of Antioch. (Euseb. *Vit. Const.* iii. 62, p. 519. Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 871.) [E. V.]

THEODORUS (44), third Nestorian bishop of Tharu in Persia, and metropolitan, flourished about A.D. 540. He composed in verse the history of St. Eugenius and his companions, a commentary upon the Psalms, answers to some questions put by Sergius, and other works. (Assemanus, *B. Or.* iii. 147; Greg. Barhebr. *Chron.* i. 86; Le Quien, *Or. C.* ii. 1261.) [J. G.]

THEODORUS (45), second bishop of Tournai. He belonged to a family that was driven into the town by the pressure of the heathen, and succeeded Superior as bishop. He is said to have been elected c. 470, and to have ruled three years, when he was killed by lightning, or as some say was martyred; his date is doubtful, being carried by Bucherius to the close of the 5th century, but he was succeeded by ELEUTHERIUS (10), (*Gall. Christ.* iii. 208; Boll. *AA.SS.* Feb. iii. 184, 190, 201, 208; *Vita S. Eleutherii*, auct. Guiberto c. 2. § 11). [J. G.]

THEODORUS (46), bishop of Trimithus in Cyprus, one of the leading bishops at the Sixth General Council at Constantinople, 680, where he took the place of his metropolitan Epiphanius from the fourteenth session onwards. He produced a collection of extracts from the writings of the fathers on the two natures of Christ, which were read to the council. (Labbe, vi. 1029, 1077). A biography of Chrysostom is ascribed to him, said to exist in *Cod. Regio*, 1833. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1070.) [E. V.]

THEODORUS (47), bishop of Tripolis in Phoenicia Prima, one of the bishops at Chalcedon in 451 (Labbe, iv. 83, 329, &c.), who, in 458, signed the reply to the encyclical of the emperor Leo (*ibid.* 922). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 823.) [E. V.]

THEODORUS (48) I., bishop of Tropaea in Bruttii, subscribed the proceedings of the council held at Rome by pope Agatho before the sixth general council at Constantinople in A.D. 680. (Mansi, xi. 301; Cappelletti, xxi. 218.) [F. D.]

THEODORUS (49) II., bishop of Tropaea, attended the council of Nicaea in A.D. 787. (Mansi, xii. 993.) [F. D.]

THEODORUS (50), bishop of Tyana, a friend and fellow-countryman of Gregory Nazianzen, to whom a considerable number of his letters are addressed. He was a native of Arianzus. His piety was manifested at an early age, at a time when he appears to have contemplated marriage, and therefore before he had embraced the clerical life (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 220). He was taken by Gregory as his companion when he settled in Constantinople in 379, and shared with him in the ill-treatment he received from the Arian monks and rabble who had broken into their assembly during the celebration of the Divine mysteries, and had pelted the ministering clergy with stones. Theodore was less able to put up with this violence than Gregory, who, as he says, was more accustomed to trials of the kind, and declared his intention of taking legal proceedings against his assailants. To divert him from his purpose Gregory wrote him a long and excellent letter (which with others has been erroneously referred to Theodore of Mopsuestia by Facundus, lib. vii. c. 7, cp. Labbe, v. 476), shewing by precept and example how far more admirable it was to forgive injuries than to avenge them (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 81). He subsequently became bishop of Tyana, but not before 381, when his predecessor Epherius attended the council of Constantinople (Labbe, ii. 956). After Gregory's return to Arianzus many letters of friendship and affection passed between him and Theodore. Gregory invited him to visit him at the time of a martyrs' festival (*Ep.* 90), but his health forbad him to return the visit (*Ep.* 221). To his urgent request that he would attend a meeting of bishops, Gregory replied that he should be delighted to come to see him alone, but he would have nothing to do with such assemblies, *συνόδους καὶ συλλόγους πόρρωθεν ἀσπάζομεθα*, which, to say the least, he had found to be pernicious (*Ep.* 84). Gregory also wrote to Theodore commendatory letters on behalf of various individuals (*Epp.* 82, 83, 85, 89), which it is unnecessary to particularize, one of which, on behalf of some ladies belonging to another province who had been tyrannically treated by some powerful man, was quoted at the second council of Constantinople (Labbe, v. 476), together with one relating to a certain George of Paspasus who conceived that he was not bound by an oath he had taken on account of some defect in its formality (*Ep.* 219; Labbe, *u. s.* 477). When, in 382, Gregory's great-nephews Nicobulus and his brothers were sent to be taught rapid writing, *ταχυγραφεῖν μαθησόμενοι*, at Tyana, Gregory begged his friend Theodore to get them lodged near his church and to see as much of the boys as he could (*Ep.* 84). On the attempt of the Apollinarians to perpetuate the schism at Nazianzus, by appointing a bishop of their own, Gregory wrote in very earnest terms, in A.D. 382, to Theodore, calling on him, as the metropolitan, to appoint a bishop in his room, as his age and weakness of health forbad his exercising efficient episcopal superintendence of the church (*Ep.* 88). After being compelled to withdraw his resolution to retire and reluctantly to resume the care of Nazianzus, he felt he had reason to complain of Theodore's apparently siding with his enemies, and expressed his feelings with some vehemence (*Ep.* 83). The real friendship between them however was not weakened, and on the completion, in 382, of the Philocalia—as the collection of extracts from Origen made

by him and Basil many years before was entitled—Gregory sent Theodore a copy as an Easter gift (*Ep.* 115 al. 87). Theodore was one of the bishops deputed to attend the council summoned against Chrysostom by Theophilus at the end of 403. He is honourably distinguished by Palladius as a man of much wisdom and authority, and of great mildness of disposition, who when he discovered the malicious intention of Theophilus and his partisans, retired to his diocese soon after his arrival (Pallad. p. 23). The Theodorus to whom Chrysostom addressed his *Ep.* 112 has been variously identified with Theodore of Mopsuestia, as assumed by Facundus Hermianensis, and with Theodore of Tyana, as stated without reasons assigned by the Second Council of Constantinople (Labb. v. 490). Tillemont who discusses the point decides (xi. 608) for Theodore of Mopsuestia. For the contents of the letter see THEODORUS (26), p. 72. [E. V.]

THEODORUS (51), a Jacobite bishop of Urema, known to us from No. 2 of the *Codices Nitrenses* placed by pope Clement XI. in the Vatican Library. This codex consists of the Four Gospels in Syriac, written in 736 under bishop Theodorus at Castrum Urema, believed to have been a Syrian camp on the bank of the Euphrates near Samosata. (Assem. *B. O.* i. 561; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 1529.) [C. H.]

THEODORUS (52), bishop of Usula, a seaport of Byzacene, Ant. *Itin.* 59, 2 (*Inshillah*), present at the council of Cabarsassum, A.D. 393, condemning Primian, and condemned by that of Bagaia, A.D. 394 (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 19, 23; 53, 59, iv. 4, 5, *c. Gaudent.* ii. 7, 7). [H. W. P.]

Presbyters.

THEODORUS (53), priest and abbat of Tabenna, in the Thebaid, closely associated with Pachomius, abbat of the same place [PACHOMIUS (1)], and with St. Athanasius in his fourth exile. [ATHANASIUS, supra, Vol. I. p. 199.] Born A.D. 314, of noble parents in the Upper Thebaid, he forsook, at an early age, his worldly prospects, and found asylum with Palaemon the anchoret, and then, in the monastery at Tabenna, with Pachomius. His mother followed to withdraw him from monasticism, but herself became a nun in a neighbouring cell. Under Pachomius he became oeconomus of the monastery, and was pressed by him to become the abbat, but declined it. His fame extended, and he is known as the Ἡγιασμένος and Sanctificatus. In the *Acts of S. Pachomius*, Theodorus is very closely associated with him, and when Pachomius died, Theodorus was again asked to accept the abbacy, but withdrew in favour of Orsisius. On the retirement of Orsisius, on account apparently of discontent among the monks, Theodorus succeeded, brought in many reforms, visited the subject monasteries, and founded five new ones, viz. two near Ptolemais and Hermothis, and three called Caius, Obi, and Bechre (Boll. *AA.SS.* Mai, iii. 327–8). But it was during the lifetime of Pachomius that he met St. Athanasius in the Thebaid, and is said to have announced to that saint the death of the emperor Julian, then occurring in the distant Persia (Athanasius, *Opp.* ii. 695). We know, at least by his letters, that St. Athanasius had a great regard for him, and bewailed his decease (*Epp. ad Orsisium* in *Pat. Graec.* xxvi. 978). St. Nilus (*De Orat.* cap. 8) gives an anecdote of him. He died A.D. 367 (Tillemont, *H. E.* vii. 225) or 368 (Boll. *AA.SS.* Mai, iii. 291). Gennadius (*De Script. Eccl.* i. 8) calls him presbyter, and gives the substance of three epistles he is said to have addressed to other monasteries, but there is none of them extant. His own feast is May 14 or 15. Boll. *AA.SS.* Mai, 14, iii. 287–362, give the most elaborate account of the abbats of Tabenna, Pachomius and Theodorus, with *Acta*, *Paralipomena*, *Epistola Ammonis Episc. ad Theophilum Pap. Alex.*, de conversatione et particulari vita SS. Pachomii et Theodori, and other illustrative documents; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* ix. 318; Tillemont, *H. E.* vii. 469 sq. 758 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 208; Fleury, *H. E.* xx. 9; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iv. 233 sq. 391). [J. G.]

THEODORUS (54), a priest at whose request and for whose use Socrates composed his Ecclesiastical History (Soc. *H. E.* ii. 1 and preface to lib. vi.). [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (55), in some MSS. Theodulus, and Theodotus, a presbyter, to whom, with Camillus, Prosper of Aquitaine addressed answers to the extracts from the works of St. Augustine on Predestination sent to him by some of the clergy of Genoa (Prosper, *Opp.* i. p. 136; Aug. *Opp.* vol. x. p. 1850, ed. Migne). [PROSPER (4).] [H. W. P.]

THEODORUS (56), priest of Antioch, in the 5th century. He wrote a treatise in fifteen books against the Apollinarian and Eunomian heresies. He has been sometimes confounded with Theodore of Rhaithu [THEODORUS (57)]. The work of Theodore of Antioch is not now extant (Gennad. *de Vir. Illust.* cap. xii.; Ceill. x. 587). [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (57), a priest and monk of Raythu, cir. 650, and author of a work on the Incarnation, in reply to the Manichaean, Paulianist, Apollinarian, Nestorian, and Eutychian heresies [JULIANUS (47)]. Combefis believed him to be the Theodorus to whose questions St. Maximus replied, *Opp.* t. ii., p. 151 [MAXIMUS (23)]. In Baron. *Annales*, at A.C. 657, in list of works of St. Maximus, is inserted an epistle written by him, 'Theodoro Presbytero Laurae Raithu de Essentia et Natura.' Fabricius in *Biblioth. Graeca*, lib. v. cap. 33, gives a list of editions of Theodore's work on the Incarnation, which was first published at Paris in 1556. It will be found in Migne's *Patr. Graec.* t. xci. col. 1479, and an analysis of it in Ceillier, xi. 787. Suidas, s. v. Μάνης. [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (58), a presbyter mentioned by Photius as having written a work (now lost) in defence of the genuineness of the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius. Pearson (*Vindic. Ignat.* i. 18) thought the author might have been Theodore of Raythu (Phot. *Biblioth.* cod. i.; Cave, i. 587; Ceill. xi. 787). [G. T. S.]

Deacons, sub-deacon, readers, cantor.

THEODORUS (59), deacon of the Roman church, one of the interlocutors in the Dialogue of Palladius, *de Vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi* (Migne, *Patr. Graec.* xlvii. i. 1). [F. D.]

THEODORUS (60), a deacon of Alexandria. He had been ordained by Cyril about the year 430, after serving for twenty-two years in the Imperial body-guard. He was deposed by Dioscorus after his accession to office. Theodorus lodged a complaint against Dioscorus, which was the first read at the third session of the council of Chalcedon, Oct. 13, 451. (Mansi, vi. 1006; Hefele, *Councils*, t. iii. p. 323, Clark's ed.; Ceill. x. 687.) [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (61), deacon, and Georgius, priest of Constantinople, were the legates sent A.D. 596 to Rome, by the patriarch CYRIACUS, *q. v.* [F. D.]

THEODORUS (62), a sub-deacon of Samosata, from whom Basil, in 374, learnt the beginning of the troubles in that church which followed the banishment of Eusebius (Basil. *Ep.* 219 [280].) [E. V.]

THEODORUS (63), reader of the church of Alexandria, who being attracted by the fame of Pachomius and his community at Tabenna, proceeded thither and obtained admission into it, where he was placed in charge of foreigners and those who spoke Greek, acting as interpreter for such as did not understand the native Egyptian. He is mentioned in the *Life of Pachomius*, where he is usually called Theodorus Alexandrinus, to distinguish him from the more eminent Theodorus, the successor of Pachomius. (*Vit. Pachom.* cap. viii. § 61 sq., in Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii. 319, 354 B; Tillem. vii. 234, 485, 486.) [C. H.]

THEODORUS (64) LECTOR or reader of the church of Constantinople, a historian in the 6th century. He composed in two books a tripartite history out of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, which is still in manuscript at Venice. It was copied by Leo Allatius, who intended to publish it, but did not fulfil his intention. Valesius used his MS. in his edition of those authors. He also composed a history which extends from the last days of Theodosius the younger to the reign of the elder Justin, A.D. 518; some portions of which remain, and will be found in Migne's *Pat. Graec.* lxxxvi. col. 157–2280. They have been collected out of Nicephorus Callistus, John of Damascus, and the fifth action of the Seventh General Council. The fragments of Theodorus contain some curious stories which illustrate the religious life of cent. vi. John of Damascus quotes from his Fourth Book an incident told also by Victor Tunnunensis, *Chron.* ann. 498, concerning an Arian who was attacking the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity in the public baths of Constantinople, and was scalded to death by an angel, though the heretic was plunged in cold water at the time. The emperor Anastasius ordered a picture of this miracle to be fixed to the spot where it occurred. His history abounds with wonderful stories in defence of orthodoxy. He tells how the empress Eudoxia found, at Jerusalem, the portrait of the Blessed Virgin painted by St. Luke, and sent it to Constantinople; how a painter of that city was divinely punished for daring to paint our Saviour as Jupiter; how the Arian bishop of the same place was miraculously reproved for daring to change the formula of baptism when baptizing one Barbas. The name of the bishop was Deuterius, and he dared to baptize him thus, "Barbas is baptized in the name of the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit," upon which the water vanished out of the font. He tells, too, that Timotheus, bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 571, was the first to ordain the recitation of the Nicene creed at all celebrations of the Holy Communion. It was previously only recited once a year, at the end of Lent. It is evident that the Arian party must have been still strong at C.P. in cent. vi. A question has been raised whether our Theodore did not live in cent. viii. and not in cent. vi. Combefis, in his *Originum Rerumque Constant. Manip.*, and Bandurius in his *Imper. Orient.* have given some quotations from a Theodorus Lector relating to the statues with which Constantinople was adorned. One of them contains an incident which proves the writer to have lived in the reign of the emperor Philip, A.D. 711–713 (Combef. p. 11; Baud. p. 88); but it is evident that two men of the same name may have occupied the same office in the same church in the course of two centuries. (Ceill. xi. 103–105; Fab. *Bib. Graec.*) [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (65), lector of Thessalonica. [EUSEBIUS (86).]

THEODORUS (66), a cantor of the Roman church, learned in the Gregorian ritual, along with another of equal merit named Benedict, while Charles the Great was visiting Rome in 787. By pope Hadrian's permission, they both accompanied Charles to France, and having been stationed one (it is not said which) at Metz and the other at Soissons, reformed the musical services of the whole French church after the Roman model (*Annales Laurishamenses*, ad ann. 787, in Bouquet V. 555, and *Pat. Lat.* civ. 427, 429). [G. W. D.]

Monks. For monks who were priests, see under Priests.

THEODORUS (67), solitary of Mount Nitria, and a disciple of Amun or Ammon, a father of the same desert. Some anecdotes are recorded of him in the *Life of Antony* by Athanasius (cap. 60), and he is mentioned also in the *Narratio Athanasii ad Ammonium*, in the works of St. Athanasius (*Pat. Gr.* xxvi. 982). He occurs also in Palladius (*Laus. Hist.* cap. 8), Sozomen (i. 14), and Cassiodorus (*Hist. Trip.* i. 14). Baronius (*Mart. R.* Jan. 7) records him, but in his note wrongly calls him a disciple of Antony. He is noticed also by Tillemont (vii. 155, 156). [C. H.]

THEODORUS (68), of Perinthus, mentioned by Nicephorus Callistus (*H. E.* ix. 14), among the monks noted for maintaining the Nicene doctrine in the reign of Constantius. [C. H.]

THEODORUS (69), Sep. 5, one of a deputation of eighty ecclesiastics led by himself Menedemes and Urbanus, and sent by the Catholic party to Valens, asking for relief from Arian persecution. Valens sent them all to sea, with orders to the sailors to set the ship on fire and then abandon it. They all perished (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 14). [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (70), solitary of Pharme, between Nitria and Scete. He lived in the fourth century and was notable for his love of solitude. On one occasion, an abbat, Joseph, was sick and desirous of his ministrations. So he sent for Theodorus in the middle of the week, who replied that he would go and see him on Saturday if he was still alive; but if not, they would see one another often enough in the next world. (Cf. Pallad. *Vit. PP.*; Coteler. *Monum.* I. 363, and a full account of him in Tillem. *Mém.* xii. 364, 662.) [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (71), monk in Cyprus, friend of Epiphanius of Salamis [EPIPHANIUS (1)], and addressed in a letter by Gregorius the abbat [GREGORIUS (55)]: he flourished A.D. 390 (Assemanus, *B. O.* i. 170–74, iii. 191; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 2). [J. G.]

THEODORUS (72), head of a monastery in Egypt, in the 4th century. Jerome translated a letter of his to the monks on the Paschal feast for the benefit of the monks of Latin race sojourning in Egypt (Jerome, vol. ii. 101, ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

THEODORUS (73), an Egyptian solitary, visited by Cassian, who describes his sanctity, wisdom, and knowledge of Scripture, which last he had acquired not so much from study and literary help as from purity of heart. Whenever he met with a difficulty, he would spend seven days and nights in prayer, until he had learnt the true meaning by divine revelation. (Cassian, *Instit.* v. 33, 34, 35.) Cassian held his sixth conference, *De Nece Sanctorum*, with one Theodorus, whom Cassian's commentator Gazaeus believes to be the same person as the above. [C. H.]

THEODORUS (74), of Lycopolis, interpreter to the famous John of Lycopolis. [JOANNES (487)], cir. 394. (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 43; Tillem. x. 15, 23.) [C. H.]

THEODORUS (75), solitary of Eleutheropolis, whose sayings are recorded in the *Apophthegmata Patrum.* (Coteler. *Mon. Graec. Eccl.* i. 461; Tillem. x. 32.) [C. H.]

THEODORUS (76), solitary of Scete, mentioned in the *Apophthegmata Patrum.* (Coteler. *Mon. Gr. Eccl.* i. 461; Tillem. x. 472.) One of his sayings was that when troubled with evil thoughts we should banish them and resort to prayer. [C. H.]

THEODORUS (77), a solitary, described as OF THE NINTH (τοῦ Ἐννάτου, e Nono, *i.e.* as Rosweyd explains, of the ninth quarter in Alexandria). A saying of his was, that if God should impute to us our negligence and distractions of mind in prayer and Psalms we could not be saved. (*Apophtheg. Patr.* in Coteler. *Gr. Eccl. Mon.* i. 460; Rosw. *Vit. Pat.* v. 11, § 11; Tillem. xi. 370.) [C. H.]

THEODORUS (78), a Roman monk, who was sent by the pope Anastasius to the East, in the year 400, to declare the condemnation of Origenism by the Roman church. He visited Theophilus at Alexandria, and probably induced him to send his letter to the bishops of Palestine and Cyprus, inviting them to join in the condemnation. After this, he visited the monasteries of Nitria, and found the monks to be obedient to the faith. He would not return to Rome without visiting Bethlehem, and Theophilus gave him a letter of introduction to Jerome (Jerome, *Epp.* 89, 92, ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

THEODORUS (79), described as a prophetic man, living at Alexandria when the younger Melania called there in 412. (*Vit. Melaniae*, § 20, in Surius, *De Prob. Hist. SS.* Dec. 31, p. 380; Tillem. xiv. 246.) [C. H.]

THEODORUS (80), an Alexandrian monk, who wrote against Themistius, the leader at Alexandria in the sixth century of the sect of the Agnoëtae (Phot. Cod. cviii.; Ceill. xi. 653). [AGNOËTAE.] Theodorus fell into the error of those who maintained the passibility of the Godhead. [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (81), had followed his brother more from necessity than inclination in becoming a monk in Gregory the Great's monastery. There he would give no heed to religious conversation, but turned off everything with a jest or an oath. For his brother's sake, however, they bore with his perverseness. Gregory relates how, when at the point of death in the pestilence at Rome, he saw a vision of a monstrous dragon trying to devour him, how he recovered, and how he became a changed man. (*Dial.* iv. 38; *Hom.* 19, 38.) [F. D.]

THEODORUS (82) STUDITA, a monk of Constantinople, and a controversialist against the Iconoclasts. He was of an honourable family at Constantinople, and the son of a woman named Theoctista, while his uncle Plato was the archimandrite of the monastery of Saccudium where Theodorus was trained for a monastic life. He was born in 759, and succeeded his uncle, who retired in his favour in 794, and died in 812 aged 97. Theodorus was so indignant with the emperor Constantine VI. and Tarasius the patriarch, for their conduct as regards the divorce of the empress Maria, and the marriage of Theodote, that he excommunicated all the parties concerned. The emperor then banished him to Thessalonica. The empress Irene recalled him after the emperor's death, and appointed him abbat of the monastery of Studium, whence his surname. In 806 he again found himself in trouble. Nicephorus, a layman, was appointed patriarch in 806. He wished to let bygones be bygones, and so he restored to his functions the priest Joseph, who had blessed the marriage of Constantine and Theodote [JOSEPHUS (30)]. Theodorus thereupon seceded from communion with the patriarch, and was again banished by a decree of a synod in 809, but was restored in 811 by Michael Rhangabe. A fresh controversy next engaged his powers. Leo, the Armenian, renewed in 814, the Iconoclastic controversy which had slept for some time, by the publication of an edict against the worship of images. Theodorus took up the defence with all the enthusiasm of his nature, manifest proofs of which remain among his writings. He testified his zeal in many ways, openly flouted the imperial decree by celebrating processions in honour of the sacred images, and finally found himself in banishment at Smyrna, whence he was liber-

ated in 821 by the emperor Michael the Stammerer. His intolerant spirit would not allow him to rest. He waxed indignant with Michael for his leniency towards the Iconoclasts, and lent his support to the rebellion of Thomas the Cappadocian. He was banished therefore for the fourth time in 823, wandering about from island to island till he died on Nov. 11, 826, on which day the Greeks celebrate his memory. His life is set forth in detail by Baronius, *Annal.* ix. A. 795-826, who derived his materials from a Greek life published by a monk variously called Joannes and Michaelis. This life will also be found in Sirmond. *Opp.* t. v. (Paris, 1696), where the remains of Theodorus, known up to date, are collected, and also in Mai's *Bib. Nov. Pat.* vi. 292-363, with which may be compared in the same volume, p. 158, Leo Allat. *de Theodoris*, sec. xcviii. He was succeeded in his office by the abbat Naucratius, whose encyclical epistle concerning the death of Theodorus has been published by Combefis, in his *Auct. Nov. Bib. PP.* t. i. p. 855-882. His writings, controversial and otherwise, were very numerous. They have been published by Sirmond in the fifth volume of his works, A.D. 1596. Cardinal Mai in his *Bib. Nov. PP.* cited above, published some treatises afterwards discovered, notable among which are his Rules and Constitutions, for the management of his monastery, where he lays down penances as numerous and strict as those of the famous Rule of St. Columbanus, with which they may be usefully compared. All his published works have now been collected in Migne's *Pat. Graec.* t. xcix., where they are arranged in the following order. First comes his life; then his dogmatic works; next his catechetical writings and his sermons; then his epistles, followed by his ascetic treatises, and concluding with his writings on liturgical, monastic and canonical subjects, and a few hymns in honour of images. The volume also contains two appendices, containing a discourse attributed to him, the will of Theodorus and the epistle of Naucratius mentioned above. The epistles form a very numerous collection. They deal with the most diverse topics, and are useful to the student of the social life of century ix. Thus the third epistle of the first Book sets forth his treatment in exile at Thessalonica; the 22nd tells of the Greek marriage ritual of the period; the 33rd and 34th of the claim made by the Byzantine emperor to be above the Divine law; while the 219th of the Second Book instructs the faithful how they may enjoy Holy Communion without a priest.

A catalogue of his letters printed and in MS. will be found in Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* t. x. pp. 434-474. The dogmatic writings of Theodorus are important for the history of the Iconoclastic controversy. They follow in the main the lines laid down by the writers on the side of images in the eighth century [cf. the article ICONOCLASTAE]. A new edition of his work is a desideratum. It was promised in the last century by Toustain and Tassin, two members of the congregation of Saint Maur. They worked at the subject for twenty years, and yet the work never appeared. Fabricius above and Ceill. xii. 298-322 bestow very exhaustive notices upon Theodorus. The names of his mother and uncle have been already mentioned. The only other member of his family with whom we are acquainted was his brother Joseph, archbishop of Thessalonica. He embraced the same views as his brother, and suffered accordingly. He lived till A.D. 832, and published a treatise on the *Adoration of the Cross*, still extant in Gretser, Opp. t. ii. p. 116: cf. Ceill. *l. c.* p. 320. [G. T. S.]

Martyr and Confessor.

THEODORUS, (83) of Amasea, a young soldier who suffered in the persecution under Maximian and Galerius in c. 306, surnamed "Tiro" in the martyrologies from having been a recruit at the time of his martyrdom. The authorities for his history are the "Encomium" of Gregory Nyssen, delivered in the church built over his relics on the day of his yearly commemoration (Greg. Nyssen. tom. iii. pp. 578-586), and the less trustworthy "Acta," acknowledged by the cautious Tillemont to have been interpolated. Theodore was a young man of humble origin (Gregory styles him "a poor recruit," ὁ πένης, ὁ νεόλεκτος) who, being already a Christian, was forced into the ranks by conscription. His birthplace, unknown to Gregory, who vaguely designates it as "the East," is defined by later writers, probably without authority, as Tyre. Having accompanied his regiment to winter quarters at Amasea the capital of Pontus, his refusal to join his comrades in sacrifice declared him to be a Christian. On his apprehension he seems to have been treated with much consideration by both the civil and military authorities. His hearing was deferred some days, to offer him time to come to a better mind. This interval the rash lad, with the morbid desire for self-sacrifice then so fatally prevalent, employed in firing the temple of the Mother of the Gods, which stood in the middle of the city on the banks of the Iris. Both the building and the statue of the deity were reduced to ashes. Such an unwarrantable insult to the religious feelings of the city, against which a canon of the contemporary synod of Elvira (*Can.* lx.) is directed, could only have one issue. At the judgment seat Theodore boldly acknowledged and gloried in the act. We may safely reject Gregory's statement, that the judges endeavoured to seduce him from his fidelity to Christ by large promises of wealth, high place, and even appointment to the high priesthood. Such offers are ludicrously out of place in dealing with a confessed incendiary, a recruit from the ranks. Theodore was handed over to the torturers, but he endured the rack and fork unmoved, chanting Ps. xxxiv. i. "I will bless the Lord at all times, His praise shall ever be in my mouth." From prison, where the story went the young confessor was visited at night by angels who filled the cell with light and song, he was led forth to death by burning in a furnace. His ashes were begged by a lady named Eusebia, and translated by her to Euchaites, where a magnificent martyry was erected, described by Gregory as adorned with carvings of stone and wood, and a pavement and wall-pictures of mosaic, in which the martyrdom of the saint was depicted. His relics were accredited with remarkable miraculous virtue. The very dust of his tomb was carefully gathered and preserved for its healing efficacy. Though held in the winter, immense crowds assembled to see and

touch his bones at his yearly festival. At one of these Gregory's oration was delivered, just after a threatened inroad of the Scythians into Pontus had been averted, and as it was believed, by the intercessions of the soldier-saint. His anniversary is held by the Greeks on Feb. 17, and by the Latins on Nov. 9. Theodore's popularity and honour as a saint and intercessor was very wide. No fewer than three churches were dedicated in his honour in Constantinople (Du Cange, *Constantinop. Christ.* vol. iv. c. 6, No. 100–102). He had also a martyry at Jerusalem (Cyr. *Vit. S. Sab.* ap. Coteler. *Eccl. Gr. Mon.* iii. No. 78) and at Damascus (Johan. Damasc. *de Sacr. Imag.* Or. iii.). The little circular church of San Teodoro, popularly known as St. Toto, at the base of the Palatine Hill in Rome, is well known. The Venetians claim to have got possession of his body c. 1256, and to preserve it in the church which bears his name. Moschus bears witness to the crowds assembling at his tomb in Euchaites (*Prat. Spirit.* c. 180). The decisive victory of the Byzantine emperor, John Zimiskes, over the invading Russian army under Swiatoslaff at Dorystolon on the Danube in 971, took place on St. Theodore's Day, and was ascribed not only to his intercession but to "the personal assistance" of the saint "who found it necessary to lead the charge of the Roman lancers, and shiver a spear with the Russians himself before their phalanx could be broken" (Finlay, *Byzantine Empire*, p. 412). This intervention, it had been revealed the day before the battle to a godly matron at Constantinople, was due to the intercession of the Virgin with Theodore. As a token of the grateful sense of St. Theodore's aid Zimiskes pulled down the old martyry which contained the relics of the saint and erected a new and more magnificent church, and changed the name of the city from Euchaites to Theodoropolis (Zonaras, *Annal.* lib. xvii. c. 3, p. 213, ed. Par. 1687; Cedrenus, *Hist. Compend.* pars ii. p. 681, ed. Par. 1647; Greg. Nyssen. *Oratio de Magno Martyre Theodoro*, tom. iii. pp. 578–586, ed. Par. 1638; Migne, *Patrol.* tom. iii. col. 735–748; Surius, Nov. 9, p. 231, § 7; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. v. pp. 369–377, notes 732–735; Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum*, pp. 505–511). [E. V.]

THEODORUS (84), a young man of Antioch, confessor under the emperor Julian. His sufferings, in which the prefect SALLUSTIUS (1) was the unwilling agent, are related by Rufinus (*H. E.* i. 36), Theodoret (*H. E.* iii. 7 al. 11), Sozomen (v. 20), and Socrates (iii. 19). He has been confused with Alexander, a martyr at Corinth (Tillem. vii. 390, 734). [C. H.]

Lay Miscellaneous.

THEODORUS (85), a layman whom Atticus, bishop of Synnada, permitted to preach in his presence (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19). See NEO. [G. S.]

THEODORUS (86) (MANLIUS or MALLIUS), a philosophical writer, wealthy and of great eminence, at the time of St. Augustine's sojourn near Milan, A.D. 386, and much esteemed by him, and to whom he dedicated his book *de Beata Vita*. But afterwards he regretted that he had praised him beyond his merits (*de Beata Vit.* i. 4; *de Ordine*, i. 31: *Retract.* i. 2). He is also mentioned by him as consul, A.D. 399, a consulship celebrated by Claudian, in his panegyric *de Cons. Mall. Theod.* (Aug. *Civ. D.* xviii. 54). [H. W. P.]

THEODORUS (87), proconsul of Africa, who pronounced sentence finally in the case of the Maximianists, probably A.D. 396 [FELICIANUS (4) Vol. II. 475]; (Ribbek. *Aug. und Don.* p. 228, 231). [H. W. P.]

THEODORUS (88), praefectus praetorio, to whom edicts were addressed by Arcadius and Honorius (1) concerning maintenance of the privileges of churches and clerks, A.D. 397; (2) concerning punishment of persons using violence in churches or towards divine worship, A.D. 398; (3) concerning treatment of clerks either deprived by the bishop of their clerical offices, or relinquishing them voluntarily, A.D. 408 (*Cod. Theodos.* xvi. tit. ii. 30, 31, 39). [H. W. P.]

THEODORUS (89), bearer with Maximus of a letter from St. Augustine to Macrobius, Donatist bishop of Hippo, and reporter of his verbal answer to the same (Aug. *Ep.* 107, 108; *de Rusticiano*, 5). [MACROBIUS (2) Vol. III. 781.] [H. W. P.]

THEODORUS (90), the commander of the pretorians by whom Chrysostom was conducted to his place of exile, of whose kindness and consideration he speaks warmly. He subsequently commended Theophilus a presbyter of Constantinople, who had written to complain of his pecuniary distress, to his good offices. (Chrys. *Epp.* 10, 11, 115.) [E. V.]

THEODORUS, (91), the "Consularis"—i.e. governor—of Syria, who having written to Chrysostom, that if he got a second letter from him he should esteem it as a signal proof of regard, Chrysostom replied that so great was his respect for him, if he had messengers he would send him a perfect snowstorm of letters, but that not being so, he must beg him not to measure his affection by the frequency of his letters (Chrys. *Ep.* 139). Several letters of Libanius to him are extant. [E. V.]

THEODORUS (92), a friend of Chrysostom's at Constantinople, who remonstrates with him seriously for his silence regarding the cowardly neglect of their ministerial duties, in time of persecution, of the presbyters Sallustius and Theophilus, of whom the former was his intimate friend, leaving him to learn it first from others; as well as for not having taken effectual measures to conceal it. (Chrys. *Ep.* 210.) [SALLUSTIUS (3).] [E. V.]

THEODORUS (93), a physician at Caesarea, who, with his brother physician Hymnetius, had shewn him much kindness and skill in relieving Chrysostom's maladies during his short stay there on his way to Cucusus (Chrys. *Ep.* 12). He afterwards wrote to Chrysostom, apologizing for not coming to visit him on the ground of incessant occupation. Chrysostom replied that such excuses were quite needless, for much as he desired to see him again, he could not dare to deprive others of his skill and advice. But he begged him to write as often as he could (*Ep.* 228). [E. V.]

THEODORUS (94). Among the treatises of Chrysostom are two bearing the title *ad Theodorum lapsum*, or more fully in Savile's edition, *εἰς Θεόδωρον ἐκπεσόντα τοῦ ἐναρέτου βίου*. The object of each treatise is the same, viz. to recall one who having adopted the monastic life, had fallen away from it and returned to the world. The length of the treatises is very different, one filling five and twenty folio pages in Savile's edition, the other only six. There is no doubt that the Theodore whose name the shorter bears, and who is referred to by name in it, is the famous Theodore of Mopsuestia. For this we have the evidence of Sozomen (*H. E.* viii. 2), Hesychius, quoted in the 5th General Council (Labbe, v. p. 470), and Proclus (*ib.* p. 490). The person to whom the larger document, which is more of a set treatise than a letter, was addressed, is uncertain. The name Theodore does not appear in the body of the work, and depends solely upon the title, the authority of which is doubtful. A question has therefore arisen whether the two were addressed to the same person, or to two of the same name. The entire absence in either treatise of any reference to the other, the subject being the same, and the arguments employed similar, would be more natural if the persons were different. This is Tillemont's view, and is also that of Valesius, who is somewhat inclined to throw a needless doubt on the authenticity of the longer work (*Not. in Sozom.* p. 160). The argument drawn from a supposed disparity of age, urged by Tillemont, is too precarious to be dwelt upon. More weight may be given to the difference of the style in which the offence of which the party had been guilty is spoken of. The strong language used in the longer work seems to imply graver moral delinquencies than a mere forsaking of the monastic profession and a return to the world. An unbiassed perusal of the two would certainly lead to the belief, that they were addressed to two different persons under somewhat similar circumstances. The subject of the longer treatise was evidently enamoured of a girl named Hermione, who is not alluded to in the shorter. On the other hand, that the same person is addressed in each is the view of Montfaucon, Dupin, and Savile. The identity is supported by the fact, that two letters of Chrysostom to Theodore of Mopsuestia, are mentioned by Leontius of Byzantium (*in Nest. et Eutych.* lib. iii. c. 7), and by Isidore of Seville (*de Script. Eccl.* c. 6). The question is ably discussed by Tillemont (*Mém. Eccl.* vol. ix. p. 10; Not. vi. p. 650; vol. xii. p. 436) and by Monfaucon in his "Monitum" to the treatises (Migne, *Patrolog. Gr.* i. 1–51). [E. V.]

THEODORUS (95), high priest of the Jews in Minorca, A.D. 425, said by Severus in a letter of doubtful authenticity to have been converted suddenly to Christianity during the stay in that island of the relics of St. Stephen (*Ep.* Sev. in Aug. *Opp.* vol. vii. App. pp. 823–830, ed. Migne). [H. W. P.]

THEODORUS (96) a vicar (*τοποτηρητής*) to whom Theodoret wrote a festal epistle, according to custom, at a time of great public calamity. (Theod. *Epp.* 40.) [E. V.]

THEODORUS (97), praeses of Cyprus, directed by Flavius Dionysius, magister militum in the East, in a letter dated May 21st at Antioch, written in 431, to use his authority against the Cypriotes electing a metropolitan bishop of Salamis or Constantia, in succession to Troilus. (Labbe, *Concil.* iii. 799; Tillem. xiv. 446, 773.) This order was sent in the interest of the patriarch and clergy of Antioch, who claimed superiority over the church of Cyprus. [C. H.]

THEODORUS (98), Augustal prefect of Egypt, directed by the emperor Marcian, in 451, to have a patriarch of Alexandria elected in the place of Dioscorus (Liberat. Diac. *Brev.* cap. 14). In the following year Florus had succeeded to the office. (Evag. ii. 5; Tillem. xv. 744, 746.) [C. H.]

THEODORUS (99), a young man of rank, highly commended by Sidonius to Tetradius. (Sidon. Apollin. *Epp.* lib. iii. ep. 10.) [C. H.]

THEODORUS (100), consul, A.D. 505, to whom Fulgentius of Ruspe addressed a letter (*Epist.* 6 ad Theodor.) congratulating him on his conversion and retirement from the world. Ceill. xi. 30. [FULGENTIUS (3).] [G. T. S.]

THEODORUS (101), an adherent of Macedonius II., patriarch of Constantinople, who, after his death, cir. 517, is said to have appeared to Theodorus, sending him with a severe message to the emperor Anastasius. (Theod. Lector, *H. E.* ii. 36; Tillem. xvi. 696.) [C. H.]

THEODORUS (102), sacristan of St. Peter's at Rome. Gregory the Great (*Dial.* iii. 24) relates how St. Peter appeared to him as he was trimming the lamps there. [F. D.]

THEODORUS (103), physician of the emperor Maurice, an intimate friend of Gregory the Great, who wrote to him three times in A.D. 593, 594, and 597. In the first he requests him to use his influence with the emperor to procure the repeal of the obnoxious law about military service. [MAURICIUS (2).] In the second, after thanking him for the money he had sent for ransoming prisoners, he remonstrates with him for neglecting to read the scriptures daily, from his being so much occupied in worldly business. In the third he thanks him for a further present sent for the poor and for ransoming prisoners, and sends him a key containing a fragment of the chains of St. Peter. (*Epp.* iii. 66; vi. 31; vii. 28.) Theodorus is also mentioned in three letters to NARSES, the patrician. (*Epp.* i. 6; iv. 32; viii. 30.) Theophylact Simocatta (vi. 11) describes his successful mission to the Chagan of the Avars. [F. D.]

THEODORUS (104), palatinus, mentioned by Gregory the Great. (*Epp.* i. 13.) [F. D.]

THEODORUS (105), magister militum and duke of Sardinia, which he and his subordinates governed oppressively. Gregory the Great wrote to him in A.D. 591 to complain of their behaviour, directed the deacon Honoratus to lay his misdeeds before the emperor, and also wrote to the exarch of Africa about him. Eight years afterwards for a bribe of ten pounds of gold he prevented Crementius, the primate of the Byzacene province, being sent for trial before Gregory (*Epp.* i. 48, 49, 61; ix. 59). [F. D.]

THEODORUS (106), vir consularis, had informed Gregory the Great about Petrus the deacon, before PAULUS (39) had written. (*Epp.* ii. 15.) [F. D.]

THEODORUS (107), counsellor, is given a slave by Gregory the Great as a reward for his services. He is also mentioned in a letter to JANUARIUS (25). (*Epp.* iii. 18, ix. 4.) [F. D.]

THEODORUS (108), converted Jew, of Messina, was accused by Paula of endeavouring to injure her by witchcraft. (Gregorius, *Epp.* vii. 44.) [F. D.]

THEODORUS (109), major populi of Naples, had several disputes with the bishop FORTUNATUS (2), whom he charged with usurping the jurisdiction of the patronus of the city in certain matters, and also with taking possession of the city gates. The latter Gregory the Great ordered to be given up, with liberty to Fortunatus to assert his alleged right in an action if he thought proper. Theodorus further complained that, whereas he had for two years supplied Vectanus, the commander of the castle, with twenty urns of wine from Prochyta as a favour, his successor now claimed it as a right. (*Epp.* ix. 69, 104, x. 25.) [F. D.]

THEODORUS (110), curator or chief municipal magistrate at Ravenna, is thanked, in A.D. 599, for his assistance in bringing about the peace with the Lombards, by Gregory the Great, who complains that the duke of Spoleto refused to sign it, except under certain conditions. He also gives his reasons for refusing to sign himself, and requests Theodorus to get king Agilulf to excuse him. In three other letters Gregory commends to Theodore the wife of Joannes, the prefect of Rome, the messengers to Ravenna of Maurentius, the magister militum, and one Peter and his mother. In the first, Theodore is asked to provide her with an escort of soldiers as far as Perugia. (*Epp.* ix. 98, x. 6, xii. 6, xiii. 47.) For the duties of curator, see Cassiodorus, *Var.* vii. 12. [F. D.]

THEODORUS (111) CALLIOPAS, certainly twice, perhaps three times, exarch of Ravenna. He was first appointed after the death of ISAACUS (42), and therefore, c. 643. (Anastas. *Vita Theodori* in Migne *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 725.) He was soon recalled, as Plato was exarch when the ex-patriarch Pyrrhus came to Rome (*Epist. de S. Martino* in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 118) which was late in A.D. 645 (Theoph. *Chron.* in *Patr. Graec.* cviii. 682) [MAXIMUS (23)]. Again appointed as the successor of Olympius, c. 652, he entered Rome in June A.D. 653, took the pope prisoner, and sent him to Constantinople [MARTINUS (3) I., Vol. III. 854). He was no longer exarch in A.D. 666, as Gregorius is mentioned as exarch in the letter of that year of the emperor Constans, granting independence to the church of Ravenna (Agnellus in *Script. Rerum Lang.* 350 note). In the episcopate of Theodorus, which began in A.D. 677, the exarch Theodorus built a monastery in honour of St. Theodore at Ravenna, and presented three golden chalices to the cathedral. He also reconciled the archbishop and his clergy when the latter seceded to Classis on Christmas day (Agnellus, 359). Muratori (*Rer. It. Script.* ii. 153), from dissimilarity of their characters, supposes this Theodore to have been a different person from Theodorus Calliopas, and the length of time between the first appointment of Calliopas and the death of this Theodore supports the supposition. Moreover the name Theodore was then very common. Theodore died in A.D. 687 (Anastasius, *Vita Cononis* in *Patr. Lat.* cxxxiii. 883), and was buried with his wife Agata in the monastery of Maria ad Blachernas, which he used to visit every day (Agnellus, 356). [F. D.]

THEODORUS (112), son of Paul the Armenian and brother of Gegnoesius. He headed a party of the PAULICIANS in a life-long schism against his elder brother. (Phot. *c. Man.* i. 19; Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 28; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 343.) [PAULICIANI, p. 222.] [M. B. C.]

THEODOSIA (1), April 2, a virgin of Tyre and martyr at Caesarea, in Palestine, under the president Urban. She suffered, A.D. 307, by drowning when eighteen years of age (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* c. vii.). [G. T. S.]

THEODOSIA (2), sister of St. Amphilochius of Iconium and teacher of the famous St. Olympias [OLYMPIAS]. Greg. Naz. *Carm.* 57 celebrates her praises. He calls her θεοῦ δόσις, the nearest approach to her name which his metre allows [AMPHILOCHIUS] (Ceill. v. 364). [G. T. S.]

THEODOSIA (3), a nun who taught in public about A.D. 430, and was reproved by St. Nilus as contradicting St. Paul's authority (Nili *Ep.* ii. 116). [G. T. S.]

THEODOSIANI, the Alexandrian name, about A.D. 630, for one section of the Monophysite party, otherwise called Severians, or φθαρτολάτραι. Theodosius was then bishop when Cyrus of Phasis was appointed patriarch in A.D. 630. He patched up a reunion with them, which was effected June 3, 633 (Mansi, ix. 562; Hefele's *Councils*, sec. 293; Ceill. xii. 923). [G. T. S.]

THEODOSIUS (1), count, father of the emperor, a Spaniard by birth, and a distinguished soldier, first appears as sent by Valentinian at the end of A.D. 367 to Britain. Ammianus (xxvii. 8, xxviii. 3) describes his victorious career there, his restoring the cities, re-erecting fortresses, and finally reuniting the country between the Solway and Clyde, known afterwards as the province of Valentia, to the empire. On his return in A.D. 370 he was made *magister equitum*, and in the beginning of A.D. 373 he was sent to put down the rebellion of FIRMUS (7) q.v. For his death see GRATIANUS (5), Vol. II. 722. Before his execution he was baptized (Orosius, vii. 33). [F. D.]

THEODOSIUS (2) I., THE GREAT, was born A.D. 346 at Cauca, a Spanish town situated upon a small tributary of the Douro. He died Jan. 17, 395. His father was an eminent general in the service of Valentinian and Valens. From 367 to 370 he commanded in Britain, when he delivered London from imminent danger, and then marched into Caledonia,

where he repelled an invasion of the Picts, Scots and Atacotti. If we are to judge from Claudian, *de IV. Cons. Honor.* 30–34, the Saxons also took part in this invasion.

> "What did the stars avail, the seas unknown,
> The frost eternal of that frigid zone?
> The Saxon lifestream steeped the Acadian plain
> Thulē with blood of Picts grew warm again,
> And icy Erin mourned her Scotsmen slain."

Theodosius the Elder also served with great distinction in Germany and Mauretania, where he was treacherously executed in 376. The whole of his story will be found in the DICTIONARY OF CLASSICAL BIOGRAPHY. He left two sons, Theodosius and Honorius, the latter of whom died in Spain before his brother's accession to the throne. The other son, Theodosius, had already distinguished himself before his father perished. He had been trained to arms under his father's eye in Britain, whence he was appointed to high command on the barbarian frontier as Dux Moesiae, distinguishing himself highly in the campaign of 373 against the Sarmatians and the Quadi. His father's fate warned him of danger. The death of the elder Theodosius seems at first inexplicable. His services would seem just then almost indispensable, and his murder an act of gratuitous folly. A story however told by Pagan and Christian historians alike, by Zosimus and Ammianus Marcellinus, as well as by Socrates and Sozomen, throws much light on it. The very year before the execution of Theodosius, in 375, an attempt had been made at Antioch to determine the name of Valens' successor by means of magic. The process, as described by Ammianus, is strikingly like the practices of modern spiritualism. The attempt was made in the interest of a certain Theodorus, one of the imperial notaries who was cherishing ambitious notions. The divining medium therefore slowly spelled out the opening letters of the future ruler's name as ΘΕΟΔ, a fact which was reported to the suspicious emperor, and thereby secured the death of the notary, and a general persecution of all persons, whether devoted to magic or not, who had the misfortune to bear any name beginning with the fatal letters. Theodosius the elder fell a victim. His services rendered him too conspicuous to escape, and naturally enough his son, who was beginning to distinguish himself, hastened to escape a pressing danger by burying himself in obscurity. He retired, therefore, to his paternal estate at Cauca, where the courtly Claudian afterwards discovered a lineage for him drawn from the emperor Trajan, whom he personally resembled, and whose fame he desired to emulate. (*Panegyr. de IV. Cons. Honor.* viii. 14; *de VI. Cons. Honor.* xxviii. 646.) He spent three years in that retirement till summoned by the young Gratian to take the place of the emperor Valens, and thus fulfil the very prophecy which Valens had vainly endeavoured to baffle. The secular history of Theodosius is sufficiently told in the DICTIONARY OF CLASSICAL BIOGRAPHY; we shall therefore endeavour to set forth his ecclesiastical polity, and the powerful influence he exercised on the fortunes of the church. The accession of Theodosius was the turning-point which secured the triumph of Trinitarian orthodoxy as against the Arianism which had been dominant in the East at least, for the previous forty years. Theodosius turned what seemed in many places an obscure and conquered sect into a triumphant church, whose orthodoxy, on this point at least, never afterwards wavered. The measures as well as the man that secured such a result deserve serious attention. In the year 378 the Roman empire was in a very bad plight. Valens, the emperor of the East, had been defeated and put to death by the Goths on August the ninth in the fatal battle of Hadrianople, and the whole empire was depending on the young Gratian, who was then less than twenty years of age. Gratian was not an able ruler, but he had judgment enough to recognise his own incompetence, and to perceive that the crisis demanded the ablest general the empire possessed. He took a bold step therefore. He summoned the deeply-injured Theodosius from his retirement, and invested him with the imperial purple as emperor of the East, January 19, 379. Theodoret (*H. E.* v. 5, 6) indeed tells us that Gratian first appointed him general of his troops and despatched him against the successful Goths, whom Theodosius so quickly defeated, that the emperor was incredulous till messengers were despatched to view the bodies of the slain. Whereupon the grateful emperor raised him to the throne. But time will scarcely permit of this. Valens was killed on August 9; Theodosius was appointed emperor little more than five months afterwards, on Jan. 19, 379. The news of the battle must first have been brought to Gratian from Hadrianople. In the disorganised state of Macedonia and Thrace this may have taken a fortnight. Boeckh's *Corp. Graec. Ins.* No. 9886, shows us that half a century later the imperial post took six weeks at least in travelling from Constantinople to Southern Gaul. A third of that time may easily have been taken up with the land journey to the city of Sirmium, where Gratian was. This would bring us to the latter part of August. Gratian had then to determine on his plans and summon Theodosius from Spain to Pannonia, whither he retired on receiving news of the disaster. All this must have taken another month or six weeks at least, which would bring us to the middle of October. There were then but three months, and that in the depth of winter, within which must have been comprised the reorganization of a defeated army, a march into Thrace in search of the barbarians, the defeat of a victorious army in a difficult country, the return of Theodosius to the base of his operations and his subsequent advancement.

Of course it is possible that, under favourable circumstances, Theodosius might have accomplished within the time all that Theodoret says, but then the circumstances were not favourable, but quite the reverse. It is, however, very probable that Theodosius did give an earnest of his abilities in cutting off some roving bands of the barbarians, and thus finally determined Gratian to raise him to the throne. Theodosius was allotted the government of the East with Illyricum in Europe.

He at once fixed his residence at Thessalonica, which he skilfully selected as the headquarters of his operations against the Goths. The period of his ecclesiastical activity did not begin

till the second year of his reign. During the winter of 379-80, Theodosius had a severe illness which led him to apply for baptism. This sacrament was administered to him by Ascolius the local bishop, who was a devoted adherent of the orthodox party. His baptism was immediately followed by his first edict about religion, issued at Thessalonica, February 28, 380. As this was the starting-point of his religious policy, it deserves special attention. The edict is addressed to the people of Constantinople. It orders that the religion which the apostle Peter taught the Romans, and which Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria profess, should be believed by all nations; that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost should be equally adored; that the adherents of this doctrine should be called Catholic Christians, while all others were to be designated heretics, their places of assembly refused the name of churches, and their souls threatened with divine punishment. This first edict was, in fact, simply a proclamation of the emperor's own faith addressed to the people of Constantinople. But why to them especially? The answer to this question reveals the existing state of religious controversy. Constantinople was just then the centre of the battle raging between the Catholic and the Arian parties. About July, 379, Gregory of Nazianzus came to Constantinople and assumed the care of the church which maintained the orthodox faith. At that time the Arian party had possession of the see and churches of Constantinople. During the autumn of 379, Gregory became the dupe of that extraordinary character, Maximus the Cynic [MAXIMUS (ii.)], who, in turn, strove to deprive him of his position by the help of Peter of Alexandria. Maximus having been surreptitiously consecrated, appealed to the emperor at Thessalonica, whose attention was thus called to the religious state of his capital city.

Maximus appealed to Theodosius in the spring of 380, immediately after his baptism. Gregory personally opposed him, and having successfully pleaded his own cause, returned to Constantinople in the summer of the same year. Towards the end of 380, Theodosius made his formal entry into Constantinople. He remained at Thessalonica till Nov. 17, and then proceeded to the capital, which he entered on Nov. 24. He at once proceeded to action against the unorthodox. He turned Demophilus, the Arian bishop, out of the churches, and personally installed Gregory into the possession of the great church [DEMOPHILUS]. But he does not seem to have satisfied the orthodox zeal of Gregory, who in his *Carmen de vita sua*, 1279-1395, speaks in a very slighting way of Theodosius. He finds fault with his toleration, and complains that the emperor made no attempt to heal the wounds and avenge the wrongs of the Catholics. Theodosius, however, soon improved under Gregory's tuition, direct or indirect. Gregory's tenure of the bishoprick of Constantinople was not long, but seven months in fact. He retired about the end of June, 381, yet he continued to exercise a most active influence over the emperor through his successor Nectarius. Gregory in the East, Ambrose in the West must be largely credited with the intolerant course pursued by the ecclesiastical legislation of Theodosius. He may have been disposed to tolerant courses at first, as Gregory complains, but a review of his edicts as they are contained in the Theodosian Code, lib. xvi., does not offer many traces of such a spirit. We may take his ecclesiastical legislation under two heads: 1st, against Heretics: 2nd, against Pagans. As to his laws against heretics, the first were issued immediately after the council of Constantinople, and they so rapidly increased in severity, that even Gregory must have been satisfied with the imperial zeal. A few examples will prove this. In June or July, 381, Theodosius issued a law which must have been directly inspired by the council. It will be found in *Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi., tit. v. leg. 6. It prohibited all assemblies of Arians, Photinians, and Eunomians, and ordered all churches to be surrendered to the orthodox party.

A few weeks later, two edicts were issued, *Cod. Theod.* xvi., tit. i. l. 3, and t. v. l. 8, prohibiting Arians, Eunomians, and Aetians from building churches in lieu of those taken from them. This Fifth Title of the Sixteenth Book of the Code bears ample evidence upon its face of the intolerant progress of Theodosius. In law ix., March, 382, first appeared the ill-omened word inquisitor in connexion with religious controversy. Officers were appointed thereby to detect and punish the Manicheans. Law xi. of July, 383, prohibited any kind of heretical worship, while law xii. of September of the same year struck at the very heart and life of heresy by prohibiting assemblies for worship, building of churches and ordinations of clergy, and confiscating to the fiscus places where they met. It is evident from this law, that the heretics had many official supporters, and that many magistrates were lax in their proceedings against them, as stern penalties were threatened against such. Yet, notwithstanding all this severity, the heretics maintained their ground. So in Feb. 384, we find law xiii. of the same title directed against the Eunomian, Macedonian, Arian, and Apollinarian clergy who had ventured back again, and were concealed in Constantinople. The Apollinarians especially, erected a regular church organization, and established an episcopal succession. Gregory of Nazianzus was much troubled by the Apollinarian party. Gregory in Ep. 77, addressed to the prefect, tells how they took advantage of his absence at the hot baths of Xanxaris to ordain a bishop at Nazianzus. He calls on the prefect to punish them for their disobedience to the imperial edict; but requests that the penalty may be a light one. His influence too seems to have caused the original issue of this edict of Feb. 384 as in Orat. 46, addressed to Nectarius, patriarch of Constantinople, he calls for this edict as necessary for the church; and then in his Epistle to Olympius, praises it, apologizing for his own toleration which had induced the heretics to act with increased boldness.

But Theodosius waxed still more stern. Gregory, Nectarius and Ascolius of Thessalonica, who baptized him, all were urging him on to persecution, while Ambrose was constantly addressing him on the same topic. (Cf. specially *Ep.* x. of S. Ambrose, written in the name of the council of Aquileia, demanding the suppression

by force of heretical assemblies and ordinations. Opp. Ambros. in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* xvi. 940.) In 388 he was marching against the usurper Maximus, when, in March, he issued for the East, and in June caused the younger Valentinian to issue for the West, a still more stringent edict, specially directed against the Apollinarians. This law will be found in *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 14 and 15. It was directed against clergy and laity alike. It banishes all Apollinarians, deposes and degrades their bishops, forbids new consecrations, and denies them all approach to the emperors. But even this does not seem to have satisfied his advisers, or to have stopped the progress of heresy. The Eunomians were very troublesome at Constantinople, where Eunomius himself had long lived, and whence Theodosius had banished him. [EUNOMIUS (3).] Theodosius took stronger measures therefore. In May, 389, he issued a law rendering him and his followers incapable of making or receiving bequests, and confiscating to the public treasury all bequests made to them. Yet all these laws seem to have been ineffectual, as in law twenty-one and twenty-two of the same title fresh penalties have to be enacted against heretical ordinations, the former imposing a penalty of ten pounds of gold on every person joining in or receiving heretical orders, and confiscating the place where the ordination was held, if with the owner's consent, and if not, fining the tenant heavily if a free man, and flogging him if a slave. If the place was public property, the appointed guardian had to pay the fine. And so the course of persecution went on, ever waxing severer, and yet never effecting its purpose of extirpating heresy. Thus, to take but one instance, the Eunomians were persecuted and put outside the pale of law by Theodosius in 389, yet, twenty-six years afterwards, we find his grandson Theodosius II. issuing a far more stringent law, aimed at a congregation of Eunomians which had been established in Constantinople. Mr. Hodgkins, in his *Invaders of Italy*, t. i. p. 182, says that Theodosius taught his sons and descendants how to persecute successfully. He certainly taught them how to persecute sternly and steadily; but, looking at the code, and then at the decrees of councils and the subsequent history of the church, I am doubtful as to the success of the policy. Theodosius aimed at suppressing paganism as well as heresy, and his handiwork in this direction is even still coming to light. In fact, the ruins of temples, statues and fountains, over which many an archæologist now sighs, may be traced back to the legislation of Theodosius. Persecution had been indeed already at work, but Theodosius advanced much further than his predecessor. Codex Theodos. lib. xvi. tit. x. de Paganis, Sacrificiis et Templis, enables us to trace accurately the progress he made. The policy of Constantine and his sons was statesmanlike, and, though intolerant, admits of defence. It is contained in the first six laws of the said title. In general it may be said to have abolished sacrifices as madness, and essentially connected with immorality and crime, specially those celebrated at night, while at the same time protecting the temples. Constantius was the severest legislator in this respect. By the fifth and sixth laws he denounced the penalty of death and confiscation of goods against all who offered sacrifices, and against all magistrates who neglected the detection and punishment of such crimes. By the same legislation the temples were closed, and all access to them forbidden, but no destruction of them was tolerated. They were preserved as public monuments, and caretakers were appointed at the public expense, who showed visitors over them. In fact, had the policy of Constantius been followed, the world would have been now much richer in artistic treasures. We have recently received an interesting illustration of the state of affairs which prevailed between A.D. 350 and 360. In *Hermes*, t. ix. p. 257, appeared an hitherto unpublished letter from the emperor Julian before he ascended the throne, describing a visit paid by him to the site of ancient Troy, and to the temples which stood there in all their former glories. The caretaker was a strange one; he was the local bishop. He seems to have read the imperial character aright. Julian tells us the man was very tolerant, permitting access to the altars on the part of the faithful pagans. In fact, he was a mere worldling without any fixed religious principles, which he proved by turning pagan as soon as Julian ascended the throne. The whole letter is a very instructive commentary on the legislation of Constantine and his sons. The same policy was continued, with the short interval of Julian's reign, till the accession of Theodosius. Even Theodosius retained the appearance of the same policy. There was a wonderful continuity in Roman legislation; the edicts of Theodosius may be searched, and yet no decree for the destruction of the temples will be found. But a new force had now come into play all through the East. The monks had become a power which must be reckoned with. They began the work of destruction in the very teeth of imperial edicts, and then trusted for protection to the influence exercised over the imperial mind by Ambrose, Nectarius, and other bishops. A few instances will illustrate the course of events. In 382 Theodosius issued a rescript to Palladius, dux of the province of Osrhoëna, which was marked by a wise and tolerant spirit. There was a magnificent temple in Edessa, useful for popular assemblies, festivals, elections, and other public meetings. Theodosius, indeed, seems to have been specially anxious to avail himself of such temples for the meetings of his provincial councils, a form of local government which he largely developed and strengthened. (Cf. *Cod. Theod.* lib. xii. tit. xii. legg. 12, 13.) The local bishop Eulogius wished, however, to shut up the temple completely. He pleaded that the law was clear on this point. All access to temples was long since forbidden, and this one was specially dangerous, as it was richly furnished with idols of the rarest beauty. The advocates of toleration for once gained the upper hand. All sacrifices were strictly forbidden, but the building was to be used for public purposes, and the statues even were to be retained as ornaments and public curiosities. Five years, however, elapsed. The emperor was taking sterner measures against oriental paganism, and had just sent Cynegius as his deputy into Egypt and the East to see that his orders were strictly

carried out; whereupon the monks, as Libanius expressly states, rose up and utterly destroyed the temple. The rage for destruction soon spread. The mob in another part of the same province, headed by the bishop, attacked and burned a Jewish synagogue and a Valentinian meeting-house. Theodosius was contemplating the punishment of these riotous proceedings when Ambrose intervened, addressing a letter (*Ep.* xl.), which effectually frightened the emperor from his purpose. He issued, however, a decree in 393 to the count of the East, prohibiting all interference with Judaism, and specially forbidding all attacks on their synagogues. But there is a significant want of all such protective measures as regards pagan temples. The simple fact is, destruction and confiscation was raging on every side, and the destroyers found perfect impunity. The most notorious act of destruction was that which took place in Egypt, and specially at Alexandria, as described by Socrates, *H. E.*, v. 16, 17, when the celebrated Serapeum was destroyed. Socrates asserts, indeed, that this destruction took place at the imperial order, a special decree having been issued at the desire of the patriarch Theophilus, but of this there is no trace in the code. The state to which the temples were reduced in Egypt is strikingly illustrated by a story told in those very gossipy records the *Vitae Patrum*, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. col. 955. There were seven brothers who adopted the monastic life about the year 390, the most celebrated of them being Poemen and Anuph. They fled from their original habitations before an invasion of the Blemmyes, and took refuge in an ancient temple, where some of them began to grumble about their hard lot. Anuph soon reproved them by an acted parable. He found lying on the ground in the temple a beautiful statue of the god formerly worshipped there. He bade his brothers keep silence for a week, and then every morning during that period smashed the statue with stones, and, in their sight, prayed to it for pardon. At the end of the time they asked an explanation of his conduct, when he replied that as the statue, no matter how treated, never grumbled, so ought they to submit without a word to the dispensations of the Almighty. The lesson was no doubt a very striking one in every sense, but it also accounts for the state in which many relics of ancient art are now found. At Rome, again, the same policy was pursued, either directly or indirectly, by Theodosius. Valentinian the younger was simply his tool. In 382 Gratian issued an order abolishing the altar of Victory, as hitherto retained in the senate house, and the other traces of paganism which still remained. He also confiscated the property of the vestal virgins, and probably seized their college. In 383 an effort was made to rescind this order, which was defeated by the vigorous action of pope Damasus. Symmachus renewed the attempt in 384, and addressed an appeal to the young emperor Valentinian, to which Ambrose made a reply marked by extreme intolerance, and warning the young sovereign to consult Theodosius before he should decide to comply with the senate's prayer. The letter of Ambrose with reference to these two attempts, and the *Relatio* of Symmachus, will be found in S. Ambros. *Epist.* Classis i. Epp. xvii.–xviii. The protest of Ambrose was successful as usual. Eugenius, the usurper, restored indeed the pagan emblems and ritual, but Theodosius, on his victory, again abolished them and adopted sterner measures against the vestal college, the violent results of which have lately come to light at Rome in the excavations on its site described in Lanciani's *L'Atrio di Vesta*, pp. 49–53, Rome, 1884, and in a very interesting letter from E. Le Blant to the Acad. des Ins. published in the *Comptes Rendus* for 1884, p. 22; cf. De Rossi's *Bullet.* 1868, p. 53. If we are to believe two extraordinary stories told by Socrates, *H. E.* v. 18, it required the presence of Theodosius at Rome to cleanse the city from two plague spots, one wherein unhappy strangers were trepanned into perpetual slavery under the appearance of charity, and the other where adulteresses were punished, not by reforming measures, but by condemnation to public outrage in the stews; so little had Christian sentiment as yet permeated the mass of Roman feeling! After the fall of Eugenius on Sep. 6, 394, the work of destruction of the pagan temples went on rapidly, till at last in 399 a decree was issued by Arcadius ordering the overthrow of all rural temples. Honorius, indeed, issued a decree that same year, *Cod. Theod.* xvi. x. 15, prohibiting the plunder or destruction of the statues and ornaments of the temples, but just as it happened at the periods of the iconoclastic controversy and of the reformation, the work of robbery could not be stopped, simply because the most influential persons were engaged therein. Zosimus, v. 38, tells us how Serena, the daughter of Theodosius himself, stole a costly necklace from off the neck of Rhea, the mother of the gods, notwithstanding the reproaches of the last of the vestal virgins, who still lingered round the venerated shrine; while her husband stripped the massive gold plates off from the doors of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.

III. Theodosius was a positive as well as a negative legislator. His legislation about the clergy and the internal state of the church was minute and far-reaching. He issued a stringent edict for the observance of the Lord's Day, suspending all public business, and branding as sacrilegious any one violating its sanctity. This edict, *Cod. Theod.* lib. viii. tit. viii. l. 3, was passed in 386. Another edict, A.D. 389, enforced this law and prescribed the holidays to be observed throughout the year, among which we find the seven days before and after Easter, *Cod. Theod.* lib. ii. tit. viii. l. 2. [Cf. LORD'S DAY in DICT. CHRIST. ANTIQ. p. 1047.] Another edict. *Cod.* xvi. ii. 27, lays down the most minute rules for deaconesses; while the previous law exempted guardians of churches and of holy places from all public duties. *Cod.* xi. xxxix. 10, exempted bishops and presbyters from torture when giving evidence, but left all the inferior clergy subject to it. The aid of Theodosius was invoked on all kinds of subjects by the bishops, so that we find scattered through his legislation decrees dealing with all manner of topics. If, for instance, religious controversy burst forth with special violence in Egypt or Antioch, the bishop applied for edicts imposing

perpetual silence on the opposite factions, an example which has been often followed by the pope in more modern times, cf. *Cod.* xvi. iv. 2 and 3. His decrees on the subject of the testamentary disposition of property were also closely mixed up with his religious legislation. Cf. the article on WILLS in DICT. CHRIST. ANTIQ. And see for other instances of his ecclesiastical legislation the articles on APOSTASY, IMMUNITIES, &c. OF CLERGY, MARRIAGE, PROHIBITED DEGREES. On this latter subject he was very strict. He prohibited marriage between first cousins, under the penalties of death by fire and confiscation of property. Cf. *Cod. Theod.* iii. x. 1, a law which has been by some attributed to the influence of St. Ambrose. Gothofred, however, refutes this in his commentary on the law.

IV. The character of Theodosius was thoroughly Spanish. He was devout to superstition, passionate to an extreme degree, and when thus excited, utterly reckless of human life and suffering, as manifested in his conduct towards his favourite residence Thessalonica. He was a brave, resolute, and skilful general when roused to action, but his spasmodic fits of energy were always succeeded by seasons of profound indolence, of which his savage detractor, Zosimus, makes the most. Two incidents in his career illustrate his character in many respects. They were the insurrection of Antioch upon the destruction of the imperial statues, and the massacre of Thessalonica. Both these incidents have been, however, fully treated already in the article on AMBROSIUS, Vol. I. p. 96, and on CHRYSOSTOM, p. 521. The constitutional indolence of Theodosius made him the dupe of his ministers. Mr. Hodgkin, in a lecture on Claudian delivered at Newcastle some few years ago, has painted in vigorous colours the character of Rufinus, who was the worst of all. We have mentioned most of the principal authorities. Tillemont's *Hist. des Emp.* t. v. is a minute survey of all the materials for the history of Theodosius, with which Clinton's *Fasti* may be usefully compared. De Broglie, in his history, and Beugnot in his work on the fall of paganism, tell the story in a more interesting way than Tillemont. Original authorities like Ammianus Marcellinus, Claudian, Zosimus, and the Greek church historians have been often quoted. [G. T. S.]

THEODOSIUS (3) II., Emperor, was born early in A.D. 401. He was the only son of the emperor Arcadius by EUDOXIA (2). He had four sisters, Flaccilla, Pulcheria, Arcadia, and Marina, the second of whom exercised a predominant influence over Theodosius during his whole life. He was appointed Augustus in January 402, and succeeded to the throne at the age of seven on his father's death in 408. The secular history of his reign will be found in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography;* the present article will therefore only deal with his actions and legislation so far as they bore on the history of the church, though it will often be difficult to draw the line. The reign of Theodosius was very prolonged, covering the first half of the 5th century, and embracing therefore the origin and rise of two great heresies, the Nestorian and Monophysite, which fatally influenced the fortunes of Christianity, and have perpetuated themselves to the present day. Theodosius II. was an exaggerated prototype of our own king James the First. King James delighted in theology, because it offered him a field where he could safely avenge himself on those Puritan divines who had disciplined his youth. Theodosius II. was nurtured in theology, was naturally inclined to it, devoted all his thoughts to it, and as the result left us the record of a reign fruitful in theological troubles and divisions. The earlier years of his reign, from A.D. 408 to 417, were passed under the direction of Anthemius, Prefect of the East. He was a very able and vigilant ruler, and with the assistance of Proclus the sophist, conducted the affairs of State with much success. He was an adherent of St. Chrysostom, and opposed therefore to Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, and to Cyril of Alexandria. We find a proof of his hostility to Cyril in a law passed by him in Sep. 416 (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. ii. l. 42), after the murder of Hypatia, restricting the number of Alexandrian Parabolani to five hundred, and forbidding their appearance in the courts or other public assemblies in that city. This law was intended to deprive Cyril of the powerful bodyguard he possessed, which enabled him to terrify his opponents. The law however seems to have been disregarded, as both at Ephesus and Chalcedon complaints were made of the influence exercised by the threats and violence of the Egyptian monks. The education of Theodosius was conducted by his sister Pulcheria, who acted as Augusta, and his guardian, from July 4, 414, when she was herself little more than fifteen years of age. Sozomen (ix. 1) and Socrates (vii. 22) describe his education. Sozomen tells us that Pulcheria "superintended with extraordinary wisdom the transactions of the Roman government; concerted her measures well, and allowed no delay to take place in their execution. She was able to write and to converse with perfect accuracy in the Greek and Latin languages. She caused all affairs to be transacted in the name of her brother, and devoted great attention to furnishing him with such information as was suitable to his years. She employed masters to instruct him in horsemanship and the use of arms, in literature and in science. He was also taught how to maintain a deportment befitting an emperor. She showed him how to gather up his robes and how to take a seat. She taught him to refrain from ill-timed laughter, to assume a mild or a formidable aspect as the occasion might require, and to inquire with urbanity into the cases of those who came before him with petitions. But she chiefly strove to imbue his mind with piety and the love of prayer; she taught him to frequent the church regularly and to be zealous in contributing to the embellishment of houses of prayer. She inspired him with reverence for priests and other good men, and for those who in accordance with the law of Christianity had devoted themselves to philosophical asceticism." Socrates again tells us about his training that "such was his fortitude in undergoing hardships that he would courageously endure both heat and cold; fasting very frequently, especially on Wednesdays and Fridays, from an earnest endeavour to observe with accuracy all the prescribed forms of the Christian religion. His palace was so regulated

that it differed little from a monastery; for he, together with his sisters, rose early in the morning and recited responsive hymns in praise of the Deity. By this training he learnt the Holy Scriptures by heart, and he would often discourse with the bishops on scriptural subjects as if he had been an ecclesiastic of long standing. He was an indefatigable collector of the sacred books and of expositions written on them, while in clemency and humanity he far surpassed all others." Such is the description given of his education by two contemporary historians; which was evidently one more calculated to produce a theological pedant than to impart that knowledge of mankind and of business required in a successful ruler. Theodosius was the nominal, while Pulcheria was for many years the real, ruler of the empire; a circumstance which comes out strongly in the Nestorian struggles, where Cyril in 430 addressed two epistles to her invoking her aid against Nestorius, whom her brother was supporting. Theodosius on that occasion did not yield however at once to her influence. He disliked Cyril and his overbearing ways. Nestorius too was the man of his own choice, whom he had brought from Antioch to preside over the see of Constantinople. Like all weak men, however, he jumped after a time at a proposal which seemed to offer escape out of his difficulties. He deposed both Nestorius and Cyril, but at length gave way and restored Cyril while exiling Nestorius and forbidding the use of his writings. His religious zeal in early life largely contributed to one of the most terrible persecutions the Oriental church ever endured. Socrates (*H. E.* vii. 8) tells us that Christianity was propagated in Persia during the early part of the 5th century, through the exertions of Maruthas, bishop of Mesopotamia, whom Theodosius sent as ambassador to the Persian sovereign Isdigerdes. This aroused the hostility of the Magi, who naturally resented this use of his position on the ambassador's part. Isdigerdes however continued to support Maruthas until Abdas, a local Persian bishop, rendered bold by impunity, presumed to burn down one of the national fire-temples. The king very properly called on him to restore what he had unjustly destroyed, which the bishop at once refused to do. The king resented this act, and convinced that Christianity was only a cloak for rebellion, began a violent persecution which lasted thirty years, and furnished Asseman with much of the material for his great work on the Eastern martyrs. This persecution led to a war between the Romans and Persians, which Ardaburius, the Roman general, brought to a successful conclusion. (Socrates, vii. 18–20; Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 39.) [ABDAS; ISDIGERDES; MARUTHAS.] The religious fanaticism and weakness of Theodosius displayed itself in every department. It not only involved the empire in its foreign and domestic affairs, but showed itself in his personal conduct. It made him miserably scrupulous. A story told by Theodoret (v. 37), illustrates his weakness. "A man of bold and audacious character who had embraced the ascetic life, went to the emperor to make some request which he refused. He therefore excommunicated the emperor and retired. The emperor returned home, where some priests had been invited to a banquet. The emperor would not sit down to eat till he received absolution. He sent to the bishop, beseeching him to request him who had imposed the restriction to remove it. The bishop replied that he ought not so readily to submit to such restrictions, and that none, in fact, existed. The emperor however was not content with this absolution, until he who had excommunicated him had been found, which was not effected without great trouble, and had restored him to communion." A monarch so weak and scrupulous was of course completely under the power of strong-minded ecclesiastics. Simeon Stylites could sway him as he pleased. Thus Evagrius (*H. E.* i. 13) tells us that when the emperor commanded the synagogues of Antioch to be restored to the Jews, the Christians having taken them by force, Simeon sent a violent letter to the emperor reproving him for his act of justice, which was immediately recalled. He seems at the same time to have been an amiable and merciful man. Socrates (vii. 22) tells us that he ever shrank from inflicting capital punishments. He had a keen sense of the value of human life, a quality in which even Christian emperors had been hitherto sadly lacking. When some of his intimate friends asked him why he never inflicted capital punishment on offenders? his answer was, "It is neither a great nor a difficult thing to put a mortal to death, but it is God only that can resuscitate by repentance a person that has once died." He strove to wean the people from the cruel displays of the amphitheatre. He set his face against all shows where human life was involved. He was once exhibiting a wild beast show at Constantinople when the people cried out, "Let one of the boldest bestiarii encounter the enraged animal." The emperor however refused, saying, "Do you not know that we are wont to view these spectacles with feelings of humanity?" His devotion at times became almost grovelling. A bishop died at Constantinople famous for his asceticism. The emperor asked for his hair cassock which, although it was excessively filthy, he wore as a cloak, hoping that he should thus become a partaker of the sanctity which the original owner possessed. Pope Leo hits off the true character of the emperor in one of his letters to him, which he intended as very laudatory (Mansi, v. 1341, cf. Soc. vii. 43), where he describes him as having "not only the heart of an emperor but also that of a priest." Theodosius delighted therefore in that magnificent ceremonial which gathered round the cultus of relics. He brought the remains of John Chrysostom back to Constantinople As soon as they arrived at the city he laid his face on the coffin and entreated that his parents might be pardoned for having persecuted such a holy bishop. He assisted also at the discovery and removal of the relics of the Forty Martyrs (Soz. ix. 2), and felt his reign honoured by God through the simultaneous discovery of the relics of the proto-martyr St. Stephen, and of Zechariah the prophet (*l. c.* ix. 16, 17). During the latter portion of his reign, which was only terminated by a fall from his horse July 28th, 450, his sister lost her power, which was comparatively a healthy influence, while on the other hand Theodosius fell completely under the power of the eunuchs, who were simply selfish and tyrannical. Pulcheria

was a woman of a certain amount of vigour and determination. Theodosius seems to have taken refuge from her sway by yielding himself completely to favourites, who succeeded one another with great rapidity. He had fifteen prime ministers in twenty-five years, the last of whom, the eunuch Chrysaphius, retained his power for the longest period, A.D. 443–450. During that time the empire was rapidly hurrying to destruction. The Vandals in Africa, and the Huns under Attila in Europe, were ravaging some of his fairest provinces while the emperor was attending to palace intrigues. In fact, it is only when we read the word-pictures of the desolation then existing in France by such a writer as Salvianus of Marseilles, in his work *De Gubernatione Dei*, that we can at all realise the madness of Theodosius during those fatal years. Chrysaphius gained complete control over Theodosius, alienated him from Pulcheria, made him favourable to Eutyches, and thus largely contributed to the establishment of the Monophysite heresy, and involved the emperor with Attila by bribing his ambassador to murder the barbarian prince. The original authorities for the reign of Leo have been already quoted to a large extent. In addition to them we may mention the fragments of Priscus in the Bonn edition of the Byzantine historians, who is Gibbon's chief authority for his vigorous picture of the latter years of Theodosius; Liberatus, *Breviar.*; John Malalas, who in his 14th book gives us much interesting gossip specially about the anxiety of Pulcheria to find a wife of royal birth for Theodosius, while his own anxiety was only to have a pretty one. Cf. Theophanes, *Chronog.* ed. Bonn. p. 130–170. The literature of the subject is very extensive; Clinton's *Fasti* is exhaustive, and gives exact references to all the minor authorities, with which we do not therefore burden our pages. Tillemont, *Hist. des Emper.* t. vi.; Le Beau, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, and Gibbon, capp. xxxiii. and xxxiv. are full and instructive. Thierry, in his *Derniers Temps de l'Empire d'Occident* and *Histoire d'Attila*, gives an interesting account of the struggles with Attila and Genseric. The relations of Theodosius with his wife Athenais (Eudocia) have been of late years discussed by Ferdinand Gregorovius in his *Athenais, Geschichte einer Byzantinischen Kaiserin*, Leipzig, 1882. Cf. on the same topic G. Krüger's *Monophysit. Streitigkeiten in Zusammenhange mit der Reichspontik*, Jena, 1884, p. 55, a treatise which uses the Syriac authorities lately discovered. The following is an analysis of his ecclesiastical legislation as embodied in the Theodosian Code published by him in A.D. 438 (see DICT. GR. AND ROM. BIOG. s.v. Theodos. II. for an account of its formation, publication and various editions). It proceeded, on the whole, upon exactly the same lines as did that of Theodosius I. as regards pagans, heretics, and Jews. As to pagans, Theodosius maintained the same course of steady repression which had been hitherto pursued. But a step in advance was taken. Hitherto all efforts had been concentrated on the suppression of pagan worship and temples, now a penalty was placed on the profession of paganism. Paganism became in itself a disability. Some of the highest servants of the state towards the end of the fourth century had been pagans; now by a law of Dec. 7, 416 (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. x. 21), pagans were prohibited from entering the military and civil services, or from attaining any judicial office. This law is followed by four others passed within the next ten years, following closely upon the lines of Western legislation in the same direction as contained in the previous laws; law 25, for instance, passed at Constantinople Nov. 426, orders the cross, "signum venerandae crucis," to be placed on such temples as were allowed to remain intact, while as for those that were pulled down the materials were to be used in repairing bridges, roads, aqueducts, etc., pointing very clearly to the places where we should look for some precious relics of antiquity (cf. *Cod. Theod.* t. v. lib. xv. tit. I. l. 36). These measures seem to have produced an apparent uniformity, as Theodosius in law 22 passed in 423, refers to the "pagans who remain, though we believe there are none such." The law however did not as yet persecnte them; but if they lived peaceably protected them; thus law 24 of the same title and year forbids Christians making attacks on Jews and pagans living among them. Heretics scarcely came off so well. The Novatians still, as throughout the fourth century, had special favour shown to them, though occasionally a law was aimed against their rebaptisms and celebrations of Easter otherwise than after the orthodox cnstom (lib. xvi. tit. vi. l. 6, passed on March 21, 413); but as for all other heretics very severe measures of exile, confiscation, and other penalties were dealt out against Montanists, Eunomians, etc., and as with the Pagans, their employment in the army or civil service was prohibited except apparently in the local militia (xvi. v. 58 and 61). Law 65 of this title is the most sweeping of all the edicts passed in this reign. Nestorius was its author, and very fitly the next law is a severe one against himself and his party. The Jews again were protected as hitherto, but certain restrictions were by degrees placed upon them. Their synagogues were not to be seized or destroyed, and if destroyed were to be restored, but no new ones were to be built (xvi. viii. 25). They were forbidden to serve in the army, but were permitted to be physicians and lawyers (lex 24). Their ecclesiastical and civil organization under their patriarchs was protected. The patriarchs indeed, about A.D. 415, seem to have advanced so far as to exercise jurisdiction over Christians and to force them to receive circumcision, while the Jewish people mocked the Christian religion and burned the cross, an instance of which is given by Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 16. Under the influence of Nestorius, however, severer laws were enacted against Jews as against heretics. In A.D. 429 we find a law forbidding the usual tribute to the patriarchs and confiscating the tax itself. This law with Gothofred's commentary is very important as regards the organization of Judaism in the fifth century (cf. the whole series of laws in lib. xvi. tit. viii. l. 18–29). Lastly, we may notice the Theodosian legislation as it bore upon education and morals. Professors and physicians continued to enjoy their privileges as of old according to the Codex lib. xiii. iii. 15–18, while as to morals Theodosius extirpated the lupanaria at Constantinople as Theodosius the Great suppressed them

at Rome. He issued a decree in 428 (xv. viii. 2) to this effect. They continued however to exist at Constantinople till 439, as we learn from Novella 18 of Theodosius which treats *de Lenonibus*. It would be impossible, however, within the compass of an article to give an outline even of the vast multiplicity of subjects with which the Theodosian legislation dealt. Nothing was exempt from its scrutiny, the expenses of the games, price of fish, the maritime corporations of Alexandria, everything came within its scope, and remains there offering to the student a complete picture of the Roman Empire and its organizations as they existed in the middle of the fifth century. [G. T. S.]

THEODOSIUS (4), eldest son of the emperor Maurice, was born in September 585, was created Caesar by him in A.D. 587, and crowned emperor on Easter-day A.D. 590. He was married in A.D. 601 to the daughter of the eminent senator Germanus, and perished with his father and brothers at the hands of PHOCAS in November A.D. 602. (Theophanes, Joan. Biclarensis, Theophyl. Simocatta, viii. 4, 8, 11, 13.) [F. D.]

THEODOSIUS (5), Arian bishop of Tripolis, established there by his party after having been refused admission into the clerical order (*εἰς κλῆρον*) by EUSTATHIUS (3), the orthodox bishop of Antioch, cir. 325. (Athan. *Hist. Ar. ad Men.* § 4; Tillem. vi. 273.) [C. H.]

THEODOSIUS (6), addressed, cir. 356, in a letter bearing the name of St. Basil, on the subject of damages caused by the overflow of the Halys. (Coteler. *Mon. Gr. Eccl.* ii. 97.) Tillemont (ix. 21, 632) suggests that he was vicar of Pontus. [C. H.]

THEODOSIUS (7), bishop of Philadelphia, in the province of Lydia, a supporter of Acacius bishop of Caesarea, and George bishop of Alexandria. He was deposed by the council of Seleucia in 359. (Soc. ii. 40; Philostorg. viii. 3; Epiph. *Haer.* lxxiii. 26; Hefel. *Counc.* ii. 267; Le Quien, i. 868.) [G. T. S.]

THEODOSIUS (8), the chief of the anchorites in the Chalcidian Desert, to whom, in the year 374, Jerome wrote from Antioch, before coming among them, to ask their prayers and welcome (Jerome, *Ep.* 2, ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

THEODOSIUS (9), a bishop of Nicopolis, who visited Basil in 376, after the death of Theodotus and the appointment of Fronto as bishop had plunged that church into trouble (Basil, *Ep.* 240 [192].) [E. V.]

THEODOSIUS (10), a bishop, either of Ida in Lycaonia (no. 12) or of Antioch in Isauria, a friend of Gregory Nyssen, at whose request Gregory expounded his views with regard to the apparition of Samuel at Endor, and other scriptural difficulties, calling on him at the same time to study such questions himself and not to depend on others for their solution (Greg. Nyss. *de Pythonissa*, tom. ii. pp. 3589). [E. V.]

THEODOSIUS (11), a layman on whose behalf Gregory Nazianzen wrote to Nemesius, governor of Cappadocia, begging him to relieve him of a distant commission (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 79). [E. V.]

THEODOSIUS (12), bishop of Ida in Lycaonia, one of the witnesses to the will of Gregory Nazianzen (Greg. Naz. *Testam.*) He attended the council of Constantinople in 381 (Labbe, ii. 953). [E. V.]

THEODOSIUS (13), the secretary of Gregory Nazianzen, whom in his will he manumitted with a legacy of five gold pieces. (Greg. Naz. *Test.*) [E. V.]

THEODOSIUS (14), a bishop of Palestine, one of those to whom Theophilus of Alexandria addressed his synodical letter in condemnation of Origen, A.D. 400 (Jerome, *Ep.* 92, ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

THEODOSIUS (15), bishop of Nichium or Nicius in Egypt, who, according to the paschal epistle of Theophilus patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 404, had just succeeded Theopemptus (Jerome, ep. 100 fin. ed. Vall.). Le Quien (*Or. Chr.* ii. 523), by a different reading of epistles, reverses the order of the two bishops. [C. H.]

THEODOSIUS (16), bishop of Scythopolis, one of the bishops who, with John of Jerusalem, Eulogius of Caesarea, and others, had declared themselves in favour of Chrysostom. Chrysostom wrote begging him to avoid all intercourse with those who caused such great troubles to the church, and thus aid in healing its evils. (Chrys. *Ep.* 89.) [E. V.]

THEODOSIUS (17), a retired general (*ἀπὸ δουκῶν*, *Exdux*). Chrysostom writes acknowledging his reply to the letter he had written him, which he had found sweeter than honey. (Chrys. *Ep.* 58.) [E. V.]

THEODOSIUS (18), bishop of Synnada, cir. 408 (Soc. vii. 3; Tillem. xii. 422). [AGAPETUS.] [C. H.]

THEODOSIUS (19), a man who had been instrumental in detecting some Manicheans and bringing them to the Church, about whom St. Augustine enquired in a letter to Quodvultdeus (Aug. *Ep.* 222). The detection here mentioned was no doubt in connection with the imperial edicts against Manicheism, of which several may be seen in *Cod. Theodos.* xvi. tit. v. [H. W. P.]

THEODOSIUS (20), a celebrated solitary of Syria contemporary with Theodoret, born at Antioch of a rich and noble family, but who abandoning all his worldly possessions betook himself to a hut he had built in a forest on the mountain-side above the city of Rhosus, on the gulf of Cilicia, where he practised the severest self-discipline, loading his neck, loins and wrists with heavy irons, and allowing his uncombed hair to grow down to his feet. He speedily gathered round him a colony of ascetics, whom he taught to alternate their religious exercises with industrial arts, such as the weaving of sackcloth and haircloth, making mats, fans and baskets, and cultivating glades in the wood, setting the example of laborious diligence himself,

and carefully superintending every department of work. He was an object of reverence even to the Isaurian banditti, who on several occasions in their predatory inroads left his monastic settlement uninjured, only asking for bread and requesting his prayers. In apprehension however lest the Isaurians, knowing how much Theodosius was reverenced, should carry him off for the sake of ransom, as they had already done one or two leading ecclesiastics, the holy man was persuaded to remove to Antioch, where he settled near the Orontes, gathering about him many who desired to adopt an ascetic life. He did not long survive his removal to the city. He was buried in a martyry, in the same shrine as Julianus and in the same tomb as Aphraates, an immense crowd, including the chief magistrates of the city, attending his funeral. The only miracle recorded of him, his supplying his laura with water drawn from the rock above it, admits of a natural explanation. (Theod. *Hist. Relig.* c. x.) [E. V.]

THEODOSIUS (21), a fanatical Monophysite monk, who on the plea that the faith had been betrayed by the council of Chalcedon, took forcible possession of the see of Jerusalem on Juvenal's return with the decrees of the synod, A.D. 452, and held it for twenty months. Theodosius had been expelled from his monastery for some crime, on which he repaired to Alexandria, where Evagrius tells us he stirred up strife, and was scourged and paraded round the city on camelback as a seditious person (Evagr. *H. E.* ii. 5). He attended the council of Chalcedon apparently as one of the ruffianly fanatical followers of the brutal Barsumas [BARSUMAS]. On the termination of the proceedings of the synod Theodosius hastened back to Jerusalem, loudly complaining that the council had betrayed the faith and ratified the heresy of Nestorius, and circulating a garbled translation of Leo's Tome (Leo. Magn. *Ep.* 97 [83]). His protestations were credited by a large number of the monks and of the populace, and having gained the ear of the empress dowager Eudocia, the former patroness of Eutyches, who had settled at Jerusalem, he established his reputation as a concessor of the faith, and so thoroughly poisoned the minds of the people of Jerusalem against Juvenal as a traitor to the truth that they refused to receive him as their bishop on his return from Chalcedon, unless he would anathematize the doctrines which he had so recently joined in declaring. On his refusal the malcontents attempted his assassination, and he barely escaped with his life to Constantinople. [JUVENALIS.] After Juvenal's flight Theodosius was ordained bishop of Jerusalem in the church of the Resurrection, and at once proceeded to ordain bishops for Palestine, chiefly for those cities whose bishops had not yet returned from Chalcedon. A reign of terror now began in Jerusalem. The public prisons were thrown open, and the liberated criminals were employed to terrify by their violence those who refused communion with Theodosius. Those who refused to anathematize the council were robbed, pillaged and insulted in the most lawless manner. Ladies of rank were outraged, the clergy maltreated. A deacon named Athanasius who openly refused to acknowledge the intruder as his true pastor, was brutally tortured, beheaded, and his body thrown into the streets to be devoured by dogs. The gates of the city were barred against Dorotheus, the governor of Palestine, who had returned from an expedition against the wild tribes of the land of Moab, to restore order, unless he promised to acknowledge Theodosius as bishop. Theodosius made repeated attempts to secure the adhesion of Euthymius the famous abbat, but to no purpose. Gelasius and others of the more leading abbats and solitaries were equally proof against his blandishments and threats. Finally the emperor Marcian interposed, and issued his orders to Dorotheus to apprehend Theodosius that he might be punished. Theodosius however managed to effect his escape to the mountain fastnesses of Sinai, whither he was pursued by the emissaries of Marcian, who called in the aid of Macarius the bishop, and the abbats and monks of the district, to discover his hiding-place and to drive him from among them, or if they could apprehend him, to give him up to the civil authorities for punishment (Labbe, iv. 879). What ultimately became of him is unknown. (Evagr. *H. E.* ii. 5; Coteler. *Mon. Graec.* i. 415 sq.; Theophan. *Chron.* p. 92; Leo Magn. *Ep.* 126 [157]; Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 879 sq.; Niceph. *H. E.* xv. 9; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* livre 38; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xv. 731 sq.; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 164.) [E. V.]

THEODOSIUS (22), the coenobiarch of a monastery near Jerusalem. There is only one *Vita S. Theodosii* (given from Metaphrastes in Boll. *AA. SS.* Jan. i. 685; *Pat. Gr.* cxiv. 455). Baronius (*Annal.* A.D. 491, 511, 518, 536 with Pagi's crit. Notes) argues from the Life as genuine, but the author, said by some to be CYRILLUS (13) of Scythopolis (*supra*, Vol. I. p. 774), is really unknown. His dates are generally fixed by points in the Life. In the Greek Menaea and western Martyrologies alike his feast is Jan. 11. He was the son of Proaeresius and Eulogia, and was born c. A.D. 423 at Marissus (Magariasus, or Mogarisus) in Cappadocia, and early chose the conventual life. He was first under St. Simon the Stylite, then under a holy man named Longinus, but in 451 he went to Jerusalem, took refuge in a neighbouring cave, and finally built an extensive monastery near St. Euthymius's laura southward from Jerusalem. There he was visited by the widowed empress Eudocia, and his special friend was St. Saba. When his zeal for the faith made him denounce the teaching of Eutyches, the emperor Anastasius thought to bribe him with money, but the attempt was in vain: the Life contains a letter and reply between the emperor and the monk (*Vit.* c. 12). When he could not be bribed, he was driven into exile, but was restored A.D. 518 at Anastasius's death. He is credited with miracles and prophecy, and died Jan. 11, A.D. 529, aged 105 years (Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* x. 337; Butler, *Saints*, Jan. 11; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iv. 393, vi. 204). [J. G.]

THEODOSIUS (23), ST., eleventh bishop of Auxerre, was present at the first council of Orleans, in 511 (Mansi, viii. 357), and was one of the three bishops who wrote an offensive letter to the aged St. Remigius, as we learn from

his reply (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxv. 966; Ceillier, xi. 80–1). After an episcopate of eight years twenty-nine days, he was buried in the church of St. Germanus, and the seat remained vacant for a year. His day is July 17, on which he appears in the martyrology of Jerome, and some modern ones (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xxx. 467; Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. iv. 276–8; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 266). [S. A. B.]

THEODOSIUS (24) I., bishop of Capitolias, between Gadara and Damascus. He was present at a synod of the bishops of Palestine in A.D. 536 held against Anthimus and other heretics. [ANTHIMUS.] Capitolias has sometimes been confounded with Jerusalem (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* t. iii. 717; Labb. *Concil.* t. v. 286). [G. T. S.]

THEODOSIUS (25) II., bishop of Capitolias, near Damascus, about the year 600, from whom Joannes Moschus got several of the stories told in his *Pratum Spirituale* (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* t. iii. 717). [G. T. S.]

THEODOSIUS (26), Jacobite patriarch of Alexandria, elected A.D. 536 by the party of the Corrupticolae on the same day that Gaianus was chosen by the Phantasiasts. Soon after his consecration he was forced by mob violence to seek shelter in Constantinople. He was restored for a time by the imperial authority, and Gaianus exiled, but was again driven out by the mob, when Justinian appointed Paul as patriarch [PAULUS (6).] Henceforth he lived in exile at or near Constantinople, where he infected the whole city and court with his Monophysite views. He lived till 567 or 568, and continued to exercise a secret jurisdiction over his adherents in Egypt. He ordained a certain Longinus bishop of the Nobadae in the Eastern Thebais, who at that time embraced Christianity according to the Monophysite type. Cf. John of Ephesus, *Eccles. Hist.* ed. Payne Smith, p. 250. He was founder of the sect of the Theodosians. Cf. Isidor. Hispal. *de Haeresibus*, num. 68, 69. (Le Quien, ii. xvi. 430; Assem. *Bib. Orient.* i. 623, ii. 89, 330; *AA. SS.* Boll. Jun. v. 64; Neale's *Hist. Pat. Alex. pass.*) [G. T. S.]

THEODOSIUS (27), 4th bishop of Rodez (circ. A.D. 581–5). His predecessor, St. Dalmatius, foreseeing the strife and intrigues usual at this period in France upon a vacancy in the episcopate, had left a testamentary document solemnly conjuring king Childebert to put in his place one who should not be either a stranger, a self-seeker, or married, but a man free to devote his life to the praise of God. The king respected the prayer, and, to the disappointment of the rival candidates, selected Theodosius. (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. 47.) Servières says that according to Optatus, a monk of Saint-Julien at Brioude, Theodosius was a Frank, originally named Harderad, and had been in earlier days a noble at the court of Theodebert, valiant in war, but depraved in heart. A meeting with Saint Aurelia, who won his affections, but whose vows restrained her from marriage, converted him, and he was ordained a priest by St. Quintianus of Clermont. At the time of his election to the see, he was living the life of a hermit a few miles from Rodez (Servières, *Hist. de l'Eglise du Rouergue*, pp. 63–8). Upon his death similar scandals preceded the election of his successor Innocentius (Greg. Tur. vi. 38). [S. A. B.]

THEODOSIUS (28), deceased collector of rent from the peasants on the church estates in Sicily. As he had failed to pay over what he had collected, and it was supposed that he had died insolvent, the tenants were obliged to pay over again. His estate, however, turning out to be sufficient, Gregory the Great directed the tenants to be recouped, and the surplus and a drinking cup of Theodosius to be restored to his daughter. (*Epp.* i. 44.) Probably two different persons of this name besides the foregoing are mentioned by Gregory. (*Epp.* i. 44, v. 47.) [F. D.]

THEODOSIUS (29), appointed abbat of St. Martin's in Campania, in place of the deposed Secundinus in A.D. 593, requested Gregory the Great in A.D. 595 to make three monks return, whom he had sent to Sicily, and who refused to come back, and in A.D. 599 to use his influence with Maurentius the magister militum to relieve him and his monks from mounting guard on the walls. (*Epp.* iii. 23, v. 35, ix. 73.) [F. D.]

THEODOSIUS (30) and Viator, deacons, and Donatus, priest, of Catana, complained to Gregory the Great that their bishop in distributing the revenues of the church disregarded the rights of the clergy. (*Epp.* viii. 7.) [F. D.]

THEODOSIUS (31), (THEODERICUS), 27th archbishop of Arles, between Cyprianus and Joannes I. performed the obsequies of St. Rusticula (Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. ii. 664.) The council of Châlon-sur-Saône, which was summoned by Clovis II. at a date variously given between 644 and 650, heard charges made against him in his province of leading an unseemly life and infringing the canons. The council's sentence, suspending him from office till he should have been presented to another council, is extant. When he was reinstated we do not know, but there is said to be an ancient document of Arles showing that he made a visitation of his province in 648 (*Gall. Christ.* i. 541; Mansi, x. 1194; Trichaud, *Hist. de l'Eglise d'Arles*, ii. 155–64). [S. A. B.]

THEODOSIUS (32), archbishop of Caesarea in Bithynia. He was a Monothelite, and was sent as an ambassador to arrange terms of peace with St. Maximus in his exile, A.D. 653. The disputation of Maximus and Theodosius will be found in Maximi *Opp.* ed. Combefis. p. xliv. sqq. Maximus there developes the doctrine of the Communicatio Idiomatum (Migne, *Pat. Gr.* xc.; Ceill. xi. 762). [G. T. S.]

THEODOSIUS (33), a monk of the 7th century, who replied to the arguments of John Philoponus against the resurrection of the body [JOANNES (564)]. (Photius, Cod. 22; Ceill. xi. 652.) [G. T. S.]

THEODOSIUS (34), bishop of Ammorium. He was originally an Iconoclast, but retracted his sentiments at the first session of the Second Nicene Council. In his retractation he used a comparison which illustrates the life of the times. He said that when the imperial images

were sent into the provinces, the people presented to them perfumes and tapers. How much more then should the images of Christ and the saints be honoured (Mansi, xii. 1013; Ceill. xiii. 620). [G. T. S.]

THEODOSIUS (35), a monk addressed by Nicephorus Chartophylax about A.D. 800 in two letters, which are valuable as showing the state of discipline and canon law in the Greek church of that time. Nicephorus lays down that monks have no right to absolve if they are not priests. The Iconoclastic persecution had raised them so high in popular estimation that they even invaded the priestly office without ordination (Migne, *Pat. Gr.* t. c. 1061–1068; Ceill. xii. 293). [G. T. S.]

THEODOTA (1), virgin and martyr with her sisters. She suffered in the Diocletian persecution with SS. Cyrus and John at Alexandria. [JOANNES (537).] Maii *Spic. Rom.* t. iii.; Ceill. iii. 61. [G. T. S.]

THEODOTA (2), a courtesan who suffered martyrdom at Philippi rather than sacrifice to Apollo in the persecution of Licinius, A.D. 318 (Asseman. *AA. Mart.* ii. 221). [G. T. S.]

THEODOTIANI. [THEODOTUS (4).]

THEODOTION, otherwise THEODOTUS (so Suidas[a] *s.v.* *κνίζων*), author of the Greek version of the Old Testament which followed, as those of Aquila and Symmachus preceded, that of the LXX. in Origen's columnar arrangements of the versions. Of his personality even less is known than of either of the other two translators whose names are thus associated with his. The earliest author by whom he is mentioned is Irenaeus, in a passage which it is needful here to give in full (see for the Greek of it the article IRENAEUS, above, Vol. III. p. 288), inasmuch as by reason of its higher antiquity and authority, it must be our standard whereby to test the accounts of later writers, and was probably one of the sources whence those accounts have been derived. Irenaeus (III. xxi. 1, p. 215), referring to the word "*virgin*" (*παρθένος*) in Isai. vii. 14, affirms that the passage is to be read "not as certain of those who now venture to misinterpret the Scripture, 'Behold, the *damsel* (*νεᾶνις*) shall be with child and shall bear a son'; as Theodotion of Ephesus interpreted it and Aquila of Pontus, both Jewish proselytes; following whom the Ebionites pretend that he was begotten of Joseph." Eusebius cites this passage (*H. E.* v. 8), adopting but adding nothing to its statements. Jerome, on the contrary, couples Theodotion, not thus with Aquila as a convert to Judaism, but as "an Ebionite," "a Judaizing heretic," with Symmachus. In one remarkable passage (*Comm. in Abac.* iii. 11–13, lib. II. c. iii.) he even contrasts these two as Ebionites and "*semi-Christians*," with Aquila, reproaching them with having given a Jewish rendering of words which "Aquila the *Jew*" had rendered as a Christian would. Jerome may perhaps have been led here into error by the habit of coupling Theodotion's name with that of the notoriously Ebionite Symmachus; but it seems more probable that in a hasty reading or through an imperfect recollection of the above words of Irenaeus, he misunderstood them as making Theodotion belong to the sect which found in his version of Isaiah a support for their heresy. In another place, however (*Praef. in Comm. in Dan.* p. 620), Jerome seems to prefer another account which represents Theodotion as in no sense a Christian, heretic or otherwise, but as one "qui utique post Christi adventum *incredulus* fuit,"[b]—agreeing substantially with the expression used by Irenaeus, "Jewish proselyte," *i.e.*, one who from a Gentile had become a Jew by religion. Epiphanius, however (*De Mensuris et Pondd.*, 17), diverges widely from all these authorities, and makes him a proselyte from a different quarter, not from heathendom but from heretical Christianity—describing him as a Marcionite, a native of Pontus, who quarrelled with his fellow-sectaries, apostatized to Judaism, and acquired the Hebrew tongue. To this narrative little weight is to be attached, as well because of the general and admitted untrustworthiness of this writer, as because it directly conflicts with the weighty testimony of Irenaeus, as already adduced to the effect that Theodotion was an Ephesian. It is of course supposable that he may have been Pontic by origin but Ephesian by habitation; but the whole account runs in so suspiciously close a parallel to what Epiphanius has told of Aquila just before, as to suggest the surmise that confusion or invention, or both, may have been here at work. It may well be that Epiphanius describes Theodotion as a Pontic Christian who turned Jew, merely because he has already so described Aquila: and that he had no better ground for setting him down as a Marcionite, than because the mention of Pontus suggested the name of the great Pontic heresiarch. On the whole it seems safest to confine ourselves as Eusebius did to accepting the facts as briefly stated by Irenaeus,—that Theodotion was of Ephesus, a heathen convert to Judaism—without attempting to add to or alter them on the unsatisfactory testimony of later writers as to his nationality or religion.

In attempting to fix the time when Theodotion flourished, we find ourselves again thrown back on the authority of Irenaeus in the same passage of the treatise *Against Heresies*: for the one certain and tolerably determinate datum we possess in the matter is, that his version, being referred to (as above) in that passage, must have been made before the composition of that treatise,—therefore before A.D. 180–189 (see Vol. III. p. 258). A second but less available datum is the fact, admitted on all hands, that he came after Aquila,—who, however, is variously assigned to the earlier or the later years of the second quarter of the second century. Thus, combining our data, we conclude that Theodotion's work cannot have been so late as 189 or earlier than 130. On the side of the later date, some would construe the expression of Irenaeus, "those who *are now venturing*"

[a] Theodoret however, from whose *Comm.* on Amos (vii. 14) Suidas borrows here, writes *Theodotion*. The name possibly represents *Nathanael* or *Elnathan*.

[b] That is (as it seems), "an unbeliever who lived after the coming of Christ," not before it, like the Seventy.

(τῶν νῦν τολμώντων), as implying that when he wrote, Theodotion had only just completed his translation. But this argument puts undue force on the words, and is sufficiently met by a reference to the sentence that follows, "as Theodotion *interpreted* (ἡρμήνευσε, aor.), and Aquila;" and by the remark that on the same grounds we should be obliged to make Aquila also write immediately before Irenaeus, which is contrary to all the evidence. The expression is to be understood merely as contrasting the comparatively recent translations with the ancient and primary authority of the LXX. On the other hand, in favour of the earlier date, the apparent use by Irenaeus throughout his treatise of Theodotion's translation of Daniel has been relied on to prove that part at least of his version must have been executed several (probably twenty) years before Irenaeus wrote, in order to have attained the acceptance implied in his so using it. But (not to mention that Irenaeus, an Eastern whose early life had been passed at Smyrna, may have had exceptional opportunities of becoming acquainted with a work proceeding from Ephesus), it will be shewn farther on that arguments founded on citations from Daniel which look like Theodotion's version, cannot be relied on. Whether, therefore, the date of this version is nearer to the upper or lower of the limits above indicated, cannot be determined with certainty. If, indeed, we could rely on Epiphanius, the doubt would be solved, for he confidently asserts that Theodotion issued his version in "the reign of the second Commodus" (*i.e.* 180–192; for the emperor, as he explains, is thus designated to distinguish him from Commodus, better known as Verus, the partner in empire of M. Aurelius); so that its date must be after 180, as it has been above shewn to be before 189. On his authority the Paschal Chronicle sets it down as 184; and in recent times Harvey (*Irenaeus*, t. i. p. clviii.) has fixed on 181, but under a misapprehension of the meaning of "the second Commodus," which expression he construes as "the second *year of* Commodus." But the testimony of Epiphanius as contained in the Greek text, is in this instance even more than usually unsafe to rely on. For it is discredited by the circumstance, that it is preceded and followed by two other equally confident statements, — (1) That Symmachus flourished under Severus (123–211), and (2) that Theodotion followed Symmachus; whence it would follow that Theodotion's version belongs to a time long after Commodus, and so late that it could not possibly have been known (as we have seen it was) to Irenaeus writing before 189. Thus these assertions of Epiphanius are contradictory alike to one another and to known historical facts. The text of the *De Menss. et Pond.* at this place, however, bears such evident marks of corruption and interpolation, that it becomes necessary at this point to give the results of a fuller examination of it.

Twelve chapters (9–20) are occupied with an account of the versions of the Old Testament, beginning with the LXX. (chh. 9–12), and then proceeding to Aquila (13–16) whose version is reckoned "the *second*" (the LXX. of course being *first*), and is assigned to the reign of Hadrian. Next follows, in ch. 16, a list of the Roman emperors for chronological reference, but a strangely dislocated and confused one, as follows. First, Antoninus Pius; then Caracalla, who is also called Geta, and identified with M. Aurelius, with the further name of Severus [here written abnormally Σουῆρ] added to him, and L. Aur. Commodus assigned as his colleague, with a joint reign of seven years (which is right as regards Caracalla, but not for M. Aurelius who reigned nineteen years); then Pertinax; then Severus [not as above written, but Σευῆρος]. On this list follows the statement, "In the time of Severus, Symmachus . . . . issued his version, the *third*." The author next goes on in ch. 17 to relate that "after him [Symmachus], closely following in succession of time, in the reign of the second Commodus who reigned after the aforesaid Commodus for thirteen years, Theodotion . . . . also issued his version." He then proceeds (ch. 18) to the finding of the "*Fifth* Version," "in the time of Caracalla who is also called Geta, son of Severus." At this point, again for chronological purposes, he introduces a second list of the emperors, which is free from the confusion of the former one with respect to M. Aurelius (to whom he adds only the surname Verus, and gives the years of his reign correctly), to Commodus, and to Caracalla (except that he once more identifies him with Geta); but no attempt is made to reconcile the contradiction between the two lists, beyond the addition of the word "another" (ἄλλος) not only to the name of Commodus, but to those of Pertinax, Severus, and Caracalla. Thus we have two imaginary emperors interpolated, in a vain attempt to cure the absurdity of placing Theodotion under Commodus, and yet making him posterior to Symmachus, who is placed under Severus the successor of Pertinax the successor of Commodus! It is noteworthy, however, that in this corrected list of emperors, the mention of Theodotion under the reign of Commodus is repeated, and his version described as the *fourth*, whereas Symmachus is not named in this chapter either before or after him. It can hardly be admitted as possible that even Epiphanius, inaccurate to the point of recklessness though he admittedly is, could so grossly stultify himself as the existing Greek copies of this work make him do here; especially as in his *Ancoratus* (written eighteen years earlier) we find (ch. 60) a list of emperors which is free from the blunders above noted. It has therefore long been suspected that his text has been here falsified by transcribers' mistakes or by editorial attempts at correction. And this suspicion has been converted into a certainty by the recovery and comparison of the ancient Syriac version of this treatise, contained in one of the Nitrian MSS. of the British Museum (Add. 17148).[a] This MS. was written (see Wright's *Catal.* p. 717) before A.D. 660, and is thus probably many centuries older than the Greek copies. The translation it contains seems to have been made in the sixth century, or earlier. But the Greek which the translator

[a] Also in Add. 14620 (ninth century). The text has been printed from these MSS. by Dr. de Lagarde, and is prefixed to his *Veteris Testamenti ab Origene recensiti Fragmenta apud Syros servata quinque* (Göttingen. 1880).

had before him was by no means free from the blunders (above pointed out) of the existing Greek text; for in ch. 16, the Syriac exhibits the same erroneous identification of M. Aurelius with Caracalla and Geta, and the same confusion as regards Commodus. Yet it must have differed from that text for the better in important particulars. In the Syriac (1) when M. Aurelius is first named (ch. 16) his proper paternal name *Verus* (not *Severus*) is added, Severus being named only farther on, as the successor of Pertinax; and in the account of Symmachus with which the same chapter closes, it is under Verus, not Severus, that he is placed. Again (not to notice minor variations) in ch. 18, where the second list of emperors is given, we find (2) the following notable additions after the name of "M. Aurelius who is also called Verus." "Now he was also called Lucius Commodus. In his time, as I said before, Symmachus was noted as a translator;" words which make it plain that the reign to which the writer assigns Symmachus is that of the successor of Antoninus Pius; though (by an error which, however great, does not affect the question of time) he here identifies him with that earlier L. Commodus whom above he has correctly represented as his colleague. Moreover, what is no less noteworthy, (3) while in the second list, in both Greek and Syriac, the emperor Commodus under whom Theodotion is placed, is distinguished as "*another* Commodus" (ܐܚܪܢܐ = ἄλλος) from the Commodus who had been mentioned before (ch. 16) as partner with M. Aurelius, the same word is not attached in Syriac as it is in the Greek to the name of the rest,—Pertinax, Severus, Caracalla. On a review, then, of these corrections of the text, we arrive at the following results of our examination of the Syriac translation. (i.) From (1) the substitution of Verus for Severus in ch. 16, together with (2) the mention of Symmachus inserted in ch. 18 under the reign of M. Aurelius, it appears certain that Epiphanius, according to the ancient Greek text underlying the Syriac, placed Symmachus not under Severus (193–211), but some thirty years earlier, under M. Aurelius. And (ii.) the threefold omission (3) of the "another" from after the names of the emperors in ch. 18 is strong evidence that ch. 16 did not originally exhibit either the superfluous mention of Pertinax and Severus, or the absurd confusion as to Caracalla, which now appear in Greek and Syriac alike; so that the intrusion of these three names into ch. 16 is to be set down to the blunder of a scribe who was misled by the similarity between *Verus* and *Severus*, and had suffered his eye to be caught by the name *Antoninus*, where it occurs below (ch. 18) as borne by the son of Severus who is known as Caracalla; or perhaps to the conjectural alterations of a corrector who believed (probably with good reason, see article SYMMACHUS) that Symmachus belonged to the time of Severus, and desired to make Epiphanius say so in despite of his own chronology.[d] These interpolations, being thus older than the Syriac version, must have occurred at a very early date.[e] The other corruptions of the text from which the Syriac is free, must have been in a copy to which the author of the Pseudo-Athanasian *Synopsis* (or at least of the latter part of it, s. 79) had access; for his account of the Greek versions of the Old Testament is a mere abstract of this of Epiphanius, as in the present Greek text, and follows it in the absurdity of placing Symmachus as "third" translator under Severus, with Theodotion as "fourth" under Commodus (the LXX. and Aquila being respectively first and second.)[f] The date of this *Synopsis* is uncertain and probably not very early. But it is remarkable that the compiler of the *Paschal Chronicle*, which is of the seventh century (contemporary therefore with the MS. of the Syriac text above cited), must have used a copy similarly altered; for he not only places Theodotion under Commodus, as already stated, under the year 183–4, but also Symmachus under Severus as late as 201–2, citing Epiphanius as his authority for his account of both.

[d] The confusion among the names, &c., in the order of these emperors, gross as it is, is not without excuse when one considers that the emperor we know as M. Aurelius Antoninus, bore originally his father's name *Verus*, and also that of his maternal grandfather *Severus*, that he transferred the name Verus to his partner *L. Commodus*; and finally that the same names, M. Aurelius Antoninus, officially designated the emperor who is usually called by his nickname *Caracalla*.

[e] The passages of Epiphanius above discussed must have run somewhat as follows in the Greek which the Syriac translator followed. — The words in square brackets appear to be interpolations, but earlier than his time.

Ch. 16. Τοῦτον (sc. Ἀντωνῖνον Πίον) διαδέχεται [Καράκαλλος ὁ καὶ Γέτας, ὃς καὶ] Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Οὐῆρος [ἐλέγετο], καὶ βασιλεύει ἔτη [ζ] (read ιθ). Ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ χρόνοις καὶ Λούκιος Αὐρήλιος Κόμμοδος βασιλεύει τὰ αὐτα [ζ] ἔτη. [Περτίναξ μῆνας ϛ. Σευῆρος ἔτη ιη.] Ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Οὐήρου χρόνοις Σύμμαχός τις . . . μὴ τιμηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ οἰκείου ἔθνους . . . προστρέχει τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις.

Ch. 17. Μετὰ τοῦτον δὲ κατὰ πόδας ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς χρόνῳ, τουτέστι περὶ τὴν Κομμόδου βασιλείαν, λέγω δὲ τοῦ δευτέρου Κομμόδου, Θεοδοτίων τις . . . ἐξέδωκε. . . .

Ch. 18. . . . Μετὰ Ἀντωνῖνον τὸν Πίον βασιλεύει Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνῖνος, ὁ καὶ Οὐῆρος, ἔτη ιθ· ἐλέγετο δὲ αὐτὸς Λούκιος Κόμμοδος. Ἐν τοῖς τούτου χρόνοις, ὡς πρότερον εἶπον, Σύμμαχος ἐγνωρίσθη ἑρμηνευτής. Μετὰ τοῦτον Κόμμοδος ἄλλος βασιλεύει ἔτη ιγ· ἐν ᾧ χρόνῳ γνωρισθῆναι Θεοδοτίωνα εἴπομεν, τὸν ἀπὸ Μαρκιωνιστῶν Ἰουδαῖον γενόμενον καὶ τὴν τετάρτην ἑρμηνείαν ἑρμηνεύσαντα. Κόμμοδον δὲ διαδέχεται Περτίναξ, καὶ . . Τοῦτον δὲ διαδέχεται Σευῆρος, καὶ βασιλεύει σὺν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἀντωνίνῳ ὃς καὶ Γέτα, ἔτη ιη· Τελευτήσαντος δὲ Σευήρου διαδέχεται τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ Ἀντωνῖνος Γέτες ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ Καράκαλλος ἐπικληθεὶς, καὶ ποιεῖ ἔτη ζ.

If the changes here indicated by brackets are made in ch. xvi. (as was long ago suggested by Huet), the serious contradictions and absurdities disappear. The inconsistent mistake about the former Commodus may be also removed by striking out ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ χρόνοις . . . τὰ αὐτὰ ζ ἔτη; or (more probably) by striking out only the first four and last five words and prefixing ὁ, so as to read, ὁ καὶ Λούκιος Αὐρήλιος Κόμμοδος,—which though an erroneous identification of him with his colleague, agrees with the misstatement in ch. 18 (as given in the Syriac).

N.B. The words τιμηθεὶς and προστρέχει are restored above in ch. 16 from the Pseudo-Athanasian *Synopsis*, which the Syriac confirms.

[f] In the *Auctarium* compiled by Garnier, and appended to most editions of Theodoret, is to be found a similar abridgement of Epiphanius's account of the three versions, in which this absurdity is also repeated. But the date and authorship of this document are uncertain.

This writer, however, it is to be noted, refrains from borrowing from Epiphanius the designation of Theodotion as "fourth," and of Aquila as "second;" while he retains that of "third" for Symmachus, which of course implies that he counted Aquila first and Theodotion second, and did not include the LXX. in his reckoning. It is certain that Epiphanius, and the Synoptist after him, in designating the three translators as second, third, and fourth, intended to mark their chronological order; for with them the LXX. is first, and Epiphanius as has been shewn states expressly that Theodotion came "after" Symmachus. In so placing these two, he was probably misled, as most writers on the subject suppose, following a suggestion offered by Montfaucon (*Praeliminaria in Hexapla*) by Origen's columnar arrangement of the Greek versions, the order of which was, as is well known, Aquila, Symmachus, LXX., Theodotion; though the fact that the LXX. stood third and not first ought to have apprised him that Origen's order was not chronological;[g] and he himself (ch. 19) actually warns his readers against being misled by it, as some had been, into supposing Aquila and Symmachus to be prior to the LXX. Hardly any scholar of later days except Petavius (*Animadversiones; De Imp. Rom. Chronol.*, p. 399, ed. 1622) has attempted to maintain that Epiphanius was right in this view. The principle of the Hexaplar arrangement, far from being chronological, was plainly this; to set over against the original Hebrew the ancient authoritative version of the LXX., and to subjoin to each the versions derived from and subsidiary to it. Thus Aquila and Symmachus, who translated direct from the Hebrew, were placed next to the two columns which contained the Hebrew (in its native character, and in the Greek); and Theodotion for the like reason was appended to the LXX., as being little more than a recension of their version. The Hexapla, therefore, yields no evidence on the matter of the relative priority of the versions. As a ground for placing Symmachus last, it is usually argued that the silence of Irenaeus concerning him in the passage so often referred to above, where he refers to Theodotion and Aquila, implies that Symmachus's version had not been made, or at least had not had time to reach Lyons, when Irenaeus wrote. But it has been shewn above, [art. SYMMACHUS] that this argument is inconclusive. At the same time the distinct evidence adduced in that article bringing Symmachus very close down to the time of Origen, whose elder contemporary he may well have been, when combined with the established fact that Theodotion's version was written before Irenaeus's treatise, which was written probably before Origen was born, certainly before his infancy was past—makes it hardly possible to avoid the conclusion, that Theodotion was the earlier of the two. Origen, who is the earliest writer to mention all three translators, seems to imply that this is so; for though in the Hexapla he places Symmachus before Theodotion for the reason already explained, in citing them in his writings he usually reverses the order. In the fragments of those of his *Commentaries* which were written before 231, occur the earliest known notices of Symmachus's existence and work; and in one of these, in a note on Ps. iv. 1 (p. 556, Delarue) on the heading εἰς τὸ τέλος, he cites the versions in the order, Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus. So also in his note in the word *Selah* (*ib.*, p. 515), which however probably belongs to another work of his on the Psalms, the *Encheiridion*, of unknown date; and again on St. John i. 28, in his *Comm. in Joann.*, tom. vi. (p. 141), written 232–238. And so finally in his *Comm. in Matt.*, tom. xvi. (p. 742), where on St. Matt. xxi. 5 he collects all the renderings known to him of Zech. ix. 9, arranging them in an order evidently meant as chronological, LXX., Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, "Fifth" Version; and this in a work written after he had compiled his Hexapla, for he refers to it in tom. xv. (p. 671). Even Eusebius, whose familiarity with the Hexapla would naturally lead him to follow its order, sometimes sets Theodotion before Symmachus, as *e.g.* in *Comm. in Pss.*, on Ps. ii. 2 ("Selah"). Jerome's evidence is more express, for, not to mention that in his *Praef. ad Comm. in Dan.* above quoted, he names Theodotion second in mentioning the three, his expression in his *Comm. in Esai.*, on lviii. 10 (p. 694) "Symmachus in Theodotionis scita concedens," can hardly (though Dr. Field seems to question this, *Prolegg. in Hex.*, p. xxx.) mean less than that he believed Symmachus to have used Theodotion's version. It may be added that some later but still early writers of repute continue occasionally to follow the order Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus. Thus Theodoret in the note on Amos above referred to; and the same arrangement is uniformly adopted by Philoponus (*In Hexaëm.*; 7th century), with the LXX. placed first, shewing that he meant it as chronological. Olympiodorus also (6th or 7th century), in his *Comm. in Job*, cites the three latter names in that order more frequently than in that of the Hexapla.

On the whole it may be offered as a probable account of the facts, and of the mistakes of Epiphanius concerning them, that he had before him some authority, now lost, which placed Theodotion under Commodus and Symmachus under Severus; and that in order to reconcile this with what seemed to him to be the evidence of the Hexapla in favour of the priority of Symmachus, he conjecturally corrected *Severus* into *Verus*, or perhaps assumed that under either name was meant M. Aurelius, who, in fact, bore both names. Of the subsequent changes introduced into his text, explanations have been suggested above.

Thus the direct evidence leads us to place Theodotion about the year 180, and Symmachus from fifteen to thirty years later; dates which agree well with the few known facts of the case. But indirect evidence of an earlier date for Theodotion has by some been supposed to be found in the apparent use of his version traceable in the *Trypho* of Justin Martyr, a work written not later than 164, perhaps some twenty years earlier. The fallacious character of this evidence will however be presently shewn.

The characteristics of Theodotion's work have been described in a previous article [HEXAPLA,

[g] Jerome implies this in his words "Aquila et Symmachus, LXX. et Theodotio *suum* ordinem tenent" (*Comm. in Ep. ad Titum*, iii. 9, p. 734).

Vol. III. p. 23]. It was not so much an independent translation as rather a revision of the LXX., with its insertions usually retained, but its omissions supplied from the Hebrew—probably with the help of Aquila's version. Accordingly, Origen could couple it with the LXX. as "equivalent" versions (τὰ ἰσοδυναμοῦντα ἀλλήλοις), in a passage (*Ep. ad African.* p. 15), where he notices the supplementary verses at the end of Job, given by them but omitted by Aquila. And Theodotion's was the version he commonly used in preference to the other two (though Epiphanius with his habitual inaccuracy reverses this statement, *l. l.*, ch. 2) in filling up the omissions of the LXX. or the *lacunae* in their text as he found it; and from it accordingly comes a large part of the ordinary Greek text of Jeremiah, and a still larger part of that of Job. Thus in these books we have fuller materials for learning the character of his version than that of either of the others; and still more, in his version of Daniel, which (as stated above, Vol. III. p. 22) has come down to us entire, having since before Jerome's time (but how long before, we are not told), superseded[h] that of the LXX., so completely that the latter was lost for centuries, and is now extant only in a single Greek copy, the *Cod. Chisianus*, and in the Syro-Hexaplar translation contained in *Cod. Ambrosianus* (C. 313 *Inf.*).[i] Anyone who compares this version with Theodotion's which is usually printed in all ordinary editions of the Greek Old Testament, will at once agree with Jerome (*Praef. in Dan.*) that the Church chose rightly in discarding the former and adopting the latter. Indeed, the greater part of this Chisian Daniel cannot be said to deserve the name of a translation at all. It deviates from the original in every possible way; transposes, expands or abridges, adds or omits, at pleasure. The latter chapters it so entirely rewrites that the predictions are perverted, sometimes even reversed, in scope. We learn from Jerome (*In Dan.* iv. 6, p. 646) that Origen himself ("in nono Stromatum volumine") abandoned this supposed LXX. Daniel for Theodotion's. And accordingly, the result of an examination of all the citations of Daniel, some of them long and important passages, that occur in Origen's extant works, is to prove that they all agree almost verbatim with the text of Theodotion now current, and differ, in some instances materially as well as verbally, from that of the reputed LXX. as derived from the Chisian MS. He seems, moreover, to have found the task of bringing its text to conform to the original by the aid of Theodotion's, a hopeless one, as we may judge by the specimens of his work shown in the asterisks, obeli, and marginalia of the two MSS. referred to. Yet that this is the version which Origen placed as that of the LXX. in the penultimate column of the Hexapla and Tetrapla is certain. The Chisian MS. testifies to the fact in its subscription to Daniel, which affirms that MS. to have been directly copied from one which again in its subscription claimed to have been transcribed from and collated with the Tetrapla; and the subscription to Daniel in the Syro-Hexaplar MS. cites the subscription of its original in exactly the same terms.[j] And the citations of the LXX. Daniel in Jerome, which are frequent, agree with the Chisian and Syro-Hexaplar texts. But though Jerome and others probably had their knowledge of this version of Daniel from Origen's great compilation, or copies derived from it, Origen was not the first to make it known to the church. There is distinct evidence that before his time it was in the hands of Justin Martyr. Not to dwell as a reference to Dan. vii. 13 in his *Apologia*, which comes nearer to the Chisian text than to Theodotion's, we have in his *Trypho* (31) the whole passage Dan. vii. 9–28 cited at length in a version agreeing in the main (though with not a few signal divergences) with the version as given in the Chisian MS., the agreements being of such nature as utterly to preclude the explanation that they result from casual coincidence. But the divergences, though fewer in number, are not less signal in character, and open an important question, which has been touched on above, with regard to Theodotion's version. In many of the points in which the passage as cited in the *Trypho*, diverges from the Chisian text—though not in all of them—it coincides with that of Theodotion. And in this case also the agreements are such as chance will not account for. Thus the indications of the extract in the *Trypho* seem, at first sight, to point to the use by the author of both the versions now extant. Of the phenomena thus presented by it, divers explanations have been offered. The *first* is perhaps hardly worth mentioning because no one seems ever to have adopted it or even to have thought it worth refuting; it is that of Wetstein (*Prolegg. in N. T.*, p. 64, edit. 1730), who, though he wrote before the Chisian text had come to light, detected in this extract the tokens of interpolation from Theodotion, and believing that translator to be posterior to Justin, suggested the inference that the *Trypho* must be the work not of Justin but of some later writer. The *second* is Stroth's (ap. Eichhorn, *Repert.* t. ii. p. 75), whose solution of the difficulty is to assign to Theodotion a date prior to 160; an assumption which, as has been shewn, is not by any means inadmissible, but which, as will presently appear, is inadequate to meet the whole case. The *third* is Credner's (*Beiträge zur Einleitung*, ii. pp. 261–272), who after a careful and very minute analysis of the extract in question was led to advance the theory, that the coincidences observed between the text of that extract and Theodotion's are to

---

[h] This fact is stated by Jerome repeatedly; in the two passages cited below, and also in *Apol. contra Ruf.* ii. 33; and *Praef. in Comm. in Dan.* p. 620.

[i] From the former MS. this Greek text of Daniel was first printed at Rome in 1772; from the latter, the Syriac at Milan in 1780.

[j] Δανιὴλ, κατὰ τοὺς Ο'.—ἐγράφη ἐξ ἀντιγράφου ἔχοντος τὴν ὑποσημείωσιν ταύτην. Ἐγράφη ἐκ τῶν τετραπλῶν, ἐξ ὧν καὶ παρετέθη. The Syro-Hexaplar subscription is precisely to the same effect. The agreement between these MSS. here and throughout, in their subscriptions, in the peculiar order in which they arrange the books contained in both, and in other points, indicate that the MS. whence the Chisian was copied, and that which contained the original of which the Syro-Hexaplar is a translation, if they were not identical must have had a very near common ancestor.

be taken as indicating not that Justin borrowed from Theodotion, but that both borrowed from a common source. This source he supposed to be a previous version of Daniel corrected after the original by Christians of Palestine; a copy of which, having reached Ephesus, there fell into the hands of Justin when he was writing his *Trypho* in that city, and afterwards of Theodotion who, as we have seen, was an Ephesian. By assuming a sufficiently early date for this supposed version, he thus accounted not only for the points of contact between the Trypho extract and Theodotion, but for other and still more remarkable facts which, in the course of his investigation, he brought to light;—the apparent traces of Theodotion's version in Clement of Rome (c. 34), and even in the Apocalypse (i. 7), and in the Second Gospel (xiv. 62). Such traces are at once explained by Credner's hypothesis; but they demonstrate the failure of the other two solutions. For it is impossible, either (after Wetstein's method), to date those writings so late as to be the work of men posterior to Theodotion; or (after Stroth's), to date Theodotion early enough for his version to have been known to St. Clement, St. John, and St. Mark. And thus much Credner appears to have rightly divined — though, as will be shewn below, his imagined early Christian version of Daniel is at once improbable and unnecessary—that a version underlies Theodotion's which is older than the New Testament, and which is not the Chisian LXX. But the facts of the case require to be brought out more distinctly, and appear to point to a different solution from that which he offered.

The facts, then, as they lie before us, may be stated thus. (1) Theodotion's version of Daniel is not an independent one, but, like the rest of his work, founded on a previous version. For all authorities agree that he was not, and was not competent to be, an original translator, but worked on lines laid down by others. (2) This previous version of Daniel was not that contained in the Chisian MS.; as is shown by simple comparison of it with Theodotion's. Not only are they in many and those the most important portions substantially distinct and even contradictory *inter se*, but Theodotion's is thoroughly dissimilar in character to the Chisian and shews no trace of the very peculiar manner and marked superiority of style which characterize the Greek of the latter as compared with the LXX. in general. (3) This version, thus underlying Theodotion's and distinct from the Chisian, must have been prior, not only to Justin, and to St. Clement, but even to some books of the New Testament. Of these points the last (3) has been indicated in the account just given of Credner's theory, and will be found to be capable of much fuller proof. The two former points (1) and (2) are of great importance, as showing how unsafe it is to rely on Greek citations from Daniel, which seem derived from Theodotion's text rather than the Chisian, in investigating the date of Theodotion, or of the works in which such citations occur. Thus Wetstein, as we have seen, was misled into conjecturing that the *Trypho* was subsequent to Justin's time. And thus very recently Dr. Hort has been misled into an attempt to lower the date of the *Pastor* of Hermas;—on the ground of an allusion to Daniel vi. 22, acutely discerned by Mr. Rendel Harris in the description of the angel *Θεγρὶ* [*Σεγρὶ*] who is described as sent to deliver Hermas from a wild beast (*Pastor*, iv. ii. 4); where the words *ἐνέφραξε* [=סגר] . . . *λυμάνῃ*, agree with Theodotion's version of the reply of Daniel concerning his deliverance, and differ from the Chisian.[k] The remaining point (3) when kept in view guides to the true source of the citations from Daniel in writers of the first and second centuries which look like Theodotion's renderings. A fuller examination of the subject will be found to add largely to the instances on which Credner founded his theory, and to lead us to substitute for it another and simpler hypothesis.

To begin with the use of Daniel in the New Testament. Credner rested his theory of an early Christian version of the book (perhaps too confidently) mainly on the two places already noted, Rev. i. 7; St. Mark xiv. 62, in both of which the Son of Man is spoken of as coming *with* (*μετὰ*) not *on* (*ἐπὶ*) the clouds,—thus agreeing with Theodotion's text against the Chisian. It is now to be added that the Apocalypse yields several other instances, some of them much more weighty than this of his, as follows:—Rev. ix. 20 (Dan. v. 23); xii. 7 (Dan. x. 30); xiii. 7 (Dan. vii. 21); xix. 6 (Dan. x. 6); xx. 4 (Dan. vii. 9); xx. 11 (Dan. ii. 35). Of these the first is a considerable passage, every word of which can be accounted for from Theodotion, but is entirely without counterpart in the Chisian LXX.: in the next four the coincidence with Theodotion against the Chisian is minute, but for that very reason the less explicable as accidental: while the last, where the expression *τόπος οὐχ εὑρέθη αὐτοῖς* agrees word for word with Theodotion, whereas the Chisian text has *ὥστε μηδὲν καταλειφθῆναι ἐξ αὐτῶν*,—would alone suffice to raise a strong presumption that the Apocalyptist knew a version which was akin to Theodotion's and unlike the reputed LXX.;—for it may fairly be assumed that an author to whom Greek was evidently no familiar vehicle of thought, and who certainly used the LXX. elsewhere in citing the Old Testament, was not in this place, or in the others given above, translating Daniel for himself from the original. In the Gospels again we find, in addition to Credner's single reference to St. Mark, the following instances which tend to the same result as the above;—St. Matt. xiii. 32, with parallels in SS. Mark and Luke (Dan. iv. 37); St. Matt. xiii. 43 (Dan. xii. 3); St. Matt. xxiv. 21, with parallel in St. Mark (Dan. xii. 1). From the Epistles probably James i. 12 (cp. v. 11) may be adduced to the like effect, compared with Daniel xii. 12 (where the Chisian reads *ἐμμένων* for the *ὑπομένων* of Theodotion and of St. James). A clearer case is Hebrews xii. 33 *ἔφραξαν στόματα λεόντων*,—words which point unmistakably to the same version of Daniel as that used by Hermas, as above pointed out.[1] So much for the evidence yielded by the New Testament. But when from it we go back to examine

---

[k] See *Johns Hopkins' University Circulars*, iii. 75; iv. 23; and article SEGRI, above.

[1] Most of these New Testament passages, and the comparison with the two versions of Daniel, are given more fully by Dr. Salmon in his *Introduction*, ch. xxvi. p. 597 ff. (2nd ed.); see also p. 587.

with the like view the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, we are enabled to conclude, that the version which underlies Theodotion's and which was used by the earliest Christian writers, was not itself a Christian production.[m] The Apocryphal Book which is available for this investigation is that of Baruch. A considerable portion of the opening of this book (i. 15–ii. 20) is founded largely on Daniel ix., and in several places the Greek differs from the Chisian text and agrees with Theodotion's. The chief instances are,—Bar. i. 15 (and ii. 11) ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη (Dan. ix. 7 and 15): Bar. i. 16, καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἡμῶν (Dan. ix. 8); Bar. i. 18, πορεύεσθαι οἷς ἔδωκε κατὰ πρόσωπον ἡμῶν (Dan. ix. 10); Bar. ii. 2, ὑποκάτω παντὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ . . . ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσῆ (Dan. ix. 12, 13); Bar. ii. 7, τὰ κακὰ ταῦτα ἦλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς (Dan. ix. 13); Bar. ii. 11, ἐν χειρὶ κραταίᾳ (Dan. ix. 15); Bar. ii. 14, εἰσάκουσον κύριε (Dan. ix. 17); Bar. ii. 16, κλῖνον τὸ οὖς (Dan. ix. 18),—in all of which Baruch agrees verbatim with Theodotion and not with the Chisian—the latter (*e.g.*) giving for the words of the first passage cited, κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην; omitting the *second* wholly; reading in the *third* κατακολουθῆσαι . . . ᾧ ἔδωκας ἐνώπιον Μωσῆ καὶ ἡμῶν,—and so on. Now though Hitzig and a few others have attempted to date this book as late as Vespasian's time (most unreasonably), no one has ever imagined that it can be later; and the weight of opinion assigns it, at least this earlier part of it, to the 3rd or 4th century B.C.[n] And the Greek text, whether original or a translation, is clearly a Jewish work. The version of Daniel therefore which the writer used cannot have been a Christian one; and the passages above collected are evidence that it was not the Chisian. Thus the Book of Baruch, even if as late as Hitzig would make it, proves that a Greek version of Daniel of Jewish origin, quite unlike the Chisian and closely akin to Theodotion's, was forthcoming in the first century. But when we assign to Baruch its proper date, we conclude that the version in question was pre-Christian. Indeed Credner's hypothesis involves grave improbabilities: for—not to mention that a version such as he supposes, remodelled by Christian hands and in a Christian sense, could not with propriety have been used (as Credner supposes it to have been) by Justin in his controversy real or fictitious with a Jew—it is hardly imaginable that a Christian of Palestine, at a date so early as to be anterior to the Gospels and Apocalypse, could or would have revised, or rather retranslated, the Book of Daniel. Moreover, not only is there no confirmation from external authority of the use by Theodotion of such a version, but the supposition that he did so is against the direct and express evidence which is forthcoming, all of which points to the LXX. as Theodotion's basis, and to no other version; except perhaps to Aquila's in a secondary degree, and in the way of occasional use. Indeed it is utterly improbable that Theodotion, a proselyte to Judaism, would use a version that had been revised in a Christian sense, as Credner's theory represents him to have done. If he had done so, some traces of a Christian bias could not fail to appear in the passages where his Daniel differs from the other, including some of those that are the most definitely Messianic in the book. But in point of fact no such trace is discoverable. Setting aside Credner's hypothesis, therefore, as at once internally improbable, against evidence, and inadequate to explain the facts, we are led to substitute for it a *fourth* solution of the question, whence come the citations of Daniel by Greek writers of the first two centuries? It is simply this, that side by side with the Chisian LXX. there was current among the Jews, from pre-Christian times, another version of Daniel, more deserving of the name, claiming to belong to the LXX. collection and similar in general character to the LXX. versions of other books of the Hagiographa; that this was the version known to the author of the book of Baruch (or the Greek translator of it, if it was written in Hebrew); and to St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. John, and other New Testament writers; and again to St. Clement and to Hermas: and that it was also the version on which Theodotion founded his. The first author to show any real signs of acquaintance[o] with the version now commonly taken for the LXX. is Justin, who certainly (as appears in the course of the preceding discussion) used it primarily and the other but occasionally; or else perhaps had in his hands a text mainly derived from it, but with considerable admixture of the other. Even as to Irenaeus, as will presently appear, there is no certain evidence that he knew the Chisian LXX., and the probability is that he too used the other. The Chisian text however was the one known to and received as the LXX. by Origen, who must be supposed to have failed to find a copy of the other, or to have been unaware of its existence;—no inadmissible supposition, for it appears that he failed to obtain complete LXX. texts of Job, Jeremiah, and Chronicles; and he himself professes ignorance of Aquila's and Theodotion's versions of Lamentations, the former of which at least must have afterwards come to light, as the Syro-Hexaplar

---

[m] It seems probable that the very remarkable expression βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως, in 1 Macc. i. 54 (cp. τὸ βδ. τῆς ἐρημ., Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14) comes likewise from this lost version. The reference is, in these citations, to Dan. ix. 27. But in this passage the words, βδ. ἐρημ., κ.τ.λ. are marked in the Syro-Hexaplar text as not properly belonging to it, but interpolated by Origen from Theodotion (for the obelus ought apparently to be an asterisk). The preceding words ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν compared with ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον in 1 Macc., and with ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ in Matt., prove that this is the passage of Daniel referred to in both citations (so Origen *in Matt.* xxiv. 15, p. 858, declares); and not the other passage xii. 11, where the like words are indeed found in the Chisian version as well as in Theodotion's, but in quite a different connexion. And the same may be said of the passage xi. 31.

[n] Ewald makes it older than Daniel; but this cannot be. (*Hist. of Isr.* v. p. 208,—Carpenter's transln.)

[o] Some slight apparent traces of a text agreeing with the Chisian are to be detected in a few places in the Apocalypse; of which the most distinct are the word ποδήρη (i. 13; cf. Dan. x. 5, LXX.; where Theodotion gives βαδδίν): and the title βασιλεὺς βασιλέων καὶ κύριος κυρίων (xix. 16; cp. Dan. iv. 31, LXX.; where Theodotion following the Chaldee has nothing to correspond). But these and other like traces may be accounted for as survivals of the primary LXX. version that have been retained in the Chisian.

margin abundantly testifies. His great authority thrown thus into the scale of the one version, is amply sufficient to account for the neglect into which the other fell after his time, and for its final disappearance. Yet of the two versions there can be little doubt that the survivor was the one of inferior value, and has less right to be accepted as the LXX. version. A suspicion of its claim to have come from the same source and to rest on the same authority as the other books of the LXX., was long ago expressed by Jerome in his conjecture that it may have been produced "sub nomine eorum [LXX.] ab alio nescio quo non satis Chaldaeam linguam sciente." (*Praef. in Dan.*) And though the ill character of the work is plainly due to wilful falsification rather than to such ignorance as Jerome supposes, yet his doubt whether it properly belongs to the LXX. collection is certainly well founded. It is at best a paraphrase, and a very unfaithful one, whereas that which Theodotion followed must have been a fairly close translation; and *primâ facie* it may be safely assumed that the paraphrase was not the first attempt to give the Book of Daniel to Greek readers, but had been preceded by a translation. Nay, the Chisian text itself here and there betrays tokens of an underlying text coincident with that which underlies Theodotion's. It is hard to account (*e.g.*) for such mistranslations as *σπανίσαι* for "*seul*" (Dan. ix. 24), and *τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θαλάσσης* for "*his body was like chalcedony*" (Dan. x. 6) except as perversions of the version whence Theodotion derived his *σφραγίσαι*, and *τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ Θάρσις*. The object of the paraphrast in great part of the work seems to have been merely to give, regardless of the original, a more truly Greek cast to the language and style than a mere translation could have: but in some places he betrays a national purpose, of encouraging the Jewish people against foreign oppression; and the altered turn he gives to the predictions of the latter chapters is such as evidently to point to the period of the great Maccabean struggle against Antiochus Epiphanes (B.C. 163) as the time of his work, as has been clearly made out by Dr. Pusey (*Daniel*, Lect. VI., vii. p. 376; and note E, p. 606). It is not likely that up to that time any book of the Jewish Scriptures remained untranslated; and we are thus confirmed in the conclusion, that the other Jewish version, whose existence we have inferred, was prior in date as well as superior in quality to the Chisian paraphrase, the latter being of the Maccabean period, the former possibly a century earlier. There is no inherent improbability in the hypothesis of two rival Septuagintal Daniels; for it has in its favour the analogous case of the two Septuagintal Ezras,—the canonical, and that known in our English Apocrypha as "*First* Esdras" (but subjoined as "Third Esdras" to the Vulgate, though ranked as "First" in many of the best Greek MSS.), which bears to the canonical Ezra very much the same relation as the Daniel now accepted as the LXX. is, in this theory, supposed to bear to the prior and authentic LXX. Daniel. Most of this Book of Esdras goes over the same ground as the canonical Ezra, and is closer to the original of that Book than the Chisian Daniel is to the original Daniel; and the interpolated story of the three youths at the court of Darius, and the appended hymn in praise of truth, have their parallels in the familiar apocryphal insertions in the Greek Daniel.[p] This hypothesis has the recommendation that, besides meeting all the known facts of the early use of Daniel by Greek writers, diverse and difficult as they are, it further supplies an answer to the question, How came the Church to accept and read in lieu of the LXX. Daniel, the version of Theodotion, a Jewish proselyte, or at best a heretic? The preference given to it, if it was put forward merely on his authority, would be strange indeed: but if we suppose it to have been received by Christians not as an independent translation, but merely as a revised form of the version which had the ancient and (as was supposed) inspired authority of the LXX., varying probably so little from that venerable version as to be practically identical with it, then we have a full explanation of how it came into esteem and use. As to the time when Theodotion's Daniel began to be thus received, we can only say that it was apparently later than the second century. The citations from Daniel in Irenaeus agree indeed substantially with Theodotion's text, but as they occur for the most part in the portions of Irenaeus which are now extant only in the old Latin version we cannot be sure that the agreement is complete; though it is beyond doubt that they are not taken from the Chisian version, inasmuch as the use made of them in many cases turns on points which in that version do not appear. In one case only (Iren. I. xii.) where the Greek survives, do we find a point of agreement with the Chisian text against

---

[p] The analogy between this 1 [3] Esdras and the Chisian Daniel goes further still, and extends even to the diction, which in these two books is less Hebraic than in any part of the LXX. proper, and characterized by an affectation of greater purity of idiom. One expression which they have in common, *ἀπηρείσατο αὐτὰ* [*τὰ σκεύη*] *ἐν τῷ εἰδωλείῳ αὐτοῦ* (Dan. i.=3 Esdr. ii.) is so singular, neither the noun nor the verb occurring elsewhere in the Old Testament, that the coincidence cannot be accidental. Are we then to infer that the author of 3 Esdras knew Daniel in the Chisian version? or that the author of that version is here using 3 Esdras? If we must choose between these alternatives, the former seems more probable, for the introduction of the three youths into 3 Esdras is plainly suggested by the "Three Children" of Daniel. But a more plausible solution of the question may be proposed,—that the authors are one and the same; that the hand which recast Daniel from an older Greek version into the form which appears in the Chisian text, is the hand which, dealing similarly with the LXX. version of the last chapter of 2 Chron. and the greater part of Ezra, produced the apocryphal book to which the best MSS. of the LXX. give precedence over the canonical Ezra. It is to be added that the remodelled Esdras was admitted by Origen into his collection, as we have already seen the remodelled Daniel to have been: for it has been shown above [PAULUS TELLENSIS, p. 269] that it was included in the Syro-Hexaplar (in this case properly Syro-Tetraplar) version, which had as its original a Greek MS., transcribed from the LXX. column of Origen's great work. Had the LXX. version of the canonical Ezra been lost, as we have supposed that of Daniel to have been, before Origen's time, it might well have happened that he would have placed part at least of this remodelled Esdras, as he placed the remodelled Daniel, in his LXX. column, parallel with the Hebrew-Chaldee original.

Theodotion's, — the word Ἀπότρεχε (where Theodotion gives Δεῦρο (Dan. xii. 9). This is explained by Overbeck (*Quaest. Hipp. Specimen*, p. 107) as a case of conflation of the two versions (Theodotion's and the Chisian); but it is surely unlikely that Irenaeus would have recourse to a second version for so trivial and questionable an amendment of the first word of a passage (xii. 9, 10) which otherwise he cites in agreement with Theodotion. The true account of the matter apparently is, that Irenaeus uses here and throughout, the true primary LXX. Daniel, and that from it Theodotion drew his version of the passage verbatim, varied only by the substitution of δεῦρο for the very inappropriate ἀπότρεχε, which the Chisian has retained from the elder version.[q] Thus alone can we explain the facts presented by the text of Irenaeus; for it is not credible that he, holding as he did that the LXX. worked under divine inspiration (III. xxi.) would have put aside a version of Daniel reputed to be theirs; still less, that in its stead he would have adopted the rendering of the same book as contained in a version of the Old Testament which (as we have seen) he knew to be recent, and denounced as of heretical tendency, holding it to be the work of a Jewish proselyte, and perverted with anti-Christian bias. Of his follower Hippolytus, and of Clement of Alexandria, it can be confidently affirmed that neither of them used the secondary LXX. Daniel; and that their citations are apparently from Theodotion. Tertullian's citations appear to be derived from a Latin version mainly based on the Chisian but with an admixture of renderings from some other source: while Cyprian's usually agree with Theodotion's text, but occasionally with the Chisian.[r] On the whole we may conclude, that the interval between Irenaeus, who used the primary LXX. exclusively, and Origen, who was entirely unaware of its existence, was the period during which that version was passing out of sight and being superseded by the two now extant, one of them taking its place in ecclesiastical use, the other in the columns of the Hexapla and Tetrapla. Another question of which our hypothesis yields a satisfactory solution is, How came Theodotion, the least skilled in Hebrew of the three translators, to be so successful in executing a version of this book, quite independent of the reputed LXX., and by universal consent preferred to it? No doubt he could not have so well fulfilled the task if he had not had the true and proper LXX. version to work on, and if that version had not been much more faithful to the original than is the loose and perverted paraphrase transmitted to us as that of the LXX. from the Tetrapla.

Theodotion, however, though not an independent translator, is by no means deserving of the epithet of an "unlearned" one, which has been fixed on him by Montfaucon (*Praelimm. in Hexapla*). The chief, and for aught that appears the only, ground for this imputation is his practice of frequently transliterating words of his original, as if ignorant of their meaning. In this practice, however, as Dr. Field has well shown (*Prolegg. in Hexapla*, IV. iii.) he guides himself mostly (though not without exception) by definable rules,—the words so dealt with being nouns reducible chiefly to the heads of names of *animals* (as θεννὶν for σειρῆνες), or *plants* (as ἀχὶ for βούτομον), or of *vestments* (as βαδδὶν for ποδήρης), or articles used in *worship* (as θεραφὶν for κενοτάφια or [Aq.] μορφώματα). In such cases, if he has chosen to transliterate, rather than adopt a conjectural Greek rendering from a former version or hazard a new guess of his own, scrupulous caution is indicated, not ignorance. He is proved at least to have diligently consulted the original; and he will often be found to have exercised a wise discretion in forbearing to translate a word whose meaning cannot be determined, or for which the Greek language has no equivalent. As well might the English translators of 1611 be called "unlearned," because they have occasionally retained such words as "*teraphim*," "*Belial*"; —or the Revisers of 1881–4, because they have replaced the "scapegoat" of the Authorized by "*Azazel*," and for "hell" have given "*Sheol*" in the Old Testament, and "*Hades*" in the New.

Theodotion's version extended to all the canonical books of the Old Testament, with the probable exception, already noticed, of Lamentations. Of the Apocryphal books, beyond the additions to Daniel already noticed,[s] he is only known to have included in his collection that of Baruch. The evidence of this is found in the marginalia of the Syro-Hexaplar Baruch, among which there appear five variations marked as his in the usual way, with his initial.[t] Hence the inference has been naturally drawn, that he knew this book—and also the apocryphal parts of Daniel—in Hebrew. Yet as regards the latter, their character is in no degree Hebraic, and in the case of the story of Susanna in particular, many writers from Origen's time[u] and after have pointed out that the play on the names of the trees (vv. 54–59) compels us to assume that the Greek text is original. But in the case of Baruch, at least the early part of it on which all the variants from Theodotion (except the last) are given, the style suits the hypothesis of a Hebrew original; and besides, "the Hebrew" is there cited on the Syro-Hexaplar margin, and its existence is implied by insertions of the asterisk and obelus (i. 17; ii. 2; ii. 3). The deviations from the text denoted by these marginalia and marks are, however, trivial; some of them are supported

[q] Both renderings of לך have many precedents in divers parts of the LXX.

[r] On these points see further in Salmon's *Introd.*, p. 593 (2nd ed.).

[s] It may be that these additions originally appeared not in the LXX. proper but in the Chisian Daniel, and were borrowed by Theodotion from thence. This is likely, at least in case of the Prayer and Song of the Three, in ch. iii., which he gives in a form almost identical with the Chisian, except as regards the words inserted to connect it with the verses (23, 24–91) between which it is interpolated. But in the stories of Susanna, and of Bel and the Dragon, the agreement of the two versions is by no means close, and Theodotion appears to have adopted a recension of them distinct from the Chisian. They were known to Irenaeus (see III. xlii.; IV. ix., xli.)

[t] See Ceriani, *Monumenta S. & P.* t. I. f. 1 for text, and his notes on the places referred to; also the subscription ὅλος ὠβελίσται κατὰ τοὺς ο′, of Cod. Chis. (as of Syr.-Hex.).

[u] Africanus, *Ep. ad Orig.* 1 (Origenis *Opera*, p. 11, Delarue).

by extant Greek manuscripts, and all of them (except perhaps that on i. 2) could be accounted for as merely implying the existence of variations in a Greek copy used by Theodotion and incorporated by him into his Old Testament.

See the article HEXAPLA above referred to in Vol. III., pp. 14, 22. Most of the authorities on the subject of Theodotion have been referred to above. In addition are to be mentioned, Dodwell's *Dissertt. in Irenaeum* IV. xxxix.; Hody, *de Bibliorum Textu*, lib. iv. cc. 1, 2; the *Praefatio* to the Roman edition of the Chisian text (1772); also those of Segaar's edition of the same (1775), and Cozza-Luzi's (1877); and that of Bugati's edition of the Syro-Hexaplar Daniel (1780).

[J. Gw.]

THEODOTUS (1), bishop of Heliopolis (Baalbec), in Phoenicia Secunda, by whom, according to the Roman Martyrology, and the Greek Menaea, a female martyr named Eudocia was baptized, under Trajan. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 843.) [E. V.]

THEODOTUS (2), Valentinian. On the extracts purporting to be from the writings of Theodotus preserved in the works of Clement of Alexandria, see CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, Vol. I. p. 564. VALENTINUS, Vol. IV. pp. 1076, 1079, 1081, 1082 sq.

THEODOTUS (3), named by Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 8) as a follower of Secundus. Probably the writer is intended from whom Clement of Alexandria has preserved extracts.

[G. S.]

THEODOTUS (4) of Byzantium. Eusebius (*E. H.* v. 27) has preserved extracts from a treatise directed against the heresy of Artemon, who taught that our Lord had been mere man. Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* ii. 5) tells us that this treatise was called the "Little Labyrinth;" and reasons have been stated (Vol. III. p. 98) for believing that the author was, as many critics have supposed, Caius of Rome, and that its date is the end of the first quarter of the 3rd century. It appears that these heretics claimed to hold the original doctrine of the church, which they alleged had continued incorrupt down to the episcopate of Victor; and they asserted that the truth had been first perverted by his successor Zephyrinus, who became bishop about A.D. 199. Their antagonist replies [a] that, on the contrary, it was in the episcopate of Victor that this God-denying heresy had been first introduced, that its father and founder Theodotus the shoe-maker (σκυτεύς), was the first to teach that our Lord was mere man, and had been excommunicated for this heresy by Victor. From what the writer proceeds to tell, it appears that after this excommunication Theodotus founded a regularly organized sect, which had its bishop, which paid him a salary (see NATALIUS); and the leading men in which, in the time of Victor's successor, were Asclepiades and another Theodotus, a banker. These two undertook to clear the text of the New Testament of corruptions, but our authority assures us that what they called "corrected" copies had been simply ruined; and that the two did not even agree among themselves as to their so-called corrections.

Our sole other primary authority for this Theodotus is Hippolytus. The section on Theodotus in the lost earlier work on heresies by Hippolytus may be to some extent recovered by a comparison of the corresponding articles in Pseudo-Tertullian, Epiphanius and Philaster; and there is every reason to think that Epiphanius whose treatment (*Haer.* 54) is the fullest, drew his materials altogether from Hippolytus. There is an article on Theodotus in the later treatise of Hippolytus (*Ref.* vii. 35). The influence of Theodotus did not extend much beyond his own generation, and later church writers appear to have known nothing of him, but what they learned from the two nearly contemporary authorities whom we have named.

The place in which the article on Theodotus came in the lost work of Hippolytus, exactly corresponds to the date assigned to him in the "Little Labyrinth." He comes immediately after Blastus, whom we otherwise know to have caused schism in Victor's time by endeavouring to introduce the Quartodeciman usage in Rome. Hippolytus stated that Theodotus was a native of Byzantium, and he alleged that the heretic had denied Christ in time of persecution, a fact which accounted for his heresy, since it was natural he should wish to maintain that he whom he had denied was only man, not God. Hippolytus reports that as respects the Deity and the work of creation, the doctrine of Theodotus was orthodox; but that with respect to our Lord's person, he agreed with Gnostic speculations, especially in distinguishing Jesus and Christ. The miraculous conception of Jesus he was willing to admit; but he held him to have been a man like others, though one of the highest virtue and piety. He taught that at the baptism of Jesus, Christ descended on him in the form of a dove, and that after that he was able to work miracles, though he had never exhibited any before; but even so he was not God; though some of the sect were willing to acknowledge his right to the title after his Resurrection.

Theodotus chiefly relied on texts of Scripture; specimens of which are given by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 54). It appears that Theodotus acknowledged the authority of St. John's Gospel, for one of these texts was John viii. 40. He appealed also to the prophecy, Deut. xviii. 15, of the prophet who was to be like unto Moses; and therefore man. He quoted besides Isai. liii. 3; Jer. xvii. 9 (LXX.); and several other texts in which our Lord is called man. [G. S.]

THEODOTUS (5) the banker. Theodotus of Byzantium had among his disciples another Theodotus, a banker, who in succession to him was a leader in his school. We might have been tempted to think that it was the same Theodotus who had taken up the business of a banker on his arrival at Rome, but the

[a] He says, "Perhaps this assertion might have been credible if it had not been contradicted, in the first place by the divine Scriptures, and secondly by the writings of the brethren who before Victor's time wrote in defence of the truth, such as Justin and Miltiades, Tatian and Clement and many others, all of whom speak of Christ as God." Hilgenfeld, who has no sense of controversial irony, infers from the "perhaps" that Caius could not deny the apparent credibility of the Artemonite statement (*Ketzergeschichte*, p. 612).

distinctness of the two Theodoti is asserted both in the "Little Labyrinth" and by Hippolytus. An account of the speculations which the second Theodotus added to the heresy of the first will be found in the article MELCHIZEDEK, Vol. III. p. 889. [G. S.]

THEODOTUS (6) Montanist. (See MONTANUS, Vol. III., p. 938 b.)

THEODOTUS (7) (8). Praedestinatus has invented two bishops of this name. In his article on Colorbasus (*Haer.* 15) he has given more than usual loose to his power of invention. He represents this heretic as teaching that the life of man is placed in seven stars, and as interpreting with reference to these the "seven churches" and seven golden candlesticks. And he states that Theodotus, bishop of Pergamus, holding a synod of seven bishops, anathematized him, and gave the true interpretation of the sevenfold work of the Holy Spirit, which need not here be repeated (see COLARBASUS). His other Theodotus is a bishop of Cyprus, whom he represents as opposing the Antidicomaritae (*Haer.* 55). [G. S.]

THEODOTUS (9), May 18, martyr at Ancyra in Galatia in the Diocletian persecution. The narrative of his martyrdom is intermingled with that of the SEVEN VIRGINS OF ANCYRA. We shall give both in one narrative. Theodotus was a devout shopkeeper at Ancyra. He was a dealer in provisions. Theotecnus, the apostate from Christianity, had just then been sent with ample power to enforce conformity to the imperial edicts [THEOTECNUS]. He began by ordering that all provisions sold in the market should be first presented to the gods. This would render them unfit for use in the Holy Communion. Theodotus used his shop and trade organization to supply the Christians with bread and wine, free from pollution. The persecution waxing hot, however, Theodotus was compelled to fly from Ancyra. He retired to a place, distant some forty miles, where a cave, through which the Halys flowed, offered a refuge for some fugitive Christians. The narrative then shows us how quietly Christians in country districts pursued their occupations and enjoyed their daily worship, while their brethren in the cities were suffering tortures and death. These acts indeed are most valuable as illustrations of the general condition of the Christians in Asia Minor during the earlier years of the Diocletian persecution. In the cave, Theodotus found certain brethren whom he had a short time previously delivered from death. They had overturned the altar of Diana, and were arrested by their relations who were carrying them for judgment to the prefect, but Theodotus bribed the accusers to let them off. They considered it prudent, however, to keep out of the way, and took refuge therefore in this cave. They were delighted to see their deliverer, and invited him to join them at their meal. Then we have a graphic picture of a picnic in those days; the fugitives reclining on the grass, which was abundant, surrounded with trees, wild fruit, and flowers, while grasshoppers, nightingales and birds of every kind made music all around. In this passage indeed (sec. xi. of his Acts), we find one of the few instances where an early Christian author seems capable of appreciating the beauty of nature. We then have a glimpse of the religious life of the time. Before he would eat, Theodotus sent some of their number to summon the presbyter from the neighbouring village, which was named Malus, to dine with them, to pray with them before they started afresh on their journey, and also to ask a blessing on their food, for, says the Acts, "the saint never took food unless a presbyter blessed it." The messengers of Theodotus found the presbyter, whose name was Fronto, or, according to the Bollandist Papebrochius, Phorto, just leaving the church, after the midday hour of prayer. The dogs of the village attacked them, and the priest ran to drive them away, asked if they were Christians, and informed them that he had seen them in a vision the night before, bringing a precious treasure to him. They told him they had the most precious of treasures with them, the martyr Theodotus, to whom the presbyter at once departed. During the meal, Theodotus suggested the spot as a fit place for building a martyrium or receptacle for relics, and exhorted the priest to set about its erection. He pleaded that he possessed no relics, when Theodotus, drawing a ring off his finger, gave it to him in token that he would provide them. He then returned to the city of Ancyra, which he found in a great state of commotion, owing to a violent persecution then on foot. [SEVEN MARTYRS OF ANCYRA.] A writer in the *Revue Archéol.* t. xxviii. p. 305, has noted a passage in the Acts of these sufferers (sec. xiv.), as deserving of careful study as an illustration of the paganism of Galatia. Theodotus having rescued the bodies of the nuns from the lake into which Theotecnus had cast them, prepared himself to suffer. He prayed therefore with the brethren and told them to give his relics to the presbyter Fronto, if he brought a ring as a token. He at once set out for the tribunal, where the priests of Minerva were demanding his arrest, as the head and front of the Christian opposition. The Acts now offer some of the most striking illustrations used by Le Blant in his *Actes des Martyrs*, cf. pp. 25, 62, 78, 80. They illustrate every detail of Roman criminal procedure, especially the offer made to the martyrs of high promotion and imperial favour if they recanted. Theodotus was offered the high priesthood of Apollo, now esteemed the greatest of all the gods, but all in vain, till at last the president ordered him to be beheaded, and his body to be burned. Another supernatural incident now occurs. He was executed, and the body was placed on a pyre, when suddenly a bright light shone around it, so that no one dared to approach. The president then ordered it to be guarded all night, in the place of common execution, by soldiers whom he had just flogged for suffering the bodies of the nuns to be carried off. Fronto, the village priest, now again appears. He was a farmer, and kept a vineyard, where he made wine. He came just at this precise juncture to Ancyra to sell his wine, bringing the ring of Theodotus with him. He arrived at the place of execution just when night was falling, and the gates of the city had been closed, and found the guard erecting a hut

of willow branches wherein to spend the night. The Galatians, indeed, were, like the Irish Celts, in their use of such willow booths. The soldiers invited him to join their party, which he did. Discovering what they were guarding, he plied them liberally with his own wine, made them drunk, and then carried off the body of the martyr, which he placed in the very spot which Theodotus himself had marked out as the site of a martyrium. The Acts purport to have been written by one Nilus, an eye witness. They speak of the chapel erected to the memory of Theodotus, which could only have been done when peace was restored to the church. The Acts will be found in Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* p. 354. They are translated into English as an appendix to Mr. Mason's *Diocletian Persecution.* [G. T. S.]

THEODOTUS (10), bishop of Ceraunia, or Cyrenia, on the north coast of Cyprus, a confessor in the persecution of Licinius. According to the Greek Menaea, after being barbarously tortured, he was thrown into prison, where he lingered till he was liberated by Constantine, Jan. 19, 324, surviving his emancipation two years. The Greek church commemorates Theodotus three times: on the day of his liberation, Jan. 17 or 19; on that of his death, March 2nd; and also, with the Latin Church, on May 6, when Tillemont thinks it probable some of his relics were brought to Constantinople (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* v. 514; *Bolland*, May 6, pp. 105, 843: *Men. Graec.* Jan. p. 310; Mar. p. 11). On the question whether Theodotus is to be identified with Theodorus of Cyrene, cf. Tillemont (*u. s.* 784, note iii.). They are distinguished, but probably erroneously, by Le Quien (*Or. Christ.* ii. 1058, 1073). [E. V.]

THEODOTUS (11), bishop of Laodicea, in Syria Prima, in the Nicene period, a zealous advocate of Arian doctrines, claimed as such by Arius in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia. (Theod. *H. E.* i. 5, v. 7.) Eusebius gives him a high character for his skill as a physician of the body as well as of the soul, remarkable for his kindness, sympathy, sincerity, and zeal to help all who needed his aid, reinstating the church in its prosperity which had suffered much by the cowardice of its last bishop, Stephen, who seems to have renounced the faith in the persecution of Diocletian. (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32.) He was present at the council of Nicaea in 325 (Labbe, ii. 51); before which he is coupled by Athanasius with the Eusebian party (Athan. *de Synod.* c. i. § 17, p. 886). On the visit of Eusebius of Nicomedia to Jerusalem in 330 or 331, ostensibly to see the newly built church, he formed one of the infamous Arian cabal which, proceeding to Antioch, succeeded by scandalous and utterly unfounded charges in deposing Eustathius (Theod. *H. E.* i. 21), and electing Eusebius of Caesarea in his room (Euseb. *Vit. Const.* iii. 62). He also took part in the infamous council of Tyre in 335 (Labbe, ii. 436); and that of the Dedication at Antioch in 341 (*ibid.* 560), and is mentioned by Athanasius as having been at Seleucia in 359 (Athan. *de Synod.* c. i. § 12, p. 880). The two Apollinarii, father and son, were excommunicated by Theodotus for having been present at the recitation of a hymn in honour of Bacchus, composed by a sophist of Laodicea with whom he had interdicted an intercourse, restoring them again on their repentance (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 25; Socr. *H. E.* ii. 46). In the third book of the untrustworthy compilation of Gelasius o Cyzicus, c. 3, is given a letter from the emperor Constantine to Theodotus, exhorting him to take warning by the punishment of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognius, and to return to the orthodox faith (Labbe, ii. 284). This letter is quoted as genuine by Benignus of Heraclea at the fifth general council (Labbe, v. 481). According to Gams, Theodotus had an episcopate of thirty years. He is commemorated in the Roman martyrology, notwithstanding his Arianism, on Nov. 2nd. [E. V.]

THEODOTUS (12), bishop of Berrhoea, in Syria, under Valens. He was orthodox, and is addressed by Basil in *Epist.* 310 (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 782). [G. T. S.]

THEODOTUS (13), bishop of Hierapolis, "conspicuous for asceticism and for meekness," ordained by Eusebius of Samosata in violation of canonical order, after his return from exile in 378 (Theod. *H. E.* v. 4). He accompanied Flavian of Antioch, Acacius of Beroea, and other men of note, clerical and lay, on an Easter visit to Marcian, the famous solitary of Chalcis, c. 382. (Theod. *Hist. Rel.* c. 3.) [E. V.]

THEODOTUS (14), bishop of Nicopolis in Lesser Armenia and metropolitan, an aged prelate of high character and unquestioned soundness in the faith, much and deservedly respected by Basil the Great, to whom his sensitive orthodoxy was the cause of repeated mortification and annoyance in the matter of Eustathius of Sebaste. Theodotus not unwarrantably entertained grave suspicions of Eustathius's doctrinal soundness, which Basil, who felt a warm friendship for him, was reluctant to credit, and used many endeavours to clear away. For the whole course of the affairs—Basil's vain attempts to pin this slippery theologian to an orthodox confession—the coldness with which Theodotus regarded Basil, passing into downright discourtesy on account of his unwillingness to give up his old friend—Basil's vain attempts at co-operation with Theodotus in giving bishops to Lesser Armenia, and Theodotus's virtual excommunication of him on his arrival, by invitation, at Nicopolis, and the ultimate re-establishment of brotherly relations —reference may be made to the biography of Basil (BASILIUS OF CAESAREIA, Vol. I. p. 292). Two of Basil's extant letters are addressed to Theodotus; one written in 373, assuring him that Faustus, bishop of Satala in Lesser Armenia, had been ordained by Anthimus of Tyana, not by him (Basil, *Ep.* 121 [195]); the other, in the same year, answering Theodotus's remonstrances for not writing to him about Eustathius, on the ground that the matter was one of public notoriety, and because he thought little of it (*Ep.* 130 [196]). That Theodotus did not long survive is seen from a consolatory letter on the death of "their common father" written to the clergy of Nicopolis in 375 (*Ep.* 229 [193]). (Tillement, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. ix. passim.) [E. V.]

THEODOTUS (15), a presbyter and monk of the monastery of St. Publius at Zeugma,

of which Chrysostom's correspondents Aphthonius, Chaereas, and Nicolaus were also members, and over which both he and Aphthonius jointly presided, Aphthonius taking the government of the Syrian portion of the commune and Theodotus that of the Greek. We have several letters of Chrysostom to Theodotus and his companions, almost entirely occupied with the strong desire they had expressed to visit him, and the various difficulties the snows in the winter and the Isaurian banditti in the summer threw in their way. These were so great that, ardent as was his wish to see them, he dared not ask them to come, and he must content himself with requesting their letters and their prayers. Two letters (*Epp.* 93, 146) were written from Cucusus; one (*Ep.* 70) after his retreat to Arabissus, A.D. 406. We learn from a subsequent letter to Rufinus (*Ep.* 126) that Theodotus had at last accomplished his desire and visited him at Arabissus. [E. V.]

THEODOTUS (16), a young "lector" of the church, the son of a gentleman of consular rank, who bore the same name as himself. The young man, having a great desire to lead an ascetic life, which he regarded as "the true philosophy," obtained his father's permission to visit Chrysostom in his exile with the view of placing himself under his instruction, bringing with him certain presents from his father. The time of the young man's arrival was an unfortunate one for his purpose. The increasing ferocity of the Isaurian inroads had compelled Chrysostom to leave Cucusus, and take refuge at Arabissus. The whole country was devastated with fire and sword up to the very gates of the town. The place was crowded with fugitives. The supply of provisions was running short. Pestilence was breaking out among them. The contrast to one delicately nurtured, as Theodotus had been, was calculated to shake the constancy of his resolution. He had weak eyes, and the severity of the climate increased the evil. Chrysostom evidently saw that Arabissus was no place for the young aspirant to ascetic honours, and took advantage of a visit of Theodotus the deacon to put the youth under his charge, to convey safely to his home (*Ep.* 135). He at the same time returned the presents to Theodotus the elder, with a courteous letter, assuring him that he was far from insensible of his generosity; but as the things sent were not necessary to him, he felt it wiser to deny himself the enjoyment of them. He also commends Theodotus very highly for not allowing his natural affection to stand in the way of his son's desire to attain the very highest pinnacle of philosophy, even if he had to leave his home and his country to secure it. He would gladly have retained the young man with him but for the unsettled state of the country, and the injury his eyes were suffering from the cold (Chrys. *Ep.* 61). Chrysostom wrote a second time to the father, thanking him for the manner in which he had received his son on his unlooked-for return, and for the attention he had paid to his letters on his behalf, of which his son had informed him; but he begs that he will do all he can to encourage him in the pursuit of the divine philosophy of which he is enamoured (*Ep.* 141).

Two letters from Chrysostom to the young man himself in answer to letters received from him, show that he was very uncomfortable at home, having secret enemies who were plotting against him, misrepresenting him to his father, and making his life a very unhappy one. Chrysostom encourages him to bear whatever trials may be sent him, and rather to rejoice in them as affording him an opportunity of glorifying God by patience, and exhibiting true charity and forgiveness towards those who were injuring him. The only real trouble was sin. His apologies for leaving Arabissus were needless; the weakness of his eyes was a sufficient reason, and though absent in body he regards him as always present in spirit. He expresses great sympathy in his malady, and begs that he will take care of his eyes, and let him know frequently how they are. He concludes by exhorting him to devote all the time the weakness of his sight permits, to the study of Holy Scripture, so that his acquaintance with the letter may qualify him to understand Chrysostom's expositions if he should ever be able to receive them. (*Epp.* 102, 136.) [E. V.]

THEODOTUS (17), a deacon of Antioch, between whom and Chrysostom there existed a very warm attachment; and who paid Chrysostom several visits during his exile, both at Cucusus and at Arabissus. We have seven letters of Chrysostom to him (*Epp.* 44, 59, 67, 68, 135, 137, 140). In the earliest (*Ep.* 140), written from Cucusus in the spring of 405, he informs Theodotus that he must be content with less frequent letters than he had been in the habit of sending him, since although the roads were cleared from the winter's snows, all the passes were occupied by the Isaurians. From *Ep.* 59 we learn that Theodotus, braving all difficulties, had paid Chrysostom a visit during that summer, and that the sorrow caused by his departure had been increased by a long silence, which Chrysostom found it difficult to explain. In the winter of 405, Theodotus had written excusing himself for not paying Chrysostom another visit on account of the season and the affairs of his church, and had given Chrysostom a list of persons whom he thought it well he should write to. Chrysostom tells him that he regards this as a proof of affection, but that it was unnecessary, as he should have written to them all without his reminder (*Ep.* 44). At a later period in the same winter, after his retirement to Arabissus, Theodotus came to see him again (*Ep.* 135). After this, the blockade of the roads by the Isaurians causing his letters to be infrequent, Chrysostom begged that he would make them the longer (*Ep.* 67). Soon afterwards his heart was gladdened by receiving two from him in one day, and that at a time when the Isaurians had shut him up in the castle of Arabissus as in a prison (*Ep.* 68). Chrysostom wrote again in the spring of 406, stating that he was sure he would have come to see him, if the Isaurians had allowed it. He dared not ask him to come, for they had recently made a night attack on Arabissus, and he himself had barely escaped their hands. He commended to his sympathy and counsel a young "lector," who was passing through a time of great trial (*Epp.* 135, 61). Chrysostom's last letter to Theodotus is in answer to one accusing him of negligence in writing, and assuring him

that he had written only one less than he had received. (*Ep.* 137.) [E. V.]

THEODOTUS (18), patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 420–429 (Clinton, *F. R.* ii. 552). He succeeded Alexander under whom the long-standing schism at Antioch had been healed, and followed his example in replacing the honoured name of Chrysostom on the diptychs of the church. The excitement created at Constantinople on the announcement by Theodotus's messengers of this step of reparation compelled Atticus, for the sake of public peace, to give a reluctant consent to a measure for which the popular voice had been long clamouring. Theodotus is commended by his contemporaries for the gentleness of his character and his consideration for the feelings of others, as well as for the strictness of his own life. He is described by Theodoret, at one time one of his presbyters, as "the pearl of temperance," "adorned with a splendid life and a knowledge of the divine dogmas" (Theod. *H. E.* v. 38; *Ep.* 83 *ad Dioscor.*). Joannes Moschus relates anecdotes illustrative of his meekness when treated rudely by his clergy, and of his kindness when on a journey he insisted on one of his presbyters exchanging his horse for the litter in which Theodotus himself was being carried (Mosch. *Prat. Spir.* c. 33). By his gentleness he succeeded in bringing back the Apollinarians to the church without rigidly insisting on their formal renouncement of their errors (Theod. *H. E.* v. 38). On the real character of Pelagius's teaching becoming known in the East, and the consequent withdrawal of the testimony previously given by the synods of Jerusalem and of Caesarea to his orthodoxy, Theodotus presided at the final synod held at Antioch (only mentioned by Mercator and by Photius, in whose text Theophilus of Alexandria has by an evident error taken the place of Theodotus of Antioch), at which Pelagius was condemned and expelled from Jerusalem and the other holy sites, and he joined with Praylius of Jerusalem in the synodical letters to Rome, stating what had been done. The date of this synod is differently given by various authorities. Garnier places it much too early in 417; Fleury too late, 429. The most probable date is that given by Hefele, A.D. 424 (Marius Mercator, ed. Garnier, Paris 1673, *Commonitor.* c. 3, p. 14; *Dissert. de Synodis*, p. 207; Photius, *Cod.* 54). When in the last-named year, 424, Alexander, founder of the order of the Acoemetae, visited Antioch, Theodotus refused to receive him on account of the suspicion of heretical views which attached to him and his followers. His feeling was not shared by the Antiochenes, who, ever eager after novelty, deserted their own churches and crowded to listen to Alexander's fervid eloquence (Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* livre xxv. ch. 27). Theodotus took part in the ordination of Sisinnius as patriarch of Constantinople, Feb. A.D. 426, and united in the synodical letter addressed by the bishops assembled on that occasion to the bishops of Pamphylia against the fanatical Massalian heresy (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 26; Phot. *Cod.* 52). The date of the death of Theodotus is fixed for A.D. 429 by a passage of Theodoret's letter to Dioscorus, where, when speaking of his having taught for six years under him at Antioch, he refers to his "blessed and holy memory," combined with one in his history stating that the death of Theodore of Mopsuestia took place in the episcopate of Theodotus (*H. E.* v. 40). (Tillemont, tom. xii. note 2, *Theod. Mops.*; Mar. Mercat. *Commonitor.* c. 3; Theophan. *Chron.* p. 72; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 720; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 405.) [E. V.]

THEODOTUS (19), bishop of Ancyra, A.D. 430. He was present at the council of Ephesus in 431, and preached at the church of S. John the Evangelist against Nestorius. His collected works, sermons, exposition of the Nicene creed, &c., will be found in Migne *P. G.* lxxvii. 1309–1432. He was a correspondent of S. Cyril in 438, and was addressed by Firmus, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, A.D. 439. (Firmi *Epist.* 22; Le Quien, i. 463; Ceill. x. 151.) [FIRMUS (10).] [G. T. S.]

THEODOTUS (20), a presbyter of Constantinople to whom Theodoret wrote in 449, by the Oriental deputies, highly commending him for the zeal with which he had contended for the orthodox faith. (Theod. *Epp.* 107.) [E. V.]

THEODOTUS (21) intruded into the see of Joppa by Theodosius, the fanatic Eutychian monk, who usurped the bishoprick of Jerusalem after the council of Chalcedon, in 452. (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 6.) [E. V.]

THEODOTUS (22), a disciple of Sergius the Paulician in the 9th century. He was one of his associate itinerants (συνέκδημοι), and mediated successfully between the rival parties of Baanites and Sergiotes in their violent strife after the death of Sergius. (Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 41; Phot. *c. Man.* i. 25.) [M. B. C.]

THEODREDUS, tenth of the supposed British bishops of London. For the authorities see OBINUS. [C. H.]

THEODULFUS (1), a deacon of Paris, who denied the resurrection. He withdrew to his friend Andoveus bishop of Angers, and was several times excommunicated by Ragnemod, bishop of Paris (577–591), for refusing to return to his church. He and Andoveus, after supping in a room on the city wall, were going downstairs, when he aimed a blow at the servant who was carrying a lamp before them, and being very drunk fell over the wall and died. (Greg. Tur. x. 14.) [F. D.]

THEODULFUS (2), bishop of Malaga, was at the second council of Seville, A.D. 619. Malaga had then been recently recovered by the Goths, having been held by the Romans since the time of Justinian. The parts of the diocese adjacent to the sees of Astigi, Eliberi, and Egabra had consequently become separated from Malaga and annexed to the three sees mentioned, which were in the hands of the Goths. Theodulphus at the council successfully obtained the restoration to Malaga of the districts in question. (*Esp. Sag.* xii. 319; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 667; Gams, *Kirch. von Spanien* ii. (2), 85.) [F. D.]

THEODULFUS (3) (THEUDULFUS), bishop of Orleans. This bishop, poet, and theologian falls just within the period covered by the

present work, but the last twenty years of his life belong to the 9th century. Beyond a few salient points, our knowledge of the events of his life is slight and conjectural. He is known to have been bishop of Orleans and abbat of Fleury; it is known that he was brought from his own country by Charles the Great, who appointed him to these offices; it is also known that he occupied a position of influence and importance at the court of Charles, that after the death of his patron he was deposed and banished on the charge of being concerned in the plot of Bernard of Italy, and that he died, either in the honourable imprisonment to which he had been consigned, or very soon after his release from it. A well-known legend, which ascribes his release to the effect produced by one of his hymns, will be mentioned later.

The date of his birth is unknown; his country is uncertain, and the best of the authorities are divided upon this point. Sirmond, the first editor of his works, believes him to have been a Lombard; other authorities consider him to have been of Ostro-gothic descent, but to have yet come from Italy; while others again (among them, of later writers, Hauréau and Ebert) think that he was from Spain, and therefore a Visigoth. The evidence upon the point is scanty. All references to his birthplace make him a foreigner; and the most important passage referring to his birthplace, in his own writings, throws very little light on the subject. He says, in the "Paraenesis ad judices":—

"Mox sedes Narbona tuas, urbemque decoram
Tangimus, occurrit quo mihi laeta cohors
Relliquiae Getici populi simul Hespera turba
Me consanguineo fit duce laeta sibi."

Two epitaphs written for him have been preserved, which are somewhat more decided in their language; but they leave the question doubtful. One speaks of him in the following terms:—

"Non noster genitus, noster habeatur alumnus,
Protulit hunc Speria, Gallia sed nutriit."
Mabillon, *Vet. Anal.* i. 426.

The other makes him say:—

"Hesperia genitus, hac sum tellure sepultus."
Gall. Christ. viii. 1419.

In both these epitaphs the meaning of Hesperia or Speria is left undecided, and we know that the name was applied both to Italy and to Spain. The same doubt attaches to the mention of him in the catalogue of the abbats of Fleury [in Baluze's *Miscellanea*, i. 491 (ed. 1678)], where we read of him that he was "a gloriosissimo Imperatore Carolo ex Hesperia in Gallias adductus." But the chronicle of Fleury printed by Duchesne (in the *Hist. Franc. Script. Coaetanei*, t. iii.), while otherwise using almost the same words with the catalogue, turns "*Hesperia*" into "*Italia*;" and this interpretation probably accords with the more ordinary use of the name. Mabillon (*Vet. Anal.* i. 433) points out that the Septimanian people, whom Theodulf describes as his own kindred race, came from Spain; but he also admits that the community of origin between the Goths of Italy and the Goths of Spain and Septimania would explain the allusion. The question to which division of the Goths Theodulf belonged can hardly be decided from the facts before us; but the evidence seems, on the whole, to be in favour of the view which makes him of Italian extraction. This view contradicts no definite statement. The view that he was a Spanish Goth contradicts the evidence of the chronicle; and though the chronicle is probably only a later reproduction, in a new shape, of the indefinite statement of the catalogue, it is worth something, as evidence of the way in which the catalogue was understood. It may also be remarked that the accusation of treason brought against Theodulf seems evidence of his Italian origin. A Spanish Goth would have been less likely than an Italian to have been concerned with two Italian bishops (those of Cremona and Milan) in the revolt of Bernard of Italy; and, assuming the charge to have been false, as was probably the case, it would have had less verisimilitude had Theodulf been a Spaniard.

Of his early life and education we know nothing. The reputation for learning which he afterwards enjoyed would lead us to believe that he had been well instructed in his youth; and the manner in which, in his poem (*Carm.* iv. 2), "De septem liberalibus," he handles his subject, would suggest that his instruction had been carried out along the paths of the "Trivium" and "Quadrivium." He was well acquainted not only with Christian but with heathen writers; as he himself says (*Carm.* iv. 1):—

"Legimus et crebro gentilia scripta sophorum."

But he puts first among the "books he was accustomed to read" the works of the great fathers, Gregory, Augustine, Hilary, Leo, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom ("flavo ore Joannem"), Cyprian, and Isidore. After these he names Sedulius, Rutilus, Paulinus, Arator, Avitus, Fortunatus, Juvencus, Prudentius, Pompeius Trogus, Donatus, Virgil, and Ovid. It is probably to the last two authors in particular that he alludes when he says, at the end of his enumeration:—

"In quorum dictis quamquam sunt frivola multa,
Plurima sub falso tegmine vera jacent,"

and he seems to have treated the works of the pagan poets as a kind of moral allegory. His list is probably not intended to be exhaustive; (that he was acquainted, for instance, with the Latin version of works ascribed to St. Athanasius, is clear from his collection of passages "de Sancto Spiritu"); but it is interesting as showing the literary tastes of a man renowned as a scholar and a divine in the Carlovingian period.

At what time Charles the Great brought him from his own country is a point which cannot be certainly determined. The list of the abbats of Fleury above referred to makes him the 14th abbat, and assigns to him a term of office of nineteen years and a half. But it is not certain at what point this term of office was accounted to end—whether at his death, or at his deposition, or whether he had ceased to be abbat before his imprisonment. In a letter from Charles the Great to Manasses, the abbat of Flavigny, which is dated 775, he is spoken of as abbat of Fleury and bishop of Orleans; the date of the letter has been held doubtful, but, if the letter be

genuine, it cannot be later than 788, the end of Manasses' life. There is, however, sufficient uncertainty as to the genuineness of the letter to compel us to give only a doubtful assent to the statement (which Ebert makes with confidence), that he was before 788 both abbat of Fleury and bishop of Orleans. Mabillon, indeed, from an examination of the catalogue, is of opinion that he cannot have been abbat of Fleury before 794 (*Ann. lib.* xxvi. p. 314; *lib.* xxviii. p. 445). Nor can we be quite sure, though we find the assertion made, that he was preferred to both offices in the same year. If approximate dates are to be assigned for the times of his removal to Charles's court and of his consecration, it seems likely enough that he joined Charles on the king's return from his visit to Rome in 781, and became bishop of Orleans about 785; and that he was afterwards made abbat. According to the view of Rivet (in the *Hist. Litt. de la France*), Theodulf had before this time been married, but was now a widower. This theory rests on the supposition that Gisla, to whom one of his poems (*Carm.* iii. 4) is addressed, was his daughter. He certainly speaks to her of himself as "pater tuus"; but it is far from improbable that this phrase refers to spiritual relationship; there are other words in the poem (where he speaks of the possession of grandchildren as a blessing enjoyed by Gisla's parents), which make it unlikely that it refers to any tie of natural kinship; for we know nothing of any other children or grandchildren of Theodulf. Baunard, in his treatise, suggests that this Gisla may have been the daughter of Charles the Great, to whom Theodulf might, not improbably, send a wedding gift, such as accompanied the poem. This idea, however, is somewhat scornfully rejected by Hauréau, who believes that Gisla was the daughter of Theodulf, and takes some pains to show that she was probably illegitimate. The whole question of his relationship to Gisla may fairly be left undecided; the phrase "pater tuus" in an epistle from a bishop is hardly enough by itself to furnish a basis for the fabric which is placed upon it in the *Hist. Litt.*; and it is hardly worth while, until we know that Gisla was Theodulf's daughter, to discuss the probabilities of her legitimacy. It may be added, that as Theodulf seems to have been abbat of Fleury within a few years from the beginning of his career at Charles's court, he was probably already a monk when he migrated from his own country, and in that case not in the least likely to have had his daughter as a travelling companion.

His stay at the court of Charles had been sufficiently prolonged, it would seem, to enable him to be on terms of intimacy with the family as well as with the household officers and the literary circle of the king. Two of his poems (*Carm.* iii. 1 and 3) contain various details as to the personages surrounding Charles, which leave no doubt that the writer knew them well. Hildebald of Cologne, Alcuin, Riculfus, and Angilbert; the servants of the household, Thyrsis, Lentulus, Menalcas and Eppinas, and the dwarf Nardus; Fredegisus, the deacon, and his companion Osulf; the "hero Wibodus," with his tipsy dissent from the poet, and the insufferable Scot, whose name is left to conjecture, but whose criticisms and character were both apparently distasteful to the Goth Theodulf; all these are sketched in the course of one poem, "ad Carolum regem," which includes, besides, the graceful picture of the king's sons and daughters gathering round him on his return from war—a truthful picture, perhaps, so far as it goes. But there is little or nothing in the poems of Theodulf from which we could infer the real state of morality at Charles's court. The darker side of the picture is left unfinished; the only hints we have of incongruous elements are those which relate to the Scots, with whom, as Theodulf frankly admits, no Goth could ever agree. Whether he deliberately shut his eyes to the evil that we know to have existed in the court, or whether he was so much occupied in his own studies and pursuits as to be unaware of it, we cannot say. It does not seem to have troubled him. The only thing that seems to have really disturbed him was the presence of the Scots; and, from his vigorous language on the subject, they seem to have troubled him a good deal. On the unhappy Scot, whoever he may have been (possibly Joannes, possibly Clemens Hibernicus), Theodulf expends great force of language. But by Alcuin and others Theodulf seems to have been held in high esteem; as we shall see later, theological questions were referred to him as to an authority, even by Alcuin himself.

It was, probably, soon after his accession to the see of Orleans that Theodulf promulgated his first "Capitulare," of which mention will be made later. The document has something of the air of a "primary charge." The directions which the Capitulare contains as to the education to be given by the clergy to their people, and by the monasteries to the kinsfolk of the clergy, seem to connect themselves with Charles's efforts in the same direction, and were perhaps the consequence of the king's letter in 787, and the first step in the direction of the orders issued by him two years later for the establishment of schools.

As bishop, Theodulf was energetic, as appears from his Capitularia, in endeavouring to reform the morals as well as to improve the education of the people and clergy of his diocese. Nor did he neglect their bodily needs. He enjoins hospitality and almsgiving, and from his poems it appears that he was not slow to set the example himself. The inscription for his own dwelling (*Carm.* vi. 29) suggests so much as this, and we gather, from another source, that he established a "hospitium" in Orleans, where travellers and the poor might be relieved by rest, food, drink, and gifts of clothing (see the app. to his poems, ed. Migne, *Carm.* 10).

He was a patron of art, and a restorer of church buildings. The account of him in the catalogue of the abbats of Fleury sets forth the beauty of the church of Germigny as rebuilt by him, and he seems also to have restored and partly re-endowed the monastery of St. Mesmin at Meaux, which had been laid waste in the war between Pepin and Waifar of Aquitaine. He also erected an "altar of St. Anianus," probably in the monastery of St. Aignan in Orleans, of which also he was perhaps himself for some time abbat. For this altar he composed an inscription (*Carm.* ii. 5). Pictures also appear

to have been executed under his orders, such as those described in *Carm.* iv. 2 and 3 of "the Seven Sciences" and of "Earth": while some of his illuminated books yet remain to show the encouragement he gave to the skill and learning of the copyists of his time. One of these books, given by him to the canons of Puy, is preserved in the library of that town, and another was among the "Codices Mesmiani" examined by Montfaucon. They have both been examined by Pitra, who describes them as being almost exactly alike (Spicil. Solesm. ii. 546).

Nor was his activity and influence confined to his own diocese. Hauréau, on quite insufficient grounds, appears inclined to think that his residence within its limits was very irregular. This was probably not the case, but his connection with the court of Charles was kept up in various ways. We find him called upon to act as one of the king's theological advisers as early as 794 or 795. Alcuin had then received from Charles for examination the book which Felix Urgellitanus, renewing the propagation of his errors after the council of Frankfort, had sent to the king; and we find him asking that copies might be sent to the pope, and to other bishops, among whom Theodulf is named, "ut singuli per se respondeant." Another letter of Alcuin to Theodulf himself leads us to believe that the bishop of Orleans was procurator of the royal vineyards. Alcuin, asking him to send some wine, compares him to Zabdi, the officer who was "over the increase of the vineyards" of David. In 798 we find him fulfilling an office of greater importance and dignity—that of Missus Dominicus to the Narbonese districts. In this duty he had for his companion Leidrad, then about to become archbishop of Lyons. An account of their journey is preserved to us by Theodulf himself in the Paraenesis ad Judices. They visited, among other towns, Lyons, Vienne, Avignon, Arles, Narbonne, Aix, and Marseilles. In 800, Theodulf appears, from a letter of Alcuin to him, to have been at Rome, and to have taken part in the process of pope Leo. It was perhaps at this time that he received the pallium. Hauréau, who believes him to have remained at Orleans, assigns a later date to this last event, believing him to have received it from pope Stephen at Rheims.

In 802, and possibly in the following years, Theodulf was engaged in a serious dispute with the monastery of St. Martin at Tours, and therefore with Alcuin himself. The cause of this was the shelter given by the monastery to a cleric of the diocese of Orleans, who had taken refuge there to avoid the imprisonment to which he had been sentenced. In spite of a letter from the emperor commanding his surrender, the monks of Tours, supported by the populace, resisted even an armed force which Theodulf had sent to take possession of his person. The mob were apparently most active in this resistance, but the monks were accused of having taken part in it. Alcuin wrote in their defence, and the dispute, which had threatened to have very serious consequences, was quieted by degrees. The emperor's commissary Theodebert was sent to Tours, and there punished some of those who had been engaged in the riot, which a letter of the emperor severely condemned.

It was probably after this time, but certainly before 806, when the division of Charles's dominions was determined upon, that Theodulf expressed in one of his poems (*Carm.* iii. 10) an opinion hostile to such division. His advice, whether asked for or not, was disregarded; but the fact, that he had given such advice, remains as an argument against the probability of his having been engaged in a conspiracy which would have resulted in intensifying the evils he dreaded.

We next find Theodulf in the character of Charles's theological adviser, consulted by the emperor on the vexed question of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, and preparing a collection of passages from the fathers on the subject. This was most likely in 809, as a preparation for the council of Aix-la-Chapelle. He was again consulted, this time through Magnus of Sens, on the question of the baptismal ceremonies, probably in the year 811. His treatise on this subject is one of the six which exist of those written in answer to the emperor's demand. In the same year we find him as one of the witnesses to the emperor's will, with ten other bishops.

When the great emperor's life was ended, the messenger sent to summon Louis to Aix-la-Chapelle passed through Orleans, but did not give the bishop information of his message. Theodulf, however, as we learn from different sources, guessed it; and he forthwith sent a messenger to Louis (who arrived before Rampo, the original messenger), to ask whether he should wait for him at Orleans, or go to meet him at once. Louis summoned him to meet him, and for a time they were on good terms, the new emperor visiting the holy places of Orleans as he passed through it, and granting two charters to the abbey of St. Aignan. Theodulf is again to be found among the prelates who met Stephen V. at Rheims in 816, by special mission from the emperor. Soon after, the friendship thus continued was destroyed. How Louis came to believe that Theodulf was really involved in Bernard's revolt we cannot tell; but he seems to have been persuaded of the truth of the charge. Theodulf was, like the other bishops, accused, deposed, and sent to be confined in a monastery (818). Angers was the place of his imprisonment. He protests his innocence again and again. He hoped for the emperor's clemency, but he would not confess himself guilty, though Modoin, the bishop of Autun, who had taken up his cause, assured him that without such confession there was no hope of his release. Several of his poems date from this period; one notable poem is assigned to it without much ground.

This poem is the well-known sequence "Gloria laus et honor," which has since his time been sung in the church on Palm Sunday. The tale which is told of it is briefly this:—It was composed by him in his imprisonment, and, as the emperor Louis was riding in Angers on Palm Sunday, the prisoner sang this hymn from his window. The emperor was so much moved as to order his release.

The story sets before us a picture which, if somewhat comical, is also somewhat touching. But it is most probably untrue. The same story, or one very like it, is told of another person, as Daniel points out in the supplementary part of his Thesaurus Hymnologicus. The

sequence, as sung, forms part of a longer poem printed in Theodulf's works (*Carm.* ii. 3). A work, professing to be by Alcuin, who died in 804, speaks of the hymn as already in use at Angers. And though this last fact is not so conclusive against the story as it seems at first sight to be, since the treatise is probably not Alcuin's, there remains a fact more destructive still—that Louis did not visit Angers at Passiontide, if at all, after October 818 (see Daniel, *Thes. Hymn.* iv. 158, and Simson, *Jahrb. des Frank. Reichs*, i. 169–71).

Whether Theodulf was ever released is doubtful. If he was released, he died very soon after. There would hardly have been time for him to return to his see after the amnesty pronounced by Louis in 821, if the amnesty had implied restoration; but we cannot be sure that he was included. Letaldus, the writer of the treatise de mir. St. Maximini (in Mabillon, *Acta SS Ord. S. Bened.* i. 601), asserts that he returned to Orleans, and was there poisoned by his enemies. His epitaphs imply, or seem to imply, that he died in banishment, and this is on the whole more likely. His death most likely took place in 821; the necrology of the abbey of St. Germain du Pré fixes it to September 18th; for the conjecture that this refers to Theodulf of Paris (who died 911) must be wrong if Mabillon is right as to the date of the manuscript, which he places in the 9th century (*Vet. Anal.* i. 434).

It remains to give a short account of Theodulf's works. These fall under two heads (i.) theological. (ii.) poetical:—

I. Of his theological writings, there are not many remains. His reply to the Adoptionist writings of Felix Urgellitanus is unfortunately lost. We have left (*a*) Two *capitularia.* (*b*) The treatise *de Sancto Spiritu.* (*c*) The treatise *de Ordine Baptismi.* (*d*) Two fragments of sermons.

(*a*) *The Capitularia.* It is doubtful whether these are really two documents, or separate parts of one. The first was printed by Sirmond in his collection of Theodulf's works, the second by Baluze in his *Miscellanea* (tom. vii.).

Some fragments, which appear in the reprint of Sirmondi's collection (Sirmondi *Opera*, tom. ii.), probably belong to the first, if they are separate works. Mabillon (*Vet. Anal.* i. 387) mentions a synodal decree of Hildegarius, bishop of Meaux, in 868, for the observance of certain "capitula," which he says are in exact agreement with the Capitulare of Theodulf. But it is not clear whether the two were combined in Hildegarius's recension, or whether Mabillon only referred to the Capitulare published by Sirmond. The latter is probably the case, as Baluze had not published his Miscellanea when Mabillon wrote. If so, the Capitularia of Theodulf are most likely independent decrees.

The first (at least that which was first printed) is divided into forty-six articles; it is an instruction to the clergy of the diocese, especially those who have cure of souls. The most noteworthy points about it, perhaps, are those articles which provide for better education. Schools are established in the monasteries of the Holy Cross (the Cathedral of Orleans), St. Aignan, St. Lifarde, and St. Benedict (*i.e.* Fleury). In these may be educated the young relatives of any of the clergy who will send them (Art. xix.). On the other hand, the parochial clergy are to teach freely all children who may be sent to them for instruction (Art. xx.). There is a remarkable rule (in Art. iv.) that the clergy attending synods should bring with them their eucharistic vessels, books, and vestments. This is explained by Hauréau as a precaution for the safe keeping of these possessions. He illustrates it by a constitution of Nimeguen, in which complaint is made that such things were frequently sold to Jewish merchants.

Article xxi. contains a summary of Christian morals, taken from an unnamed Father. It is in fact taken from the 4th chapter of the rule of St. Benedict. Article xxii. directs that all are to be taught the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, which they are to repeat (in a church if possible) at least morning and evening, with other short prayers which are set forth. They are to be recommended, after the prayer to God, to invoke the aid of the apostles and martyrs. Article xxx. enjoins that confession of sins be made daily to God; confession to a priest is beneficial by giving the penitent the advantage of spiritual counsels and of salutary penance. Confession is to be of all sins, including evil thoughts, and is to be made under the heads of the "*eight* chief sins" (pride and vain-glory being both enumerated among the eight).

Among sins which the clergy are bidden specially to denounce are perjury and false witness, which seem to have been prevalent. (Art. xxvi.–vii.) Article xxxvi. lays down rules for the observance of Lent, in which is to be noticed a prohibition of law suits, claims for debts, and disputes, during that season.

Article xli. in treating of times of communion, orders that all who are not excommunicated shall receive the eucharist on every Sunday in Lent, and that all ("penitus omnes") shall receive on Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, Easter Eve, and Easter. Article xliv. directs that special masses are not to be allowed to draw the people from the public celebration at the third hour, and condemns the practice of going early to a special celebration, and spending the rest of the day in revelry. There are prohibitions also of various abuses, such as the storing of grain in churches, the enticing by one priest of the parishioners of another to frequent his church and pay their tithes to him, &c.

The second Capitulare (Baluze, *Misc.* vii. 21) enjoins that all priests are to know by heart the "Credo" and "Quicunque vult salvus esse," and the canon of the mass; they are to recite the diptychs "cum omni devotione"; to preach to the people on Sundays on their duty to one another; and, if they can, to explain the gospel and epistle; to receive nothing but voluntary offerings at baptisms and funerals; and to follow the canonical rules touching the imposition of penance. Some further rules are given on the subject of confessions and penances, and a detailed account is set forth of the sacrament of Unction. Priests are forbidden to dwell in the same house with women, even with their nearest relatives, since the permission to do so given by the ancient canons had led to serious disorders. There are some portions of this Capitulare, especially the penitential rules, and those relating to extreme unction, which seem to be decrees of a provincial synod.

The Capitularia are simple and direct, as one might expect such documents to be; and this is especially noticeable in those parts which are hortatory or explanatory. They were documents intended for an ignorant clergy, and for the government of a rude people; and they are well fitted for their purpose, while they are by no means deficient in dignity or weight.

(*b*) The treatise "de Sancto Spiritu," composed at the request of Charles himself, is prefaced by a short dedication in elegiacs. The treatise itself consists entirely of extracts from other writers. These extracts, which are intended to show that the Holy Spirit may be said to proceed from the Son, are taken from "Athanasius" (*i.e.* from the work *de Trinitate* and from the *Quicunque*), from St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, St. Fulgentius, the popes Hormisdas, St. Gregory and St. Leo, St. Isidore, St. Prosper (the work is not really his), Proclus of Constantinople, Agnellus, Cassiodorus, Prudentius, and Vigilius Tapsensis (whom he calls "Africanus"). Here again, though the work is not in the strictest sense "original," there is ability shown in the selection and arrangement of the passages extracted.

(*c*) The treatise, "de Ordine Baptismi," is an explanation of the ceremonies employed in administering the sacrament of baptism, which is characterized by the same direct simplicity which is to be found in the Capitularia. The "raison d'être" of the ceremonies is shortly stated: their spiritual significance, while pointed out, is not dwelt upon. The treatise would be an easy one to expand; it would not be an easy one to condense. One noticeable point in its theology is to be found in the fact, that the explanation of the creed contains statements clearly directed against the Adoptionists.

(*d*) Lastly, there are two fragments of sermons first published in the "*Spicilegium Acherii*," tom. v., and afterwards (with the other works of Theodulf) in Sirmondi *Opera*, tom. ii. One is apparently a sermon "ad clerum," the other a sermon "ad populum." Both deal with moral subjects, and both, as their first editor, d'Achery, remarks, are distinctly "in the style of Theodulf." They are straightforward, clear, and at the same time suggestive.

There is appended to these, as though it formed part of the second of them, a fragment of a letter to one Desiderius, on the subject of commentators on Holy Scripture. This fragment again runs into another fragment, which is so small that only the change from singular to plural in the persons addressed makes it clear that it cannot be part of the same letter.

It may be more convenient to mention at this point certain works attributed to Theodulf. He is spoken of as the author of an explanation of the "Quicunque," and of a mystic explanation of the ceremonies of the Mass. These are said to exist in MS. in the library of Fleury, but have never been printed.

A Speculum, or collection of passages of Scripture on various subjects, was published by Vignier "from a copy made by Theodulf." Vignier held it to be by St. Augustine; but it differs from the Speculum which goes under his name, and may be, possibly, the work of Theodulf himself.

II. The bulk of Theodulf's poetical writings is contained in the six books of poems published by Sirmond. Mabillon found some others, a selection from which he published (in the *Vet. Anal.* tom. i.). These have been reprinted, not only in the second volume of Sirmond's collected works, but in Migne's *Patrologia*. Two short inscriptions in verse, for the porch and the altar at Germigny, are contained in the catalogue of the abbats of Fleury, already quoted (Baluz. *Misc.* i. 492).

Book i. of Sirmond's edition contains but one poem, the "Paraenesis ad Judices" or "Contra Judices." This was printed in Paris 1598, and at Leyden 1618. It is an interesting account of Theodulf's legation as Missus Dominicus, and an exhortation to all judges, based upon the corruption which he found to prevail in Gallia Narbonensis.

Book ii. contains sixteen pieces, of which the most notable are those intended for the beginning and end of a MS. of the Bible, (1 and 2); the "Gloria laus et honor," which contains not only the verses sung in the procession, but a description of the procession itself, (3); and an epitaph on Charles's queen, Fastrada.

Book iii. contains twelve pieces; the most important, that "ad Carolum regem," has been already mentioned. It also contains an epitaph on pope Adrian I., and various poems on subjects of state, or addressed to members of the court. It is in this book that we find the poem "ad Gislam" mentioned above; and its very position appears to indicate that Gisla was a person of higher rank than Theodulf's own daughter would have been.

Among the nine poems of Book iv. are the two on works of art already mentioned; there is also one addressed to Modoinus, bishop of Autun, in which the writer, then in prison, protests his innocence of the crimes laid to his charge. There is a reply from Modoinus, who asserts his belief in the truth of this protestation.

Book v. contains only three poems, and an epigram. The second of the poems, which is incomplete, is on the seven deadly sins. To this very likely belongs a fragment, "contra luxuriam," given by Martene in the *Anecdota*. The third, written when Theodulf was a deacon, is a "Paraenesis ad Episcopos."

The last book is made up of thirty poems. These are mostly on moral and religious subjects; but among them are inscriptions for the bishop's house, and for particular rooms in it. The eighteenth poem of this book, "De hypocritis," is unfortunately imperfect. It is a lament over the state of the church in Theodulf's days.

Of the ten poems, edited by Mabillon, two are on the occasion of Louis's entry into Orleans in 814. Another, an epitaph on Chrodegang of Metz, is rougher and less flowing in style than Theodulf's other writings.

The poetical works of Theodulf are somewhat uneven in merit. But they are all marked by vigour, most of them by dignity or even nobility of thought, and some of them by a strong vein of humour. These characteristics are especially to be seen in the "Paraenesis ad Judices," the longest and most systematic of the poems. There are a few unusual words and obscure phrases, and there are several instances of metrical eccentricity; these, however, are not

sufficient to detract seriously from Theodulf's merit as a poet, or at least a versifier of distinct ability and of considerable skill.

Theodulf's works may be found separately in the small edition, published by Sirmond (Paris, 1646), or in the second vol. of Sirmond's collected works (1728); they are also in Migne's *Patrologia*, vol. cv. The best accounts of the author are to be found in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, vol. iv.; in Ceillier's *Histoire Générale des Auteurs Sacrés, &c.* (1862), vol. ii. p. 262; in Hauréau's *Singularités Historiques et Littéraires;* in a treatise by M. Baunard, professor at Orleans, entitled *Théodulfe* (published in 1860); and a carefully prepared *Inaugural Dissertation* by Ernst Rzehulka of Breslau. This treatise is printed at Breslau, undated, but about the year 1875. [H. A. W.]

THEODULUS (1), Feb. 17, an aged and trusty slave of Firmilian, the governor of Palestine. He was crucified by his master at Caesarea on the same day as eleven others were put to death. (Euseb. *Mart. Palaest.* cap. xi.) [G. T. S.]

THEODULUS (2), bishop of Trajanopolis. He was condemned to death through Arian influence by the emperor Constantius, but saved himself through flight (Athanas. *Hist. Arian.* c. 18, 19; *Hefele's Councils*, Clark's ed., t. i. pp. 161, 178). [G. T. S.]

THEODULUS (3), son of St. Nilus, monk of Mt. Sinai. He retired from the world with his father, was captured in a Saracen invasion, and destined as a sacrifice to the morning star. The story of his capture, dangers, and final escape, will be found at length in the vii. *Narrationes* S. Nili in *opp.* S. Nili, Migne, *P. G.* t. lxxix. col. 590–694. The Bollandists, 14 Jan. t. i. p. 960, treat him as a martyr. [NILUS (3).] [G. T. S.]

THEODULUS (4), bishop of Apamea, in Pisidia, one of the witnesses to the will of Gregory Nazianzen (Greg. Naz., *Testam.*). [E. V.]

THEODULUS (5), one of the deacons of Gregory Nazianzen, to whom, designating him as γλυκύτατος, he bequeathed in his will one robe, two tunics, and twenty gold pieces. (Greg. Naz., *Test.*) [E. V.]

THEODULUS (6), bishop of Octodorus, Sion, or Sitten. [THEODORUS (41).]

THEODULUS (7), a deacon of Constantinople, to whom Chrysostom wrote from Cucusus, after the death of the Gothic bishop Unilas, when he feared that a successor would be sent by Atticus and his party, begging Theodulus and his friends to do all in their power to hinder it, or at any rate to get the matter deferred till the following spring. (Chrys. *Ep.* 206.) [E. V.]

THEODULUS (8), a metropolitan of Eastern Illyria who opposed the tyrannical conduct of Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica and vicar of pope Leo, A.D. 444 (Leon. *Ep.* 13; Ceill. x. 206). [G. T. S.]

THEODULUS (9), ST., a priest (or bishop), in Coele-Syria, who died very near the close of the fifth century. He wrote a work entitled *De Consonantia Divinae Scripturae* (Gennad. *Vir. Illust.* 91) against heretics. He is not to be confounded, as he is by Trithemius, with Theodulus Italus, author of *Ecloga*, placed by Ceillier (xii. 878) in the tenth century. (Cave, *Hist. Liter.* i. p. 456, s. v.; Trithem. *De Scriptor. Eccles.* c. 185; Fabric. *Biblioth. Eccles.* ad loc.) [I. G. S.]

THEODULUS (10) (THEODORUS), a Stylite to whom Theodorus Studita wrote a letter reproving him for having painted angels as crucified like Christ (Theod. Stud. *Epist.* i. 15; Ceill. xii. 302). [G. T. S.]

THEODWIN (DEDWYN), ninth of the supposed British bishops of London. For authorities see OBINUS and Stubbs's *Registrum Sacrum*, 152. [C. H.]

THEOFRIDUS (ST. CHAFFRE), second abbat of Columelia (Chemilly), slain by the Saracens in 728. He was the author of *Micrologus de lapsu mundi senario*, now lost, and to him also are attributed the two discourses: *De Sanctorum Reliquiis* and *De Veneratione Sanctorum* (La Bigne, *Max. Bibl. Pat.* xii. 417, 419; Mabill. *Acta SS. O.S.B.* saec. iii. pt. i. p. 481, ed. 1668; Boll. *Acta SS.* 19, Oct. viii. 527; *Hist. Litt. de la Fr.* iv. 60; *Gall. Chr.* ii. 776). [G. W. D.]

THEOGENES, bishop of Hippo Regius, suffrag. xiv. in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. *de Bap.* iii. He was martyred. Augustine, preaching at Hippo, uses his name as familiar to his auditors, together with SS. Peter and Paul, to illustrate the difference between commemorating saints and offering to them, "Quando audistis dici apud memoriam Sancti Theogenis a me, vel ab aliquo fratre et collega meo, vel aliquo presbytero, 'Offero tibi Sancte Theogenes'? aut 'Offero tibi, Petre'? aut 'Offero tibi, Paule'? Nunquam audistis." Aug. *Serm.* 273. 7. The common martyrologists say that he suffered, with thirty-six others, on 267 an., under Valerian. [E. W. B.]

THEOGNIS, bishop of Nicaea at the time of the first General Council held at that city. He defended Arian views, and was ordered to be banished, together with Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris of Chalcedon, Theonas of Marmarica, and Secundus of Ptolemais. They, however, saved themselves by a pretended submission. Philostorgius (*H. E.* I. 9) tells us they embraced the sentence of the council, secretly substituting the word Ὁμοιούσιος for Ὁμοούσιος, cf. Socrates, *H. E.* i. 8. According to Sozom. ii. 21, they bribed the notary to efface their signatures. Sozomen (cap. 22) regards him as one of the chief opponents of Athanasius. [G. T. S.]

THEOGNISTES, a bishop of Gaul. He condemned the execution of Priscillian as unjust and unchristian. With St. Martin, of Tours, he refused to communicate with the bishops who were concerned in it (Sulp. Sev. *Dialog.* iii. 12). [M. B. C.]

THEOGNOSTUS (1), a priest of Alexandria and a writer of cent. iii., whose existence we only know through quotations in Saint Athanasius and in Photius. His date seems to have

been about the middle of that century. He composed a work called *Hypotyposes* in seven books, which was still in existence when Photius wrote (*Cod.* 106). He used language in the second book which had a very Arian sound, speaking of the Son as a creature, and in the third book of the Holy Ghost in a style as little orthodox as that of Origen. In the fifth he attributed bodies to angels and devils. In the sixth and seventh books he discussed the doctrine of the Incarnation in a more orthodox manner than in the second. Yet Saint Athanasius regarded him as a useful witness against Arianism. Philip of Side says that he presided over the school of Alexandria after Pierius A.D. 282 (cf. Dodwell, *Dissert. in Irenaeum*, p. 488). The fragments of Theognostus will be found collected together in Routh's *Reliq. Sac.* t. iii. 407–422. Cf. Migne, *Pat. Graec.* t. x. col. 235–242; Ceill. ii. 450; Athanas. *Epist.* 4 *ad Serap.*, *de decretis Nic. Syn.* [G. T. S.]

THEOGNOSTUS (2), priest of Alexandria, who along with the priest Charmosinus and the deacon Leontius was an agent of Cyril of Alexandria at Constantinople (Cyril. *Ep.* 37 al. 41). [C. H.]

THEOLOGIUS, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (i. 54), in reply to the Nestorian objection to the term Theotokos that it placed the Blessed Virgin in the same rank as the mothers of the pagan deities. [ISID. PELUS. in Vol. III. p. 318.] (Ceill. viii. 480.) [G. T. S.]

THEON (1) (THEONAS), anchoret near Oxyrynchus in the Thebaid, flourished about the close of the fourth century (Sozomen, *H. E.* vi. c. 28). He presided over monasteries, was silent for thirty years, and was said to have the gifts of prophecy and miracles; he was learned in the Greek, Latin, and Egyptian languages. (Nicephorus, *H. E.* xi. c. 34; Rufinus, *H. E. Aquil.* c. 6; Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* viii. c. 50.) [J. G.]

THEON (2), priest, was preaching at Jerusalem on the subject of the Holy Spirit, when Epiphanius shut his ears and ran outside the church, so as not to hear such blasphemy (Hieron. *Lib. Cont. Joan. Hier. ad Pamm.* i. § 8 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. xxiii. 361; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* vii. 497). [J. G.]

THEON (3) monk, addressed by St. Nilus, the ascetic, in three letters (*Epp.* iii. nos. 72, 73, 74) upon the spiritual danger and duties of the solitary life, the preference being given to the social or monastic. [J. G.]

THEON (4), monk and inclusus at Corinth, addressed by Nicephorus Cartophylax about the end of the 8th century or beginning of the 9th. The questions discussed relate for the most part to monastic discipline (Bigne, *Bibl. Patr. Vet. et Script. Eccl.* iii. 91–4; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* vi. 298, l. v., c. 5; Migne, *Pat. Graec.* c. 1061 sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xii. 293). [J. G.]

THEON, *vid.* also THEONAS.

THEONAS (1), 15th bishop of Alexandria (whom Eutychius absurdly calls *Neron*), succeeded Maximus in 282. His episcopate, says Neale (*Hist. Patr. Alex.* i. 86), was a time of much suffering to the Egyptians, owing to the revolt of Achilleus. Diocletian besieged Alexandria in 294; and after a siege of eight months the city, "wasted by the sword and by fire, implored the mercy of the conqueror, but experienced the full extent of his severity" in the form of "promiscuous slaughter," and sentences "of death or of exile" (Gibbon, ii. 76). Yet Theonas has left behind him a very interesting and attractive picture of the relations which the emperor in the former part of his reign maintained towards his Christian servants. Eusebius's testimony on this point, to the effect that those imperial domestics who held the faith (three of whom he afterward names, Dorotheus, Gorgonius, and Peter) were allowed perfect freedom in the possession of it, and were even peculiarly valued by their master (viii. 1), is singularly illustrated by the "letter of Theonas the bishop to Lucian, *praepositus cubiculariorum* or high chamberlain ("chief of the gentlemen of the bed-chamber," Neale). It was first published in the 17th century by D'Achery. It is obviously a translation from a Greek original, which no one will now hesitate to ascribe to Theonas of Alexandria. (See it in Routh's *Rell. Sac.* iii. 439, and an English version in Mason's *Persecution of Diocletian*, p. 348, and see *ib.* p. 39.) After some opening words on the duty of so using the peace which the church was then enjoying "by means of a kindly sovereign" that God might be glorified by genuinely Christian lives, Theonas urges Lucian to thank Him for a signal opportunity of thus promoting His cause by fidelity to "an emperor who was indeed not yet enrolled in the Christian ranks," but who might be favourably impressed in regard to Christianity by the loyalty of the Christians to whose care he had "entrusted his life." Thus it was a primary duty to avoid everything that was "base and unworthy, not to say flagitious," lest the name of Christ should thereby be blasphemed. The Christian chamberlains were not to take money for procuring any one an audience; they must be clear of all avarice, of duplicity, of scurrility; must act in all things with modesty, courtesy, affability, and justice; must discharge their several duties in the fear of God, with love for their prince, and with exact diligence, regarding all his orders which did not clash with God's as coming from God Himself, and taking care in their ministrations to put away all gloom or bad temper, and to refresh his weariness by a cheerful manner and glad obedience. So much in general as to all the Christian "cubiculars." As to particular functions, he who kept the privy purse must be thoroughly businesslike and methodical, keeping strict accounts, "never trusting to memory," setting down every item in a clear, legible hand, so as to shew the whole case at a glance, "which will be easily done if the receipts themselves, the time, the medium, and the place, be written *distinctè*." The keeper of the robes and ornaments must be not less punctilious in making an inventory, and "noting what the things are, of what sort, where stored up, when received, by whose means, with or without flaw; and must also often look there, and always know where to find each article; doing all this with humility and cheery patience, so that Christ's name may

be praised even in so small a matter." The same advice is given to the keeper of vessels of gold, silver, &c. But the most important place was the librarianship, which was not yet filled up, but *might* be entrusted to a Christian, who should then take care not to think himself above being interested in the emperor's secular books. Let him, in his intercourse with his master, bestow due commendation on poets, orators, philosophers, historians, and then bring in judiciously, at intervals, some "praising" of the older Scriptures (in this context Theonas twice refers to the Alexandrian story of Ptolemy Philadelphus and the Septuagint) and of "the Gospel and the Apostle" (meaning the "fourfold gospel" and the epistles of St. Paul) "as divine oracles." And so "he will be able to mention Christ, and by degrees to explain the truth of His sole divinity" (the phrase is not to be misread in a Sabellian sense, as if the Son were but an aspect of the Father). The Christian librarian thus supposed must "know all the books in his charge, often turn them over, arrange them according to their catalogue, employ the most accomplished copyists (*librarios*) for purposes of transcription," or the best scholars for correction of text; he must get old MSS. repaired as they require it, and adorned in the most serviceable way, "not caring about purple vellum and golden letters, unless the emperor shall instruct him to that effect." He should "suggest to the emperor to read or hear read books useful and appropriate for his dignity, rather than books of mere amusement," and should be able to cite authorities in their favour. Those who wait on the emperor's person must be "prompt, bright-faced, sometimes humorous" (*faceti*), but always respectful; their own persons and dress must be clean and neat, but not showy; everything must be in its place, each room duly arranged. Their own slaves must be of thoroughly good character; slaves who will not be trained must be sent away. In the empress's presence every look, gesture, or word must be properly regulated; her attendants should see how modest and self-controlled Christians could be, "and so praise Christ our Lord in them." [The empress Prisca was secretly a believer.] "Let there be among you no jealousy nor quarrelling which might bring you into confusion and dissension." Lucian, "as wise," must "bear with the unwise, that they may become wise. Never be unkind to any one, never provoke any one; if any one wrongs you, look to Jesus Christ; forgive, as you hope to be forgiven; so shall you . . . crush the head of the old serpent, who craftily plots against your good works . . . Let not a day pass without reading some portion of Scripture at a suitable time. Nothing feeds the soul or enriches the mind like the reading of Scripture;" but the chief benefit from it should be found in the discharge of your functions "juste et pie, hoc est in charitate Christi." The letter is an admirable specimen of polished tact and practical good sense; it shews that the writer, though a literary man, was no recluse, but one who knew how to deal with men in high position, and to keep an eye upon any opportunity for promoting the cause of Christ. He did not foresee the storm-clouds which were after his time to darken the quiet sunshine of this Christian court-life. Eusebius tells us that he entrusted the presidency of the catechetical school of Alexandria to Achillas, whom he had ordained priest (vii. 32), and who was his next successor but one in the episcopate. Eutychius imagined (p. 399) that before his time the Alexandrian Christians worshipped privately in caves and houses for fear of being slaughtered by the Romans, and the patriarch did not openly shew himself in the city; but when "Neron" was made patriarch, he did shew himself openly, and did not cease to coax the Romans until he was able to build a church and dedicate it to "our Lady Mary." To which, says Renaudot (*Hist. Pat. Alex.* p. 50), Severus adds that this church was called by a name signifying "miracles," and dedicated to the Holy Virgin. Renaudot ventures to doubt whether such dedications were usual at that period, but suggests that earlier churches had been destroyed, and Theonas might have built a new one. He quotes from Severus an absurd story, how that Sabellius taught his heresy in Theonas's time, and challenged him to dispute, whereupon Theonas put forward Peter, whom he had ordained priest at seventeen, and after whose speech the heresiarch fell dead; a specimen of Oriental "incredibilia." Theonas held the see nineteen years, and died A.D. 300, when he was succeeded by Peter.

[W. B.]

THEONAS (2), monastic oeconomus in the Nitrian desert, and abbat, is the interlocutor in three of Cassian's conferences. Cassian (*Coll.* xxi.) says that after living in marriage five years, he was so moved by the words of an abbat named John, to whose monastery he had, according to custom, carried his tithes and first-fruits, that, against the will of his wife, he renounced the world and became a monk. This action is stated by Cassian, as not given in way of precedent for others doing the same by their wives, but simply as a fact, in itself doubtful, but condoned by the evidence of miraculous gifts. In the monastery he was soon chosen to succeed Elias in the distribution of the alms (see DIACONIA in Smith and Cheetham, *D. C. A.* i. 549), and afterwards became abbat. In conference with Cassian and Germanus he discussed—(1) "De remissione quinquagesima," the times, forms, and duties of fasting (Cass. *Coll.* xxi.); (2) "De nocturnis illusionibus," in how far they affect the due reception of the Holy Communion (*Coll.* xxii.); and (3) "De velle bonum et agere malum," or the imperfection of even our best (*Coll.* xxiii.) His personal history is otherwise unknown. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. xlix. 1169 sqq.; Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* c. 50; Rufinus, *H. E.* ii. c. 6; Fleury, *H. E.* xx. c. 6; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 188 sqq.) [J. G.]

THEONAS, *vid.* also THEON.

THEONE, a virgin and martyr in Egypt in the persecution of Diocletian. She is unknown to the Martyrologies, but some fragments of her acts are preserved in Aug. Ant. Georgii, *SS. Col. et Panes. Miracula*, pp. 212, 242. [G. T. S.]

THEONILLA, a lady of rank, to whom Theodoret wrote a letter of consolation on the death of her husband. (Theod. *Epp.* 7.)

[E. V.]

seeker after truth, of the divine authority of the Christian religion, and to remove his objections to its veracity, while at the same time he exhibits the falsehood and absurdity of paganism. It admits of question whether Autolycus is to be regarded as a real person, or as a fictitious representative of the class of highly-cultured liberal-minded heathen of the time, with understandings not closed against conviction but strongly prejudiced against Christianity by the current misconceptions of its character, and the popular calumnies respecting it, whom, in his person, Theophilus was endeavouring to win over to the truth. Whether the object of the work was personal or general, the three books profess to be written at intervals of time to meet the successive objections of the real or supposed enquirer. It deserves notice that there is no mention in the work of any of what are known as the distinctive truths of Christianity. His arguments are drawn almost entirely from the Old Testament, with but very scanty reference to the New. His argument is to a great extent chronological. He makes the truth of Christianity depend on his demonstration, that the books of the Old Testament were long anterior to the writings of the Greeks, and that they were divinely inspired. Whatever of truth the heathen authors contain he regards as borrowed from the writings of Moses and the prophets, which alone declare God's revelation to man. He contrasts the perfect consistency of the divine oracles among themselves, which he regards as a convincing proof of their inspiration, with the inconsistencies of heathen philosophers. He contrasts the account of the creation of the universe and of man, on which, together with the history contained in the earlier chapters of Genesis, he comments at great length, but with singularly little intelligence, with the statements of Plato, "reputed the wisest of all the Greeks" (lib. iii. c. 15, 16), of Aratus, who had the hardihood to assert that the earth was spherical (ii. 32, iii. 2), and other Greek writers on whom he pours contempt as mere ignorant retailers of stolen goods. A large portion of his work is devoted to chronological and genealogical details. He supplies a series of dates, beginning with Adam and ending with the death of Marcus Aurelius, which had occurred a short time before he was writing, i.e. early in the reign of Commodus. The importance he places on an accurate statement of chronology as a proof of the faith is indicated by the solemnity with which he prefaces this part of his book with a prayer, that "God would give him grace to declare in all things the truth accurately according to His will, in order that all who meet with it may be guided by His truth and grace" (iii. 23). It is not a little curious that a writer who is unable to discern any fragment of divine truth in the works of the Greek philosophers and poets beyond what they have stolen from the sacred writers, should regard the Sibylline verses as authentic and inspired productions, which he quotes from largely as declaring the same truths with the prophets. The omission by the Greeks of all mention of the writings of the Old Testament, from which they draw all their wisdom, is ascribed to a self-chosen blindness in refusing to recognise the only God, and in persecuting the followers of Him who is the only fountain of truth (iii. 30, *ad fin.*). His estimate of all heathen philosophy is of the narrowest and most prejudiced character. He passes a sweeping condemnation on all heathen writers without distinction. They neither knew the truth themselves, nor sought to lead others to it, but wrote only for vainglory. The only revelation of God he can recognise is that given in the Scriptures. All truth was to be sought there only. Those who were ignorant of them must be ignorant of God and His truth. No man could ascertain the truth for himself. He can realise no medium between absolute knowledge and absolute ignorance of divine things. Shut up in his own self-satisfaction as in possession of the divine oracles, he regards all who were less perfectly instructed with a proud contempt. He can recognise in them no aspirations after the divine life, no earnest gropings after truth, no gleams of the all-illumining light. Their religion was a mere worship of idols, bearing the names of dead men. Almost the only point in which he will allow the heathen writers to be in harmony with revealed truth is in the doctrine of retribution and punishment after death for sins committed in life (ii. 37, 38). The literary character of the Apology deserves commendation. The style is characterised by dignity and refinement. It is clear and forcible. The diction is pure and well chosen. Theophilus also displays wide and multifarious reading, though of a superficial character, and a familiar acquaintance with the most celebrated writers among the Greeks. His quotations are numerous and varied. But Donaldson remarks that he has committed very many blunders, such as misquoting Plato several times (iii. 6, 16), ranking Zopyrus among the Greeks (iii. 26), and speaking of Pausanias as having only run a risk of starvation instead of being actually starved to death in the temple of Minerva (*ibid.*) (Donaldson, *Hist. of Christ. Lit.* iii. p. 69). His critical powers were not above his age. He adopts Herodotus's derivation (ii. 52) of θεός from τίθημι, since God set all things in order, comparing with it that of Plato (*Crat.* 397 c) from θέειν, because the Deity is ever in motion (*Apol.* i. 4). He asserts that Satan is called the dragon (δράκων) on account of his having revolted (ἀποδεδρακέναι) from God (ii. 28), and traces the bacchanalian cry "Evoe" to the name of Eve as the first sinner (*ibid.*). His physical theories are equally puerile. As an example, he ridicules those who maintain the spherical form of the earth (ii. 32), and asserts that it is a flat surface which is covered by the heavens as by a domical vault (ii. 13). His exegesis is based on allegories usually of the most arbitrary character. He makes no attempt to educe the real meaning of a passage, but seeks to find in it some recondite spiritual truth, a method which often betrays him into great absurdities. He discovers the reason of blood coagulating on the surface of the ground in the divine word to Cain (Gen. iv. 10–12), the earth struck with terror (φοβηθεῖσα ἡ γῆ) refusing to drink it in. Theophilus's testimony to the Old Testament is copious. He quotes very largely from the books of Moses, and to a smaller extent from the other historical books. His references are copious to the Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah and,

Jeremiah, and he quotes from Ezekiel and from Hosea and other of the Minor Prophets. His direct evidence respecting the canons of the New Testament does not go much beyond a few precepts from the Sermon on the Mount (iii. 13, 14), a possible quotation from Luke xviii. 27 (ii. 13), and quotations from St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans, 1 Corinthians, and 1 Timothy. More important is a distinct citation from the opening of St. John's Gospel (i. 1–3), mentioning the Evangelist by name, as one of the inspired men (πνευματοφόροι) by whom the Holy Scriptures (αἱ ἅγιαι γραφαί) were written (ii. 22). The use of a metaphor found in 2 Pet. i. 19 has a bearing on the date of that epistle. According to Eusebius (*l. c.*) Theophilus quoted the Apocalypse in his work against Hermogenes. A very precarious allusion to that book has been seen in ii. 28, cf. Rev. xii. 3, 7, etc. A full index of these and other possible references to the Old and New Testaments is given by Otto (*Corp. Apol. Christ.* ii. 353–355). The work, as has been said, is divided into three books, professing to be written at intervals of time to meet the successive objections of his enquiring friend. In Book I. he deals with the objections based on the invisibility and incomprehensibility of the God of the Christians. God is to be apprehended by the eyes of the soul alone, and will not be fully perceived until mortality is put off. Meanwhile He is to be seen and known by His works, while sin darkens the spiritual eye and renders Him invisible. He then meets the objections to the resurrection, seeking illustrations from the course of nature, such as the changes of the seasons, diverging to the commonplace with Christian apologists, the foul crimes attributed to the heathen gods. The names of their deities are the names of dead men, many of them guilty of horrible wickedness. In Book II. Theophilus contrasts the varying cosmogonies of the heathen writers, such as Homer and Hesiod, and their contradictory views as to creation, matter, providence, and the like, and the genealogies, deducing human families from divine ancestors, with the account of the creation of the world and of man, and of the Fall, uniformly revealed by inspired men, ἄνθρωποι πνευματοφόροι, in the Scriptures (ii. 9). Then he quotes largely from other parts of the Old Testament, and transcribes a considerable portion of the first three chapters of Genesis with his own allegorizing comments upon the successive work of the creation week. The Sun is the image of God; the Moon of man, whose death and resurrection are prefigured by the monthly changes of that luminary. The three first days before the creation of the heavenly bodies are types of the Trinity—τύποι τῆς τριάδος—the first place, be it remarked, in Christian writings where the word is known to occur (lib. ii. c. 15) —i.e. "God, His Word and His Wisdom." The fourth day represents man, who stands in need of divine light. The more brilliant stars are types of the prophets, the lesser stars of the various degrees of the righteous; the planets of those who wander from God and forsake His ways. The sea resembles the world, fed by the law of God and the prophets which keep it from destruction, as the rivers and fountains keep the ocean from being parched up by its saltness. The holy churches are islands of refuge to those who would escape the wrath of God. Heresies are rocks which wreck and ruin all who approach them (ii. 14). Man, he asserts, was created neither mortal nor immortal, but with a capacity for either state. From the Creation and Fall he carries on the history in Genesis, showing its completeness and reasonableness as contrasted with the absurd fables of the Greeks. He then passes on to the moral teaching of the prophets, whose testimony the heathen poets willingly or unwillingly in many places corroborate, quoting at considerable length from the Sibylline verses, of the authenticity of which, and their prophetical authority, he evidently has not a doubt (ii. 9, 31, 36, 38). Whatever is true in the heathen writers he regards as a theft from the Scriptures. In Book III. Theophilus refutes the charge of scandalous crimes brought against the Christians. Such charges, he shows, belong far more truly to heathen writers (iii. 6–8). Since the divine law inculcates holiness, chastity, justice, and hospitality to strangers, and forbids every kind of immorality (iii. 9–14), Christians even abstain from gladiatorial shows and theatrical spectacles lest they should become sharers in wickedness (15). He goes on to contrast the absurdity and inaccuracy of the early pagan histories, such as that of the deluge, with the reasonableness and certainty of the Scripture narratives. These also are far more ancient than those of the heathen writers Berosus, Manetho, Menander and the like, which, since the authors had no sure means of arriving at the truth, are full of contradictions and follies. To prove the truth of his words Theophilus proceeds to give the Scripture chronology from Adam to the return from the Captivity in Babylon (iii. 24), followed by the Roman chronology from Romulus to the death of Marcus Antoninus (c. 26). As Aurelius died in 180, the date of the Apology is approximately fixed. For fuller details he refers to the tables compiled by "Chryseros the nomenclator," a freedman of Marcus Aurelius (ii. 27). The omission of all mention of the Scripture records by the Greeks is ascribed to a self-chosen blindness in refusing to recognise the only God, and in persecuting His followers, who is the only source of truth.

It has been already remarked that Theophilus is the first Christian writer in whom we find distinct mention of a Trinity (τριάς) in the Divine nature (ii. 15). The first three days of creation were "types of the triad-God," His Word (λόγος) and His Wisdom (σοφία). His doctrine of the Logos is allied to Justin's. The Logos had a being from all eternity, as the Reason (νοῦς) and Intelligence (φρόνησις) of God. He rested in the heart of God, and was His Counsellor before anything was. As such, He is called Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, whom God produced by a self-determined effort, ἐξερευξάμενος, together with His Wisdom before all things (ii. 10, 22). This He did for the purpose of creation, begetting the Λόγος προφορικός, to which Theophilus applies St. Paul's word "the firstborn of the whole creation" (Col. i. 15); not thereby emptying Himself of His Logos, but ever retaining Him in Himself, and conversing with Him (ii. 22). Not the Creation only, but also the Divine manifestations in the Old Testament—such as that to Adam in Paradise (Gen. iii. 10), the

Logos assuming the person (πρόσωπον) of the Father,—and the inspiration of the prophets and others were through the Logos, who is therefore called ἀρχή, as being the ruling principle of all things (ii. 10). The doctrine of the personality of the Holy Spirit is still in an undeveloped state in Theophilus's mind. He confounds the Logos with the Holy Spirit, designating Him πνεῦμα θεοῦ (ii. 10), and yet at the same time he distinguishes the one from the other. The Spirit is to all creation what life is to man, regarded as an all-pervading influence (i. 7). The Spirit is also described as an all-containing power, enclosing all creation in itself, even as the rind of a pomegranate encloses its cells and seeds, and is itself contained in the hand of God (i. 5). The vagueness of his conception of the Spirit, and of His distinction from, and relation to the Logos, is evident. . . . He regards "the Holy Spirit" (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) as the inspirer of Moses and the prophets, and as speaking through them (ii. 30, 33, &c.), and speaks of them as containing (χωρήσαντες) the Holy Spirit of God (ii. 9). It is doubtful, however, how far he regarded the Spirit as a distinct Divine Person. Men were chosen by God to be His instruments (ὄργανα Θεοῦ) as prophets, as a reward (ἀντιμισθίαν) for their holiness, itself the product of divine inspiration (*ibid.*). Nothing is said of the work of Christ in the salvation of mankind. Eternal life is the result of obedience to the will of God, which is in the power of every one, but only as the free gift of the lovingkindness (φιλανθρωπία, cf. Tit. iii. 4) and mercy of God, who has of His own will attached salvation to obedience (ii. 27). Repentance, in its sense of a change of mind (μετάνοια), is needed, and is characteristic of Christianity. It is the desire of God to turn all men from their sins (iii. 11). This is effected by Him by means of His Logos and His Wisdom, through Which the Great Physician heals and makes alive (i. 71). The Church as a universal body is never alluded to by Theophilus. He once speaks of what are called "holy churches" in the plural, as "gathering places" (τὰς συναγωγὰς λεγομένας δὲ ἐκκλησίας), which, as we have already seen, he compares to islands to which those flee who desire to escape God's wrath, in which are the teachings (διδασκάλιαι) of the truth (ii. 14).

Baptism is once referred to, not by name, as that by which those who come to the truth are born again and receive blessing from God, and obtain repentance and remission of sins by water and the laver of regeneration" (ii. 16). There is no allusion to the Eucharist.

The silence regarding the Apology of Theophilus in the East is remarkable. We find the work nowhere mentioned or quoted by Greek writers before the time of Eusebius. Irenaeus affords an apparent exception. Several passages in his works show an undoubted relationship to passages in one small section of the Apology (Iren. v. 23, 1; *Autol.* ii. 25 init.: Iren. iv. 38, 1; iii. 23, 6; *Autol.* ii. 25: Iren. iii. 23, 6; *Autol.* ii. 25, 26). But Harnack (p. 294) regards it as probable that the quotations, limited to two chapters, are not taken from the Apology, but from Theophilus's work against Marcion, (cf. Möhler, *Patrol.* p. 286; Otto, *Corp. Apol.* II. viii. p. 357; Donaldson, *Christ. Lit.* iii. 66). Harnack gives reasons also (p. 296) for believing that Theophilus's work against Hermogenes may have been the common source to which Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Hippolytus have gone for their references to that heretic. In the West, there are certain references to the *Autolycus*, though not copious. It is quoted by Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* i. 23) under the title "Liber de Temporibus ad Autolycum." There is also a passage first cited by Maranus in Novatian (*de Trinitate*, c. 2), which without being an exact quotation shows great similarity to the language of Theophilus (*ad Autol.* i. 3). In the next century the book is mentioned by Gennadius (c. 34) as "tres libelli de fide." He found them attributed to Theophilus of Alexandria, but the disparity of the style caused him to question the authorship. The notice of Theophilus by Jerome has been already referred to. The learned but capricious Dodwell found internal evidence in the reference to existing persecutions, a supposed reference to Origen and his followers, and for assigning the work to a younger Theophilus who perished in the reign of Severus (*Dissert. ad Iren.* §§ 44. 50, p. 170 ff. ed. 1689). [The doubt has been in modern times removed by Erbes (*Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.* 1879, pp. 485, 618 ff.).] Dodwell's arguments have been carefully examined by Tillemont (*Mém. Eccl.* iii. 612 notes), Cave (*Hist. Lit.* i. 70), Donaldson (*Hist. Christ. Lit.* ii. 65) and Harnack (*u. s.* p. 287), and the received authorship fully established.

Literature MS.—There are only three Manuscripts of the Apology of Theophilus. (1) *Marcianus.* Once the property of Cardinal Bessarion, now in the Library of St. Mark's at Venice (No. CCCCXCVI.), containing also writings of Gregory Nyssen, Origen, Eusebius, etc. Otto, who was the first to collate this MS. with the printed text, ascribes it to the eleventh century, and praises it as "codex excellentissimus" (*u. s.* pp. xv.–xviii.). (2) *Bodleianus* in the Bodleian Library (No. XXV. obn. 2040) copied from the Marcianus about the middle of the fifteenth century (*ib.* xvii.–xx.). *Parisianus* (Bibl. Nat. No. DCCCLXXXVII.) written in 1540, also a copy containing only the third book (*ib.* xx.–xxiii.).

Editions.—The Apology was first published at Zurich, in 1546, in a collection of Ἀπομνημονεύματα διάφορα made by the monks Antonius and Maximus, and printed by Christopher Froschover, under the editorship of Conrad Gesner. The volume contains Tatian's *Oratio c. Graec.*, and aphorisms from the *Melissa* of Antonius, and from the *Loci Communes* of Maximus, together with the *Autolycus.* This last was transcribed by Joannes Frisius of Zurich, from a MS. lent him at Venice by Arnoldus Arlenius Peraxylus, and placed in Gesner's hands for publication with a letter of his own. This codex, which varies from the Marcian, is now lost. In the same year, 1546, a Latin translation of the Autolycus and the other above-named works by Conrad Clauser issued from Froschover's press. This is the translation which with emendations appears in the various *Bibliothecae Patrum*, as well as in most of the editions of the Greek text. Eight years after its first appearance, the Greek text, with Clauser's Latin version, was given by Joannes Heroldus, in his *Orthodoxographa*, Basil. 1555,

fol. It was added, with Tatian and other apologists, to the edition of Justin by Morel (Par. 1615, 1636; Frankf. 1686), the last named edition having a commentary by Chr. Kortholt. An edition "multo emendatior" by bishop Fell, issued from the Sheldonian Theatre, Oxon. 1684, 12mo. This was followed by an edition by I. Chr. Wolf., Hamb. 1724, 8vo, with a large apparatus of notes and dissertations, which far surpassed all previous editions in accuracy and completeness. The *Autolycus* was also published by Prudentius Maranus (Paris, 1742, fol.), in his collection of the Apologists of the second century, with a new Latin translation. Of this there have been several reprints and editions, especially in Galland's *Bibl. Vet. Patr.* (Venet. 1766, tom. ii., pp. 77–140), and more recently in Migne's *Patrologia* (tom. vi., col. 1023–1168), with not a few unwarranted and ill-considered changes in the text. A small edition for lecture-room purposes was brought out at Cambridge in 1852, by the Rev. W. G. Humphry, of which Otto says pithily, "nequaquam effecit ut rectius Theophilus legatur, meliusque intelligatur" (p. xxxiii.). Otto's own edition in the second volume of his *Corpus Apologet. Christ. Saec. Secund.*, Jena, 1861, 8vo, is by far the most complete and useful. The annotations are copious and valuable, and the prolegomena convey all needful information respecting manuscripts, editions, and translations. Of English translations we may mention that by Joseph Belty, M.A., Fellow of Exeter, Oxford, 1722, 8vo, "versio nimis libera, et adnotatio nullius pretii" (Otto); that by Rev. W. B. Flower, Lond., 1860, 8vo, "well executed but marred by omissions and misprints" (Donaldson); and that of the Rev. Marcus Dods (Clark's *Ante-Nicene Library*).

At an earlier part of this article reference has been made to Jerome's testimony concerning the commentaries on the Gospels attributed to Theophilus; of the genuineness he felt considerable doubt, as well as to the so-called commentaries in four books, still extant in Latin, and to the controversy, recently revived by Zahn, as to their authenticity. The subject is far too extensive to be treated of adequately here. Our readers may be referred to Zahn's original rehabilitation of the commentaries (*Forschungen z. Gesch. d. Neutest. Kanons*, 2. Theil., Erlangen 1883), to Harnack's searching reply, demonstrating most satisfactorily the utter untenableness of Zahn's hypothesis (*Texte u. Untersuch. z. Gesch. d. Altchrist. Literatur*, 1. Band, Heft 4, Leipzig, 1883); Zahn's rejoinder (*Forschungen*, 3. Theil, Beilage 3, 1884), or to a convenient *résumé* of the whole controversy by Professor Sanday (*Studia Biblica*, Oxford, 1885, pp. 89–101). It must suffice here to say, that our only authority for attributing the extant Latin commentaries to Theophilus of Antioch is the title prefixed to the first of the four books (that on St. Matthew), originally published by De la Bigne in 1576, in his *Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*. The name of Theophilus of Antioch is only found in this heading. The title of the other books, in the original edition (it is altered in the later) ascribes the commentaries to the later Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 385–412. It is probable, as both Zahn and Harnack agree, that the title of the commentary on St. Matthew originally corresponded with those of the other three, and that "patriarchae Antiocheni" is a critical correction on the part of the editor, who knowing that certain commentaries on the Gospels ascribed to Theophilus of Antioch were named and quoted by Jerome, jumped to the conclusion that these must be they. This conclusion, however, has not been accepted by any later scholar, until Zahn set himself to the courageous task of re-establishing their genuineness. The occurrence in the commentaries of many direct coincidences in language with Jerome, with Arnobius the younger (a Gallican bishop, probably not earlier than A.D. 460) with Ambrose, Hilary, Juvencus, and other writers, including some possible agreements with Bede, together with the almost verbal identity of a passage of Cyprian relating to the body and blood of Christ (*Ep.* 58, s. 5, p. 754, ed. Harkel), with the commentary on Matt. xxvi. 26, and as many as ten passages borrowed *totidem verbis* from Eucherius, bishop of Lyons (c. 434–450), together with patent anachronisms in language, doctrine, and ecclesiastical arrangements, have, in the temperate words of Bishop Lightfoot (*Ignatius*, i. 134), furnished "grave reasons for supposing that the extant commentary was not the same which was read by Jerome, but a later work written originally in Latin, and compiled from Latin fathers." It is indeed difficult to see how any one who has not a theory to support, with which facts must be made to square, could for a moment imagine that the "Autolycus" and the "commentaries" were the product of the same mind, and of the same age. As has been noticed above, the doctrine of the Trinity appears in the Apology in a very crude undeveloped shape, while in the commentaries it is formalized with the utmost post-Nicene accuracy. It is the "trinitas sancta quae dividi non potest" (i. 72, Otto), by the virtue of which spiritual life is infused in men, "trinitatis virtute spiritales effecti sunt" (iv. 5), involving a confession of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost (iii. 14). The Christology of the commentaries evidently belongs to an age, subsequent not only to the Arian heresy, but also to Nestorianism and Eutychianism. Christ is no longer the "Logos," the wisdom of the Father, but "filius Dei, Deus ex Deo," in whom "natura patris" resides, and "una divinitas patris et filii" (i. 133). Christ is God and man in one person, "licet homo factus est, non tamen Deus esse destitit. Idem est ergo homo et Deus, id est, Christus una persona est" (iii. 34, 35), "very God and very man; God of God his Father, man of His human mother" (iv. 17). The church, which is unrecognized in the apology in its universal spiritual unity, appears constantly in the Commentaries, as the "ecclesia catholica," "unica ecclesia," "regnum Christi catholicum," containing the "apostolorum catholica doctrina," prefigured allegorically in almost every event of the Gospel history. It is the Lord's garden, "hortus domini," in which, with a distinction of different degrees of sanctity entirely unknown in primitive times, "sunt rosae martyrum, lilia virginum, violae viduarum, hedera conjugum" (iv. *ad fin.*). The Passion of Christ, which has no defined place in the salvation of man as propounded in the Apology, in the com-

mentaries is the means whereby the human race is set free from the debt of sin (i. 119); Christ was crucified for us, and His blood has become a medicine for the cure of all sick souls (i. 69). When we further find original sin predicated of the whole human race (iv. 11), a distinction constantly drawn between ordinary Christians and the spiritual, "spiritalis," with the occurrence of such terms as "pabulum spiritale," "copula spiritalis," "spiritalis pecunia"—a special dignity assigned to virginity, and the contemplative life, and a reference to the monastic life, "duo in lecto esse monachos significet qui amant quietem, alieni a tumultu generis humani, et Domino servientes" (i. 140), and to the distinctive duties of bishops "stabularii episcopi sunt" (iii. 11) and priests, and a broad line of demarcation drawn between the country folks "agrestes," "rustici," "pagani," who for the most part continued heathen, and Christian believers, to omit many other evidences of a later age we can hardly see how Harnack's verdict is to be gainsaid, that to attribute these commonplaces to the second century would be to work an entire revolution in the history of the church and its doctrines, and that we have here a compilation, made at a time when the Augustinian terminology had obtained currency in the West; when monasticism had become fully established, and had supplanted the more unfettered asceticism, and when paganism was only to be found among the rude country population, and that it cannot be dated, at earliest, before the end of the fifth century, and that all its indications point to the West rather than the East as the place of its origin, especially its Christological formulas with their brief, natural profession of the two natures and unity of person (p. 141). To these evidences of a much later date than that of Theophilus of Antioch it is difficult to see what sufficient answer can be given. Equally hard is it to resist the evidence that the original language of the commentary—or at least some portions of it—was Latin. The play upon the words "panis" and "pannis" (i. 5–7), and the interpretation of the "jot" and the "tittle" (*apex*) of Matt. v. 18, as the law and the Gospel ("*iota* enim pro decem est apud Graecos; *apex* autem quatuor literas habens per evangelicum quadruplex testamentum indicat novum" (i. 36, 37)), would only be possible in a Latin writer. Zahn has supported his theory with marked ability, and with the advantage of immense stores of accurate learning. But his reasonings are entirely unconvincing. In Professor Sanday's words "carried away by honest and single-minded zeal for his subject he has pursued fine and subtle reasonings to such an extent that the plain and simple indications have dropped out of sight. But with the average reader, it is just these plain and simple indications which tell most strongly. And in criticism as in life they are the safest guides to follow" (*Stud. Bibl.* p. 98). The coincidences between the commentaries and Jerome and other writers might be explicable on the hypothesis that they borrowed from Theophilus, not Theophilus from them, and that the priority was on the side of the commentator. But the internal evidence of a later date cannot be explained in this way, and is in itself irrefragable. But even had this not been the case, had the evidence for and against the early date of the commentaries been much more evenly balanced, the whole question would have been at once settled by the discovery of a MS. in the Royal Library, containing the so-called commentaries of Theophilus, preceded by a preface in which the compiler distinctly states that the work is a collection of passages culled from different commentators — "tractatoribus defloratis opusculum spiritale composui"—as a bee collects its honey from flowers of every kind. The title of the codex declares that it was written at the request of a certain Nomedius, who is known to have been abbat of the monastery of Soissons, A.D. 695–711, and to have been presented by him to the Basilica of St. Medard in that city. This fixes the date of the MS. at the extreme end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century. This would seem to close the whole controversy. Zahn, however, "still maintains his old position with stubborn resolution." He claims the bulk of the commentary for the bishop of Antioch, and suggests that the preface may be the work of a supposed interpolator some time between A.D. 450 and 700, by whom the passages confessedly borrowed from Eucharius, and other later authors were introduced into Theophilus's text. Such an escape from an acknowledged difficulty will probably appear convincing to few besides its originator.

Although these commentaries cannot be regarded as the work of Theophilus of Antioch, a few words may be devoted to their nature and form. Their character is entirely allegorical, without any attempt to arrive at the primary sense, or original object of the passages commented on. This character is declared in the title, "Commentariorum sive allegoriarum in sacra quatuor evangelia liber primus," &c. The four books into which they are divided are very unequal in length. The first book on St. Matthew occupies about five and twenty pages in Otto's edition; that on St. Mark, only four; that on St. Luke, a little more than ten; and that on St. John, about six pages. The several books of the commentaries are generally restricted to the gospel the name of which they severally bear. There are a few exceptions; *e.g.* the parable of the Pounds, Luke xix. 12–23, is introduced in book ii. between Mark vi. 38 and vii. 35, and this book ends with a section "de tribus mortuis a Christo resuscitatis." In Book iii. words from Matthew x. 36 are intruded into the comment on Luke xii. 52–53, and the "wedding garment." Matthew xxii. 11 into the parable of the Supper, Luke xiv. 16–24. A longish comment on John iii. 13, 34, precedes that on the parable of the barren fig-tree. In Book iv. we find comments on Matthew xi. 30, and Luke xvii. 21, following the Miraculous Draught. These dislocations give no support to Zahn's hypothesis, that this work is the harmony of the Gospels described by Jerome (*ad Algas.*), and are to be otherwise accounted for. The order of the chapters and verses is on the whole fairly preserved in St. Matthew. But there are large exceptions even here, and still more in the later Gospels. The scanty and desultory notes on St. John are completely without plan. It is important to observe that we find several decided repetitions, *e.g.* i. 70, 114 (Otto); i. 75, 115, ii. 18; i. 17, ii. 4;

i. 57, ii. 13; i. 18, 19, 20, iii. 2, 3; iv. 6, 26; and especially in the double interpretation of the parable of the "unjust steward" (iii. 24, 44-76 (Otto); the long passage quoted by St. Jerome (*ad Algas. u.s.*) from Theophilus of Antioch (in Abp. Trench's words, "perhaps the strangest of the many strange explanations to which this parable has given birth," in which the steward represents the apostle Paul) being added at the end of the Gospel, completely out of place, a short commentary on the parable having been already given in its proper order. Perhaps no stronger proof of the work being a compilation could be furnished than the appearance of this passage, as a kind of rider, tacked on inartistically to the end of the gospel. The length of it, so greatly exceeding that of any other of the sections, is in itself an evidence that it is no integral part of the work. As Harnack has remarked (*u. s.* p. 158), it is by no means improbable that this section, which was well known in early times as the work of Theophilus, was the cause of the whole collection being ascribed to that writer by some half instructed copyist, destitute of all critical discernment; and thus an ill-founded guess has saddled the second century Antiochene patriarch with a compilation made some four centuries later, belonging to the same class as those of Isidore of Seville, Bede, Rabanus Maurus and others, though probably the most ancient of them all.

(Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* iii. 49, 612; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 69; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* lib. v., c. 1; Permaneder, *Bibl. Patrist.* tom. ii. pars i. pp. 191-208; Renan, *Origines*, vii. 386-389; Pressensé, *Trois premiers siècles*, 2e série, ii. 395; Donaldson's *Hist. of Christ. Lit.* iii. 63-106; Harnack, *Texte u. Untersuch.* 1. Bd., Heft 1, 2, pp. 282-298, Heft 4, pp. 97-175; Zahn, *Forschungen*, 2. Theil, 3. Theil, Beilage 2.) [E. V.]

THEOPHILUS (5), Dec. 20, military martyr at Alexandria in the Decian persecution mentioned by Dionysius Alexandrinus. (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 41.) [G. T. S.]

THEOPHILUS (6), bishop of Beneventum, present at the council at Rome under Melchiades, concerning Caecilianus, A.D. 313 (*Opt.* i. 23). [H. W. P.]

THEOPHILUS (7), bishop among the Goths, and predecessor and teacher of Ulphilas. He was at the first council of Nice. (Soc. *H. E.* ii. 41; C. A. A. Scott's *Ulfilas*, p. 28.) [G. T. S.]

THEOPHILUS (8), bishop of Castabala, in Cilicia, a leader of the Semiarians, a man of high character, for whom Basil entertained much regard and esteem, as πάσης αἰδοῦς καὶ τιμῆς ἄξιος. He had been previously elected bishop of Eleutheropolis, in Palaestina Prima, when, according to Sozomen, he had promised on oath not to accept any other bishoprick (Soz. *H. E.* iv. 24). He was, however, translated to Castabala by Silvanus, the metropolitan of Tarsus, which was made a ground of accusation against the latter when deposed by the synod of Constantinople in 360 (*ibid.*). He united, in 362, with Silvanus, Basil of Ancyra, and other leading Semiarian prelates in the memorial addressed to Jovian immediately after his accession, begging him to confirm the decrees of Seleucia and banish the Anomoeans, and convene a general council (Socr. *H. E.* iii. 25; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 4). When, after the council of Lampsacus, Valens declared himself an open supporter of Eudoxius and the more thorough-paced Arians, Theophilus was one of three deputies—Eustathius and Silvanus being the other two—commissioned, in 365, by the hard pressed Semiarians, who were drawing closer and closer to the orthodox party, to present a memorial to Valentinian. The emperor having started on his Gaulish campaign before they arrived in Italy, they betook themselves to the bishop of Rome. On the production of a confession of faith, signed by 59 Semiarians, substantially identical with that of Nicaea, Liberius recognized their orthodoxy, admitted them to communion, and wrote to the Semiarian bishops of the East expressing his satisfaction at their acceptance of the Catholic faith. Theophilus and his companions then visited Sicily, and repeated the same declaration of faith at a synod of the bishops of the island, after which they returned home (Socr. *H. E.* iv. 12; Sozom. *H. E.* vi. 10, 11, 12). Theophilus appears again in the correspondence of Basil (A.D. 373, 376), to whom he had caused much sorrow by uniting himself with Eustathius of Sebaste, and joining in the calumnious charges the latter made against him publicly—even denying his right to be regarded as a bishop, and sending him merely a verbal message, lest in addressing him in writing he should be forced to give him the episcopal title. At the same time Basil expressed his regard for him, and said that he should cherish his friendship in spite of all causes of offence. (Basil, *Epp.* 130 [196]; 244 [82]; 245 [309]). [E. V.]

THEOPHILUS (9), twenty-second bishop of Alexandria, succeeded Timotheus in the last week of July 385. He had probably been a leading member of the Alexandrian clergy. But when Rufinus, in 401, claimed to have been one of his hearers, Jerome replied that Theophilus, "out of humility, had never taught in public before his consecration, and that since that event Rufinus had not visited Alexandria" (*c. Rufin.* iii. 18). Eutychius tells an extravagant story to the effect, that Theophilus had, as a young man, been very intimate with Theodosius, had interpreted a dream of his as portending that they would respectively become emperor and patriarch, and haunted the palace-gates in vain for a year after Theodosius's accession, until another vision reminded the monarch to place his friend in the Alexandrian see (*Annal.* i. 496 ff.). This legend grew out of the fact, that Theodosius treated the new bishop of Alexandria with respect and confidence, and consulted him soon after his appointment as to the difficulty about the Roman and the Alexandrian reckonings of the Easter of 387, which the Alexandrian reckoning would place some five weeks later than the Roman (Hefele, *Hist. Councils*, vol. i. § 37). "There was great confusion," says Cyril of Alexandria, "in every church, praetorium, and palace" (*Prolog.* in Bucherius, *in Canonem Pasch.* p. 482), and Theodosius asked Theophilus to advise him on the question. Accordingly the archbishop made "a

paschal cycle of 418 years, and" (also) "reckoned the days on which Easter should fall for 100 years, from the first year of Theodosius's consulate" (i.e. from 380), and gave the true state of the case briefly in a "libellus" which he sent the emperor (Leo the Great, *Epist.* 121; Gennadius, *de Vir. Illustr.* 33; Bede, *H. E.* v. 21, and compare Tillemont, xi. 496). The prologue to this "laterculus," or table of 100 Easters, is extant (see Galland. *Bibl. Patr.* vii. 614). In it Theophilus asserts that our Lord was crucified on Nisan 15, not 14, and gives the well-known rule, that if the 14th moon falls on a Sunday, Easter must be deferred for a week. He must have repaid the emperor's confidence but ill if, as Socrates believed (vi. 2), he sent a priest named Isidore to Italy, in the summer of 388, with letters and gifts to be delivered either to Theodosius or to Maximus, according to the issue of their then impending conflict, which letters fell into the hands of a church "reader," who accompanied Isidore, and betrayed his master's secret. Sozomen thinks this story questionable (viii. 2); and it is somewhat discredited, to say the least, not only by what we know of the sagacity of Theophilus, but by Socrates's own statement, that Theophilus (probably two years later, Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* i. 522) obtained from Theodosius a commission to demolish the pagan temples of Alexandria (Soc. v. 16). Sozomen corrects this statement by saying that Theodosius granted to Theophilus, at his own request, the temple of Dionysus, on the site of which he proposed to build a church (vii. 15). As to what followed, the two historians slightly differ. Socrates says that Theophilus "cleared out the temple of Mithras, and exposed its bloody mysteries," words which Fleury explains as referring to heads of slaughtered infants, and pictures of "cruel ways of inflicting death" (b. xix. c. 30). Socrates adds that the bishop exhibited the foul symbols used in the worship of Serapis and of the other gods. Sozomen is probably more accurate when he connects these emblems with the worship of Dionysus, i.e. of Osiris. By the archbishop's order they were carried through the "agora" as objects of contemptuous abhorrence—a sight which acted on the hot-headed votaries of Alexandrian idolatry as the question of the Arian George in regard to a temple, "How long is that sepulchre to remain standing?" had acted on their predecessors twenty-nine years before (Ammianus, xxii. 11. 7). Eager for vengeance, they arranged an onslaught on the Christians, which was tragically successful; and then they took possession of the vast Serapeum, in the north-western quarter of the city. This famous structure, which Ammianus considered to be for grandeur second only to the capitol of Rome (xxii. 16. 12), rose on the top of a huge artificial mound, and consisted of an outermost set of buildings, or cloistered square, and a temple proper within it, supported by "pillars of enormous magnitude and beautiful proportion" (Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, iii. 68). The Serapeum had been the great popular sanctuary of Alexandrian paganism. In the words of a contemporary pagan writer, it had made the city seem like a sacred world (Eunapius, vol. i. p. 43, ed. 1822). Not unnaturally, it now became the stronghold of the "furious despair" of those who loathed the worship of the Crucified (*Orations of St. Athanasius against the Arians*, p. v. ed. Oxon.). They made sallies from its precincts, captured several Christians, dragged them within their precincts, and inflicted torture or death on those who would not sacrifice to their gods. The general in command at Alexandria, and the Augustal prefect, summoned them to surrender, but in vain. Olympius, a philosopher, sustained their obstinate resolution until the arrival of an edict ordering the destruction of all the temples. Terrified by the shouts which proclaimed this mandate, the desperadoes abandoned the Serapeum; and Theophilus, with a great body of soldiers, of exultant Christians, and of astounded pagans, ascended the hundred steps which led up the mound, and penetrated into the faintly lighted sanctuary, from within which the Christians afterwards believed that Olympius, on the night before the evacuation, had heard a voice chanting "Alleluia" (Soz. vii. 15). There, with its hands stretching from wall to wall, was the huge seated statue of Serapis, constructed of various metals, now dusky with age, and inlaid with various precious stones (Clem. Alex. *Cohort.* 48). The image was that of an old man with a bushel on his head, "the emblem of productiveness and plenty" (Milman). By his side was a figure with the heads of a lion, a dog, and a wolf. On one of his arms was a serpent, the emblem of eternity (compare Fleury, b. xix. c. 28). The successor of Athanasius gazed with feelings which can well be imagined on this visible concentration of the power of Egyptian idolatry, no doubt the symbol to many Alexandrians of the principle of life and of the powers that ruled the under-world. It was a supreme moment: at last, he would feel, the hour and the man were come; the church had her foot on the neck of her foe. Mutterings of superstitious fear were heard; to draw near that image was to cause an earthquake. The scorn in the archbishop's face became yet more triumphant; he turned to a soldier who held an axe, and bade him "strike hard." The man obeyed: a shriek of terror burst from many of the spectators; another and another blow followed, the head was lopped off, and there ran out a troop of mice, which had "dwelt within the god of the Egyptians." Misgiving and alarm were at once exchanged for noisy triumph; the body of Serapis was broken up into bits and burned; the head was made a public show, and Theophilus doubtless pointed the moral in the spirit of Isaiah xliv. 10–20. At Canopus, fourteen miles from Alexandria, temples were immediately laid low. The images, with one exception, were melted down into caldrons and other vessels required in the eleemosynary work of the Alexandrian church. The exception was an image of an ape, which Theophilus set up in a public place "in perpetuam rei memoriam," to the vexation of the pagan grammarian Ammonius, who lived to teach the young Socrates at Constantinople, and used to complain seriously of the injustice thus done to "Greek religion" (Soc. v. 16). During the demolition of various temples there were found hollow statues of bronze and wood, set against the walls, but capable of being entered by the priests, who thus carried on their impos-

tures, which Theophilus explained to his pagan fellow citizens (Theod. v. 22). But when the Nile-gauge was removed from the Serapeum to the church, the pagans began to take heart; would not the god avenge himself by withholding the yearly inundation which his power had been wont to effect? It was, in fact, delayed. Murmurs swelled into remonstrances; the state of the city was becoming dangerous; the prefect had to consult his sovereign. Theodosius's answer was decisive: "If the Nile would not rise except by means of enchantments or of sacrifices, let Egypt remain unwatered." Forthwith the river began to rise with vehemence; the fear now was not of drought, but of a flood which might damage the city (Soz. vii. 20). We know not the nature of those concessions to the pagans which, according to a letter from Atticus to Theophilus's nephew Cyril, Theophilus made at this time for the sake of peace (Cyril, *Epist.* p. 202), but whatever they were they did not prevent a pagan like Eunapius from abusing him as a "leader of the polluted ones," a man like Eurymedon, "erewhile king of the misproud giants." To Eunapius the temple-breakers were impious men who "threw everything into confusion, boasted of having conquered the gods," enriched themselves by the plunder, "brought into the sacred places the so-called monks, men in form but swinish in life," deified the "bones and heads of worthless men who had been punished by the courts for their offences," and assigned to "bad slaves who had borne the marks of the lash the title of martyrs and intercessors with the gods" (vol. i. p. 44).

In 391 or 392, Theophilus was named by the council of Capua as arbiter of the dispute between Flavian, as representing the Meletian succession to the see of Antioch, and Evagrius, whose claims, like those of his predecessor Paulinus, were upheld by the West. The church of Egypt, being then neutral, was considered to be an appropriate judge. Theophilus undertook to examine the case with the aid of his suffragans; but Flavian had recourse to imperial support, and would not submit to the trial. Theophilus wrote to inform Ambrose of this, and Ambrose advised him again to summon Flavian, adding that "if he still thought fit not to come," a decision must be arrived at after consultation with Siricius of Rome (Ambrose, *Epist.* 56). In fact, Evagrius died soon afterwards, but Flavian was not recognised by the West until Chrysostom primarily, and Theophilus secondarily, effected that result in 398 (Soz. viii. 3, cp. Tillemont, x. 538).

In A.D. 394 we find Theophilus for the first time at Constantinople. A council met there, in the baptistery of the great church, on the 29th of September; Theophilus sat next to Nectarius of Constantinople, and among the other prelates were Flavian, Gregory of Nyssa, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. A question had arisen as to the see of Bostra, Bagadius and Agapius being the litigants. Bagadius had been deposed from the episcopate, but only in his absence, and by two bishops, both of whom were dead. Theophilus delivered his opinion to this effect: "We cannot sit in judgment on the acts of the dead; but, in future, depositions should be pronounced not only by three bishops, the number required by the Nicene council for a consecration, but, if possible, by all the comprovincials." Nectarius and Flavian approved this opinion, as "reasonable and benevolent" (Mansi, *Concil.* iii. 852). "It is remarkable," says Tillemont, "to see Theophilus there with Flavian, although they were not in communion with each other" (ix. 592). He thinks that the probable occasion of this episcopal gathering was not the dispute about Bostra, but the dedication of a grand church "of the Apostles" Peter and Paul, which Rufinus, then in full ascendency as praetorian prefect, had erected in a suburb of Chalcedon called the Oak (Soz. viii. 17), a place which, nine years afterwards, was to be associated with the deepest stain on the character of the Egyptian primate, now so high in honour and popularity. "We see," says Tillemont, "by various anecdotes, that Theophilus was in close relations with the solitaries of Egypt" (xi. 457). In the "Sayings of the Fathers" he appears as inviting some of them to be present at the destruction of the temples, and again as visiting the famous Nitrian settlement, and asking its abbat, "Father, what is the chief thing that thou hast found in this way" (of life)? The answer was, "To blame and accuse oneself always." "There is no other way but this," rejoined Theophilus. On another occasion he penetrated to the more distant Scetis: the brethren assembled, and said to abbat Pambo, "Say something to the pope" (the archbishop of Alexandria) "that he may profit thereby." "If my silence," said Pambo bluntly, "profits him not, neither would my speech profit him." Theophilus once went with a magistrate to see the celebrated recluse Arsenius at Scetis, and asked him to say something to them. After a pause, Arsenius asked, "If I do, will you observe it?" "Yes," they both said. Then said "the old man," with a touch of grim humour, "Wherever you hear that Arsenius is, do not go near him!" Another time, the archbishop sent to ask whether Arsenius would open the door of his cell to him. Arsenius answered, "If you come, I shall open my door to you: and then I shall have to open it to everybody: and then I can no longer dwell here." Theophilus, on receiving this message, said, "If my going to him is to drive him away, I will go to him no more" (Cotelerius, *Mon. Eccl. Gr.* i. 462, 354). Palladius, the biographer of St. Chrysostom, says that while he was really a "Theophilus," he conferred the episcopate on seven or eight monks, the disciples of Isaac, himself a disciple of Macarius, and celebrated for his knowledge of Scripture; and the context implies that it was by Theophilus that many of the disciples of another Isaac, eminent for his active hospitality, were similarly promoted (*Dial.* p. 161). Still more celebrated was his intimacy with four monks of Scetis, known as "the Tall Brothers:" he constrained one of them, Dioscorus, to accept the see of Hermopolis the Lesser, and two others, Eusebius and Euthymius, to take orders, to live with him, and to act as stewards of the Alexandrian church (Soc. vi. 7). These years, in fact, were the best in Theophilus's episcopate; and if it had lasted only ten years, he might have left the name, if not of a saint, at least of a good as well as an able and energetic prelate.

But in 395 the story of his life changes its

character. "Office exhibits him" in a sinister sense: his faults come to the surface—the faults of a domineering nature, aggravated by the lordly position of his see (cp. Card. Newman, *Historical Sketches*, iii.). He begins to justify the description afterwards given of him by an adversary: "Naturally impulsive, headlong, intensely contentious, insatiable in grasping at his objects, awaiting in his own case neither trial nor inquiry, impatient of opposition, determined to carry out his own resolves" (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 76). He was a friend, if he had not been an instructor, of Rufinus of Aquileia: he was on good terms with John bishop of Jerusalem, and he entertained a contempt for what he considered the unspiritual narrowness of Epiphanius's views as an interpreter of Scripture, even denouncing him to pope Siricius. For himself he was disposed to go some lengths in the line of Origenistic idealism, as to which a sharp controversy had broken out; and in the year 395, at the request of bishop John, he sent his friend Isidore, who is said to have been an Origenist, as his envoy into Palestine, in order to abate the strife which had raged between John and Jerome. Rufinus, then on bad terms with his old friend, had stimulated Theophilus's resentment against him on account of the welcome given by Jerome to a fugitive Egyptian bishop named Paul, who was a strong anti-Origenist, and whom Theophilus had synodically deposed (Jerome, *c. Ruf.* iii. 17). In a letter which fell into unfriendly hands, Isidore encouraged Rufinus to stand firm against Jerome (*c. Joan. Jeros.* 37). He visited Jerome three times, but would not give him a letter which Theophilus, as he admitted, had written to Jerome (*ib.* 39); and the only effect of his so-called mediation was to produce a soreness on Theophilus's part towards Jerome, whose letters for some time he ignored. At last he wrote, coldly exhorting Jerome to respect the authority of the bishop of Jerusalem. Jerome replied, plainly informing Theophilus that many holy men were displeased at his patience and mildness towards the Origenists (*Epist.* 63). Two years later, in 399 (according to Vallarsi), Theophilus again urged Jerome to come to terms with John; and Jerome, in a letter full of sore feeling, protested that he too wished for peace, but it must be Christianlike and real. "You," he said in effect, "do not know what it is to encounter enmity; you are accustomed to be met by the spontaneous affection of monks, who are loyal to you because you are not their tyrant" (*Epist.* 82). Theophilus had been throwing his whole force into the repression of that extreme literalism which in the controversial history of the time is called the error of the Anthropomorphists, a coarse reaction from the Alexandrian allegorism. A number of ill-informed and enthusiastic monks recoiled even from the ordinary explanation of those Old Testament economies by which, as Epiphanius himself held, the Divine manifestation had been adapted to the capacities of human nature (*Haer.* 70. 7, see also Augustine, *Haer.* 50 and 76; Theodoret, iv. 10). They took the scriptural expressions "as to 'eyes, face, and hands' of God, as they found them, without examination" (Soz. viii. 11). "Sensuous forms of conception," as Neander says, were to them the only forms by which they could grasp the Divine ideas; and such a passage as that in which Origen excludes all corporeal notions of God would be invested, in their eyes, with all the unsoundness imputed to much else in the treatise where it occurs (*de Princip.* i. 1. 2). It seemed to make prayer unreal, to leave a blank which should have been filled with a Divine presence. Thus, when Theophilus, in his paschal letter for 399, insisted peremptorily on the immateriality of the Divine nature, a storm of wrathful zeal broke out among "the solitaries:" one of them, indeed, named Serapion, was candid enough to be convinced by argument, but the pain which ensued was such that when his brethren were engaged in their devotions, he exclaimed with tears, "They have taken away my God, and I know not whom to adore!" (Cassian, *Collat.* x. 3). Many others were of fiercer mood: was the "image of God" to be thus nullified? They actually hurried from their deserts to Alexandria, and menaced the "pope" whom they had been wont to honour. "Impious man! thou deservest death!" He saw that they were not to be defied, but a smooth prevarication might disarm them. "In seeing you I see God's face!" It was enough: he had appeared to accept the imperilled phrase: they asked more calmly, "If you admit that God's face is like ours, anathematise the books of Origen; for some people contradict us on their authority. If you will not do this, be prepared for the treatment due to those who fight against God." Theophilus uttered the fateful words of compliance: "I will do what you think fit; do not be angry with me, for I object to Origen's books, and blame those who approve them." Here we see at once that he was using "economy." The issue in the controversy was ambiguous; there was Origenism and Origenism. Theophilus might agree with, might value, much that he read in Origen's multifarious writings; he might also reject, and even strongly condemn, much else that he found there. What the Anthropomorphists, in their ignorance, would brand as Origenism every rational Christian would hold, whatever he might think of the pre-existence of souls, the Filial inequality, the universal restitution. As Theophilus afterwards said of himself, "a man might gather from Origen's meadow such flowers as were beautiful, and pass by those that were thorny" (Soc. vi. 17). Theophilus's fault on this occasion was that he stooped to propitiate the Anthropomorphists by using their phrase in a sense of his own, and by letting them think that he condemned Origen absolutely. Why did he thus unexpectedly change his front, and incur the name of "See-saw" as a time-server? (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 49). Not simply to get rid of a menacing presence, but also, we are told, for the sake of securing its aid in the gratification of personal animosity. In the first place, his old confidant Isidore, whom he had made hospitaller of the Alexandrian church, had become odious to him. Socrates (vi. 2) explains the fact by a story to the effect that, when in February 398 he had recommended Isidore for the see of Constantinople, the high chamberlain Eutropius showed him a bundle of papers, observing, "These contain evidence of your doublefacedness in the war between Theodosius and Maximus: now choose between standing your trial and consecrating" John (CHRYSOSTOM). By this account,

vexation at Isidore's ill-luck in losing the letters above referred to would be exasperated by the humiliation thus incurred. But we have seen reason to question this tale; and Palladius, the biographer of Chrysostom, gives a more probable explanation. A rich Alexandrian lady wished to expend 1000 pieces of gold in clothes for poor women, but to do so without her "pope's" knowledge, because he had a mania for building beyond what was necessary for the church. (The phrase is just like that which Isidore of Pelusium, somewhat later, employed to describe Theophilus—λιθομανῆ, *Epist.* i. 152.) She prevailed on the "hospitaller" to swear by the Holy Table that he would manage the business secretly for her. He kept his pledge, but spies brought the matter to the ears of Theophilus, who said nothing about it for two months, and then handed to Isidore a paper containing a terrible accusation: "I received this eighteen years ago, but had forgotten it; now it has turned up again." Isidore calmly asked for the name of his accuser; Theophilus shuffled out of this difficulty, and soon afterwards excommunicated Isidore, professing that his offence was too bad to reveal (*Dial.* p. 51 ff.). Palladius detested Theophilus heartily enough to adopt the worst tales current about him; but Sozomen had heard the like from a well-informed person, and represents Isidore as having said to Theophilus, "Better spend money on curing the bodies of the sick, which are more properly God's temples, than on building walls." Another story, resting on the same warrant, was that Isidore and Peter the archpriest had refused to attest the existence of a will, alleged to have been made in favour of Theophilus's sister (Soz. viii. 12). A third, which Socrates also gives (vi. 9), was that, Theophilus having rebuked Peter for giving communion to a Manichean woman before she had abjured her heresy, Peter declared that he had done so with Theophilus's own consent, and referred to Isidore as a witness. Isidore was then at Rome, but on his return he averred that Theophilus himself "had imparted the mysteries to her." Isidore, as we have seen, was in some sense an Origenizer, and Theophilus could best crush him by enlisting the sympathy of the Anthropomorphists. Moreover, the Tall Brothers were themselves among those monks—the majority after all, according to Socrates (vi. 7)—who insisted on the truth that God was a Spirit, without body and therefore without passions; and the two who had acted as church stewards, and who, with Dioscorus, had joined with Theophilus in that very assertion, had now seen too much of their archbishop. "He was pursuing a money-making life, and leaving no stone unturned in order to acquire money, and they therefore came to think that their souls were being damaged by intercourse with him." Such is Socrates's account; it is likely enough that he imputes to Theophilus too much of selfish motive, that the "money" was accumulated in great part for the sake of the church building in which the magnificent "pope" took such delight. However, Eusebius and Euthymius pressed him to let them return to Nitria. For some time he remonstrated, "but when he found out that they had (mentally) judged him, he was filled with anger, and threatened to do them all possible mischief. They despised his menaces, and retired into the desert;" according to Sozomen, their brother Ammonius, with a few others, interceded with Theophilus in behalf of Isidore; he promised to cancel the censure which he had pronounced; but time passed away, and they had to remind him of his word. To frighten them he thrust one of them in prison. Ammonius and the rest went to the prison, were admitted as visitors, but refused to come out again; Theophilus sent for them, and after a while they came to him, when he gave them smooth words, "but nursed his wrath in secret." Socrates knows nothing of this story, and connects the withdrawal of the two brothers with the persecution which Theophilus, being a hot-tempered man (θερμός τις), stirred up against them (Soc. vi. 7). About the end of 399 or the beginning of 400, he held a synod at Alexandria, at which "Origenism" was condemned. He then wrote to Anastasius of Rome, and to Jerome, informing them of this step. "Certain worthless and frenzied men, who attempted to sow the heresy of Origen in the monasteries of Nitria, have been cut down. . . . We remembered the apostle's admonition, 'Rebuke them sharply'" (Jerome, *Epist.* 87). At the beginning of 401 he attacked Origenism in his Paschal letter (Jerome, *Epist.* 96). It is a remarkable document, anticipating as it does the Christology of his nephew and successor Cyril, while it excludes all Apollinarian ideas. Theophilus traces to Origen the (Marcellian) notion, that Christ's kingdom would have an end. He goes on to denounce Origenistic Universalism, and the notions that Christ would suffer again on behalf of the demons, and that after the resurrection human bodies would again be subject to dissolution. Origen had erred grievously in denying the Son to be properly adorable ("quem Deum esse constiterit, adorandus et orandus"); in saying that *if* magic was a reality it was not an evil thing; in his theory ot the pre-existence of evil; in his disparagement ot "corporeal nature." Theophilus is here so far from patronising Anthropomorphism, that he expressly affirms that "no form of corporeal nature is like to God." Jerome translated this letter in the spring of 401; and about the same time Theophilus followed up his synodal proceedings of the previous year by measures of a more effective kind. Fortified by an imperial edict forbidding all monks to read Origen (Anastasius, *ad Joan. Jeros.*), he ordered the neighbouring bishops to banish the chief Nitrian monks from their own mountains and from the farther desert. Some of the monks came to remonstrate with him. They probably disclaimed the special errors associated with the name of Origen, and urged that they ought not to be treated as heretics because they were opposed to the degrading literalism of the Anthropomorphists. Palladius represents him as glaring at them in a fury, turning first pale and then livid, writhing his lips into a bitter laugh, throwing his scarf or "omophorion" over the neck of Ammonius, one of the Tall Brothers, and striking him on the face so as to draw blood, with the fierce exclamation, "You heretic, anathematise Origen!" (*Dial.* p. 54). In this there is probably some exaggeration; but it is likely enough that on some such occasion he treated Ammonius with indignity, and that, as Palladius adds, he induced five of the Nitrian monks ("men unworthy even to be door-

keepers"), whom he had promoted to ecclesiastical office, to sign accusations against three of their chief brethren, who were accordingly excommunicated in a council. At his request, the Augustal prefect decreed their expulsion from Egypt; and Theophilus is said to have attacked the Nitrian settlement by night at the head of a force which was to execute this order. A wild scene, according to Palladius, ensued (*Dial.* p. 57). The unearthly stillness of this mountain home of some five thousand "solitaries" (*Hist. Laus.* 6), with their orderly variety of manual occupations as students, weavers, physicians, confectioners, and their concentrated unity of religious aims and devotional habits; the swarms of monks moving on Sundays and Saturdays towards the great church with the three palm-trees beside it; the cordial entertaining of strangers in the hospice adjoining the church—these things should be realised in order to appreciate the contrast presented when Disocorus took shelter in the church, but was dragged away, we are told, by Ethiopians flushed with wine;—when his three brothers found safety in a well, the mouth of which was hastily closed;—when the cells were plundered and set on fire, and the flames consumed copies of Scripture and of religious works, together with "the Eucharist," reserved, as was usual, for private reception on ordinary week days. It is even said, on the authority of eye-witnesses, that a young boy was thus burnt to death. Against this account is to be set Theophilus's own statement in what is called the synodical letter to the bishops of Palestine and Cyprus (translated by Jerome, *Epist.* 92). It was intended to be read by the former when assembled for the dedication festival at Jerusalem in the September of 401. In this letter Theophilus says that, having been memorialised by orthodox "fathers and presbyters," he went to Nitria with a great number of neighbouring bishops, and there, "in presence of many fathers who came together from nearly the whole of Egypt, some of Origen's treatises were read. From the *De Principiis* it appeared that he denied the Son's co-equality and the eternity of His kingdom, and affirmed the future salvation of the devil. In the *De Oratione*, Origen had maintained that the Son was not to be prayed to with the Father. Here, says Theophilus, "we topped our ears." He goes on to mention Origenistic speculations concerning the resurrection-body, the previous "lapses" of the angels, their sensuous enjoyment of animal sacrifices, the prescience of demons, the future sufferings of Christ on their behalf, together with the statement, that not the actual Word but a heavenly spirit became incarnate. The adherents of Origenism, he says, were therefore condemned; but they took possession of the church of Nitria, closed it against the bishops and abbats, holding in their hands clubs wrapped in palm leaves. The orthodox majority prevented further outrage, and the service was at last duly performed. Soon after Theophilus returned home, some Origenist monks gathered a band of "poor men and slaves," and raised a tumult in which the pagans cried out against "the destroyer of the Serapeum." This was got up in order to prevent the bishops from trying Isidore on a charge of immorality, which he endeavoured to meet by subterfuges in hopes of buying off his accusers. The Origenist monks were now going about in foreign provinces, "seeking whom to devour with their impiety;" their mad impetuosity must be restrained. Theophilus protests that he has done them no hurt, and taken nothing wrongfully from them. Amid this conflict of authorities it is clear that Theophilus did personally visit Nitria, and that its "Origenist monks" were put under ban, and driven forth, probably in the early summer of 401, and that their places were filled by others on whose "docility" Theophilus could rely.

Jerome had heard of what he calls "the display of the standard of the cross" from two monks, Priscus and Eubulus, whom Theophilus sent into Palestine to counteract the representations of the Nitrian fugitives; but they did not then bring him any letter from Theophilus. Very shortly, however, a monk named Theodore, who had seen Nitria in its new condition, brought a letter, brief but friendly, in which "Theophilus, bishop," announced the restoration of peace to the church of Egypt, but expressed his fear that "the truth" would be secretly attacked in Palestine (*Epist.* 86). Jerome replied in a half-patronising tone, with a "Macte virtute," which must have somewhat ruffled the pride of the majestic "pope" (*Epist.* 86). The bishops assembled at Jerusalem promised not to receive any of those whom Theophilus had condemned for heresy (*Epist.* 93), and Dionysius bishop of Lydda wrote him a letter of fervent gratitude for having used "the Gospel sword" against "the teacher of Arius and his disciples" (*Epist.* 94). On the other hand, Theophilus found it prudent to write to some monks who complained loudly of the condemnation of Origenism (Mansi, *Concil.* ix. 509); and Posthumianus, a Gallic churchman, and a friend of Sulpicius Severus, who happened to be visiting Alexandria, was scandalised by the "cruel precedent" which had been set when a chief pastor invoked the secular arm against monks. "The bishop of Alexandria," said he, "welcomed me very kindly, treated me better than I had expected, and tried to keep me with him. But I could not bring myself to stay, ubi recens fraternae cladis fervebat invidia" (Sulp. Sev. *Dial.* i. 7). The countryman of St. Martin could not breathe freely in an atmosphere of persecution; and the archbishop must have felt his departure as a rebuke.

The persecuted "Brothers" had found a temporary refuge in Palestine. Accompanied or followed by many other fugitives (Palladius tells us, *Dial.* p. 160, that Theophilus drove away two eminent monks named Isaac, and one named Hierax, who had been 25 years in Nitria), they settled for a while at Scythopolis, the representative of Bethshan, on the slope of Mount Gilboa. Its palm-trees were serviceable for their familiar craft of basket-making. They had time to review their position. It was sufficiently unhopeful; for although they had been cast out as heretics without apparently any proof that they were less than loyal to Nicene orthodoxy, that they Platonized on the nature of the soul or the work of redemption, that they were ultra-allegorists or universalists, yet they had against them their own "pope," with his iron will and his tenacious enmity; the bishop of Rome, who would take his

word about their guilt; Jerome, the most powerful of monks, the most vehement of controversialists; Epiphanius, whose learning would with many minds outweigh his impetuous bigotry. Even Paul, the exiled Egyptian bishop, held sternly aloof from men suspected of Origenism (Jerome, *c. Ruf.* iii. 18). Rufinus, who on his visit to Nitria had been met with water-vessels, led to the church with psalms, even welcomed in cell after cell with emulous hospitality (*Hist. Laus.* 69), was not, indeed, under any church ban, but was ecclesiastically in a position of great disadvantage; and some bishops of Palestine who had shown them countenance were peremptorily warned by Theophilus not to repeat an offence which on the score of ignorance he was graciously content to excuse (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 58). Thus hunted from place to place, the Nitrians took the only course left open to them. They determined to seek redress at Constantinople. And here it is that the current of the Origenistic controversy flows suddenly and strongly, and with momentous consequences, into the stream of Chrysostom's episcopate. For towards the close of 401, some fifty elderly men asked admission to his presence, and fell at his feet as suppliants (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 58; Socrates and Sozomen reckon Isidore the Hospitaller among the number. He died in 403, aged 85, Tillemont, xi. 478). The tender-hearted bishop was moved to tears, and asked who had accused them. "Sit down, father," they answered, "and provide some remedy for the harm that pope Theophilus has done us. If out of regard to him you will not act, we shall be obliged to apply to the emperor. But we beg you to induce Theophilus to let us live in our own country; for we have not offended against him or against the law of our Saviour." Chrysostom promised to do his best. "Meanwhile," he said, "until I have written to my brother Theophilus, keep silence about your affairs." He assigned them a lodging in the precincts of the church of Anastasia; pious ladies contributed to their support; and the bishop conferred with some Alexandrian clerics who had been sent to the court about some other business, and who admitted that the Nitrians had been harshly treated. "If you think fit, my lord, do not admit them to communion, lest you annoy the pope, but shew them kindness in other ways." Chrysostom therefore allowed them to attend the service, but not to communicate while they were under their own bishop's ban (Soc. vi. 9). He placed them, in short, in the position of *consistentes*. He wrote to Theophilus, "Oblige me as your son and brother" (alluding to his own consecration by Theophilus), "by being reconciled to these men." Theophilus, on hearing of their reception at Constantinople, sent thither the five monks already mentioned, with documents which had such an effect that the Brothers, on appearing within the palace gates, were pointed at as "magicians." With a certain inconsistency, they now sent many intercessors to Theophilus, and at the same time presented to Chrysostom a paper charging their "pope" with graver offences, as well as with tyranny. Chrysostom wrote to Theophilus that he regretted this step, but that the Nitrians would not take his advice and withdraw from the court. Theophilus, eager to pick a quarrel, construed this friendly letter as an attempt to dictate to the Alexandrian see. He replied in a tone of haughty bluster: "If you do not know the Nicene canons which forbid a bishop to judge cases that arise beyond his own bounds, be so good as to inform yourself, and keep clear of indictments against me. If I am to be tried, it shall be by Egyptian bishops, not by you who live at a distance of seventy-five days' journey." Chrysostom kept to himself this insulting letter, and tried to persuade the Nitrians and their accusers that it would be better for both sides to let the matter drop. Naturally this advice displeased both parties. The fugitives thought he was truckling, the five monks had no commission to make terms, and peace was farthest from the thoughts of Theophilus. He saw his way to a blow, not only at the Origenists, whom he had denounced in his paschal letter for 402 as complaining of his salutary discipline, as if it were a personal injury (Jerome, *Ep.* 98. 22) but at Chrysostom, whom, according to Palladius, he had disliked from the first, auguring from his look and bearing that he was one who would "speak boldly," for what he thought right. "For," proceeds Palladius, according to what seems the true reading of the passage, "Theophilus is clever at discerning from a man's outward appearance his inward purpose and mind" (*ἔστι γὰρ δεινὸς ἐκ τῆς φανερᾶς ὄψεως ἀφανὲς ἀνθρώπου βούλημα καὶ γνώμην συνιδεῖν*, *Dial.* p. 43). It was natural then that Theophilus, although he had co-operated with Chrysostom in reconciling the Westerns to Flavian, should wish to humble him both in his own person and as bishop of the rival see of Constantinople. Accordingly he wrote to the once despised Epiphanius, urging him to get Origenism condemned by a synod of his suffragans in Cyprus, to make the sentence widely known, to send trusty agents to Constantinople, and to warn the Isaurian and Pamphylian bishops against the intrigues of the heterodox Gregelius (Jer. *Epist.* 90). Epiphanius's complacency may be imagined. He "flattered himself that he had converted the patriarch" (Stephens, *Life of St. Chrysostom*, p. 299); he wrote to Jerome, describing Theophilus's proceedings in language taken from the defeat of Amalek at Rephidim, "Herein is fulfilled the text, 'Write this sign, for I will utterly blot out the heresy of Origen from the face of the earth'" (*Epist.* 91); and he obtained from a synod of his insular church a decree forbidding the faithful of Cyprus to read Origen's works (A.D. 402). Meantime the Brothers had laid before Arcadius their charges against Theophilus, and requested the empress Eudoxia to promote a formal hearing of the case, and even to cause Theophilus to be brought to Constantinople and be tried by its bishop. Arcadius ordered Theophilus to be summoned, examined the charges brought by the monks against the Nitrians, found them baseless, and pronounced the accusers to have incurred sentence of death. They begged for a reprieve until their "pope" could appear, and were committed to prison, where some of them died. So stood the affair at the beginning of 403. Epiphanius's ill-advised conduct during his visit to Constantinople in the spring of that year has been described elsewhere [CHRYSOSTOM]. Theophilus had presumed on his great place by delaying to obey the imperial citation. When at last he set forth, and when he passed through Lycia, he is said to have boasted that he was "going to the court to depose-

John" (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 72). It was not a mere brag; he knew his own diplomatic ability, and knew also that Chrysostom's unworldly strictness had alienated Eudoxia herself, and some people of rank, on the one hand, and not a few ecclesiastics on the other. The great name of the see of Athanasius would also go for much, and the watchword of "No Origenism" for yet more. On the whole, he felt that he could exchange the position of a defendant for that of a judge. Accompanied by some obsequious suffragans, and by his own nephew and successor Cyril, he arrived at Chalcedon. The local bishop Cyrenius, a hot-tempered Egyptian, was only too glad to make his church a muster-place for prelates who had any grievances against one whom he was pleased to describe as "that irreligious, that arrogant, that inflexible" bishop of Constantinople (Soc. vi. 15). Arrangements having thus been made, Theophilus landed at Constantinople at midday on a Thursday in the latter part of June, 403 (Pallad. p. 64). The sailors of the Egyptian corn-ships cheered their "pope," but not one of the clergy went to meet him or pay him the usual honour (Soc.). Chrysostom invited him to the episcopal residence (Chrys. *Epist.* i. to Innocent; Pallad. p. 12), but he ignored all friendly messages, would not enter the cathedral, and betook himself to lodgings without the city. The emperor now urged Chrysostom to sit as judge in the case; he refused, for he "knew" (so he says) "the laws of the fathers, and had a respect for the man." Theophilus had no such scruples. Palladius describes him as having arrived laden with the richest things of Egypt and India, like a beetle with dung" (p. 64), and as having used bribes, entertainments, promises, and other means of gaining support in Constantinople. After persuading two deacons, deposed by Chrysostom for crimes, to present charges at his suggestion against their bishop, and holding a rendezvous of malignant intriguers at the house of a widow named Eugraphia, who had come in for one of Chrysostom's sharp rebukes, he and his fellow conspirators, among whom was Acacius bishop of Berrhoea, determined to accuse Chrysostom before the emperor, and so to enforce his attendance before a synod of bishops, over which the archbishop of Alexandria would naturally preside. For the proceedings of the subsequent council of "the Oak," a suburb of Chalcedon, see above [CHRYSOSTOM]. After it had passed its sentence on "John" (see Soc. vi. 16; Tillemont, xi. 638), Theophilus was pleased to take up the almost forgotten question of the Nitrian exiles. Of the Brothers, Dioscorus (who had followed the rest to Constantinople, Tillemont, xi. 483) had recently died, with a high reputation for sanctity (Pallad. p. 159); Ammonius had been brought to the Oak, and was now dying there. The remaining Brothers were men of inferior mark. The bishops exhorted the Nitrians to ask their pope's forgiveness. Nothing was more usual than for Egyptian monks to say, "Pardon me" (see Soz. viii. 17); the phrase had become a formula, implying no consciousness of fault; it was thus the more readily uttered, and Theophilus restored the supplicants to the privilege of his communion. To do him justice, he shed tears on hearing of Ammonius's death, saying, "I have never known such a monk, although he has given us much annoyance." The announcement of the deposition of Chrysostom produced a great excitement in his favour. For two days it was practically impossible to remove the condemned prelate. On the third day he privately surrendered himself to the imperial officers, and was put on board ship for Bithynia. On the next day Theophilus returned to Constantinople, and boldly entered the cathedral with an armed following, in order to enforce the installation of a successor to "John." Chrysostom afterwards apostrophised him as to this invasion. "Thou bringest clubs into the church . . . Thou didst not reverence the place, wretched and unhappy man!" (*Serm. post red. ab exsil.* ii.) Theophilus found, in fact, that he had undertaken too much. The people were resolutely loyal to Chrysostom. A bitter invective by bishop Severian against John's "pride" provoked loud outcries against the preacher and against Theophilus, who thereupon ordered his satellites to clear the church. They used their sticks, and some blood was spilt on the floor of the baptistery, in anticipation of worse outrages on the Easter-eve of the next year. Forthwith arose a wild universal outcry, ringing through the streets, thundering at the palace-gates, "Give us back our bishop!" The emperor's own name was not spared (Soc. vi. 16); vehement lamentations were blended with the shouts of wrath (Soz. viii. 18); an earthquake took place at night, which was felt even in the imperial bedchamber (Pallad. p. 75), and Eudoxia, terror-struck, easily persuaded her husband to recall Chrysostom. After his return he induced Arcadius to issue citations for a new synod; whereupon, as he himself tells the story, in his first letter to pope Innocent, "Theophilus, as one self-convicted, and fearing exposure, put himself on board a vessel at midnight, and fled away with his followers" (*ib.* p. 16). It was high time, for, says Palladius drily, "the city was seeking to throw him into the sea" (*ib.* p. 75). Chrysostom heard that when he returned home, his own Alexandrians "wiped him down" (lit. washed him, πλύνας) "with many reproaches" (*ib.* p. 17). When summoned by the emperor to "return at once and give account of his late conduct, and not to think that" the mere forms of a council, observed with such contempt for the spirit of justice, "would be sufficient for his excuse, he staid at home, pleading that his departure would cause a sedition, as if some who clung to him were unseasonably zealous in his behalf" (*ib.* p. 16). Ere long the tide of court feeling turned again; Eudoxia, provoked by Chrysostom's denunciation of the honours paid to her statue, had recourse to his irreconcileable enemies, who urged Theophilus either to return personally or to suggest a method of opening a new campaign. "Theophilus," says Palladius, "would not come himself, for he knew how he had fled" (*ib.* p. 75). He had had enough of Constantinople. But he sent "three pitiable bishops, Paul, Poemen, and another newly ordained," putting into their hands a copy of the canons of the Dedication council of Antioch, the fourth of which enacted that "any bishop who should officiate after being deposed by a synod should never have a hope of synodical re-hearing." It was nothing to Theophilus that this decree had been used against the greatest of his own predecessors (Soc. ii. 8). The results need not be

described here. [CHRYSOSTOM.] Theophilus did not attack Chrysostom in his paschal letter for A.D. 404, but he returned to the subject of Origenism as an error which deceived "simple and shallow" minds. He concluded with some information as to seven Egyptian churches in which one bishop had been recently succeeded by another (Jerome, *Epist.* 100). He informed pope Innocent that he had deposed Chrysostom; and Innocent was much disposed to censure his "hasty arrogance" in not communicating the grounds of the condemnation (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 9). Innocent, on receiving a letter from Chrysostom, wrote to both parties, ignoring the sentence of "the Oak," and saying that a new and irreprehensible synod of Easterns and Westerns must take cognisance of the affair. A few days after he received from Alexandria and from Constantinople information as to the late proceedings, and then, as Palladius words it, "he continued to treat with contempt" (lit. to whistle down) "the madness of Theophilus in passing such a sentence on an absent man" (*ib.* p. 23). He accordingly wrote, "Brother Theophilus, we are in communion with you *and* with our brother John . . . Again we write, and shall do so whenever you write to us, that unless that mock trial is followed by a proper one, it will be impossible for us to withdraw from communion with John." He exhorted him to attend the expected synod, and to prove his case "by Nicene canons; for no other canon does the Roman church accept" (*ib.* p. 24; cp. Tillemont, xi. 230). But no synod in fact was held; the remonstrance of Honorius addressed to his brother Arcadius, and especially urging him to enforce the attendance of Theophilus, was in vain (*ib.* p. 29). Chrysostom was finally ejected on June 20, 404; on Nov. 18, Arcadius commanded all provincial governors to "put down the illegal meetings of those who dissented from the communion of Arsacius," who had been intruded into Chrysostom's place, "of Theophilus, and of Porphyrius," an unprincipled adventurer, who had procured the great see of Antioch (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. 4. 6; *Dial.* p. 26). Theophilus was doubtless no inactive spectator of the persecution of the "Joannites;" the bishops of his communion, says Palladius (*ib.* p. 200), urged the authorities to yet greater severity; and the "pope" must have been cognisant of the banishment of Demetrius and Palladius, two bishops who had visited the West in Chrysostom's cause, to one of the Oases and to Syene, and of the imprisonment of a deacon named Sophronius in the Thebaid (*ib.* p. 194, 196). He had already employed himself in writing what is called an invective against Chrysostom. Facundus of Hermiane thought himself obliged by his argument to give some specimens of this performance, in which Theophilus described "John" as a "persecutor . . . frantically tyrannous . . . a leader of sacrilegious men, sacrilegious in his own priestly ministrations, a man of hardened forehead . . . not only not a Christian, but far worse than Belshazzar. He was not what he seemed to be: his guilt transcended all possible penalties; in the world to come he would endure an eternal penalty; God would say, 'Judge ye between me and John; I waited for him to do justice, but he has done iniquity.' Christ Himself would command John to be cast into outer darkness. For he had dared to say in church that Christ had prayed and not been heard, because He did not pray well; so that Arians were delighted with his blasphemies against Christ" (*Pro Defens. Tr. Capit.* vi. 5, in Galland. *Bibl. Patr.* xi. 730. Photius gives this charge about Christ's prayer as the seventh of bishop Isaac's accusations at the Oak, *Bibl.* 59). Theophilus sent this tract to Jerome, asking him to translate it, and protesting that he *had* wished well to Chrysostom, and been unwilling to believe the charges laid against him (Jer. *Epist.* 113). Jerome must bear the discredit of having translated not only the letter but the tract (*Epist.* 114), which, however, except for Facundus's quotation, has met with the fate which it deserved (Vallarsi, Hieron. Vit. 251). We see too well from what source Cyril, while yet a young bishop, derived his comparison of Chrysostom to the great traitor (Cyril, *Epist.* p. 206). Tillemont says it was doubtless in this work that he vilified Chrysostom's friend, Olympias the deaconess, for having shewn kindness to the Nitrians (xi. 492). Time was, says Palladius, when he had "kissed her knees in hopes of money" (*Dial.* p. 151). Renaudot observes that in Severus's annals of the Alexandrian episcopate, there is not one word about Theophilus's enmity against Chrysostom (*Hist. Patr. Alex.* p. 107).

Very little remains to be said of his career. He seems to have written another work of great length against Origenism (Gennadius, *de Vir. Illustr.* 33), from which Cyril quotes in his treatise, *Ad Arcadiam et Marinam* (P. Pusey's *Cyril*, vii. 166), in support of the "Personal Union," and Theodoret in his second dialogue on the distinction between Christ's soul and the Word. In this work he affirmed that Origen had been condemned (not only by Demetrius, but) by Heraclas. Either in this work (as Tillemont thinks, xi. 497) or in another, he did his best to show that he had only seemed to agree with the Anthropomorphists, for "he showed," says Gennadius, that, according to the faith, God was incorporeal, "neque ullis omnino membrorum lineamentis compositum." In A.D. 410 he consecrated the eccentric philosopher and sportsman Synesius to the metropolitan see of Ptolemais [SYNESIUS], who thanked him warmly for his paschal letter of A.D. 411, and wished him a long and happy old age (Synes. *Epist.* 9). Theophilus can hardly have relished another letter in which Synesius asked for instructions as to Alexander, bishop of Basilinopolis, driven from his see in the cause of "John of blessed memory" (*Epist.* 66). A more important letter is that in which Synesius, after professing his readiness to "treat as a law whatever the throne of Alexandria, might ordain," asks the archbishop what should be done in regard to the people of Palaebisca and Hydrax, who were most reluctant to be placed, as Theophilus intended, under a bishop of their own, and asked leave to remain under Paul bishop of Erythrum, to which diocese in fact these "villages" had always belonged, save when Siderius was for a while their bishop. Theophilus had also asked him to reconcile the bishops of Erythra and Dardanis to each other (*Epist.* 67).

Theophilus died "of lethargy" on Oct. 15, A.D. 412 (Soc. vii. 7), after an episcopate of

twenty-seven years and nearly three months. We are told that in his last moments of consciousness he said, "Happy art thou, father Arsenius, because thou hast always kept this hour in mind!" (Cotelerius, *Eccl. Gr. Mon.* i. 465). There is little need to point the moral of his life. It is—the deterioration which too great power can produce in one whose zeal in the cause of religion, although in itself genuine and active, is not combined with single ness of heart. Among the sayings of his which were traditionally preserved is a solemn passage on the awfulness of the particular judgment following upon death, beginning, "What fear and trouble and anguish we have to see when the soul is parted from the body!" Another is a good practical explanation of "redeeming the time," given in reply to a question of "the Mother Theodora." The oppressor of the Brothers, the enemy of Chrysostom, tells her that if an occasion for insolence presents itself, she is to make spiritual gain of it by showing "humility and forbearance." (*Ib.* i. 463-5.) His extant paschal letters and other fragments show him to have been an accurate theologian; and Gregory of Nyssa once asked him to refute the Apollinarians' contention that their Catholic opponents divided Christ into two Sons (*in Apollin.* tom. iii. p. 262). This shows, says Tillemont, that Theophilus's theological knowledge was celebrated in the church. But, he proceeds with characteristic sternness, "woe to him . . . in whom the knowledge which puffs up is stronger than the charity which edifieth."

All his extant remains are collected in Gallandius, *Bibl. Patrum*, vol. vii. p. 603 ff. His "canons" are also in Beveridge, *Pand. Can.* ii. 170. The sense of these canons is given in Johnson's *Vade mecum*, ii. 255. One of them prescribes the mode of ordination: the candidates are to be selected by the clergy, examined by the bishop, and ordained publicly, with the express assent of the clergy, and after the bishop has asked whether the laity also can testify to them. In another, Theophilus shows that he understood the eighth Nicene canon as requiring ex-Novatians to be ordained *de novo*. Clerics who had communicated with Arian bishops while in possession of sees are to be punished if they acted voluntarily, but not if they acted in obedience to their own bishop; if, however, all the people reject them, others must be ordained (a remarkable testimony to the rights of the laity in regard to the appointment of their pastors). Theophilus directs that a church be appointed by the consentient voice of the bishop and clergy, and that "no one shall make a property (ἰδιοποιείσθω) of what belongs to the church." The remainder of the consecrated elements is to be distributed to the clergy and the faithful. When the vigil-fast of Epiphany falls on a Sunday, it would be well to break the fast on a few dates, in honour of the Lord's day, but to eat no more until after the 3 p.m. service. Bishop Agatho had asked for directions as to one Maximus, who professed that his unlawful marriage had been contracted in ignorance of church law, that his conscience was "disturbed" by it, and that he and the woman were resolved to separate. Theophilus answers, in effect, "If you think they are sincere, let them rank with catechumens. If you think otherwise, use greater severity, always in conformity with established rule. You are on the spot, and can judge of their intentions better than I." Bishop Menas is told that if a certain statement be correct, the presbyter of a village has done right in excluding from communion a woman named Cyradion, who had injured another person and was not willing to make amends; but "since I have ascertained that she wishes to set right the wrong, and so to communicate," she is to be admitted on giving proof of repentance and religious motives. A short letter to a bishop named Ammonius exhibits Theophilus in a pleasing light. He thanks Ammonius for having so often gladdened him by written memoirs of holy men (Galland. xi. 647). Various fragments of his writings are collected by Gallandius, two of which, read at the council of Ephesus (Mansi, iv. 1188), affirm the reality of Christ's human body. Another contradicts the Origenistic notion of souls being imprisoned in bodies by way of punishment for previous sin. [W. B.]

THEOPHILUS (10), a monk, a member of the same community with Stagirius, who reported to Chrysostom the symptoms of the latter, when supposed to be suffering from demoniacal possession (Chrysost. *ad Stagir. de Div. Provid.* lib. 1, p. 139, tom. iv. ed. Paris, 1636). [E. V.]

THEOPHILUS (11), a presbyter of Constantinople, sharply rebuked by Chrysostom, together with his brother presbyter Sallustius, for neglect of their ministerial duties in time of persecution (Chrys. *Ep.* 212). [SALLUSTIUS (3).] Chrysostom had written to him twice previously. Neither of the letters give us a high idea of Theophilus. In the former, written while still on his way to Cucusus, Chrysostom complains of having had to write to him first, and expresses his disappointment at not having heard from him. Now that he has opened the door he begs that he will send a perfect snowstorm of letters, and not allow the tyranny of despair to crush him (*Ep.* 119). This remonstrance elicited a letter, which it is evident, from Chrysostom's reply (*Ep.* 115), was a lagging one, and not the first he had sent. He was in great distress, and entreated the bishop to get him assistance from his rich and powerful friends. Those to whom Chrysostom had first commended him had proved deaf to his requests. He hopes he will make a second and more urgent application. Chrysostom replies that he has not failed to mention his necessities to many of those to whom he has lately written, and has specially named him to Theodore, the kind-hearted officer of the pretorian guard, who had commanded the troop by which he had been escorted to his place of exile. Should these efforts prove ineffectual, he will try some other shorter way of relieving Theophilus from his pecuniary difficulties (*Ep.* 115). The next letter written to him by Chrysostom was the one of severe reproof which has been already mentioned (*Ep.* 212). Lukewarm as Theophilus had proved himself, he had to pay for his connexion with Chrysostom's cause by banishment to Paphlagonia. (Pallad. p. 196.) [E. V.]

THEOPHILUS (12), a count, through whose instrumentality Chrysostom hoped to

receive Syncletica's remedies from Olympias. (Chrys. *Ep.* 4.) [E. V.]

THEOPHILUS (13), a Christian who discussed Christianity with Simon, a Jew, in a treatise published by a Gallic writer named Evagrius [EVAGRIUS (14)] in the 5th century. The title of this work as given by Gennadius, *de Vir. Illust.* c. 51, is *Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani.* This work lay hid till the close of the 17th century, when Zacagni the Vatican Librarian noticed it in 1698 in his *Collectan. Monument.* pp. 51, 53, 324. It was first published by Martene in his *Thesaurus Nov. Anecdot.* t. v. Paris, 1717, and has been republished by Galland in t. ix. of his collection; by Migne, in t. xx. c. 1165, of the *Patrol. Lat.*, and last of all by Gebhardt and Harnack in their *Texte u. Untersuch. zur Geschichte der Altchrist. Literatur*, Bd. i. Hft. 3, Leipzig, 1883, together with exhaustive notes and dissertations. To this last edition we shall return. We now offer a brief analysis of the work as having an important bearing on the controversy waged during patristic times between the church and Judaism. The reader who wishes for a fuller account may consult Ceill. viii. 424. The disputants discuss various arguments against the deity of Christ drawn from the O. T. while Theophilus defends his views from the same source, making a very liberal use of the mystical method of exposition. The Jew begins by objecting that Christ cannot be God because in Deuteronomy it is said "There is no other God beside me," and Isaiah says, "I am the first and the last, and beside me there is no God." Theophilus then explains the Catholic view, whence Simon concludes that his opponent maintains two Gods. Theophilus then defends his position from the conduct of Abraham towards the angel whom he worshipped at the oak of Mamre and from the Psalms. He quotes Isaiah vii. 14, "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel." To which Simon replied that the virgin was the daughter of Jerusalem, whom Isaiah in his message to Hezekiah represents as despising Shalmanezer, king of Assyria, while the angel who smote the Assyrians is the fulfilment of the prophecy contained in the name Emanuel, since he was for them indeed "Nobiscum Deus." Theophilus retorts that the virgin daughter of Jerusalem had brought forth no son, and did neither eat butter nor honey, and had taken no spoils of Samaria as predicted by Isaiah; all of which prophecies by means of mystical allusions he applies to our Lord. Thus butter is the unction of the Holy Ghost, and honey is the sweetness of his doctrine, while the spoils of Samaria are the gifts presented by the Magi to Christ when an infant, and the idols which Samaria and Damascus abandoned through his teaching. The difficulties of the Incarnation are then discussed, and Christ's descent from David maintained by Theophilus, who shows that conception by a virgin was no more difficult to God than bringing water out of a rock. The question of circumcision is then raised. God ordered it to Abraham, Christ submitted to it, and yet Christians reject it. Theophilus defends himself as St. Paul did, explaining circumcision in a spiritual light as applying to the heart and inner man. Simon then raises the favourite difficulty of the Jews from the second century downwards, drawn from Deut. xxi. 23, "He that is hanged is accursed of God" [ARISTO PELLAEUS], which introduces the subject of Christ's passion, where Theophilus alleges at length the 22nd Psalm as describing all the circumstances of our Lord's sufferings. The discussion terminates by the conversion of Simon, who is baptized by Theophilus. Harnack (*l. c.*) has bestowed a learned monograph on this subject, wherein he prints the text, offers an analysis thereof, explains the character and composition of the Altercatio, and discusses the Jewish controversy as it was maintained by the Fathers. He then devotes fifty pages to a statement of the relation between the Altercatio and Tertullian's *Tract. adv. Jud.*, Cyprian's *Testimonia*, Lactantius's *Institutiones* and Justin's *Dialogus cum Tryphone*. He then skilfully makes use of the Altercatio to determine the nature and contents of the similar second century work, "Altercatio Jasonis et Papisci," which he considers to have been the groundwork used in the composition of the fifth century document. His two strongest points in favour of this view will be found on p. 121, where he points out that the passage from Deuteronomy xxi. already cited, and a discussion about the meaning of Genesis i. 1, finds a place in both; cf. Hieron. *Comm. ad Galat.* c. iii. and *Quaest. Hebr. in lib. Genes.*; Harnack appends an excursus, pp. 130–134, on the interpretation of Gen. i. 1 among the Fathers. [G. T. S.]

THEOPHILUS (14), ADANENSIS, ST., was the oeconomus or bursar of the church at Adana near Tarsus, in Cilicia Secunda, about the middle of the sixth century. According to the biography by Eutychianus of Adana [EUTYCHIANUS (12)], translated by Paulus Diaconus, Theophilus strenuously refused to be made bishop, and was removed from his office of treasurer by the new bishop. He subsequently lapsed for a time into heresy, but repented and was forgiven. Cave, however, questions the authenticity of this biography. (*Acta Sanctorum*, Febr. iv.; Cave, *Hist. Liter.* i. p. 184.) [I. G. S.]

THEOPHRASTUS (1), the bearer of a letter from Basil to Melitius in 371 (Basil, *Ep.* 57 [56]); probably the deacon who was prevented by death from carrying a letter to Eustathius in 372 (*Ep.* 95 [261]). [E. V.]

THEOPHRASTUS (2). [AENEAS.]

THEOPHRONIUS, bishop of Tyana. He drew up the creed adopted at the Dedication Synod of Antioch in A.D. 341. The creed is found in Athanasius *de Synodis*, c. 24, and in Hefele's *Councils*, t. ii. p. 79, Clark's ed., cf. Ceill. iii. 466. [G. T. S.]

THEOPHYLACTUS (1) SIMOCATTA (Θεοφύλακτος σοφιστὴς ᾧ ἐπώνυμον Σιμοκάτης, Suidas), a writer to whom we owe a very minute account of the wars of the emperor Maurice, A.D. 582–602. He was an Egyptian by birth and related to Peter, who was Viceroy of Egypt at the death of Maurice. He wrote several works of which no complete edition has ever been published. His extant compositions are three: (1) *Quaestiones Physicae.*

This treatise is interesting as showing the state of natural science in his age. (2) His Letters, divided into three classes,—Epistolae Morales, Rusticae and Amatoriae. Labbe (*de Scriptt. Eccles.* t. ii. p. 416) is doubtful about a fragment against unruly conduct on saints' days ascribed to Theophylact, which possibly may be his. (3) His history, variously known as his Oecumenical History, or Historiae Mauricii Tiberii Imperatoris. A copious analysis of this history is furnished by Photius (Cod. lxv.), which was the only printed notice of it till the full work was published by Jac. Pontanus in 1604 from a MS. in the library of Maximilian of Bavaria. This history is very important for Byzantine history at a very critical period, just before the rise of Mahomet, when the struggles with the Turks and Slavs began to lay the foundations of the modern Eastern question. Photius praises the style of it, and it is remarkable among the Byzantine historians for its frequent notice and appreciation of natural beauty. The main subjects of the history are two—the war with the Persians on the Mesopotamian frontier, and that with the barbarians, including the Avars, Huns, Slavs, in Europe, upon which the reader may consult the articles on CHOSROES and MAURICIUS (2) in this Dictionary and in the *Dict. of Classical Biography*, together with Gibbon's forty-sixth chapter, where copious use is made of Theophylact. From the point of Church history his historical writings are interesting, because they give a vivid picture of the rites, superstitions, and ideas of the close of the sixth century. It shows, for instance, that the emperor Maurice in many points was superior to his spiritual teachers. Thus in lib. i. cap. 11 we have the story of a sorcerer named Paulinus, who came by his fate in the following manner. He had a silver dish, which he used in his magical incantations to receive the blood of his sacrificial victims. Magic seems to have been then on the decline, so he sold the dish to a silversmith, who exposed it for sale. The bishop of Heraclea was just then in Constantinople. He brought it home and substituted it for a brazen dish, in which he used to collect a miraculous discharge which proceeded from the relics of the local martyr, St. Glyceria. The martyr, however, resented the contact of witchcraft, and the wondrous pinguent immediately ceased to flow. The church of Heraclea thereupon fasted and prayed till the bishop received a revelation intimating the cause of the martyr's displeasure. The bishop at once removed the obnoxious dish and resorted to the patriarch of Constantinople, who soon discovered the offending Paulinus, brought him before the emperor, and pressed for his capital punishment. The emperor suggested that instruction, rather than punishment, was what the man required. The patriarch, however, referred him to Heb. vi. 4–8, the last words of which passage, "whose end is to be burned," seemed decisive as to the fate of such transgressors, whereupon the unfortunate man was condemned to be strangled. Many similar points of interest may be noted in this history, *e.g.* the frequent use of a miraculous image (ἀχειροποίητος) of our Lord, lib. ii., 3 and lib. iii. 1; the conversion of Chosroes, v. 15, and of a woman of noble birth among the Magi of Babylon, named Golinducha, her escape, pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and life at Nisibis, lib. v. 12; the continued existence of the Marcionists, viii. 9; the church in honour of St. Paul at Tarsus, viii. 13; the incredulity of the emperor about the liquefaction of the blood of St. Euphemia, viii. 14; his overthrow and murder by Phocas, and the miraculous announcement of it by his statues at Alexandria the very night it happened, viii. 13. Theophylact's history is frequently interrupted with moral reflections, and at times by speculations. Thus lib. vii. cap. 17 is entirely taken up with an account of the various opinions held by philosophers and geographers as to the origin and rise of the Nile. He gives the palm to the theory of Agatharchides or Agatharcus of Cnidus (see Fab. *Bib. Graec.* s. v.), which approaches most closely to that of modern science. For the bibliography of our subject, see THEOPHYLACTUS (1) in the *Dict. of Classical Biography*, and Fabricius, *Bib. Graec.* ed. Harles, t. vii. p. 585, where a copious list of authors quoted by Theophylact will also be found. The History of Theophylact is contained in the Bonn series of Byzantine historians, but the most complete and pleasant edition for use is that by C. H. Fabrottus in Labbe's *Corpus Hist. Byzant.*, Paris, 1648. It is to it Fabricius refers in his *Bibliotheca.* It contains notes, glossary, and copious index. His minor works have been several times printed, the Letters first by Aldus in 1499, and the Questions and Letters together at Leyden in 1596. [G. T. S.]

THEOPHYLACTUS (2), patriarch of Antioch. According to Theophanes (*Chronograph.* 353), after the death of Stephen IV. Marvam the Arabian chief, A.D. 744, gave permission to the Christians of Antioch to elect as their bishop Theophylact, a presbyter of Edessa, who was conspicuous for his excellent spiritual gifts and great temperance, and issued letters authorizing his being honourably received by the Arabians. According to the same authority (p. 358), Theophylact died in A.D. 750. Eutychius (ii. 399) names him Prophylact, and extends his episcopate to eighteen years. [E. V.]

THEOPHYLACTUS (3), bishop of Tudertum or Todi (Ughelli, *Ital. Sac.* i. 1351; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese de Italia*, v. 219, 242). He was sent by pope Hadrian I. on a mission to Britain A.D. 786, in company with GEORGIUS (33), bishop of Ostia (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 443, 445), and in 794 with Stephanus, bishop of Orta, to the council of Frankfort, as mentioned by various minor French annalists, by Eginhard, by Ado, and in the *Chronicles* St. Denys, Fulda, and Metz (Bouquet, v. 22, 49, 157, 211, 244, 320, 330, 347). [C. H.]

THEOPONITAE, a name given by Praedestinatus to heretics of whom he had read in Augustine (*Haer.* 73), who taught that our Lord's divinity suffered pain on the cross. Augustine had drawn his information from Philaster (*Haer.* 92); but neither of these authorities gives a name to the heresy. See THEOPASCHITES. [G. S.]

THEOSEBAS, a deacon of the Thirian (? Tyrian) church, ordained priest by bishop

John of Jerusalem. Jerome takes this ordination as a justification of the ordination of his brother Paulinian by Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis. He describes Theosebas as an eloquent man, and believes John to have ordained him in order to employ him to speak against himself and his friends (Jerome, *Cont. Joan. Hieros.* 41). [W. H. F.]

THEOSEBEIA, the wife of Gregory Nyssen. (GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, Vol. II. p. 762, b.) [E. V.]

THEOSTHENES, a Christian to whom Macarius Magnes dedicated his writings. (Pitra, *Solesm. Spicil.* i. 309; Macarii Magnet. *Opp.* ed. Blondel, Paris, 1876.) [G. T. S.]

THEOTECNUS (1), bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, succeeded Domnus, c. 260 (Gams). He was a disciple of Origen, who is much praised in a letter addressed to him by Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 14; Phot. *Cod.* 232, c. 11, p. 904). Eusebius, who was a contemporary of his, relates a story of his encouraging Marinus, a soldier distinguished for his military honours, to martyrdom at Caesarea, c. 263 (*u. s.* 15). Theotecnus ordained Anastolius, afterwards bishop of the Syrian Laodicea, as his coadjutor bishop, designing him to be his successor (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32). He attended the synod held at Antioch on the heresy of Paul of Samosata in 264, and also the later one in 269 (Labbe, i. 843, 893). He was succeeded by Agapius, c. 303. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 543; Clark's *Fasti Roman.* vol. ii., Appendix No. 96.) [E. V.]

THEOTECNUS (2), an apostate from Christianity and governor of Cilicia, under whom THEODOTUS and the SEVEN VIRGINS OF ANCYRA suffered. (*Passio S. Theodoti.* in Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 355.) He distinguished himself under Maximin as a virulent persecutor at Antioch, where he was curator of the city. (Euseb. *H. E.* ix. 2; cf. Mason's *Diocletian Persecution*, pp. 235, 314, 317, 321, 355.) To him is ascribed the forged *Acta Pilati*, circulated by Maximin's order. (Euseb. *H. E.* ix. 5, cf. i. 9.) He was put to death by command of Licinius. (Euseb. ix. 11.) [G. T. S.]

THEOTECNUS (3), a deacon, not a native of Cappadocia, the chaplain of a martyry, where, though exceedingly poor, he hospitably entertained wayfarers. Gregory remonstrates with the civil authorities for subjecting him to taxation (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 197). [E. V.]

THEOTECNUS (4), a layman recently baptized, whose wife and daughters had received some grievous insult which had also in some way affected Gregory Nazianzen, for which Theotecnus was proposing to bring the offenders to capital punishment. Gregory writes to mitigate his anger, setting forgiveness before him as a duty belonging to the faith he had recently embraced. (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 198.) [E. V.]

THEOTIMUS (1), a Valentinian teacher, concerning whom our knowledge is limited to what can be gathered from Tertullian's words, "Multum circa imagines legis Theotimus operatus est" (*Adv. Val.* 4). [G. S.]

THEOTIMUS (2), bishop and metropolitan of Tomi, the capital of Scythia Minor in Lower Moesia. Theotimus was by birth a Goth, but was educated in Greece, where he adopted the name by which he is known to us. He was deservedly celebrated for his piety and the uprightness of his life. He had adopted strict asceticism, not eating at any regular hours, but only when he felt hungry, and then of the plainest fare. At the same time he kept a liberal table, at which it was his habit to welcome members of the savage Gothic and Hunnish tribes who visited Tomis as the great central market of the province, endeavouring by his hospitality, gifts, and courteous treatment to soften their ferocity and to prepare their hearts for the reception of the truths of the Gospel. In some instances the seed was sown in a good soil, and the Hunnish strangers returned to their distant homes converts themselves and eager to make converts of their fellow-barbarians. Theotimus is with much probability identified by Baronius (*sub ann.* 402) with the successful missionary to the Huns mentioned by St. Jerome. He was regarded by the Huns with superstitious reverence, and was styled by them "the God of the Romans." Supernatural powers were ascribed to him. By his prayers he and his party were preserved from falling into the hands of barbarians; the arm of a savage who was attempting to make him prisoner by a lasso was arrested in the air; cures were wrought by his intercessions. The long hair of a philosopher flowed over his episcopal attire. Theotimus was both a frequent and much revered visitor at Constantinople. He was one of the twenty-two prelates assembled there in the spring of A.D. 400 before whom the charges against Antoninus bishop of Ephesus were brought (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 126). Three years later, A.D. 403, Theotimus was again at Constantinople during the unhappy visit of Epiphanius of Salamis, and resolutely refused to affix his signature to the decree of the council of Cyprus condemning the teaching of Origen, boldly denouncing the indecency of an attempt to cast insult on a justly honoured name, and to call in question the decisions of the wise and good men who had gone before them. He supported his refusal by publicly reading some powerful and beautiful passages from a volume of Origen which he had brought with him, remarking that those who treated such words with contumely because they were Origen's were in danger of shewing contumely to the great subjects on which these words were written. Theotimus was himself an author of some note. Jerome ascribes to him, among other works, some concise and pithy treatises couched in the form of dialogues, "in morem dialogorum veterisque eloquentiae breves commaticosque tractus." Some fragments of his are to be found in John Damascene's *Parallel. Sacr.* (vol. ii. pp. 640, 675, 694, 785, Le Quien's ed.). The archimandrite Carosus at the council of Chalcedon vaunted that he had been baptized by Theotimus, and had been charged by him to keep the Nicene faith inviolate (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 530). His name is found in the Roman martyrologies on April 20. (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 12; Soz. *H. E.* vii. 26, viii. 14; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xi. 190; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1217; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 288.) [E. V.]

THERAPEUTAE. [PHILO.]

THERAPIUS. (African) bishop of Bulla in Prov. Proc. (not of the more famous Bulla Regia in Numidia, Morcelli and Routh iii. 144), according to later MSS. reputed a confessor. Two other bishops of this see are known. He was censured by sixty-seven bishops, A.D. 253, for too hasty restoration of the lapsed presbyters. The words "satis fuit objurgare Therapium collegam nostrum . . . et instruxisse" may seem to imply that he received the reproof in person and in his place. His is the 61st suffrage in Conc. Carth. vii. sub Cyp. *de Bap.* iii., and is not wise. [E. W. B.]

THERASIUS, a governor of Cappadocia, highly praised by Basil. He appears to have been removed from his office after a very short tenure of it, in consequence of calumnious charges brought by some corrupt persons to whom his high-minded and stainless administration had given umbrage. He may probably be identified with the governor in whose behalf Basil wrote to Sophronius, the prefect of Constantinople, in 372, begging him to befriend him with the emperor, and to show the groundlessness of the charges against him. (Basil, *Epp.* 96, [332] 77, [226]). [E. V.]

THERMUTHIS, supposed name of Pharaoh's daughter, who brought up Moses (Epiph. *Haer.* lxxviii. 24). [G. S.]

THESPESIUS, a professor of rhetoric at Caesarea, in Palestine, under whom Gregory Nazianzen studied, at the same time with Euzoius, subsequently the Arian bishop of that city. (Hieron. *de Virr. Illust.* c. 113.) [E. V.]

THEUCARIUS, reader and choir-master at Carthage, who apostatized to the Arians in the persecution of Hunneric. His endeavour to bring over to them twelve of the children who had the best voices among those who had been under his instructions, their unavailing struggles to share the lot of the senior confessors, and their constancy afterwards, are related by Victor Vitensis. (*Persec. Vandal.* lib. v. cap. 10.) [C. H.]

THEUDECHILDIS. [THEODECHILDIS.]

THIUDIS, Gothic king, was originally armour-bearer to Theoderic the Ostrogoth, who appointed him regent in Spain and Septimania during the minority of his grandson Amalaric. There he married a native lady of great wealth, by means of which he raised a private force of 2000 men, and though nominally regent was really king. After Amalaric's death in A.D. 531 he openly assumed the title of king, and reigned till A.D. 548, when he was assassinated. The only ground for asserting that he had a hand in Amalaric's death is the story that he forbade his own murderer to be executed, as he had only received what he deserved for killing his own master. In 542 the Franks under CHILDEBERT and CLOTAIRE invaded Spain, took Pampeluna, besieged Saragossa and ravaged the neighbouring country, but on their retreat, laden with booty, they were attacked in the passes of the Pyrenees by Thiudigisclus, and great numbers of them slain. Thiudis had evaded the request for an alliance made by Gelimer, having learnt the capture of Carthage by the Romans before the arrival of the Vandal ambassadors, and though in A.D. 539 his nephew Ildibad was made king by the Ostrogoths in Italy, in hopes that they might receive aid from his uncle, their expectations were disappointed. He, however, c. A.D. 544, invaded Africa and took Ceuta, which was retaken by the Byzantines. A second expedition was disastrous. The Imperialists took advantage of the Goths keeping Sunday to attack them by sea and land, and the whole army was destroyed. Thiudis, though an Arian, did not molest the Catholics. He allowed their bishops to hold synods freely, and in fact the first council of Barcelona (c. A.D. 540) and those of Lerida and Valencia in A.D. 546 fall within his reign. (Isidorus, *de Reg. Goth.;* Procopius, *B. V.* i. 24; *B. G.* i. 12, ii. 30; Greg. Tur. iii. 29, 30; Jordanes, *Get.* 58; Victor Tun. *Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxviii. 955; Dahn, *die Könige der Germanen*, v. 118; Gams, *Kirchen. von Sp.* ii. (1), 487.) [F. D.]

THNETOPSYCHITAE, heretics mentioned by John of Damascus in his book on heresies, as teaching that the soul perishes with the body (Ceill. xii. 69; Johan. Damasc. t. i. p. 108; *Opp.;* ed. Migne, *Pat. Graec.* xciv. 758). [G. T. S.]

THOMAS THE APOSTLE, APOCRYPHAL ACTS OF. [ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, APOCRYPHAL.]

THOMAS (1), disciple of Manes, to whom he is said to have entrusted the region of Syria as his field of operations. Petrus Siculus, *Hist. Manich.* c. 16, Migne's *Patr. Graec.* t. civ. col. 12.., accuses him of forging the apocryphal Gospel of Thomas, but Origen mentions it long before his time. (Flügel's *Mani*, pp. 12, 15, 174.) [G. T. S.]

THOMAS (2), bishop of unknown see, who had been deprived like HELIAS and Nicostratus in the time of Anastasius, and was still excluded from communion. Besides the letters of Hormisdas mentioned under HELIAS, dealing with the cases of all three, in the following letters Thomas and Nicostratus only are referred to. (*Epp.* 53–56, 63, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 461–463, 469.) [F. D.]

THOMAS (3), bishop of Amid. Joshua the Stylite, writing probably about A.D. 507 (*Chron.* 83), followed by Dionysius (*Chron.* s. a. 505, ap. Assem. t. ii. p. 280, n. 3), relates that while Amid was besieged by the Persians under Cabades, the bishop John having died shortly before, some of the clergy of the city went to Antioch and requested the patriarch Flavian II. to give them a bishop. At their instance he chose and consecrated Nonnus [NONNUS (5)], "when he [*or* they] escaped from captivity" (that is, apparently, when the city had been recovered from the Persians, 505). Entering on his see, Nonnus sent one Thomas (described by Joshua as his chorepiscopus, by Dionysius as his archdeacon) to Constantinople, to recall certain Amidenes who had fled thither, and to solicit the charity of the emperor Anastasius for the city. Thomas, however, used the opportunity for his own ends, and by the support of these

refugees induced Anastasius to compel Flavian to consecrate him and thrust out Nonnus. In the *History* of Zacharias, however, the nomination of Thomas is ascribed to "the advice of Donatus" [so Assem., but this name does not appear in Land's text], and nothing is said of Nonnus, or of intrigue on the part of Thomas (bk. vii. chs. 5, 6 [Land]; chs. 10, 11 [Mai.]). Anastasius, as well as the patriarch, made Thomas the channel of large bounties for the relief of the Amidenes who had suffered in the siege; and not only so, but (according to Zacharias) when urged by his military advisers to fortify one of the border towns of Mesopotamia against the Persians, he wrote to ask counsel of Thomas and by his opinion was led to decide on Dara, for which town (being church property) he paid a considerable sum to the bishop. To him also he entrusted, not merely the money for the fortifications but the supervision of the work (506). Of the clergy whom Thomas employed to look after it, he consecrated one Eutychianus first bishop of Dara. Thomas was a Monophysite, and is accordingly praised by John of Asia (Dionys. *Chron.* ap. Assem. ii. 50), for his virtues and spiritual attainments; but Assemani (*ib.* n. 1) comments, perhaps rather too sharply, on the inconsistency of this eulogium with Dionysius's record of the means whereby he obtained his elevation. From Dionysius also we learn the circumstances of his end. In view of the dangers that threatened the Monophysite communion after the accession of Justin, he prayed that he might not live to see the evil coming on his church. His prayer was heard, he died next day (519), and Nonnus was reinstated.

For Joshua's *Chronicle*, see Wright's ed. and Assem. i. 280; ii. 50, n. 1. For that of Zacharias, Land's *Anecdd. Syr.* iii.; Mai, *Scriptt. Vett. Nova Coll.* x. p. 332; Assem. ii. 58. [J. Gw.]

THOMAS (4), bishop of Jabruda in Phoenicia Secunda, c. 518, a Monophysite driven from his see by Justin, in 518, on account of his heretical tenets (Dionys. *Chronicon*; Asseman. *de Monophys.*; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 845). [E. V.]

THOMAS (5), bishop of Damascus, a Monophysite, appointed by Sergius as successor to Peter, and expelled from his see by Justin in 518 on account of his heresy (Asseman. *Dissert. de Monophys.*; *Bibl. Orient.* ii. 327). According to Barhebraeus (*Chron.* i. 198), he lived a life of strict asceticism for 25 years, abstaining entirely from bread and wine. [E. V.]

THOMAS (6), second bishop of Dara, "son of Abdias of Ras'ain, a Roman," expelled as a Severian by Justinian, died after seventeen years of exile, 540 (Zach. *Hist.*, *ut supr.*). He is one of those mentioned as the leaders of the Monophysite party by Gregory Barhebraeus (*Chron. Eccl.* i. 45; ed. Abbeloos and Lamy, t. i. col. 213); also by Dionys. *Chron.* (ap. Assem. ii. 327). [J. Gw.]

THOMAS (7), bishop of Germanicia (otherwise Mar'as) in Euphratensis, expelled as a Monophysite under Justin in 520; was one of the six Severian bishops summoned by Justinian in 533 to Constantinople to confer with the orthodox bishops. A report of this conference is extant [PHILOXENUS (4); INNOCENTIUS (17)]; and a "Defence before Justinian," preserved in Br. Mus. Add. 14532, signed by this Thomas, and three others of the six, and by THOMAS of DARA (6), probably belongs to the same occasion. A few remains of his writings are to be found in Nitrian MSS. (Wright, *Catal.* pp. 935, 964, 1006: see also p. 691), and a letter from Severus to him (*ib.* p. 730; see also p. 567). He died in exile at Samosata (Dionys. *Chron.* ap. Assem. ii. pp. 89, 92). Gregory Barh. (*ut supr.*) makes his death prior to the consecration of Jacob Baradaeus (circ. 541; see Vol. III. p. 330). [J. Gw.]

THOMAS (8) EDESSENUS, appears in the narrative of the life of Mar Abas. The latter, originally Magian by religion, was converted to Christianity, learnt Syriac at Nisibis, and Greek at Edessa from Thomas a Jacobite, whom he afterwards took with him to Alexandria and there with his help translated the Scriptures [*or*, the books] from Greek into Syriac (Gregory Barhebr. *Chr. Eccl.* ii. 22, t. iii. col. 189). Amrus (ap. Assem. iii. 75) gives a similar history of their relations; but the only translation he ascribes to them is of the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia. He farther relates how they went to Constantinople, and finding their lives in peril in consequence of their refusal to "anathematize the Three Fathers" [see Vol. III. p. 547] fled to Nisibis. There Mar Abas became a teacher, and an eloquent assailant of Zoroastrianism. Gregory says he was at one time taught by John Grammaticus, the Tritheite [see Vol. III. p. 426]; but on the other hand the facts alleged by Amrus lead us to conclude that he lapsed early into Nestorianism. It is certain he was elected Catholicus of the Chaldeans in 536. He was persecuted by the Magians; and Chosroes called on him either to return to his original faith, or to conform to Christian orthodoxy. Refusing to do either, he was exiled; and when he ventured to return to his see without the king's permission, was cast into prison, and died there, 552. Among his disciples Amrus (Assem. ii. 411) reckons "Thomas of Edessa," no doubt his former teacher drawn by him from the opposing sect into Nestorianism. Of their joint work, the version of Theodore's Liturgy survives (Br. Mus. 7181 Rich., R.-F. *Catal.* p. 59 — see also Rénaudot, *Liturg. Or.* t. i. p. 616); and the liturgy of Nestorius (*ib.* p. 626) still in use in the Nestorian churches, is probably their version mentioned by Ebedjesu (*Catal.*, Assem. iii. 36), who also says they translated the Old Testament (*ib.* 75), and adds a list of the writings of Mar Abas. [J. Gw.]

THOMAS (9) APAMEENSIS, bishop of Apamea, the metropolis of Syria Secunda, was one of the bishops sent to invite pope Vigilius to the second council of Constantinople, and himself attended that council. Two contemporary historians, Procopius and Evagrius (the latter of whom praises Thomas as a "man most mighty in word and in deed"), represent him as displaying much tact and courage in the face of a great peril that threatened his city. In the year 540, Chosroes at the head of his Persians, after burning Antioch, was reported to be

marching on Apamea. The panic-stricken people giving themselves up for lost, flocked to their bishop, and entreated him to comfort and strengthen them to meet their fate by displaying an object of singular sanctity, a piece of the true cross, a cubit in length, which was treasured in their church, in a casket richly decorated with gold and gems, and usually shown to the faithful but once a year. Thomas, in compliance with their desire, fixed a day for the exhibition of this relic, to which, by his invitation, the people of the neighbouring towns, as well as the Apameans, eagerly repaired: among the rest the parents of Evagrius, bringing with them their son, the future historian, who gives a vivid picture of the crowds pressing to see, and begging to be allowed to kiss the sacred wood. The bishop (as both narrators relate) took it out of the casket, lifted it up with both hands, and holding it on high, proceeded round the church, according to usage. "A flame of fire shining, but not consuming," accompanied the relic around and above, and moved as he moved, lighting up the roof overhead. This was repeated several times. The people greeted with joy this visible token of divine protection, and were uplifted with confident hopes of deliverance. When Chosroes approached, the bishop went out to meet him, and in reply to his questions assured him that no resistance was contemplated by the citizens, on whose behalf he engaged that the king with a limited guard should be admitted within the gates. Chosroes accordingly leaving his army in camp outside, entered the city with 200 men. In violation of a compact he had recently entered into with the emperor (to receive 5000 pounds of gold paid down and 500 annually, and to make no further demands), he exacted from the bishop more than 10,000 pounds of silver, and all the gold and silver ornaments in the treasury of the church. Thomas, after surrendering the rest, produced last of all the casket that enshrined the cross, opened it, and shewing its contents to the king, said—"This alone is left; take the gold and gems, I grudge them not; only leave us the precious wood of salvation." The king, whether in reverence for its sanctity, or in contempt of its little intrinsic worth, granted his petition. The bishop succeeded in conciliating the good will of Chosroes by assiduously courting his favour. It would not be fair to judge hardly of the character of a man by his conduct under circumstances of so great responsibility and peril, as those in which we find Thomas placed. But it is impossible not to observe that he shows in this history politic suppleness and tact in exercising influence through pious fraud, rather than the higher virtues of a prelate and a patriot.

However, though he carried his complaisance so far as to attend Chosroes even to the hippodrome as spectator with him (*συνθεάσασθαι*) of the horse-races, yet when the King proposed in return to show him his capital, asking him—"Are you disposed to come and visit me in my own city?" (*εἴπερ ἤθελεν αὐτὸν ἀνὰ τὴν οἰκείαν θεάσασθαι πόλιν*) there was spirit as well as humour in the bishop's answer to the invitation. "I do not at all like seeing you here in *my* own city," (*ὡς οὐχ ἥδιστα τὸν Χοσρόη ὁρῴη κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν πόλιν*) and Chosroes had the good sense to be pleased with the blunt truthfulness of the rejoinder. The visit, however, which he thus declined, was many years afterwards compulsorily paid by him or (more probably) one of his successors, when in the time of Justin II. (573) Apamea was taken by Chosroes, and the bishop and prefect carried captive into Persia (Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 25; Procopius, *De B.P.* II. xi.; Le Quien, *O. C.* t. ii. p. 914). [J. Gw.]

THOMAS (10), former bishop of Calaris and founder of a hospice there. (Gregorius, *Epp.* iv. 15, xiv. 2.) [F. D.]

THOMAS (11). Adeodatus, a citizen of Pisaurum (Pesaro) had bequeathed his property to his son and another minor, and appointed Thomas their guardian, and directed that if both the minors died under age Thomas should distribute it among the poor. The contingency happened, and Gregory the Great directed CASTORIUS (8) to see that Thomas complied with the directions of the will. (*Epp.* v. 28.) [F. D.]

THOMAS (12) and Euphemius, clerics of the church of Corinth, had received holy orders from the ultimately deposed bishop Anastasius to induce them to withdraw from acting as prosecutors against him. Gregory the Great ordered them to be deprived of their orders and never re-ordained, but as an act of grace allowed them to retain their original position and stipends. (*Epp.* v. 52.) [F. D.]

THOMAS (13), slave of the Roman church, with Montana was manumitted by Gregory the Great, who at the same time appointed him one of his notaries and confirmed the bequest to him by the priest Gaudiosus of five-twelfths of his property, on condition that if Thomas left no children he was to have only a life interest in it, and that on his death it was to revert to the church. (*Epp.* vi. 12.) [F. D.]

THOMAS (14), defensor of the church of Salona, mentioned in a letter of Gregory the Great to MAXIMUS (18). (*Epp.* xiii. 11.) [F. D.]

THOMAS (15) I., patriarch of Constantinople, was consecrated on January 23, A.D. 607. He had previously been a deacon, and treasurer to the patriarch. He died on March 20, A.D. 610. (*Chron. Pasch.*, Theophanes.) [F. D.]

THOMAS (16) II., patriarch of Constantinople, succeeded PETRUS in A.D. 666, and died in A.D. 669, after an episcopate of two years and seven months. He had been deacon and keeper of the records there. (Theophanes; Nicephorus, *Chron.*, in Migne, *Patr. Graec.* c. 1047.) [F. D.]

THOMAS (17) HARKLENSIS is reckoned by Gregory Barhebraeus among the notable Jacobites of the time of the patriarch Athanasius I. of Antioch (A.D. 595–631; see above, p. 266). He was "of the monastery of Tar'il; had been trained from boyhood at Kennesrin in the Greek tongue; and became bishop of Mabug. When expelled by Domitian of Melitene, he departed to Egypt and dwelt in the Enaton [see above, p. 267, n. *] of Alexandria, . . . and corrected (ܐܬܪܨܗ) very accurately the Gospel and the

other books of the New Testament after the former version made by the care of Philoxenus at Mabug." (*Chron. Eccl.* i. 49; t. i. *col.* 267, Abbeloos and Lamy.) And in another place (*ib.* ii. 22; t. iii. col. 89) Gregory repeats this account of this revision and adds its date, A. Gr. 927 [A.D. 616]. Again, in his account of the Syriac versions of the Bible in the *Prooemium* to his *Horreum Mysteriorum*, he places the result of the labours of Thomas in the same category with the Philoxenian and the Peshitto, designating it as a third version, which "was *rendered* (ܐܬܦܫܩ) by the hand of Thomas of Harkel." In like manner, an anonymous Syriac writer (ap. Assem., *B. O.*, ii. p. 90) couples it with the Philoxenian version, using the same verb (ܦܫܩ) to describe the work of both translators. The latter author however, in his account of Thomas, while extolling his episcopal virtues, styles him bishop of Germanicia, not of Mabug as stated by Gregory. This may perhaps be set down as a mistake in the part of the writer in question, who certainly confused Thomas of Harkel with the THOMAS OF GERMANICIA [see above (7)] of the preceding century; for he proceeds to say that this Thomas died at Samosata, which city we know to have been the place of the death of the earlier Thomas. But if so, we must suppose the same mistake as to the see to have crept into some liturgic MSS. which contain an Anaphora of Thomas of Harkel, whom they designate bishop of Germanicia. This city (otherwise Mar'as), situated on the confines of Syria, Cilicia, and Cappadocia, was a see of the province of Euphratensis, of which Mabug was metropolis. It is possible that Thomas may have held the suffragan see along with the metropolitan; an arrangement which Jacobite usage sanctioned, while it forbade translation from see to see. Harkel, whence he derives his designation, no doubt his birthplace, was probably not (as this anonymous author supposed) in Palestine, but is to be identified with the Heraclea named by Ptolemy (V. 15) as a city of Cyrrhestice, which district was included in Euphratensis, afterwards his province. The account of his exile above cited from Barhebraeus implies that it took place not later than A.D. 602, for in that year Domitian of Melitene died (see above, Vol. I., p. 875). Of his life for fourteen years after that date we have no account; but that in 616 he was, as the same Barhebraeus states, at "the Enaton of Alexandria in the monastery of the Antonians," engaged in revising the Philoxenian New Testament, is confirmed by a subscription, apparently composed by himself, which is appended to several of the extant MSS. of his version, one of them (Cod. Vat. 268, formerly Assem. xi.) being probably as early as the eighth century. Above (pp. 266, 267) it has been shewn that in the same year, and within the same abode, namely (according to the subscription), the monastery of the Antonians, Athanasius I. of Antioch was sojourning in Alexandria, whither he had repaired with five of his bishops; and that under his auspices the cognate work of translating the Old Testament from the LXX. was being carried on by PAUL OF TELLA and his fellow-workers. The subscription attached to Paul's version of 1 Kings, whence we learn these facts, proceeds to mention as the chief among those who assisted him in his task, one Thomas, whom it describes as the patriarch's "minister [or deacon, ܡܫܡܫܢܐ] and Syncellus." It is natural to conjecture that this was Thomas of Harkel. He may probably have returned to his see after Domitian's death, and again visited Alexandria as one of the bishops who accompanied their patriarch thither. Dr. Ceriani objects to this identification, on the ground that the Thomas of this subscription is represented not as bishop but as filling a subordinate office. But it may be that in his long exile from his see, Thomas of Harkel had suffered his episcopal style to fall into disuse; and in the position of these Syrian prelates, fugitives as they were in Alexandria, it seems quite intelligible that Thomas should have undertaken the duties of Syncellus to the patriarch, an office involving specially confidential relations and close association; and this agrees well with the circumstance that they had, as it appears, passed their earlier life together, both having been monks of Kennesrin. Moreover, if Thomas is the writer of the subscription to 1 Kings—which seems likely, inasmuch as it closely resembles those attached to his own New Testament translations—the omission of the episcopal title from the mention of his own name may be naturally accounted for as fully in accordance with Syrian usages of humility.

Of his latter days nothing is really known; for the statement of the unknown author above cited, that he was banished to Samosata and died there, has been shown to be in all probability a mistake, arising from confusion of two distinct persons; and would (if we were obliged to receive it as true) be hard to reconcile with what is known with certainty of his life and work at Alexandria in 616.

Whether he ever afterwards returned to his diocese, is unknown. He can hardly have remained long in Alexandria, seeing that it was sacked by the Persians, with every circumstance of devastation and massacre, in 620, and was utterly laid waste twenty-three years later by the Saracens. But his translation did not perish in the ruins of the city where it was made, but was conveyed safely, whether by himself or by some of his companions, to the East; where it soon made its way into repute and even into ecclesiastical use. Of the numerous existing MSS. which contain part of it, the earliest is that of the Gospels in the Mediceo-Laurentian Library of Florence, which is shown by its colophon to have been transcribed in 757—before the version was a century and a-half old. Another, in the Vatican Library (268, above mentioned), also of the Gospels, is not much less ancient, and exhibits the critical apparatus (presently to be described) which is characteristic of this version but is not found in the Florence MS. Other copies of the Gospels, in the British Museum Library and elsewhere, range from the 9th or 10th century downwards; and one of these (Brit. Mus., Add. 14474), containing part of the Catholic Epistles, is of 9th century. Many of these MSS., including the two above-mentioned as the most ancient, are marked *prima manu* with the lessons for the Sundays and holydays of the Christian year. Several MS. Lectionaries have also been preserved, of considerable age, some of which consist of

lessons from the Harklensian version only (see Rosen-Forshall, *Catal.*, p. 42; Wright, pp. 159, 167; Zotenberg, p. 16), others of Peshito and Harklensian lessons mingled to all appearance arbitrarily (Rosen-Forshall, pp. 32, 37, 45; Wright, p. 154; Payne Smith, col. 138; Zotenberg, p. 21). Gregory Barhebraeus (d. 1281), whose account of this version has been given above, frequently cites it in his works. More than a century before him it was used by Dionysius Barsalibaeus (d. 1171), who refers to it in his *Commentaries* on the New Testament. In fact it was through the works of this author that the existence of the Harklensian version first became known to European scholars.

Pococke, while engaged in preparing his edition, published in 1630, of the Four Minor Catholic Epistles which are not in the Peshitto, (see p. 432) observed that in the *Commentary* of Barsalibaeus on these Epistles, (which he had before him in a MS., now Bodl. Or. 560) passages of their text were cited from a version akin to, yet distinct from, that given in the MS. whence he derived the text which he has edited. These passages he has printed and inserted in the notes appended to his edition, distinguishing them as S. A. (= *Syrus Alter*). In his preface he called attention to the peculiarity of the diction of these fragments, especially to its characteristic feature, the substitution in lieu of suffixes to represent the possessive pronouns, of separate words formed by means of the syllable ܕܝܠ; and he cited a sentence from Dionysius's preface to the Catholic Epistles in which that author states the Four Epistles in question were known to him "only in the version of *Thomas of Harkel*." [a]

Pococke had also in his hands a copy of the Gospels in this version (no doubt that which is now Bod. Or. 361), the text of which he proposed to publish; an intention which, however, he never carried out. Other copies of the Gospels seem to have been acquired about the same time, or soon after, by various European libraries. When Montfaucon visited Florence in 1700, he found in the Mediceo-Laurentian Library the MS. already referred to, and communicated a description of it to Lelong, which was printed by the latter in his *Biblioth. Sacra* (1709). Another is recorded in the *Catalogus Bibliothecae Regiae*, Paris, 1729 (Syr., no. 23), as having been brought from Nicosia in Cyprus by Vansleb, probably on his return from his visit to Egypt in 1672 (see also Zotenberg, *Catal.*, 54, p. 20). From Egypt likewise, from the Syrian monastery of the Deipara at Scete in the Nitrian valley, the Assemani, in 1707 and 1717, obtained the above-mentioned MS., Vat. 268, and with it another, Vat. 271 (formerly Assem. xiv.). But with the possible exception of a Lectionary (Vat. 35), which Assemani describes as containing Harklensian lessons from the Epistles and Gospels, there seems to be no record of any MS. containing more than the Gospels in this version, until 1732, in which year the first (and till very lately the only) MS. known to Western scholars as containing also the Acts and Epistles, was sent from Diarbekr (formerly Amid) by Samuel Palmer to Mr. Gloucester Ridley. This copy is now in the Library of New College, Oxford (No. 333). In it, the Gospels are followed by the Acts and the seven Catholic Epistles, and finally by the fourteen Pauline, breaking off at Hebr. xi. 7. Owing to this mutilation, it is uncertain whether it ever contained the Apocalypse. The newly acquired Cambridge Harklensian MS. (Add. 1700) which is perfect, exhibits the entire New Testament, with the exception of that book. Ridley in 1761 published an account of his MS., and of another which he had obtained along with it (now New Coll. 334, Harklensian Gospels only), distinguishing them as Cod. Heracleensis and Cod. Barsalibaeus respectively. The former he regarded as the Philoxenian version edited by Thomas of Harkel, and the latter as a subsequent revision of the same by Dionysius Barsalibaeus. J. J. Wetstein was the first to make use of this version in the criticism of the New Testament. In 1746 he visited England and made a hasty examination of the Cod. Heracleensis, the results of which are embodied in the *apparatus criticus* of his edition of the Greek Testament, published in 1751–2. The full text of this MS., collated in the Gospels with Cod. Barsalibaeus and the Bodleian copy (Or. 361), was at last published, the Gospels in 1778 and the Acts and Epistles in 1803, by Dr. Joseph White, Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford, being the first and only edition of this version that has been printed. The Gospel of St. John has since been issued separately by Bernstein (1853); the text being taken from Cod. Vat. 271, which is of so recent date as 1471, but (alone of the known MSS. of this version) has the vowels and other points fully supplied.

The Harklensian New Testament, in general character, diction, and accessories, is closely akin to the Syro-Hexaplar version of the Old Testament above referred to as made at the same time and place and under the same auspices. This affinity appears in two principal characteristics. (1) In the former as in the latter we have a translation executed with a laborious fidelity which is not merely strict but servile. In its grammatical forms and even in the order of the words the translator strives to reproduce the original with an exactness which often violates the Syriac idiom; he even extends his Graecism so far as to represent the article (which is wanting in Syriac) by pressing personal pronouns into the service, as writers of debased Latin use *hic, haec, hoc;* he imitates Greek compounds by rude juxtapositions of Syriac words which the genius of the language forbids to coalesce; and frequently in cases of words of whose meaning he was doubtful, or for which no Syriac equivalent was forthcoming, he falls back on the clumsy makeshift of transliterating (sometimes even nouns with their case-endings) what he finds himself unable to translate. (2) Side-notes, including many various readings and sometimes exhibiting the words of the original in Greek, are inserted (in the same manner as that which Paul of Tella adopted in reproducing Origen's Tetraplar text of the LXX.), in considerable numbers in the margin; appearing in greater or less frequency in different MSS., while from some they are entirely absent; and words and sentences are occasionally marked, after Origen's fashion, with the asterisk or obelus. The meaning and use

[a] It appears therefore that Dionysius was unacquainted with the version which is known as Pococke's text, though, as has been shown, p. 432, that version was prior to the Harklensian.

of these signs, as applied to the Harklensian text, has been much questioned. Wetstein's guess—that they marked the passages when the new version, following the Greek, deviated from the Peshitto by addition or omission—was a natural and plausible one; but it proves on examination not to agree with the facts of the case. The analogy of the use of these signs in the sister version of the Old Testament, which reproduces that of the Tetraplar text of the LXX., suggests the explanation that, as Origen, operating on the LXX. text, noted with the asterisk or the obelus the words which were needful to be added to it or omitted from it to bring it into conformity with the original Hebrew, so Thomas, operating on the Philoxenian version, notes by the same signs the additions and omissions by which he seeks to bring that version into conformity with the Greek text which he derived from his Alexandrian Greek MSS. On an examination of instances, this explanation is found to hold good in many cases: but there are others in which it fails, so numerous that it requires to be helped out by the further supposition that Thomas, or subsequent editors of his text, sometimes used these signs with some other signification, or that copyists have occasionally misplaced them. There are, however, but few instances in which they are not worthy of notice, as evincing the translator's knowledge of a variation in the reading of his Greek original. The marginal notes, likewise, though sometimes trifling or even absurd,[b] usually throw some light on the text of the MSS. used by Thomas, or the text which underlay the original Philoxenian version. Some uncertainty, however, attaches to them, inasmuch as a few of them appear to bear marks of a later hand.[c]

The version itself, apart from the knowledge derivable from these appendages, is of no slight critical value. Its very faults as a translation, its rigid assimilation to the Greek beyond what the Syriac idiom properly admits of, its servility in labouring to represent the original word for word, and even in respect of the order of the words, and its barbarous adoption of Greek words wholesale and unmodified,—all these vastly enhance its importance as a witness to the underlying Greek text. If we had it as it came from the translator's hands, it would be practically equivalent to a transcript made by a learned Syrian, A.D. 616, from two or more of the best Greek MSS. he could find in Alexandria. Yet before we can safely use this version in the textual criticism of the Greek Testament, there are two points to be determined: (1) whether it has come down to us substantially as it issued from the hand of Thomas? and (2) whether it is to the text, or to the margin, that we are to look for the readings of the Greek MSS. used by him? To the former question (1) it appears that we may confidently reply, that the existing MSS. of this version, though varying not a little in details, exhibit a substantial agreement sufficient to make it possible to arrive at an approximately correct text; and that the marginalia (with the few exceptions above referred to) appear to form an *apparatus criticus* arranged by one and the same editor. But as to the latter question (2) opinions are divided; and it involves the larger question, Was the work of Thomas of Harkel a distinct version? or was it merely a recension of the Philoxenian, with its text superficially graecized, its variations from the best Greek text (by excess or defect) noted by obeli and asterisks, and alternative readings or renderings supplied in the margin? The latter was the view of Ridley and of White, derived by them from their interpretation of the subscription appended to the version; and it is perpetuated in the usage, still prevalent among biblical scholars, of applying the name "Philoxenian" to the version which is properly Harklensian. But the former view is at least as readily deducible from the language of the subscriptions, and is unmistakeably that of the best Syriac authority on the subject, Gregory Barhebraeus, who reckons three versions of the New Testament into Syriac, placing that of Thomas as one of the three, third in order but distinctly on equal terms with the prior Philoxenian and even the Peshitto. This view has been of late years maintained by several scholars, notably by Bernstein, and will be found on examination to approve itself as the only admissible one. It is evident that the version as we have it has been uniformly worked over, so as to bring it into rigid uniformity with the Greek, by modifying the language after a fashion unknown in the time of Philoxenus, and first introduced in the seventh century; and this very fact compels us to admit its claim to be received as a new version, in substance as well as in form, for it would not be possible that in subjecting the Philoxenian basis to such a process, Thomas could confine himself to graecizing its diction merely. In his endeavour to bring it as close as possible to the Greek text derived from his MSS., he could not avoid materially deviating, more or less frequently, from the version made by the earlier translator from a different Greek text. The remains of the Philoxenian version, as has been stated above in the article POLYCARP (p. 432), are too scanty and doubtful to enable us to determine its relation to the Harklensian by direct comparison, with one important exception. It has been shown in that article, that the Four Minor Catholic Epistles in the text above referred to as Pococke's, and usually printed in Syriac New Testaments, may be confidently accepted as a surviving portion of that earlier version, the rest of which has disappeared. In these Epistles then, and in them only, we can place the two versions side by side. When they are thus examined, their mutual relation comes out unmistakeably. It appears evident that, in diction, and likewise (though less completely) in substance, they are distinct versions, yet not independent of each other; and it appears no less evident that the Harklensian is based on the other version, and not *vice versâ*. Where they agree, as they very generally do, the Harklensian rendering is little more than the older one graecized. Where they differ, as they do to a not inconsiderable extent, they represent differing Greek texts. And it is a remarkable fact, that of the two the older version, for the most

[b] See e.g. that on Acts x. 1, which explains the name *Cornelius* as meaning *κόρην ἡλίου* !

[c] It is worth noticing that some copies of the Peshitto have been enriched by the scribes with Harklensian readings on their margin.

part, comes nearer to the text of the most ancient Greek uncials. In such cases, it is important to observe, the older rendering, displaced from the Harklensian text, very frequently appears in the margin, as, for example, the *εὑρεθήσεται* of 2 Pet. iii. 10. In fact, of the marginal readings in these Epistles, as exhibited by White's edition, there are but one or two which do not coincide with the readings of the version printed by Pococke. So likewise as to the critical marks. In the Harklensian text several asterisks but no obeli occur within the limits of these Epistles; and (what is noteworthy) in every case but one, the word to which the asterisk is attached is found (or implied) in the older text. This is contrary to what the analogy, above adduced, of the Tetraplar LXX. text would lead us to expect; and almost looks as if Thomas in using this sign regarded the Philoxenian version, not as a text which he was revising as Origen revised the LXX., but rather as one which he was using as ancillary to his work, as Origen used the version of Theodotion. It is needful here to repeat the caution above suggested, that as regards both these signs and the marginalia, confusion may have crept into our MSS., whether by accidental errors or by alterations intentionally introduced on the part of transcribers. Asterisks may have been substituted for obeli, and *vice versâ* (as has certainly happened in some MSS. of the Syro-Hexapla); and readings of the text and of the margin may have exchanged places, a thing which a comparison of two of the MSS. shows to have actually occurred sometimes in other parts of the New Testament; as, for example, in Luke xviii. 9, Cod. Harkl. reads for *τοὺς λοιποὺς* in the text ܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ and in the margin ܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪܢܐ, while Cod. Barsal. places the latter words in the text, and the former on the margin.[d] However this may be, it is clear that, as regards these four Epistles, the Harklensian version, apart from the apparatus of signs and notes attached to it, though not an independent version, is a distinct one, and by no means a mere recension of an earlier version. And there is no reason to suppose that the relation in which the rest of it stood to the lost portions of the Philoxenian was other or closer than we find it to be in this small portion in which alone both versions are forthcoming;—except so far as in the other parts the predominant influence of the Peshitto (the traces of which are largely apparent in the Harklensian generally) made itself felt in the two later versions, in keeping them more nearly together.

On the whole, it seems to be the fair conclusion to draw from these data, that Thomas did not always insert his new readings or renderings into the text, nor yet did he always confine them to the margin; that while arranging his version or revision he followed no rigidly mechanical rule, but exercised throughout a critical judgment in its construction: in cases of two alternative readings or renderings adopting into his text that which he preferred, and placing on the margin that which he accounted less probable, yet worth preserving; in cases where the question was of insertion or omission, marking with an asterisk words which seemed to him worthy to stand part of the text, and with an obelus words which he was disposed to reject. And accordingly we are to regard it as fully entitled to be ranked, as Gregory Barhebraeus ranked it, in the same category with the Peshitto and the Philoxenian, as the third Syriac version of the New Testament. Its claim to be esteemed as such is not barred by the fact of its dependence on its predecessor. So the Vulgate, though based on the Old Latin, and the English Authorized, though based on Cranmer's Bible, are each of them universally accounted distinct versions.

The version as we have it shows evident signs of the mode of its formation in the fact, that (as regards the Gospels at least) the text represents (on the whole) a Greek basis akin in the main to the Constantinopolitan or "Received" Greek text, while the margin inclines strongly to the Western Greek text, as represented by D and the Old Latin, and not seldom (though less decidedly) towards that of the other older uncials, mostly B and L, sometimes A, C, and others. A full analysis of the instances of agreements between the Harklensian margin and the readings of these authorities (in the Gospels) is given in Adler's work (pp. 130 ff.), where will also be found a discussion of the theory started by Wetstein, and controverted by Ridley, that D may actually have been one of the MSS. used by Thomas (who, it is to be borne in mind, is regarded by Adler as having inserted his alterations in the margin exclusively). There is, however, no lack of cases where readings agreeing with D or other of the Greek uncials above mentioned occur in the Harklensian text, while marginal readings attached agree with the "Received." So (in White's edition), Matt. xviii. 14, the *πατρός μου* of B stands in the text, and the "Received" *πατρὸς ὑμῶν* in the margin, while the reading of D, *ἡμῶν*, does not appear at all: Matt. xviii. 29 *πάντα* is omitted from the text with ℵ B C D, but inserted on the margin as in "Received"; Mark i. 11, *ἐν σοὶ* appears in the text as in ℵ B D L, for *ἐν ᾧ* of "Received," which is placed in the margin; John xii. 47, *φυλάξῃ* is in the text as in ℵ A B D L, while the margin has the *πιστεύσῃ* of the "Received"; John xvii. 23, the reading of D, *ἠγάπησα*, is in the text, but the margin gives the "Received" *ἠγάπησας*. It is here to be noted that these facts cannot be accounted for as due to the influence of the Peshitto; for of the five instances here cited, in two (the first and second) the Peshitto confirms the reading of the Harklensian margin, in the remaining three that of its text. It is remarkable that at Luke xx. 34, the Western insertion *γεννῶνται καὶ γεννῶσι*, now found in D only among the uncials, is given in the margin indeed, but with the note "This is in the former copy, but not in the Greek." Here the words "not in the Greek" directly

[d] Storr (holding the text to be Philoxenian mainly and the margin Harklensian) regards the former of these readings as the rendering of the original version, and the latter as Thomas's explanation of it by a more usual expression. But Thomas's aim was not to make the Philoxenian version more clear, but to make it more literal; and it is evident that the former reading is his, introduced as the exact equivalent of *τοὺς λοιποὺς*, and that the latter reading, which no doubt stood in the Philoxenian text, but which would more properly represent *τοὺς ἄλλους*, was therefore relegated by him to the margin.

prove that Thomas neither used D nor any MS. identical in text with it. The words "the former copy" cannot mean the Peshitto (as elsewhere), for the insertion is not found in it, even in copies that were written before Thomas was born, but may mean the recension known as the Curetonian, which here agrees with D; yet it seems more probably to denote the Philoxenian, which Thomas would naturally describe as "former," being the immediate antecedent of his own version. If this be so, it goes to prove that Thomas's text does not simply reproduce the Philoxenian. The same inference follows yet more distinctly in another way from his note, at Matt. xxviii. 5, which states that the word ܢܨܪܝܐ [Ναζωραῖος], which stands in his text with an asterisk, is "not found in three Greek copies, nor in the former [here no doubt the Peshitto] Syriac." In fact it is now found neither in any Greek authority, nor in the Peshitto (the Curetonian is wanting here) or any other version; and we must therefore conclude that he adopted it into his text from the Philoxenian, marking it as approved notwithstanding its lack of Greek authority,—a use of the asterisk which agrees with what is found (as above shown) in the Four Minor Epistles.[e] But, on the other hand, the insertion εἰρήνη ἐν οὐρανῷ, δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις in Mark xi. 10 is marked with the asterisk, but accompanied by the note "not found in all the Greek copies nor in that of Xenaias" [=PHILOXENUS]. It is not in the Peshitto, but a few Greek MSS. have it. With regard to more conspicuous instances, it may be here stated that the Harklensian, both text and margin, as well as the Peshitto, ignores (with D and A) the impossible interpolation of ℵ B C in Matt. xxvii. 49, and (with D and ℵ) the unhappy omission to which A and B give their authority, of Luke xxii. 43, 44; while it is found opposed to D as regards the equally grievous omissions of Luke xxii. 19, 20; xxiii. 34; xxiv. 51; in the first of which D stands alone among the uncials, while in the second it is supported by B alone, and in the third by ℵ alone. The disputed passage, Mark xvi. 9–20, the Harklensian gives without question (as do the Peshitto and Curetonian), but one copy (Ridley's) inserts on its margin the spurious conclusion found in L, preceded by the words "These also are added elsewhere." The case of John v. 4 is peculiar. The whole verse (which D omits with ℵ B C, but against A) appears in the Harklensian (as in the Peshitto, though not in the Curetonian), but with an asterisk attached to the former half of it, and an obelus to the latter. The last words of the preceding verse it inserts as D does (except παραλυτικῶν, which D interpolates) against A ℵ B C. And, finally, the Harklensian, like the Peshitto, has no trace of the *Pericope de Adultera* (John vii. 53–viii, 12) as will be shown presently, though D inserts it, against the earlier uncials.[f] The subject requires fuller investigation, and it is probably premature to lay down any conclusions with confidence until a critical text of the Harklensian version, based on a full examination of the principal MSS., shall have been arrived at. Meantime it may be fairly said that these examples taken from the Gospels tend, so far as they go, to support the result arrived at above in case of the Four Epistles; that Thomas's treatment of the original Philoxenian version was not uniform, but that in some parts that version is as frequently to be found on his margin as in his text, in some probably more so. The study of his version, therefore, fails to enable us to say, with confidence, "This was the reading of the MS. Polycarp used at Mabug in 508; that was the reading of one of Thomas's Alexandrian MSS. in 616;" except in some few instances, such as Mark xi. 10. Its critical value is, therefore, hardly so great as at first sight one is led to expect.

As regards the *Pericope de Adultera*, the statement above made, that it is absent from the Harklensian version, requires qualification. It appears in the text of St. John in the Cod. Barsalibaeus, but in no other copy. It is contained also in two Paris copies of the Harklensian, namely that mentioned above as Syr. 23 (54 of Zotenberg), and Syr. 12 (56 Zot.); in the former in the margin, in the latter at the end of the Gospel. A much older copy of it (the oldest known) is also found, written in a ninth-century hand as a fly-leaf of a very ancient MS. of the Peshitto Gospels in the British Museum (Add. 14470). This copy is prefaced by a note, relating that the passage "was found by the Abbat Mar Paul in one of the Alexandrian copies and translated by him into Syriac"; and the same note, somewhat abridged, is found in the Paris copies. In all probability the Paul here named is Paul of Tella, whose close association with Thomas in the work of Bible translation would naturally cause this passage to be appended to, though not usually incorporated with, the Harklensian text. Moreover, it is found in two Jacobite Lectionaries of Peshitto and Harklensian lessons intermixed, as a lesson for Thursday in Passion week,—Br. Mus. Rich. 7170, and Paris, Syr. 37 (59 Zot.). This translation of the Pericope was first made known in Europe by Archbishop Ussher, who in 1626 obtained from the East a transcript including it with the other portions of the New Testament not contained in the Peshitto (now B. 5, 15 in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin). From this copy it was printed by De Dieu in his *Animadvv. in Evangg.* in 1630, and thence passed into Walton's Polyglot, where it is interpolated into the Peshitto text, as in all subsequent editions of the Syriac New Testament. Another version is given in the "Jerusalem Lectionary," and a third, distinct from both, has been printed by Bernstein (*Zeitschr. der Deutsch. morgenl. Gesellsch.*, t. iii. p. 397) from a MS. in the Medicean Library, and is also found in another Paris MS. Syr. 31 (60 Zot.), subjoined to the Seven Catholic Epistles.

Whether the Syriac version of the Apocalypse, which also appears in the Syriac New Testament as ordinarily printed, is part of the work of Thomas, is uncertain. We are informed that he translated the New Testament, with the aid of Greek MSS., and we know that in his time, and for centuries before him, the Revelation was

[e] Matthew xxvii. 35, probably is a similar instance, but the asterisk is wanting from the MSS.

[f] In the Acts, however, where the interpolations of D and E (Cod. Laud.) are so numerous and eccentric, they are often, though by no means always, followed by Thomas, sometimes placing their readings in his text with an asterisk, sometimes on his margin.

included as an integral part of the Greek Testament. We know also that the fact of its omission from the Peshitto would not cause him to exclude it from his work; for he included, as we have seen, the Four Epistles which like the Apocalypse are wanting from the Peshitto. The presumption is therefore that the Apocalypse formed part of his version. But we find no direct statement to this effect in any Syriac authority; nor have we any positive evidence as to the authorship of the extant version, unless we are to accept the statement said to have been contained in a MS. (now missing[g]) of this Syriac Apocalypse, belonging to the Library of St. Mark, Florence, to the effect that Thomas was the translator. The scribe, Jacob of Hesron, who wrote this note in 1581, affirms that he transcribed it from his archetype, which he believed (of course mistakenly) to be the autograph of Thomas himself. (Montfaucon, ap. Lelong, *Biblioth. S.* t. i. p. 191.) With this exception, the external evidence, such as it is, inclines the other way. It is indeed impossible to say whether Ridley's Cod. Harkl. ever contained the Book in question, inasmuch as that MS. has lost its concluding leaves; but (as above stated) the Harklensian MS. recently added to the University Library of Cambridge (Add. 1700) is unmutilated, and exhibits all the Books except the Apocalypse. Moreover, in none of the very few existing copies of the Syriac version of the book does it occur in combination with any part of the Harklensian. It was first printed, by De Dieu in 1627, from a sixteenth-century MS. of Scaliger's, now in the University Library of Leyden (Cod. Scal. 18), from which edition, or from the nearly identical text of the Paris Polyglot (1635) all subsequent reprints have been derived: and this MS., like the lost Florence copy, which was of the same period, contains the Apocalypse alone. In the Nitrian collection of the British Museum (Add. 17127) there is a much older copy, written in 1088, accompanied by a commentary, but (like the other two) associated with no other portion of the New Testament. In Archbishop Ussher's MS. (T.C. D., B. 5. 16) above mentioned, it is subjoined (but was intended by the scribe to be prefixed, as the numbering of the quires shows) to the *Pericope de Adultera*, and the Four Minor Catholic Epistles, which in this copy are of the pre-Harklensian version. This combination is accounted for by the fact, that it is a transcript made by a Maronite scribe in 1625 for Ussher, who desired to obtain a copy in Syriac of the parts omitted from the Peshitto. And finally, in the only copy known to exist (excluding transcripts of very recent date) of the whole New Testament in Syriac—a MS. of considerable antiquity belonging to the Earl of Crawford[h]—the Apocalypse in this or a kindred version follows the Gospels and precedes the Acts and Epistles, all of which are of the Peshitto version, except of course the Four Minor Catholic Epistles which (as in Ussher's MS.) are of the pre-Harklensian version.[i] But when from the external evidence, which thus tends at least negatively against the supposition that Thomas translated this book, we turn to the internal evidence of the Syriac Apocalypse itself, we are led towards an opposite result. Its manner is distinctly Harklensian: it graecizes throughout, forcing the Syriac words into Greek order, misusing the third personal pronouns for the article, separating the possessive pronouns, and transliterating Greek nouns, case-endings and all. Further, its text bears two notes of Harklensian workmanship which do not appear in the printed editions. (1) The use of the *asterisk*. This was pointed out by Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, pp. 465, 466) on the ground of a single instance occurring at Rev. i. 2, in the now missing Florentine MS., from which Adler obtained a transcript of Rev. i. 1 and 2, and printed it in his work (p. 78), but failed, as it seems, to perceive the significance of the asterisk as connecting this Book with the work of Thomas. The writer of this article, in a recent examination of Scaliger's MS., has found that it is marked throughout with asterisks, in nearly forty places, none of them reproduced in De Dieu's otherwise accurate edition, most of which can be shown to refer to known variations, usually in respect of omissions or additions, in the Greek text. (2) The *Marginalia*. Ussher's MS. exhibits six of them, all occurring within the first nine chapters,—a limitation which suggests that many other such may have stood on the margin of the remaining chapters in the exemplar whence this copy is derived, but have been omitted by the remissness of the seventeenth-century transcriber. Of these six notes, two are explanations of the names of the first two churches addressed in ch. ii. (whence it may be presumed that the exemplar attached similar notes to the names of the remaining five); and two indicate various readings of the Greek: the former as well as the latter being strictly analogous to the marginalia of the admittedly Harklensian Books. It is further to be remarked that the asterisks and marginalia of this book not only are evidence that it belongs to the Harklensian version, but moreover, assuming that this *apparatus* is rightly explained as indicating the relations between the Harklensian and its basis, they go to prove that the Apocalypse was included also in the original Philoxenian [see above, p. 433], which possibly is the text of it given in Lord Crawford's MS., or Add. 17127, or both. The cumulative force of the facts adduced seems to add much to the arguments in favour of the view upheld in the last century by Ridley and Eichhorn, and more recently by Davidson (though controverted by Adler, Marsh, and Tregelles), that in this Syriac Apocalypse we have a genuine portion of the version of the New Testament made by Thomas. If not his work, it has been made by an early imitator who has studiously and with great success adopted his manner. The arguments advanced by Adler against ascribing it to Thomas (p. 78) merely come to this: that the Harklensian characteristics, as above specified, do not appear in it so constantly or markedly as in the books known to have come from the hand of Thomas. Even if this were so, it would not be a sufficient ground for Adler's conclusion, for no translator ever is, and Thomas certainly was not, uniform in maintaining the same style of rendering through

[g] See Bernstein, *De Harkl. N. T. Transl.* p. 8.

[h] The writer knows this MS. only through information kindly communicated by Rev. G. H. Gwilliam.

[i] This very peculiar order of the books of the New Testament is followed by Dionysius Barsalibaeus in his *Commentary*. See Payne Smith's *Catal.* (Bod. Or. 560).

a long work. But besides, Adler has overstated, or even misstated, the facts on which he rests his case. The adoption of Greek words into the Syriac text, which he affirms to be infrequent in the Apocalypse, is on the contrary conspicuously present throughout it. Of the deviation from the Harklensian manner of strict reproduction of the Greek which he alleges against it, he alleges but two examples (Rev. i. 8; i. 9); and both of these may be accounted for as representing well-attested variations in the Greek text; in the former case, the omission of ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, in the latter, the reading κοινωνὸς for συγκοινωνός. Again, the ludicrous blunder which disfigures the rendering of ἀετοῦ πετομένου ἐν μεσουρανήματι (viii. 13), "an eagle flying in the midst *which had a tail of blood*" (as if ἐν μέσῳ, οὐρὰν, αἵματι), is cited as a proof that this version is unworthy of Thomas: but gross as it is, it has parallels in the undoubted work of Thomas. See for example his rendering of παροψίς (Matt. xxiii. 25); and his explanation (above cited) of the name Κορνήλιος. The translation of the Apocalypse, like the translation of the other books known to be rendered by Thomas, has serious faults, but like them it is on the whole a valuable aid, both in the interpretation of the New Testament and in the criticism of its text.

Besides the works above cited, discussions of this version will be found in Wetstein's *Prolegomena in N. T.*; in Storr's *Observationes* and his memoirs in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, t. vii. pp. 1–77, and t. x. pp. 1–58; in Michaelis's *Introduction* and Marsh's *Notes* to same; in Dr. Scrivener's *Introduction* and in Dr. Tregelles's *Introduction* and his articles in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, t. iii. pp. 1635 ff. See also Dr. Ceriani, *Monumenta S. et P.*, t. i. sec. 1, *Prolegomena*, p. iii.; and the Abbé Martin, *Introd. à la Critique du N.T.*, 1883, pp. 135 ff. and 1885–6, pp. 228 ff. For the Syriac Apocalypse, see Prof. J. H. Hall's important study in the *American Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, p. 134, which it is much to be hoped he will complete. For it, and the versions of the *Pericope de Adultera*, and of the Four Epistles, see also a paper by the writer of this article, in the *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. xxvii. pp. 288 ff.

Thomas also translated into Syriac some Greek Liturgies (Assem. *B. O.* ii. p. 92).

The Anaphora above mentioned as composed by him, is in some MSS. ascribed to St. Thomas the Apostle! (Wright, *Catal.* pp. 207, 211; Zotenberg, p. 48.) Rénaudot has printed a Latin version of it in his *Liturg. Orient.* t. ii. p. 383; see also Assemani, *ut supr.* It is of alphabetical structure, and begins ܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܘܟܣܐ ܘܟܣܝܐ ["Eternal and mysterious Being"]. Like a few other Jacobite liturgies, it omits the recitation of Christ's words of institution, the Epiclesis being taken as sufficing for consecration. It may here be mentioned that Paul of Tella composed a *Sedra*, extant in a Paris MS. (Zotenberg, p. 48). This was a hymn peculiar to Eastern Liturgies, sung while the oblation was being brought to the altar.
[J. Gw.]

THOMAS (18 and 19), Jacobite bishop of Amid, consecrated A.D. 623 (Dionys. *Chron.* ap. Assem. ii. 90), and still living A.D. 644 (*ib.* 102). Assemani wrongly identifies him with a Thomas who died bishop of Amid in the year 713 (*ib.* 105), giving him a 90 years' episcopate! The latter Thomas attended a Jacobite synod in 706 (Assem. i. 468). [J. Gw.]

THOMAS (20), an abbat addressed by St. Maximus (33) in two letters concerning difficulties in Dionysius Areop. and in Gregr. Nazianz., one only of which remains in a Latin translation, appended to the works of Joan. Scot. Erigena, Oxford, 1681; cf. Migne, *Pat. Graec.* t. xc. 47. [G. T. S.]

THOMAS (21), the second bishop of the East Angles, who governed the undivided diocese, sitting at Dunwich. He succeeded bishop Felix, whose deacon he had been, about the year 647; but it is impossible, owing to the difficulties of the East Anglian chronology, to be certain about the date. Felix ruled for seventeen years, Thomas for five, and Berhtgils, or Boniface, who succeeded him, for seventeen. Bisi, the successor of Boniface, was consecrated by Theodore before the year 673, in which he was present at the council of Hertford. The appointment of Thomas may therefore have taken place as late as the year 650. Thomas was of the nation of the Gyrvii, or men of the fens, and is the second native Englishman promoted to an episcopal see. He was contemporary with Anna, king of the East Angles, 635–654, and no doubt did good work in the consolidation of the church and in the pious family of the king. Nothing, however, is known of his acts. His death must be fixed between 652 and 654 (see Bede, *H. E.* iii. 20; *Liber Eliens.* i. c. 6; Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 530, 617). [S.]

THOMAS (22), patriarch of Antioch, c. A.D. 686, is only found in the chronicle of Eutychius (tom. ii. p. 364), who assigns twenty years to his episcopate. He is omitted by Theophanes. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 743.)
[E. V.]

THOMAS (23), bishop of Neo-Caesarea, Paulician persecutor in the reign of Leo the Armenian. He was assassinated while executing his commission at Cynoschora in Armenia. (Phot. *c. Man.* i. 24; Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 41.)
[M. B. C.]

THOMIAN (THOMANUS, THOMENUS, THOMIENUS, TOIMEN, TOIMENE, TOMENE, TOMIANUS, TOMMENE, TOMMIAN, TOMYN), abbat and bishop of Armagh. In A.D. 623 he succeeded MacLaiore, and ruled for thirty-eight years, dying on Jan. 10, A.D. 661 (*Ann. Tig.*). The only known event of his episcopate is the sending a letter, now lost, to pope Severinus, and receiving an answer from his successor, John, while yet only pope elect, with others of the papal court. This famous paschal letter, addressed to Tomianus and four other bishops, five priests, and the Scottish doctors, is preserved in a fragmentary form by Bede (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. c. 19; Ussher, *Sylloge*, ep. ix. wks. iv. 427) and belongs to the autumn of A.D. 640. It is valuable as a document in the paschal controversy, and as a testimony against Pelagianism; yet by itself it is misleading, as the natural inference from it would be that the

Britons were Quartodecimans. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 53, collecting his information into a memoir; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* ii. 347, 409, iii. 34; Stubbs, *Reg.* 2.) [J. G.]

THORISMUND (1), king of the Visigoths, eldest son of THEODORIC I., was elected king on the battlefield of the Mauriac plains, where his father had been slain, and where he had distinguished himself greatly, by the Gothic army in A.D. 451. His desire to storm the camp of Attila to avenge his father was restrained by Aetius, who advised him to return to Toulouse and secure the throne against any attempt of his brothers. The only events recorded in his short reign are a victory over the Alans (Copenhagen Contin. Prosp.), magnified by Jordanes into a defeat of Attila himself, and a visit to Arles, known only by an allusion of Sidonius. (*Ep.* vii. 12.) In A.D. 453 a conspiracy was formed against him by his next brothers Theoderic and Frederic and he was murdered. The cause is obscure, his severity being sometimes assigned as the reason, and sometimes his hostility to the Romans. (Prosper and Idatius, *Chronica;* Isidorus, *de Reg. Goth.;* Jordanes, *Get.* 40–44; Dahn, *die Könige der Germanen*, v. 80.) [F. D.]

THRASAMUND (2) (TRASAMUND, TRASIMUND), king of the Vandals, succeeded his brother Gundamund Sept. 24, A.D. 496. Procopius praises him for his beauty, wisdom, and greatness of soul. Though he did not, like his uncle and grandfather, use actual violence against the Catholics, he endeavoured to convert them by honours and rewards and by pardoning criminals on condition of their embracing Arianism, while on the other hand he tried to extinguish Catholicism by forbidding any vacancies in sees to be filled up. The exact date of this edict is unknown, but it was probably soon after his accession, and the fact that Eugenius the bishop of Carthage, who had been recalled by Gundamund, died in exile in A.D. 505 [EUGENIUS (22)], proves that the king had early in his reign adopted measures of repression against the Catholics. The bishops who ventured, contrary to the edict, to consecrate to vacant sees, and the persons they consecrated, were punished by exile to Sardinia. Of these Fulgentius of Ruspe was the most illustrious. For an account of his exile, his recall to Carthage, his argument with the king (who seems to have had a taste for theological disputations), and his second exile, see FULGENTIUS, Vol. II. 578, 579. According to the *Life of S. Fulgentius* more than sixty bishops shared his exile. This number is raised by Victor Tunnuensis (in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxviii. 949) to 120, and by the author of the *Historia Miscella* to 220.

Thrasamund's foreign policy was one of peace. He was on good terms with the emperor Anastasius and king Theodoric, whose sister Amalafrida he had married as his second wife, receiving Lilybaeum in Sicily as her dowry. His friendly relations with Theodoric were for a moment interrupted by a report that he had assisted Gesalic [GESALIC], but his excuse was graciously accepted by the Gothic king (Cassiodorus, 95, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxix. 677–679). The only recorded disaster of his reign was the decisive defeat of an expedition against the Moors in Tripoli, of which Procopius (*B. V.* i. 8) gives a curious account. Under him the kingdom of the Vandals attained its greatest prosperity.

Thrasamund died on May 28th, A.D. 523. He was succeeded by his cousin Hilderic, whom he compelled before his death to swear that he would not restore to the Catholics their churches and privileges. (Ruinart, *de Pers. Vand.* c. 11, in *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 420–430; *Vita S. Fulgentii* in *Patr. Lat.* lxv. 133–146; Gibbon, c. 37.) [F. D.]

THRASEAS, Oct. 5, bishop of Eumenia and martyr at Smyrna. He is mentioned by two writers of the 2nd century, Apollonius, in his work against the Montanists, and Polycrates (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18, 24). [G. T. S.]

THREE CHAPTERS, THE (**Τρία κεφάλαια**, TRIA CAPITULA), the name of an edict issued by Justinian between A.D. 543 and 545, probably in the latter year. The edict has perished, three or four fragments alone having survived in the writings of Facundus, a North-African bishop, which are of primary importance for the history of the controversy. First, we may notice the title of the controversy, "The Three Chapters," because it has given occasion to much confusion. Hefele (*Concilien-geschichte*, ii. 777) has remarked that this title, "Three Chapters," quite changed its meaning and application in the course of the dispute, so that we must investigate in what sense the title is used by any special writer before we can pronounce upon which side he is to be ranged. "The Three Chapters," it may be explained, originally meant three great anathemas, pronounced by Justinian's edict upon the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas. This is the sense in which the name "Three Chapters" is used by Justinian himself in his second edict published in 551, styled **Ὁμολογία Πίστεως**. When the "Three Chapters" are spoken of, in this their original sense, Justinian's followers, the Monophysites and the Origenists were supporters of the "Three Chapters," while the orthodox party and the supporters of the council of Chalcedon condemned the "Three Chapters" as involving a condemnation of that council. But the term "Three Chapters" soon changed its meaning to a directly opposite one, and effected thereby a corresponding change in the position of the contending parties. "The Three Chapters" originally designated Justinian's anathemas, but soon was used to express the persons and writings anathematized. Thus in the decrees of the Fifth General Council, and in the letters of the popes, the name "Three Chapters" is used to express (1) the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia; (2) the writings of Theodoret in defence of Nestorius and against Cyril; (3) the letter of Ibas to Maris the Persian. In this sense of the word (which became the prevailing one) Justinian, the Monophysites, and the Fifth General Council, condemned the "Three Chapters," while the orthodox supported them. It is easy to see what confusion was introduced by this ambiguity; a man might be described as at the same time a friend or an enemy of the "Three Chapters," according to the contradictory senses in which that term

was used. And the worst of all is that there is no uniformity in the use of the word even by the emperor himself. In his 'Ομολογία he uses it to express his anathemas. In his edict read at the first session of the Fifth Council he uses it of the persons anathematized, cf. Mansi, *Concil.* ix. 181. With this necessary word of warning we proceed to indicate the leading points in the history of this controversy, whose results perpetuated themselves in a western schism, even till the eighth century. The "Three Chapters" controversy arose in the following way. Justinian was persecuting the Origenistic party, which was protected by THEODORUS ASCIDAS, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, a favourite of the emperor, while attacked by Mennas patriarch of Constantinople. Mennas was ordered by Justinian in 544 to convene a Σύνοδος 'Ενδημοῦσα wherein fifteen canons were enacted against Origen and his views (see Mansi, ix. 395 and Lambecius in *Comment. Bibl. August. Vindob.* viii. 435). Theodorus Ascidas now skilfully drew Justinian off on another scent. He knew that he was anxious, from political as well as theological reasons, to reconcile the Monophysites to the church. So he persuaded Justinian that this could be effected by a public condemnation, not only of Theodore of Mopsuestia who had been long in disrepute, but also of Theodoret's writings against Cyril, and the letter of Ibas to Maris, though the two latter had been pronounced orthodox by the council of Chalcedon. Justinian issued his edict accordingly, and sent it for signature by the bishops. The eastern prelates were obedient enough, but the westerns were not so compliant. To secure the submission of the latter, Justinian summoned pope Vigilius to Constantinople in 545, where he arrived after a prolonged journey Jan. 25, 547. In 548 the emperor prevailed on him to condemn the "Three Chapters" in a document called the "Judicatum." Vigilius soon retracted and refused to accept the emperor's second edict, promulgated probably in 551 against the obnoxious theologians (see Mansi, ix. 537–582). The emperor now summoned the Fifth General Council at Constantinople, A.D. 553, at which Vigilius not only refused to attend, but even defended the impugned writings of Theodoret and Ibas in a document called the "Constitutum." The story of papal and imperial vacillations and negociations becomes now a miserable one, and far too long for these pages. We may sum it up thus. In 554 Vigilius finally retracted his opposition, joined in the condemnation, and was permitted to return homewards. He died on the journey at Syracuse in 555. His conduct necessarily constitutes a very serious difficulty for the champions of papal infallibility. Vigilius was succeeded by the archdeacon of Rome, Pelagius I., who accepted the imperial decrees, and the Fifth Council, and condemned the "Three Chapters." In consequence of this he was treated as heretical by a great part of the west. But now we find an illustration of the growing greatness of the Roman see. Pelagius I. accepted the Fifth Council, and maintained the position taken up by Vigilius. This was at first viewed as heretical by the west, but yet in consequence of papal action and influence it became the orthodox view; while churches like that of Istria and Aquileia, which retained the old traditional position, were treated as heretical or at least schismatic. All the popes subsequent to Vigilius condemned the "Three Chapters;" in consequence of which the patriarch of Aquileia and his suffragans seceded from the papal communion and maintained a schismatic position which they did not surrender till the eighth century, when a union was effected by the synod of Aquileia A.D. 707. Bower in his *History of the Popes*, ii. 446–458, gives a long account of the progress of this schism, and the efforts to heal it made by pope Pelagius II., and by his deacon Gregory, afterwards pope Gregory the Great. The quarrel about the "Three Chapters" seems to have extended even to Ireland, if the heading of one of Gregory's encyclical letters is genuine (see Ussher's *Sylloge* in opp. ed. Elrington, t. iv. p. 399; GREGORIUS I. in this Dictionary, Vol. II. p. 784; and COLUMBANUS, Vol. I. p. 606). Columbanus, early in the seventh century, evidently sympathized with the North Italian opposition to the condemnation of the "Three Chapters." We have not entered into the details of this controversy, because it has been already discussed at great length under JUSTINIAN and FULGENTIUS (4). Further details will be found under the various names which occur in this article as Mennas, Theodorus Ascidas, Pelagius, Vigilius. Original authorities are Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 38; the works of Fulgentius Ferrandus, Facundus, the Breviarium of Liberatus, the Chronicle of Victor of Tunnunum, besides the documents contained in Mansi, t. ix. For the literature of the subject it will be sufficient to refer to Hefele's monograph on the Fifth Council in his *History* as already quoted. The first note on sec. 258 is exhaustive.

[G. T. S.]

THRUIDRED, abbat of Dacre (Dacore) in Cumberland, when Beda wrote the life of Cuthbert. He had been previously a priest in the same monastery, and was concerned in a miracle said to have been wrought at Dacre by some of Cuthbert's hair (Beda, iv. 32). His name occurs among the abbats in the *Liber Vitae* of Durham (p. 6). [J. R.]

THRYDWULF, abbat, in Beda's time, of the monastery in the wood of Elmete. Beda tells us that the stone altar was preserved there which had previously been in use in the church in the royal town of Campodonum, or Doncaster, before it was burnt after the death of Edwin on the neighbouring battle-field of Hatfield. The wood of Elmet was very extensive, and it is not easy to say where Thrydwulf's monastery was. Possibly it was at Sherburne, a very ancient ecclesiastical site, but Anglo-Saxon remains are common thereabout. (Bed. ii. 14.) [J. R.]

THUNDERING LEGION (LEGIO FULMINATRIX). The story of the Thundering Legion is as follows. During the war against the Quadi, about A.D. 174, Marcus Aurelius and his army were surprised at Carnuntum, near Presburg, by a large force of the enemy. They were at the same time suffering from a terrific drought, which threatened them with speedy destruction. The emperor at first prayed to the gods, but finding no response summoned a Christian Legion among his soldiers to his aid.

They threw themselves on the ground, and prayed to God to relieve their necessities, as they had not drunk anything for five days. As soon as they had prayed, rain forthwith came from heaven—very cold water upon the Romans, but fiery hail upon the barbarians. Whereupon the emperor issued a decree exempting the Christians from persecution, while the Legion gained the name of the Legio Fulminatrix. The pretended letter of the emperor in which this history is told ends thus: "I desire that this decision be ratified by a decree of the Senate, and I direct that my ordinance be published in the Forum of Trajan that it may be read. The prefect Vitrasius Pollio will take care that it is sent to the several provinces. Anyone who wishes to make use of it and to possess it shall not be prevented from obtaining a copy from the decrees promulgated by us."

The difficulties of this story are manifest, and have been carefully investigated by Moyle, *Opp.* t. ii., and by Mosheim in the last century, by Aubé, *Hist. des Persécut.*, 1st ser. ch. viii. pp. 364–372, and by bishop Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, t. i. pp. 469–476, in the present century. In fact, the legend of the Thundering Legion has been, since the age of Scaliger, one of the commonplaces of historical criticism, and any of the authorities just quoted will direct attention to many writers who have discussed it. The difficulties of the story are briefly these: we condense them from Dr. Lightfoot's learned statement: (1) The Thundering Legion obtained the surname of Thundering long before the time of Marcus Aurelius. Dion Cassius (lv. 23), enumerating the legions of Augustus, mentions among them the 12th as stationed in Cappadocia, and surnamed *τὸ κεραυνοφόρον*. An inscription too of the 11th year of Nero (*Corp. Ins. Lat.* iii. 30) records it as then in existence. This difficulty was first pointed out by Scaliger. (2) The name of this Legion is now ascertained to have been not *Fulminatrix*, but *Fulminata*. (3) The proper station of the 12th legion was not Germany, but the East. This is indeed a serious difficulty, but one which a fuller knowledge of Roman military arrangements soon dispels. The study of Greek and Latin inscriptions has shown us that while the Legions were as a rule permanently stationed, and that even for centuries in the same districts, yet that on great emergencies, like a Jewish revolt or a war against the Quadi, legions were hurried like our own regiments from one part of the empire to another. Thus to take this very Thundering Legion alone, we learn from an inscription (*C. I. L.* iii. 6097) that it was once stationed in Achaia, though its usual post was Asia Minor (cf. Tacit. *Ann.* xv. 25, 26). We have now stated the difficulties of the legend. Yet Dr. Lightfoot and the majority of fair critics acknowledge that there was some truth in the Christian account. The incident itself is undoubtedly true. It is depicted in the sculptures of the Antonine Column erected at Rome soon after, where Jupiter Pluvius is represented as an old man from whose hair and beard flow copious streams, which are caught in the shields of the Roman soldiers while the enemy is struck down by lightning. The event was perpetuated in painting too. Themistius (Orat. 15), the pagan orator of the age of Theodosius the Great, two centuries later, saw the same scene represented in a picture, the emperor praying in the midst of the phalanx and the soldiers holding out their helmets to catch the descending waters. The escape of the emperor and his army is told also by Dion Cassius, A.D. 220 (lxxi. 8, 10), the earliest heathen writer who mentions it, and by Capitolinus (*Marc.* 24) writing under Diocletian, not to speak of Christian authorities. But the Christian version of the story is quite compatible with the pagan one. There were some Christians among the soldiers of Marcus Aurelius, though there could not possibly have been a whole legion composed of Christians. They doubtless prayed earnestly for the relief of their wants, and the relief came. They told the story to their Christian brethren, and the tale soon spread and magnified itself till it attained its present proportions. The Christian writers who attest it were strictly contemporary witnesses. Claudius Apollinaris, who first mentions it, addressed his apology to M. Aurelius, and therefore must have written within six years of the event at the outside. He lived too in the very neighbourhood where the legion was usually stationed, and therefore had ample opportunities to hear the facts stated by eye-witnesses. Tertullian's testimony too (*Apol.* 5, *ad Scap.* 4) is that of a contemporary. Still there is nothing necessarily miraculous in the story, nothing in fact surpassing many well-attested coincidences. [G. T. S.]

TIA, son of one Soterichus, an ascetic in the Thebaid, and martyr in the persecution of Diocletian. His acts well illustrate the spirit which animated the Egyptian ascetics at that time. The president Arianus assembled the troops stationed at the Egyptian Babylon to hear the edict of persecution read. Tia mingled himself among them. As soon as it was completed, all worshipped the gods save Tia, who remained conspicuously upright. He was at once arrested and tortured, and then sent to Pompeius, another president, who beheaded him. Arianus was himself converted, and suffered at Alexandria, Dec. 14, 305. (Georgii *Miracula SS. Coluthi et Panesniu*, pp. clxv–clxxviii.) Concerning Babylon, see Butler's *Coptic Churches of Egypt*, t. i. p. 155 sqq. [G. T. S.]

TIBERIANUS. A letter is given by John Malalas (xi. 273, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xcvii. 413) and Suidas, *s.v.* *Τραϊανός*, purporting to come from a governor of Palaestina prima of that name addressed to the emperor Trajan. The writer states that he had performed the emperor's orders in punishing and executing the Galilaeans who held the faith of those who were called Christians, but that they still kept on offering themselves for execution. He was weary of exhorting them and even trying to deter them by threats from accusing themselves, but all in vain. He therefore asks Trajan's advice under the circumstances. This letter, however, since the time of Tillemont has, for the numerous reasons he gives (*M. E.* ii. 571), been almost universally considered a forgery. (See Görres, *Zeitschrift für wiss. Theol.* xxi. 37.) Wieseler alone of recent critics (*Die Christenverfolgung der Cäsaren*, 126–130) considers it genuine. [F. D.]

TIBERIANUS, a Priscillianist. In 386 banished for heresy to the Scilly Islands, and his property confiscated (Sulp. Sev. ii. 51). [PRISCILLIANUS.] [M. B. C.]

TIBERIUS (1), a deacon and superior of a monastery, to whom St. Cyril directed his replies to certain queries about the creation (cf. Coteler. *Monum.* iii. 557). [G. T. S.]

TIBERIUS (2) II., emperor of Constantinople, A.D. 578–582. The secular history of his reign will be found in the *Dictionary of Classical Biography*, we shall therefore confine this notice to the religious history of the period for which the church history of the Monophysite John of Ephesus (Dr. Payne Smith's translation) affords fresh material. Tiberius presented a striking example of toleration in an intolerant age. The patriarchs of Constantinople were ardent opponents of the Monophysites. The patriarch, John Scholasticus, soon after the emperor's accession to the position of Caesar (A.D. 574), called on him to persecute the Monophysites. The emperor, however, interrogated the patriarch as to their character and teaching, and having extorted an acknowledgment of their Christian character, declared that he would not become a Diocletian in persecuting such followers of Christ. Eutychius, who succeeded John in 877, again urged Tiberius in the same direction, and again Tiberius refused, whereupon Eutychius, of his own mere motion, set the laws against heresy in operation (cf. John of Ephesus, *H. E.* pp. 72, 201). On p. 207 John (1) of Ephesus tells a curious story of the only act of persecution, or rather of weakness, Tiberius was ever guilty. He had hired an army of Goths from the west to fight his battles against the Persians. They brought their families to Constantinople and left them there, stipulating merely for the use of a church for Arian worship. Tiberius consulted the patriarch about this condition, whereupon interested parties roused the mob to hoot the emperor and accuse him of Arianism. To clear himself from this imputation, he permitted the mob to attack the houses of all heretics, a permission which they naturally used for the purposes of plunder. Tiberius once, and once only, interfered in matters of controversy. Eutychius published a book on a favourite topic among Greek writers of those times, concerning the nature of the resurrection body. He taught that it would be impalpable like a pure spirit. Gregory, afterwards pope Gregory the Great, was then a deacon and Roman apocrisarius at the imperial court. He at once detected heresy in the patriarch's teaching; pointed out that it contradicted scripture, for had not our Lord said, after the resurrection, "Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." Appeal was made to the emperor, who decided in favour of Gregory, while the patriarch was induced to burn the obnoxious book. John of Ephesus, p. 192, tells us that Tiberius substituted a cross on his coins for a female figure, like Venus, which Justin introduced. In addition to the work of John of Ephesus there may be consulted Evagrius, *H. E.* v. 11–22; Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Miscell.* lib. xvii.; Theophanes, *Chronographia*, i. 380–387; Baron. *Annal.* A.D. 582–585; Clinton's *Fasti*, p. 840. [G. T. S.]

TIBURTIUS, martyr (*D. C. A. s.v.*).

TIBURTIUS, priest of the church of St. Laurence at Rome. REPARATUS saw in the vision of the lower world a vast pyre prepared and Tiburtius placed on it and burnt, and it was found that he had died at the same moment. (Gregorius, *Dial.* iv. 31.) [F. D.]

TICHONIUS (TYCHONIUS), an African Donatist, of whose personal history very little is known, but whose name is conspicuous in the Donatist controversy, chiefly through the mention of it by St. Augustine, both in his letters to Parmenian and elsewhere. He appears to have flourished between A.D. 380 and 420, for Gennadius speaks of him as living in the time of Theodosius and his sons, of whom Arcadius was declared Augustus in 383, and in his book *de Doctr. Chr.* published A.D. 426, Augustine speaks of him as if he were no longer alive, but according to Tillemont, his date may be carried back as far as 370. He appears to have been a layman with a strong turn for church matters, including theology, to have been well versed in Scripture, and though a Donatist, to have revolted from the exclusive views of the sect, and to have occupied a position intermediate, as Neander says, between it and the church (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iii. 280, ed. Clark). At some time in the earlier part of his career, perhaps as early as A.D. 370–373, he published a work maintaining the universality of the church, and that no misconduct of a portion of it can annul the promise of God in this respect, or contaminate Christians elsewhere. Consequently in his view catholic Christians in Africa were not cut off from the Church of Christ, but were still in communion with it. He also pointed out the arbitrary character of the Donatist test of holiness, summing it up in the epigrammatic phrase, "quod volumus sanctum est" (Aug. *c. Parm.* i. 1, ii. 13, 31; see also ii. 21, 40; 22, 42, iii. 3, 17; *Ep.* 93, 43). In support of his argument he quoted the decision of a council at Carthage of 270 bishops, who having debated for 75 days concluded, as the words of Augustine seem to imply, that traditors ought to be invited to receive rebaptism, but that if they declined to do so they ought to be admitted to communion. Not only, said he, was this decision made, but that down to the time of Macarius, A.D. 348, communion was not refused to Catholics by Donatists (Aug. *Ep.* 93, 43). Of this council no other record exists than the statement of Tichonius, and the absence of evidence for it was plainly known to St. Augustine; for, allowing that it would have been possible for Parmenian to deny the truth of the fact, he says that Tichonius in making it had appealed to the experience of many persons living who could remember it (*ib.* 44). But Parmenian not only found fault with Tichonius for his indiscreet statements and admissions, so contrary to existing Donatist principles, but said that he was condemned by a council, of which however he gives no date (Aug. *c. Parm.* i. 1. 1; iii. 6, 29). This work of Tichonius has perished, but is probably the same either as the one in three books mentioned by Gennadius under the title "bellum intestinum," or the one entitled "expositiones diversarum causarum,"

unless under these two titles he means to speak of one book only, in which, says Gennadius, he mentions some ancient councils (Gennadius, *de Scr. Eccl.* 18). Though denounced strongly for his inconsistency by St. Augustine he appears to have continued his allegiance to the Donatists (Aug. *de Doctr. Chr.* iii. 30; Gennadius, *u. s.*), and while still belonging to them he wrote another book entitled "The seven rules or keys of Christian life," which is discussed by Augustine in his work *de Doctr. Christ.* iii. 30–42, in which he says of the rules that they are useful to some extent in explaining Scripture, but inadequate to meet all difficulties, though the writer thought otherwise, and in this estimate of them by Augustine most readers of them will probably agree. The following is an abstract of them:— i. The church is the Lord's Body, indivisible from Him, so that in Scripture language applicable to Him is applied also to the church. ii. As to the twofold Body of the Lord, i.e. the distinction between bad and good people in the Church. On this expression Augustine remarks that it is an improper one, and that instead of it should be used the true and the pretended body of Christ, for, says he, hypocrites cannot even in this world belong to the true Body. iii. As to the promises and the law. This phrase might well be exchanged, Augustine says, for "grace" and "commandment," or "spirit" and "letter," a distinction misunderstood by Pelagians whom by anticipation Tichonius has refuted well. But he speaks of works as if they were the reward of faith, and of faith itself, as if it were not God's gift. iv. As to genus and species. Readers ought to be careful not to confound the one with the other, and to ascribe to the one what belongs to the other, as might be done in explaining Ezek. xxxvi. 23, which must be explained by reference to N. T. and the promise of baptism there contained. The "new land" is the church to be gathered from all nations, but not yet revealed. v. Concerning Jewish expressions denoting time, as "three days and three nights," &c., and also such numbers as 7, 10, 12, &c. vi. Concerning what he calls Recapitulation, *i.e.* return to a subject already discussed freely after an interval, as in Genesis (c. ii.), the writer returns to some points in the history of creation after having previously concluded it (in chapter i.). vii. Concerning the personality of Satan. As Christ is the Head of the Church, so he is the head of the wicked, and some things are ascribed to him which belong to a body. Though some of the rules, especially i. and ii., apply to Donatist questions, the writer does not appear to have had them especially in view, but only to have drawn up a manual containing some theological principles which in his own opinion were very important. Augustine mentions Rule v. in his work *quaestiones ad Heptateuchum*, ii. 47, and in a letter to Aurelius asks his opinion about the rules in general (*Ep.* 41). The views of Tichonius respecting the presence in the church of faults which cannot be corrected are also recommended by him to Restitutus, a deacon, for his study (*Ep.* 249), and he speaks with approval of the work in general in his Retractations (*Retract.* ii. 18. The rules are described by Ribbek, *Aug. und Don.* pp. 198–202). Tichonius also wrote a commentary on the Revelation, in which Gennadius tells us that he interpreted it entirely in a spiritual sense, that the human body is an abode of angels (angelicam stationem corpus esse); that the Millennium in a personal sense is doubtful, that there is only one resurrection in which human bodies of every sort and age will rise, and that of the two resurrections mentioned, one is to be understood of the growth of grace in the soul of man and in the church (Gennadius, *u. s.*). A work under this name, formerly thought to be the one just mentioned, is printed in the third volume of the works of Augustine (*App.* p. 2418, ed. Migne), but this is more probably a commentary drawn from various sources, including the work of Tichonius. Two MSS. of the seven rules have lately been discovered by Dom Pitra in the libraries, respectively of St. Geneviève at Paris, and of Brusseis (*Spicileg. Solesm.* iii. p. 397; Ceillier, v. 102). They were printed by Grynaeus at Basle in 1569 and at Paris in *Bibl. Patr.* of de la Bigne, 1575. They were reprinted by Schott, 1622, and are to be found at length in the *Bibl. Max. Patr.* Lyons, 1677, vi. 49, and in *Bibl. Patr.* Galland, Venice, 1765, viii. 107. The work on the Apocalypse is criticized with faint praise by Cassiodorus (*Inst.* c. 9), and unfavourably by Primasius (Ceillier, v. 105). It is mentioned as a standard work by the author of the work on the promises of God appended to the works of Prosper of Aquitaine, and entitled "dimidium temporis," c. 13 (*Prosp. Aq.* vol. ii. p. 139). [H. W. P.]

TIDFERTH (TIDBERHT, TIDFRITH, TIDFERD, THDFRID, HIDFERTH), the ninth bishop of Dunwich after the division of the East Anglian diocese (*M. H. B.* 618). He succeeded bishop Alfhun, who, according to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, died in 797, probably in 798, and appears in councils and among the witnesses to charters down to the year 816, after which date there is no trace of a bishop of Dunwich until 824 (*M. H. B.* 618; *Chr. S. ib.* 340). Tidferth's profession of obedience to the see of Canterbury, made to archbishop Ethelheard on the occasion either of his consecration or of his reconciliation after the abolition of the archbishopric of Lichfield, is extant (MS. Cotton, Cleopatra, E. 1; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 511). It contains a brief paraphrase of the articles of the creed containing expressions found in the Nicene and Apostles' Creed, and also in the *Quicumque vult.* He was present at a synod at Clovesho in 798, in which the two rival archbishops took part (*Councils*, H. and S. iii. 515, 517), at a synod at Chelsea in 801 (*ib.* 531), and at the great council of Clovesho in 803, where he was accompanied by two abbats and four presbyters (*ib.* 547). Nearly at the same time Tidferth and his fellow bishop of Elmham, Alheard, had a letter from Alcuin (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 551; Mon. Alcuin. ed. Dümmler, p. 739), containing good wishes and good advice, especially for activity in preaching; and a warning against secular games. Alcuin had heard of their good conversation from Lull, an East Anglian abbat who had attended Tidferth at Clovesho in 803 and now desires that his name may be placed on the diptychs for commemoration in their churches. In the council of Chelsea held by archbishop Wilfred in 816, Tidferth and his

colleague Sibba appeared as usual in company. He must have died before 824. He attests the charters from 798 to 816 with much regularity. (See Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 175, 176, 183, 184, 185, 190, 191, 207, 210, 1018, 1020, 1024.) [S.]

TIDFIRTH, or TILFERD, the last of the ancient bishops of Hexham. He must have held that see at the very beginning of the ninth century. Richard of Hexham (ed. *Surtees Soc.* p. 45) says that he died on the way to Rome. Not many years ago a stone was found in the cemetery of the monks of Wearmouth, on which the name Tidfirth was inscribed in runes. It is possible that this is the bishop who was about to embark at the mouth of the Wear, but according to the *Liber Vitae* of Durham, the name of Tidfirth is not an uncommon one. The stone, which is now in the British Museum, is figured in the *Preface to the Memorials of Hexham*, i. xl. [J. R.]

TIGERNAC (TIGERNAGIUS, TYGERNACHUS, GERMAGIUS) **(1)**, bishop of Clones, co. Monaghan, was one of the chief saints of Ireland in the 6th century, but his legend is unhistorical, and his Life belongs to the 12th century. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Apr. 5, i. 400–403) treat *De S. Tigernaco Episcopo in Hibernia* and give his *Vita*, ex trib. cod. MSS., preceded by a preface by Henschenius, and two hymns. (See Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. pt. i. 105, pt. ii. 902, app., mentioning two Lives; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 120, 121.)

He was of royal race, and when a child he was carried off by pirates to Britain, where at last he was put under Movennus or Monennus in the Rosnatense Monasterium, probably Whithern. He visited Rome and Tours, and on his return to Ireland was made bishop of Clones at the suggestion of St. Brigida. His first monastery was at Galloon in Lough Erne, which he gave to St. Comgall when he left to found his house at Clones. Ware (*Ir. Ant.* c. 26) says that he also had a church at Derryvullen, co. Fermanagh, and Lanigan (*E. H. Ir.* ii. 434) follows Ware (*Irish Bps.* by Harris, 177) in placing him next in succession to Maccarthen at Clogher, of which he retained the oversight while bishop at Clones (Cotton, *Fast.* iii. 71) and hence was called Feradrich in the *Calend. Cassel.* (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 740 c. 1). In old age he became blind, and died in sanctity, April 4 or 5, before A.D. 550 (*Ann. Tig.* A.D. 544). Tierney's well and manor are still pointed out, but his ceolan or musical bell is lost. (*Ulst. Jour. Arch.* iv. 62–3; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4 ser. iii. 52–3.) By the Scotch annalists he is uniformly venerated on April 5, but they place him in the 9th century. [J. G.]

TIGHERNAN (TIERNAN), of Errew, par. Crossmolina, bar. Tyrawley, co. Mayo, son of Ninnidh, of the race of Colla Uais; his monastery was built on a promontory in Lough Conn, where an abbey of considerable extent, now in ruins, was built by the O'Barretts. Judging from the genealogies he must have flourished in the end of the 5th century. His feast is April 8 (*M. Doneg.*). Tobar Tighearnain is in the townland of Killeen, but his chief relic is the Mias Tigearnain, the dish or paten of Tighearnan, which is said to have been dug out of the saint's grave on an island in the lough, was long in the family of O'Flynn, as the Erenachs or hereditary wardens of Errew, but was finally sold, in a time of poverty and distress, to Mr. Knox of Rappa Castle, in whose family it is still preserved; it was used by the peasantry as a sacred relic on which to take oaths. (*Gen. Hy. Fiachr.* by O'Donovan, 11–13, 239–40.) [J. G.]

TIGRIUS, a presbyter of Constantinople, closely attached to Chrysostom, and employed by him in carrying out his disciplinary measures with the clergy. He was a eunuch serving as a slave in the house of a man of rank, by whom he was rewarded with his freedom for the fidelity of his service. He was subsequently advanced to the presbyterate, and became distinguished for the moderation and gentleness of his disposition, and his liberality and kindness to strangers and the poor. He was cited by the council of the Oak, together with Chrysostom and Serapion. After the expulsion of Chrysostom, Tigrius was brought before Optatus, the pagan prefect of the city, by whom he was cruelly tortured, to elicit a confession inculpating others as the authors of the conflagration. He was scourged, and racked till his bones were dislocated. He survived the torture and was banished to Mesopotamia. (Pallad. p. 70; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 17, 24.) [E. V.]

TILBERT, consecrated bishop of Hexham at Fons Lupi, or Wulfswell (probably Ulva in Westmoreland, where there is a holy well to this day), on Oct. 2, 781 (*Chr. S.*; Flor. Wig. in *M. H. B.* 636; Ric. of Hexham, p. 37). There is nothing known of him save that he died in 789, and was buried at Hexham. In 1154 a coffer was found in the church, which was believed to be the receptacle of his remains (*Mem. of Hexham*, i. 199–200). Tilbert was regarded as a saint. [J. R.]

TILHERE, the seventh bishop of Worcester (Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 545, 623). According to Florence he succeeded Weremund in the year 778, and was at the time of his consecration an abbat. His attestation as abbat appears in Mercian charters of the reign of Offa (K. *C. D.* 125), and, as bishop, for the first time in a charter granted by that king to Aldred, the ealdorman of the Hwiccii, dated in 778 (Kemble, *C. D.* 131; corrected by the Indiction to 777). He is traditionally described as abbat of Berkeley (*Ann. Wigorn. Ang. Sac.* i. 470; *Mon. Angl.* vi. 1618; Thomas, *Worcester*, p. 18). His episcopate was short; Florence dates the appointment of his successor Heathored in 781, and his name appears in charters of that year. Tilhere appears in the Worcester Cartulary as the recipient of a grant, made to him by Offa for the episcopal church at Worcester, of land at Cropthorn, Netherton, Elmley, Criddesho, Ceorletun, Heantune, and Benningwyrthe. The gift is said to have been made at Fladbury, where Tilhere entertained the king at a great feast. The same year the bishop at a synod at Brentford obtained Offa's leave to give half of the estate to his relations (parentibus) on condition of service to the bishop and reversion to the cathedral (Kemble, *C. D.* 139). The charter is unquestionably spurious. Tilhere's name is at-

tached to a charter of Offa to Bredon, on the language of which the forged document is partly formed (Kemb. *C. D.* 140). Nothing distinct is known about the monastery at Berkeley, which is associated with the name of Tilhere, but it certainly existed in 824, and under a female head. [S.]

TILPINUS (TURPIN), twenty-ninth bishop of Rheims, and archbishop, was appointed to the see when it had been all but desolated by the oppression of Milo, archbishop of Treves, who took possession of it after the ejection of Abel [MILO] (Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 12, 16). He is best known by the name of Turpin from his connexion with the myths of the middle ages, but his proper name is Tilpinus, as fixed by Flodoardus, our primary authority on his life. He was a monk in the monastery of St. Dionysius in Rheims, and became bishop A.D. 753, when Pepin le Bref had lately been crowned and was taking steps to consolidate his power. Of his work we have no account beyond what we gather from pope Adrian's letter to Tilpin, c. 775 (Flodoard. *H. E. Rem.* ii. 17; Adrian, *Ep.* 54; *Pat. Lat.* cxxxv. 122 sq. xcvi. 1212 sq.), conveying to him a grant of privileges to the see of Rheims, and requesting him to send accredited envoys for the pallium which the pope granted at the request of Charlemagne. The pallium is said to have been brought to Tilpinus by Fulradus, archpresbyter of France [FULRADUS (1)] (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 206). In the forementioned letter a commission was issued to Tilpinus, c. A.D. 775, to associate with himself two other bishops and enquire regarding the ordination, faith, doctrine and morals of Lullus, archbishop of Mainz [LULLUS], but we do not hear of the result. He continued to rule his diocese for forty-seven years, and died A.D. 800, being succeeded by Vulfarius. His feast is Sept. 2 (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xii. 140, 151; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 205 sq.). Trithemius (*De Script. Eccl.*, no. cclxxv. p. 74, ed. Fabricius) ascribes to him *Gesta Caroli Magni*, and *Epistolae ad diversos*, but probably they never existed, and the idea was suggested by the mediaeval history of the exploits of Charlemagne and Roland against the Saracens (Bayle, *Dict. Hist. et Crit.* iv. 2777, ed. 1720; Vossius, *Hist. Lat.* 298, ed. 1654). [J. G.]

TIMAEUS, bishop of Antioch, the 17th in succession, succeeded Domnus A.D. 272, died and was succeeded by Cyrillus A.D. 280. (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32; Clinton, *Fasti Rom.*) [E. V.]

TIMARCHIUS, excubitor, bearer of letters from the domestic Amandinus to Gregory the Great, and from the latter to the exarch. (*Epp.* x. 52.) [F. D.]

TIMASIUS (1), a general who spoke strongly against the monks at an interview between St. Ambrose and the emperor Theodosius, after a sermon in 388 (Ambros. *Ep.* 41, § 27.) [C. H.]

TIMASIUS (2), consul. [PENTADIA.]

TIMASIUS (3), almost always mentioned with Jacobus [JACOBUS (36), Vol. III. 335], but also as the bearer of a message to Augustine from Pinianus (Aug. *Ep.* 126, 6). [H. W. P.]

TIMOCLES, a writer of troparia, who lived apparently at Constantinople, in the latter part of the 5th century. He is seldom mentioned, and is always, or almost always, coupled with Anthimus, another hymn-writer of the same period. Cardinal Pitra says of Anthimus, "omnibus sicut et mihi ignotus, nisi quod ejus cum obscuro Timocle unus Theodorus Lector nudo nomine meminerit." (*Anal. Sacr. Spicil. Solesm.* I. xxii.). But this is not quite accurate. The two are mentioned together as flourishing in the eighth year of Leo I., by Theophanes, and also (in the same words) by Cedrenus. (Theoph. p. 98, and Cedrenus p. 354, in the *Corpus Hist. Byzant.*). Theodorus, under the same date, speaks of a separation having taken place between A. and T., their followers forming distinct factions, Anthimus being joined by those who accepted, Timocles by those who opposed the council of Chalcedon. (See Theod. Lect. *Hist. Eccles.* lib. i.; in Valesius's ed. of Theodoret, Paris, 1673, p. 554.) [H. A. W.]

TIMOLAUS, March 24, a native of Pontus, and martyr at Caesarea in Palestine, under Urbanus, with seven others (Eus. *Mart. Palaest.* c. 3). [G. T. S.]

TIMOTHEA, lady of Ariminum. At her request Gregory the Great in A.D. 592 directed CASTORIUS (7) to consecrate on the usual conditions an oratory she had built there. (*Epp.* ii. 12.) [F. D.]

TIMOTHEUS (1), a young man to whom Dionysius of Alexandria addressed some epistles on philosophy refuting the atomic theory of Democritus and Epicurus. Eusebius has preserved long extracts from them in his *Praeparat. Evang.* lib. xiv. capp. 23–27. Dionysius urged the argument from design with considerable force, using some illustrations similar to those employed by Paley in his Natural Theology. Dr. Westcott thinks Timotheus was the son of Dionysius. [DIONYSIUS (6) Vol. I. p. 851, note [c].] [G. T. S.]

TIMOTHEUS (2), Nov. 20. Martyr at Gaza under Urban the prefect, A.D. 304. His acts have been published by Assemani. He suffered with Agapius and Thecla. (Euseb. *Mart. Palaest.* cap. iii.) [G. T. S.]

TIMOTHEUS. For other martyrs of this name, *vid. D.C.A.*

TIMOTHEUS (3), disciple of Apollinaris, whom Athanasius introduced to pope Damasus as orthodox; when the pope discovered his heresy, he condemned him in a synod held at Rome, A.D. 377. At that time Timotheus was the Apollinarian bishop at Alexandria, as Vitalis was at Antioch. (Sozomen, *H. E.* vi. 25; Theodoret, v. 16; Hefele's *Councils*, ii. 290, Clark's edit.; Ceill. v. 14, cf. viii. 388.) [G. T. S.]

TIMOTHEUS (4), a chorepiscopus, whom Basil emphatically clears of the charge of being the author of the accusation brought against Athanasius, the father of Athanasius, bishop of Tyana, of unkind behaviour to his children (Basil, *Ep.* 24 [54]). At another time, on his having declined from the first fervour of his

ascetic life, and engaged in worldly business, Basil wrote an earnest and affectionate remonstrance, entreating him not to mix up two incompatible pursuits, lest he should become useless to his friends and ridiculous to his enemies (*Ep.* 291 [340]). [E. V.]

TIMOTHEUS (5), a man of learning and piety, but of great diffidence, whom Gregory Nazianzen, during his residence at Constantinople, in 381, had drawn from his retirement and "set his light upon a candlestick," perhaps by ordaining him to the priesthood. After Gregory had left Constantinople Timotheus wrote him a very laudatory letter, for which Gregory thanked him, stating that he regarded his praises as an exhortation to make himself worthy of them, and at the same time he exhorted him to lay aside his love of retirement and contend earnestly for the doctrine of the Trinity (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 187). Timotheus having subsequently met with some calamity which he was not bearing with becoming fortitude, Gregory wrote to remonstrate with him on his weakness, urging him to seek his consolation in religious books, which, in the extremity of his sorrow, he had too much neglected. (*Ibid. Ep.* 189.) Gregory's letter had the desired effect, but Timotheus appears to have replied in somewhat sarcastic terms as to the difference between giving advice and following it oneself, which Gregory fully confirmed from his own experience, his whole life having been one continual struggle (*Ep.* 190). Timotheus and Nicobulus having fallen out, and mutually exasperating one another by bitter speeches, Gregory wrote begging him to restrain his tongue, and not show a bad example to the young men by whom he was surrounded (*Ep.* 191). [E. V.]

TIMOTHEUS (6), bishop of Berytus (381–399, Gams), attended the council of Constantinople in 381 (Labbe, ii. 955). He may be the same with the disciple of Apollinarius, who wrote a book addressed to a brother bishop, Homonius, of which some fragments are found in the work of Leontius of Byzantium, "*adversus fraudes Apollinarii*" (Migne, *Patrol.* lxxxvi. pars ii. col. 1959), denying the consubstantiality of the deity and humanity of Christ (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 818). [E. V.]

TIMOTHEUS (7) I., archbishop of Alexandria, was unanimously elected, as Theodosius I. affirms (*Cod. Theod.* tom. vi. p. 348; Tillemont, vi. 621), on the death of his brother, Peter II., in the latter half of Feb. A.D. 381. He was an elderly man of high character, who had sat at the feet of Athanasius; and his distinguishing epithet of ἀκτήμων (Cotelerius, *Eccl. Gr. Mon.* i. 366) indicates that he had parted with all his property. The council of Constantinople met in the May after his accession; he and his attendant suffragans arrived late, and did not contribute to the peace of the assembly (Greg. Naz. *Carm. de Vita sua*, 1800 ff.). They were annoyed at finding Gregory of Nazianzus established in the see of Constantinople; their jealousy of the "Oriental" bishops who had "enthroned him" broke forth in angry debate. They assured Gregory that they had no objection to him personally; but it is likely enough that they resented the disgrace of Maximus, who had attempted by the aid of some Egyptian bishops to possess himself of the see. Gregory was too glad to take this opportunity of resigning it, and Timotheus may perhaps have presided over the council during the few days between this abdication and the appointment of Nectarius (Tillemont, ix. 474). Doubtless he was outvoted in the passing of the third canon, which gave to the see of Constantinople the second rank throughout the church; Neale says that he "refused to allow" its "validity" (*Hist. Alex.* i. 209). The council of Aquileia alludes to some annoyance which he, as well as Paulinus of Antioch, sustained at the hands of those whose orthodoxy had previously been suspected (Ambrose, *Epist.* 12); yet that he did not break off openly from the majority is proved by the law of July 30, A.D. 381, in which Theodosius names him as one of the centres of Catholic communion (Soz. vii. 9; comp. Tillemont, ix. 720). His episcopate was brief and uneventful. Facundus transcribes a letter of his to Diodore of Tarsus, in which he refers to Athanasius as having spoken highly of Diodore, and professes his own inability to do justice to his virtue and orthodox zeal (*Pro Defens. Tri. Capit.* iv. 2). Timotheus was deeply interested in monastic life, and wrote an account of several eminent monks, which Sozomen knew and used (vi. 29). When Ammonius, one of the Tall Brothers, cut off one of his own ears in order to disqualify himself for the episcopate, with a reference to Lev. xxi. 17, the archbishop observed, with a remarkable superiority to technical rigorism, "Let that law prevail among Jews! Bring me a man with a clipped nose, and if he be but morally worthy, I will ordain him" (*Hist. Laus.* 12). His eighteen "canonical answers" to questions put by his clergy for their own direction are in several parts interesting, and became part of the church law of the East. (See Beveridge, *Pand. Can.* ii. 165; Galland. vii. 345.) 1. If a catechumen is present at the oblation, and partakes of it without knowing what it is, "he ought to be illuminated" (baptized) "for he has received a Divine call." 4. A sick catechumen who loses his intellect, so that he cannot make a profession of faith, should be baptized, unless he is possessed with an unclean spirit. 9. The deacon's proclamation, "Let those who are not in communion depart" (before the kiss of peace is given in the Liturgy) shows that the oblation should not be made in presence of heretics unless they promise to eschew their heresy. If a priest is called to marry a couple, and finds that the marriage contemplated is an unlawful one, *e.g.* with a deceased wife's sister, he ought not to comply, nor to make the oblation, lest he become partaker in other persons' sins. 14. Let not the oblation be made for the soul of a suicide unless you have fully ascertained that he was really of unsound mind; for the friends in such cases often "say that the man was not himself, in order to procure the oblation and the prayer for him," whereas, in fact, he was only under some strong emotion, and for such a person as a self-slayer no oblation should be made. The 16th query shows that the rule or usage of fasting communion was in full observance, for it asks whether one may communicate who, while fasting in order to do so, has unwittingly swallowed a drop of water. Timotheus answers, "If Satan has found a means of hindering him from com-

munion, he will do this the oftener," *i.e.* "Do not let this scruple prevail; if you do, the enemy of souls will multiply occasions for thus depriving you of spiritual food." The last answer, somewhat strangely, makes ten years of age the earliest time for the commencement of moral responsibility. Eutychius says that Timotheus permitted prelates and monks to eat meat on Sundays by way of showing that they were not Manicheans; and he adds the ridiculous statement, that "very many metropolitans and bishops in Egypt were Manicheans" (*Annal.* i. 515). Timotheus died on Sunday the 20th of July, 385 (see Tillemont, vi. 802), and was succeeded by Theophilus. [W. B.]

TIMOTHEUS (8), a man about whom a misunderstanding arose between St. Augustine and Severus, bishop of Mileum, A.D. 400. He had been appointed to the office of Reader in the diocese of Hippo, and had exercised it at a place called Subsana, and at least three other places. According to custom, but not yet, as it seems, according to church law, he was bound to remain in the diocese and place in which he had thus served (Bruns, *Conc*, i. 178). But without consulting his parish-priest, Carchedonius, he chose to attach himself to Severus, from whom he swore that nothing should separate him. Severus at first wished him to continue at Subsana, but while his case was still under consideration, and without the knowledge or consent of Augustine and his episcopal brethren, Timotheus considered himself to be bound by his oath to remain with him. With this view he sought and obtained ordination as a sub-deacon from Verinus and a presbyter whose name is unknown (see Bingham, book iii. 2, 2, vol. i. p. 356). Upon this Augustine with Alypius bishop of Tagaste, and Samsucius of Turris, arranged to meet Severus at Subsana. Tillemont thinks that a previous meeting had taken place at Hippo, a supposition which seems needless, but Augustine and his friends were unable to arrive in time, and before their arrival Severus had departed. Two persons, perhaps monks, had accompanied him, of whom the people of Subsana thought that they had been brought to create a feeling against the committee of bishops. By-and-by they also departed, which they were suffered to do without a guide to show them the way, an omission for which Augustine offered a full apology, though it appears to have arisen from a mistake, for it was said, without authority, that Timotheus accompanied them. Augustine now wrote to Severus, expressing his own willingness, and that of the other bishops, to leave the matter in his hands, but representing that the oath of Timotheus was invalid without his concurrence, and mentioning what he had done in the way of reproof, correction, exhortation, and prayer. 1. He had reproved (*a*) Timotheus for leaving his post without consulting Carchedonius. (*b*) Verinus and the other presbyter for their irregular act of ordination. (*c*) Carchedonius, whom he thought he had persuaded to take patiently what had occurred. 2. He had prayed for himself and the others that they may commend to God themselves and the issue of the whole question. What this was is not perfectly clear, but the letters of Augustine serve to illustrate his profound and unswerving respect for the custom of the Church, his exquisite delicacy, fairness, and moderation in dealing both with Severus and Timotheus, yet his firm resolution to reprove and correct when necessary (Aug. *Ep.* 62, 63). Whether a deacon named Timotheus, the bearer of a letter from Augustine to Severus at a later date was the same as Timotheus above mentioned is not clear, nor whether he was the brother on whose loss Augustine addressed a letter of condolence to his sister Sapida. That this last was identical with the last but one seems likely, but the identity of the three is doubtful. If either supposition be true, it is clear that all displeasure had passed away from the minds of both Augustine and Timotheus (Aug. *Ep.* 110, 263; SAPIDA). [H. W. P.]

TIMOTHEUS (9), solitary of Scetis, brother of PAULUS (79), and of the same handicraft. They found their brethren so vexatious that Timotheus urged the relinquishment of their art; but Paulus replied that if they would but keep watch over their thoughts they would find their nightly repose sufficient (Coteler. *Apophth. Patr.* i. 651). [C. H.]

TIMOTHEUS (10), a presbyter, who had shown great zeal in Chrysostom's cause, and had undergone many dangers for his sake. Chrysostom complains that, though he had written to him, and sent through him a letter to Marcian the tribune, he had received no answer. (Chrys. *Ep.* 211.) [E. V.]

TIMOTHEUS (11), bishop of Laton, or Latopolis, in Egypt, mentioned in the Paschal epistle of Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 40[illegible], as recently dead (Jerom. ep. 100 fin.; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 522). [C. H.]

TIMOTHEUS (12), bishop of Maronea in Thrace, expelled as a partisan of Chrysostom, who, in A.D. 408, was in Macedonia. (Pallad. p. 195.) [E. V.]

TIMOTHEUS (13), archdeacon of Alexandria, and candidate for the patriarchal chair when St. Cyril was elected, A.D. 412. [CYRILLUS (7), Vol. I. p. 763.] (Ceill. viii. 256.) [G. T. S.]

TIMOTHEUS (14), a character introduced as taking part in a dialogue between a Christian and a Jew, one Aquila, which is assigned to the age of St. Cyril. It is useful for comparison with Justin's dialogue with Trypho, those between Jason and Papiscus, Simon and Theophilus, all bearing on the Jewish controversy. Timotheus converted the Jew, and brought him to Cyril for baptism. Cyril, however, wished Timotheus to perform that office, and so ordained him priest and deacon at once. The MS. is in the Vatican (Gebhardt u. Harnack, *Altchristl. Literatur*, Bd. i. Hft. 3, p. 75; Mai, *Nov. Biblioth.* vi. 2, p. 537 sq., and *Spic. Rom.* ix. p. [illegible]; Ceill. viii. 388; Migne, *Pat. Graec.* lxxvi. [illegible] 254). [G. T. S.]

TIMOTHEUS (15), presbyter at Constantinople in 431, with EULOGIUS (19). [C. H.]

TIMOTHEUS (16), the name of some persons addressed in the epistles of Isidore of Pelusium:—i. A reader (lib. i. epp. 4, 67, 68, and

many more). ii. A clarissimus (ii. 136, iii. 353, 384). iii. A scholasticus (v. 254). iv. One or more others undesignated (i. 7, 8, 9, v. 168, 170, 274). [C. H.]

TIMOTHEUS (17), a subdeacon of the fifth century, to whom St. Nilus addressed six letters on the benefit of vigils and nocturnal prayers. Timotheus had asked what was the need for vigils, seeing that God had cast Adam into a deep sleep. Sleep could not then be a bad thing when God sent it. The reply of Nilus may be compared with St. Jerome's treatise against Vigilantius (S. Nili *Epist.* i. 26–31, in Migne's *P. G.* t. lxxix. col. 91–98). [G. T. S.]

TIMOTHEUS (18), commonly called AELURUS (but also Janurius, Eutych. *Ann.* ii. 103), a Monophysite intruder into the see of Alexandria, had been at first a monk, had then become a presbyter under Dioscorus, and soon after the deposition of the latter at the council of Chalcedon had come into collision with his successor Proterius under circumstances above described. [PETER MONGUS, PROTERIUS.] Deposed from office, and banished into Libya (Mansi, *Concil.* vii. 617), he awaited, as his opponents afterwards said, the death of the emperor Marcian (*ib.* 525, 532). When it took place in January of 457, he returned to Alexandria; and it was then that he practised the curious trick which apparently procured him his distinguishing epithet. He "crept" at night to the cells of certain ignorant monks, called to each by name, and on being asked who he was, replied, "I am an angel, sent to warn you to break off communion with Proterius, and to choose Timotheus as bishop" (Theod. Lect. i. 1). These "nocturnal expeditions" (Gibbon, vii. 30) were afterwards discovered, and Timotheus became known as ὁ Αἴλουρος, "the Cat" (see Valesius on Theod. Lect.). But he had thus secured new monastic partisans in addition to those who, like himself, had previously stood out against Proterius (Mansi, vii. 532); he then collected a motley band of "ignorant and turbulent men," who raised such a tumult that "no quiet person durst go into the streets on that day;" and soon afterwards, in the latter part of Lent, he took possession of the great "Caesarean" church, and was there lawlessly consecrated by only *two* bishops, whom Proterius and the Egyptian synod had deposed for participating in his revolt, and who, like himself, had been sentenced to exile. Thus, without the countenance of a single legitimate prelate (see Mansi, vii. 585), he "enthroned himself," as fourteen Egyptian bishops express it in their memorials to the emperor Leo I., and to Anatolius of Constantinople (Mansi, vii. 526, 533), "while the real archbishop was sitting in his own palace among his clergy." He instantly proceeded to hold ordinations, and to perform other episcopal acts; but after thus playing the anti-patriarch for a few days, he was expelled by the "dux" Dionysius; and it was apparently in revenge that his adherents—as his opponents said, "carrying out his intentions," or even acting at his "suggestion" (Mansi, vii. 526, 533)—hunted Proterius into a baptistery and sacrilegiously murdered him (Easter, 457). Thereupon Timotheus returned and acted as archbishop; he "celebrated the holy mysteries," say the Egyptian memorialists, "although he had no right to communicate even as a layman;" but before doing so, we are assured by them that he washed the altars which Proterius had used, and burned the throne on which he had sat (Mansi, vii. 534). He substituted his own name and that of Dioscorus for that of Proterius on the diptychs (see Mansi, vii. 604); he ejected the clerics who had been loyal to his predecessor; he diverted to the use of his adherents the church funds which had been set apart for the sustenance of the poor; and as he could only count on about five Egyptian prelates (already under censure for having taken part against the decisions of the council), he kept some of them constantly with him, and sent the others into various dioceses to harass the "orthodox" bishops, and moreover strengthened himself by new consecrations. He declared open war against the maintainers of "two natures" as being in effect Nestorianisers, and on this ground boldly broke off communion with Rome, Constantinople, and Antioch, and consistently denounced bishops of the Alexandrian patriarchate who had accepted the formula of the council, and some of whom had held their sees before the accession of Cyril; he also sent to cities and monasteries, a prohibition to communicate with such bishops or to recognise the clerics whom they had ordained. Thus it was that the fourteen prelates from whom we derive our most authentic information on these events were constrained by the storm thus raised against them to abandon their homes, to lead, as they quaintly express it, "a life more full of fear than that of hares or frogs," and ultimately, leaving behind some of their more infirm colleagues, who, like themselves had become fugitives, to travel to Constantinople and present memorials to the emperor and the archbishop. These petitions are extant in Latin versions (Mansi, vii. 524 ff.), and the first of them is signed by fourteen bishops (one of whom, Nestor or Nestorius of Phragon, had taken an active part in the election of Proterius), four presbyters (two of whom were stewards of the Alexandrian church), and two deacons. On the other hand, Timotheus Aelurus sent some bishops and clerics to plead his cause with the emperor. We possess a fragment of their petition (Mansi, vii. 536), to the effect that under their "most pious archbishop, the great city of the Alexandrians, with its churches and monasteries, was by God's favour enjoying complete peace," and that they and their archbishop held firmly to the Nicene creed, refusing to admit any alterations in or additions to its text (alluding in part to what is called the Constantinopolitan recension of it, and in part to the Chalcedonian "definition"), and acknowledged "the synods held at Ephesus" (the second being the "Latrocinium," at which Dioscorus and the Egyptians terrorised their colleagues into condemning Flavian) but did not acknowledge the synod of the 150" (i. e. the council of Constantinople in 381, which had been so expressly recognised at Chalcedon). The document, as we now have it, breaks off abruptly with the words, "for the church of the great city of the Alexandrians does not accept the council of Chalcedon;" but it appears from other evidence (Leo, *Epist.* 149; Mansi, vii. 522), that it went on to ask that the sanction given to

that council might be recalled, and a new council summoned, and to assert that the Alexandrian people, the civil dignitaries, the municipal functionaries, and the company of transporters of corn-freights, desired to retain Timotheus as their bishop. The Monophysite cause had friends among the clergy of Constantinople; and pope Leo complains more than once of Anatolius's remissness in checking their intrigues (*Epist.* 155, 157), which appear to have had some effect, for although the emperor Leo so far discouraged the emissaries of Timotheus as to refuse their request for immediate action against the authority of the council of Chalcedon, which he had already constructively upheld by confirming the ecclesiastical acts of his predecessors (cp. pope Leo's *Epist.* 149 with Mansi, vii. 524), he yet deemed it expedient to send copies of both memorials to the bishops of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and to fifty-five other prelates, and also to three leading monks (one of them being Symeon Stylites), requesting their opinion as to the case of Timotheus and as to the authority of the council (Evagrius, ii. 9; Mansi, vii. 521). Pope Leo, who had already in July memorialised the emperor against the intrusion of Timotheus (*Epist.* 145), and written in October a letter of consolation to the exiled bishops (*Epist.* 154), replied to the rescript on 1st December, 457, dwelling on the consistency of the Chalcedonian definition with the Nicene faith, and pleading for the deliverance of the Alexandrian church from a gang of sacrilegious parricides (*Epist.* 156); and on the same day wrote again to the exiles, exhorting them to think of "that country which was their own" (*Epist.* 158). The emperor received replies from the other prelates whom he had consulted; all but one, the inconstant Amphilochius of Side, accepted the council of Chalcedon (Evagr. ii. 10), and all condemned Timotheus in more or less energetic terms, although some with "a salvo, if the statements of the exiles were true" (Mansi, vii. 537 ff.). "A tyrant and a man of blood, who in his excessive cruelty exceeds the old tyrants who armed themselves against the martyrs;" "a homicide, a slayer of his father;" "not to be reckoned among priests, but to be regarded as under anathema and among Simeniacs;" "he became not a shepherd of Christ's sheep, but an intolerable wolf; not a father, but a parricide;" "like Absalom he took away the spouse of a father who was still living" (a bishop being "espoused" to his church); "an adulterer . . . a homicide . . . worse than an unbeliever;" "he is unworthy even to be called a Christian;" "he is known to have plotted, either in will or in act, against Proterius of holy memory;" "he received an unholy and imaginary ordination from bishops condemned, and from only two such;" "he ought to be removed even from the rank of laymen," &c. Pope Leo wrote again to the emperor in March 458, urging him to put an end to the deplorable captivity of the Alexandrian church (*Epist.* 162); but owing to Monophysite influence near the court, this object was not attained until two years after the receipt of the episcopal opinions, for it was in the early summer of 460 that Leo I. sent orders to Stilas, the "dux" commanding at Alexandria, to expel Timotheus from the church, and to promote the election of an orthodox bishop (Liberatus, *Brev.* 15). "The Cat" was then ejected, but showed his wonted acuteness by obtaining permission to come to Constantinople and pretend that he had adopted the Chalcedonian doctrine, as if heterodoxy had been his only fault, and so on becoming orthodox he might hope to retain his see. Pope Leo wrote, on the 17th of June, 460, to Leo I. and to Gennadius, the new patriarch of Constantinople, urging that Timotheus, even supposing his conversion to be sincere, was disqualified by having "invaded so great a see during the lifetime of its bishop" (*Epist.* 169, 170). Accordingly Timotheus was a second time exiled with his brother Anatolius—first to Gangra, and then, on his causing fresh disturbances, to a village on the shore of the Chersonesus which Eutychius calls Marsuphia (cp. Evagr. ii. 11; Liberatus, *Brev.* 16; Theophanes, *Chronogr.* i. 186; Eutychius, ii. 103); and during sixteen years the church over which he had tyrannised was at peace under the rule of his namesake, Timotheus called Salofaciolus [TIMOTHEUS SALOFACIOLUS]. But when the next emperor, Zeno, fled from the usurper Basiliscus, towards the close of 475, a new scene opened for Aelurus. He was summoned to Constantinople, where his admirers greeted him with "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord" (Simplicius, in Mansi, vii. 976), but according to the anecdote-loving Theophanes, on reaching a place called the Octagon, he fell off his ass and sprained his ankle (*Chronograph.* i. 187). The patriarch Acacius closed the churches against him, but he held services in private houses (Mansi, l.c.). Basiliscus recognised him as rightful bishop of Alexandria, and by his advice put forth a circular to the episcopate, condemning "the innovation in the faith which was made at Chalcedon," whereby a "stumbling-block was cast in the way of the orthodox people" (Evagr. iii. 4). But when the Eutychians of Constantinople, deeming his arrival a godsend, hastened to pay court to him, he disappointed them by declaring that he for his part accepted the statement which Cyril had in effect adopted at his reunion with John of Antioch, that "the Incarnate Word was consubstantial with us, according to the flesh" (Evagr. iii. 5). On his way home, he visited Ephesus, and gratified its clergy and laity by declaring their church (the fifth in Christendom in point of dignity) to be free from that subjection to Constantinople which had been imposed on it by the 28th canon of Chalcedon (Evagr. iii. 6). When he reached Alexandria, the kindly and popular Salofaciolus was allowed to retire to his monastery at the suburb called Canopus, whereupon, according to Theophanes, the partisans of Aelurus cried aloud, "Thou hast fed (ἐψώμισας) thine enemies, O pope!" and he answered complacently, "Yes, indeed I have fed them." In accordance with the imperial letter, he "required all who approached him to anathematise the council of Chalcedon," but he could not retain his hold on the extreme section of his party (Evagr. l.c.). He probably committed much of the administration to his old friend Peter Mongus, whom he made his archdeacon. [PETRUS (6) MONGUS.] Pope Simplicius, in June of 476, besought Basiliscus to "deliver the see of St. Mark from the impious

parricide" (Mansi, vii. 977: the date of 4 Id. Jan. has been corrected to 4 Id. Jun., Pagi, ii. 395); but he was not likely to move the usurper, and even when Zeno regained his throne in July of 477, and thought of acting on Simplicius's exhortation to "restore the Alexandrian church to its lawful and Catholic bishop" (Mansi, vii. 981), he was dissuaded from disturbing "an old man who had nearly reached the common resting-place of all" (Evagr. iii. 11). In effect, Timotheus did not long survive; if the Coptic reckoning which gives him twenty-two years is correct (Renaudot, *Hist. Patr.* p. 121) his death must be dated on the 31st of July in 479 (Le Quien, ii. 416); but this date is inadmissible, for pope Simplicius's ninth letter, written shortly after the restoration of Salofaciolus, which was somewhat subsequent to Aelurus's death, is dated March 13th, 478; Aelurus therefore probably died in the autumn of 477, and Neale dates the event in that year (*Hist. Alex.* ii. 17). Liberatus tells us that, fearing fresh troubles, he longed for death, and ultimately hastened it by taking poison (*Brev.* 16). Theophanes says, on the authority of "Peter, a presbyter of Alexandria," that Timotheus, having found some unpublished writings of Cyril, corrupted their text in various places; and Leontius quotes as from Timotheus "Aulurus" (so he writes instead of Aelurus) a passage reflecting on the "inconsistency" of Cyril as a theologian; but as it refers to Severus of Antioch (A.D. 513) it is clearly the product of a later writer (see it in Galland. *Bibl. Patr.* xii. 737). Neale says briefly of Aelurus, "With respect to his character there can be but one opinion." [W. B.]

TIMOTHEUS (19), commonly called SALOFACIOLUS, patriarch of Alexandria, was duly elected, after the expulsion of Timotheus Aelurus, at the beginning of August, A.D. 460. He was attached to the Chalcedonian dogma, and may be identified with the "Timotheus, presbyter, and a steward of the Alexandrian church," who had signed the memorial of the persecuted Catholic bishops presented to the emperor Leo in A.D. 457 (Mansi, *Concil.* vii. 530). His distinguishing name of Salofaciolus, or Salafaciolus, appears to be made up of a Coptic and a Latin word, and to signify "wearer of a white head-gear or cap" (Du Fresne, *Gloss. Med. et Infim. Graecit.* ii. 1659); hence Liberatus, according to the probable correction of his text "Asbus" into "Albus," explains it as "white" (*Brev.* 16). Evagrius says (ii. 11) that he was also called "Basilicus," which, of course, is a Monophysite nickname, equivalent to Melchite or "the emperor's man;" and Eutychius surnames him Surus (*Ann.* ii. 103). After his consecration he sent a presbyter named Daniel and a deacon named Timotheus, with a letter to pope Leo, who replied in terms of warm congratulation, to the effect that "the universal church shared in his joy" at the good news; and urged the newly appointed "Catholic bishop of the Alexandrian church" to root out all remains of Nestorian as well as of Eutychian error (*Epist.* 171, August 18, 460). Ten orthodox Egyptian bishops had also written to Leo, and informed him, as his reply indicates, that the election had been regular and deliberate, unstained by "canvassing, sedition, or unfairness of any kind," and that Timotheus was approved as worthy of so eminent a bishopric for purity of character and integrity of faith (*Epist.* 173). The great pope here insists, in terms which resemble our Quinquagesima collect, on "that standard (*formam*) of charity without which no other virtues are of any avail," as to be kept in view amid the efforts of the orthodox patriarch and his suffragans to heal "the widespread sore" of misbelief; and Timotheus "of the White Cap" is said to have carried such charity to a point which his own supporters thought extreme. "In his episcopal administration," says Liberatus, "he was exceedingly gentle, so that even those who were of his communion complained of him to the emperor for being too remiss and easy-going towards heretics, in consequence of which the emperor wrote to him not to allow the heretics to hold assemblies or to administer baptism; but he continued to treat them gently, and while he thus discharged his office the Alexandrians loved him, and cried aloud to him in the streets and in the churches, "Even if we do not communicate with thee, yet we love thee.'" Acacius of Constantinople confirms this description by calling Salofaciolus's "submissive patience after the example of the meekness of David" (Mansi, vii. 983, alluding to LXX. Ps. cxxxi. 1); but this gentleness became weakness when, in the hope of conciliating the Monophysites, he reinserted the name of Dioscorus in his church diptychs (Mansi, vii. 983), and so gave occasion for the blundering Eutychius to rank him with the other Timotheus as a "Jacobite" (*Ann.* ii. 103). Timidity had evidently much to do with this softness of disposition; but such a man could not be unpopular, and accordingly when Timotheus Aelurus returned in A.D. 476, and took possession of the archbishopric, Salofaciolus was allowed to reside in the monastery of the monks of Tabennesus, situated in a suburb of Alexandria called Canopus (see Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 415). He was there when Aelurus died, and there he remained, fearing to cause a "tumult" if he showed himself in the city; whereupon the Monophysites took the opportunity of electing and enthroning Peter Mongus, who had been archdeacon under Aelurus; but the Augustal prefect Anthemius, acting on a mandate from Zeno, expelled Peter from the church, and reinstated Timotheus Salofaciolus (Evagr. l. c.). This step was followed up by rigorous edicts, intended to overawe the numerous clerics, monks, and laymen who refused to communicate with the restored patriarch (*Breviculus Hist. Eutych.* in Mansi, vii. 1063). Timotheus sent his thanks to Zeno by means of his brother Gennadius, who had been ejected by Aelurus from the see of Lower Hermopolis, and whom he had promptly reinstated, and also of John called Talaia, who had been at first, like Salofaciolus, a steward of the Alexandrian church, and had since then been ordained a presbyter for the monks of Tabennesus, and who ere long succeeded to the patriarchate. (Cf. Liberatus, *Brev.* 16.) Simplicius naturally rejoiced in the restoration, and was still better pleased when Timotheus sent a bishop named Isaiah, with Nilus, a priest, and Martyrius, a deacon, to express regret for his previous "error" as to the commemoration of Dioscorus, to tell Simplicius that it had been cancelled, and to present a copy of a "libellus

satisfactionis" indicating the repentance of some whom Aelurus and Peter Mongus had "drawn away, by dread" of censures, from the profession of orthodoxy (Mansi, vii. 985). "Persecution," as Simplicius remarked, had taught Salofaciolus that a merely conciliatory policy was ineffective. Peter was lurking in corners of Alexandria, "plotting against the church;" the patriarch wrote to Zeno, as well as to Simplicius, on the subject, and begged that he might be removed to a distance (Liberatus, *Brev.* 16; *Breviculus*, in Mansi, vii. 1063). Simplicius pressed the point in letters to Acacius; but Zeno could not be induced to take this step against Peter, and it is probable that Acacius was at least lukewarm in the cause. At last, according to the *Breviculus*, Timotheus sent John Talaia again to Constantinople, to ask for some assurance that he might have a Catholic successor. He obtained a promise to that effect, and soon afterwards "died undisturbed" (Liberatus), about midsummer of A.D. 482, as we learn from letters of Simplicius, dated July 15 in that year (Mansi, vii. 991). [W. B.]

TIMOTHEUS (20), bishop of Doliche, in the Euphratensis, attended the council of Antioch which deposed Athanasius of Penta (Labbe, iv. 728, 733) and also the council of Chalcedon (*ibid.* 329, 377, 453, 589, 808). During Theodoret's banishment, Timotheus wrote friendly letters to him which he acknowledges with gratitude, at the same time bearing testimony to his zeal for the orthodox faith. At his request, Theodoret wrote a long letter containing an exposition of the orthodox faith regarding the Incarnation. (Theod. *Ep.* 130.) [E. V.]

TIMOTHEUS (21), an orthodox bishop, whose see is not named, to whom Theodoret sent a short treatise on the Incarnation, which he had composed a short time previously at the request of a man of God. (Theod. *Ep.* 130.) [E. V.]

TIMOTHEUS (22), bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, under the emperor Zeno, c. 484. In his episcopate, the turbulent Samaritans headed by Joshua a chief of the banditti, attacked Caesarea, and burnt the church of St. Probus (*Chron. Paschal.* A.D. 484, p. 327; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 569). [E. V.]

TIMOTHEUS (23), bishop of Gaza, sent by the people of Jerusalem to Constantinople in 491, to appeal to the emperor Anastasius against the hateful impost known as the Chrysargyrum, which was remitted by him (Evagr. iii. 39; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 617; Dositheus Hieros. *Patr. Hieros.* lib. iv. c. 18, § 1). [E. V.]

TIMOTHEUS (24), patriarch of Constantinople, appointed in A.D. 511, by the emperor Anastasius the day after the deposition of MACEDONIUS (3). He had been priest and keeper of the ornaments of the cathedral, and was a man of bad character. He adopted the Monophysite doctrines from ambition, not conviction, at least if the following story is true. A new abbat for the monastery of Studium was to be ordained by him, but refused to receive ordination from one who rejected the council of Chalcedon. Timothy immediately anathematized all who opposed or anathematized that council. An enemy of Timothy reported this to the emperor, and Timothy then denied he had ever said such a thing, and promptly anathematized all who acknowledged that council. He refused to celebrate mass in any church till the images of Macedonius had been removed. Two liturgical innovations are attributed to him, the prayers on Good Friday at the church of the Virgin, and the recital of the Nicene creed at every service, though the last is also ascribed to Peter the Fuller.

Timothy sent circular letters to all the bishops which he requested them to subscribe, and also to assent to the deposition of Macedonius. Some assented, others refused, while others again subscribed the letters, but refused to assent to the deposition of Macedonius. The extreme Monophysites headed by JOANNES (…) of Alexandria, whose name he had inserted in the diptychs, at first stood aloof from him, because though he accepted the Henoticon he did not reject the council of Chalcedon, and for the same reason FLAVIANUS (16), and ELIAS … at first communicated with him. He afterwards in conjunction with SEVERUS of Antioch assembled a synod which condemned that council, on which Severus communicated with him. Timothy sent the decrees of his synod to Jerusalem, which bishop ELIAS refused to receive them. Timothy then incited Anastasius to depose him (Liberatus, 18, 19; Mansi, viii. 375). He also induced the emperor to persecute the clergy, monks, and laity who adhered to Macedonius, many of whom were banished to the Oasis in the Thebaid. His emissaries to Alexandria anathematized from the pulpit the council of Chalcedon.

Within a year of his accession Timothy directed that the *Ter Sanctus* should be recited with the Monophysite addition of "Who was crucified for us." On November 4th and … this caused disturbances in two churches in which many were slain [MARINUS (7)], and the next day a terrible riot broke out which nearly caused the deposition of Anastasius.

Timothy died on April 5th, A.D. 517. (Vict. Tun., *Chron.*; Marcellinus, *Chron.*; Theod. Lector, ii. 28, 29, 30, 32, 33; Evagrius, iii. …; Theophanes; Tillemont, *M. E.* xvi. 691, … 728.) [F. D.]

TIMOTHEUS (25) II. (Neale), III. (Le Quien), patriarch of Alexandria A.D. 520–5… During his rule the church of Alexandria was distracted by disputes between the Corrupticolae and the Aphtharto-docetae. He strove to moderate them, whereupon a deacon of Alexandria, one Themistius, started a new sect called the Agnoïtae. [THEMISTIUS.] Le Quien identifies him with one Asterius or Apollinaris mentioned as Catholic patriarch in Sim. Metaph. *AA. S. Arethae.* Justinian summoned him to Constantinople to subscribe the decrees of Chalcedon, but he died before starting. (Le Quien, ii. 428; Assem. *Bib. Orient.* p. …; Pagi in Ann. 521, num. 18; *AA. SS.* Boll. Jun. v. 63; Neale, ii. 30–33.) [G. T. S.]

TIMOTHEUS (26), priest of Jerusalem about A.D. 535, and author of a homily on the song of Simeon and the Blessed Virgin Mary. Combefis first published it in Latin in his *Auctarium.* Mai published the Greek text in

his *Auct. Class.* x. 585–595. Some critics attribute it to Hesychius of Jerusalem, and others to Methodius of the same city. It will be found in Migne, *Pat. Graec.* t. lxxxvi. col. 235. [G. T. S.]

TIMOTHEUS (27), presbyter and treasurer of the great church of Constantinople in cent. vi. He wrote a treatise on the Reception of Heretics (de iis qui ad Ecclesiam ab haereticis accedunt) which, with a treatise on the two natures in Christ, was first published in Greek by Meursius in 1619. This latter treatise was not by Timotheus; it is ascribed to St. Maximus. His catalogue of heresies is important for the history of these sects. He divides their adherents into three classes. (1) Those who must be rebaptised, as the Manichaeans, because their baptism was invalid. (2) Those who require unction merely, as the Novatians and Macedonians. (3) Those who require neither baptism nor unction, but who must anathematise their former opinions, as the Nestorians and Eutychians. His date can only be approximately fixed. He seems to have written before the 7th century, as he makes no mention of the Monothelites, but finishes his catalogue with the Acephali and the branches of that heresy. He speaks, on the other hand, of the 5th General Council, and ranks it along with the four great councils. His work must have been widely used throughout the East, and was modified according to the circumstances of each church, whence, as Cotelerius has concluded, have arisen the great diversities which exist in the various MSS. Lambecius, *Commentar.* v. 122, and viii. 428, notices that a Vienna MS. differs widely from all those hitherto published. The work of Timotheus will be found in the collections of Combefis, Cotelerius, and in Migne's *Pat. Graec.* t. lxxxvi. (Ceill. xi. 340; Fabric. *Bib. Graec.* viii. 358–360, ed. Harles.) [G. T. S.]

TIMOTHEUS (28), priest of Antioch, who published a lenten homily on the Cross and the Transfiguration. Gretser, ii. 313, first published it. It will be found in Migne's *Pat. Graec.* t. lxxxvi. 253–266. He flourished about the sixth century. [G. T. S.]

TIRECHAN, bishop, author of the *Annotations* upon St. Patrick, which form the second collection upon his life in the *Book of Armagh*, being one of the two earliest authorities extant; they are in Latin, simply in the form of notes collecting traditional notices, and belong to the middle of the 7th century. (See Hogan in *Analecta Bolland.*, t. i. pp. 531, 543; also t. ii. where the *Annotations* are given in full, pp. 35–68. See also O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 343, 347; Todd, *S. Patr.* 395, 429; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* iii. 316, 356; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 15, 27, 425; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 405, 423.) Nothing is known of him except the testimony in the *Book of Armagh*, f. 9, "Tirechan episcopus hec scripsit ex ore vel libro Ultani episcopi, cujus ipse alumpnus vel discipulus fuit;" Ultan died A.D. 657. Tirechan is also supposed to be the author of the *Catalogus Sanctorum Hiberniae, secundum diversa tempora*, first published by Ussher (*Wks.* vi. 477 sq.) from two MSS., but Colgan's identification (*Acta SS.* 134, c. 14, 141, n.[e]) with Tyrechanus, whom St. Fechin recalled from Rome, is doubtful as the story is legendary (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 371). His feast is July 3. [J. G.]

TITHFERTH (Kemble, *C. D.* 116). [TIDFERTH.] [C. H.]

TITIANUS, or Tatianus, the correspondent to whom Ambrose's *Ep.* lii. is addressed. [J. Ll. D.]

TITIANUS, the advocate who conducted the case against Felicianus before the pro-consul (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iv. 4, 5; 5, 6; 39, 46; 41, 48). [FELICIANUS (4) Vol. II. 475.] [H. W. P.]

TITUS, emperor. [VESPASIANUS.]

TITUS (1), a bishop addressed in the ninth of the pretended letters of the Pseudo-Dionysius. The latter there explains the use of material language concerning the Deity in Holy Scripture as being a condescension to human weakness (Ceill. x. 552). [DIONYSIUS (1) Vol. I. p. 843.] [G. T. S.]

TITUS (2), bishop of Bostra in Arabia Auranitis, c. 362–371, of very high repute for learning and eloquence. He is named by Jerome among the many distinguished Christian writers in whom you are in doubt whether most to admire their secular erudition or their knowledge of Holy Scripture. (Hieron. *Ep.* 70 (84).) Jerome mentions his works, dwelling especially on the three works written against the Manichaeans "fortes adversus Manichaeum scripsit libros et nonnulla volumina alia." (Hieron. *de Vir. illust.* c. 102.) He is also enumerated by Sozomen (*H. E.* iii. 14, *ad fin.*), together with Eusebius of Emesa, Basil of Ancyra, Cyril of Jerusalem, and others, as writers of the highest celebrity, ἐπισημότατοι, whose learning is proved by the many and remarkable writings they left behind them. On the principle "noscitur a sociis" the appearance of Titus in such company, as well as his being distinctly reckoned among the Acacians by Socrates (*H. E.* iii. 25), would seem to make his orthodoxy doubtful. Titus is chiefly known to us from the mean and spiteful attempt made by Julian to induce the citizens of Bostra to expel him as a calumniator of their city. The circumstances were these. The re-establishment of pagan worship in the cities of the East by the emperor Julian had led to many popular outbreaks in places where the Christians were strong and the rival religions pretty equally balanced. Bostra was one of these places. The pagan inhabitants had made the authoritative revival of their ancient cult the signal for organized attacks on their Christian fellow-citizens. The Christians retaliated. The passions of both parties were exasperated, and public peace was seriously endangered. Julian, with the unfairness which characterized all his dealings with the church, chose to assume that the Christians were responsible for these disturbances, and sent a message to Titus, threatening to call him and the clergy of the city to account judicially if any fresh outbreak took place (Soz. *H. E.* v. 15). Titus replied in a letter, in which he stated that though the Christian population exceeded the heathen in numbers, in obedience to his admoni-

tions they had maintained quietness under severe provocations, and that there was no fear of the peace of the city being disturbed by them (*ibid.*). Julian on this issued a rescript to the citizens of Bostra, Aug. 1, 362, charging Titus with calumniating them by his representations that they only abstained from violence in obedience to his monitions, and calling upon them to rise up against him and drive him out of their city as a public enemy ὡς οὖν κατήγορον ὑμῶν ἔκοντες τῆς πόλεως διώξατε. (Julian Imp. *Ep.* 52, p. 437.) This truly contemptible exhibition of petty spite completely failed of its object, and the death of Julian found Titus still bishop of Bostra. (Rendell, *Emperor Julian*, pp. 188, 222. [JULIAN, Vol. III. p. 510A.] On the accession of Jovian, Titus is enumerated by Socrates (*H. E.* iii. 25) as a member of the Acacian party, who with characteristic suppleness and absence of fixed principle sought to secure a standing with the new emperor by uniting themselves to the orthodox Meletius, at a synod held at Antioch, at which they drew up a declaration of faith, and presented it to the emperor, denouncing the Anomoeans and accepting the Nicene faith, including the test word of the "Homoousion" with the proviso that it signified no more than that the Son was begotten of the Father's essence, and that He was like to the Father in essence (Socr. *H. E.* iii. 25; Labbe, ii. 828). According to Jerome, he died in the reign of Valens, c. 370. Of the works of which he was author, πολλά τε καὶ λόγου ἄξια (Soz. *H. E.* iii. 14), we have only very scanty remains. Of his powerful work against the Manichees in four books (" fortes libros," *l. c.*) commended by Jerome and referred to by Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxvi. c. 21), and Theodoret (*Haeret. fab.* lib. i. c. 26) three books exist in MS. in the Library of the Johanneum, at Hamburg (Fabr. *Biblioth. Graeca*, viii. 684, ix. 320). The Greek text with Turrianus's Latin version was printed, but not at all accurately, by Jacques Basnage in his *Thesaurus Monumentorum Ecclesiastorum*, Antwerp, 1725 (tom. i. pp. 59 ff.) A Latin version by Turrianus of the first two books with part of the third had been previously published by Henr. Canisius in his *Lectiones Antiquae*, of which Basnage's Thesaurus is a revised edition (tom. v. p. 36 ff.), and is reprinted in the *Bibl. Patr. Maxima*, Lugd. 1677; (tom. iv. p. 443 ff.), by Galland; (*Bibl. Patr.* tom. v. pp. 269 ff.), by Migne (*Patrolog.* tom. xviii. pp. 1069 ff.); Caillau (*Patr. Apost.* tom. xli. Latin only). What we have appears to consist only of excerpts from the larger work. A short fragment of 14 lines on φθορὰ ἄφθαρτος is found in Photius (*cod.* 232), by whom the work is also referred to (*cod.* 85). The fourth book is wanting in the Hamburg MS., but is preserved in a Syriac version. The Greek arguments of all four survive and are given by Basnage, but are omitted by Migne. An edition of the Greek text from the Hamburg codex has been published by P. A. de Lagarde, Berlin, 1859; and the four books in a Syriac version by the same editor, at the same place and date. A commentary on St. Luke, printed under Titus's name in Greek by Fronto Ducaeus (*Auctar. Nov.* ii. Par. 1624), and in Latin in the *Biblioth. Patr. Maxima* (*u. s.*), and by Peltanus (Ingolst. 1580), is a cento made up of fragments of Titus pieced out from various later authors (Fabr. *Bibl. Graec.* viii. 685). A Palm Sunday homily ascribed to him is given by Combefis (*Auctar. Nov.* i. 638, *Bibl. Concion.* iii. 379), but is certainly the work of a later author.

(Baron. *Annal.* tom. iv. sub ann. 362, No. 1[illegible]; sub ann. 363, No. 143; Tillemont, *Mém. E*[illegible] vii. 385; Ceillier, *Aut. Eccl.* vi. 43 ff.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 228; Gallandi, *Bibl. Patr.* vol. [illegible] p. xxvi. 269; *Bibliotheca Patrum Max.* Lugd. 1677, pp. 415–477; Migne, *Patr.* xviii. 1069 ff.; Fabr. *Bibl. Graec.* vi. 7[illegible]; viii. 684; ix. 320; Clinton, *Fasti R.* [illegible] No. 141.) [E. V.]

TOBIAS (1), the fifth bishop of Jerusalem, the beginning of whose episcopate is placed in the fourth year of Hadrian, A.D. 121. Eutychius (356) assigns three years to his episcopate. (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 5; Epiphan. *Haer.* lxvi. 20; *Chr. Armen.* Euseb.) [E. V.]

TOBIAS (2), the ninth bishop of Rochester, consecrated by archbishop Brihtwald, to succeed bishop Gebmund, who was alive at Theodore's death, and probably lived over the year [illegible] [GEBMUND]. (Bede, *H. E.* v. 8.) His name [is] attached to a privilege of king Wihtred, placed in the Chronicle in 694; but the date is uncertain, and the attestations may be spurious even if the act itself be partly genuine. (See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 241) [and see WIHTRED]. In 706 the name of Tobias appears among the attestations of an Evesham charter (K. *C. D.* 5[illegible]) and this is perhaps the earliest unsuspected place where it is found. (See also K. *C. D.* [illegible], a Crowland charter undoubtedly spurious.) He was at the council of Clovesho in 716, in which the genuine Act of Wihtred was confirmed. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 301). All we know about Tobias is learned from Bede, who describes him as a very learned man, skilled in the Greek, Latin and Saxon tongues, and in various departments of learning (*H. E.* v. 8). He had been a scholar of abbat Adrian and archbishop Theodore, and spoke both Greek and Latin as well as his mother-tongue. His learning was general as well as ecclesiastical. He died in 726, the year after Wihtred's death, and was buried in the porch of St. Paul in St. Andrew's cathedral at Rochester, where he had prepared his own grave (Bede, *H. E.* v. 23). Bale (Scriptt. [illegible] 1559, p. 90) ascribes to him a book of letters and another of Homilies, written with the eloquence of Demosthenes. Leland also (Scr. p. [illegible]) enlarges on Bede's account of him, but ascribes to him no extant work. If Bale was not writing at random, he may have seen something now lost bearing the name of Tobias. See Wharton, *Ang. Sac.* i. 330, &c. [S.]

TOCCA, bishop. [TORTHELM.]

TOLA (TOL, TOLAI, TOLAUS) **(1)**, bishop of Ardbraccan, co. Meath, died A.D. 765. (*Ann. Tig.*) [J. G.]

TOLA (2), abbat and bishop of Clonard, was son of Dunchadh of the family of the Galeng, descended from Oilill Olum. After leading an eremic life for many years at Disert-Tola (probably in King's Co.), he became bishop of Clonard, co. Meath, and, though with less likelihood,

bishop of Kildare. He died March 30th, A.D. 738 (*Ann. Tig.*). He is designated sometimes from Disert-Tola (*M. Doneg.* Mar. 30; Boll. *Acta SS.* Mart. iii. 792, praet.), and sometimes from Clonard. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 407 c. 5, 793, gathering a memoir *De S. Tola abbate et episcopo;* Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* iii. c. 19, § 8; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 229.) [J. G.]

TOLMANNUS, companion and martyr with St. Killian at Würzburg, A.D. 689, wrote *Ad Gozbertum super Repudio cum Geilana.* (Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 608.) [TOTNANUS.] [J. G.]

TOMARSA. [TAMUSA.]

TOMENE (TOMIANUS, TOMMENE, TOMMIAN, TOMYN), bishop of Armagh. [THOMIAN.]

TONANTIUS (1), a defender of the faith in Spain against the Nestorians who were propagating their tenets there. He was addressed on the subject along with Vitalis in a letter of Capreolus bishop of Carthage (*Ep.* 2 in *Pat. Lat.* liii. 849). This edition of the letter reads the name as Constantius, but Baronius (ann. 431, xxviii.) citing the letter in full has Tonantius. [C. H.]

TONANTIUS (2) requests Sidonius Apollinaris to compose some verses for him to recite at table. Sidonius (*Ep.* 13) suggests a discourse on piety, but if such a subject should seem too serious for the age of Tonantius he suggests to him to propose and solve some philosophical question, or some question concerning nature. At the same time he concedes the wish of his petitioner, and sends him a poem, composed some twenty years before, but never previously made public. (*Pat. Lat.* lviii. 292.) [R. J. K.]

TOPOS. In the Valentinian system the DEMIURGE was sometimes called by the name of the region where he dwelt, and over which he presided. Thus he is called HEBDOMAS (see Vol. I. p. 850 a), and τόπος (Hippol. Ref. vi. 32, p. 191), and the latter is used as if it were his primary name (Clem. Alex. *Excerpt. ex script. Theod.* 34, 38, 39). [G. S.]

TORA, a bishop, subscribing the legatine council of Celchyth, 787. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461.) [TOTA.] [C. H.]

TORCTGYTH, a nun of Barking, who had visions, recorded by Bede. She was the assistant of St. Ethelburga in managing the discipline of the young inmates of the monastery, but was for nine years subject to a grievous bodily infirmity. Shortly before the death of the abbess Ethelburga Torctgyth saw in the evening twilight a luminous body drawn up from the dormitory by golden ropes to heaven. After the death of Ethelburga Torctgyth lived three years, reduced almost to a skeleton, and shortly before her death had a trance of three days and nights' duration. Awaking from this she opened her eyes on a heavenly vision, and began to speak with a person invisible to the bystanders, praying for an early release. Being asked to whom she was speaking, she replied, to my dearest mother Ethelburga. She died twenty-four hours later (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 9). [S.]

TORHTHELM (TOTTA, TOCCA, TOTCA), the fourth bishop of the Middle Anglian see of Leicester (*M. H. B.* 624). On the death of bishop Aldwin, who had held the Mercian and Middle Anglian bishoprics together, in the year 737 (Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* 659), two bishops were appointed, Hwitta to Lichfield, Totta—or Torhthelm—to Leicester. The date of his death is given by Simeon of Durham, doubtless from the Northumbrian annals, from which he drew the most valuable part of his early material (*M. H. B.* 663) in 764; his successor's name was Eadberht. There can be no doubt that Totta is a familiar abbreviation for Torhthelm, as Sigga is for Sigfrith. Nothing of especial note is preserved about Torhthelm, except a letter written by him to St. Boniface, whom he addresses in language of great affection, and congratulates on the conversion of the Saxons. Boniface, it appears, had written to him first, telling him of his earnest purpose to preach to the heathen. "Who," writes Torhthelm, "would not rejoice at this sweet hearing; who would not exult and be glad in these works, that our nation should believe in Christ the Almighty God?" He encourages him with good wishes and exhortations, asks to be remembered in prayers and at mass, and sends him a little present, the pledge of a great affection. The letter is more terse and intelligible than most letters of the period (Mon. Moguntina, ed. Jaffé, No. 101; pp. 251, 252). Torhthelm's presence can be traced in councils and charters; he attests charters of Offa (K. *C. D.* 90, 99, 102) and one of the West Saxon Cynewulf (*ib.* 193), and was present at the great council of the year 747, held at Clovesho (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 360, 362; W. Malmesb. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, pp. 9–11), for the reformation of the church. [S.]

TORHTHERE, the third bishop of Hereford (*M. H. B.* 621). He succeeded Tyrhtel between 693 and 716, in which latter year he attests the confirmation of king Wihtred's privilege in a council at Clovesho (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 300). His successor, Walchstod, was bishop when Bede finished his work: Torhthere, like Tyrhtel, is not mentioned by any historian, but his name is preserved in the epitaph ascribed to archbishop Cuthbert by William of Malmesbury (*G. P.* iv. § 163) [TYRHTEL]. [S.]

TORKINUS, bishop of Man, said to have been consecrated by St. Patrick (Stubbs, *Reg. Sac.* 154). [C. H.]

TOTA, the sixth bishop of Selsey, the successor of Giselhere and predecessor of Wiohthun (*M. H. B.* p. 618). The name of this bishop does not occur in any of the chronicles, nor does he appear as attesting any charters. There can, however, be no doubt that he is the bishop "Tora" who attended the great council held by the legates George and Theophylact in 786 or 787; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461, and that he is in his right place in the South Saxon Fasti. Giselhere disappears after the year 781; and Wiohthun is first found in charters of 789. Nothing is certainly known of the condition of Sussex at this time. [S.]

TOTANEUS, abbat, disciple and companion of St. Columba, flourished A.D. 606 and wrote

Regula ad Fratres (Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 610). The authority for this is Boethius (*Scot. Hist.* l. ix. i. 166–7), who names him thus among St. Columba's disciples and companions; Leslaeus (*Hist. Scot.* l. iv. p. 152, ed. 1675) calls him Iotaneus. [J. G.]

TOTCA, bishop. [TORTHELM.]

TOTILA (BADUILA), chosen king by the Goths in the autumn of A.D. 541 on the murder of Erarich. A sufficient account of the events of his reign of eleven years, and his recovery of almost all Italy, and of his final defeat by Narses and his death in A.D. 552, is given under JUSTINIANUS I. Vol. III. 542. During the embittered strife between the Goths and Romans the influence of the orthodox clergy was exerted on the side of the latter, and several of them were cruelly treated by the Goths. The story of the bishop of Populonia being exposed to a bear (Gregorius, *Dial.* iii. 11) for concealing Roman soldiers savours indeed of legend, but on the taking of Tibur and Perugia the bishops of these places were cruelly put to death (Procop. iii. 10; Gregorius, *Dial.* iii. 13), and when bishop Valentinus, who had been sent by pope Vigilius with the corn ships to Rome during the siege, was taken prisoner, Totila, accusing him of answering his questions untruly, caused his hands to be cut off (Procop. iii. 15). On the other hand Totila treated St. Benedict and certain other ecclesiastics, for instance SABINUS of Canusium, with great respect (Gregorius, *Dial.* ii. 14, 15; iii. 5). On the taking of Rome he went to pray at St. Peter's, where he was met by the deacon Pelagius, and at his entreaty forbade any further slaughter of the inhabitants. He afterwards sent Pelagius to Justinian to endeavour to make peace (Procop. iii. 20, 21), and he had already despatched the bishop of Assisi on a similar mission (Marcellinus, *Chron.*). On the other hand, pope Vigilius at Constantinople used all his influence to induce the emperor to continue the war. On the first approach of Totila to Rome, it is mentioned that all the Arian priests were expelled from the city on suspicion of being in communication with him (Procop. iii. 9). Totila, alone among the Gothic kings in Italy, coined silver money bearing only his own image and superscription, thereby declaring that he acknowledged no dependence on the emperor (Dahn, *die Könige der Germanen*, ii. 235). [F. D.]

TOTNANUS (THEODHANUS, THOLMANNUS, THOTNANUS, TOKNANUS, TORNANUS, TOTHAT, TOTHNANUS, TOTMANNUS, TOTNAM, TOTNATUS, TOTTMAN, TOTUANUS), deacon, companion and fellow-martyr with St. Kilian at Würzburg in Franconia [CILIAN]. Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 608) says he wrote *Acta Kiliani magistri.* [J. G.]

TOTTA, bishop. [TOTA.]

TOTTA AND TOTTAN, bishop (Kemble, *C. D.* 102, 112). [TORTHELM.]

TOXOTIUS (1). Julius Toxotius, husband of Paula, the friend of Jerome. He was, by ancestry, both Greek and Roman, being descended from the Julian family, and tracing his descent from Aeneas. It may be concluded that he was a Christian, from the fact that his wid[illegible] mourned so bitterly for him at his death. [illegible] wish to have a son was only gratified short[illegible] before his death, their four daughters being [illegible] before the younger Toxotius. He possessed gre[illegible] wealth. His death probably occurred betwe[illegible] 375 and 380. [W. H. F.]

TOXOTIUS (2), son of the foregoing, [illegible] born shortly before his father's death. He wa[illegible] still a child in 384, when his mother and [illegible] sister Eustochium left Rome for Palestine, a[illegible] is represented by Jerome as standing on th[illegible] shore and stretching out his hands to them [illegible] they sailed. It is not known to whom his ed[illegible]cation was entrusted, nor whether he became [illegible] Christian. Jerome speaks of Paula as despoi[illegible] her children of their inheritance for the sa[illegible] her charities (*Ep.* cviii. 5); and it is poss[illegible] that Toxotius may, as Thierry supposes, have be[illegible] by this alienated from Christianity. Laeta, whom he married, was the daughter of the [illegible]then priest Albinus. But, if not converted be[illegible] their marriage, they must have become Christian[illegible] soon after, since their first living child [illegible] younger Paula, was dedicated to Christian v[illegible]ginity, even before her birth, and learned [illegible] lisp Halleluia in her cradle. The expression [illegible] Jerome, Luctuosa fecunditas, seems to indi[illegible] that previous children had died at their bir[illegible] Toxotius, though no salutation is sent him [illegible] Jerome in his epistle to Laeta on the educati[illegible] of their daughter, and though his wish to ha[illegible] sons shows that he had no tendency to asceticis[illegible] seems to have made no objection to the ascet[illegible] education proposed for his daughter. This ep[illegible]tle was written in 443. Paula died in 404, [illegible] it is probable that soon after that time [illegible] younger Paula was sent to Bethlehem. Jer[illegible] also states that the wife of Toxotius, th[illegible] remaining in Rome, had taken a vow of etern[illegible] chastity. Since we have no further mentio[illegible] Toxotius in the writings of Jerome, it is pr[illegible]able that he advanced no further in the path [illegible] asceticism which his mother and sister [illegible] pursued (Jerome, *Ep.* 107, 108, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

TRAJANUS (1), M. ULPIUS (NERVA), emperor, belonged to a family of Italian [illegible] settled in the colony of Italica in Baetica. [illegible] was born on September 18th, probably in [illegible] 53,[a] and passed his early life in the army [illegible] his father, a distinguished officer who had r[illegible] to the consulship. After having been consu[illegible] A.D. 91, in October A.D. 97, being then in c[illegible]mand of the army of Lower Germany, he wa[illegible] adopted by Nerva, with whom till his death [illegible] following January 27th he reigned jointly, and then became sole emperor. He remained [illegible] the Rhine, placing that frontier in a state [illegible] defence, till in the latter half of A.D. [illegible] made his entrance into Rome, where he wa[illegible] received with the greatest joy. Among [illegible] earliest acts of his reign were the establishme[illegible] of endowments on a large scale for the supp[illegible] of the children of the poor in Italy by advanc[illegible] money out of the fiscus on the security of priv[illegible] or corporate property, the interest on which w[illegible]

[a] La Berge (p. 300), to allow time for his ten year[illegible] service as tribune and for the civil offices he held before his praetorship in A.D. 85, places his birth in A.D. 5[illegible]

o be applied for the purpose (Dion, lxviii. 5;)ierauer, 56), and the regulation of the grain upply from the provinces, so as to secure Rome ind Italy from any danger of scarcity.

The years A.D. 101 and 102 were spent in the irst Dacian war, which terminated in the reluction of Dacia to a dependent kingdom. In ..D. 105 the second war broke out, which ended n A.D. 106 or early in A.D. 107, the result of vhich was that Dacia was made a Roman rovince.

The next seven or eight years were peaceful. His correspondence with Pliny shows the attenion he gave to the affairs of the provinces, and, even if the circumstances of Bithynia were exceptional (see La Berge, 119), and other governors did not feel Pliny's nervous shrinking 'rom responsibility, the amount of labour that levolved upon him personally must have been mmense. Besides this mass of business he executed gigantic works, which excited the wonler of antiquity, and which even in ruins show the splendour of the age. His first care was to improve the communications of the emire. The Appian Way through the Pontine marshes was reconstructed with masonry, and a new road from Beneventum to Brunlisium was completed in A.D. 109. The greatest work of the kind in the provinces was the continuation along the upper course of the Danube to the frontiers of Gaul of the road which had been made in Moesia for the purposes of the Dacian war. To the Claudian port at Ostia another great harbour was added, which was connected with the Tiber by a canal, and an entirely new port was constructed at Centum Cellae. Even in remote Egypt the same care was bestowed on the communications. The eastern part of the canal made by the Ptolemies between the Red Sea and the Nile was restored, and received the name of the emperor, and a branch to the site of the present Cairo was added. Probably through this canal were conveyed without transshipment from the ports of Myos Hormus and Philotera the granite columns of the Ulpian Basilica, which had been hewn in the mountain quarries overlooking the Red Sea (Letronne, *Recueil des Inscriptions*, i. 196, 421). The emperor completed the work Nerva had begun in connection with the Aqua Marcia, and constructed an entirely new aqueduct from the Lacus Sabatinus to the Janiculum. All these undertakings were eclipsed by that marvellous forum which two hundred years later is described as a work too great for mortal men, and as having no compeer under heaven (Ammianus, xvi. 10), amid the ruins of which still rises in solitary grandeur the matchless column beneath which the ashes of the founder once reposed.

From these peaceful pursuits Trajan was again summoned to defend the frontiers of the empire. A dispute had arisen with the Parthians as to which power was entitled to the vassalage of Armenia. Trajan landed at Seleucia in December A.D. 113, and after dedicating part of the Dacian spoils in the temple of Zeus Casius near Antioch, marched in the spring through Commagene into Armenia.[b] That country was made a Roman province, and the kings of the tribes between the Euxine and the Caspian did homage to the conqueror. He then visited Edessa, and subdued the north of Mesopotamia, taking Nisibis and Batnae, and returned to winter at Antioch. Early in A.D. 115, he had a narrow escape in the great earthquake there. In the following spring he again took the field, crossed the Tigris, conquered Adiabene, and after marching through Mesopotamia and again crossing the Tigris, captured Ctesiphon the Parthian capital. Thence he descended the river to its mouth, and, first and last of Roman emperors, sailed on the Persian Gulf. But ere long he was recalled by a dangerous rising in his rear. A revolt of the Jews in Cyrenaica, Egypt, and Cyprus broke out, probably in A.D. 115, in which the most horrible atrocities were perpetrated.[c] It was eventually put down by Marcius Turbo, who had been sent by Trajan, but in concert with their brethren the Jews in Mesopotamia took up arms and a general rising throughout Mesopotamia and Osrhoene followed, in which the Romans sustained considerable losses, one of Trajan's legates being defeated and slain, and Trajan himself was repulsed before the little town of Atra. Nisibis and Edessa were, however, recovered by his legates, and Seleucia, probably the town of that name in Commagene on the Euphrates, was taken and burnt. Great numbers of the Jews were slain by Lusius Quietus, who had been given the chief command. After raising the siege of Atra Trajan's health began to fail, and though he had contemplated another Mesopotamian campaign, he was obliged to give up the plan and became eager to return to Italy. He set out, but died on the way at Selinus in Cilicia, probably about August 7th or 8th, A.D. 117.

For the purposes of this work the interest of Trajan's life centres in the famous Rescript, addressed to his friend Pliny in reply to his letter detailing his procedure towards the Christians in Bithynia, and inquiring whether Trajan approved of it, and if not what course he was to pursue. Pliny had arrived in his province immediately before September 18th, A.D. 110, or more probably A.D. 111 (Mommsen, *Hermes*, 1869, 59), and the letter was probably written in the year after his arrival. The Rescript is one of a series of replies to inquiries on the most various subjects—police, baths, sewerage, precautions against fires, water supply, public buildings, &c.—and neither Pliny nor Trajan seems to have considered the subject one of special importance. As Pliny's letter is the earliest heathen account of the services and behaviour of the Christians, and Trajan's reply is the earliest piece of legislation about Christianity that we possess, we shall first give a translation of the correspondence and then proceed to comment upon it.

After stating that having never been present at trials of Christians, he was ignorant of the

[b] The chronology of these events is that adopted by Lightfoot. Merivale places the arrival of Trajan in the East a year later, the Armenian campaign in A.D. 115, and both the Mesopotamian and Assyrian campaigns in A.D. 116. Dierauer and La Berge place the arrival in Dec. 113, the Armenian campaign in A.D. 114, the Mesopotamian in A.D. 115, and the earthquake in the winter of that year.

[c] Dierauer (p. 182) places this revolt early in A.D. 117, but La Berge, following Eus. (*H. E.* iv. 2) and Jerome (*Chron.*), puts its commencement in A.D. 115, and its final suppression in A.D. 117.

precise nature of the crime and the usual punishment, and also how far it was the practice to pursue the inquiry, he submits to the emperor the following points, namely, whether any distinction should be made on the ground of age, or should young and old be treated exactly alike; should those who abjured Christianity be pardoned, or should a man who had ever embraced Christianity gain nothing by renouncing it; should the mere name apart from any crime or the crimes associated with the name be punished? Provisionally he had taken the following course in the case of persons brought before him on the charge of being Christians. "I demanded," he says, "of the accused themselves if they were Christians, and if they admitted it, I repeated the question a second and a third time, threatening them with punishment; if they persisted I ordered them to be led to execution. For I felt convinced that, whatever it might be they confessed they were, at any rate their unyielding obstinacy deserved punishment. Some others, who were Roman citizens, I decided should be sent to Rome for trial. In the course of the proceedings, as is generally the case, the number of persons involved increased and several varieties appeared. An anonymous document was presented to me which contained the names of many. Those who denied that they were or ever had been Christians I thought should be released when they had, after my example, invoked the gods and offered incense and wine to your image, which I had ordered to be brought for the purpose along with those of the gods, and had also blasphemed Christ, none of which things, it is said, can those who are really Christians be compelled to do. Others, who were accused by an informer, first said they were Christians and then denied it, saying that they had been, but had ceased to be, some three years, some several, and one twenty years ago. All adored your image and those of the gods, and blasphemed Christ. They declared that all the wrong they had committed, wittingly or unwittingly, was this, that they had been accustomed on a fixed day to meet before dawn and sing antiphonally a hymn[d] to Christ as a god, and bind themselves by a solemn pledge (*sacramento*) not to commit any enormity, but to abstain from theft, brigandage, and adultery, to keep their word, and not to refuse to restore what had been entrusted to their charge if demanded. After these ceremonies they used to disperse and assemble again to share a common meal of innocent food, and even this they had given up after I had issued the edict by which, according to your instructions, I prohibited secret societies (*hetaeriae*). I therefore considered it the more necessary, in order to ascertain what truth there was in this account, to examine two slave-girls, who were called deaconesses (*ministrae*), and even to use torture. I found nothing except a perverted and unbounded superstition. I therefore have adjourned the investigation and hastened to consult you, for I thought the matter was worth consulting you about, especially on account of the numbers who are involved. For many of every age and rank, and of both sexes, are already and will be summoned to stand their trial. For this superstition has infected not only the towns, but also the villages and country; yet it apparently can be checked and corrected. At any rate it is certainly the case that the temples which were almost deserted begin to be frequented, the sacred ceremonies which had long been interrupted to be resumed, and there is a sale for fodder for the victims (*pastumque venire victimarum*, so Lightfoot), for which previously hardly a buyer was to be found. From this one can easily conclude what a number of people may be reformed, if they are given a chance of repentance."

To this letter Trajan replied with the following Rescript: "You have followed the right course, my dear Secundus, in investigating the cases of those who were denounced to you as Christians, for no fixed rule can be laid down for universal adoption. Search is not to be made for them; if they are accused and convicted they are to be punished, yet with the proviso that if a man denies he is a Christian and gives tangible proof of it by adoring our gods, he shall by his repentance obtain pardon, however strong the suspicion against him may be. But no notice should be taken of anonymous accusations in any kind of proceeding. For they are of most evil precedent and are inconsistent with our times." (*Plini et Trajani epp.* 96, 97.)

Besides the interesting information afforded by this letter on the belief and practice of the early Christians (hints are apparently given of the existence of some formula of prayer, of the Eucharist and Agape), what light does it throw on the legal position of the Christians? That trials of Christians had to Pliny's knowledge already taken place appears by it, and the allusion cannot be to the Neronian persecution when he was scarcely three years old, and hardly can be to that which was commenced and almost immediately discontinued by Domitian, assuming that the objects of it were Christians and not Jews. Pliny's language points rather to proceedings of a regular kind against Christians. On the other hand, the fact that a man who had attained distinction at the bar, and who had held all the high offices of state, had never witnessed a trial of this kind, proves that they were rare. Again no statutory enactments as to Christianity existed, still less had Trajan ordered a general and systematic persecution. Had there been any, Pliny would have referred to them, or at any rate Trajan would have done so in his Rescript according to his usual custom, when Senatus Consulta or edicts of preceding emperors were to be found relating to the subject on which he is writing (compare lxvi. and lxxiii.). Pliny's action was therefore based on the fact, that Christianity was a *religio illicita*, its professors members of a *collegium illicitum*, at what might be termed the Roman common law. As long as Christians were regarded by the Roman government as a mere variety of Jews, they shared in the toleration enjoyed by Judaism as a *religio licita*. As soon as the separation between the two religions became apparent to Roman eyes, Christianity lost this shelter and its professors fell under the ban that extended to all unlawful associations. The exact time when the Romans became aware of the distinction has been the subject of much controversy; at any

[d] *Carmen* may also mean a form of prayer, but the words *secum invicem* seem to show it is here used in the restricted sense. See Lightfoot, *Ap. F.* Part II. i. 51, *note*.

rate it had become apparent by the end of the first century. Whatever view may be taken of the Neronian persecution, he does not appear to have issued any edicts against Christians in general, and if Christianity, either apart from or along with Judaism, suffered under Domitian (Dion, lxvii. 14), all the measures on the subject were repealed by Nerva on his accession (Dion, lxviii. 1). This repeal however simply restored the Christians to the position in which they had been before Domitian's proceedings, without changing it for better or worse.

What then was the effect of Trajan's Rescript? Formally it made the position of the Christians worse. It confirmed, by a positive enactment, the view Pliny had taken of their status at common law. Practically, however, the qualifications that they were not to be sought after, and that anonymous accusations were to be rejected—qualifications, which were introduced not from any particular favour with which the emperor regarded the Christians, but from his abhorrence of delation in all its forms, that evil whose prevalence under his predecessors, and especially under Domitian, had left such an abiding horror in the Roman mind (see for instance Juv. iv. 87; Tac. *Ann.* iv. 30; Pliny, *Pan.* 34, 35), and from which it was his especial pride to be free—must frequently have been a boon to the Christians. This secondary bearing of the Rescript was first insisted on by Tertullian (e.g. *Apol.* c. 5, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* i. 276), and the primary thrown into the background. From Tertullian this view of the Rescript passed to Eusebius and from him to other Christian writers, till at last it came to be taken as an edict of toleration terminating a general persecution (Sulp. Sev. ii. 31; Orosius, vii. 12, in *Patr. Lat.* xx. 146, xxxi. 1091), a theory excluded by the words of the Rescript itself, "That no fixed rule could be laid down for the whole empire."

If on the one hand it was not from favour of the Christians that these limitations were introduced, on the other it would appear that Trajan's chief motive was his dread of secret societies, which were especially prevalent in Bithynia (*Epp.* xxxiv., xciii., cxvii.). Pliny's apparently harmless suggestion, that a guild of *fabri*, whose numbers should be strictly limited and which should be open only to *bonâ fide* members of the craft, should be established at Nicomedia as a fire brigade, had seemed so dangerous that the emperor had sternly refused his permission, and it was indeed in consequence of this that Pliny had issued the edict against *hetaeriae* already referred to; with how much more jealousy must Trajan have regarded a body whose meetings were secret, whose members were linked together by a new and strange belief, and whose spread had been so rapid?

Improving on the view that the edict was in reality one of toleration, later writers like Malalas (xi. 273, in *Patr. Gr.* xcvii. 413) assert that Trajan issued a formal general prohibition of the infliction of capital punishment on the Christians [TIBERIANUS], and going a step further, the Syrian and Armenian apocryphal acts of Barsimaeus contain an edict not only granting full toleration to the Christians, but actually punishing capitally any one who molested them. The former statement is given up even by Wieseler (*die Christenverfolgungen der Cäsaren*, 130), who alone among recent writers maintains the authenticity of the letter of Tiberianus, and Görres (*Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theol.* 1878, 39) demonstrates, on several grounds, that the acts in question and consequently the edict they contain are equally spurious. Overbeck (*Studien zur Geschichte der Alten Kirche*) maintains that the Rescript was the law that regulated the position of the Christians till the beginning of the persecution of Severus in A.D. 202, and that from Tertullian downwards a thoroughly mistaken view of it has been taken by the tradition of the church. He asserts that during this period it regulated the practice of the emperors, and that they did not deviate from it either in favour of the Christians or against them. He supports his position by pointing out that Justin Martyr under Antoninus Pius, Athenagoras under M. Aurelius, and Tertullian under Severus (*Apol. I.* 4, *Legatio pro Christ.* 1 and 2, in *Patr. Gr.* vi. 333, 892–893, and *Apol.* 1–4, in *Patr. Lat.* i. 259–289), all agree in stating that the mere name of Christian was punishable. The trials of Ptolemy and Lucius before the prefect of the city are conducted precisely in the manner laid down by the Rescript (Justin, *Apol. II.* in *Patr. Gr.* vi. 445). M. Aurelius, on the occasion of the persecution of Lyons, issues a Rescript which follows the rule approved by Trajan, that those who abjured Christianity should be released, those who refused to do so should be executed (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1). In consequence, Overbeck rejects not only the protection edicts ascribed to M. Aurelius and Antoninus Pius, which are now generally considered to be forgeries, but also, following Keim, argues (134–148) for the spuriousness of Hadrian's letter to Minucius Fundanus, which has usually been thought to be genuine, and which is not really inconsistent with Trajan's Rescript.

The only martyrs who are known by name to have suffered under Trajan, are the bishops SYMEON of Jerusalem and IGNATIUS of Antioch.

By a strange caprice of fortune, the first emperor who issued a formal law against the Christians is, according to the legend of Gregory the Great, the only pagan who has escaped eternal punishment. The pope, according to the story told by his biographer (Joannes Diaconus, ii. 44), one day passing in procession through Trajan's forum, and being struck by a group representing the emperor pausing on his march to hear a widow that demanded justice for the murder of her son, wept at the thought of the perdition of so just a prince, and prayed before the tomb of St. Peter. That night the pope was assured by a vision that his prayers had been heard, but was warned that he was never again to venture to pray for any pagan.

The legend had a wide currency in the middle ages. Dante (*Purgatorio*, x. 73) describes a group representing the interview between Trajan and the widow, and in the *Paradiso* (xx. 44) beholds the soul of the pious emperor in the sixth heaven among the spirits of the just made perfect. In art the legend was no less popular. It appears among the sculptures of the Doge's Palace; it is found in the tapestries at Berne, the spoils of Charles the Bold.

The chief authorities for the general history of Trajan are (i.) ancient—the epitome of Dion

Cassius, lxviii. 3–35; Pliny's Panegyric and letters (quoted above from Keil's edition); Victor *de Caesaribus* and *Epitome;* and John Malalas, xi., whose statements must be received with great caution (for a critique of the sources of his account of Trajan see Professor von Gutschmid's note in Dierauer, 155). (ii.) Modern—Tillemont, *Emp.* ii. 144–218; Francke, *Zur Geschichte Trajan's:* Merivale, ch. lxiii. and lxv.; Dierauer's essay in Büdinger's *Untersuchungen zur Römischen Kaisergeschichte*, vol. i., and La Berge in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*, vol. xxxii. For his relations with the Christians, to the authorities already cited may be added Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 32, 33, 36; Tillemont, *M. E.* ii. 167–212; and Gibbon, c. 16. The ancient authorities for the reign of Trajan are singularly meagre, and the dates, and even the order of many of the important events in his reign have been determined only by the evidence of inscriptions and coins. [F. D.]

TRAJANUS (2), commander-in-chief under the emperor Valens. He was defeated by the Goths. The emperor upbraided him, when he boldly replied that it was the imperial Arianism, and not his own inefficiency, caused his defeat, by setting God against him (Theodoret, iv. 30). He may be the same as the Trajan, to whom St. Basil wrote, in A.D. 373, on behalf of one Maximus, a former governor of Cappadocia (*Epp.* cxlvii.–cxlix.; Ceill. iv. 280, 455). [G. T. S.]

TRAJANUS (3), priest of Syracuse. Gregory the Great thought him the most likely to be chosen as bishop on the death of Maximianus, but though he praised his good qualities he considered him hardly competent. He preferred JOANNES (389), who ultimately became bishop. (*Epp.* v. 17.) [F. D.]

TRAJANUS (4), bishop of Melita (Malta), succeeded the deposed bishop LUCILLUS (3) in A.D. 599. He had been previously abbat of a monastery at Syracuse. Gregory the Great, subject to the approval of JOANNES, bishop of that city, gives him leave to take with him four or five of his monks, and also the slaves he had bought with his own money, and his own MSS. and those of his father, and also what he had acquired since he ceased to be abbat. What, however, he had acquired during his abbacy, was to remain the property of the monastery. Three years afterwards a circular letter is addressed to him, with the other Sicilian bishops. He may be the Trajanus whom Gregory considered unfit to succeed MAXIMIANUS (7) in the bishopric of Syracuse (*Epp.* x. 1; xiii. 18; v. 17). [F. D.]

TRANQUILLINUS (1), a friend of Jerome and Oceanus, in Rome, at the end of the 4th century. He had written, in the year of 396, to speak of the prevalence of Origenism, and the resistance made to it by Oceanus. Jerome points out to him, in reply, that Origen, though his opinions were dangerous, might be read for the sake of his learning and his power as a commentator. (Jerome, *Ep.* 62, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

TRANQUILLINUS (2), an old friend of Chrysostom, who wrote him a letter of affection from Cucusus. (Chrys. *Ep.* 63.) [E. V.]

TRANQUILLINUS (3), bishop of Anti... Pisidia (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 1037). He t... prominent part at the council of Ephesus in ... In the *Contestatio* addressed to Cyril and Ju... his name stands first both in the document ... and in the subscriptions. He also subsc... the Epistle of the Orientals to the clergy ... people of Hierapolis (Hard. i. 1350, 1352; ... *Adv. Trag. Iren.* cc. 7, 13, 28 in Mansi v. ... He must afterwards have become reconcil... Cyril, as he is not among those finally ex... (*ib.* cap. 190). [C. H.]

TRANQUILLINUS (4), bishop of Tarra... is said to have been a disciple of St. Vict... and a monk in his monastery, and to have ... many years bishop. These statements ... derived solely from the late life of St. Victor... by Ayusa y Yriarti, the materials of which ... derived from ancient Breviaries (*AA. SS.* ... i. 741), but if Tranquillinus filled the ... between SERGIUS (died after A.D. 546) and Ar... temius (bishop before A.D. 589), it wou... consistent with the date of St. Victorian (... *Sag.* xxv. 75). [F. ...]

TRANQUILLUS (1), an imaginary bi... of the "Chalcedonii of Syria," who, accor... to Praedestinatus confuted the Noetians. [G. ...]

TRANQUILLUS (2), a bishop, who at... tended the second council summoned by ... enemies of Chrysostom, where, together w... Elpidius of Laodicea, he repudiated the autho... of the canon of the council of Antioch, used ... a weapon against him, on the grounds of ... heretical character of the synod (Pallad. p. ... He may perhaps be the same as the ... Tranquillinus to whom Chrysostom wrote, ... 37. [E. V.]

TRASAMUND, king. [THRASAMUND.]

TRANSAMUNDUS II., duke of Sp... [FAROALDUS II., GREGORIUS (52, 53), LIU... PRANDUS I.]. [F. ...]

TREBELLIUS POLLIO, one of the A... gustan historians. He wrote under Diocle... and Constantine. To him are ascribed bio... phies of the Valeriani, Gallieni, Thirty Tyr... and of Claudius II. [SPARTIANUS]. Teuffel's ... *of Roman Literature*, 11, 320. [G. T. S.]

TREDAN, abbat, 778–785. K. 148*, Bir...

TREFERIUS, bishop. [OCTAVIUS (6).]

TREMORINUS, bishop of Caerleon, ... A.D. 490, and was followed by St. Dubr... but we owe his name to Geoffrey of Monm... (*Hist. Brit.* viii. 10), and find it forming ... of the legend of Merlin and king Arthur; ... is probably the same as the mythical TRE... NORUS. (Ussher, *Wks.* v. 102–3, *Ind.* C... A.D. 490; Stubbs, *Reg.* 154.) [J. G.]

TRESANUS (TRESSANUS, TESANUS), co... fessor at Avenay in France about the ... century. By the Scotch annalists (Boeth... Lesley, Dempster, and Camerarius) he is made a native of Scotland; but he was probably an Irishman, and went to Gaul with six brothers and three sisters. According to the ...

Tressani conf. compiled by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 271 sq. with appendix), from records at Rheims, and republished by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Feb. 7, ii. 53–6 with comment. praev. in 16 paragraphs), but not of much value historically, he was pious, but ignorant and simple, and was acting as a swineherd when St. Remigius came to the village of Murigny where Tresan lived, and cleared him from some false accusations. He was ordained priest by St. Remigius, and remained on the Marne near Rheims till he died on Feb. 7th, and was buried at Avenay in Champagne, but his date is unfixed. [GIBHRIANUS.] (Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. pt. i. 127, pt. ii. 902, app.; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* 376 sq.) [J. G.]

TRIBONIANUS (1), a bishop addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. *Ep.* 149) on the responsibilities of the episcopal office. [C. H.]

TRIBONIANUS (2), successively quaestor, consul, and master of the offices to Justinian. He was also that emperor's confidential adviser in all his legal reforms and compilations. His history is given at length in Smith's DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY, *s. v.* Tribonianus. In addition to the authorities there quoted, the reader may consult on the vexed question as to the real religion of Tribonianus Helwig, *de Paganismo Triboniani*, Greifswald, 1728; and Fabric. *Bib. Graeca, pass.* Cf. also the article on Justinian in this Dictionary, Vol. III. p. 551–559, and in the *Encyclop. Britann.*, new edition. [G. T. S.]

TRIBUNUS, cleric of Sipontum. [FELIX (156).]

TRIDUANA (KIDUANA, TRADLIN, TRADWELL, TRALLEW, TREDDLES, TREDUANA, TREDWALL, TREDWELL, TROLLHAENA, TRULLEN), virgin, commemorated Oct. 8, appears in two Scotch legends as accompanying both St. Bonifacius Kiritinus (Skene, *Chron.* 423) and St. Regulus (*ib.* 187 as Kiduana); in the *Orkneyinga Saga* (ed. Anderson, 1873) she is called Trollhaena. The account in *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. SS. p. aest. f. cxxii.) follows the legend of St. Regulus in saying that Triduana came to Scotland with St. Regulus and lived as hermit at Rostoby (Roscoby, Forfarshire) with her two virgins, Potentia and Emeria (or Cineria). Being pursued by the impure love of a neighbouring chief, she fled to Dunfallandy, Perthshire. She devoted herself more entirely to fasting and prayer at Restalrig, near Edinburgh, which afterwards became a place of pilgrimage for the blind and tender-eyed. (Bp. Forbes. *Kals.* 454; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 270, 275; Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 612.) [J. G.]

TRIFERIUS, bishop. [OCTAVIUS (4).]

TRIFOLIUS (1), prefect of Italy, to whom the emperor Theodosius the Great addressed a law dated June 14, 387, enjoining that the regulations to prevent Apollinarists and other heretics holding assemblies should be enforced (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi.; lit. iv. l. 2, p. 100, ed. Gothofred). [C. H.]

TRIFOLIUS (2), a priest, was asked by the senator Faustus whether the doctrine of certain monks of Scythia, who had arrived at Rome from Constantinople, that one of the Trinity was crucified [HORMISDAS, Vol. III., 160], was consistent with the teaching of the fathers. Trifolius in his letter replied in the negative, on the authority of the first four general councils. This was in A.D. 520 (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 553). [F. D.]

TRIGETIUS, an ex-prefect, with the exconsul Avienus, accompanied pope LEO the Great, q. v. on his mission to Attila in A.D. 452. He may be the person of that name who negotiated the peace with the Vandals in February, A.D. 435 (Prosper, *Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* li. 596, 603). [F. D.]

TRIGUILLA, master of the household of Theoderic, is accused by Boethius (*De Cons.* i. Pr. 4) of using his position for extortion and oppression, in which Boethius asserts he had often checked him. [F. D.]

TRILLO (TERILLO, THERILLO), Welsh saint, son of Ithael Hael, accompanied St. Cadfan from Armorica, and became a member of the college on Bardsey early in the 6th century: patron of Llandrillo, Merionethshire, and Llandrillo-yn-Rhos, with the singular little building called St. Trillo's chapel on Beaumaris Bay, Carnarvonshire. His feast is June 16. (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 24, 54; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 223.) [J. G.]

TRINIO (TRINIAW, TRINIAWG, TRUNNYAV, TRUNYAW, TRYNYAV), Welsh saint, son of Difwng ap Emyr Llydaw, came with St. Cadfan from Armorica to Wales and Bardsey early in the 6th century: founded Llandrinio, Montgomeryshire. (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 24, 31, 54; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 165, 213, 219.) [J. G.]

TRINITY, THE HOLY (Ἡ ἁγία Τριάς; *Sancta, Sanctissima Trinitas*).

I. *The Terms.*—There is nothing transcendental or mysterious in the terms by which the central mystery of the Christian faith is designated by Greek and Latin writers. Τριάς is either the number three, or a triplet of similar objects, as in the phrase κασιγνήτων τριάς (Rost u. Palm's *Lexicon*, s. v.). In this sense it is applied by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* IV. vii. 55; p. 588 Pott.) to the Triad of Christian graces, Faith, Hope, Charity. As Gregory of Nazianzus says (*Orat.* xiii. p. 211), τριὰς οὐ πραγμάτων ἀνίσων ἀπαρίθμησις, ἀλλ' ἴσων καὶ ὁμοτίμων σύλληψις. The first instance of its application to the Three Persons in the one God is in Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autol.* ii. 15). Similarly, the word Trinitas, in its proper force, means either the number three, or a triad. It is first applied to the mystery of the Three in One by Tertullian, who says that the Church "proprie et principaliter ipse est spiritus, in quo est Trinitas unius divinitatis, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus" (*De Pudicitia*, 21. Compare *adv. Praxeam*, 2—"οἰκονομίας sacramentum quae unitatem in trinitatem disponit").

It may be convenient to mention here also the terms which became most prominent in the Trinitarian controversy. Οὐσία, in the Platonic terminology, designates the idea or "form" the inherence of which makes any object that which it actually is—its essence or being. It is of course a νοούμενον, inaccessible to sense, that

which is apparent to the senses being *φαινόμενον*. The word *ὑπόστασις* came to be used in later times, especially by the Stoics, as the noetic substratum which underlies (*ὑφίσταται*) the phenomena. It was consequently, in philosophic diction, undistinguishable from *οὐσία*. In the exigencies of controversy, however, a distinction was drawn, and it was laid down (Basil, *Epist.* 42; iii. 63 *Opp.* ed. Paris, 1638) that *οὐσία* is a "universal," denoting that which is common to the individuals of a species; while *ὑπόστασις* expresses that which makes an individual that which he is; that, in fact, which constitutes personal existence. It is worth mention, that these terms seem to have been introduced into theology by the Gnostics; *οὐσία*, *ὁμοούσιος*, *ὑπόστασις*, *ὑποκείμενον*, all occur in Irenaeus's account of the Valentinians (*c. Haeres.* i. 5). The word *πρόσωπον* (primarily the countenance, afterwards a mask or "part") was employed by Sabellius to designate the three manifestations of the one Deity (which he did not regard as being individual existences), and afterwards with an orthodox signification. Cicero translated the word *οὐσία* by its etymological equivalent, *essentia* (Seneca, *Epist.* vi. 6 [158]); it is evident that in Seneca's time it was not naturalized in the Latin language. The word *ὑπόστασις* was rendered in later times by *substantia*, but this was also employed to render *οὐσία*, which was regarded as equivalent. *Hypostasis* was also used as a quasi-Latin word, but took no root in the language. Πρόσωπον was rendered by *persona*, a word, however, which from its legal associations expressed individual separate existence much more emphatically than *πρόσωπον* (see the note in Baur's *Dreieinigkeit*, i. 446; Routh's *Reliquiae*, iii. 383, note on *ὑποστάσεις*; C. Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, p. 183 ff.). Compare HOMOUSIOS, Vol. III. 133.

II. *The Doctrine.* — 1. *Introductory.* — The doctrine of the Holy Trinity is confessedly transcendental. It is made known to us by divine revelation; but even when revealed, it is still beyond the grasp of human conception. To speak generally, the Heavenly Father reveals Himself in the Son as propitiated, and in the Holy Spirit certifies the faithful of their relation to God as His children, and by His ever-working power draws them to partake of His own divine life; He "sanctifies all the elect people of God." The doctrine may be summed up in the words "the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet they are not three Gods, but one God." It was the attempts of various thinkers to put this great mystery into such terms as to be, or seem to be, comprehensible by man, which occasioned the Trinitarian discussions and heresies of the early centuries. It is the task of this article briefly to follow the course of Christian thought on this subject.

2. *The Holy Trinity in the New Testament.*— The Latin Fathers from the end of the fifth century onward constantly appeal to the well-known interpolation 1 John v. 7. Greeks and Latins alike refer to the voice of the Father and the vision of the Spirit at the baptism of the Son (Matt. iii. 16, 17), and to the Lord's injunction as to baptism (Matt. xxviii. 19) as grounds for the Christian faith in the Holy Trinity. With regard to the divinity of the Son in particular, reference is made to H[is] designation as God in Acts xx. 28 (reading θεοῦ), 1 John v. 20; Tit. ii. 13; Rom. ix. 5; to the application to the Son of passages which in the Old Testament relate to God the Father, as in 1 Cor. x. 9 (reading Χριστόν), John xii. 38 f., Eph. iv. 8; Heb. i. 6 ff.; Matt. iii. 3; to the designation of Christ as Son of God, Only begotten of the Father, of the same nature with Him, in John i. 14, 18; iii. 16; v. 18; to the divine attributes which are given to Him, as eternity, John i. 1; Rev. i. 8, 18; Heb. i. 11; omniscience, Matt. ix. 4; John ii. 24 f.; xxi. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 5; Col. ii. 3; omnipotence, John [...]; Rev. i. 8; to the divine operations which are attributed to Him, as the creation of the world, John i. 3; 1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 16; Heb. i. 2; its maintenance, Col. i. 17; Heb. i. 3; the raising and quickening of the dead, John v. 21, 28 f.; Matt. xxv. 31 ff.; to the honour paid to Him as to God, John v. 23; Acts i. 24; vii. [...]; 1 Cor. i. 2; Heb. i. 6, 8; Rev. v. 9 ff. Christ is called God not only by St. Thomas (1 John xx. [...]) but also by St. Paul in Rom. ix. 5, where the connexion seems to require this explanation. In Col. ii. 9 the whole fulness of the Godhead is said to dwell in Him bodily; and the [...] passage in St. John (i. 1 ff.) undoubtedly represents the Word or Reason of God, who was incarnate in Jesus Christ, as being with the Father from all eternity. St. Paul (Col. i. [...]) describes Him as the complete representation (*εἰκὼν*) of the invisible God. Texts are also found which represent the Son as "inferior to the Father, as touching his manhood:" John v. 19; viii. 28; xiv. 28 (*ὁ πατὴρ μείζων μου ἐστίν*); xx. 17; 1 Cor. xi. 3; Eph. i. 17; Matt. xix. 17 (text. recept.).

Of the Holy Spirit, the personality seems to be proved by the reference (John xiv. 16) to Him as *another* Comforter, i.e. as of the same nature with the Son; compare xiv. 26; xv. [...]; xvi. 8, 13, *ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει*, etc. He is spoken of in such a manner as to imply His personality in Rom. viii. 16, 26 (*συμμαρτυρεῖ, ἀντιλαμβάνεται*) and Rev. xxii. 17. [HOLY GHOST, Vol. III. [...]]

The union of the Three Persons is found in Matt. xxviii. 29; 2 Cor. xiii. 13. But, in truth, when we are once convinced that "the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God," and join this to the patent fact that Christians worshipped one God [GOD, Vol. II. 689], it necessarily follows that these are "not three Gods, but one God."

3. *The Father.*—About the nature of God the Father, there has been comparatively little controversy in the Church. Jewish and Gentile Christians agreed in recognising the one God Who made and maintains all things. Nor did they doubt that He is a Person, a Being having a Will, and that Will to good. Yet in fact the differences of conception on this subject which were found in different schools of thought were not inconsiderable, and not without influence on the discussions about the mystery of the Holy Trinity.

a. In the Gnostic conceptions of the Most High—which, though heretical, exercised some influence on speculation within the Church—the most prominent point is the difficulty of conceiving pure Spirit, such as God is, being brought into connexion with matter, which was held to

be by its very nature impure; it is only through a series of beings gradually descending in purity and dignity that He can be brought into connexion with the material world. The first beginning of the succession of Aeons is in the mind of the supreme Deity, who in them becomes conscious of himself.

b. In the Alexandrian school, influenced as it was by the later Platonism, we find the most purely immaterial conception of the Most High God. Human thought is utterly powerless, said Clement (*Strom.* v. 11, § 72), to express anything positively as to the being of God; it is only possible to know what He is not (γνωρίζειν οὐχ ὅ ἐστιν, ὃ δὲ μή ἐστιν). Origen holds that God alone is, in the strict sense, a purely spiritual, incorporeal Being. He is therefore incapable of direct contact with matter. There must consequently be some kind of intermediate being between Him and matter, though at the same time Origen seeks to avoid anything like the Gnostic emanation-process. But though God is "beyond all being" (ἐπέκεινα πάσης οὐσίας), and so inconceivable, Origen always represents Him, not as a mere abstraction, but as a Person having consciousness, thought, and will. This Alexandrian mode of thought, which withdraws the Deity from all positive affirmation, has been called the *via negationis*.

c. The antithesis of this is the *via eminentiae*, according to which God is conceived as having faculties similar to those of man, but of inconceivably greater purity, intensity, and power. This is found in the Clementine Homilies, which represent a kind of Judaic Gnosticism. Thus, Simon says, and Peter approves (*Hom.* xix. 11), that τῶν προσόντων ἀνθρώποις τὰ κρείττονα αἰωνίως πρόσεστιν τῷ Θεῷ. In this view, God cannot be without body and limbs, without form and beauty, in order that He may be the object of human love and reverence, for man can neither love nor fear a mere abstraction. This Clementine view, however, runs into Pantheism; God is the heart of all things; from Him all things stream forth; to Him all things return (*Hom.* xi. 2 f.). The Clementines are no doubt heretical, but some of the early teachers of the Church also appear to identify reality with corporeity. When Melito of Sardes wrote a special treatise on the corporeity of God (περὶ ἐνσωμάτου Θεοῦ, Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 26. 2), he may have intended, as has been supposed, to vindicate the materialistic conception of God [MELITO, Vol. III. 898], but the title is equally applicable to a treatise on the Incarnation. Tertullian, however, maintains in the frankest manner that we must ascribe corporeity to God, because that which is incorporeal is non-existent, "nihil est incorporale, nisi quod non est" (*De Carne Christi*, c. 11). Yet we are not to suppose that he ascribed to God the same kind of body as a man has; he distinguishes "omne quod est corpus est *sui generis*" (*ib.*).

d. Christians have always maintained the unity of God both against pagan polytheism and against Gnostic dualism. [GOD, Vol. II. 689.] No one has attacked the latter with keener dialectic than Tertullian (*c. Marcion.* i. 3, 5, 9). And they were further bound to oppose the Gnostic hypothesis, that such apparently opposed qualities as Justice and Mercy could not be found in one being, and therefore must be distributed to several (Tert. *c. Marc.* ii. 11; Clem. *Hom.* xviii. 1 f.). The great problem, how to reconcile God's omniscience and omnipotence with man's freedom, also emerged in early times (Justin. *Apol.* i. 43; Origen *in Genes.* cc. 5–9; c. Cels. ii. 20).

4. *The Son.*—The great controversy, however, of the early centuries turned on the nature of the second Person of the Holy Trinity and His relation to the Father. The two principal forms of error, towards which human thought on the subject gravitated, were, the belief that Jesus was simply a man chosen by God and endowed with a special portion of His Spirit (Adoptianism); and the belief that Christ was a heavenly Being, the Spirit nearest in dignity to the Father, who took our nature upon him, and after accomplishing his work on earth ascended to God the Father (Pneumatism).

In the earliest writers there is a looseness or carelessness of expression with regard to the Person of Christ which later teachers, taught by centuries of controversy, avoided. But the general lines of their teaching are sufficiently clear. They sought to give adequate expression to the central mystery of Christianity, the union of the nature of God with the nature of man (2 Pet. i. 4). And this could only be attained by such a conception of Christ as should make evident the divine and the human in Him, without confusion of Persons or division of substance. Hence the Ebionite conception [EBIONISM, Vol. II. 25] of Christ as a being essentially human, though filled with the Spirit of God and even in wondrous wise begotten of the Spirit, was at once rejected as altogether short of the truth. Equally inadequate was felt to be the conception of a being, essentially divine, seemingly appearing in human form, or seemingly united with the man Jesus [DOCETISM, Vol. I. 867]. In a word, all conceptions were finally rejected by the Catholic Church which seemed to endanger either the true divinity of the Son of God, or the true humanity of the Son of Man, or the true union of God and Man in one Christ.

5. *Views of Apostolic Fathers.*—The earliest pagan witness to the Christian faith (Pliny, *Epist.* x. 96 [*al.* 97]; cf. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 28, 5) testifies expressly to the fact that, according to the evidence produced to him, Christians in their worship were accustomed to sing a hymn to Christ as God. When we come to the Christian writers themselves, we find Jesus Christ described as κύριος, the LXX translation of the name of God, everywhere, both by Jewish and Gentile Christians. Clement of Rome (1 Cor. 2, § 1) speaks of the sufferings of Christ in a connexion which compels us to identify the sufferer with God. The earliest extant sermon (Clem. Rom. on 2 Cor. i.) begins with the words, "Brethren, we must think of Jesus Christ as God, as the Judge of quick and dead," and goes on to speak of Him as the bestower of spiritual light (i. § 4), and the giver of life to the spiritually dead (i. § 8); in short, in terms which can only apply to God. Barnabas (v. 2) tells us that the Lord endured to suffer for us, though He was Lord (κύριος) of the whole universe, to Whom God said in the beginning, "Let us make man." Ignatius calls Christ God without any qualification (*Eph.* c. 18), and God incarnate (*Eph.* c. 7). Polycarp (*ad Phil.* c. 2)

speaks of Him and having all things in heaven and earth made subject to Him, and as the Judge of quick and dead. In Hermas (*Sim.* v. 16, 5) we find the peculiar conception, that God caused the pre-existent Holy Spirit to dwell in flesh [HOLY GHOST, Vol. III. 115]. So far, there is no speculation about the relation of the Son to the Father, but simple unspeculative recognition of His divinity.

6. *The Apologists.*—With the Apologists we enter on a different phase of thought. When they endeavoured to explain the nature of their faith to pagan opponents, they naturally availed themselves, so far as possible, of terms already intelligible to cultivated heathens. Such a term was *λόγος*. The Stoics, the prevalent philosophical sect in the second century, had already applied to the God whom they recognised as maintaining and organising the universe the terms *λόγος* and *λόγος σπερματικὸς*, considering Him as the rational principle and the cause of existence of all things (Diogenes Laert. vii. 134; Plutarch, *de Placit. Phil.* i. 7; in Ritter and Preller, *Hist. Phil.* p. 365 ff.). Philo, again, resting on the Jewish speculations which distinguished between the unrevealed God and the revealed Wisdom described in such passages as Prov. viii., Wisdom vii., Ecclus. xxiv., had used the word *λόγος* to designate on the one hand God's eternal thought, on the other the organisation and force which are the result of this thought. With him the Logos is *ἰδεὰ τῶν ἰδεῶν*, the unity of the rational forces which are at work in the development of the universe. [LOGOS, Vol. III. 735.] In St. John's Gospel the Logos Who was in the beginning with God, and through Whom all things were made, is revealed as incarnate in Christ. Here then was a means of making at any rate one aspect of the Triune Deity to some extent intelligible to those who were unacquainted with the Jewish Scriptures, but acquainted with current philosophy. Hence the Apologists constantly used the word *λόγος* when they had to explain the nature of Christ's Person to pagan opponents. Tertullian (*Apol.* 21) distinctly refers to the ethnic use of the word, "apud vestros quoque sapientes *λόγον*, i.e. sermonem atque rationem, constat artificem videri universitatis." Moreover, the great pretensions of the Gnostics stimulated them to show that Christianity itself offered an adequate explanation of the phenomena of the world, both moral and physical. It should be especially observed, however, that the Logos of the Apologists has nothing in common with any Gnostic emanation-theory; they do not place an inferior being between the Most High and the created universe in order to avoid the contact of the former with anything material. The Gnostic horror of matter is not in their thoughts.

The Logos-theory of the Apologists is in essentials uniform. God had from all eternity the Logos in Himself, *ἀϊδίως λογικὸς ὤν* (Athenag. *Leg.* 10). Before all created things God produced a rational power (*δύναμίν τινα λογικὴν*) out of Himself (Justin. *Apol.* i. 61). Yet the Logos is not cut off from the Father, so as to leave Him *ἄλογον*; He came into being *κατὰ μερισμὸν οὐ κατὰ ἀποκοπήν*, by distribution of office, not by separation (Tatian. *Orat.* 5; Justin. *Dial.* 128). Theophilus uses the terms which Philo had already applied to the nature of man, *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and *λόγος προφορικός*, to describe the Word or Reason remaining in the Father, and the Word or Reason operating in creation (*ad Autol.* ii. 10); and other Apologists, without using exactly the same terms, make a similar distinction. This Logos is both the regulator of the physical world and the guide of man to true wisdom; wherever reason is, there is the divine Logos. As "begotten" He is distinguished from all creatures; He alone is strictly and properly "son" (*κυρίως υἱὸς*, Justin. *Apol.* ii. 6), and of the same nature with the Father. Yet He is personally distinct from the Father, *δεύτερος Θεός* (Origen, *c. Celsum*, v. 39). [CHRISTOLOGY, Vol. I. 490.]

With whatever inexactness of expression it is abundantly clear that Justin regarded Jesus Christ as existing in and with the Father, as Son or word of God, before His incarnation and before all created things, *προϋπῆρχεν υἱὸς τοῦ ποιητοῦ τῶν ὅλων, θεὸς ὤν* (*Dial.* c. 48). But He is a numerically distinct being (*ἀριθμῷ ἕτερόν τι*, *Dial.* 128), not merely a power or effluence, as that of light from the sun; begotten by the will of the Father (*τοῦ Πατρός θελήσει*, *Dial.* 61; cf. 127, 128). Justin in these passages seems to imply that he believes the Son to have been begotten from all eternity (*ἀπ' αἰῶνος*). Certainly he nowhere falls into the phraseology which was afterwards characteristic of Arianism. With regard to the Holy Spirit he is somewhat indefinite, and even seems in one passage to identify the Spirit with the Word (*τὸ πνεῦμα ... οὐδὲν ἄλλο νοῆσαι θέμις ἢ τὸν λόγον ὃς πρωτότοκος τῷ Θεῷ ἐστίν*, *Apol.* i. 33). Yet he also speaks (*Apol.* i. 13) of placing the Son in the second rank or order, and the prophetic Spirit in the third, clearly distinguishing the Son from the Spirit, and he seems to approach the doctrine of the Procession when he speaks (*Dial.* 116) of the Spirit as the angel or power of God sent to us through Jesus Christ [JUSTINUS MARTYR, Vol. III. 572; HOLY GHOST, Vol. III. 115].

Theophilus of Antioch, in his description of the relation of the Logos to the Father, presents several points of resemblance with Justin. His use of the terms *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and *λόγος προφορικὸς* has already been noticed. It is in him also that we first find the word *τριάς* used in reference to the Godhead. Speaking (*ad Autol.* ii. 15) of the fourth day of Creation, he says that the three days which preceded the making of the lights are types of the Trinity, God and His Word and His Wisdom (*τῆς Τριάδος, τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς Σοφίας αὐτοῦ*), where the "Wisdom" of God is clearly identified with His Spirit, and distinguished from the Word. Athenagoras (*Legat.* 12), repudiating the pagan "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," says that we Christians do not fall into this sensuousness, as we are urged forward by the hope of knowing God and the Word proceeding from Him, of knowing what is the unity of the Child with the Father, what the fellowship of the Father with the Son, what the Spirit is, what is the uniting and distinguishing of these united Beings, Spirit, Child, Father (*Θεὸν καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ Λόγον εἰδέναι, τίς ἡ τοῦ Παιδὸς πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα ἑνότης, τίς ἡ τοῦ Πατρὸς πρὸς τὸν Υἱὸν κοινωνία, τί τὸ Πνεῦμα, τίς ἡ τῶν τοσούτων* [*al.* *τίς ἡ τούτων*] *ἕνωσις καὶ διαίρεσις ἑνουμένων, τοῦ Πνεύματος*

τοῦ Παιδὸς τοῦ Πατρός). He says (*Leg.* 10) that Christians acknowledge a Father God, a Son God, and a Holy Spirit, pointing out in them their unity in power and distinction in rank (θεὸν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν θεὸν καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, δεικνύντας αὐτῶν τὴν ἐν τῇ ἑνώσει δύναμιν καὶ τὴν ἐν τάξει διαίρεσιν); and again (*Leg.* 24) that God, and the Son His Word, and the Holy Spirit, are united in respect of power, or potentially (ἑνούμενα κατὰ δύναμιν). The Holy Spirit he describes (*Leg.* 10) more particularly as an effluence (ἀπόρροια) from God. He also in the same passage speaks of the unity of the Father and the Son (ἑνὸς ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ), and of the Son being in the Father, and the Father in the Son, in the unity and power of the Spirit. [ATHENAGORAS, Vol. I. 206.]

7. *Irenaeus.*—To some of the early teachers of the Church the speculations of bolder thinkers were in some degree offensive, probably as too nearly resembling Gnostic theories. They clung to apostolic simplicity. Such a teacher was Irenaeus, who rejects (ii. 28. 5, 6) in the most emphatic way all attempts to explain and give a definite account of the generation of the divine Son, and scorns those who speak as if they had presided at His birth (quasi ipsi obstetricaverint). They who presume to transfer the phenomena of human speech to the divine Logos know neither things human nor things divine. God's attributes are not to be hypostatized. But this is said with reference to the Gnostic personifications of Ennoia, Nus, and the like, not to the orthodox doctrine, for he, too, like the Apologists, speaks of Christ as the Logos, existing in God and coming forth to men (iv. 6, etc.). He fully recognises (iii. 6) the existence of the Son of God with the Father before all words, and the distinction of the personality of the Son from that of the Father. No one before him expressed so clearly the co-eternity of the Son as he does in the words "semper coexistens Filius Patri" (ii. 30, 9, cf. iii. 18, 1). The Holy Spirit Irenaeus constantly speaks of as "Wisdom;" the Son and the Holy Spirit are precisely equivalent terms to the Word and the Wisdom; the Wisdom, like the Word, is personal, "progenies et figuratio Dei" (iv. 7, 4). [IRENAEUS, Vol. III. 276 ff.]

8. *Clement of Alexandria.*—It is remarkable that Clement of Alexandria, bent as he is on presenting the philosophical aspect of Christianity, has yet but little to say on the unity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in one God. But if he does not philosophise upon it, he fully recognises it. "One," he says (*Paedag.* i. 6, § 42), is the Father of all, One also the Word or Reason (λόγος) of all, and the Holy Spirit is one, and the same everywhere. And, again (*Strom.* v. 14, § 103 f.), he finds in a Platonic sentence a distinct reference to the Holy Trinity (τὴν ἁγίαν τριάδα), in which the Spirit is the third in order, and the second the Son, through Whom all things were made according to the will (βούλησιν) of the Father. He clearly asserts (*Strom.* v. 1. 1) the co-eternity of the Son with the Father, inasmuch as the very conception of "Father" implies that of "Son." Nay, it is not improbable that he used the word ὁμοούσιος to describe the relation of the Son to the Father (Zahn, *Forschungen*, iii. p. 87, 138, quoted by Harnack, *D. G.* 531 n.), as he certainly uses it to designate the identity of the nature of the Son with that of man (*Strom.* iv. 13, 93). He has been supposed to reject (*Strom.* v. 1, 6) the distinction implied in the use of the term λόγος προφορικός, but this is probably an error; see Zahn, u. s. p. 145.

9. *The Monarchians.*—The great Trinitarian conflict of the third century was brought about by those who refused to recognise a distinct personality in the Son, regarding Him as a mere *mode* of the Father's existence. The first leader of these was PRAXEAS [q. v.], who taught from about 175 to 189. He reproached the Catholics with teaching that there were two or three Gods, and claimed in his own doctrine to maintain "Dei monarchiam"—God as the sole origin and ruler of all things—whence he and his party received the name of Monarchians. Praxeas seems to have held (we draw our accounts of him from an opponent, Tertullian) that the same God was at once Father and Logos, the unknowable and the revealed God; that one and the same divine Being, as God the Father infinite and incomprehensible, had revealed Himself as Logos in the world, and become man in Christ. According to this view, it seemed impossible to avoid attributing to the Father what Holy Scripture expressly assigns to the Son—Incarnation, Passion, Death (Tert. *adv. Prax.* c. 2). It consequently received from Tertullian the nickname of the "Patripassian" theory. In spite, however, of the hostility of Tertullian, it does not appear that Praxeas was troubled by the authorities at Rome on account of his doctrine. His contemporary, THEODOTUS the tanner, was indeed excommunicated by Victor, bishop of Rome; but this was for a different and more flagrant heresy. He declared Christ to be a mere man, who had enjoyed a special divine guidance, in whom a divine power had worked (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 28; Tertull. *Praescript. Haer.* 53; Hippolytus, *Haeres. Ref.* x. 23; Epiphan. *Haeres.* 54, 55; Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* ii. 5). It was of course impossible for Catholics to tolerate the views of Theodotus; for if Christ was conceived as merely acted upon by a divine power or influence, he differed only in degree from the prophets. And when Artemon revived the views of Praxeas, he was ejected from the Church at Rome by its bishop Zephyrinus, though he protested that in the time of Victor his views had not been assailed (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 28; Theodoret, *Haeret. Fab.* ii. 5). Henceforth all theories were condemned which denied the distinct personality of the Logos or Son of God. Thus NOETUS of Smyrna, whose opinions were similar to those of Praxeas (Hippolytus *c. Haer. Noeti*; Epiphan. *Haeres.* 57), was condemned, and BERYLLUS of Bostra [Vol. I. 317], who took the same side, was induced by Origen to recant (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 33; Jerome, *Catal. Ill. Scr.* 60). The line of thought which had begun with Praxeas was continued and completed by SABELLIUS. It is uncertain whether this remarkable person sprang from Libya or from Italy. It is certain that in the episcopate of Zephyrinus he was at Rome, where he was won over to Patripassian opinions, which he developed after his own fashion. When Callistus, who had previously seemed to give him some encouragement, became bishop, he renounced Sabellius, and it was probably in consequence of this discouragement that the latter left Rome

and became a presbyter at Ptolemais, where he seems to have attracted many followers. His system was probably in some degree influenced by the peculiar Gnosticism which appears in the Clementine Homilies (*Hom.* xvi. 12). God, he says, extends and contracts Himself; the Monad becomes by extension a Triad. As there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit, so the Father always remains the same, but is extended into Son and Spirit (Athanasius, *c. Arian. Orat.* iv. 12 and 25). The same God, remaining One in substance, transforms Himself according to the needs which arise, and is to us sometimes Father, sometimes Son, sometimes Holy Spirit. In the Old Testament He legislated as Father; in the New He became incarnate as Son; as Holy Spirit He descended upon the Apostles (Theodoret, *Haeret. Fabb.* ii. 9). And he compared the Deity to the sun, which, always remaining one in substance, has three energies or modes of manifestation; first, his actual mass or orb; second, that which causes light; third, that which causes heat. And again to man. As man is composed of body, soul, and spirit; so, in the Deity, the Father is as it were the body, the Son the soul, while the Holy Spirit plays the same part in the Godhead which the spirit does in man (Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 62, § 1). The views of Sabellius were condemned in a synod held at Antioch (c. 265), which declared that the Son was not of one essence with the Father (μὴ εἶναι ὁμοούσιον τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρί), i.e. was not the same being or person as the Father, the word οὐσία not having yet been distinguished from ὑπόστασις (Athanasius, *De Synod. Arim.* §§ 43, 44, in Routh's *Reliquiae*, iii. 314 ff.).

10. *Tertullian and Hippolytus.*—In the words of the ardent opponent of Gnosticism we find a curious resemblance to Gnostic phraseology. Explaining the Christian faith to heathens, Tertullian says, speaking of the Word (λόγος, Sermo, Ratio) through Whom God made the universe, "hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus et prolatione generatum et idcirco filium Dei et Deum dictum ex unitate substantiae," and he proceeds to the comparison of the ray proceeding from the sun without diminution of his substance, and of the kindling of light from light, afterwards so frequent—"ita de spiritu spiritus, et de Deo Deus, ut lumen de lumine accensum" (*Apolog.* 21). Elsewhere (*Adv. Prax.* 8) he thinks it necessary to defend his use of the Valentinian "prolatio" (προβολή), on the ground that the word was none the worse in its true sense, for having been used by the Gnostics in a false one. "Haec erit προβολὴ veritatis," he says, "custos unitatis, qua prolatum dicimus filium a patre, sed non separatum;" the Son proceeds or emanates from the Father, but is not separated. In precisely the same spirit Hippolytus (*c. Noetum*, 10, 11) says that God, in Whom were all things and Himself the All (αὐτὸς ἦν τὸ πᾶν), begat the Word as His counsellor and administrator in the work of creation. This Word, at first invisible, abiding with Himself, He made visible to the world in its being created, and sent Him forth, light from light (φῶς ἐκ φωτός), to be Lord of the creation. And so there stood by the side of God a second (παρίστατο αὐτῷ ἕτερος). Not that he makes two Gods; the Father is "the All," from Whom proceeds the Word as a potency or influence (τὸ δὲ πᾶν πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ δύναμις λόγος). And he too seems to be aware that his words may seem akin to Gnosticism, for he points out that even the Gnostics, for all their multitude of divinities, are compelled by their emanation-system to acknowledge at last one cause of all things. It is not in the mere assertion, that another Being can proceed from God, that they are wrong. That his teaching gives insufficient dignity and personality to the Son is clear from this passage. He regards the Son as a personified influence rather than a Person. And in another place (*Haer. Ref.* x. 33, p. 436) he makes it clear that he regarded the Son as a Being created simply by the will of the Father; "if God had willed to make thee, O man, a god, He could have done it; thou hast an instance of such creation in the Logos" (ἔχεις τοῦ λόγου τὸ παράδειγμα). The Logos, however, was made out of God's self, wherefore He is God, being in essence God (οὐσία ὑπάρχων θεοῦ); but the world was made out of nothing, hence it is not God. Nor does the teaching of Tertullian give to the Son, as touching His Godhead, full equality with the Father. Substantial existence, he says (*adv. Prax.* 9), is wholly with the Father; the Son is an emanation and fragment of the Father's substance (Pater tota substantia est, Filius vero derivatio totius et portio, where derivatio is clearly equivalent to the Gnostic term ἀπόρροια). But though Tertullian, when hard pressed by the Monarchian accusation of Ditheism, took refuge in emanation, he is in the main a zealous assertor of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. He will not divide the substance of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (inseparatos ab alterutro Patrem et Filium et Spiritum testor), even though, for want of other language, he may speak of "alium Patrem et alium Filium et alium Spiritum" (*c. Prax.* 9).

11. *Origen.*—It was in the midst of Monarchian and Sabellian controversy that Origen wrote, certainly the man most able, in his day, to seize upon the central truths which are often obscured in partizan warfare. His leading thoughts on the Trinitarian controversy were as follows.

As God is perfectly good, He must reveal or communicate Himself; it is contained in the conception of God that He should impart perfection to other beings. And as God is unchangeable, it follows that this process must have gone on from all eternity—it can have had no beginning. But here he comes upon the difficulty which constantly appears in Alexandrian philosophy—how can the primal Unity be brought into connexion with the many? That which is always the same, with diversity? This Origen holds, can only be through the Logos the rational energy or organising power of th[e] One God. In this, his teaching is substantiall[y] identical with that of the Apologists, excep[t] that, in opposition to Monarchianism and Sabe[l]lianism, he is more careful to assert the substa[n]tial existence or hypostasis of the Second Perso[n]. The Logos is, as we read in the Scriptures, t[he] Wisdom of God, the effulgence of His glory, t[he] very impress or counterpart of His substanc[e] like the Father, incorporeal (*De Princip.* I. ii. [illegible] Christ is God. His Godhead is not imparted [to] Him, as if He had some kind of separate existe[nce] before it was imparted; the Godhead is [H]is essence or substance; ὁ Σωτὴρ οὐ κατὰ μετ[…]

σίαν ἀλλὰ κατ' οὐσίαν ἐστὶ θεός (*Selecta in Psalmos*, *Opp.* ed. Lommatsch, xiii. p. 134; see also *Fragm. Comm. in Hebraeos*, v. 299 ff. Lomm.). And since He is God κατ' οὐσίαν, it follows that He is of the very same essence or substance with the Father. If He is an effluence from the Father, He is ὁμοούσιος with that from which He is an effluence (aporrhoea) (*in Psalmos*, u.s.). And the Son was from all eternity begotten of the Father (*De Princip.* I. ii. 2–9); for we cannot conceive God without His Wisdom, nor the Father beginning to be a Father. He uses the expression "there never was a time when the Son was not the Son" (*in Hebr.* p. 296), and again apologises (*De Princip.* IV. 28) for applying to the timeless Three-in-One terms which belong to time, such as "never" and "time when." He adheres to the word "beget" (γεννᾶν) for the indescribable act which can only be represented by imperfect metaphor. "Prolatio," the equivalent for the Gnostic προβολή, he expressly rejects, as he does also the "conversio partis alicujus Dei in Filium" and the "procreatio ex nullis substantibus," which some advocated (*De Princip.* IV. 28; cf. VI. ii. 4). And the Son, the Logos, has a distinct personal existence; He is "Sapientia Dei substantialiter subsistens" (*De Princ.* I. ii. 2); the Son is essentially a distinct being from the Father (ἕτερος κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ ὑποκείμενον, *De Orat.* 15); the Father and the Son are two things in substance (δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα), though one in absolute identity of will (*c. Cels.* viii. 12).

But Christ is not the one God (ὁ θεός), not Very God by Himself (αὐτόθεος). We may call Him "a second God," but by these words we mean the Virtue that includes all virtues and the Reason that includes all reasons (*c. Celsum*, v. 39). The Father is the unoriginated origin of all things; even the Son originates from Him; He is αἰτιατός. Moreover, the Father is simple and absolute Unity, while the Son is in relation to the Many (διὰ τὰ πολλά, *in Joann.* tom. i. c. 22; cf. tom. xiii. c. 25). The Son is therefore, in a sense, inferior and subordinate to the Father (*c. Cels.* vi. 62, 64; *De Orat.* 24; *De Princip.* I. iii. 5). On Origen's doctrine of the Holy Spirit, see HOLY GHOST, Vol. III. 119.

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three Substances (ὑποστάσεις, *in Joann.* tom. ii. c. 6). The Father is the author of all Being, the Son of all Reason, the Holy Spirit of all sanctification (*De Princip.* I. iii. 5–8). Father, Son, and Holy Spirit form a Trinity to which nothing can be compared. In honour and dignity the three Persons are alike, and all are of one substance (*l. c.* 7; cf. *Hom. in Num.* vol. x. p. 127, ed. Lomm.). The Trinity is with Origen the very inmost secret of the faith. To err on this is the token of a Jewish and carnal mind.

12. *The two Dionysii.*—A fresh development of the Trinitarian controversy was brought about by DIONYSIUS, bishop of Alexandria (248–265) [Vol. I. 850]. As Sabellianism spread from Ptolemais over the neighbouring district, it was natural for the bishop of Alexandria to attempt to refute it. This he did in such a way as himself to fall under suspicion of an opposite heresy. His opponents alleged that he separated the Father from the Son, that he denied that the Son was coeternal and consubstantial (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father, that (in fact) he regarded the Son as a creature (Athanasius, *De Sententia Dionysii*, cc. 10, 14, 16, 18). Complaints were made to DIONYSIUS of Rome [Vol. I. 852], who was thereby moved to refute the tenets of his Alexandrian namesake, whose name, however, he never mentions (fragment in Athanasius, *De Decretis Synodi Nicaenae*, c. 26; see Routh's *Reliquiae*, iii. 374 ff.). The Roman bishop, with the discretion which characterised the Roman Church, seeks a middle course between the Sabellianism which confounded the Persons, and the Tritheism, attributed to the Alexandrians, which divided the substance; he declines speculation in the practical Roman fashion. The Logos (he says) is not made nor created, but is the inseparable offspring of the essence of the Father (ἴδιον τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας γέννημα ἀδιαίρετον). We must not divide the divine Monad into three Godheads (οὐ καταμερίζειν χρὴ εἰς τρεῖς θεότητας τὴν . . . θείαν μονάδα), but maintain in our doctrine both the divine Triad and the holy Monarchia. The Alexandrian denied that he had used the expressions attributed to him, which he represented as false inferences from what he had said; but it is at any rate evident that the controversy between the two Dionysii is the beginning of that which was to set the Church on fire for some generations.

13. *Origen's Successors.*—The successors of Origen in the school of Alexandria maintained his teaching, for the most part unmolested. Photius testifies (*Codex* 119, in Routh, *Rell.* iii. 429) of one of them, PIERIUS [Vol. IV. 396], that he taught that the Father and the Son were two Essences and two Natures (οὐσίας δύο καὶ φύσεις δύο), an expression of which he says, that it is evident from the context, that Pierius, writing in the fashion of an earlier time, meant no more than is implied by the later ὑποστάσεις. The successor of Pierius was THEOGNOSTUS (1) (fl. c. 283), who taught, as Origen had done, that the Son was an effluence (ἀπόρροια) from the Father, without division or diminution of the Father's substance (Athan. *De Decr. Syn. Nic.* c. 25; Routh's *Rell.* iii. 411). His teaching won the approval of Athanasius; yet, according to Gregory of Nyssa (in Routh's *Rell.* iii. 412), he maintained that the Father created the Son, first of created beings, as a kind of pattern or standard of His work (οἷόν τινα κανόνα τῆς δημιουργίας). And, according to Photius (cod. 106, in Routh u.s. 413), he declared the Son to be a creature (κτίσμα) and to preside over the reasonable portion of creation only. He maintained the substantial existence (ὕπαρξιν) of the Holy Spirit (Photius u.s.), and that the Spirit abides with, and is the seal of, them that are perfected or initiated (τῶν τελειουμένων); hence the enormity of the sin against the Holy Spirit (Athanas. *ad Serap. Epist.* 4, in Routh, 409).

But the greatest and most influential of the pupils of Origen was GREGORY the Wonder-worker († 270) [Vol. II. 733 f.], who maintained, in essentials, his master's view of the Trinity. In his Exposition of the Faith, if it be his (Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, § 114, p. 183), after setting forth the offices of the several Persons, he concludes with an emphatic assertion of the eternity of the Holy Trinity. There is, he says, a perfect Trinity, in glory and eternity and sovereignty not divided nor alienated. There is, therefore, nothing created nor subordinate

(δοῦλον) in the Trinity, nor anything introduced into it (ἐπείσακτον), as if not previously forming part of it, but coming to it as an addition (ἐπεισελθόν); nor, therefore, was the Father ever without the Son, or the Son without the Spirit; but the same Trinity always existed without turning or change (ἄτρεπτος καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος). Basil, however, admits (*Epist.* 64, p. 101 D. ed. Par. 1638) that Gregory, in an Exposition of the Faith (ἐν ἐκθέσει), described Father and Son as two in thought, but one in substance (ἐπινοίᾳ μὲν δύο, ὑποστάσει δὲ ἕν), an expression which he declares not to be used dogmatically but controversially. (Compare HOLY GHOST, Vol. III. 120.)

14. *Arius.*—With the fourth century began the Arian controversy, at the end of which the doctrine of the Holy Trinity came to be defined in the terms which the Church still retains.

We have seen already, in Origen and others, traces of the opinion which subordinated the Son to the Father. This was reasserted by Arius (from about 318) in a form which seemed to many to be distinctly ditheistic [ARIANISM, Vol. I. 156]. If Arius's opinions were true, there must be two Gods.

These opinions were stated by himself in a letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia (Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 5) as follows. The Son is not unbegotten, nor in any sense a part of the Unbegotten, nor formed out of subject-matter previously existing (ἐξ ὑποκειμένου τινός); but by will and counsel He existed before times and before ages, complete God, only-born, unchangeable; and before He was begotten—or created, or limited, or founded—He was not; for He was not unbegotten (θελήματι καὶ βουλῇ ὑπέστη πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων πλήρης θεὸς, μονογενὴς, ἀναλλοίωτος· καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῇ, ἤτοι κτισθῇ, ἢ ὁρισθῇ, ἢ θεμελιωθῇ, οὐκ ἦν, ἀγέννητος γὰρ οὐκ ἦν). (Compare Arius's *Epistola ad Alexandrum*, in Athan *de Syn. Arim.* c. 16.) This is Arius's own statement of his views. Athanasius (*Orat. c. Arian.* i. c. 5, p. 294 c, ed. Colon. 1686), citing Arius's *Thalia*, states the heretical doctrine thus:—God was not always Father, there was not always a Son; but as all things were produced from nothing, so the Son is from nothing; and as all things are creatures, so He too is created and made (κτίσμα καὶ ποίημα); and as all things were not from the beginning, but came into being afterwards, so there was [a time] when the Word of God Himself was not (αὐτὸς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν); and He was not before He was begotten, but has a beginning of existence; for He then came into existence when God had willed to make Him (δημιουργῆσαι), for He too is one of God's works. And He is by nature capable of change (τρεπτὸς), but of His own free-will He chose to remain good. . . . Neither is Christ very God (Θεὸς ἀληθινός), but He, like others, is called God by participation (μετοχῇ). He is not that Logos Who is in the Father by nature and belongs to His very essence and is His own Wisdom, through which He made this world; but there is another Logos, properly belonging to the Father, and another eternal Wisdom in the Father, in and by which Wisdom He also made this Logos . . . And He in no way belongs to the essence of the Father (ξένος καὶ ἀλλότριος τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας ἐστί), for He is a creature, a thing made, a work (κτίσμα γάρ ἐστι καὶ ποίημα καὶ ἔργον). (Compare *Orat.* ii. c. 9, p. 310 D.)

Under whatever reservations, the Arian scheme made the Son a creature, though beginning before time began. To this error Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, and others, opposed the assertion, that the Son was of the essence (οὐσία) of the Father, begotten from all eternity after an incomprehensible manner. That consequently He Himself exists from all eternity. Alexander also excommunicated Arius and his followers about A.D. 320 [ALEXANDER, Vol. I. 80]. Several bishops, however, in Syria and Asia Minor, especially EUSEBIUS OF NICOMEDIA [Vol. II. 360], and his namesake of Caesarea [Vol. II. 312], supported Arius, either as holding his views or as thinking them, at any rate, not contrary to the received doctrine, and in the end the whole Church was agitated. Constantine, after attempting in vain to stay the strife by temperate counsels, summoned a meeting of all the bishops of the Church—the First Oecumenical Council —at NICAEA [DICT. CHR. ANTIQ. ii. 1389] in Bithynia (A.D. 325). The Confession of Faith[a] which was agreed upon in this famous council declared Jesus Christ to be "begotten from the Father only born (μονογενῆ), that is, from the essence (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας) of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, Very God from Very God (θεὸς ἀληθινὸς ἐκ θ. ἀ.), begotten, not made (γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα), of one and the same essence with the Father (ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί); [the Christ] through Whom all things were made." And it anathematized those who said that "there was a time when He was not," "before He was begotten, He was not," "He came into being out of things that were not," and those who allege that the Son is of a different substance or essence (ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας) from God [the Father], and is capable of being created or changed or altered—i.e. all the principal Arian propositions. In the version of Hilary of Poictiers (*De Synodis*, § 84; *Opp.* ii. 510) the critical phrases were as follows:—"Credimus . . . in unum Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum Filium Dei, natum ex Patre unigenitum, hoc est, de substantia Patris, Deum ex Deo, lumen ex lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero, natum non factum, unius substantiae cum Patre, quod Graece dicunt homousion, per quem omnia facta sunt . . . Eos autem qui dicunt: erat quando non erat, et antequam nasceretur non erat, et quod de non extantibus factus est, vel ex alia substantia aut essentia, dicentes convertibilem et demutabilem Deum, hos anathematizat catholica ecclesia." It will be seen that the word οὐσία is here translated by "substantia," the etymological equivalent of ὑπόστασις, excepting that in the sentence in which ὑπόστασις and οὐσία both occur, οὐσία is rendered by "essentia," its etymological equivalent.

This creed at once found general acceptance in the Western Church. In the East it was far otherwise. To some the ὁμοούσιος was displeasing simply as not being found in Scripture; to

---

[a] I have used the text of Eusebius, *Epist. ad Caesareenses*, given in Athanas. *De Decr. Syn. Nic.* p. 23, ed. Montfaucon, which is reprinted by Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, p. 78 ff. (2nd ed.); also in Socrates, *H. E.* i. 8, reprinted by W. W. Harvey in *Eccl. Anglic. Vindex.* i. 541.

others it seemed too much to merge the Person of the Son in that of the Father, on which account it had already, in fact, been condemned at Antioch. But there was no agreement among the opponents of the Nicene definitions.

15. *The Semiarians.*—The Semi-Arians, whose leaders were BASIL of Ancyra [Vol. I. 281] and GEORGE of Laodicea [Vol. II. 637], accepted substantially the Nicene definitions, except that they rejected the ὁμοούσιος as savouring of Sabellianism. Their views are most clearly set forth in the definitions of the Synod of Ancyra (A.D. 358, Hardouin's *Concilia*, i. 707; Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 73, c. 2 ff.). According to their view, the Son was undoubtedly begotten, in respect of essence, from the Father (κατ' οὐσίαν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός), and that, in an unconceivable manner, before the ages; the Son had not His beginning in time, nor was the Father to be conceived as existing before the Son in time; but He was not of the same identical essence with the Father, but of like essence, of an essence the same *in kind* (ὁμοιούσιος). From their clinging to this term they received the name of Homoeusians. This system, in fact, differed from that sanctioned at Nicaea only in the rejection of the term ὁμοούσιος, and was regarded by such men as Athanasius and Basil the Great as no very flagrant heresy, though still error.

16. *The Strict Arians.*—On the other hand, the Strict Arians, under the guidance of AETIUS [Vol I. 51] and EUNOMIUS [Vol. II. 286], developed the original system of Arius. Going beyond his views, they maintained, that though the Son is like the Father in regard to Will and Energy, He is actually unlike Him in respect of essence (ἀνόμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν). From this expression the party received the name of Anomoeans, and, from their leaders, of Aetians and Eunomians. They also regarded the Son as begotten in time, and consequently not eternal, on the old ground that a father must exist before his son.

17. *The Athanasian Party.*—These views were vigorously combated by ATHANASIUS [Vol. I. 181 ff.], HILARY of Poictiers [Vol. III. 59], BASIL the Great [Vol. I. 282], and the two GREGORIES [Vol. II. 741, 761], who maintained the decision of Nicaea, that the Son was begotten of the essence of the Father from all eternity, avoiding the Sabellianism which acknowledged one Personality underlying the threefold appearance of the Deity, and equally avoiding the Arianism which made the Son a created Being, having a beginning in time. They wished to avoid all expressions which implied any division, diminution, or alteration of the Divine Essence. In the course of the controversy the old question recurred, whether Son was begotten by the *Will* of the Father; if so, it would seem to follow, that He was subordinate to Him. Athanasius, recognising this, contended (*In Arianos Orat.* ii. p. 335) that the begetting of the Son was not by the *Will* of the Father, but of necessity. As a light cannot be without radiance, so the Son must always have existed with the Father as the effulgence of His Glory. The Son, he further contended, was both greater than and equal to the HOLY GHOST [Vol. III. 121]; greater in dignity of office, equal as to His Nature. Views which imply a certain subordination of the Son to the Father were expressed by some Fathers of the fourth century. Hilary of Poictiers (*De Trin.* iv. 16) speaks of the Father as the God who commands (jubentem Deum), the Son as the God who executes (facientem Deum); and St. Basil (*c. Eunom.* iii. p. 751), while insisting on the unity of nature in the three Persons, seems to concede a difference in excellence and dignity, such as exists between the different orders of angels.

In course of time a difference arose among the adherents of the Nicene definition as to the use of the word ὑπόστασις in reference to the Holy Trinity. Origen had already described Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as three ὑποστάσεις or Beings, in opposition to the Monarchians, who saw in them only three modes of manifestation of one and the same Being. And as Sabellius had used the words τρία πρόσωπα for these modes of manifestation, this form of expression naturally fell into disfavour with the Catholics. But when Arius insisted on (virtually) three different hypostases in the Holy Trinity, Catholics began to avoid applying the word hypostasis to the Persons of the Godhead. To this was added a difficulty arising from the fact, that the Eastern Church used Greek as the official language of its theology, while the Western Church used Latin, a language at that time much less well provided with abstract theological terms. Disputes were caused, says Gregory of Nazianzus (*Orat.* xxi. p. 395) διὰ στενότητα τῆς παρὰ τοῖς Ἰτάλοις γλώττης καὶ ὀνομάτων πενίαν. (Compare Seneca, *Epist.* 58.) The Latins used *essentia* and *substantia* as equivalent to the Greek οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, but interchanged them, as we have seen in the translation of the Nicene Creed, with little scruple, regarding them as synonymous. They used both expressions to describe the Divine Nature common to the Three. It followed that they looked upon the expression "three Hypostases" as implying a division of the substance of the Deity, and therefore as Arian. They preferred to speak of "tres Personae." Athanasius also spoke of τρία πρόσωπα, and thus the words πρόσωπα and Personae became current among the Nicene party. But about the year 360, the Neo-Nicene party, or Meletians, as they are sometimes called, became scrupulous about the use of such an expression as τρία πρόσωπα, which seemed to them to savour of Sabellianism. Thus a difference arose between the old Athanasian party and the Meletians. Basil the Great (*Epist.* 42, p. 63) contends for the use of the expression τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, and lays it down very clearly, that while οὐσία is the "universal," that which is common to all the individuals of a species (as, e.g. man), ὑπόστασις is that which gives personal existence to an individual. Consequently, the expression μία ὑπόστασις, applied to the Deity, is Sabellian, as implying only one Personality; while only an Arian could use the expression τρεῖς οὐσίαι. In precisely the same sense Theodoret (*Eranistes*, *Dial.* i. p. 7 f. ed. Sirmond-Schulze) points out that the usage of Christian writers, in regard to οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, differs from that of the philosophers. The Christians take οὐσία to be that which is common to the three Persons of the Holy Trinity, ὑπόστασις to designate one of the Persons, whether Father, Son, or Holy Spirit; for with Christian writers ὑπόστασις, πρόσωπον, and ἰδιότης designate one and the same thing.

(On the point, see Kuhn, *Dreieinigkeit* p. 428 ff.) The council of Alexandria (A.D. 362; Hardouin's *Concilia*, i. 731 ff.) pointed out the purely verbal nature of some of these disputes, but the contention did not cease. Basil adhered to his expressions, and in the Greek Church generally the expression τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις became prevalent. The Latins, however, continued to speak of one *Substantia* (ὑπόστασις) and Tres *Personae*, and to reject the expression "Tres Hypostases" (Jerome, *Epist.* 57 *ad Damasum;* Augustine, *De Trinitate* v. 8, 9). Subsequently, when the Meletian schism was composed, these distinctions came to be looked upon as unimportant, or at any rate ceased to be prominent in controversy.

18. *The Pneumatomachi.*—During the disputes about the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, the nature of the Holy Spirit was comparatively seldom brought prominently into discussion. It is evident, however, that the discussion about the Son could not but affect the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Some, who were otherwise orthodox, held the Holy Spirit to be a creature, the servant and minister of God [HOLY GHOST, Vol. III. 121], and from about the year 360, discussions on the subject of the Holy Spirit became manifest even among some who held Catholic views as to the Divinity of the Son. Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Didymus came forward as champions of the Faith against those who impugned the substantiality of the Holy Spirit, and the opinion, that the Holy Spirit is a creature, disappeared from among the Catholics. As the Son is "begotten," so the Holy Ghost (they insisted) "proceeds" from the Father from all eternity (παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, St. John xv. 26). The special characteristics of the three Persons are, that the Father is begotten of none, the Son is begotten, the Holy Spirit proceedeth; ἐκπόρευσις became a kind of technical term for the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father, or to the Father and the Son. If the Holy Ghost were a creature, it would be blasphemous to place His name by those of the Father and of the Son in the baptismal formula (Basil, *c. Eunom.* iii. p. 752). Those who held the erroneous opinion, that the Holy Ghost is a creature, received in Constantinople the name of Macedonians, from a former Semi-Arian bishop, Macedonius, of that city (deposed A.D. 360); and as this view of the creaturely nature of the Holy Spirit was almost entirely confined to the Semi-Arians, the names Pneumatomachi, Macedonians, and Semi-Arians came to be used as synonymous.

These various opinions concerning the Holy Trinity came before the Council of Constantinople (the second General) in the year 381 (DICT. CHR. ANTIQ. i. 436 ff]. At this council the Nicene Creed was modified in regard to its declaration of the Divinity of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, and a considerable addition made to that clause which treats of the Holy Spirit (Mansi's *Concilia*, iii. 565; Hardouin, i. 814). Belief in the Son of God was now professed in these terms: Πιστεύομεν . . εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο. And belief in the Holy Spirit as follows:—Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ κύριον τὸ ζωοποιοῦν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. In the Latin translation of Dionysius Exiguus, these clauses stand—"Credimus . . in unum Dominum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei, natum ex Patre ante omnia saecula, Deum verum de Deo vero, natum non factum, consubstantialem Patri, per quem omnia facta sunt ... Et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum et vivificantem ex Patre procedentem, cum Patre et Filio adorandum et conglorificandum, qui locutus est per sanctos prophetas."

19. *St. Augustine.*—In the West, St. Augustine formulated the doctrine of the Holy Trinity with precision greater than had yet been given to it. He saw more clearly than his predecessors had done that no subordination could be admitted into the conception of the Divine Tri-unity. No one of three Persons, who are of the same essence or substance, could be subordinate to any other of those Persons. There had been a tendency to regard the Father as absolutely invisible, and consequently to refer the Theophanies of the Old Testament to the Son alone. He contends that this was an error, infringing the complete equality of the Father and the Son; we are not to attribute invisibility more to one Person than to another (*De Trin.* ii. 9–18). When we say that we believe in one God, we say in effect, that we believe in the Holy Trinity, not in the Father alone (*De Trin.* v. 12; *Epist.* 238, c. 3). And this unity is not merely identity of kind; it is absolute unity in one "essentia," in which are (to use the Greek expression) "tres substantiae," i.e. ὑποστάσεις, or (to use the Latin) "tres personae" (*De Trin.* vii. 7). The Latins cannot (St. Augustine holds) adopt the Greek expression, because with them "essentia" and "substantia" are synonymous. The Three Persons are so absolutely one, that in everything which God works, the Holy Trinity works (*De Trin.* i. 8, 12; ii. 18).

20. *The Filioque.*—With regard to the Holy Spirit, differences, or apparent differences, between East and West manifested themselves in the fourth century. The Orientals, desiring to assert strongly the unity of the source of life against the Arians, whose teaching tended to make two principles or origins, clung stedfastly to the definition of the Second General Council, which teaches that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. In the West, the great influence of Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, and Augustine gave weight to the proposition, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son [HOLY GHOST, Vol. III. 126 f.]. They, having regard to another aspect of Arianism, favoured a form of expression which could not be twisted into disparagement of the Son. The difference on this point between East and West was less than at first sight appears; for the Orientals also, though shrinking from an expression which they regarded as un-Scriptural, used expressions —such as "τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον" (Epiphanius, *Haeres.* lxix. c. 52)—which are nearly equivalent to the Latin "proceeding from the ... Son" (Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 324).

It was in Spain that the Western form of expression was first found in a publicly acknowledged Creed. In a council at Toledo, generally

dated about A.D. 400, but possibly not earlier than the time of Leo the Great (see Quesnel, *Diss.* xiv. c. 8, in his ed. of Leo's *Works*; HOLY GHOST, Vol. III. 129), we find the doctrine of the Holy Trinity thus expressed: "Credimus in unum Deum Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum, visibilium et invisibilium factorem, per quem creata sunt omnia in coelo et in terra: hunc unum Deum et unam esse divinae substantiae trinitatem, Patrem autem non esse ipsum Filium, sed habere Filium qui Pater non sit; Filium non esse Patrem, sed Filium Dei de Patris esse natura; Spiritum quoque Paracletum esse, qui nec Pater ipse sit nec Filius, sed a Patre Filioque procedens. Est ergo ingenitus Pater, genitur Filius, non genitus Paracletus, sed a Patre Filioque procedens ... Hanc trinitatem, personis distinctam, substantia unitam, virtute et potestate et majestate indivisibilem, indifferentem, praeter hanc nullam credimus divinam esse naturam, vel angeli vel spiritus vel virtutis alicujus, quae Deus esse credatur" (Hahn, *Bibliothek*, p. 130; Hardouin, *Concilia*, i. 993). At the third Council of Toledo (A.D. 589) the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed (commonly known as the Nicene Creed) was itself set forth and promulgated, under the authority of king Reccared, with the addition, in the clause relating to the Holy Spirit, "ex Patre ET FILIO procedentem." The attendant bishops, already accustomed to the "Filioque" of the earlier Council, were evidently quite unaware that the Creed which they recited was not in all respects identical with the Catholic Creed of the Eastern Church, as set forth at Constantinople. To whatever hand the addition may be due, the so-called Nicene Creed, in the form which it received at Toledo, came to be universally accepted in the Western Church. [CREED, Vol. I. 706.]

21. *The Quicunque Vult.*—The whole doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as defined by St. Augustine, and after him by various Western formularies, was set forth with great precision in the Latin *Expositio Fidei*, which is known as the *Psalmus Quicunque Vult* or *the Athanasian Creed.* Its author is unknown, its date is extremely uncertain (C. A. Swainson, *The Nicene and Apostles' Creed*, etc. p. 195 ff.; G. D. W. Ommaney, *The Athanasian Creed*, etc.; CREED, Vol. II. 711 f.). It bears very strongly the stamp of Augustinian theology, and might (so far as regards the Holy Trinity) have been produced at any time after the influence of that Father became prevalent. As in Augustine, so in this, the essence of the triune Deity is *substantia;* its components are *personae*, and this substantia is inseparable, these personae are equal (so Aug. *De Trin.* i. § 7). And a large portion of the Exposition consists of variations on the theme—"audiunt Deum Patrem, Deum Filium, et Deum Spiritum-Sanctum; et tamen hanc Trinitatem non tres Deos, sed unum Deum"—which we find in Augustine (*De Trin.* i. § 8; cf. vii. § 8). Various attributes of God—increatus, immensus, aeternus, omnipotens—are given to each Person, and then the caution is added that there are not Three uncreated, unlimited, eternal, all-powerful, but One. We may not say that there are three Gods or three Lords. As in Augustine, so in the Exposition, subordinationism is emphatically excluded. In the Trinity, nothing is before or after, nothing is greater or less, but the three Persons in their completeness (totae tres Personae) are coeternal and coequal. The procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son is distinctly asserted in the words, "Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio non factus nec creatus nec genitus est, sed procedens."

22. *Summary.* — Thus after generations of discussion, the following result is arrived at. In the West henceforth it is recognised as the orthodox expression of the Catholic Faith with regard to the Holy Trinity, that God is one "substantia," and in this "substantia" are three "Personae," absolutely coequal and coeternal; not three Gods, but one God. In the East, there is in terms somewhat more variety, as is natural in the more copious language. The orthodox expression for the triune Deity is, "μία οὐσία (sometimes θεότης) τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος." The three Persons are ὑποστάσεις or πρόσωπα. The word ὑπόστασις was, however, preferred in the earlier period of the discussion, as πρόσωπον was thought to bear a Sabellian taint, and the expression most commonly found in the Catholic Fathers who wrote shortly after the Council of Nicaea is μία οὐσία ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν. There were some, however, who took ὑπόστασις — in spite of Basil's distinction (see above, 1051)—as the ethnic philosophers did, and indeed as the Nicene Fathers themselves did, when they condemned those who asserted that the Son was ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας, as precisely equivalent to οὐσία. These were driven to use the word πρόσωπον, and in their sense the expression was allowed "μία οὐσία ἢ ὑπόστασις ἐν τρισὶ προσώποις." The Greek πρόσωπον, however, though primarily designating the same material object, was never fully equivalent to the Latin *persona.* Πρόσωπον always retained something of its original meaning, "countenance"; *persona*, transformed by its legal use among the Romans, much more decidedly expressed individual existence, what we call "personality." Here was a latent flaw which in time became a rift. The differences between the Eastern and the Western Church do not, however, fall within the compass of this work.

Literature.—G. Bull, *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae;* E. Burton, *Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Doctrine of the Trinity;* F. C. Baur, *Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit* u.s.w.; J. Kuhn, *Die Christliche Lehre von der Göttlichen Dreieinigkeit;* J. A. Dorner, *Person Christi;* J. A. W. Neander, *Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church* (Torrey's trans.); J. C. L. Gieseler, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, vol. vi. (*Die Dogmengeschichte*); A. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, Band i. (vol. i. of the *Sammlung Theologischer Lehrbücher* published by Mohr, Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1886). The causes which enabled Arianism to maintain itself so long are well given by H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism.* [C.]

TRIPHYLLIUS (TRIPHYLLUS), bishop of Ledra (otherwise Leuteon), in Cyprus, in the middle of the 4th century. He received his education in the celebrated law schools of Berytus, in which city he enjoyed great reputation for his rhetorical power and legal knowledge. On his conversion he gave up all worldly advancement and placed himself under the teaching of Spyridon, the shepherd-bishop of Cyprus,

whose deacon he became. He obtained great celebrity for his scriptural learning and eloquence as a preacher. For the story of Spyridon's rebuke of his over-refinement in phraseology, see SPYRIDON. Jerome calls him "the most eloquent man of his age," and states that many works were ascribed to him, of which his commentary on the Canticles was the only one he had read (Hieron. *De Eccl. Script.* c. 92). He also reckons Triphyllius among the chief Christian writers in his letter to Magnus (Hieron. *Ep.* 84 [70]). According to Suidas, Triphyllius wrote the life of his master, Spyridon, in Greek iambics, in a very edifying manner (Soz. *H. E.* i. 11; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1075; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* vii. 245; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 206; Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* viii. 633, ix. 321). [E. V.]

TRISCELIDAE, a name bestowed by Praedestinatus on heretics, of whom Augustine tells (*Haer.* 74) that they looked on Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, not as each possessing perfect divinity, but as the names of three parts into which the Deity is divided. [G. S.]

TRITHEITES, a subdivision of the Monophysites towards the end of the sixth century. They emphasised the personal distinctions in the Godhead to such an extent that they were accused of teaching tritheism. John of Ephesus was a contemporary of the sect, and in his Ecclesiastical History, pp. 50–52 (Payne Smith's translation) gives us an account of them. They were founded by one Joannes Ascasnagus, or Ascusnaghes, a philosophical teacher of Constantinople. They flourished through the patronage and support of Athanasius, son of the empress Theodora [THEODORA]. Their leading men were JOHN PHILIPINUS CONON (4), of Tarsus, and EUGENIUS (24), of Seleucia. A great discussion, lasting four days, was held at Constantinople between the Tritheites and the more orthodox section of the Monophysites. The discussion is said to have exhibited an instance of toleration rare in that age. The orthodox patriarch of C. P. presided. The Monophysites, John of Ephesus, and Paul, afterwards patriarch of Antioch, upheld orthodoxy as against the Tritheites represented by Conon and his friends. It was agreed that appeal should be made to none other save Monophysite authorities like Severus of Antioch. The Tritheites were defeated (see Assemani, *Bib. Orient.* ii. 327–329). Roscelin, the father of Monothelism, was accused of teaching the same view as Anselm in cent. xi. [G. T. S.]

TROILUS (1), a celebrated Sophist of Constantinople. Socrates, the church historian, is believed to have been his pupil about A.D. 380. Troilus was a native of Side in Pamphylia, and a relation of Philip, presbyter of Side. [PHILIPPUS (9).] (Socrat. *H. E.* vii. 27, ed. Vales.) He was the chief adviser of Anthemius, praetorian prefect, who acted as regent during the minority of Theodosius the younger, *l. c.* vii. 1. Some of his commentaries on Hermogenes are still extant in MS. (Fab. *Bib. Graec.* vi. 76, 140; viii. 83). [G. T. S.]

TROILUS (2), a bishop of Cyprus, who, it was stated by Rheginus of Constantia in his memorial to the council of Ephesus, had suffered much in old time from the clergy of Antioch (Labbe, iii. 787; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1046). [E. V.]

TROJANUS (TROFIANUS, TROPHIANUS), ST., sixth bishop of Saintes (circ. A.D. 511–532). According to Gregory of Tours, who gives the story of a miraculous interview between him and St. Martin of Tours, his reputation for sanctity was so great that the people used to pluck the fringe from his cloak as he went about his diocese. He was buried outside the walls near St. Bibianus, the second bishop of the see (huic conjunctus coelo, vicinus est tumulo), and the spot became famous for cures wrought on the possessed and diseased who prayed there (Greg. Tur. *De Glor. Conf.* lix.). In 1568 his remains were destroyed by Calvinists. His day is variously given as Nov. 30, Dec. 1, and Dec. 30. He is probably the bishop Trojanus who wrote a short letter to Eumerius in answer to one asking advice on the subject of a boy who was ignorant whether he had been baptized (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxvii. 995; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 1056). [S. A. B.]

TROPHIMUS (1), Cyp. *Ep.* 55, 11 (Trofimus, Hartel), an Italian bishop (*sacerdotii*) who offered incense in the Decian persecution, and was followed by all his flock in this lapse. He was restored to lay-communion by Cornelius, bishop of Rome. It is not denied that his people's attachment to him, and the assurance that they would follow his return, eased the reception of Trofimus. The Novatianists forwarded to Africa the misstatement that Cornelius had restored him to his episcopal orders, and so shook the confidence of some in him; but Cyprian of his own knowledge denies the statement. It is improbable that a lapsed bishop would be obliged or allowed to do public penance. The expression that Trofimus with "penance *of entreaty* confessed his own fault" is itself against it, and although it is said that he made "satisfaction," it is presently added that "the return of the brethren made satisfaction for him." The restoration seems to have been made at the Roman council of June (or July) A.D. 251, from the words (*Ep.* 55, ix. (6), H 11), *tractatu cum collegis plurimis habito susceptus est.* Ritschl (*Cyprian von Karthago*, p. 79) calls Trofimus a "sacrificatus," though the case of the sacrificati is treated separately in the next section of *Ep.* 55, and though the words *Trofimo et turificatis* do not make it certain that he was even a "Turificatus." Ritschl also bases a false argument on his false rendering of "conligendis fratribus nostris carissimus Frater noster necessitate succubuit," saying that "it is no defence of Trophimus that he had, after the example of earlier bishops, sacrificed himself for his flock, in order to keep them together." *Frater* is of course Cornelius, and *necessitas* is the obligation which he felt to receive Trophimus, in accordance with precedents, for the sake of recovering the whole diocese. Fechtrup also blunders about this unhappy man, "seeing" in his restitution the "special occasion" of the secession of Novatian. The "sight" is too acute, since (1) it must have been known in Rome that Trophimus was *not* restored to orders, though it was reported to Africa that he was; and (2)

the restitution to lay-communion was to all appearance later than the secession of Novatian. [E. W. B.]

TROPHIMUS (2), Sep. 19, martyred at Synnada under the emperor Probus, cir. 278. He and Dorymedon were exposed in the amphitheatre to the wild beasts, who, however, would not molest them, and they were finally despatched by executioners. Their *Acta* in Greek and Latin are given in Boll. *Acta SS.* 19 Sept. vi. 9, and they are also mentioned among the praetermissi of Sep. 18 (t. v. p. 758, ed. 1866). [C. H.]

TROPHIMUS (3), ST., first bishop of Arles, has been the subject of eager controversy. According to the tradition of the see, he was the disciple of St. Paul mentioned in the Acts and the 2nd Epistle to Timothy, and was sent forth as a missionary to Arles by St. Peter or St. Paul, or both. As early as 417 pope Zosimus, in a letter to the bishops of Gaul, speaking of the city of Arles, says: "Ad quam primum ex hâc sede Trophimus summus antistes, ex cujus fonte totae Galliae fidei rivulos acceperunt, directus est" (*Epist.* i. *Patr. Lat.* xx. 645); and in the same pope's letter to Hilary, bishop of Narbonne, Trophimus was "quondam ad Arelatensem urbem ab apostolica sede transmissus" (*Ep.* 6, *Patr. Lat. ibid.* 667). Again, the nineteen bishops of the province of Arles, writing to pope Leo about the middle of the 5th century, assert that it is known to all Gaul and to the church of Rome "prima intra Gallias Arelatensis civitas missum a beatissimo Petro apostolo sanctum Trophimum habere meruit sacerdotem, et exinde aliis paulatim regionibus Galliarum bonum fidei et religionis infusum" (*Patr. Lat.* liv. 1880), though it should be mentioned that the genuineness of this letter has been questioned. So too, Ado, in his *Martyrologium* (Dec. 29) and *Chronicon*. On the other hand, Gregory of Tours, apparently quoting from the *Acta* of St. Saturninus, says in effect that Trophimus arrived in Gaul with the first bishops of Tours, Paris, and other cities in the consulate of Decius and Gratus, *i.e.* after the middle of the 3rd century; and in a very old catalogue of the archbishops published by Mabillon, *Vetera Analecta*, p. 220, Paris, 1723, he is preceded by Dionysius, as though he were the second bishop. The question to which some bitterness has been imparted, from the fact that it is closely connected with the hotly resented claims of the early archbishops of Arles to a sort of primacy in Gaul, is elaborately discussed by Trichaud (*Hist. de l'Eglise d'Arles*, i. 21–143).

Nothing is known of the life of Trophimus, whose day of commemoration is Dec. 29, and who was succeeded by St. Regulus. The cathedral church at Arles was dedicated to him, with St. Stephen. (*Gall. Christ.*, i. 519.) [S. A. B.]

TRUMBERT (1), (Tunberte), was consecrated bishop of Hexham by Theodore in A.D. 681 (Beda, iv. 12). For some reason or other he was deposed in A.D. 684. (Beda, iv. 28.) [J. R.]

TRUMBERT (2), a pupil and friend of bishop Ceadda, probably at Lastingham. He was afterwards one of the instructors of Beda in the Holy Scriptures, and gave to him some account of his old master, particularly describing his conduct and words during a thunderstorm. It seems probable, therefore, that Trumbert had become a monk at Jarrow. (Beda, *H. E.* iv. 3.) [J. R.]

TRUMHERI, the third bishop of the Mercians, Lindisfari, and Middle Angles, following Cellach, before the see was established; an Anglian by birth, trained and ordained by the Scots (i.e. by Finan at Lindisfarne); previously abbat of Ingetlingum (Gilling near Richmond), a monastery constructed by him on the spot where Oswin was slain by Oswy, for perpetual prayer for both kings, the land being granted for that purpose by Oswy, at the request of his queen Eanfled, she and Trumheri being both related to Oswin (Bed. iii. 24). Wharton (*Angl. Sac.* i. 423) fixes the dates of his episcopate as 660–663, while Stubbs gives 659–662 (Stubbs, *Reg. Sac.* 2; Moberly's Bede, 167, 190). [C. H.]

TRUMWIN (Triumwini), a missionary bishop, who was consecrated by Theodore in A.D. 681, and sent to labour among the Picts (Beda, iv. 12). In A.D. 685 he was present at the synod on the Alne, and was one of those who went thence to Lindisfarne to persuade Cuthbert to accept the bishopric (*Id.* iv. 28). In the following year, in consequence of the troubles which arose after the death of Ecgfrid, Trumwin resigned his see, and retired with his friends from the monastery of Aebbercurnig, or Abercorn, at the head of the Frith of Forth, to a more peaceful abode, the monastery of Streoneshalch, or Whitby, where he spent the remainder of a long life as a monk. He died and was buried at Whitby. (*Id.* iv. 26.) [J. R.]

TRYCHAN, bishop of Llandaff, in probably the second half of the 7th century; in his episcopate many grants were made to the see of Llandaff, and he is probably also the clerical witness named Trychan under the bishops Oudoceus and Berthgwyn, being under the latter called "Trican lector." (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, pass.; Stubbs, *Reg.* 156.) [J. G.]

TRYGETIUS (1), a young man, and fellow citizen with Augustine in Africa, who having served for a time in the army joined him together with Licentius as a pupil in the house which he occupied at Cassiciacum, and as well as his fellow pupil slept in the same room with him, A.D. 386 (Aug. *c. Acad.* i. 1, 4; *de Ord.* i. 2, 5; 3, 6; *de Beat. Vit.* i. 6). They also made a vacation excursion together into Liguria (id. *de qu. an.* 31, 62). He is described by Augustine as an interlocutor in the dialogues *contra Academicos*, *de Ordine*, and *de Beata Vita*. In the first of these he appears as arguing against the Academic philosophy, and in general as taking the practical rather than the theoretical side in the arguments, in which, though plainly a Christian in belief, but not perhaps in possession, he was led hypothetically to deny the providence of God. (Aug. *de Ord.* i. 2, 5; 6, 17; 10, 29; *de Beat. Vit.* i. 7, 8.) [H. W. P.]

TRYGETIUS (2), envoy [Trigetius].

TRYGETIUS (3), a friend of Sidonius Apollinaris (Sid. *Ep.* viii. 12). [H. W. P.]

TRYPHO (1). [See Justinus (2), p. 570.]

TRYPHO (2), martyr [RESPICIUS].

TRYPHO (3), vir religiosus, bearer of a letter, c. A.D. 493, from pope Gelasius to the bishops of Dardania, and of their reply (Gelasius, *Epp.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 22). [F. D.]

TRYPHO (4), a local chieftain in Armenia, who allied himself with Simeon against the Paulicians in the persecution under Constantine Pogonatus in 684. (Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 25; Phot. *c. Man.* i. 17.) [M. B. C.]

TUBA, soldier, censured by Isidore of Pelusinus (lib. i. ep. 40) for wearing arms and military dress in the forum and about the city. [C. H.]

TUDA, bishop of Lindisfarne on the departure of St. Colman (A.D. 664); he was an Irishman, educated and consecrated bishop in the south of Ireland, where the new calculation of Easter had been adopted. Having come into Northumbria, where he laboured diligently both by word and deed, he stood on the side of St. Wilfrid at the synod of Whitby (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. c. 26). He died in the same year, and was buried (*ib.* iii. *c.* 27) at Paegnalaech (perhaps Finchale, near Durham), or (*Angl. Sax. Chron.* A.D. 664) at Wagele (perhaps Whalley, Lancashire). Bede (iii. 26) sums up his life in a few words as "a good and religious man, but governed the church only a very short time," having been cut off by the great plague. (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* iii. 444; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* iii. 75; Stubbs, *Reg.* 3.) Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 622) ascribes to him *Ad ecclesias Northumbricas; De paschae Celebratione*, and gives his feast as Oct. 21. Tuda's name is subscribed to a spurious charter of Wulfhere king of Mercia, A.D. 664 (Kemble, *C. D.* 984). [J. G.]

TUDFRID, bishop. [TIDFERTH.]

TUDNO (THUTNO), Welsh saint early in the 6th century, son of Seithenyn and founder of Llandudno, Carnarvonshire, where a rocking-stone is called Cryd Tudno, or Tudno's cradle; his feast is June 5. (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 24, 54; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 236; *Notes and Queries*, 2nd ser. ii. 230, with an account of him and family.) [J. G.]

TUDWAL, surnamed Befr (the fair), Welsh saint of the 5th century, son of Morfawr, Eurmur or Corinwr ap Cadfan. He is a favourite subject for the legends in the French Breviaries of Rennes, Leon, Vannes, etc., and is made by them abbat at Llantwit Major, and afterwards in Brittany, also even pope at Rome. Tudwal is called a bishop, but no see is mentioned; St. Tudwal's Isle, with a ruined chapel dedicated to him, is off the coast of Carnarvonshire, in the parish of Llanengan (Rees, *Welsh SS.* 89, 133–4, 148). He is probably the TUTWALE invoked among the confessors in the 10th century, *Litany of Brittany*. (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 81 sq.) [J. G.]

TUENTIUS, a Gallic bishop illegally consecrated by Proculus bishop of Marseilles, to the infringement of the jurisdiction of his metropolitan, Patroclus, archbishop of Arles. The fourth letter of pope Zosimus, written Sept. 22 417 to the bishops of Africa, Gaul and Spain, declares him and one Ursus to be accursed, and deprives them of the communion. It appears he had already been convicted of the heresy of Priscillian (*Epist.* iv. *Pat. Lat.* xx. 661, Ceillier, vii. 534). Apparently, however, he obtained pardon, if, as is supposed, he was the Tuentius to whom pope Coelestinus wrote, perhaps in 431, on the subject of a dispute which had arisen among the priests of Marseilles touching grace and free-will. The letter is lost, but referred to in another of the same pope (*Epist.* xxi. cap. i. in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* l. 529; Ceillier, viii. 145). [S. A. B.]

TUNBERT, of Hexham. [TRUMBERT.]

TUNNA, abbat of the monastery of Tunnacaestir, to which he gave his name. In A.D. 679 a battle was fought between Egfrith and Ethelred, near the river Trent, in which Elfwin, the brother of Egfrith, was slain. A young soldier, named Imma, was sorely wounded at the same time, and was left for dead, but, recovering, fell into the hands of Ethelred. Tunna, Imma's brother, searched the field of battle for him, and finding a corpse which he supposed to be that of his brother, carried it to his monastery and buried it, causing many masses to be celebrated for his soul. The effect of these masses was that although Imma was treated as a captive, no bonds could hold him (Beda, iv. 22). The name of Tunnacester betokens a Roman station, and may perhaps, therefore, be identified with Littleborough on the Trent. Doncaster (suggested by Messrs. Mayor and Lumley) is at too great a distance. [J. R.]

TURBANTIUS, an Italian bishop, who was one of the fellow sufferers of Julian of Eclana [JULIANUS (15).] It was to him that Julian dedicated his work against the first book of Augustine's *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia* (*Pat. Lat.* xlv. 1737; Aug. *c. Julian.* iii. 17, § 31 in *P. L.* xliv. 718; Garnier's notes on Marius Mercator and his *Dissert.* vi. in *P. L.* xlviii. 623). Turbantius afterwards recanted, and before A.D. 428 (August. *Opus Imperf. c. Julian.* iv. 30, v. 4, in *P. L.* xlv. 1353, 1435). [T. W. D.]

TURBO (1), a disciple of Manes, who sent him with an epistle to Marcellus of Caschar, who, with Aschelaus, the local bishop, converted him (Epiph. *Haer.* lxvi. cap. 5; Flügel's *Mani*, pp. 6, 17, 354). [MANES.] [G. T. S.]

TURBO (2), bishop of Eleutheropolis (Hebron) in Palaestina Prima, c. 380–390 (Gams). He served as deacon of the church under Eutychius (EUTYCHIUS (13)), and succeeded him as bishop on his death (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 638; Ceillier, *Aut. Eccl.* v. 156). [E. V.]

TURENTIUS, addressed as "Dominus sublimis atque magnificus" by Ruricius, in a letter requesting him to send him a copy of St. Augustine *De Civitate Dei*: cf. *Ruricii Epp.* lib. ii. 15 in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 98. [G. W. D.]

TURNINUS, confessor, Irish priest and monk who laboured in the province of Antwerp and died there near the close of the 8th century: his relics were translated to a monastery on the

Sambre in the province of Liege. (Butler, *Lives SS.* July 17.) [J. G.]

TURNOALDUS, bishop of Paris, present at a *placitum* under Clovis III. A.D. 693 (*Diplomata* vi. cc. 19, 23). He subscribed a *privilegium* to the monastery of St. Mary in Paris, A.D. 696, and a charter to a nunnery at Limoux A.D. 697. He is said to have abdicated in A.D. 698, and probably died before A.D. 716 (*Gall. Christ.* vii. 28). [J. G.]

TURPIN, archbishop of Rheims. [TILPIN.]

TURPIO, relieved of a debt when near death at the intercession of Sidonius (Sidon. *Ep.* 24). [R. J. K.]

TURRIANUS, a pagan who was praetorian prefect in the 5th century. He violated the sanctuary of St. Piato's church at Ancyra by arresting some people who had taken refuge there. S. Nilus, the monk of Sinai, wrote a letter denouncing God's judgments against him for this action. (Nili *Epist.* 178.) [G. T. S.]

TURRIBIUS, bishop of Asturica (Astorga). In a letter to Leo the Great he enumerated the Priscillianist errors under sixteen heads. Leo in his reply (St. Leo, tom. i. *Ep.* xv.) comments seriatim upon these, for the most part accepting Turribius's report, in order to their confutation. [M. B. C.]

TUTTA, abbess. [TETTA.]

TWENTY MARTYRS, THE, commemorated at Hippo Regius. In their church here and on their day, Augustine preached his *Sermo* 148. In another discourse on their day (*Serm.* 325, where see the Benedictine note), Augustine names three of them, the only ones known, Fidentius (2), Valeriana, Victoria. For an invocation to them related by Augustine, see FLORENTIUS (48). They are thought by some, including Baronius (*A. E.* ann. 304, xiv.) to be the twenty martyrs who suffered at Tarsus (*Mart. Rom.* June 6), but others are of a different opinion (Tillem. v. 173). [C. H.]

TYDECHO (TEDECHO), Welsh saint early in the 6th century. He accompanied his cousin St. Cadfan from Armorica to Wales, and with his sister Tegfedd took up his abode at Mowddwy, Merionethshire, where he founded the church of Llanymowddwy. His special acts are unknown, but he is said to have been much oppressed by Maelgwn Gwynedd prince of North Wales, who, however, by force of miracles, was compelled to submit and make amends; for the violent abduction of his sister Tegfedd, Cynon, a chief, purchased peace by the gift of Garthbeibio to the saint. His feast is Dec. 17, and his dedications are Llanymowddwy, Merionethshire, Mallwyd, Garthbeibio and Cemmaes, Montgomeryshire, and Capel Tydecho in Llanegfan, co. Anglesey. (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 24, 31, 54–5; *Achau y Saint*, ap. Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 266, 594; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 218 et al.) A metrical life of St. Tydecho was written about the year 1450 by the poet Davydd Llwyd ap Llywelyn. (Williams, *Em. Welsh.* 501.) [J. G.]

TYFODWG (TYVODWG), Welsh saint early in the 6th century, is of unascertained descent, founder of Llandyfodwg, and one of the three founders of Llantrisaint, with its chapel Ystrad Tyfodwg or Dyvodwg, Glamorganshire (Rees, *Welsh SS.* 180, 223). He is probably the Tyfodwg mentioned as sixth in the late Iolo Morganwg's list of the bishops of Margam. (Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 625.) [J. G.]

TYFRYDOG (TEVREDAUCUS, TYURYDAVC, TYVREDAUC, TYVRYDOG), Welsh saint in the second half of the 6th century; founder of Llandyfrydog in Anglesey. His feast is Jan. 1. (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 25, 55; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 276.) [J. G.]

TYPE, THE (ὁ τύπος or ὁ τύπος περὶ πίστεως). This was an imperial decree issued to impose silence on the combatants in the Monothelite controversy. The Ecthesis was issued by the emperor Heraclius in the year 638. [ECTHESIS.] That document had favoured the Monothelites, and continued in force till the year 648, when it was superseded by the Type. Pope Theodore condemned the Monothelite opinions of Paul, bishop of Constantinople, as professed in a letter addressed to him. Paul retorted by arresting and imprisoning the papal legates at the imperial court, and by persuading the emperor, Constantine IV. to issue the Type. Theodore died soon after, and was succeeded by his deacon Martin, who had been the papal representative at Constantinople. Martin, aided by St. Maximus, vigorously condemned the Type. It differed from the Ecthesis in one important respect. The Ecthesis expressed Monothelite sentiments. The Type expressed no sentiments at all, but imposed silence equally upon all, yet it was almost as objectionable to Martin and Maximus as the Ecthesis, because, as they said, it placed truth and falsehood on the same level. They repudiated it, therefore, and condemned it. The text of the Type will be found in the acts of the Lateran Synod of A.D. 649, Mansi, x. 1030. It lays down that there had been great discord upon the question, whether Christ had one or two wills. It then forbids all further discussion on such topics. All parties must remain satisfied with the statements of the Scriptures, the decrees of the five general councils adding nothing and diminishing nothing. It concludes with a formal repeal of the Ecthesis; and with setting forth the penalties for disobedience, which were, degradation for a cleric, confiscation of goods for a layman of rank, and flogging with exile for those of meaner station. The arrest and imprisonment of Maximus soon followed the Lateran council. His acts, as given in the edition of his works by Combefis, are full of information about the Type. They prove that the emperor was claiming the right as supreme priest, as well as sovereign, to decree doctrines as well as ceremonies; cf. specially capp. iv. and v. The Type held its ground for several years, but of course fell, together with the Monothelite party, at the sixth general council. Mansi's *Councils*, t. x. col. 701, 778, 880, 908, 1029; Hefele's *Councils*, sec. 306. [G. T. S.]

TYRANNION, bishop of Tyre, a martyr under Diocletian, commemorated in the Roman Martyrology, on Feb. 28. He suffered at Antioch, at the same time with Zenobias, a presbyter of Sidon, and ultimately was taken to the sea and drowned (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13). [E. V.]

TYRANNUS, bishop of Antioch, 19th in succession. He succeeded Cyrillus A.D. 302. His episcopate synchronizes with the persecution of Diocletian, καθ' ὃν ἤκμασεν ἡ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν πολιορκία (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32), and though we know nothing further of him, in the words of Dr. Neale "his acceptance of the office in the midst of so fiery a trial is enough to stamp him at once as a Christian hero" (*Patriarchate of Antioch*, p. 60). He survived till peace was restored to the church, *i.e.* c. A.D. 312 (Theod. *H. E.* 1, 2). Eutychius calls him Euris, and assigns him ten years of office, placing, however, his accession too late, in the tenth year of Diocletian (p. 404). [E. V.]

TYRHTEL, the second bishop of Hereford (*M. H. B.* 621). He must have succeeded bishop Putta some time before 693, for his name is attached to a Mercian charter (K. *C. D.* 36), which, although undated, seems to belong to that year. He is not, however, mentioned by Bede, and the date, 688, assigned to him in a MS. addition to Florence of Worcester (*M. H. B.* 538) has no authority. His name occurs in the epitaph inscribed, according to William of Malmesbury, by archbishop Cuthbert on the tomb of his predecessors in the see of Hereford "Nomina sunt quorum, Walhstodus, Torthere, Tirhtil" (W. Malmesb. *G. P.* iv. § 163). [S.]

TYRI. [See SEGRI.]

TYSILIO (TYSSILIO, TYSSILIAW, TYSSILAV, TUSSILIAV), Welsh saint and poet, son of Brochwel Ysgythrog ap Cyngen, prince of Powys, who is said to have commanded the native forces against the Saxons when the monks of Bangor were massacred. He is made by some the successor of St. Asaph as bishop, but is not accepted by Stubbs (*Reg. Sacr. Angl.* 157) and his being a bishop is doubtful. The events of his life are unknown; he belongs to the middle of the 7th century, and his feast is Nov. 8 (Rees, *Welsh SS.* 161, 277; Williams, *Em. Welsh.* 502; Rev. W. J. Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 267, 595; Rowlands, *Mon. Ant. Rest.* 155). His churches are numerous (*Camb. Quart. Mag.* i. 318 on Meivod and its antiquities; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 278–9). Of his poetry only one piece remains, in the form of a religious dialogue between two monks. (It is printed in *Myv. Arch.* i. 162 sq. and again as the *Colloquy of Llewelyn and Gwrnerth*, with translation by Skene, *Four Anc. Books of Wales*, i. 590–4, ii. 237, from the *Red Book of Hergest.*) In the above collection of Welsh Archaeology (*ib.* ii. 81-390) there is the *Brut Breninodd ynys Prydain* or *Chronicle of the Kings of Britain*, which the editor has named the *Brut Tyssilio*, and given as one of the chief sources of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of Britain*; this has been translated into English "from the Welsh of Tyssilio," by the Rev. Peter Roberts (4to, London, 1811), but there is no ground for believing that Tyssilio wrote this Chronicle or other historical treatise. (Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. pt. ii. 902; Skene, *Four An. Books of Wales*, i. 23 sq.; Stephens, *Lit. Kymry*, 315 sq. has an exhaustive account of the question and concludes wholly against the Tysilian authorship.) [J. G.]

U

UBILIGISCLUS, Arian bishop of Valencia, was one of the bishops who recanted Arianism at the third council of Toledo, A.D. 589, and were allowed to retain their sees. As in some other cases Valencia had for some time two bishops, Ubilisgisclus, and the previous orthodox bishop, Celsinus. (*Esp. Sag.* viii. 164; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 226, 254.) [F. D.]

UFELWY (UFELWYNUS, UVELWYN, UBELUNI, UBILLWINUS), son of Cennydd ab Aneurin y Coed Aur ap Gildas, disciple of St. Dubricius and first a priest in his diocese and clerical witness (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, 69); became a bishop in the see of Llandaff, probably in the district of Ergyng, and grants were made to him and the see of Llandaff during the reign of Gwrfodw, king of that district (*ib.* 151 sq. 625: Godwin, *De Præs. Angl.* 621; Stubbs, *Reg. Sacr. Angl.* 156); founded Llanufelwyn, Glamorganshire, probably near Cardiff (Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 517; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 226, 276). [J. G.]

UGNAS, bishop of Barcelona, one of the Arian bishops intruded by Leovigild, renounced Arianism at the third council of Toledo A.D. 589, the canons of which he subscribes first of all bishops who were not metropolitans, and was allowed to retain his see. He was also at the second council of Barcelona in Nov. A.D. 599. As the date of the appointment of Ugnas to Barcelona must have been c. A.D. 580, when Leovigild began to persecute, and as this date would scarcely have been sufficiently remote to give him precedence over all the bishops of Spain, Risco argues that he must have been previously bishop of some other see. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 226, 2[illegible] 692; *Esp. Sag.* xxix. 124.) [F. D.]

UHTRED, a subregulus of the Hwiccas, frequently occurring in Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus*. He was subject to Offa, king of Mercia (No. 178). Sometimes alone, and sometimes in conjunction with his brothers Aldred and Eanberht, he bestowed lands on two churches in Worcester, namely, St. Peter's, where their parents were buried, and St. Mary's. The charters, genuine and spurious, which convey and profess to convey these benefactions are numbers 102, 105, 117, 118, 125, 127, 128, 146. Their period is from 757 to 780, during the episcopates of Milred, Weremund, Tilhere, bishops of Worcester. The localities of the lands are marked chiefly by the rivers Stour and Salwarpe. [EANBERHT (3); HWICCII.] [C. H.]

UIBERT, bishop, subscribing a doubtful synodal act at Celchyth in 801. (Kemble, *C. D.* 1023; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 531.) [HIGBERT.] [C. H.]

ULCHED, Welsh saint of the 7th century, founder of Llachylched, in Anglesey, and commemorated Jan. 6th. (Rees, *Welsh SS.* 50[illegible].) [J. G.]

ULFILAS (Ulphilas, Urphilas in Philostorgius), the apostle of the Goths in the fourth century. His life and career are involved in much obscurity. Till fifty years ago we depended entirely upon the Church historians of the fifth century for our knowledge; Waitz, in 1840, discovered a manuscript of the Louvre, containing an independent account of Ulphilas, written by one of his own pupils, named Auxentius, Arian bishop of Silistria, who must therefore be regarded as an original witness. This manuscript gives us some details which shed light on the obscurity in which Ulfilas is involved. From these two sources we learn that he was born in the early years of the fourth century, probably in 311. He was consecrated bishop when thirty years of age, possibly by Eusebius of Nicomedia, at the Council of the Dedication, held at Antioch 341. In 380 he went to Constantinople, and died there that same year, or in the early days of 381. The circumstances of the life of Ulfilas raise the question of the origin of Gothic Christianity. Philostorgius tells us that, under Valerian and Gallienus in the second half of the third century, the Goths from the north of the Danube invaded the Roman territory and laid waste the province of Moesia as far as the Black Sea. They also crossed into Asia and ravaged Cappadocia and Galatia, whence they took a vast number of captives, including many Christian ecclesiastics. "These pious captives, by their intercourse with the barbarians, brought over large numbers to the true faith, and persuaded them to embrace the Christian religion in place of heathen superstitions. Of the number of these captives were the ancestors of Urphilas himself, who were of Cappadocian descent, deriving their origin from a village called Sadagolthina, near the city of Parnassus" (Philost. *H. E.* ii. 5). The Goths carried back these Christian captives into Dacia, where they were settled, and where considerable numbers embraced Christianity through their instrumentality. Ulfilas was the child of one of these Christian captives, and was trained in Christian principles. Socrates asserts that he was a disciple of a bishop, Theophilus who was present at Nice and subscribed its creed. He was at first a lector or reader in the church. The king of the Goths then sent him to Constantinople as ambassador to the emperor, about 340, when he was consecrated bishop. He returned to Dacia, laboured there for seven years, and then migrated into Moesia, driven from his original home by a persecution, probably between 347 and 350. About that period he produced his great literary work, inventing the Gothic character and translating "all the books of Scripture with the exception of the Books of Kings, which he omitted because they are a mere narrative of military exploits, and the Gothic tribes were especially fond of war, and were in more need of restraints to check their military passions than of spurs to urge them on to deeds of war" (Philost. *l.c.*). We next hear of Ulfilas as present at the synod of Constantinople A.D. 360, when the Acacian party triumphed and issued a creed which taught a middle view between that of the orthodox and Arian parties. This was the creed of the Homoean sect, headed by Acacius in the East and by Ursacius and Valens in the West. It is important to note the exact words of this creed, as it defines the position of Ulfilas. The material part runs thus: "We do not despise the Antiochian formula of the synod *in Encaeniis*, but because the terms Ὁμοούσιος and Ὁμοιούσιος occasion much confusion, and because some have recently set up the ἀνόμοιος, we therefore reject ὁμοούσιος and ὁμοιούσιος as contrary to the Holy Scriptures; the ἀνόμοιος, however, we anathematize, and acknowledge that the Son is similar to the Father in accordance with the words of the Apostle, who calls him the image of the invisible God. We believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, his Son, who was begotten by Him before all ages without change, the only begotten God, Logos from God, Light, Life, Truth, and Wisdom . . . . And whoever declares anything else outside this faith has no part in the Catholic Church" (see Hefele, ii. 265, Clark's ed.; and Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, pp. 180–182). The subsequent history of Ulfilas is involved in much obscurity. Sozomen, vi. 37, intimates that Ulfilas and his converts suffered much at the hands of Athanaric, a lively picture of whose persecution, A.D. 372–375, will be found in the Acts of St. Sabas, Ruinart's *Acta Sincera*, p. 670, and of St. Nicetas, Sep. 15 (cf. *AA.SS.* Boll. Sep.), both of which documents are full of most interesting details concerning the life and manners of the Goths. Mr. C. A. Scott, of Cambridge, has lately published an interesting monograph on Ulfilas, in which he diligently collects every scrap of information and discusses his history and that of Gothic Christianity during this period at considerable length. Arianism seems to have specially flourished during the first half of the fourth century in the provinces lying along the Danube. Valens and Ursacius, who lived there, were the leaders of Western Arianism, and Sulpicius Severus expressly asserts (*Chron.* ii. 38) that almost all the bishops of the two Pannonias were Arians. This would sufficiently account for the Arianism of the Goths who were just then accepting Christianity. The literary fame of Ulfilas is connected with his Gothic translation of the Bible, the one great monument of that language now extant. It does not exist in a complete shape. The fragments extant are contained in (1) the Codex Argenteus, now at Upsala; (2) the Codex Carolinus; and (3) the Ambrosian fragments published by Mai. A complete bibliography of these fragments, as known till 1840, will be found in Ceillier, iv. 346, and a complete edition in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. xviii. with a Life, Gothic Grammar and Glossaries. Scott, in his book, whose title is *Ulfilas, the Apostle of the Goths*, 1885, gathers together the literature since 1840, and gives a long account of the MS. of Waitz. He also discusses (p. 137) some fragments attributed to Ulfilas. The best German works on the life of Ulfilas are those of Waitz, 1840, Krafft, 1860, and Bessel, 1860. The latest works on the Gothic Bible are those of E. Bernhardt, Halle, 1875, and Stamm, Paderborn, 1878, in Germany; Bosworth's *Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels*, London, 1874, and Skeat, *Gospel of St. Mark in Gothic*, Oxford, 1883; *An Introduction, Phonological, Morphological, Syntactic, to the Gothic of Ulfilas*, by T. Le Marchant Douse, 1886.

The chief ancient sources for the life of

Ulfilas are Philostorgius, *H. E.* ii. 5; Soc. ii. 41, iv. 33; Soz. vi. 37; Theod. iv. 37. [G. T. S.]

ULPIANUS (1), a martyr at Tyre, in the Diocletian persecution, celebrated by Eusebius in *Mart. Palaest.* c. 5. He was whipped, and then flung into the sea, tied up in a bull's hide with a serpent and a dog. [G. T. S.]

ULPIANUS (2), a count to whom Theodoret wrote a highly complimentary letter. (Theod. *Ep.* 22.) [E. V.]

ULTAN (1), bishop of Clogher, said to have succeeded Maccartin, A.D. 506, and been buried at Clogher near him. (Ware, *Ir. Bps.* Clogher; Cotton, *Fast. Eccl. Hib.* iii. 71; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 210.) [J. G.]

ULTAN (2), bishop of Ardbraccan, co. Meath, son of Conchobhair. He belongs to the third class of Irish saints, and flourished in the first half of the 7th century. He was related to St. Brigida of Kildare, and may have been disciple of St. Declan of Ardmore, or at least a contemporary. At Ardbraccan he was specially the bishop of the Dal Conchobair branch of the Desi of Meath, and belonged to the southern half of the Irish Church which began early to symbolise with Rome. It is related of him (*M. Doneg.* Sept. 4) that in the plagues which were then so common his special delight was to care for and feed the motherless children of Erinn. But his chief fame rests on his connection with the two great saints of Ireland, St. Patrick and St. Brigida. As master of Tirechan he gave that author the material for his *Annotations on the Life of S. Patrick* in the *Book of Armagh* [TIRECHAN]: whether he himself had previously written a *Life of St. Patrick* is uncertain. He is also said to have collected the works of St. Brigida, which his disciple Brogan Cloen put into form, and which Colgan has given as his first *Life of St. Brigida.* [BROGAN (2).] *The Alphabetical Hymn in praise of St. Brigid*, attributed to him, is of very doubtful authorship, and ascribed also to Ninnidh Laimidan and Fiacc of Sletty. It is given in its fragmentary form, with prefatory and additional notes by Dr. Todd (*Book of Hymns*, fasc. i. 54 sq.) and only the last three stanzas are extant, a fourth being added by another hand. Though Colgan (*Tr. Th.* 527 sq.) gives the *Tertia Vita S. Brigida*, as "authore, ut videtur, S. Ultano episcopo," yet in his notes (p. 542) he leaves the authorship entirely uncertain. St. Ultan died Sept. 4th, A.D. 576 (Ussher), but his age of one hundred and eighty-nine years is merely a chronological expedient to make him synchronize with SS. Patrick, Brigida, and Declan (Todd, *S. Patr.* and *Book of Hymns;* Colgan, *Acta SS.* and *Tr. Th.* pass.; *Four Mast.* by O'Don. i. 268–9; O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 343 sq. 607–8; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. 87, 454. ii. 342 sq.; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 375, 534, *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 657). In *Kal. Drum.* (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 23) he is simply presbyter and confessor. [J. G.]

ULTAN (3), brother of St. Furseus, and abbat of Peronne [FURSEUS (1)]. After a long monastic probation he became a hermit, and St. Furseus lived with him a whole year in continence, prayer, and manual labour before he set out for Gaul about A.D. 648 (Bede, *H. E.* iii. c. 19; *M. H. B.* 192–3; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 539; O'Conor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 185 sq.). On the death of his brother he crossed over to France, and becoming abbat of Peronne died on May 1st, about A.D. 680. He may also have been at Fosse in the interval between his leaving England and being abbat at Peronne [FULLANUS (2)], but the legend is mythical. He is also accounted the founder of St. Quentin, in the Dep. of Aisne; his relics were preserved at Peronne and Fosse. (Mabillon, *Acta SS. O. S. B.* ii. 732; Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai, i. 121; Lappenberg, *Hist. Engl.* ed. Thorpe, 1845, i. 183; Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 455–6, with the Scotch annalists.) [J. G.]

ULTAN (4), son of Ui Cunga, abbat of Clonard, co. Meath, died A.D. 665 (*Ann. Tig.*; *Ann. Ult.*, and *Four Mast.* A.D. 664). Ultan O'Conga is included among the bishops of Meath (Cotton, *Fast. Eccl. Hib.* iii. 109; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 229). [J. G.]

ULTAN (5), son of Cummine, bishop of Tullamain, co. Tipperary, died A.D. 711. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 710; *Four Mast.* A.D. 709.) [J. G.]

ULTAN (6), monk of Lindisfarne, probably an Irish Scot, about the middle of the 8th century, has a short memoir by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 109) from Harpsfield and Menard, at Jan. 17, but his proper feast is Aug. 8. He had come to England for pious retirement, and was famous as a painter and decorator of the sacred books (Harpsfield, *Hist.* c. 14, p. 177; Leland, *Collect.* t. ii. 364). He may be the Ultan or Ulton who had a chapel in Valay in the Scotch Hebrides (Martin, *West Isl.*, 67, 2nd ed.), and that Ultan whose arm, enclosed in a silver shrine, was held by the O'Donnells in the island of Sanda, off the Mull of Cantire (Reeves, *S. Adamnan*, lxvii.; O'Conor, *Ep. Nuncup.* 179). [J. G.]

UNILAS (Οὐνίλας, WUNNILA), a bishop ordained by Chrysostom for the Goths. He was a man of uncommon abilities, and had already accomplished great things within a brief episcopate, when in 404 news was brought to Chrysostom at Cucusus that he was dead (Chrys. *Ep.* xiv. § 5; C. A. A. Scott's *Ulfilas*, 153). [MODUARIUS.] [C. H.]

UNWONA (UNWONO, INWONA) (*Chr. S.* 778), the sixth bishop of Leicester (*M. H. B.* 624). He succeeded bishop Eadbert some time after the year 781, and appears in charters and councils as late as 799. Werenbert, his successor, was bishop in 802. His episcopate coincides thus with the stormy period of the archbishopric of Lichfield, in the history of which he must have taken no unimportant part. He appears first among the bishops attending the legatine council of 787, the decrees of which he attests as "Unuwona Legorensium episcopus," Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461; and he attests charters during the rest of the life of Offa, being almost invariably among the witan of that king: in 788 (K. *C. D.* No. 153), in 789 (*ib.* 155, 156, 157), in 793 or 795 (*ib.* 159); and his name appears in other charters undated (*ib.* 165, 166, 167). The two charters of Ecgfrith, Offa's son, to which

Unwona's name is appended, are of questionable authenticity (*ib.* 172, 173); but he reappears under Kenulf in 798 (*ib.* 175) and 799 (*ib.* 176, 1020). He is mentioned in the Peterborough copy of the Chronicle as attesting a charter of Offa, printed in Kemble's *Codex*, No. 165 (Chr. S. *M. H. B.* 335), but under a misleading date (A.D. 777, "in the days of king Offa"); the date assigned to him in the interpolated MS. of Florence of Worcester (*M. H. B.* p. 546, note 6) is quite arbitrary. William of Malmesbury, *G. P.* iv. 176, knew only his name, which in the best charters (No. 153, 175) is written Unwono. The Charter of Caenwalha (K. *C. D.* 985), to which the attestation of *Unwana* is appended, is spurious or garbled. Unwona is mentioned by Matthew Paris as accompanying Offa at the Invention and Translation of St. Alban (*Hist. duor.* Off. p. 26), but this is fable. [S.]

URANIUS (1), Carthaginian refugee at Rome, A.D. 250. (Cyp. *Ep.* 22.) See MACARIUS (20). [E. W. B.]

URANIUS (2), a Mesopotamian bishop, who united himself to Audius, and was head of his sect after the death of its founder. (Epiph. *Haer.* lxx.; Ceill. vi. 406.) [ANTHROPOMORPHITAE.] [G. T. S.]

URANIUS (3), bishop of Tyre, one of the pronounced Arians of the Athanasian period, the associate of Acacius, Eudoxius, and George of Alexandria. We find him one of the infamous little Anomoean cabal 358, by which Eudoxius was raised to the throne of Antioch (Soz. *H. E.* iv. 12), and again at Seleucia the next year, where he was deposed along with Acacius, and the other Anomoean leaders (Socr. *H. E.* ii. 39, 40; Soz. *H. E.* iv. 22), some unspecified crime being alleged against him (Athanas. *de Synod.* pp. 880–913; Epiphan. *Haer.* 73; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 805). [E. V.]

URANIUS (4), a priest who, at the request of Pacatus, who was intending to write a metrical life of Paulinus of Nola, sends him an account of the death of the saint. (Uranii *Epist.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liii. 859.) Chifflet supposes him to be the Uranius mentioned by Paulinus in his nineteenth letter written in A.D. 400. [F. D.]

URANIUS (5), bishop of Emesa, a constant friend of Theodoret, remaining faithful to him during all his troubles. He succeeded Pompeianus subsequently to 445, in which year the latter attend the synod at Antioch (Labbe, iv. 727). On Theodoret's deposition by the "Robbers' Synod," Uranius wrote in language which Theodoret mistaking for a counsel to conceal his real sentiments by a so-called economy (τὴν καλουμένην οἰκονομίαν), vigorously repudiated (Theod. *Ep.* 122). Uranius replied in a long letter, which convinced Theodoret of his mistake and exhibited such affectionate fidelity, that he was induced in his case to violate his rule of refusing the presents (*eulogiae*), which other sympathising bishops had sent him (*Ep.* 123). At the "Latrocinium" Uranius also was himself the subject of a lengthy act of accusation, intercalated in the proceedings against Domnus of Antioch, brought forward by a presbyter named Marcellus and the monks of his convent, in which he was charged with profligacy, and the usurpation of the see to which a certain Peter had been canonically consecrated. It was alleged that his own consecration was defective, having been enforced on his consecrators by his friends among pagans, Jews, and stage players, and had been at once repudiated by those who had been compelled to perform it, who warned his clergy to hold no communion with Uranius. The moving cause of this unscrupulous attack was (as Abbé Martin has remarked) the fact that Uranius was a friend of Theodoret, and had signed the act of deposition of Eutyches (Martin, *Actes du Brigandage*, pp. 146–148). He attended the council of Chalcedon in 451 (Labbe, iv. 443, 451, 789), and subscribed with the other bishops of his province the reply to the encyclical of the emperor Leo (*ibid.* 922). During his episcopate the head of John the Baptist was believed to have been discovered at Emesa, for the reception of which sacred relic he caused a new church to be erected (*Acta Sanctorum*, Jun. 24; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 840). [E. V.]

URANIUS (6), bishop of Himeria in Osrhoëne. He first appears as the instigator of the cabal against his metropolitan Ibas of Edessa, and taking part in the synod held at Antioch in 445, in the matter of Athanasius of Perrha, at which Ibas was summoned to appear, but excused himself by letter (Labbe, iv. 728). Resolved to hunt down Ibas, Uranius followed his fellow conspirators to Constantinople to lay their complaints before the emperor and Flavian, by whom the case was remitted for trial to the East, Oct. 26, 448. Uranius was appointed, with Photius of Tyre, and Eustathius of Berytus, to hear the case at Tyre, whence to avoid popular tumults it was removed to Berytus, Feb. 1, 449. (For the details of the trial see IBAS, Vol. III. p. 194.) The trial ended in a compromise, from which Uranius alone dissented (Labbe, iv. 630–638). We next find Uranius in the violent and unscrupulous majority at the Robbers' Synod at Ephesus (Labbe, iv. 118). He was not present at the opening of the proceedings against Ibas (Martin, *Actes du Brigandage*, p. 43); but he took part in the deposition of his nephew, Daniel, bishop of Charrae, employing Libanius a deacon of Samosata as his spokesman, from his ignorance of Greek (*ibid.* p. 79), and with utter disregard of consistency asserted the orthodoxy of Eutyches, Eulogius, a presbyter of Edessa, speaking for him (Labbe, iv. 266). He followed the tide at Chalcedon, and calmly reversed his former decisions (*ibid.* 589). In consequence of a list of subscriptions of an earlier date having been carelessly appended to the acts of the council of Rome under Symmachus, A.D. 503, it has been erroneously asserted that Uranius took part in that synod half a century later than that of Chalcedon (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 983; Martin, *Le Brigandage; Actes du Brigandage*). [E. V.]

URANIUS (7), subadjuva (see RODANUS), bearer of the letter of Zeno to Simplicius against JOANNES (11) TALAIA (Mansi, viii. 1063), to which the 17th letter of Simplicius, written July 15th, A.D. 482 (in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 56), is a reply. Simplicius praises the bearer for his fidelity and ability. He is perhaps the

same person as the Uranius sent as ambassador by Zeno in A.D. 484, to HUNNERIC, q. v Vol. III. 180. [F. D.]

URBANENSES, a small party among the Donatists, taking their name, as Morcelli thinks, from Urbanus, bishop of Formi, but nothing is known about them. Aug. *c. Cresc.* iv. 60, 73. Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 160. [URBANUS, of Formi.] [H. W. P.]

URBANUS ASTERIUS. [ASTERIUS.]

URBANUS (1), bishop of Rome, under the emperor Alexander Severus, from A.D. 223 (or 222) to A.D. 230. The Liberian Catalogue gives Maximinus and Elianus (223) as the consuls of the year of his accession; Agricola and Clementinus (230) as those of the year of his death; but, inconsistently, eight years eleven months and eleven days as the duration of his episcopate. Eusebius also intimates A.D. 223 as the year of his accession, saying (*H. E.* vi. 21) that Callistus succeeded Zephyrinus in the first year of Elagabalus (*i.e.* 218), and after five years was succeeded by Urbanus. Lipsius, however (*Chron. der Röm. Bischöfe*), considers A.D. 222 as the probable date, thus accounting for the duration assigned to his reign. In the Felician Catalogue (A.D. 530), and also in some, considered the most authentic, MSS. of the *Lib. Pontif.*, xiv. *Kal.* Jun. (*i.e.* 19 May) is given as the day of his burial; but in other texts of the *Lib. Pontif.*, and in the Martyrologies, and in the *Acta S. Urbani*, it is said to have been 25 May, on which day he is commemorated in the Roman Calendar.

Nothing is known with certainty of the life of this pope. The *Acta S. Urbani*, accepted as genuine by the Bollandists, and by them assigned to pope Anteros (235–236), show signs of a much later date, probably not earlier than the 5th century, and cannot be at all relied on. One sufficient ground for discrediting them is that he is represented as having suffered martyrdom under Alexander Severus, whereas (in addition to the fact that there appears to have been no persecution of the Christians at Rome under this emperor) neither in the *Catalog. Felic.*, nor in the later editions of the *Lib. Pontif.*, nor in the *Acta S. Caeciliae*, in which Urban is prominently referred to (these *Acta* themselves being now thought to have been compiled not before, and probably after, the end of the 4th century), is there any mention of his martyrdom.

In the *Lib. Pontif.*, all that is said of him in connexion with any martyrdoms is, "Hic sua traditione multos convertit ad baptismum et credulitatem: Tiburtium etiam et Valerianum nobilissimum virum, sponsum sanctae Caeciliae, quos etiam usque ad martyrii palmam perduxit. Et per ejus monita et doctrinam multi martyrio coronati sunt." Nearly the same is the account of him in the *Catal. Felic.*, and what is thus said about him corresponds with what we find in the *Acta S. Caeciliae*, which seem thus to have been known to the compilers of the pontifical annals, but not the *Acta S. Urbani*, which make him out to have been himself a martyr. For the Acts of St. Caecilia give the following account of her:—She was of a noble Roman family, had believed in Christ, and vowed virginity. Espoused by her parents to Valerian, a young Roman who was not a Christian, she went through the form of marriage with him, but afterwards acquainted him with her vow, and persuaded him to resort to Urban the pope, by whom he was converted and baptized. So also was Tiburtius, the brother of Valerian. These two, Valerian and Tiburtius, were brought before Turcius Almachius, the praefectus Urbi, and by him delivered for execution to one Maximus, who, through their exhortations, was also converted to the faith. All three were put to death, and thus received the crown of martyrdom. Soon afterwards Caecilia was sought out by the praefect Turcius, and required to sacrifice to the gods. On her refusal she also, after miraculous incidents, died a martyr, and was buried by Urban and his deacons in the cemetery of Callistus, on the Appian Way "among his fellow-bishops, where all the bishops, confessors, and martyrs were buried." Her house beyond the Tiber Urban consecrated to God as a church. For further details see CAECILIA (1) and VALERIANUS (3). Now it seems plain that, as has been said above, the notices of Urban in the *Lib. Pontif.* are founded on this story about Caecilia and her companions, whatever be the date or authenticity of the story itself. That there was a Caecilia who suffered martyrdom is open to no reasonable doubt; but the true facts about her are uncertain. According to Fortunatus of Poitiers, writing at the end of the 6th century, she suffered in Sicily under Marcus Aurelius or Commodus; the martyrology of Ado also assigns her martyrdom to the age of M. Aurelius and Commodus (161–192), though inconsistently connecting her with pope Urban; the Greek Menologies represent her as suffering at Rome in the time of Diocletian (284–305); in the Liberian *Depositiones Martyrum* she is not mentioned at all. De Rossi (having in view the ancient traditions and recent discoveries with respect to her and pope Urban's places of burial, of which more will be said below) thinks it most probable that she suffered at Rome under M. Aurelius or Commodus (as alleged by Ado), when there was really such a persecution of Christians there as her Acts speak of; that some other Urban (a bishop, otherwise unknown, who was in Rome in her day) had been associated with her, and had taken charge of her burial; and that he came to be erroneously identified in the martyrologies with the pope of the same name, a mistake all the more likely to occur from the tomb of pope Urban being found in the papal crypt of the cemetery of St. Callistus close to the crypt called that of St. Caecilia, in which the virgin martyr lay (see Brownlow and Northcote's *Roma Sotterranea*, p. 163). If this supposition be correct, the legend of pope Urban's martyrdom may have had some foundation in tradition about the earlier Urban, whom De Rossi supposes to have been really a martyr, though nothing is known about him. Lipsius (*Chron. der Röm. Bisch.*) objects to this theory of there having been an earlier bishop Urban resident at Rome as unsupported and improbable. De Rossi, however, maintains it with confidence, as explaining many difficulties; and it certainly appears tenable, though it does not seem necessary for his explanation that the supposed earlier Urban should have been a bishop.

The discovery by De Rossi in the papal crypt of the cemetery of St. Callistus of a broken stone

(apparently once the *mensa* of an altar-tomb), bearing the imperfect inscription ΟΥΡΒΑΝΟϹ Ε... has raised an interest in the question of pope Urban's burial-place, and in the more general one of his alleged connexion with St. Caecilia. Adjoining the papal crypt, and communicating with it, there is another, called that of St. Caecilia, which the numerous epitaphs to Caecilii and their connexions show to have been the burial-place of the Caecilian family. On one of the walls is a painting of a richly-attired Roman lady, supposed to represent St. Caecilia, which De Rossi attributes conjecturally to the 7th century, and also one of pope Urban in pontifical robes, with his name inscribed, apparently not earlier than the 10th or 11th century. These pictures of course prove nothing beyond the belief current at the times when they were painted; viz. that St. Caecilia (if the painting is intended for her) had been buried here, and that pope Urban had been associated with her according to the legend. But, further, pope Paschal I. (*acc.* 817) is said in the *Lib. Pontif.* to have sought for, and at length found close to where the ancient popes were buried (*i.e.* the aforesaid papal crypt), the remains of St. Caecilia, clad in rich garments embroidered with gold, with linen cloths, stained with blood, rolled up at her feet, lying in a cypress coffin, and to have translated them to the church which had been built in her honour on the supposed site of her house and martyrdom in the Trastevere. He is said also to have translated previously the remains of popes Urban and Lucius and others from a place close to that where he found St. Caecilia.[a] It is to be here observed that a stone bearing the inscription ΛΟΥΚΙϹ (with others inscribed with the names of popes of the same period) have been discovered in the papal crypt as well as that, above mentioned, bearing the name of Urban. Now there seems to be no reason to doubt that the crypt called that of St. Caecilia was her original resting-place; it was likely that she would be laid in the crypt of her family, if it existed in her time; and the tradition embodied in her *Acta* that she was buried near the popes, as well as the alleged discovery by pope Paschal of her remains in proximity to theirs, with the painting on the wall of her crypt above described, supports this conclusion. There is a deep recess in the wall of this crypt which separates it from the papal crypt, capable of receiving a sarcophagus; and in this De Rossi concludes that she was originally laid, and that there pope Paschal found her. But there is still a doubt as to whether the Urban whose monumental stone has been discovered in the papal crypt, and whose remains were presumably translated by Paschal, was really the pope of that name. The letter Ε after ΟΥΡΒΑΝΟϹ suggests ἐπίσκοπος, and the letters are said by De Rossi to be of the same general character with those of the names of other popes of the same period, whose slabs remain, and of whose burial in the crypt there is no doubt. But on the other hand we find a consentient old tradition that pope Urban was buried, not in the cemetery of Callistus, but in that of Praetextatus, which is on the opposite side of the Appian Way. So state the Felician Catalogue (530), the later editions of the *Lib. Pontif.*, the *Martyrol. Hieron. ad* 25 Maii, and Itineraries of the 7th and 8th centuries. Lipsius, relying on this testimony, inclines to the view that the Urban of the papal crypt was some other Urban, not necessarily a bishop, since the letter E after his name might have been the beginning of some other expression than ἐπίσκοπος, *e.g.* ἐν εἰρήνῃ. De Rossi, on the other hand, is decidedly of opinion that the slab in the papal crypt must have been that of the pope, who was actually buried there; and he attributes the contrary tradition to a confusion between him and the earlier Urban, whom he supposes to have been contemporary with St. Caecilia, and to have been buried in the cemetery of Praetextatus. The facts of the case he takes to have been as follows:—Caecilia was martyred (as aforesaid) under M. Aurelius or Commodus, *i.e.* some forty years before the time of pope Urban, who consequently had nothing to do with her. She was buried, through the care of the supposed earlier Urban, in the crypt of her *gens*, viz. the same as is now known as that of St. Caecilia, and which existed then. The land in which this crypt was situated was made over by the Caecilian family, which had then become a Christian one,[b] to pope Zephyrinus (c. 200) for the purpose of a common Christian cemetery (see ZEPHYRINUS). Callistus, to whose care it was entrusted by Zephyrinus, extended it, adding to the original Caecilian crypt, and hence the whole cemetery came to be called his. Among such extensions was the papal crypt, adjoining the original one, which became the usual burial-place of the popes, and there pope Urban was in due time buried. The fact of his tomb being there, and thus near to St. Caecilia's, would naturally suggest in a later age the view of his having been the Urban who had been contemporary with her and buried her; and the tradition that he had laid her "inter collegas suos episcopos," &c., had this foundation of fact, that she was interred close to where he and other popes were afterwards laid, and that her remains and theirs did thus rest together.

The legend about St. Urban's martyrdom is to

[a] As the story is told, the body of the saint was found whole and incorrupt as when she died; and it is said also to have been so discovered under the altar of the church of St. Caecilia in Trastevere in the time of pope Clement VIII., A.D. 1599. Baronius, the historian, was commissioned by the pope to examine and report upon it, and he states that it was so. Whatever may be thought now of the probability of the body having been preserved from decay (a circumstance alleged of other saints), there is no improbability in the story of Paschal having found and translated the remains with the gold embroidered garments, in which the saint had been buried, round them. The discovery (A.D. 1827) of the supposed remains of St. Cuthbert (another saint whose body was said to have been incorruptible) under the site of his shrine at Durham is a case in point. Only a skeleton of the body was found in 1827, but it was enveloped in gold embroidered vestments, considerable portions of which had been remarkably preserved, together with other relics. (*See* Raine's St. Cuthbert, *publ.* 1828.)

[b] That it was not supposed to have been a Christian one when St. Caecilia witnessed for the faith seems implied by the story of her having been espoused against her will to a heathen. If that part of her legend (in which there is nothing improbable) be true, her martyrdom may have led to the general conversion of her family.

the effect that, though Alexander Severus did not persecute the Christians, yet governors and magistrates continued to bring accusations against them; that Urban, who was hiding in the catacombs, was brought before Turcius Almachius,[c] the praefectus Urbi, on a charge of exciting sedition, and of having been the cause of the martyrdoms, in number five thousand, under the late emperors, and also of having received the possessions of St. Caecilia which had been confiscated to the state; that, on his replying that all these possessions had been given to the poor, he was beaten, imprisoned, and after first converting Aurelinus his jailor, was beheaded.[d]

He is thus noticed (25 May) in the Roman Martyrology: "Romae via Nomentana natalis B. Urbani Papae et Martyris, cujus exhortatione et doctrina multi (in quibus sunt Tiburtius et Valerianus) Christi fidem susceperunt: ipse quoque in persecutione Alexandrini Severi pro ecclesia Dei multa passus tandem cervicibus abscissis martyrio coronatus est." [J. B—y.]

URBANUS (2), Cyp. *Ep.* 51, Roman confessor, A.D. 250. See MOYSES, MAXIMUS (20). [E. W. B.]

URBANUS (3), governor of Palestine, under whom a great number suffered in the second year of the Diocletian persecution (Eus. *MM. Palaest.* cap 3). Eusebius, in cap. 7 of the same treatise, tells us of his deposition and condemnation to death by Maximinus, whose favourite and active agent in persecution he had been. [G. T. S.]

URBANUS (4), Donatist bishop of Formi, one of two places in Numidia, of the same name but of unknown site, probably near Idicra, who was associated with Felix bishop of that place, in his scandalous behaviour. [FELIX (90) Vol. I. 491.] (Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 160.) [H. W. P.]

URBANUS (5), Sept. 5, martyr with Theodoretus, Menedemus, and seventy-seven other ecclesiastics, at the hands of the Arians, about the year 371. The emperor Valens was displeased with them for laying a complaint before him concerning the ill-treatment suffered by the Catholic party. Modestus, the prefect, sent them to sea with secret orders to the sailors to burn their ship, which they duly effected (Socrates, *H. E.* iv. 16). [G. T. S.]

URBANUS (6), bishop of Sicca, or Sicia Veneria, a town of proconsular Africa (Kaff) 22 m. from Musti (Ant. *Itin.* 41. 4. Shaw, *Trav.* p. 95. Aug. *Ep.* 229). Urbanus, who appears to have been a member of Augustine's monastic society at Hippo (Aug. *Ep.* 139. 34), had occasion to remove from his office for grave misconduct a presbyter named Apiarius. Perhaps, as Tillemont suggests, he had done so in a manner which was not quite regular. However this may be, Apiarius took upon himself to appeal to Zosimus, bishop of Rome, who, in a manner equally irregular, ordered him to be restored. In a council which met May 1, 418, the African bishops decreed that no priest, deacon, or inferior clerk, should prosecute any appeal beyond sea. Zosimus then sent a commission to Africa, consisting of Faustinus, bishop of Potenza, and two Roman presbyters, Philip and Asellus. They carried with them verbal instructions, and also a letter (commonitorium) stating four points which they were to impress on the African bishops: 1. That appeals from bishops of other churches should be made to Rome. 2. That bishops should not cross the sea unnecessarily (importune) to visit the seat of government (comitatum). 3. About settling through neighbouring bishops matters relating to priests and deacons excommunicated by their own bishops. In this letter Zosimus quotes a decree purporting to be one of the council of Nicaea, enjoining appeal to the bishop of Rome in case of bishops degraded by the bishops of their own province. 4. About excommunicating Urbanus, or at least summoning him to Rome unless he revoked his decision against Apiarius. This was in the latter part of the year 418. Though no record exists of any council held for the purpose, it is plain from the reference in the acts of the subsequent council to a "former" letter, that the African bishops must have considered these propositions, and determined that they were willing to accept provisionally the first and third, until the canons of Nicaea on which they were said to be founded, should be examined, for they were not aware of the existence among them of such rules as these. But at the end of 418 Zosimus died, and was succeeded by Boniface, and probably in consequence of the troubles connected with his accession, no further action was taken, and no meeting of bishops took place until May 419, when 217 bishops met in council at Carthage with Aurelius and Valentinus, primate of Numidia, at their head. (Hardouin, *Conc.* vol. i. p. 934; Bruns, *Conc.* i. 156, 157. d.) Faustinus and his colleagues attended the meeting, and stated the conditions proposed by Zosimus. The bishops insisted on seeing them in writing, and the documents were accordingly, but not till then, produced and read by Daniel the notary. The fourth article referred, as has been seen above, to a decree said to be one of those of the council of Nicaea. On this Alypius, bishop of Tagaste, remarked that the decree quoted by Zosimus did not appear in the Greek copies with which the African bishops were acquainted, and proposed that reference should be made to the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, to obtain information as to the genuineness, and also that pope Boniface should be requested to communicate with the same bishops for the same purpose. Faustinus then proposed that the enquiry should be made by the pope alone, who should communicate its result to the African bishops, to which proposal Aurelius replied, that they would send a letter to him with a full account of their proceedings. To this, after some discussion in which Augustine took part, the council unanimously agreed, agreeing also that full submission was due to the decrees of the Nicene council, of which copies

[c] The name of Turcius Almachius (who appears also in the Acts of St. Caecilia as her persecutor) is pointed out by Lipsius as a sign of the comparative lateness of these *Acta*. For it was not (he says) till towards the end of the fourth century that the Turcian family begins to be prominent in the accounts of martyrs, as one that had remained heathen, and was peculiarly obnoxious to the Christians.

had been brought to Africa by Caecilianus the bishop who was present at its meeting. (Hardouin, *Conc.* vol. i. pp. 934–939, and p.1242–1250. Bruns, *Conc.* vol. i. p. 155–160.) Accordingly a letter was sent to Boniface, of which the Roman delegates were the bearers, relating the circumstances of the case, and the decisions at which the African bishops had arrived, including a request to him to consult the eastern bishops as to the decrees of the council of Nicaea (Bruns, pp. 196–198). Letters were also sent to them requesting information, and answers received from Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, and from Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, containing authentic copies of the Nicene decrees, which were by the direction of Atticus, translated into Latin for the benefit of the African church (Bruns, p. 200), in whose archives they were retained, and copies sent to Boniface in November 419. (Hefele, *Conc.* i. p. 358 German ed., p. 357 Eng. ed.) Pending the result of these consultations, the council determined that Apiarius should be allowed, under a circular letter, to exercise his office in any other place than Sicca, and the letter to Boniface contained a respectful protest against arrogance (typhum) perhaps as shown on the part of Faustinus, but seeming also indirectly, by a marked expression of contrast (tua sanctitate Romanae ecclesiae praesidente), to include Zosimus in this charge. No mention is made of any action taken in this matter by Boniface, who died A.D. 422, and was succeeded by Celestine I., but in 426 the question was revived by further misconduct on the part of Apiarius at Tahraca, and, when he was removed from his office by the African bishops, he again appealed to Rome. At a council summoned for the purpose Faustinus appealed again and behaved with great insolence, demanding on the part of the Roman pontiff that Apiarius should be restored, a demand which the bishops entirely refused to concede. A strenuous dispute was carried on for three days, which however was brought to an end by a confession of his own guilt by Apiarius; but the assembled bishops did not neglect the opportunity of requesting the bishop of Rome in future to be less easy in receiving appeals, and not to admit to communion persons excommunicated by them, being not only as the canons of Nicaea prescribe, clergy and lay people, but still more so bishops, lest if they have been condemned in their own province and restored by his authority he may seem to have acted hastily or unduly: all appeals ought to be terminated in the province in which they begin, or in a general council. They repeat, on the authority of the replies received from the bishops of Alexandria and Constantinople, the absence from the decrees of the Nicene council of the one alleged by Celestine's predecessor, and beg him not to send clerical messengers (legatos a latere) to execute his decrees at the request of any one, so that there may be no importation into the Church of Christ of the pretentious arrogance of the world (fumosum typhum saeculi). The alleged decree of the Nicaean council so often mentioned above was really one of the council of Sardica (Bruns, *Conc. Sard.* 3, 4, 7, i., pp. 91, 93), but, as Quesnel remarks, there is no reason to think that either of the Roman pontiffs acted in the matter with bad faith, however much they may be thought to have overstepped their own authority, for the decrees of Sardica were no doubt accepted by the Roman church as having an oecumenical sanction, and as such might be quoted as on the same level with those of Nicaea, but it seems strange that the African bishops should have been ignorant of this fact, for one bishop at least from that region was present at the council [GRATUS (1) Vol. II. 278]. The whole matter is of great importance in the controversy respecting the supremacy of the see of Rome. Baronius, who gives a very full account of the letters and decrees of the African council, labours hard to show that the bishops attending the council made no general, but only a special and conditional objection to the Roman claim, but his reasoning is inconsistent with the plain meaning of their language, and rests both on a gratuitous assumption of his own as to the Nicaean canons, viz. that the copy of them quoted by Zosimus contained the decree on which he relied, although the Eastern copies omitted it, and also on the improbability of its being quoted by three Pontiffs in succession unless it had been originally contained in the acts of the council (Baronius, ann. 418, lxxvii.; 419, lix.–xcii, especially lxxxvii.–lxxxix.) Reference may also be made for information on the whole subject to the following: Hardouin and Bruns, as cited above, Tillemont, vol. xiii. 292, 295, 323, 775, 783, 860, 861. Fleury, *H. E.* xxiv. 6, 7, 10, 11, 35. Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* vol. i. p. 450, § 94, Eng. tr. Van Espen, *Com. in Can.* Opp. vol. iii. ed. Cologne 1727, pp. 296, 298, 301, 302, 307. He treats the subject very clearly, and points out that the African church did not admit an equality in authority between the councils of Nicaea and of Sardica, *ib.* p. 307. Robertson, *Hist. of Church*, i. 493. Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 91, 93, 139, 114, 115. Hefele, *Concilien-Geschichte*, vol. i. p. 357, 358, p. 356 Eng. tr.; ii. p. 122, 133, 135, 138, p. 464, 476, 477, 481 Eng. tr. Rohrbacher remarks that the Sardican canons were in truth complementary to the Nicaean, and takes the same view as Baronius about the special character of the objection raised by the African bishops, and says further that some good theologians here thought that the letter purporting to come from them, and indeed the whole history of Apiarius is a forgery. (*Hist. de l'Eglise*, vol. iv. pp. 348–371.) The canons of the African church A.D. 419, are given by the Ballerini, and also remarks by Quesnel in the notes to the life of St. Leo, vol. iii. (Migne, *Patrol.* vol. 56, pp. 863–875, 920.) See also Aug. *Ep.* 157, 261; *Retract.* ii. 51, and Possidius, *Vit. Aug.* 14; also COELESTINUS I., Vol. II. 584. In a letter to Celestine, A.D. 423, St. Augustine discusses the subject of appeals to the Apostolic See, and of decisions pronounced by it, but makes no mention of Apiarius. Doubt has been thrown on the genuineness of this letter, but as on the one hand there can be no doubt that Augustine was present at the council A.D. 419, so on the other not much can be inferred from his silence in the subsequent letter. (Aug. *Ep.* 209, and note by editor, ed. Migne, vol. i. p. 956.) [H. W. P.]

URBANUS (7), a bishop, probably the same as in the last art., bearer of a letter from Darius to St. Augustine. (Aug. *Ep.* 229.) [H. W. P.]

URBANUS (8), called by Optatus Carisus, by Augustine, Donatus, a man at whose house the bishops met who ordained Secundus of Tigisis. (Opt. i. 14; Aug. *Ep.* 53, 4.) [H. W. P.]

URBANUS (9), a presbyter, bearer of a letter to Augustine from Marcellinus. (Aug. *Ep.* 143. 2.) [H. W. P.]

URBANUS (10), a man of rank to whom Theodoret wrote a Festal Epistle (Theod. *Ep.* 74). [E. V.]

URBANUS (11), former abbat of the untenanted monastery mentioned under EPIPHANIUS (45). [F. D.]

URBANUS (12), precentor (veteranus melodicus) of Toledo, is praised with FRODOARIUS bishop of Acci, and EVANTIUS (3) by Isidorus Pacensis under Era 757 = A.D. 719, for his learning, wisdom, and sanctity. His death is placed by the same author with that of Evantius in Era 785 = A.D. 737. The first mention of him as bishop occurs in Roderic of Toledo (c. A.D. 1240) iii. 19, who narrates that he was elected bishop on the flight of SINDERED. This testimony however seems insufficient when the silence of the contemporary Isidorus and the absence of the name of Urbanus from all ancient catalogues are taken into account. Roderic also (iv. 3) attributes to him the removal to the Asturias of the holy ark of relics, the writings of Ildefonsus and Julianus, and the vestment given by the Virgin to Ildefonsus. Urbanus and Evantius are also coupled by Cixila (*Vita Ildefonsi*, 5) as persons from whom he had heard accounts of the saint. Florez endeavours to reconcile the accounts of Isidorus and Roderic by supposing that Urban was elected bishop but never consecrated. (*Esp. Sag.* v. 318; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (2) 243.) [F. D.]

URBICA (1), a widow of Figentes, a place of unknown site, but probably near Uzalis, mentioned by Evodius as having seen a vision. (Aug. *Ep.* 158. 3.) [H. W. P.]

URBICA (2), of Bordeaux, a convert of Priscillian. On account of her religious opinions she was stoned to death in a tumult of the populace (Prosper, *Chron.* p. 2). [M. B. C.]

URBICIUS (1), persecutor. [PTOLEMAEUS (2).]

URBICIUS (2), a monk, a correspondent of Basil, who writes in A.D. 373 reproaching him for not visiting him and affording him his advice and consolation when he was afflicted by the calamities then affecting the church (Basil, *Ep.* 123 [345]. At a later period, A.D. 377, Basil begs him to lay aside all bashfulness and write frequently to him, and inform him who are sound in the faith that he may encourage them by his letters to persevere. Having heard that some members of the church to which he belonged entertained the false view that Christ did not take our common humanity inherited from Adam, but by His almighty power changed His Deity into Flesh, Basil confutes the error, and shows that it robs the Incarnation of its value for us (*Ep.* 262 [344]). [E. V.]

URBICIUS (3), a bishop of an unnamed see, whom Chrysostom had formerly known at Antioch, to whom he wrote a letter of friendship from Cucusus (Chrys. *Ep.* 108). [E. V.]

URBICUS (1), 8th bishop of Riez, was present at the council of Valence, held in 584, and the 2nd of Mâcon in 585. He was also one of the 10 prelates who signed the letter on the subject of the rebellious nuns of Poitiers (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ix. 41; CHRODIELDIS). Dynamius, the patrician, dedicated to him the life of his predecessor, St. Maximus of Riez, for which he supplied some ancient records (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx., 31 seqq.; *Gall. Christ.* i. 394). [S. A. B.]

URBICUS (2) Q. LOLLIUS M. F., Cos. Suff. about 132. Prefect of the city under Antoninus Pius from about A.D. 152. The date of this magistrate has been much disputed, as upon it depends the date of Justin's Second Apology in which his name occurs (cap. ii.). Borghesi (*Oeuvres Complètes*, t. ix. p. 295, cf. viii. 545) discusses the question. He fixes with Valesius the date of the martyrdom of St. Ptolemaeus there mentioned to the closing years of Antoninus Pius in opposition to Tillemont (*Mém.* ii. 653) who assigns it to Marcus Aurelius. Borghesi, *l. c.* gives several new inscriptions from Africa, where we find his *cursus honorum* and details of his family history. He served with distinction in Britain, Germany, and against Barcochba before he became city prefect. (Remer's *Ins. Rom. de l'Algéric*, No. 2319; *Corp. Ins. Lat.* vi. 10707; vii. 1125; viii. 6705; cf. Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, t. i. p. 493, and JUSTINUS MART. Vol. III. p. 564 of this DICTIONARY.) [G. T. S.]

URBICUS (3), April 3rd, second bishop of Clermont, said by Greg. Tur. (*Hist. Franc.* i. 39 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 181) to have succeeded Austremonius (Stremonius). He was a senator and married, when raised to the episcopate: but he seems to have abdicated, and to have died c. 312. (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 226; Boll. *AA. SS.* Apr. i. 251–2.) [J. G.]

URBICUS (4). Gregory the Great in A.D. 591 directed the sub-deacon Anthimus to give his widow Palatina twenty solidi and three hundred bushels of wheat, and afterwards to allow her annually thirty solidi. (*Epp.* i. 39, 59.) [F. D.]

URBICUS (5), defensor of the church property in Sabina and at Carseoli, died so largely indebted to the church, that his whole property would have been insufficient to make up the deficiency. Gregory the Great, however, in March, A.D. 593, compassionately granted his estate, free from debt, to his three children. (*Epp.* iii. 21.) [F. D.]

URBICUS (6), prior, and afterwards (A.D. 594) abbat of the monastery of St. Hermes at Palermo, one of the six monasteries founded in Sicily by Gregory the Great. At his request Gregory asked the bishop of Palermo to ordain one of the monks priest, in order to celebrate mass within the monastery. He seems to have exercised a general supervision over Gregory's Sicilian monasteries. On one occasion he man-

aged the choice of an abbat so badly, that each of two candidates claimed to be elected. Gregory rebukes him sharply for his indecision. In A.D. 603 he was proposed by one party for the vacant see of Palermo, but JOANNES (284) was eventually chosen. (*Epp.* v. 6; vi. 42, 48; xi. 48, 49; xiii. 15.) [F. D.]

URBITIUS, bishop of Dyrrachium, is, with other bishops, addressed in two circular letters of Gregory the Great. (*Epp.* viii. 5, ix. 68.) [F. D.]

URSA, wife of FORTUNIUS (2), *q. v.* She was carried into captivity by the Goths, and during her absence her husband married again. [F. D.]

URSACIUS (1), bishop of Singidunum (Belgrade). He and Valens, bishop of Mursa, appear at every synod and council, from 330 till about 370, as leaders of the Arian party, both in the East and West. They seem to have imbibed their Arian views from Arius himself during the period of his exile into Illyricum immediately after the council of Nice. They are described by Athanasius *Ad Episc. Aegypt.* 7, p. 218, as the disciples of Arius. They could scarcely have been taught by him at Alexandria, but may easily have come in contact with Arius during the period of his exile, which seems to have been very fruitful in spreading his views, as almost all the bishops of the Danubian provinces, together with Ulfilas and the Gothic converts, appear as Arians immediately afterwards (cf. Sulp. Sever. *Chron.* ii. 38). Ursacius must have been born, at latest, about A.D. 300, as we find him a bishop, actively engaged in conspiracy against Athanasius at the time of the recall of Arius, about 332. From Socrates we may gather the leading events of his life. In *H. E.* I. 27, we find him united with Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nice, Maris of Chalcedon, and Valens in getting up a case against Athanasius, and fabricating those scandalous charges of theft, sacrilege, and murder, which were investigated at the council of Tyre in 335, when Ursacius and Valens were also present. They must have been very active and influential members of the party even at that early period, for they were sent to Egypt, as deputies of the synod, to investigate the charge on the spot, notwithstanding the protests of Athanasius (*l. c.* i. 31). In 342 they appeared at Constantinople, when they assisted at the consecration of Macedonius as Patriarch. [MACEDONIUS.] Upon the triumph of Athanasius in 346, they made their peace with Julius, bishop of Rome, accepted the Nicene formula, and wrote to Athanasius, professing their readiness to hold communion with him. At the synod of Sirmium in 359, they again appeared as active members of the Homoean party, who drew up the Dated Creed, May 22, 359. Ursacius and Valens duly presented the creed to the council of Aruminum a few weeks later, which promptly rejected it, and deposed Ursacius and Valens from their sees, "as well for their present conspiracy to introduce heresy, as for the confusion they had caused in all the churches by their repeated changes of faith." Ursacius and Valens at once sought the emperor's presence and gained him over to their side. The council also sent a long epistle to the emperor, which Socrates (ii. 37) inserts. The emperor refused to see the deputies of the council, and sent them to wait his leisure at Hadrianople first, and then at Nice in Thrace; where Ursacius and Valens displayed their power of managing men, by inducing these same deputies to sign, on Oct. 10, 359, a revised version of the creed, which the council had rejected. Socrates tells us that Nice, in Thrace, was chosen in order that it might impress the ignorant, who would confound it with Nice in Bithynia, where the orthodox symbol had been framed; cf. Soz. *H. E.* iv. 19; Hieron. *Adv. Lucif.* p. 189: Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* ii. 44; and Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, pp. 157–178, for the history of this troubled period, during which Ursacius and Valens were the acknowledged leaders of the Anti-Athanasian party. They seem to have remained influential with the court till the end of life, for the last notice of either of them in history tells, how Valens obtained the recall of the Arian Eunomius from exile, in 367 (Philostorg. *H. E.* ix. 8. [EUNOMIUS (3).] Most of the original authorities have been already mentioned. The writings of Athanasius and Hilary have frequent notices of Ursacius and Valens. Mr. Gwatkin's book is very full of information, and Hefele's *Councils* (t. ii., Clark's trans. *s. v.* Valens and Ursacius) give abundant references to the synods in which they took part; see also Till. *Mém.* vi. [G. T. S.]

URSACIUS (2), friend of RUFINUS, was with him when he took refuge in Sicily, A.D. 410, and it was at his instigation that he translated the *Homilies* of Origen on Numbers. Ursacius assisted him as a copyist in the work. (Rufinus, *Prologus* in Origenis *Op.* ii. 275 in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xii. 583.) [F. D.]

URSACIUS (3), a Roman officer (dux), employed under Leontius, count of Africa in the time of Constantine and also Constans, to repress the excesses of the Donatists, in doing which some of them lost their lives, and the name of Ursacius, like that of Taurinus and others, was branded by them as that of a persecutor (Opt. iii. 4, 10.) It is mentioned in this way in the speech of a Donatist about A.D. 430 (M. V. D. xxvii. 2, p. 219, ed. Oberthür), and in that of Habetdeus at the conference A.D. 411. (Carth. Coll. iii. 253.) Silvanus of Cirta was to have been banished for refusing to communicate with him and Zenophilus. He must therefore have been a Christian by profession. (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 30. 34.) Petilian said that having been wounded in battle with barbarians, the birds of prey and dogs tore him in pieces, a death which he regarded as an instance of divine vengeance on him for his former behaviour, but Augustine seems to doubt the truth of this story. (Aug. *c. Petil.* ii. 92, 202, 208, 209.) [H. W. P.]

URSEIUS, abbat of a monastery at the Pinetum near Ravenna, where RUFINUS sojourned on his return from one of his journeys to the east, and to whom he dedicated his translation of the rule of St. Basil. (*Praefatio in Reg.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* ciii. 485.) [F. D.]

URSICINUS (1), June 19, physician and martyr at Ravenna. His martyrdom, with that

of Vitalis, is related in a letter once ascribed to St. Ambrose (*Ep.* 2 al. 53, §§ 7, 8 in *Pat. Lat.* xvii. 744). He is mentioned in the *Ancient Roman Mart.*, the *Rom. Mart.*, Usuard, and Ado. The period is said to have been the reign of Nero (Tillem. ii. 75, 496). [C. H.]

URSICINUS (2), July 24th, ninth bishop of Sens, succeeded Simplicius, and seems to have been one of the Catholic bishops exiled at the council of Béziers A.D. 356, but he is not mentioned in Hilary's account of the council (*Opp.* ii. 563 in *P. L.* x. 579). Returning in 360, he founded c. 386 the monastery of St. Gervasius and St. Protasius, and in it he was interred. (Boll. *A. SS.* Jul. v. 545-6; Tillemont, *H. E.* x. 195 ed. 1732; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 4.) [J. G.]

URSICINUS (3), bishop, bearer in A.D. 493 of a letter of pope Gelasius to the bishops of Dardania to announce his election, and to exhort them to abandon the Eutychian heresy (Gelasii *Epist.* 3 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 25). Three fragments of a letter alleged to be addressed to him by pope Anastasius, the successor of Gelasius (Mansi, viii. 193), are merely extracts from the letter of Gelasius to Laurentius, bishop of Lychnidus. [F. D.]

URSICINUS (4), 9th bishop of Cahors, between Maurilio and Eusebius, towards the close of the sixth century, was originally referendarius to queen Ultrogottha, wife of Childebert. Maurilio, in his last illness, nominated him as his successor, and begged that he might be consecrated before his own death. He was liberal in the dispensing of alms, very learned in the Holy Scriptures, a just judge, and a zealous champion of the poor of his church (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. 43). His episcopate was troubled first by a hot dispute with Innocentius, bishop of Rodez, as to the jurisdiction over certain parishes, which was finally settled in Ursicinus' favour by an assembly of bishops convoked at Clermont by the metropolitan, said to be Sulpicius of Bourges (*ibid.* vi. 38), and secondly by the appearance in France of the pretender, Gundovald, in 582, with whom he sided, a proceeding which caused his suspension for three years by the second council of Mâcon, held in 585 (*ibid.* viii. 20; Mansi, ix. 958). In the *Gallia Christiana* he has the prefix of saint, but it does not appear on what authority (i. 119). [S. A. B.]

URSICINUS (5) wrote to Constantius, bishop of Milan, against Joannes, bishop of Ravenna. (Gregorius, *Epp.* iv. 39.) [F. D.]

URSICINUS (6), bishop of Turin. The Franks, under Guntram, having conquered the outlying parts of his diocese, formed them into the diocese of St. Jean de Maurienne and Susa, as Turin itself was in the hands of their enemies, the Lombards. Ursicinus naturally objected to his diocese being thus diminished, and complained to Gregory the Great, who wrote to Theoderic and Theodebert, the kings of the Franks, asking that the severed districts might be restored to Ursicinus, and also complaining of his imprisonment. Gregory further wrote to Syagrius, bishop of Autun, asking him to use his influence with the kings for the same object. (*Epist.* lib. ix. ind. ii. 116, 115, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* 1047, 1045.) Gregory's intervention was fruitless, and St. Jean de Maurienne has remained a separate diocese to the present day. [F. D.]

URSINUS (1) ST., first bishop of Bourges. According to the *De Gloria Confessorum* of Gregory of Tours, Bourges first received the Gospel from St. Ursinus, *who was ordained bishop by the disciples of the Apostles* and sent into Gaul. He first founded and ruled the church at Bourges, and when he died, was buried outside the city (cap. 80). But the same author in his *Historia Francorum*, after enumerating various Saints who, he says, came to Gaul *in the middle of the 3rd century* (i. 28), goes on to relate that *some disciple of these* came to Bourges and announced Christ to the people, of whom many believed and were ordained as clergy. He further relates the difficulty experienced by the congregation in obtaining a church, till a rich senator Leocadius gave his house, which became the first church of Bourges, and was made illustrious by relics of Stephen the protomartyr (i. 29). These two accounts, probably representing distinct traditions, heard by Gregory at different times are quite irreconcileable, and we have no further knowledge on the subject to assist us. Ursinus is commemorated Nov. 9 and Dec. 29. About the year 558, Germanus, bishop of Paris, visiting Bourges, was warned in sleep that he should cause the body, whose resting-place was now forgotten, to be removed to a more decent grave. Miraculously (it is said) guided to the spot, then occupied by a vineyard, he exhumed and transferred it to the church of St. Symphorian, which afterwards took Ursinus's name (*De Glor. Conf.* ibid.). In 1239, the remains were enclosed in a silver coffin, which in 1475 was opened in the presence of Louis XI., and in 1562 was carried off by Calvinists (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 4). [S. A. B.]

URSINUS (2) (URCICINUS), anti-pope elected after the death of Liberius in the September of the year 366, in opposition to Damasus. The conflicts during the life of Liberius between his adherents and those of Felix, who had been intruded into the see by the emperor Constantius, are spoken of under LIBERIUS (4) and FELIX ([illegible]). To the existence of these two parties at Rome the election of an anti-pope was due, Damasus being set up by the party of Felix, Ursinus by that of Liberius. The virulence of the contest that ensued, and the fact that the party of Damasus triumphed, seem to show that Felix had had a larger and more influential following than extant accounts would have led us to suppose. Conflicting evidence is before us as to the circumstances of the election and ordination of the two rivals, and as to which was most to blame for the disgraceful and even bloody conflicts that, according to all accounts, arose. On the one hand, S. Jerome (*Chron.*), Rufinus (l. ii. c. 10), and Socrates (l. iv. c. 24), agree in saying that Damasus was elected first, and lay the blame on Ursinus, who after this election is said to have got hold with his followers of the church of Sicinus (or Sicininus), and to have been ordained. Rufinus says that Damasus had already been not only elected but ordained, and that the consecrator of Ursinus was a certain "imperitus et agrestis episcopus," whom he persuaded to

perform the ceremony, accompanied by a band of seditious and turbulent people. Socrates tells us that he had been a candidate when Damasus was elected, and that, disappointed by his failure, he got some obscure bishops to ordain him at the above-named church, not, however, openly in the church itself, but in a secret place connected with it. The church called that of Sicinus, but by Marcellinus and Faustus (in their account, to be mentioned below) that of Liberius, is supposed to be that of St. Maria Maggiore on the Esquiline, the foundation of which is attributed to pope Liberius. Sozomen (l. vi. c. 22) and Nicephorus (l. xi. c. 30) give similar accounts. Further, a council at Rome twelve years afterwards, and an influential one at Aquileia, A.D. 381, in which St. Ambrose took a prominent part, both declared Ursinus to be a usurper, and addressed letters to the emperors Gratian and Valentinian against him. [See *Epist. Concil. Roman.* ad *Grat. et Valentin.*; Labbe, t. ii. p. 1187; and *Ep. I. Conc. Aquil.* ad *Grat. imp.*; *ib.* p. 1183.] Further, St. Ambrose (*Ep.* 11) speaks of Damasus having been elected by the judgment of God. The emperors also, and the civil authorities at Rome, throughout the contest, supported Damasus as being the lawful pope. On the other hand, a different account of things is given by Marcellinus and Faustinus, two Luciferian priests, who, having been expelled from Rome under Damasus, presented a petition (*libellus precum*) to the emperors Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius (c. A.D. 383). They had been supporters of Ursinus, and in the preface to their *libellus precum* they assert that he was elected before Damasus by the people who had been in communion with Liberius in the church of Julius, beyond the Tiber, and was ordained by Paul, bishop of Tivoli; and that Damasus had subsequently, with a mob of charioteers and other low fellows, broken into the church of Julius, massacred many persons there, and, after seven days, had, with his bribed followers, got possession of the Lateran Basilica, and been there ordained. Thus, as to priority of election and consecration, the evidence is conflicting. The most important witnesses, Jerome on the one side and Marcellinus and Faustinus on the other, were both likely to be personally cognizant of the events, but also to be prejudiced; the former as being the close friend of Damasus, the latter as having been supporters of Ursinus, and being sore from persecution under Damasus after his success. The verdicts of the two councils above named, having been given after Damasus had carried the day, are not conclusive: and it is to be observed that, while the contest was going on, certain Italian bishops, who had assembled at Rome on the occasion of the birthday of Damasus, are said by Marcellinus and Faustinus to have refused at that stage of the proceedings to concur in condemning Ursinus, saying "We have come for a birthday, not to condemn a man unheard." However, the balance of evidence appears to be decidedly in favour of Damasus, the only witnesses against him being the two Luciferian presbyters, who were likely to be prejudiced partizans, and whose veracity we have no means of testing. Still their clear statement of what they allege to be facts—together with the fact that the impartial Ammianus Marcellinus (see below) decides in favour of neither party,—may suggest the possibility that there was more to be said for Ursinus and his party than is allowed by writers who sided with the triumphant one, and got their accounts from it. After the two elections all accounts agree that the two parties disturbed Rome by continual conflicts, in which lives were lost. At length Juventius, the praefectus urbi, and Julianus, the praefectus annonae, concurred in banishing Ursinus with his two deacons, Amantius and Lupus. According to Marcellinus and Faustinus, they had been bribed by Damasus to do so. But the disturbances continued. The same complainants allege further that Damasus afterwards armed his followers with clubs, swords, and other weapons; that seven presbyters of the party of Ursinus, having been seized by them, were rescued by their own party and carried in triumph to the basilica of Liberius; that Damasus in person, with an armed force of clergy as well as laity, attacked the church, set fire to it in places, uncovered the roof and threw tiles down on those within, killed 160 persons, men and women, and wounded others, none of the party of Damasus having lost their lives in the conflict. This attack on the church is said to have been made at 8 A.M. on the 25th of October, A.D. 366. There is other sufficient evidence that such an attack was made with such disastrous consequences, though we cannot well believe without further proof that Damasus headed it in person. Even Jerome allows that, Ursinus and his friends having got possession of the church of Sicinus, the partizans of Damasus attacked them there, and that "most cruel slaughter of both sexes was perpetrated." Rufinus says generally that the illegal election of Ursinus caused civil war among the people, so than places of prayer were filled with blood. Further, we have the important testimony of Ammianus Marcellinus, the historian, who, though not a Christian, writes of the Christians in a friendly spirit, and shows no bias on one side or the other of the contest between Damasus and Ursinus. In the following passage (which is given at length for the light it throws on the state of things in the Roman church at the time, and on the view taken of it by an intelligent and impartial heathen) it will be observed that he alludes definitely to the massacre in the church of Sicinus, and implies that it was perpetrated by the party of Damasus. "The prefecture of Juventius was accompanied with peace and plenty; but the tranquillity of his government was soon disturbed by a bloody sedition of the distracted people. The ardour of Damasus and Ursinus to seize the episcopal seat surpassed the ordinary measure of human ambition. They contended with the rage of party; the quarrel was maintained by the wounds and death of their followers; and the prefect, unable to resist or to appease the tumult, was constrained by superior violence to retire into the suburbs. Damasus prevailed: the well-disputed victory remained on the side of his faction: one-hundred-and-thirty-seven dead bodies were found in the Basilica of Sicininus, where the Christians hold their religious assemblies; and it was long before the angry minds of the people resumed their accustomed tranquillity. When I consider the splendour of the capital, I am not astonished that so valuable a prize should inflame the desires

of ambitious men, and should produce the fiercest and most obstinate contests. The successful candidate is secure that he will be enriched by the offerings of matrons; that, as soon as his dress is composed with becoming care and elegance, he may proceed in his chariot through the streets of Rome; and that the sumptuousness of the imperial table will not equal the profuse and delicate entertainment provided by the taste and at the expense of the Roman pontiffs. How much more rationally would those pontiffs consult their true happiness, if, instead of alleging the greatness of the city as an excuse for their manners, they would imitate the exemplary life of some provincial bishops, whose temperance and sobriety, whose mean apparel and downcast looks, recommended their pure and modest virtue to the Deity and his true worshippers (*Perpetuo Numini, verisque ejus cultoribus*)!" [Ammian. 27, 3:—*Gibbon's translation*, c. xxv.]

In the following year, Praetextatus* having succeeded Juventius as praefectus urbi, the emperor Valentinian, who had heard from Damasus that the adherents of Ursinus retained still one basilica in their hands, sent a Rescript to Praetextatus, ordering it to be restored to the pope, but at the same time permitting those who had been banished by Juventius to live where they chose, except in Rome itself. In a second Rescript he removed even this embargo, allowing all to return to the city on condition of their keeping quiet, but threatening severe punishment in case of renewed disturbance. (Baronius, *ad ann.* 368, ii. iii. iv., gives extracts from these Rescripts.) Ursinus thereupon returned, and is said to have been received by his followers on the 15th of September (467) with great joy (*Lib. precum*); but he was again banished by order of the emperor (16th Nov.), with seven of his adherents, into Gaul. Marcellinus and Faustinus again accuse Damasus of having procured the sentence by bribery, saying that he bribed "all the palace," so that the emperor was kept in ignorance of the facts. It was probably necessitated by renewed disturbances. Still peace was not thus at once restored. The followers of Ursinus continued to assemble in cemeteries, and got possession of the church of St. Agnes without the walls. Thence they were dislodged,—the two presbyters say by Damasus himself with his satellites, and they add, with great slaughter. We may again doubt the allegation of the pope's personal complicity. After this, Praetextatus banished more of the party of Ursinus, and the two presbyters allege cruel persecution, having been themselves among the sufferers.

Rescripts of the emperors Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian (A.D. 371) to Ampelius, then the Praefectus Urbi, and to Maximinus the Vicarius, again release Ursinus and his friends from their confinement in Gaul, allowing them to live at large, so long as they keep away from Rome and the suburbicarian regions. (Given by Baron. *ad. ann.* 371, i. ii. iii.) Advantage was probably taken of this licence; for to Maximinus, who was afterwards Praefectus (spoken of by Ammianus Marcellinus as a violent and cruel man), Rufinus and other Christian historians attribute severe and cruel measures which unjustly brought odium upon Damasus.

After the death of Valentinian I. (A.D. 375), a Roman council (A.D. 378) addressed a letter to the emperors Gratian and Valentinian II., in which it is represented that Ursinus and his followers continued their machinations secretly, encouraging other bishops who had been deposed by Damasus to resist his authority; and that one of their schemes had been to suborn one Isaac, a Jew at Rome, to accuse the pope of crime before the civil tribunal, by which Damasus had been acquitted, and Isaac banished to Spain. The emperors consequently sent a Rescript to Aquilinus, the then vicarius urbis, reproving him for remissness in carrying out orders previously given for the repression of Ursinus and his followers, and assigning in general terms to Damasus as pope the power of deciding, in the last instance, on the affairs of all bishops implicated in the schism that had ensued, saving only the rights of metropolitans in the provinces. (Labbe, tom. ii. p. 1187–1192.)

After this we find Ursinus himself at Milan, where he is said to have joined the Arian party, who promised him their support (Ambrose, *Ep.* 4). But St. Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, having informed the emperor Gratian of what was going on, the latter banished Ursinus from Italy, and confined him to Cologne (*Epist. I. Concil. Aquil. ad Gratian.*; Labbe, tom. ii. p. 1183). No more is heard of Ursinus till after the death of Damasus (Dec. 384), when he again came forward in opposition to Siricius, who, having been one of the supporters of Damasus against him, was elected with the general consent of the Roman people. Ursinus does not appear to have had any sufficient party in Rome at that time to cause conflict and disturbance. The election of Siricius was confirmed, with allusion to the unanimity of the electors, by Valentinian II. [J. B—y.]

URSINUS (3) (URSICINUS), an Irish monk of Luxeuil, founder of the monastery of St. Ursanne in Franche-Comté. He left Luxeuil with St. Columbanus and first founded a monastery on the shore of Lake Bienne and then at St. Ursanne, where he died. He belongs to the beginning of the 7th century. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 21 Feb. iii. 523, praet.; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, ii. 488 sq.) [J. G.]

URSINUS (4), a prior or abbat of Locociacum (Ligugé), near Poitiers, who wrote a life of St. Leodegarius (Léger), whose contemporary he was. This and the anonymous biography of the same saint, are most valuable sources of the history of a time, of which there are very few records. For the editions of the work and remarks on it, see LEODEGARIUS (2). [S. A. B.]

URSMARUS, ST., 3rd abbat of Lobbes or Laubes, in the diocese of Cambray (A.D. 691–713). His life was written by Anso, a later abbat of Lobbes (A.D. 776–800), about 60 years after his death. Though founded on an earlier narrative (see *Praefatio*), it contains little of historical worth, but we gather from it and

* It was this Praetextatus (reported of very favourably by Ammianus Marcellinus) of whom Jerome tells us that he said pleasantly to Damasus, "Facite me Romanae urbis episcopum; et ero protinus Christianus."

other records of the abbey that he was born near Avesnes, where an oratory was afterwards dedicated to him. As abbat he dedicated the church of the monastery, as yet unconsecrated, and built another for the brethren's cemetery on the hill overlooking Lobbes. He is also said to have preached to the heathen of Flanders, and to have founded two small cells. The records call him episcopus; but his see, if he ever had one, is unknown. His day is April 18. Anso's life was amplified and rewritten in the 10th and 11th centuries by Ratherius, Fulcuinus and Herigerus, abbats of Lobbes. Everything that is known of Ursinarus and a mass of posthumous miracles, may be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. ii. 557 sqq.; Mabillon, *AA. SS. Ord. S. Bened.* 1733, saec. iii., pars i. p. 241, sqq.; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 80; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 203–4, vi. 352. [S. A. B.]

URSULA, Oct. 21, a famous British virgin and martyr, celebrated as having suffered with eleven thousand other virgins at Cologne. Her notice in the Roman martyrology is simple enough. It runs thus:—"At Cologne, the natal day of SS. Ursula and her companions, who, being slain by the Huns for their Christianity and their virginal constancy, terminated their life by martyrdom. Very many of their bodies were discovered at Cologne." On this simple foundation the new Bollandists have raised a prodigious edifice of 230 folio pages, where they discuss (*AA. SS.* Boll. Oct. t. ix. pp. 73–303) every conceivable fact, topic, or hypothesis concerning these problematical martyrs. Nothing escapes them; they bestow elaborate pains upon the fortunes and history of the church and monastery at Cologne, called after them, and give a list of the names of the 11,000, so far as they have been recovered or imagined. Their story, which is purely mediaeval, is briefly thus. Ursula was daughter of Dionoc, king of Cornwall. She was sent by him with her numerous companions to Conan, a British prince, who had followed the tyrant Maximus into Gaul, about the year 383. They were somehow carried up the Rhine to Cologne by mistake, where the Huns murdered them all. The whole legend, with its manifold historical blunders, including an apocryphal pope Cyriacus, has been also discussed by Ussher in *Antiq. Brit. Eccles.* pp. 107, 108, cf. *Opp.* ed. Elrington, t. vi., pp. 153–155, 169, 171, 556. Ursula was the patroness of the Sorbonne in Paris, Ussher, *l. c.* t. v., p. 244, and of the Ursulines and teaching order of the Roman church, founded in 1537 (*Ursulinus* in Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*). The enormous number of St. Ursula's companions has been since explained as originally in a mistake of the early copyists, who found some such entry as—"Ursula et xi. M. V.," which, taking M. for millia, not for martyrs, they read as Ursula and eleven thousand virgins instead of Ursula and eleven martyr virgins. Such mistakes frequently occurred in the ancient martyrologies. Polthartis *Bibliotheca*, i. 917, gives a full account of the manuscript traditions of Ursula's acts. The earliest document which the industry of the Bollandists has discovered bearing on her history is a sermon for her natal day, which they date between 750 and 850. Geoffrey of Monmouth, a writer of the twelfth century, gives the English version of her story, which is, however, too late for genuine history. It has been also celebrated by the visions and ravings of the twelfth century prophetess Elizabeth of Schonaurs, and by the writings of Sigebert of Gemblou. [G. T. S.]

URSUS (1), a Roman officer, accountant general or superintendent of the imperial finances in Africa (Rationalis Africae), to whom Constantine gave in charge to distribute his gift of 3000 *folles* for the church expenses of the ministers of the church, with directions that if more were needed, the deficiency should be supplied from the imperial estates, A.D. 313. (Mon. Vet. Don. x. p. 191, ed. Oberthür. Euseb. *H. E.* x. 6. Böcking, *Not. Dign.* i. xi. p. 52.) [H. W. P.]

URSUS (2), a lay friend to whom Gregory Nazianzen wrote by a young friend Anysius, to excuse himself for declining his invitation to visit him, which it would be very delightful to do, but it would lay him open to suspicions of inconsistency (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 122). [E. V.]

URSUS (3), an officer (ducenarius), perhaps a retired, military man, employed by the President of the Conference, A.D. 411. (Carth. Coll. i. 1, ii. 1, iii. 1. Böcking, *Not. Dig.* i. 185, 277.) [H. W. P.]

URSUS (4), a Gallic bishop, who was illegally consecrated by Proculus, bishop of Marseilles, to some church dependent on Patroclus, the metropolitan of Arles, whose jurisdiction was thereby infringed. The pope, Coelestinus I., in a letter written Sept. 22, 417, to the bishops of Africa, Gaul and Spain, declares him, and one Tuentius who was in like case, accursed, and deprives them of the communion. It seems that Ursus had already been deprived of the priesthood for some crime at the council of Turin (*Epist.* iv., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 661; Ceillier, vii. 534). [S. A. B.]

URSUS (5), a tribune and procurator of the imperial palace, in A.D 421, caused the famous temple of the heavenly goddess (Caelestis) at Carthage to be levelled to the ground, and the site converted into a cemetery. He also detected some Manichaeans at Carthage, and caused them to be examined by the bishops, among whom was St. Augustine [EUSEBIA (2)]. (*Liber de Promissionibus*, iii. 38; Possidius, *Vita S. Augustini*, 16; Augustini *De Haer.* 46, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* li. 835, xxxii. 46, xlii. 36.) [F. D.]

URSUS (6) ST., 7th bishop of Troyes, is said to have died on the 25th of July, 426, at a spot near Meaux, where his body was buried in a marble sarcophagus. Part of his relics was afterwards brought to Troyes and divided between the cathedral and collegiate church of St. Stephen. His day is July 25, but the feast has been kept on the following day (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 485; Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. vi. 167.) [S. A. B.]

URSUS (7), bishop of Nomentum. [FLORENTIUS (16).] [F. D.]

URSUS (8) ST., founder and abbat of several monasteries in the districts of Bourges and

Tours, lived in the latter half of the 5th century. A native of Cahors, he visited Bourges, and founded monasteries at Tausiriacum (perhaps Toiselay), Onia (la Forêt d'Heugne), and Britiniacum. Leaving these under the care of priors, he repaired to Tours and built an oratory and another monastery at Senaparia (Sénevière). Over this he set St. Leobatius as prior, and founded yet another monastery, Loccis (Loches), which he ruled in person, the community winning their bread from the earth by the sweat of their brows. Gregory of Tours gives a story of the miraculous punishment of one of Alaric's Goths, who coveted the monastery mill and persecuted the brethren. Ursus' tomb became famous for the cures performed at it. His death is placed about 510. He is commemorated Jul. 28 (Greg. Tur. *Vitae Patr.* xviii.; Boll. *Actae SS.* Jul. vi. 563). [S. A. B.]

URSUS (9), monk, died at the same moment as JOANNES (510), q. v.

USAILLE (AUXILIUS), son of Ua Baird, bishop of Killashee or Killosy, co. Kildare, and associate of SS. Patrick and Isserninus, died A.D. 460. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 459; *Four Mast.* A.D. 454; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 384, A.D. 460; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 658, and *Tr. Th.* pass.) [J. G.]

USIA (Οὐσία), a female recluse at the monastery of Hesycha (Ἡσυχᾶ) near the sea, visited by Palladius, who describes her as in all points most worthy of veneration (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* cap. 129 in *Pat. Gr.* xxxiv. 1232, *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 1205; Tillem. xi. 280). [C. H.]

USTHAZANES, April 21, a Persian eunuch, and favourite of Sapor. He was a Christian, and suffered with Symeon, bishop of Seleucia, about A.D. 343. Sozomen (*H. E.* ii. 9) gives a long account of his martyrdom. [G. T. S.]

UTEL (UTTOL, UTTEL), the twelfth bishop of Hereford in the ancient lists (*M. H. B.* p. 621). He was the successor of Ceolmund, who was alive in 793, and himself attests charters of the years 798 and 799, after which Wulfhard succeeds. (Kemble, *C. D.* 175, 1020.)

He was probably the same person with the abbat Uttel, who appeared at the legatine council in 786, with other Mercian abbats (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 461), and who as abbat attests charters of 788–790 (Kemb. *C. D.* No. 156, 159). [S.]

UTTA, a Northumbrian priest of high character, and of good repute among the princes of his time. He was selected to bring from the Kentish court Eanfleda, the daughter of Edwin, to be the bride of Oswy, king of Northumbria. Utta told Cynimund, a friend of Beda, how, before he went, he sought the prayers of bishop Aidan, who gave him some consecrated oil to calm the stormy sea over which he was to journey. The predicted storm burst upon the voyager, who describes the results of the oil as miraculous (Beda, iii. 15). Utta afterwards became the abbat of the monastery called Ad Caprae Caput, the modern Gateshead, on the Durham bank of the Tyne (*Id.* iii. 21). The name, perhaps, indicated in the first instance the sign-board of a hostelry which was haunted by the herdsmen who tended the flocks of goats which pastured on Gateshead Fell, and its vicinity, and it was afterwards assigned to the village which grew up around the inn. Utta was the brother of Adda, one of the four priests who were sent as missionaries into Mid-Anglia after the baptism, in the north, of Peada, son of Penda (Beda, iii. 21). [J. R.]

V

[Names commencing with V will sometimes be found under the initial W.]

VADIANI (Aug. *Haer.* 50), heretics, also called AUDIANI. [AUDIUS.] [C. H.]

VALENS (1), a presbyter of Philippi mentioned by St. Polycarp (*Ad Philip.* § 11) as having caused a scandal in his church through some sin of covetousness. [C. H.]

VALENS (2), the twenty-eighth bishop of Jerusalem, the eleventh of the Gentile succession. The beginning of his episcopate is placed in the first year of Caracalla, A.D. 211. He succeeded Capito, and was succeeded by Dulichianus. Eutychius (376) assigns him three years of office. (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 12; Epiphan. *Haer.* lxvi. 20, Chron. Armen.) [E. V.]

VALENS (3), June 1, martyr at Caesarea, a deacon of the church of Aelia (Jerusalem). He was eminent for his knowledge of the scriptures. He suffered with Pamphilus in the Diocletian persecution (Euseb. *Mart. Palaest.* cap. xi.) [G. T. S.]

VALENS (4), Arian bishop of Mursa in Pannonia, and, together with Ursacius, the leading western opponent of Athanasius. He must have been born about A.D. 300, as we find him a most influential bishop from the year 332 (cf. Soc. *H. E.* i. 27). He was a disciple of Arius, probably during the period of Arius's exile in Illyricum after the council of Nice. This exile seems to have resulted in the wholesale adhesion of the bishops of Pannonia to the Arian view (cf. Sulp. Severus, *Chron.* ii. 38), and may have had a great deal to do with the subsequent Arianism of the Gothic tribes [ULFILAS]. Valens remained ever firm in his Arian views, though, like the majority of his sect, he proved very shifty, ever striving to keep in favour with the party in power. He was bitterly hostile to Athanasius, being one of his chief opponents from the time of the council of Tyre in 335. He was not a scrupulous opponent. Thus, he brought charges against Athanasius, which he retracted as false before pope Julius in 347 (Epiph. *Haer.* lxviii. 9) [ATHANASIUS, JULIUS (5) in Vol. III. p. 532]. Valens and Ursacius were ever changing. At a conference of western bishops at Sirmium in 357, they put forward a creed which avowed Anomoean doctrine as to Christ's person. In 359, Valens signed, with a reservation, the dated creed of Sirmium, but withdrew his reservation

at the command of the emperor Constantius. In 359, he formed the Homoean party, which ruled the eastern church during the following twenty years, till the accession of Theodosius gave the victory to the Nicene or catholic party. He probably retained, however, his Anomoean views to the end, as we find him interfering with the emperor Valens in behalf of Eunomius, the leader of that party, when condemned to exile in 366 (Philost. *H. E.* ix. 8). The activity and influence of Valens was confined to the east. The west was always hostile to him, and frequently excommunicated him, the last occasion being at a council held at Rome in 369. He probably died some time prior to 375. The authorities for Valens are very numerous. Hilary of Poitiers and Athanasius, and Socrates in his *History*, frequently mention him. Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, and Hefele's *Councils*, t. ii. (Clark's translation) give full references for his manifold intrigues. [G. T. S.]

VALENS (5), emperor, A.D. 364–378. He was brother of Valentinian I., and was born about 328. His wife was named Albia Dominica, by whom he had a son Galates, and two daughters, Anastasia and Carosa. He was made emperor of the East in March 364, and immediately displayed his sympathy with Arian doctrines, which showed itself in active hostility to the Athanasian party. His secular history will be found in the *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, we shall here confine ourselves to his church action. He was baptized in 368, by the Arian Eudoxius, patriarch of C. P. In 370 he is credited by all the historians, Socrates iv. 16, Sozomen vi. 14, Theodoret iv. 24, with an act of atrocious cruelty. Eighty ecclesiastics, led by Urbanus, Theodorus, and Mendemus, were sent by the orthodox party of C. P. to protest against the conduct of the Arians in that city. Valens is said to have sent them all to sea, ordering the sailors to set fire to the ship and then to abandon it. They all perished off the coast of Bithynia, and are celebrated as martyrs on Sept. 5. (*Mart. Rom.*) In 371 he made a tour through his Asiatic province. At Caesarea in Cappadocia, he came into conflict with St. Basil, whose letters, Migne, *P. G.* t. xxxii., afford us a very lively picture of the persecution of Valens. He proposed to send St. Basil into exile. Just at that moment his only son fell sick. Valens had recourse to the saint, who promised to heal him if he received orthodox baptism. The Arians were however allowed to baptize the young prince, who thereupon died. Basil and the orthodox naturally attributed his death to the judgment of heaven on the imperial obstinacy. In 374 Valens raised a persecution against the Neo-platonic philosophers, and put to death several of their leaders, among others MAXIMUS (25) of Ephesus, the tutor and friend of the emperor Julian, Hilarius, Simonides and Andronicus. His anger was excited at this period against magical practices, by a conspiracy which he discovered at Antioch. The story is told at length in Soc. *H. E.* iv. 19, and Soz. vi. 35. The pagan party wished to secure the succession to the throne of Theodorus, one of Valens' principal court officicials. They resorted to magical incantations with a tripod of laurel-wood and the letters of the alphabet, just like modern spiritualism. The table spelled out the four letters θ, ε, ο, δ, whence they concluded that Theodorus would certainly succeed. The séance came to the ears of Valens, who put Theodore to death and every one else whose name began with the unfortunate letters, the emperor absurdly supposing, as the historian well remarks, that he could put his successor to death. The father of Theodosius the Great is supposed to have suffered in consequence of the suspicion of Valens. St. Chrysostom too, as is told in the article on him, had a narrow escape at the same time. It would extend this article to undue limits to enumerate and describe all the acts of persecution at Edessa, Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople attributed by the historians to Valens, in all of which MODESTUS (3), the praetorian prefect, was his most active agent, save in Egypt, where Lucius, the Arian successor of Athanasius, endeavoured in vain to terrify the monks into conformity. The last year of Valens' life was marked by a striking manifestation of monkish courage. In the year 378 Valens was leaving Constantinople for his fatal struggle with the Goths at Adrianople. As he rode out of the city an anchorite, Isaac, who lived there, met the emperor and boldly predicted his death. The emperor ordered him to be kept in prison till his return when he would punish him; a threat at which the monk only laughed. Clinton's *Fasti*, i. 476, ii. 119, should be consulted for the chronology of Valens. Till. *Emp.* t. v. and De Broglie's *L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain*, t. v., give good connected accounts of the career and violence of Valens. The names and narratives of the contemporary church historians have been already mentioned. [G. T. S.]

VALENS (6), a deacon in Augustine's clerical community, intending to devote his property, like the subdeacon Patricius, to its maintenance (Aug. *Serm.* 356, § 3). [PATRICIUS (6).] [C. H.]

VALENTIANUS, Roman curator of Russicada, who compelled Victor, bishop of that place, to burn the book of the four gospels which he had in his possession at the time of the persecution under Diocletian. (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. c. 27, § 30.) [H. W. P.]

VALENTINA, July 25, virgin of Caesarea and martyr in Palestine under FIRMILIANUS (2), the successor of Urbanus as governor of that province. She protested against the tortures inflicted on another woman, and kicked over the altar which stood in front of Firmilianus. She was then tortured and condemned to die by fire. (Euseb. *Mart. Palaest.* viii.) [G. T. S.]

VALENTINIANUS (1) I. was a native of Cibalis in Pannonia. He entered the army, and having served with distinction, was captain of the guards during the reign of Julian, when he boldly confessed Christ. Theodoret tells us (*H. E.* iii. 16) that when Julian was one day entering the temple of Fortune with great pomp, Valentinian was marching in the procession before him. Two priests had stationed themselves at the gate, to sprinkle all who entered with lustral water. Some of it fell upon Valentinian's robe, whereupon he struck the

priest and cried out that he was defiled, not purified. Julian banished him for this act to a desert fortress. Upon the death of Jovian, Valentinian was elected emperor, Feb. 26, 364, and reigned till his death, Nov. 17, 375, a period of twelve years all but one hundred days. An exhaustive account of the civil history of his reign will be found in the DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY; we now confine ourselves to the ecclesiastical history of that period. Valentinian presents the rare phenomenon of an emperor who was a sincere adherent of orthodoxy, and yet generously tolerant of the Arians and all other heretical sects. He published an edict at the very beginning of his reign, giving a complete toleration in religious matters. To this fact we have the most opposite testimonies. The emperor himself refers to it in *Cod. Theod.* ix. 16. 9, in a law directed against the practices of the Haruspices. Ammianus Marcellinus, xxx. 9, praises him for it, and St. Ambrose, in his oration, *de Obitu Valent. Junioris* implicitly censures it (cf. Hilar. Pictav. *Cont. Auxent. Opp.* t. iii. p. 64); yet his toleration was only directed towards religious opinions, permitting men to be orthodox, Arians or Pagans, as they pleased. It did not extend to practices. Thus in September of 364 he issued a law (*C. T.* ix. 16. 7) prohibiting nocturnal sacrifices and magical incantations, a law which was further enforced by legg. viii. and ix. of the same title. These edicts, however, seem to have been issued more from a moral and social than religious point of view. They were directed against immorality, not against paganism, as is evident from the fact, which Ambrose (*l. c.*) laments, that he tolerated the public profession and practices of paganism in the Roman senate house. One circumstance alone demonstrates his tolerance towards the followers of the ancient religion. There is not a single edict in the Theodosian code, lib. xvi. tit. x.—the celebrated title *De Paganis*, which is filled with persecuting laws—dating from any year between 356 and 381; while the same remark will also apply with one exception to the titles *De Haereticis* and *De Judaeis*, lib. xvi. tit. v. and viii. The one exception is the Manichean heresy, which he strictly prohibited by a law of A.D. 372 (*C. T.* xvi. v. 3), which orders the punishment of their teachers and the confiscation of the houses where they instructed their pupils in the city of Rome: for Manicheism seems at that time to have assumed the character of a philosophy rather than of a religion. This tolerant spirit of the emperor seems to have been helpful rather than the contrary to true religion. This appears from the fact that, under Valentinian, heathenism began first to be called by the name of the peasant's religion (paganismus). The name religio paganorum, applied to heathenism, first occurs in a law of the year 368 (*C. T.* xvi. ii. 18). Valentinian legislated also for the clergy (*Theod. Cod.* xv. ii. 17–22), restraining the tendency of rich men to take holy orders in order to escape civil duties, legg. 17, 18, 19; and rendering illegal, bequests to the clergy and to monks from widows and virgins, by a celebrated law (leg. 20 same title) addressed in 370 to Damasus, bishop of Rome, under the description "De Vita, Honestate, Conversatione Ecclesiasticorum et Continentium," which has been the model of much subsequent legislation. (Cf. on this celebrated law and its restrictions upon the clergy, the commentary of Godefroy, *Theod. Cod.* t. vi. p. 54, where all the notices of it in the works of contemporary writers are collected.) The legislative activity of Valentinian in every direction was very great, as can be seen by an inspection of the Theodosian Code. Though not directly bearing on ecclesiastical history, we may note his laws "de Medicis et Professoribus" in lib. xiii. tit. iii. legg. vi.–x., organizing the profession of medicine and education. Lex viii. of this title with Godefroy's commentary is especially deserving of attention as appointing physicians to attend the poor at the public expense, one for each region of the city of Rome, offering thus in the year 368 the first instance of that system of medical relief for the poor which modern legislation has brought to perfection. He also issued, in 370, an edict regulating the schools of Rome (*C. T.* xiv. ix. 1), upon which Godefroy's commentary is an exhaustive handbook concerning ancient education.

The reign of Valentinian was marked on the whole by a tolerant spirit. It is possible, however, that he would have changed in this respect had he lived. The influence of St. Ambrose would have been injurious to him. St. Ambrose was essentially intolerant. A synod was held in Illyria in 375, convoked as Theodoret, says *H. E.* iv. 7–10, by Valentinian, to interfere in favour of the orthodox who were depressed under the Arian rule of Valens. Valentinian was at that time wholly under the influence of St. Ambrose. Theodoret (*l. c.*) gives us the decree in favour of the orthodox which Valentinian then issued to the bishops of Asia. Death, however, overtook him before he could make any substantial change in his policy. Socrates tells a curious story (*H. E.* iv. 31) concerning his domestic relations. His wife Severa had a female friend Justina, to whom she was deeply attached. She praised her beauty so much to the emperor that he fell in love with her, and then considered how he could espouse Justina without repudiating Severa. He accordingly published a law permitting men to have two lawful wives, and then married Justina, by whom he had Valentinian II. and three daughters, Justa, Grata and Galla, the last of whom married Theodosius the Great. This story is, however, vigorously contested by Tillemont (*Hist. des Emp.* v. 682), and by Bonamy in the *Mém. de l'Acad. des Ins.* for 1760, t. xxx. p. 394–405 [JUSTINA]. We have already cited the contemporary authorities. We need only add to the moderns quoted, Clinton's *Fasti*, i. 460, and appendix, p. 110–119, where is an exhaustive statement of all his legislation, together with notices of medals, coins, &c., bearing on his reign, and De Broglie's *L'Église et l'Empire Romain*, part iii. ch. i. [G. T. S.]

VALENTINIANUS (2) II., emperor, A.D. 375–392, son of Valentinian I. and of Justina his second wife. The narrative of his secular life will be found in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, we shall therefore deal merely with his life so far as it touches on ecclesiastical matters. His name is celebrated in church history in connection with two events. The first is the attempt made in 384 by the Roman senate to restore the altar of victory and the

ancient pagan rites connected with the senate. We possess the documents connected with this attempt in the *Relatio Symmachi Urbis praefecti* on the one side, and the Epistles xvii. and xviii. of St. Ambrose to Valentinian on the other (cf. St. Amb. opp. Migne, *P. L.* t. xvi. col. 962–982). As might naturally have been expected St. Ambrose carried the day, and the senatorial petition was rejected. The document drawn up by the younger Symmachus is marked by grace and dignity; the Epistles of St. Ambrose by a spirit of intolerance, natural enough however in the professors of a triumphant creed smarting under the remembrance of recent sufferings. The senate made a similar attempt in 391, but were again refused (see Till. *Emp.* v. 244, 300, 349). The other celebrated point connected with Valentinian regards the necessity of baptism. He died, or more probably was murdered by his general Arbogastes, at Vienne in Gaul. He was then about twenty, and as yet only a catechumen. He was anxious to receive baptism however, and had sent for St. Ambrose to baptize him. Before the sacrament could be administered he was found dead. St. Ambrose's treatise, *De obitu Valentiniani Consolatio*, §§ 51–56, is most interesting on this point, showing how Ambrose rose superior to any hard mechanical view of the sacraments and recognised the sincere will and desire as equivalent to the deed (cf. Till. *Emp.* v. 356; De Broglie, *L'Église et l'Empire*, part iii. chs. v. and viii.). At one time Valentinian was inclined to support the Arian party at Milan, influenced by his mother Justina, who was bitterly hostile to St. Ambrose. It is difficult, however, to arrive at a true view of the facts, as we have practically only one side of the story. Thus Sozomen, *H. E.* vii. 13, followed by Ceillier, v. 386, represents Valentinian and the empress as persecuting St. Ambrose and the Catholics of Milan in 386, but when we turn to the *Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. i. leg. iv., to which they refer, we find that the persecution simply resolves itself into a permission to the Arians to [m]eet for worship as freely as the Catholics, and a prohibition of the Catholics from molesting [th]em in so doing. [AMBROSIUS; JUSTINA.] [G. T. S.]

VALENTINIANUS (3) III., emperor, A.D. [4]25–455. He was the son of Constantius III. [(]CONST. III. in DICT. G. AND R. BIOG.) by Galla [P]lacidia, daughter of Theodosius the Great and [c]onsequently great-grandson of Valentinian I. [(]GALLA (5) PLACIDIA]. The civil history of [V]alentinian will be found at length in the *Dict. [o]f Greek and Roman Biography.* He was [m]anaged by his mother till her death in 450. [H]is character was weak and vicious, and after [h]er death he plunged from one crime to another, [t]ill in 455 he was assassinated by the friends of [a] lady whom he had outraged. His reign was [s]ignalised by several laws bearing on church [m]atters. At the very beginning of it, on July [1]7, 425, he issued at Aquileia or rather there [w]as issued in his name by his mother Placidia, [a] decree (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. v. l. 62), [w]hereby all heretics and schismatics were ex[p]elled from Rome. A special provision was [i]nserted, whereby the adherents of Eulalius, [e]lected anti-pope in 419, were ordered to be [r]emoved to the hundredth milestone from the city. This law has been illustrated at great length by Gothofred, t. vi. 204. Identical laws were at the same time issued for the other cities of Italy and for Africa, which are numbered 63 and 64 in the same title. In the same year he issued edicts (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. ii. l. 46 and 47) renewing clerical privileges and reserving clerical offenders to the tribunal of the bishops alone, a rule which, as we shall see, he abrogated in later life. In tit. vii. of the same 16th book of the Theodosian Code we find a law against apostates dated at Ravenna April 7, 426, whereby they are deprived of all testamentary power. On the very next day April 8, 426, a law was enacted (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. viii. l. 28), whereby Jews were prevented disinheriting their children who became Christians. The most interesting portion, however, of his ecclesiastical legislation will be found in his Novels embodied in Ritter's Appendix to Gothofred's great work. Lip., 1743, t. vi. pars ii. p. 105–133. Thus tit. ii. p. 106, A.D. 445, treats of the Manicheans and gives us various particulars about the action of pope Leo the Great against them. Tit. v. p. 111, A.D. 447, treats of the violations of sepulchres, and enacts severe penalties against such crimes; from this law we learn that the clergy themselves were frequently guilty of such offences. Tit. xii. p. 127, A.D. 452, is his most celebrated law, and is an anticipation of mediaeval legislation. It withdraws the clergy from the episcopal courts and subjects them to the lay judges. Baronius in his *Annals*, A.D. 451, heartily abuses Valentinian for this impious law, and considers Attila's invasion a direct and immediate expression of Heaven's anger. Many of the remaining Novels deal with testamentary law, and are of importance for the history of that branch of forensic science. [G. T. S.]

VALENTINIANUS (4), surnamed Galates, only son of the emperor Valens, was born in January A.D. 366, was consul in A.D. 369 (*Fasti Idatiani*, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* li. 910), and died in January A.D. 372. For the circumstances of his death, see BASILIUS OF CAESAREA, Vol. I. 289. [F. D.]

VALENTINIANUS (5), a relation of Gregory Nazianzen who, having, it appears, met with a serious accident when making use of a vehicle belonging to the state, by which the horses were killed and he himself injured, Gregory wrote in his behalf to Nemesius the governor of Cappadocia for a remission of the penalty incurred (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 183). Valentinian caused grievous offence to Gregory by settling with the female members of his family near Carbala, where Gregory, towards the close of his life, had found a temporary resting-place in the vicinity of a martyry. The proximity of a number of women, whose character was not above suspicion, was very offensive to Gregory, and he wrote an indignant letter to Valentinian, charging him with driving him from paradise by an Eve (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 196). [E. V.]

VALENTINIANUS (6), a presbyter of Rome, one of the Western deputation charged with the letters of Honorius, Innocent, and the Italian bishops to Constantinople. (Pallad. 31.) [E. V.]

VALENTINIANUS (7), monk in Gregory the Great's monastery, one of the monks whose death was foreshadowed by the vision that appeared to the monk Gerontius. (*Dial.* iv. 26.) [F. D.]

VALENTINIANUS (8), abbat of the Lateran monastery, where the Benedictines took refuge after the destruction of M. Cassino. After a rule of many years, he died some time before the date of the Dialogues of Gregory the Great. He was one of his four authorities for the life of St. Benedict. (*Dial.* ii. *Praef.*) [F. D.]

VALENTINUS (1), (*Οὐαλεντῖνος*), founder of one of the Gnostic sects which originated in the first half of the second century.

I. *Biography.*—According to the tradition of the Valentinian School witnessed to by Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* vii. 17, 106, p. 898, Potter), Valentinus had been a disciple of Theodas, who himself, it is said, had been acquainted with the apostle St. Paul (*ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Οὐαλεντῖνον Θεοδάδι ἀκηκοέναι φέρουσιν· γνώριμος δ' οὗτος γεγόνει Παύλῳ*). The latter half of this statement is very improbable. Valentinus cannot have begun to disseminate his Gnostic doctrines for which he is said to have alleged Theodas as a witness, till towards the end of the reign of Hadrian. Before this he is said to have been a catholic Christian. It must have been, therefore, at that very time, or only shortly before his appearance as the head of a Gnostic sect, that Valentinus became a hearer of Theodas and received, as he said, his doctrines from him. Now we know that the gnostics were fond of deriving their secret doctrines from apostolic tradition, and to trace them back to disciples of the apostles. As such a disciple of the apostles themselves we must suppose this otherwise unknown Theodas to have been described. To him the Valentinians appealed as an authority in much the same way as Basilides was said to have been a disciple of Glaucias, and he to have been an "interpreter of Peter." If with Bentley we read *Θεοδᾶ διακηκοέναι* (instead of *Θεοδάδι ἀκηκοέναι*) it seems obvious to find in *Θεοδᾶς* or *Θευδᾶς* a contraction from *Θεόδωρος*, or as Ussher had assumed from *Θεόδοτος*. In the latter case there would be something very attractive in Zahn's conjecture (*Forschungen*, iii. 125), that Theodas was one and the same person with that Theodotus from whose teaching Clemens Alexandrinus has elsewhere preserved some fragments (*excerpta ex scriptis Theodoti*). But this after all remains a mere possibility which receives no confirmation from the terms of the superscription prefixed to those *Excerpta* (*ἐκ τῶν Θεοδότου καὶ τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας κατὰ τοὺς Οὐαλεντίνου χρόνους ἐπιτομαί*). For "the Anatolic school" we know, on the testimony of other witnesses, to have been a branch of the Valentinians, though it must have stood nearer to the original teaching of Valentinus himself. At any rate this *Ἀνατολικὴ διδασκαλία*, said to have existed *κατὰ τοὺς Οὐαλεντίνου χρόνους*, and to have had, as would seem, this Theodotus at its head, cannot be meant to designate a doctrine which was disseminated before Valentinus and adopted by him as an external authority, but rather an opinion widely received among his disciples, as is clearly proved by the designation, so frequent in the excerpts, *οἱ ἀπὸ Οὐαλεντίνου* or *οἱ Οὐαλεντινιανοί*. If then that Theodotus was really one and the same person with Valentinus's alleged teacher *Θεοδᾶς*, we must at any rate assume, not indeed that Clemens made his excerpts from a book disseminated in the name of Theodas, but only that in the writings of those Anatolic Valentinians from which Clemens excerpted, Theodotus was cited as an older authority. But whether such citations were actually made, as Zahn would have it, from a book bearing the name of either Theodotus or Theodas, must be left to stand as a mere conjecture.

Irenaeus (i. 11, 1) speaks of Valentinus as the first who transformed the doctrines of the Gnostic "Heresy" to a peculiar doctrinal system of his own (*εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου*). The meaning of these words cannot possibly be that Valentinus was the first among all heretics to be the founder of an independent school called after his own name. For Irenaeus would thereby set himself in opposition to his own statements concerning Simon, Menander, Saturninus, Basilides. The only alternative is to take the expression *γνωστικὴ αἵρεσις* in the narrower sense, and to understand it as designating a party which called themselves "Gnostics." These self-styled "Gnostics" we may recognize in the so-called Ophites whose opinions are described by Irenaeus (i. 30). For at the conclusion of his description of them Irenaeus himself remarks that the Valentinian school originated from those unnamed heretics as from the many-headed Lernaean Hydra (i. 30, 15: a quibus velut Lernaea hydra multiplex capitibus fera de Valentini schola generata est). The same statement is repeated in somewhat different words further on (i. 31, 3: a talibus matribus et patribus et proavis eos qui a Valentino sunt . . . necessarium fuit manifeste arguere). The only remaining difficulty is found in the circumstance that we do not know whether the words in *Haer.* i. 11, 1 (which, moreover, have been handed down to us with a variation of text), are Irenaeus's own words or a quotation from an older authority. The old Latin text renders them thus: "Qui enim est primus ab ea quae dicitur gnostica haeresi antiquas in suum characterem doctrinas transferens, Valentinus sic definivit." Epiphanius reads, on the other hand: *ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης γνωστικῆς αἱρέσεως τὰς ἀρχὰς εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου μεθαρμόσας Οὐαλεντῖνος οὕτως ἐξηροφόρησεν ... ἐληρολόγησεν*). Similar expressions recur in i. 24, 7 (illorum enim theoremata accipientes, in suum characterem doctrinae transtulerunt) and i. 28, 1 (proprium characterem doctrinae constituit). Hereby it seems that the original reading in i. 11, 1, must also have been *τὰς ἀρχαίας εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλίας*. It is also to be proved that the words in question are Irenaeus's own, to whose peculiar diction they appear to belong. Irenaeus then informs us that Valentinus transformed the already existing doctrines of those nameless (Ophitic) Gnostics in a way peculiar to himself, and so became the founder of a new form of doctrine. The correctness of this statement will appear further

on when we come to a detailed description of the Valentinian system. Concerning the home and locality of these so-called "Gnostics" Irenaeus tells us nothing. But we know from other sources that those Ophite parties to whom he refers had their homes both in Egypt and Syria.

Concerning the fatherland of Valentinus himself Epiphanius is the first to give us accurate information, which, however, he derived not from any older writer, but simply, it appears, from oral tradition (Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxxi. 2). According to this his native home was on the coast of Egypt, and he received instruction in Greek literature and science at Alexandria (*αὐτὸν γεγενῆσθαι Φρεβωνίτην τῆς Αἰγύπτου παραλιώτην· ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ δὲ πεπαιδεῦσθαι τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων παιδείαν*). This statement appears to have been derived from an Egyptian local tradition. Whether the name assigned to the district is correct or not, seems impossible to determine. (For *φρεβονίτην* or *φρεβωνίτην* some have proposed to substitute *Φθενοτίτην Πτενοτίτην Φαρβαιθίτην*.) In various parts of Egypt (*ἐν τῷ Ἀθριβίτῃ καὶ Προσωπίτῃ καὶ Ἀρσενοΐτῃ καὶ Θηβαΐδι, καὶ τοῖς κάτω μέρεσι τῆς παραλίας, καὶ Ἀλεξανδρειοπολίτῃ*) there were found, in the time of Epiphanius himself (*Haer.* xxxi. 17) scattered relics of the Valentinian sect. The statement, that the birthplace of Valentinus was in Egypt, was probably derived from the traditional reports of these Egyptian Valentinians of the fourth century.

It may, on the other hand, appear doubtful in what place or country Valentinus first came forward with his Gnostic doctrines. Epiphanius, who makes him begin to teach in Egypt, relates further that he also went to Rome, and appeared as a religious teacher there, but that, both in Egypt and at Rome, he was regarded as orthodox, and first made shipwreck of faith in Cyprus, and began to disseminate heretical opinions (*l. c.* *Ἐποιήσατο δὲ οὗτος τὸ κήρυγμα καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ . . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀνελθὼν κεκήρυχεν. Εἰς Κύπρον δὲ ἐληλυθώς, ὡς ναυάγιον ὑποστὰς φύσει σωματικῶς, τῆς πίστεως ἐξέστη, καὶ τὸν νοῦν ἐξετράπη. Ἐνομίζετο γὰρ πρὸ τούτου μέρος ἔχειν εὐσεβείας ἐν τοῖς προειρημένοις τόποις· ἐν δὲ τῇ Κύπρῳ λοιπὸν εἰς ἔσχατον ἀσεβείας ἐλήλακε. κ. τ. λ.*). But this statement rests merely on a confused combination of different accounts. According to Irenaeus, Valentinus "flourished" at Rome in the times of Pius and Anicetus (*ἤκμασε ἐπὶ Πίου καὶ παρέμεινεν ἕως Ἀνικήτου·* Haer. iii. 4, 3). Epiphanius, on the other hand, read (as we learn from Philaster, *Haer.* 38) in the *σύνταγμα* of Hippolytus, that Valentinus stood once in the communion of the church, but being drawn by overweening pride into apostasy had, during his residence in Cyprus, propounded his heretical doctrine. (Et in primis quidem fuit in Ecclesia. Elatior autem factus postmodum errore non parvo deceptus est, degensque in Cypri provincia coepit hoc definire.) Epiphanius, we see, combining the different accounts and traditions which in various ways had reached him, drew the conclusion that, after teaching orthodox doctrine in Egypt and Rome, he propounded his gnostic system first in Cyprus. But we cannot doubt that when Irenaeus speaks of Valentinus's flourishing at Rome during the times of Pius and Anicetus, he refers to the fact, that his chief activity as a religious teacher was then displayed, and that under Anicetus he stood at the head of his own Gnostic school. With this there will be no difficulty in reconciling Tertullian's statement, that Valentinus no more than Marcion separated himself from the Church on his arrival at Rome (*Praescript. Haeret.* 36). For the Gnostics, for the very sake of disseminating their doctrines the more freely, made a great point of remaining in the Catholic church, and made use for that end of a twofold mode of teaching, one exoteric for the simpler sort of Believers, the other esoteric for the Initiated. The proof of this is found in the fragments which have come down to us, the most part of which purposely keep the peculiarly Gnostic doctrines in the background. Tertullian, in another place (*adv. Valent.* 4), gives, as the occasion of Valentinus's apostasy from the church, his having been a candidate for the Episcopal dignity as being a man of intellectual ability and eloquence, and his having been passed over in favour of another who had the higher claim (praerogativa) of having been a Martyr, *i.e.* a Confessor. This narrative, it must be allowed, is, like so many other imputations of unworthy motives laid by the Fathers to the charge of their heretical opponents, subject to the suspicion of having been a malicious invention.

In the other place in which Tertullian relates the origin of the false doctrines of Valentinus and Marcion, he tells us that they both, after more than one excommunication (*semel et iterum*) on account of the injury they were doing to the brethren by their unruly search after novelties, had been finally cast out, and then spread abroad their poisonous teaching. It may, nevertheless, be quite true that Valentinus was once a candidate for the episcopal dignity. His philosophical training (for which we have abundant evidence—Tertullian, *Praescr. Haer.* 30; Philast., *Haer.* 38; *Philosoph.* vi., 37, p. 197 et passim), his ability and his eloquence may well have given him claims in the eyes of others as well as in his own, to the bishop's chair. But whether this candidature was at Rome or Cyprus must remain uncertain. If we assume the former alternative it seems a probable conjecture of Hilgenfeld's that the Roman confessor for whose sake he was passed over, was the bishop Pius, and that Pius's "Martyrium" was contemporaneous with the martyr death of Telesphorus (Irenaeus, *Haer.* iii. 3, 3). But neither of Pius nor of Hyginus, his immediate predecessor, is it elsewhere recorded that he had attained the glory of a Confessor; for statements to that effect in the *Liber Pontificalis*, which makes out nearly all the first bishops of Rome to have been martyrs, deserve no consideration.

We may confidently place Valentinus's residence in Cyprus before his journey to Rome. According to the express statement of Irenaeus (iii. 4, 3), Valentinus came to Rome in the time of Hyginus, flourished under Pius, and remained there till Anicetus. According to this the residence at Rome must have occupied the period between A.D. 138 and A.D. 160. With this agrees the statement of Clemens Alexandrinus, who, in a passage (*Strom.* vii. 17, 106, p. 898) of some obscurity, but evidently intended to

be chronological, reckons Valentinus among heretical leaders in the time of Hadrian, and places him between Basilides and Marcion. Tertullian (*Praescr. Haer.* 30) puts him along with Marcion in the time of Antoninus Pius; but when he states further (*l. c.*) that Valentinus was still an orthodox member of the Catholic church under the episcopate of the blessed Eleutherus (since 175 or 176) he is evidently confusing Eleutherus either with Hyginus or with Pius. Elsewhere (*de Carne Christi*, i.) he designates Valentinus as Marcion's *Condiscipulus* and *Condesertor*, who, like him, was at first a disciple of the catholic verity, but in like manner had afterwards fallen away. Later writers, as Eusebius (*Chronicon ad Ann. Abrah.* 2153 and 2159; *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 11), Hieronymus (*Chronicon ad Ann. Abrah.* 2156 and 2159), Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 7), and others, merely repeat the statements of Irenaeus.

Following the above authorities we may conclude that Valentinus, towards the end of Hadrian's reign (cir. A.D. 130), appeared as a teacher in Egypt and in Cyprus, and that after this, about the commencement of the reign of Antoninus Pius, or in the early years of that emperor, he came to Rome, and during the long reign of Antoninus worked as a teacher in the eternal city. It is probable that he had developed and secretly prepared his theological system before he came to Rome. His removal thither was doubtless occasioned by the same motive as that which led other leaders of sects, like Cerdon and Marcion, to go to Rome; he hoped to find a wider field for his activity as a teacher. From a similar motive he attached himself at first to the communion of the Catholic church.

II. *History of the Sect.*—Valentinus had numerous adherents. They divided themselves, we are told, into two schools—the anatolic or oriental, and the Italian school (Pseudorig. *Philosoph.* vi. 35, p. 195, Miller, cf. Tertullian, *adv. Valentinian.* c. 11, and the title prefixed to the excerpts of Clemens Ἐκ τοῦ Θεοδότου καὶ τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας). The former of these schools was spread through Egypt and Syria, the latter in Rome, Italy, and Southern Gaul. Among his disciples, Secundus appears to have been one of the earliest. Tertullian (*adv. Valentinian.* 4) and the epitomators of Hippolytus mention him after Ptolemaeus (Pseudotertull. *Haer.* 13; Philast. *Haer.* 40); the older work, on the other hand, excerpted by Irenaeus is apparently correct in naming him first as Valentinus's earliest disciple (*Haer.* i. 11, 2). Then follows, in the same original work as quoted by Irenaeus (*Haer.* i. 11, 3), another illustrious teacher (ἄλλος ἐπιφανὴς διδάσκαλος), of whom a misunderstanding of later heresiologists has made a Valentinian leader, named Epiphanes; who this illustrious teacher was is matter of dispute. Certainly not the much later Heracleon, whose views as known to us from other sources by no means coincide with the statements of Irenaeus. A much more probable conjecture is with Neander (*Gnostische Systeme*, p. 169), and Salmon [MARCUS (17)] to suppose it was Marcus whose first Tetrad exactly corresponds to that of this unnamed teacher (cf. *Haer.* i. 15, 1, καθ' ἃ προείρηται). That Irenaeus does not name him here is easily explained by the supposition, that no name was given in the source from which he was quoting, and that the agreement of the views there described with those of Marcus escaped his attention. Harvey and Hilgenfeld suggest the name of Colorbasus or Kolarbasos (Iren. i. 14, 1, cf. Tertull. *adv. Valentinian.* 4). The name itself Hilgenfeld has shown to be Egyptian (Κολάρβασις, *Inscr. Gr.* 6585; Kolorbasi in Nilus, *Epp.* iii. 52). Meanwhile, however, the historical reality of the alleged heretic Colarbasus is not hereby established, but only the ease with which the misunderstanding may have arisen [KOLARBASUS]. The agreement between Hippolytus (ap. Pseudotertull. 15, Philast. 43; cf. *Philos.* vi. 5, p. 161, and vi. 55, p. 222), and Tertullian (*adv. Valentinian.* 4, where instead of "colubroso" we must read "Colarbaso"), makes it a very probable conjecture that Irenaeus himself may have been guilty of the misunderstanding of the Aramaic כל ארבע or קול ארבע. Meanwhile the words Οὗτος οὖν ὁ Μάρκος μήτραν καὶ ἐκδοχεῖον τῆς Κολαρβάσου Σιγῆς ἑαυτὸν μονώτατον γεγενέναι λέγων (Iren. *Haer.* i. 14, 1) can only mean what is more plainly expressed immediately afterwards, that the highest Tetrad had itself descended upon Marcus in female guise because the world would have been unable to bear its manhood (τὸ ἄρρεν αὐτῆς), and that it has made known to him only what till then had not been revealed to any whether gods or men. This Σιγή, then of Marcus, to which Irenaeus elsewhere refers in a tone of irony, is none other than the female form of the masculine Tetrad, which for all except only the μονώτατος Μάρκος has remained a Σιγὴ σεσιωπημένη. In this way the expression ἡ Κολαρβάσου Σιγή explains itself as one already used by Marcus himself. Κολάρβασος is τὸ ἄρρεν τῆς Τετράδος, and Σιγή the highest female principle which has revealed to Marcus alone the mysteries of the Tetrad (cf. Iren. *Haer.* i. 14, 2, 3, 7, and 15, 5). As this Σιγή is introduced by Irenaeus as the speaking authority for the doctrines of Marcus (ἡ Μάρκου Σιγὴ ἐδογμάτισε—ὥς φησι ἡ Μάρκου Σιγή—οὕτως ἀπαγγέλλει ἡ πάνσοφος αὐτῷ Σιγή), one is led to the conjecture, that Irenaeus may have made his citations from a writing of Marcus which bore the title ἡ Κολαρβάσου Σιγή. Quite impossible on the other hand is the attempt of Hilgenfeld to amend τῆς Κολαρβάσου Σιγῆς into τῆς Κολαρβάσου γνώσεως (*Ketzergeschichte*, p. 288). Hippolytus (*ll. cc.*) made this supposed Colarbasus into a disciple of Marcus, while Hilgenfeld regards him as his teacher. Marcus himself will, in any case, belong to the eldest of Valentinus's disciples (Lipsius, *Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte*, p. 33). His labours in Asia were probably contemporaneous with Valentinus's residence and activity at Rome, and there a "godly elder and herald of the truth" whom Irenaeus quotes from as an older authority made him the subject of metrical objurgation as the "forerunner of anti-Christian malice" (Iren. *Haer.* i. 15, 6).

Ptolemaeus, on the other hand, was a contemporary of Irenaeus himself [PTOLEMAEUS], and one of the leaders of the Italian school (Iren. *Haer. Praef.* 2, Pseudorig. *Philos.* vi. 35), whose

Hippolytus in the syntagma, and probably on the basis of an arbitrary combination of Iren. i. 8, 5, with 11, 2, puts at the head of all other disciples of Valentinus. Heracleon was still younger than Ptolemaeus [HERACLEON], and the second head of the Italian school. His doctrinal system appears to be that mainly kept in view in the *Philosophumena* (cf. vi. 29, 35). Irenaeus names him as it were in passing (*Haer.* ii. 4, 1), while Tertullian designates his relation to his predecessors with the words, Valentinus showed the way, Ptolemaeus walked along it, Heracleon struck out some side paths (*Adv. Valentinian.* 4). He makes also the like remark concerning Secundus and Marcus. Clemens speaks of Heracleon (cir. A.D. 193) as the most distinguished among the disciples of Valentinus (*Strom.* iv. 9, 73, p. 595). He means of course among those of his own time. Origen's statement, therefore, that he had a personal acquaintance with Valentinus (Origen. *in Joann.* tom. ii. 8) is to be received with caution. In part contemporaneously with him appear to have worked the heads of the anatolian (oriental) school Axionikos and Bardesanes (Ἀρδησιάνης, Philos. vi. 35), who both lived into the first decennia of the third century.

Axionikos was still working at Antioch when Tertullian composed his book against the Valentinians, and therefore circa A.D. 218 (Tertull. l. c.). We cannot here enter into the inquiry how far the celebrated Edessene Gnostic Bardesanes (*ob.* 223) may be rightly accounted a Valentinian. Tertullian indicates Axionikos as the only one who in his day still represented the original teaching of Valentinus. Theotimus, therefore, who is previously mentioned by Tertullian, and seems to have occupied himself much with the "Figures of the Law," was, it appears, an older teacher. The same was also probably the case with Alexander, the Valentinian whose syllogisms Tertullian had in his hands (*de Carne Christi*, c. 16 sqq.).

Concerning the later history of the Valentinian sect we have but meagre information. Tertullian, writing about A.D. 218, speaks of the Valentinians in his book against them as the "*frequentissimum collegium inter haereticos.*" This is confirmed by what is told us of the local extension of the sect. From Egypt it seems to have spread to Syria, Asia Minor, and to Rome. Its division into an oriental and an Italian school shows that the party had its adherents even after the death of its founder, in both the east (Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia) and the west (especially at Rome). In Asia Minor the Valentinian doctrine appears to have been mainly disseminated by Marcus, who was so vigorously attacked (cir. A.D. 150) by the "godly elder," quoted by Irenaeus (*Haer.* i. 15, 6). Disciples of Marcus were found by Irenaeus in the Rhone districts (*Haer.* i. 13, 7), and in the same parts the bishop of Lyons appears to have met with adherents of Ptolemaeus (*Haer. Praef.* 2). In Rome, about A.D. 223, an important work of the Italian school came into the hands of the writer of the *Philosophumena*, who speaks of both schools as being in existence in his time (*Philos.* vi. 35, p. 195). Tertullian also mentions the *duae scholae* and *duae cathedrae*, between which the party was divided in his time (*Adv. Valentinian.* 11). Remains of the sect were still found in Egypt, as we have seen, in the time of Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 7). Theodoret, on the other hand (*H. f. Praef.*), can only speak of the Valentinians as of other Gnostic sects (whom he deals with in his first book) as belonging to the past—παλαιὰς αἱρέσεις—of whom he possesses a mere historical knowledge.

III. *Writings.*—The fragments of the writings of Valentinus have been collected by Grabe (*Spicilegium*, ii. 45–48), and more completely by Hilgenfeld (*Ketzergeschichte*, p. 93–207). These consist of fragments of letters and homilies preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* ii. 8, 36, p. 448; ii. 20, 114, p. 488 sq.; iii. 7, 59, p. 538; iv. 13, 91, p. 603; vi. 6, 52, p. 767), and of two pieces contained in the *Philosophumena*, the narrative of a vision (ὅραμα) seen by Valentinus (*Philos.* vi. 42, p. 203), and the fragment of a psalm composed by him (*Philos.* vi. 37, p. 197 sq.). Psalms of Valentinus's authorship are mentioned by Tertullian (*de carne Christi*, 17, 20). On the other hand, the opinion that he was the author of a gospel (Pseudotertull. *adv. Haeres.* 12) rests on a misunderstanding, as does also Grabe's assumption (*Spicil.* ii. p. 49) founded on Tertullian (*adv. Valentinian.* 2) that he had composed a peculiar work entitled "Sophia." Grabe was moreover in error when he placed the piece taken from the *Dialogus de recta in Deum fide*, sect. iv. (Origen. *Opp.* i. 840 sq. de la Rue) and superscribed τὸ δόγμα Οὐαλεντίνου among the fragments of Valentinus. The same piece is found in a more complete form in Methodius περὶ τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου (ed. A. Jahn, p. 54 sqq.), as part of a dialogue in which a Valentinian takes part. Its source was probably the writing of Maximus, περὶ τῆς ὕλης, from which a considerable piece in the fourth section of the dialogue *de recta fide* can be shown to have been derived (cf. Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* vii. 22).

Remains of the writings of the school of Valentinus are more abundantly forthcoming. Beside the numerous fragments and quotations in Irenaeus and the *Philosophumena*, and in the excerpts from Theodotus, and the anatolic school, which seem yet to need a closer investigation, may be mentioned here: The letter of Ptolemaeus to Flora (ap. Epiphan. *Haer.* xxxiii. 3–7), numerous fragments from the commentaries (ὑπομνήματα) of Heracleon on S. Luke (ap. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. 9, 73 sq., p. 595 sq.; excerpt. ex prophet. § 25, p. 995), and on S. John (ap. Origen *in Joann. passim*), collected by Grabe (*Spicil.* i. 80–117) and Hilgenfeld (*Ketzergeschichte*, 472–498); lastly, a rather large piece out of an otherwise unknown Valentinian writing preserved by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 5 and 6).

IV. *Accounts given by the Fathers.*—Statements concerning Valentinus and his school are very numerous in the writings of doctors of the church. But many of these are so contradictory that it is difficult to make out what was the original doctrine of Valentinus in distinction from later developments. Even in his day Tertullian made the complaint (*adv. Valentinian.* 4), "Ita nunquam jam Valentinus, et tamen Valentiniani, qui per Valentinum." Among those who before him had controverted the Valentinians, Tertullian enumerates (*l. c.* 5): Justin Martyr, Miltiades, Irenaeus, and the Montanist Proculus. Of the writings of these four men on this sub-

ject one only has been preserved, the great work of Irenaeus in five books, entitled Ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, which has come down to us, alas! in great part, only in the ancient Latin version. This work was written, as we learn from a notice near the commencement of the third book (iii. 3, 3) in the time of the Roman bishop Eleutherus, cir. A.D. 180–185. The greater part of the first book (cc. 1-21, according to Massuet's division), which Epiphanius has preserved to us almost completely (*Haer.* xxxi. 8–32; xxxii. 1, 5, 7; xxxiii. 1, 2; xxxiv. 1–20; xxxv. 1; xxxvi. 3), and in part Pseudorigenes also (*Philos.* vi. 38, 39, 42–55) occupies itself exclusively with the Valentinians; and the refutations contained in the following books are principally concerned with them. The lengthened descriptions of Valentinian doctrine fall into four main groups. The first seven chapters give a connected account of the whole system, to which cc. 8 and 9 add a description and confutation of the Valentinian method of interpreting Scripture, followed in c. 10 by a concluding summary of the Christian faith. Chapters 11 and 12 give, by way of appendix, brief statements concerning the different opinions of Valentinus and his chief disciples, with interspersed polemical observations. Chapters 13–18 treat of the Valentinian Marcus and his followers, the Marcosians. Finally, cc. 19–21 form an appendix to the whole description, as is evident from the introductory words (19, 1), and yet more from the contrast between the subjects treated of in these chapters and those of the preceding section (cc. 13–18). Again, cc. 19 and 20 give further examples of the Valentinian (here chiefly the Marcosian) method of scriptural interpretation; c. 21 contains a collection of Gnostic customs and formulas which are expressly referred back to various groups and divisions of the sect. The Aramaic forms of prayer, for instance, belong probably not to the Marcosian group but to the Syrian branch of the Valentinians, concerning whose later theories Epiphanius has some further information to give us, derived from the above mentioned original source to which he had access (*Haer.* xxxi. 5 and 6, cf. cap. 2–4).

Isolated notices serving to complete the whole representation are found in the following books of Irenaeus (*e.g.* the notice concerning Horus in ii. 12, 7). The sources from which Irenaeus derived his accounts are of sufficient variety. In the preface to the first book (c. 2) he refers to the writings of those who call themselves disciples of Valentinus, adding that he had met some of them himself, and heard their opinions from their own mouths (ἐντυχὼν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι τῶν, ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν, Οὐαλεντίνου μαθητῶν, ἐνίοις δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ συμβαλὼν καὶ καταλαβόμενος τὴν γνώμην αὐτῶν). Immediately afterwards he indicates that the contemporary Valentinians, whose doctrine he promises to describe, are those of the school of Ptolemaeus (καὶ καθὼς δύναμις ἡμῖν, τήν τε γνώμην αὐτῶν τῶν νῦν παραδιδασκόντων, λέγω δὴ τῶν περὶ Πτολεμαῖον, ἀπάνθισμα οὖσαν τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς, συντόμως καὶ σαφῶς ἀναγγελοῦμεν). According to this we may venture to assume, that Irenaeus had read writings proceeding from Ptolemaeus and members of his school, and that information thus obtained he had completed by means of oral communications. In the first book (c. 8, 5) he introduces into a detailed description of the Valentinian method of interpreting Scripture a large fragment which undertakes to prove the truth of the higher Ogdoad of the Valentinian Pleroma from the prologue of the Gospel of St. John. The concluding notice (found only in the Latin text) expressly ascribes the authorship of this fragment to Ptolemaeus. In like manner with regard to the doctrine and practices of the Marcosians, Irenaeus has obtained his information partly from a written source, partly from oral communications. We can hardly assume that Marcus was still alive when Irenaeus wrote. As proof of this we cannot admit either his occasional use of the present tense in his account of Marcus, nor his occasionally addressing him in the second person, as Tertullian does Marcion. Still less can we assume with S. Jerome (*in Jes.* 64) that Marcus himself worked in Gaul and Spain. This assumption rests on a misunderstanding of a passage in Irenaeus (*Haer.* i. 13, 7), whereas another (i. 13, 5) plainly intimates that he lived in Asia Minor, and there also we must look for the "godly elder," from whose iambics against Marcus Irenaeus quotes a few verses (i. 15, 6). It is, however, not unlikely that adherents of Marcus may have appeared in the Rhone districts in the time of Irenaeus [MARCUS]. The section which specially treats of Marcus (i. 12–15) appears to have been derived from a written source. But what he brings to light for the first time (cc. 16–18) concerning the mysteries celebrated by the adherents of Marcus is founded on oral information.

A written source of information forms also the basis of cc. 11 and 12, or at least of c. 11, 1–3. My conjecture (Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanios*, p. 159), that the account (c. 11, 1) of Valentinus's own doctrine, was taken from the same heresiological writing which Irenaeus made use of in his summary review (cc. 22–27) of all the heretical parties, has been extended to the whole section (*Haer.* i. cc. 11 and 12) by Heinrici (*Die Valentinianische Gnosis und die Heilige Schrift*, p. 40), and I have myself been inclined to agree with him (*Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte*, p. 60). But this view has been opposed by Lüdemann (*Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland*, 1876, col. 348), and by Hilgenfeld (*l. c.* p. 53–56) [IRENAEUS]. And, in fact, it remains only a mere possibility, that the same writing, from which Irenaeus made extracts to furnish out his description of the doctrine of Valentinus, as well as that of his two oldest disciples, Secundus and the unnamed, ἄλλος ἐπιφανὴς διδάσκαλος (interspersing at 11, 4 observations of his own)—should also be the source from which he derives his later statements (11, 5 and 12, 1 and 3) concerning subsequent developments of the school. At 12, 2 Irenaeus is again himself the speaker, and we must also regard the good bishop of Lyons as responsible for what is stated at 12, 4 concerning differences of teaching among the Valentinians about the soter. It remains, therefore, the safest course to restrict to I. 11, 1–3, the assumed use by Irenaeus of his old written authority, and to regard the statements at 1, 11, 5, and those at 12, 1, 3 and 4 as additional notices obtained by him from other

quarters. The words (11, 5) ἵνα τελείων τελειότεροι φανῶσιν ὄντες καὶ γνωστικῶν γνωστικώτεροι betray the same writer as those at 12, 1, οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον γνωστικώτεροι (Epiphan. ἐμπειρότεροι), and at 12, 3 "qui autem prudentiores putantur illorum esse." If indeed (as at one time I was disposed to assume, *Quellen der ält. Ketzergesch.* p. 206) Ptolemaeus and his whole party are meant (at 12, 1) to be seriously designated as "the more prudent or experienced ones," such a description would by no means agree with the first seven chapters in which Irenaeus sets himself, especially to describe the doctrine of the Ptolemaic school, nor with the fragment 8, 5. But neither would this discrepancy be any proof that 12, 1 was derived from the same older source as 11, 1–3; on the contrary, it remains undeniable that the hand of Irenaeus is to be traced in every part of this twelfth chapter. But he has here probably in view (as indeed Tertullian understood him, *Adv. Valentinian.* 33), not Ptolemaeus himself but the "emendatores Ptolemaei," with whose views he could hardly have become acquainted in any other way than by oral communication. Assuming, then, that the use made by Irenaeus of the old written authority must be restricted to 11, 1–3, the main difficulty is removed for regarding that document as identical with the syntagma against all heresies of Justin-Martyr. A second difficulty which still remains is also capable of a like solution [IRENAEUS]. But yet more difficult is it to determine from what sources Irenaeus drew his main description (i. 1–8). That several accounts must have lain before him has already been rightly discerned by Heinrici. Twice is our attention specially directed to the transition made from one authority to another by the expressions ἔνιοι δὲ αὐτῶν (2, 3), and εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ λέγοντες (7, 2). But for the most part, Irenaeus is content to introduce the Valentinians whom he means to controvert, without quoting any particular authority, and simply with the word λέγουσι or φασί. That his statements differ among themselves in certain particulars is no sure proof of his having used different written authorities. One such source may have gathered and combined a variety of statements. The concluding notice at the end of 8, 5, "et Ptolemaeus quidem ita" proves only that the piece immediately preceding was derived from a book of Ptolemaeus' authorship, and does not even warrant our inferring that 8, 1–4 consist of statements from the same authority. Our footing becomes firmer when we come to the observation, that Irenaeus has sometimes drawn from the same source as Clemens Alexandrinus in the excerpts from Theodotus. The agreements between them are sometimes literal. They begin at 4, 5 and extend to 6, 1, and again re-appear at 7, 1 and 5. What lies between is partly drawn from another source (6, 2; 7, 2–4), and partly added by Irenaeus himself (6, 3 and 4). The corresponding section of the excerpts extends from 43 to 65. The authority thus made use of belonged not to the oriental but to the Italian school. No single utterance in the whole section over which the common use extends can be traced back to Theodotus himself. Heinrici's assumption that the description in Clemens Alexandrinus, if not the direct source of that given by Irenaeus, is, at any rate, the more original of the two (*l. c.* p. 92) proves on a closer comparison to be untenable. The truth is rather that sometimes Irenaeus, sometimes Clemens, has made the fuller use of the original document. Nor can we any longer determine with certainty how much of what he has written Irenaeus actually read in this particular authority. For in many instances his description seems to have combined two separate accounts; as, for instance, is evident from the numerous repetitions. In regard to section i. 1–4, 4, we can prove that he made use of different sources. i. 1–2, 2 forms a connected whole (A). At 2, 3 with ἔνιοι δὲ αὐτῶν begins another account (B), which, according to Lüdemann (*l. c.*), extends to the words μεταγωγέα καλοῦσι (in 2, 4), and gets mixed up with the former account in 3, 1. The second authority had, according to Lüdemann, maintained the unity of the Sophia, and "according to all appearance" (?) the identity of Horos with "Christus" and "Soter." The origination of the world is here derived from the sufferings (πάθη) of the Sophia by which she is seized on beholding the οὐσία ἄμορφος to which she has given birth. To the same source (B) must we refer the conception of Βυθός as sexless. Irenaeus, on the other hand, appears to have gone back (2, 4) to the former account (beginning at the words διὰ δὲ τοῦ Ὅρου τούτου φασί), and to this authority he continues to adhere through 2, 5 and 6. With regard to the section 3, 1–6, which gives, for the most part, mere allegorical interpretations, we might be in some doubt as to its origin; but here again there does not appear to be any mixture of the two sources; the dogmatic form is really identical with that of A. From the same source A was at any rate derived the account given at 4, 1 and 2 of the formation of the world.

4, 3 and 4 contain additions made by Irenaeus himself.

With 4, 5 begins the authority common to Irenaeus and Clement (C) whose description is frequently completed by means of A, or interrupted by parallel accounts from that source. From all this the relation of the sources appears to be as follows:—From A are derived 1, 1–2, 2; 2, 4 (from διὰ δὲ τοῦ Ὅρου τούτου on) to 2, 6, 4, 1 and 2; 4, 4 from the words τήν τε Ἀχαμὼθ ἐκτὸς πάθους γενομένην, and on to the end of 5, 1; 5, 3 some clauses (from ταύτην δὲ τὴν μητέρα to συντελείας); 5, 4 from the words διὰ τοῦτο ἀτονώτερον to the words ἐν τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς κόσμῳ; 5, 6; 6, 1 the greater part apparently; 6, 2–4 entirely; and 7, 2–5. From B are taken 2, 3–4 (as far as to διὰ δὲ τοῦ Ὅρου). From C: 4, 5 and 6 (for the most part) to the words δεδημιουργηκέναι φάσκουσι); 5, 2–4 (for the most part) to θηρίων καὶ ἀνθρώπων, and from ἐκ δὲ τῆς ἐκπλήξεως onwards to the end; 5, 5 entire; some things in 6, 1 (?); and 7, 1.

It seems certain that A and C were written sources. The brief account, which we have entitled B, is probably to be traced back to various occasional notices derived from oral tradition (2, 4; 2, 1; 5, 1. 3). The here, so-called, ἔνιοι will be the same as those whom Irenaeus speaks of in the preface (c. 2). Of the two main sources, A and C, the former, which Irenaeus follows with only a few interruptions down to 4, and to which he afterwards re-

peatedly returns, seems to have originated in the Ptolemaic school, if not to have been the work of Ptolemaeus himself. Source C presents what is, at least in all essential points, the same form of doctrine. The extract 8, 5 is certainly made from an exegetical work of Ptolemaeus; from which may also have been taken the examples of allegorical interpretation at 8, 1–4, unless they be derived from the same source as the examples at 3, 1–5. But, inasmuch as in one case, at any rate (the symbolical indication of the suffering of the twelfth Aeon by the suffering of Jesus in the twelth month), the same example recurs in both sections, we may perhaps, from hence, conclude that a borrowing took place from both sources.

Next in importance to the statements of Irenaeus, as a source of information concerning Valentinus himself and his school, are the fragments preserved among the works of Clemens Alexandrinus, and bearing the title Ἐκ τῶν Θεοδότου καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας ἐπιτομαί. These are found in the Florentine MS., fol. 358[a], with this superscription, after the so-called viiith Book of the *Stromateis;* they are immediately followed, fol. 374[b], by ἐκ τῶν προφητικῶν ἐκλογαί. They appear also to have occupied the same position in the now lost *Codex Augustanus*, which is occasionally cited by Sylburg in his edition of Clemens (p. 385 sq.). The text of these excerpts is come down to us in a somewhat forlorn condition. The only useable edition (along with the older editions of Sylburg and Potter) is that of Bunsen, in the first volume of the *Analecta Antinicaena* (London, 1854), p. 205–278. The Greek text is furnished with a Latin translation by Jakob Bernays, to whom we are also indebted for numerous happy emendations of the original Greek. The Oxford edition of W. Dindorf (vol. iii. p. 424–435) gives merely the old text without taking any notice of the labours of Bernays and Bunsen. The edition by Klotz (vol. iv. p. 1–31) distinguishes itself in these excerpts, as everywhere else, by negligence and untrustworthiness. The general character of these excerpts is similar to that of the like cases in other writings of Clemens Alexandrinus, and does not justify the assumption, that the abrupt fragmentary form in which they have reached us proceeded from Clemens himself. Still less can we discern in these excerpts, "A youthful work of Clemens belonging to the time in which he was laboriously striving for the first time to emancipate himself from the influence of Gnostic authority." (Heinrici, *l. c.* p. 13, 89.) The kindred relation in which Clemens stands to Gnostic opinions is not greater in these excerpts than in his other writings. These sections, which have reached us only as mere extracts, constituted formerly one of the greatest works of Clemens. Zahn (*Forschungen*, iii. 122) would assign them to the viiith Book of the *Stromateis*, because he found the *eclog. proph.* sometimes assigned to that book in the quotations of later Church writers (*l. c.* p. 29, 119 sq.). But no such citation can be alleged on behalf of the *Excerpt. ex Theod.*, and internal evidence (cf. *Strom.* iv. 1–3) would rather refer them to the writing περὶ ἀρχῶν καὶ θεολογίας, or to the Hypotyposes, whose first book they may possibly have formed. The title of the excerpta is not exact. For only a portion of them is, in fact, derived from the Valentinian sources made use of; another and not smaller portion of the work consists of counter-observations and independent discussions by Clemens himself. With respect to the fragmentary character of the extracts themselves, and the near relationship between the opinions of Clemens and those of some Gnostics, it may in some cases be doubtful what origin to assign to this or that piece. Discussions belonging to Clemens himself, are: § 1, τὸ ἐκλεκτὸν σπέρμα . . . εἰς πίστιν. §§ 4, 5, ὁ κύριος διὰ πολλὴν . . . νομοδιδασκάλων ἀγωγῇ, §§ 8–15, ἡμεῖς δὲ—καὶ ταῖς οὐσίαις; § 17, from ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ on to § 20 τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ; § 23 from τάχα δὲ τὸ πρόσωπον on to the end ἀγνωστόν ἐστι τοῦ πατρός; § 24 from ἀγνοοῦσι δὲ to παλαιὰν διαθήκην; § 27 (the whole piece); § 34 ἔστιν οὖν ὁ λόγος to καρποὶ αὐτοῦ. With respect to the last sections from § 66 on, and especially, § 82–86, the judgment may remain doubtful. It is evident that the excerptor himself regarded what is there given as Valentinian opinion, and sometimes even in these sections we find a φησί or φασί (§§ 67, 75, 78, 79, 81); §§ 66–68, are isolated additions made to a preceding exposition, the Gnostic origin of which is indubitable. §§ 69–81, form a connected discussion concerning the εἱμαρμένη. At the same time, the violent way in which these excerpts have been dislocated and their original coherence broken up, renders it almost impossible to arrive at a fixed judgment. The title which they now bear is, further, inexact on another account. Theodotus is actually cited as authority in these excerpts only five times (§§ 22, 26, 30, 32, 35). The circumstance, that in a few places, φησί is used instead of φασί cannot prove that the writer here meant is Theodotus, and not the Valentinians (οἱ ἀπὸ Οὐαλαντίνου or οἱ Οὐαλεντινιανοί): for φησί and φασί are perpetually interchanged in MSS. (φησί stands § 1, 22, and before that in § 21, we have φασὶν οἱ Οὐαλεντινιανοί, but immediately afterwards, we have again φασίν; § 41 φησίν, immediately afterwards φασίν; § 43 φησί, and after that, λέγουσιν, § 67 φησίν—on which, see Zahn, l. c. p. 123). Heinrici thinks himself able to trace back yet more sections to Theodotus, and attributes to him a series of passages which are certainly not of his authorship; *e.g.* (§ 58) the statement about the bodily nature of Christ and the whole of § 67. The first remark to be made on this is that, in the passages parallel with Irenaeus, the name of Theodotus nowhere meets us. But even such sections as substantially agree with what can be expressly traced back to Theodotus are (excepting only in § 1. the interpretation of Luke xxiii. 46, cf. § 35) not with any certainty to be referred to him. So at § 23, the very same doctrine concerning Christ, for which at § 32 Theodotus is cited as authority, is ascribed to the Valentinians; and Zahn remarks with right (p. 123), that statements from and concerning Theodotus are wont insensibly to pass over into utterances concerning Valentinian doctrine generally. According to this, our previous inference will be confirmed that Clemens made use of a Valentinian writing, which appealed to Theodotus as its chief authority. A third inaccuracy in the title given

to these excerpts, is that of ascribing them to the Oriental school (ἐκ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς λεγομένης διδασκαλίας). For it is only the first portion of the Valentinian fragments which belong to that school (§§ 1–42); the second portion, on the other hand (§§ 43–65), expound the teaching of the Italian school. The writing made use of for the latter exposition had also served, as remarked above, as one of the sources made use of by Irenaeus. It distinguishes the upper Sophia from the Achamoth, contains a Christology differing from that of the first portion, and assigns to Christ, not a pneumatic, but a merely psychial body. Heinrici (*l. c.* p. 90) distinguishes three groups in these excerpts: (1) Exegetical pieces (§§ 1–7; §§ 21–27); (2) A well-connected exposition of doctrine (§§ 29–65), and (3) another well-connected piece (§§ 69–85). True it is that the first of these groups, which is frequently interrupted by counter-observations and detailed expositions on the part of Clemens, is almost exclusively occupied with interpretation of passages of Scripture. It belongs to the Anatolic school, and presents the same type of doctrine as §§ 29–42.

The passages treated of point for the most part to allegorical interpretations of Genesis (§§ 2, 21), and the prologue of St. John (§§ 6, 7), and passages (generally) from the Gospel of St. John (§ 26), though other passages of Scripture are also dealt with (§ 1, St. Luke xxiii. 46; § 16, St. Luke iii. 33; § 22, 1 Cor. xv. 29; § 28, Numb. xiv. 18). The fragments given are not sufficient to enable us to form a satisfactory judgment as to the writings from which they are taken. The main group, §§ 29–65, was already regarded by Bunsen as forming a connected whole. But inasmuch as here also there are not a few expositions of Scripture texts, we shall hardly be warranted in classing the supposed sources made use of as works of exegesis on the one hand, and of systematic theology on the other. §§ 6 and 7 give a connected account of the Pleroma and its aeons and treat specially of the position of the Μονογενής and the Λόγος, which latter appear to have been identified by Theodotus with Jesus. §§ 2, 21 treat of the origin of pneumatic souls, and the difference of the seed, male and female. §§ 1, 3, 16, 17, 22, 23, 25, 26, treat of the coming down of the Logos as Jesus, and the redemption of pneumatic souls. All these pieces fit in readily into the connection of §§ 29–42. This latter section gives a complete outline of the system, beginning with the suffering within the Pleroma caused by the xiith Aeon, the Sophia, and ending with the Redemption by Jesus of the pneumatic souls. It is here related how Christus, an Emanation from the Sophia, forsakes his Mother and mounts to the Pleroma, and how then she, in her longing after the escaped one, produces the Τόπος, the Ἄρχων τῆς οἰκονομίας, and then how those of the Right and the Left, and, further, the *Pneumatici* (σπέρματα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, the ἐκλογή), the *Psychici* (δίκαιοι or κλῆσις), and the unrighteous go forth. On the intercession of Christus, the Aeons of the Pleroma, emanate Jesus, who, clothed with the Sophia and the Ἐκκλησία, and accompanied by the ἄγγελοι ἀῤῥενικοί, comes down, and takes his place beside the fiery Topos, in order to appease him and to raise up the pneumatic seed by the sign of the Cross to that Upper World to which from the beginning it has belonged. Immediately connected with this exposition there now follows upon it the Second Piece (§§ 43–65), belonging to the Italian school, which relates first the coming down of the Soter in order to impart to the Sophia the μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν, and then describes in detail the formation of the natural world and its constituent parts out of the πάθη of the Sophia. It dwells with special predilection on the origination of the different classes of men and of the constituent parts of human nature, and then once more describes the Redemption accomplished by the (second) coming down of the Soter with the Angels. Among the discrepancies between this Piece and that which preceded it must be reckoned (besides what has just been noticed) the notion of the psychical Christus of the Demiurge and the different conception of the Demiurge himself, who appears here no longer as a terrible but simply as an inferior restricted Being. The terminology is also different. The peculiar way in which this Piece is connected with that which precedes it seems not to be explicable by the supposition that this younger (Italian) writer had the older (Anatolic) account before him, and has here developed it in his own way, but simply to be due to Clemens himself.

With the former (Anatolic) account, Irenaeus (if we except a superficial resemblance between I. iv. 5 and § 23 of the *Excerpt. ex Theodot.*) betrays no acquaintance; Clemens, on the other hand, repeatedly refers in the *Stromateis* to Valentinian opinions which recur in that account (compare § 32 with *Strom.* iv. 13, 92; v. 1, 3; III. 1, 1; with § 41 comp. *Strom.* ii. 3, 10). We also find in the *Stromateis* (iii. 17, 102) the same view of the psychical Body of Jesus as in the second (Italian) account in the Excerpts. The division between the two pieces is to be drawn (§ 43) after the sentence beginning λέγουσιν οὖν ὅτι αἱ δεξιαί, and ending with δύναμιν. That sentence still treats of the redemption of the Pneumatici, whereas what follows is part of a description of the descent of the Soter to effect the μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν of the lower Sophia. (In accordance with this observation should be corrected my remark in the *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*, 1872, col. 179 sq.) Hilgenfeld moreover is wrong in his determination of the relationship between the two Valentinian sources when he regards §§ 43–47 only as a piece of "Western Valentinianism," and refers all the rest to the Anatolic school (cf. Hilgenfeld, *l. c.* p. 507).

Very little is to be obtained from the *Syntagma* of Hippolytus, which is preserved to us in the excerpts of Pseudotertullian (*Haer.* 12), and by Philaster (*Haer.* 38), as also in part by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 8; cf. *Quellen der ält. Ketzergeschichte*, p. 166). My former assumption that Hippolytus is here quite independent of Irenaeus (*Quellenkritik der Epiphanios*, p. 152; *Quellen der ält. Ketzergesch.* p. 166). I can no longer maintain against the arguments of Heinrici (*l. c.* p. 158), and more especially those of Lüdemann (*l. c.* col. 349). We must rather conclude that Hippolytus has here combined Irenaeus (cc. 1–7) with some other

authority belonging to the older Anatolic system. This is most evidently the case in the somewhat detailed excerpt in Pseudotertullian. The doctrine concerning the Aeons is derived from Irenaeus, i. 1–3; the precedence given to the twelve emanations from Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία, and their being placed before the ten derived from Λόγος and Ζωή, appears to find its explanation in Hippolytus's method of making his extracts. Having mentioned Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία, he at once proceeds to name the twelve Aeons which emanate from them, and then by way of supplement adds the ten earlier emanations from Λόγος and Ζωή. It must be allowed that the same transposition recurs in the authority excerpted by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 5).

But here, as well as in the system of the *prudentiores* referred to by Irenaeus (I. xii. 3, cf. Epiphan. *Haer.* xxxv. 1), the arrangement is a consistent one; the Syzygy of Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία precedes that of Λόγος and Ζωή, which in Hippolytus is not the case. When Philaster, after mentioning the twelve and then the ten Aeons adds, "*de Intellectu autem et Veritate octo aeones*," this rests on a mere misunderstanding of the words of Irenaeus, 1, 1, καὶ εἶναι ταύτην ἀρχέγονον Ὀγδοάδα ῥίζαν καὶ ὑπόστασιν τῶν πάντων (this Ogdoad being Βυθός and Σιγή, Νοῦς and Ἀλήθεια, Λόγος and Ζωή, Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία). The doctrine of the Aeons is immediately followed in Hippolytus by the narrative of the Sophia's fall, and her re-establishment by means of Horus (Ὅρος) cf. Iren. 2, 2; 3, 1. Here the words *et paene dissolutum esse nisi* and *paene perditi* point clearly back to Irenaeus (ἀναλελύσθαι—εἰ μή, Iren. 2, 2; μετὰ (or κατὰ) μικρὸν ἀπολολότος, Iren. 3, 1). To this attaches itself the notice in Iren. 4, 1 that Horus hinders the lower Sophia from forcing her way into the Pleroma by the utterance of the word Ἰαώ. Hippolytus who had read in his former authority of only one Sophia, makes this narrative refer to *her* and her establishment in the Pleroma, against the original sense of the words. But having thus identified the Sophia of his former authority with the Achamoth of Irenaeus, he goes on to relate (following Irenaeus 4, 1) the origination of the world and its various parts from the longing and the πάθη of the Sophia, and proceeds with the words *quoniam quidem ipse fuerit de deceptatione* (ἀπορίᾳ) *conceptus atque prolatus* to adopt and make completely his own the conception of Irenaeus who had made the world to originate entirely in the sufferings of *Achamoth*, the lower Sophia. The excerpt goes on in a very abrupt manner, and with a perfectly unintelligible *hunc* to speak of the active part taken by the Soter in the creation of the world (cf. Iren. 4, 5). And here Hippolytus makes another mistake; misunderstanding an ironical expression of Irenaeus about the sweat of Achamoth (4, 4), he derives the elements of the universe not merely (as Irenaeus's authority 4, 2 had done) from the fear and grief (φόβος καὶ λύπη), but also from the sweat of Achamoth. After this, Hippolytus returns to his former authority with the words—*Christum autem missum ab illo Propatore*. According to that authority Christus had been endowed by Bythos with a pneumatic body, and so had passed through Mary as through a channel. This authority followed by Hippolytus is not (as I once assumed) identical with that which Irenaeus made use of (c. 11), nor again (as Lüdemann conjectures) with that followed by Irenaeus at 2, 3 and 4. The concluding remarks concerning the denial by Valentinus of the bodily resurrection, and concerning his relation to the Old and New Testament may have been drawn from the same source as that from which he derived his Christological statements. Philaster, who leaves out all that has been said above about the origination of the world from the πάθη of Achamoth, agrees pretty exactly with the accounts of Valentinus's Christology and his denial of a bodily resurrection as given by Pseudotertullian, but omits the concluding notice about Valentinus's relation to the canon of Scripture. This last point is also wanting in Epiphanius, who takes (*Haer.* xxxi. 8) from Hippolytus along with some particulars concerning the biography of Valentinus, the accounts of his Christology, and the statements concerning the resurrection of the σῶμα πνευματικόν. To these he adds some particulars about the pneumatici, the psychici, and the hylici, but falls into the mistake of introducing the psychical souls into the pleroma, and there espousing them to the angels of the Χριστός. In the following sections which treat of the disciples of Valentinus (Pseudotertullian, *Haer.* 13, 14; Philaster, *Haer.* 39–41) Hippolytus appears to have also combined the accounts given by Irenaeus (cc. 11 and 12) with notices derived from another source. From Irenaeus (11, 2) appears also to have been derived the statement (Pseudotertull. 13) that the fallen Aeon does not belong to the thirty. For Hippolytus, who, resting on his other authority, had assumed, though not with perfect consistency, the unity of the Sophia, this statement must have seemed to be specially important. What he relates concerning the two-fold Tetrad (which Ptolemaeus had made to precede his Triacontad), is connected with Iren. 11, 5 (comp. 11, 2); while his statements concerning Heracleon are connected with the doctrines of the ἄλλος ἐπιφανὴς διδάσκαλος of Iren. 11, 3. What is here peculiar is that Irenaeus neither attributes the latter of these views to Heracleon, nor the former to Ptolemaeus, and that on the other hand just those doctrines which Irenaeus does attribute to Secundus and Ptolemaeus (*e.g.* 11, 2 the τετρὰς δεξιά and ἀριστερά; 12, 1, the doctrine of the two σύζυγοι of Bythos which are assigned him by the περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον γνωστικώτεροι) are not so attributed by Hippolytus. Moreover in contradiction to the order observed by Irenaeus (cc. 11 and 12), Hippolytus puts Ptolemaeus before Secundus. And even if this last-mentioned transposition be explained by a reference to Irenaeus 8, 5, we must yet probably refer the other discrepancies to the influence of another authority, which I can now no longer identify as I did formerly (*Quellen der ält. Ketzerg.* p. 169) with that which is supposed to have formed the basis of Irenaeus, i. 11 and 12. A trace of this authority appears to be found in the introductory words as given by Philaster: *post istum Valentinus quidam surrexit, Pythagoricus magis quam Christianus, vanam quandam ac perniciosam doctrinam*

eructans et velut arithmeticam id est numerositatis notitiam, fallacium praedicans. In perfect accordance with this are the statements in the *Philosophumena* that Valentinus derived his doctrines from Pythagoras and Plato, and that his whole system ended in arithmetic (*Philos.* vi. 21, 29, 34). The following sentences from *Philos.* vi. 29, p. 184 sq., are almost literally identical with what we find in Philaster (ἡ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος δόξα) ἀφ' ἧς Οὐαλεντῖνος . . . δικαίως Πυθαγορικὸς καὶ Πλατωνικός, οὐ Χριστιανὸς λογισθείη. Οὐαλεντῖνος τοίνυν καὶ Ἡρακλέων καὶ Πτολεμαῖος καὶ πᾶσα ἡ τούτων σχολή, οἱ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος μαθηταί, ἀκολουθήσαντες τοῖς καθηγησαμένοις ἀριθμητικὴν τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν ἑαυτῶν κατεβάλοντο. The assumption, that all this is due to some common authority from which these judgments concerning Valentinus were taken, is not established. If the author of the σύνταγμα and of the *Philosophumena* be not identical, we may yet assume that the former work was made use of by the writer of the latter. Moreover, Irenaeus himself more than once points out the relationship between the Valentinian system and Pythagorean ideas (i. 1, 1, and especially ii. 14, 6).

PSEUDORIGENES, or as is now almost universally assumed, HIPPOLYTUS, gives us in the *Philosophumena* (the larger Ἔλεγχος κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων) a quite peculiar account of the Valentinian system, one more uniform and synoptical than that of Irenaeus. The original authority on which this description is based cannot have been the same as that in the Syntagma, because whereas the latter belonged to the Anatolic school, the former was a product of the Western or Italian. The doctrinal system reproduced by Pseudorigenes is in a general way akin to the Ptolemaic system as presented by Irenaeus. But the representation of his original authority is entirely independent of the sources made use of by Irenaeus. It has, to begin with, a different terminology. The first principle is called Μονάς and most frequently Πατήρ instead of Βυθός, the lower Sophia is never called Ἀχαμώθ, but ἡ ἔξω Σοφία, ἡμέρα κ. τ. λ., the Soter (Jesus) is never called Παράκλητος, the κοσμοκράτωρ is Βεελζεβούλ and so on. The form of doctrine moreover is (in some particulars at any rate) a different one. The Βυθός is a simple Unity (Μονάς), and therefore sexless without Syzygy, which Irenaeus reports to have been the opinion of "some"; the original number of Aeons is therefore here reduced to 28. The subsequent addition to this number of Χριστός and Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον makes up finally the full Triacontad. The series of Aeons are also differently determined. Whereas according to Irenaeus Λόγος and Ζωή emanate *ten*, Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία *twelve* Aeons, there proceed, *here*, from Nous and Ἀλήθεια (after the emanation of Λόγος and Ζωή), a (perfect) Decad of further Aeons, while the (imperfect) Dodecad of Aeons issue (after the appearance of Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία, not from this Pair but) from Λόγος and Ζωή. The Fall of the Sophia also and her restoration, the formation of the lower world out of the ἔκτρωμα to which she had given birth (the external—ἡ ἔξω—Sophia) are in many particulars differently related. That the form of doctrine belongs to the Italian school is evident from its Christology. The Soter (the common fruit of the Pleroma), who after the redemption of the ἔξω Σοφία remains with her as σύζυγος, is distinguished here (as in Irenaeus' Source C) from the Son of Mary, who is produced by the power of the Sophia herself for the redemption of the psychical world. Numerous literal citations are inserted from the original authority made use of—each of these being introduced with a φησί. Some have thought that this φησί points to Valentinus himself as the actual speaker from whose words the citation is made. But it is evident from the form of doctrine propounded in the Philosophumena that this is impossible, for that is demonstrably a younger development of the Italian school. I have myself offered the suggestion, that we have here the form of teaching which was prevalent in the school of Heracleon (*Quellenkritik des Epiphan.* p. 171). Heinrici (*l. c.* p. 38) and Hilgenfeld (*l. c.* p. 472) have expressed agreement with me. Dr. Salmon [HERACLEON] objects that the grounds alleged for this view in the *Quellenkr. des Epiphan.* are not strong enough to prove it. And certainly, the fact that Pseudorigenes twice mentions Heracleon (*Philos.* vi. 29, p. 185; vi. 35, p. 195) without furnishing a special article concerning this celebrated Gnostic teacher, is no proof that the main exposition which he gives us of Gnostic doctrine is taken from a writing of Heracleon's. To which must be added that we know otherwise only of exegetical writings of Heracleon, and not of any strictly systematic treatise. But Hilgenfeld (*l. c.* p. 499 sqq.) has shewn that the Fragments of Heracleon contain, with some discrepancies, yet also many points of agreement with the account given in the *Philosophumena*, and thinks it to be therefore "a less important (?) description of the system taught in the school of Heracleon."—To the main body of this description Pseudorigenes adds a series of his own observations, which inform us of various differences of teaching in the Valentinian school. So he mentions, for example, at vi. 30, p. 187, the genealogy of the Aeons given by Irenaeus as the teaching of "others," and supplies from Irenaeus the names of individual Aeons; vi. 31, p. 188, he mentions (again following Irenaeus) that τινές would give the Father (Πατήρ) for his companion the Σιγή, and then reckon both these in the triacontad of Aeons. Other particulars of information he has obtained in other ways. So, vi. 31, p. 189, he gives (varying from the statements in Irenaeus) different appellations for the Σταυρός (Ὅρος and Μετοχεύς), different appellations of the Demiurge (Τόπος, Ἑβδομάς, Παλαιὸς τῶν ἡμερῶν) and (vi. 35, p. 195) the doctrinal differences of the Anatolic and Italian schools. In conclusion, he gives the fragment of a Psalm of Valentinus (vi. 37, p. 198), of which it remains a question whether it was derived from an original source or from elsewhere at second-hand. This probably was the case also with the notice (vi. 40, p. 203) of a vision which Valentinus is said to have had. It occurs in the section about Marcus, and introduces a narrative taken from Irenaeus about another vision which Marcus had. The section (vi. 38) which treats of the disciples of Valentinus is taken bodily from Irenaeus. The same is the case with the large section about Marcus

(vi. 40–54). It is the introductory sentences only (vi. 39), which are derived from another source.

Tertullian's tractate *Adversus Valentinianos* cannot be considered as an independent authority. Apart from a few personal notices concerning him and his disciples which he may have taken from the lost work of Proculus (c. 4, cf. c. 11), his whole account is a paraphrase of Irenaeus, whom he follows almost word for word, and more or less faithfully from cap. 7 onwards.

Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 9–32) has incorporated the whole long section of Irenaeus (i. 1–10) in his Panarion. *Haer.* xxxii. and xxxiv. (Secundus, Marcus) are simply taken from Irenaeus. He follows Irenaeus also in his somewhat arbitrary way in what he says about Ptolemaeus, Colarbasus, Heracleon (*Haer.* xxxiii, xxxv, xxxvi).

On the other hand, *Haer.* xxxi. 7 and 8, is taken from the Syntagma of Hippolytus; *Haer.* xxxiii. 3–7, contains the important letter of Ptolemaeus to Flora. [PTOLEMAEUS.] *Haer.* xxxi. 5 and 6, gives us a fragment of an unknown Valentinian writing, from which the statements in cap. 2 are also in part derived. This writing, with its barbarous names for the Aeons, and its mixture of Valentinian and Basilidian doctrines, betrays an already degenerate development of Anatolic Valentinianism. Matter, who (*Histoire critique du Gnosticisme*, II. ii. 5) endeavours to interpret these names from Hebrew, is wrong in attributing the authorship of this work to Valentinus himself. The names of the Aeons and their order differ in several respects from the older tradition; and beside this, under the influence, as appears, of the Marcosian symbolism of numbers in regard to the upper Ogdoad, a second is placed at its side, which is named merely after the numbers of those composing it. This writing has also preserved several older elements, *e.g.* the identity of Horus and Jesus.

Later heresiologists, such as Theodoret, who (*Haer. Fab.* i. 7–9) simply follows Irenaeus and Epiphanius, cannot be regarded in any way as independent authorities.

V. *The System.* — A review of the accounts given by the Fathers confirms the judgment that, with the means at our command, it is very difficult to distinguish between the original doctrine of Valentinus himself, and the later developments made by his disciples. A description of his system must start from the Fragments, against the authenticity of which (apart from the so-called ὅρος Οὐαλεντίνου in *Dial. de recta fide*) no doubts have been started. But from the nature of these Fragments we cannot expect to be able to reconstruct the whole system out of them. From an abundant literature a few relics only have been preserved. And in addition to this the kinds of literature to which these Fragments belong — Letters, Homilies, Hymns—show us only the outer side of the system, while its secret Gnostic doctrine is passed over and concealed, or only indicated in the obscurest manner. The modes of expression in these Fragments are brought as near as possible to those in ordinary church use. We see therein the evident desire and effort of Valentinus to remain in the fellowship of the Catholic church. Of specific Gnostic doctrines two only appear in their genuine undisguised shape, that of the celestial origin of the spiritual man (the Pneumaticos), and that of the Demiurge; for the docetic Christology was not then, as is clear from Clemens Alexandrinus, exclusively peculiar to the Gnostics. All the more emphatically is the Anthropological and ethical side of the system insisted on in these Fragments.

As the world is an image of the living Aeon (*τοῦ ζῶντος αἰῶνος*), so is man an image of the pre-existent man of the *ἄνθρωπος προών.* Valentinus, according to Clemens Alexandrinus (*Valentini homil. ap. Clem. Strom.* iv. 13, 92), spoke of the Sophia as an artist (*ζωγράφος*) making this visible lower world a picture of the glorious Archetype, but the hearer or reader would as readily understand the heavenly wisdom of the Book of Proverbs to be meant by this Sophia, as the 12th and fallen Aeon. Under her (according to Valentinus) stand the world-creative angels, whose head is the Demiurge. Her formation (*πλάσμα*) is Adam created in the name of the *Ἄνθρωπος προών*. In him thus made a higher power puts the seed of the heavenly pneumatic essence (*σπέρμα τῆς ἄνωθεν οὐσίας*). Thus furnished with higher insight, Adam excites the fears of the angels; for even as *κοσμικοὶ ἄνθρωποι* are seized with fear of the images made by their own hands to bear the name of God, *i.e.* the idols, so these angels cause the images they have made to disappear (*Ep. ad amicos ap. Clem. Alex. Strom.* ii. 8, 36). The pneumatic seed (*πνεῦμα διαφέρον* or *γένος διαφέρον*) nevertheless remains in the world, as a race by nature capable of being saved (*φύσει σωζόμενον γένος*), and which has come down from a higher sphere in order to put an end to the reign of death. Death originates from the Demiurge, to whom the word (Exod. xxxiii. 20) refers that no one can see the face of God without dying. The members of the pneumatic church are from the first immortal, and children of eternal life. They have only assumed mortality in order to overcome death in themselves and by themselves. They shall dissolve the world without themselves suffering dissolution, and be lords over the creation and over all transitory things (Valent. *hom. ap. Clem. Strom.* iv. 13, 91 sq.). But without the help of the only good Father the heart even of the spiritual man (the pneumaticos) cannot be cleansed from the many evil spirits which make their abode in him, and each accomplishes his own desire. But when the only good Father visits the soul, it is hallowed and enlightened, and is called blessed because one day it shall see God. This cleansing and illumination is a consequence of the revelation of the Son (Valent. *Epist. ap. Clem. Strom.* ii. 20, 114).

We learn from the Fragments only (Valent. *Epist. ad Agathopoda ap. Clem. Strom.* iv. 7, 59) that Jesus by steadfastness and abstinence earned for Himself Deity (*πάντα ὑπομείνας ἐγκρατὴς ἦν, τὴν θεότητα Ἰησοῦς εἰργάσατο*), and that by virtue of his abstinence he did not even suffer to be corrupted the food which he received (*i.e.* it did not undergo the natural process of digestion), because he himself was not subject to corruption (*ἤσθιεν καὶ ἔπιεν ἰδίως, οὐκ ἀποδιδοὺς τὰ βρώματα· τοσαύτη ἦν αὐτῷ τῆς ἐγκρατείας δύναμις, ὥστε καὶ μὴ φθαρῆναι τὴν τροφὴν ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐπεὶ τὸ φθείρεσθαι αὐτὸς οὐκ εἶχεν*). It must remain undetermined how Valentinus defined the rela-

tion of Jesus to the υἱός. If the text of the passage quoted above be sound, Jesus must be thought to have put himself in possession of Godhead by his own abstinence, a notion which we should rather expect to find in Ebionitic than in Gnostic circles. But it may be that the true reading is εἰκάζετο (not εἰργάζετο), and in that case the meaning will be that by an extraordinary asceticism Jesus avoided every kind of material pollution, and so became himself the image of the incorruptible and imperishable Godhead. At any rate this Fragment does not tell us whether, according to the teaching of Valentinus, the body of Jesus was pneumatic or psychical. According to another Fragment attributed to Valentinus, and preserved by Eulogius of Alexandria (ap. Photium, *Bibl. Cod.* 230), he appears to have treated with ridicule the opinion of the "Galileans" that Christ had two natures, and to have maintained that He had but one nature composed of the visible and the invisible. Hilgenfeld (*l. c.* p. 302 sq.) supposes the Valentinus of this Fragment to be the Gnostic, while others take him to have been the Apollinarian. But we have no other instance of any Gnostic giving to Catholic Christians (like the emperor Julian of later times) the epithet "Galilean." And further, although Tertullian (*adv. Prax.* 29) and Origen (*de Princip.* i. 2, 1) may have spoken of two natures or two substances in Christ, we can hardly imagine Valentinus pronouncing a doctrine ridiculous, which, under such circumstances, could hardly have found acceptance in his own school. For so we find the Occidental Valentinians actually teaching in very similar terms, that Soter, the common product of the whole Pleroma, united himself with the Christus of the Demiurge the Man Jesus. Could we otherwise assume that the Fragment is genuine, it would serve to prove that the doctrine of the oriental school concerning the pneumatic body of Christ was in fact the original teaching of Valentinus. How Valentinus thought concerning the origin of matter and of evil cannot be made out from existing Fragments. When however we find him designating the Demiurge as author of death, we can hardly suppose that he derived the transitory nature and other imperfections of the terrestrial universe from an originally evil material substance. The view moreover which underlies the psalm of Valentinus, of which the *Philosophumena* have preserved a Fragment (*Philos.* vi. 37, p. 197 sq.) is decidedly monastic. He there sees in the spirit how "all things are hanging (κρεμάμενα) and are upborne (ὀχούμενα), the flesh hanging on the soul, the soul upborne by the air, the air hanging on the aether, from Bythos fruits produced and from the womb the child." An interpretation of these sayings current in the Valentinian school is appended. According to this interpretation, flesh is the ὕλη which depends upon the soul (the psychical nature) of the Demiurge. Again the Demiurge hangs from the spirit which is outside the Pleroma, *i.e.* the Sophia in the kingdom of the Midst, the Sophia from Horus and from the Pleroma, and finally the world of Aeons in the Pleroma from the abyss, *i.e.* their Father. If this interpretation be, as we may assume it to be, correct, Valentinus must have conceived the whole universe as forming a grand scale of being, beginning with the abysmal ground of all spiritual life, and thence descending lower and lower down to matter. The whole scale then is a descent from the perfect to ever more and more imperfect images; according to the principle expressly laid down by Valentinus, that the cosmos is as inferior to the living Aeon as the image is inferior to the living countenance (*ap. Clem. Strom.* iv. 13, 92). It is clear that this view of the nature of the universe exhibits a much nearer relationship to Platonic philosophy, than to the oriental dualism which underlay the older Gnostic systems; and Hippolytus is therefore completely in the right, when dealing with the psalm of Valentinus, to speak of *Platonising* Gnostics (*Philos.* vi. 37, p. 197).

The Fragments do not suffice to give us any detailed acquaintance with the doctrine of Valentinus concerning the Aeons. The Πατήρ or Βυθός stands at their head; but what place in the Valentinian Pleroma was assigned to the Ἄνθρωπος προών in whose name Adam was created, is difficult to determine. Valentinus's connection with the ordinary Syrian Gnosis, for which we have the express testimony of Irenaeus (i. 11, 1), makes the assumption highly probable, that the Ἄνθρωπος προών was one of the highest Aeons, either Βυθός himself or one of his earliest emanations. The Gnostics in Irenaeus (i. 30, 6) designate the *Pater Omnium* as *primus Anthropos* from whom as second masculine principle proceeds *Anthropos filius Anthropi.* The Naassenes moreover of the Philosophumena (*Philos.* v. 6, p. 95; 7, p. 96 sq.; p. 104; 8, p. 109; x. 9, p. 314) designated by the names Ἄνθρωπος and also Ἀρχάνθρωπος, and Ἀδάμας, the First Principle (τὴν πρώτην τῶν πάντων ἀρχήν), to whom, like Valentinus, they also gave the predicates ὁ προών (*Philos.* v. 7, p. 98; 9, p. 117), and ὁ μόνος ἀγαθός (*Philos.* v. 7, p. 102; 8, p. 116). With him again is occasionally identified (*Philos.* x. 9, p. 314) the second Masculine Principle, who is also described (v. 6, p. 95) as male-female (ἀρσενόθηλυς) Ἄνθρωπος. We have it also as a tradition from some of the Valentinians themselves that with them (just as it was with the Ophite parties) the First Father or First Principle bore the name Ἄνθρωπος (Iren. *Haer.* i. 12, 4), and so also a work quoted by Epiphanius (xxxi. 5) as belonging to the Valentinian school, gives the same name to the Πατὴρ τῆς Ἀληθείας, the second Masculine Principle, called also Νοῦς or Μονογενής, who is designated here as ἀντίτυπος τοῦ προόντος ἀγεννήτου, and is expressly distinguished from the σύζυγος of Ἐκκλησία, who is also called Ἄνθρωπος. Among the Marcosians also the First Principle of Revelation, πηγὴ παντὸς λόγου, who seems to be identical with the πατὴρ τῆς ἀληθείας—is called Ἄνθρωπος (Iren. i. 14, 3); and Heracleon calls the upper Christus υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου, and transfers the same appellation πατρωνυμικῶς to the Soter also (*ap. Origen. in Joann.* tom. xiii. 58). But further—if the Ἄνθρωπος προών of Valentinus is not to be identified with the like-named Aeon of the Fourth Syzygy, just as little is the Λόγος of Valentinus to be identified with the Aeon of the Third Syzygy which bears the same name. The Logos which appeared to Valentinus in the form of a new-born child (*Philos.* vi. 42, p. 203) is

probably to be identified with the Soter who elsewhere also in the older Valentinian school bears the name of Logos (*Exc. ex Theodot.* § 1, cf. § 26, § 2, 25). He and not the Sophia, is probably meant, by the *higher Power* which secretly infuses the Seed of the higher Essence into the formation of the angels (*Exc. ex Theod.* § 2).

These Fragments give us no more information about the history of the Sophia, and the processes by which the present world came into existence, than they do about Valentinus's world of Aeons. Of a two-fold Sophia, a higher and a lower, we read nothing. Sophia is the artist (ζωγράφος) who forms the world after the archetype of the living Aeon, in order to be honoured by his name. And the world as formed obtains credit and stability through the invisible nature of God (*Strom.* iv. 13, 92). The ὄνομα (after whose type this world has been formed to be its image, solid indeed but yet imperfect), is in the teaching of the Anatolic school sometimes designated as the name of archetypal being (ὄνομα ἀνωνόμαστον), sometimes as the υἱός whose shadow is the κένωμα γνώσεως produced by the twelfth Aeon in its ἀγνωσία and ἀμορφία (*excerpt. ex Theod.* § 31, cf. § 22); and here we are expressly met with the thought, that that only is perfect which proceeds from a Syzygy, but that what proceeds from a single Principle is merely an imperfect Image (ὅσα ἐκ συζυγίας προέρχεται πληρώματά ἐστιν, ὅσα δὲ ἀπὸ ἑνὸς εἰκόνες, Clem. *Strom.* iv. 13, 92, cf. *Excerpt. ex Theodot.* § 31). It seems natural to understand under the word ὄνομα here the υἱός, i.e. the χριστός who has mounted upwards to the realm of the Aeons, and after whose image the Sophia has formed this lower world (*Excerpt. ex Theod.* § 33). After the type of Christus she first forms the Demiurge, the head of the psychical creation, from whom again Death and Mutability and the perishing material substance have their origin. The Fragment however does not itself clearly intimate what is meant by the ὄνομα after which the κόσμος and the Demiurge are formed. Adam was, according to another Fragment, formed εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ προόντος Ἀνθρώπου. As Clemens interprets the words which have been already discussed, the Demiurge himself is identical with the typical κόσμος, and his Archetype is not χριστός but ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός, the supreme Father, whence he is also himself called θεὸς καὶ πατήρ. This would agree with what has been already remarked concerning Adam. The following words of Clemens seem meant to explain the condition of the pneumatic seed. Because, says he, the visible manifestation of the Invisible is not the soul which proceeds from the Midst (i.e. the Demiurge), therefore the "excellent" comes, and that is the inspiration of the excellent spirit (ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ φαινόμενον αὐτοῦ [i.e. τοῦ ἀοράτου) οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ἐκ μεσότητος ψυχή, ἔρχεται τὸ διαφέρον, καὶ τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὸ ἐμφύσημα τοῦ διαφέροντος πνεύματος). The πνεῦμα διαφέρον according to a usus loquendi of repeated occurrence in the *Excerpt. ex Theod.* is the pneumatic seed. This seed as Clemens relates further on, without expressly saying that it is the teaching of Valentinus himself, has been without her knowledge imparted to the soul, by a process which is typically represented in Genesis by the inbreathing into Adam of the breath of life. The inbreathing of this πνεῦμα διαφέρον is made by the Soter or Logos into that which has been formed by the Demiurge and his angels, i.e. into the psychical Adam, who, as in the doctrine of the Ophites (Iren. i. 30, 6–8) is by them cast down and set aside because he had alarmed them by his higher knowledge. The preservation of the pneumatic Seed in the world, was probably represented by Valentinus likewise in a similar way to that of the Ophites, according to whom this was provided for by the Sophia without the knowledge of the Demiurge (Iren. i. 30, 9).

To what authority Valentinus made appeal as the source of his doctrine cannot be made out from the Fragments. From the *Homily to the Friends*, Clemens Alexandrinus has preserved a sentence which defines "many of the things written in the public books" (δημοσίοις βίβλοις: he means doubtless the writings of the Old Testament) as "found written in the Church of God"—"for," he adds, "those things which are common" (i.e. not *merely* found in books—read, with Heinrici κοινά instead of κενά) "are words from the heart": and proceeds: "The law written in the heart is the People of the Beloved One, both loved and loving" (Grabe was wrong in proposing to emend λαός into λόγος). The meaning is that this "People" is in virtue of the inward revelation of the Logos a Law unto itself (cf. Rom. ii. 14). But this inward revelation has reference only to "that which is common" (τὰ κοινά) *i.e.* to the universal ethical truths written in the heart which "the Church of God" needs not first to learn from "the public books." But this passage tells us nothing about the sources whence Valentinus derived his Gnosis. For these we must go back to the statement of Clemens (*Strom.* vii. 17, 106) already referred to, according to which the Valentinians spoke of their leader as having learned of a certain Theodas, a disciple of St. Paul. But the actual statement of Irenaeus is more to be depended on, that Valentinus was the first who transformed the old doctrines of "the Gnostics" into a system of his own (*Haer.* i. 11, 1; cf. Tertullian, *adv. Valentinian.* 4). The Fragments, moreover, give us a series of points of contact with the opinions of these older "Gnostics." We may therefore regard as an axiom to be adhered to in our investigations that of any two Valentinian doctrines, that is the older and more originally which approaches more closely to the older and vulgar Gnosis (Iren. i. 30). Yet herewith we do not mean to deny that the system of Valentinus had a peculiar character of its own. He was the first to breathe a really philosophic spirit into the old vulgar Gnosis, by making use of Plato's world of thought to infuse a deeper meaning into the old Gnostic myths. Baur therefore was quite right in emphasizing the Platonism of Valentinus (*Christliche Gnosis*, p. 124 sq.), to which the *Philosophumena* had already called attention (*Philos.* vi. 21 sqq.).

The section of Irenaeus, in which he finds the origin of Valentinus's system in the λεγομένη γνωστικὴ αἵρεσις, is then, as already remarked, the first independent description of his doctrine. It commences with the words;

ἴδωμεν νῦν καὶ τὴν τούτων ἄστατον (ἀσύστατον, Harvey) γνώμην, δύο που καὶ τριῶν ὄντων, πῶς περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἐναντία ἀποφαίνονται. That Irenaeus simply borrowed these words from the older authority which he was following (Lipsius, *Alt. Quellen der Ketzerg.* p. 53 sq.) is a conjecture which I no longer maintain. The τούτων of the sentence just quoted refers to the διδάσκαλοι of whom shortly before Irenaeus has been speaking as having fallen away from the truth, and whose ἄστατος γνώμη is about to be contrasted with the unity of Catholic teaching throughout the world. At the utmost we may find in the words δύο που καὶ τριῶν ὄντων a reminiscence of the authority made use of, since they are not well applicable to the much greater number of Valentinian parties who are introduced in the following cc. 11 and 12. But all the more certain is it that at 11, 1 Irenaeus really means to give the opinion of Valentinus himself in contradistinction to the doctrinal aberrations of the numerous adherents of his school. He expressly closes the short article devoted to Valentinus with a *haec quidem ille*, and then passes on at once to the doctrine of his disciple Secundus. But even so we must remark—first that Irenaeus may not have been rightly informed as to all the statements made by him concerning Valentinus, and secondly that in this particular section he may not have been able to withstand his inclination to allege a variety of inconsistent doctrines, of which one or the other might not really have proceeded from Valentinus himself.

Irenaeus, in the first place, completes the information afforded by the Fragments concerning Valentinus's doctrine of the Aeons. At the head of them stands a δυὰς ἀνονόμαστος, the Ἄρρητος (called also Βυθός and Πατὴρ ἀγέννητος) and his σύζυγος the Σιγή. From this Dyad proceeds a second Dyad, Πατήρ and Ἀλήθεια, which with the first Dyad forms the highest Tetrad. From this Tetrad a second Tetrad proceeds — Λόγος and Ζωή, Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία, and these complete the First Ogdoad. From Λόγος and Ζωή proceed a Decad, from Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία a Dodecad of Aeons. In this the number 30 of Aeons forming the Pleroma is completed. The names of the Aeons composing the Decad and the Dodecad are not given. We may however venture to assume that the names elsewhere given by Irenaeus (i. 1, 2), and literally repeated by Pseudorigenes (*Philos.* vi. 30), and then again by Epiphanius (xxxi. 6) with some differences of detail, in his mnch later account, did really originate from Valentinus himself. They are as follows: From Λόγος and Ζωή proceed Βύθιος and Μίξις, Ἀγήρατος and Ἕνωσις, Αὐτοφυὴς and Ἡδονή, Ἀκίνητος and Σύγκρασις, Μονογενής and Μακαρία. From Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία proceed: Παράκλητος and Πίστις, Πατρικός and Ἐλπίς, Μητρικός and Ἀγάπη, Ἀείνους and Σύνεσις, Ἐκκλησιαστικός and Μακαριότης, Θελητός and Σοφία. However arbitrary this name-giving may seem, it is evident that the first four masculine Aeons repeat the notion of the First Principle and the first four feminine, the notion of his Syzygy, in various forms of expression. The names Μονογενής and Νοῦς (here Ἀείνους) meet us again among the Valentinians of Irenaeus as expression for the second Masculine Principle, and Παράκλητος as that for the common product of all the Aeons—the Soter. Πατρικός, Μητρικός, Ἐκκλησιαστικός are names simply expressing that the Aeons which bear them are derived from the higher powers within the Pleroma. The feminine names Μακαρία, Πίστις, Ἐλπίς, Ἀγάπη, Σύνεσις, Σοφία, describe generally the perfection of the Pleroma by means of Predicates borrowed from the characteristics of the perfect Pneumaticos. So that all these inferior Aeon names are but a further and more detailed expression of the Thought contained in the names of the first and second Tetrad. The first Tetrad expresses the essence of the Upper Pleroma in itself, the second Tetrad divided into two pairs of Aeons expresses its revelation to the Pneumatici and the Pneumatic World.

The last of the 30 Aeons, the Sophia or Μήτηρ falls out of the Pleroma. In her remembrance of the better world she gives birth to Christus with a shadow (μετὰ σκιᾶς τινος). Christus being of masculine nature cuts away the shadow from himself and hastens back into the Pleroma. The mother, on the other hand, being left behind and alone with the shadow, and emptied of the pneumatic substance, gives birth to another Son the Demiurge, called also Παντοκράτωρ, and at the same time with him a sinistrous archon (the Κοσμοκράτωρ). So then from these two elements, "the right and the left," the psychical and the hylical, proceeds this lower world. This the original doctrine of Valentinus appears to have had in common with that of the Ophites (Iren. i. 30), that both doctrines knew of only one Sophia, and that for the Ophites also Christus leaves the Sophia behind and escapes himself into the upper realm of light. But whereas among them Christus and Sophia as "right and left" proceed from the union of the first and second masculine principle with "the mother of all living," and so are in fact brother and sister, here, on the other hand, according to Valentinus Christus is Sophia's son and elder brother of the Demiurge. And whereas further, among the Ophites, the Sophia herself does not originally belong to the upper world of light, but has come into existence through the sparks of heavenly light which, when Christus was produced, issued from the Pleroma and overflowed into chaos, so here with Valentinus she has her original place in the Pleroma, and now has lost it by a fall into the Kenoma. The σκιά from which Christus separates himself as he mounts upwards into the world of light, is according to the Ophites of Irenaeus, Sophia herself, whereas according to Valentinus it is the Sophia who gives birth to Christus *with a shadow*, the darkened image of departed light, from which Christus separates himself, leaving his mother with this shadow to form the lower world—"a right hand and a left." Both views were subsequently combined in the later developments of the Valentinian school. The "shadow" was identified with the ἔκτρωμα to which Sophia gives birth after the departure of Christus, and this again is shaped into the lower or external Sophia (ἡ ἔξω Σοφία) while the true, the upper Sophia, returns once more herself to the Pleroma.

The notion of a fall of the last of the Aeons from the Pleroma, and the consequent formation of this lower world as the fruit of that fall, is that which is new and peculiar to Valentinus in his reconstruction of the older Gnosticism. He set in fact his Platonic Monism in the place of the Oriental Dualism. The Platonic thought of the soul's fall and longing after the lost world of light he combined with the other Platonic thought of the things of this lower world being types and images of heavenly Archetypes, and so obtained a new solution of the old problems of the world's creation and the origin of evil.

The statements of Irenaeus concerning his teaching are alas too fragmentary on the one hand and too uncertain on the other, to enable us to obtain a complete view of the system of Valentinus. He is said to have taught the existence of a twofold boundary (Ὅρος), one separating the Βυθός from the rest of the Pleroma, the other dividing the Pleroma from the Sophia. Later Valentinian doctrine knew of one *Horos* only, who after the return of the upper Sophia into the Pleroma, cut the Pleroma off from any contact with the lower Sophia and her creation. That to this Ὅρος a twofold function was ascribed—first that of confirming or establishing the Pleroma (in virtue of which he was called Σταυρός), and the second that of dividing the Pleroma from the lower world (Iren. i. 3, 5), is not explained by the doctrine ascribed to Valentinus of a twofold Ὅρος. Possibly by the higher Ὅρος which divides the Bythos from the Pleroma he may have meant the Σίγη (cf. *Exc. ex Theodot.* § 29). Yet more unreliable is that which Irenaeus has to tell us about the Christology of Valentinus. According to him Valentinus had three views of the origin of Jesus, first making him the offspring of Theletos the *σύζυγος* of Sophia, who after her fall had withdrawn from her and united himself to the rest of the Aeons; then again deriving him from the Aeon Christus (the son of Sophia) after his admission within the Pleroma; and thirdly making him the offspring of Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία. We cannot imagine that all three views were actually taken by Valentinus himself. The second was probably his own original view, but maintained in the sense of the Anatolic school, that Jesus or Soter, at the intercession of Christus issued from the Pleroma as the common fruit of all the Aeons (*Exc. ex Theodot.* §§ 23, 41). The derivation or mission of Jesus from Theletos the *σύζυγος* of Sophia may be explained as a misunderstanding of the doctrine that their reconciliation had been his work. The simpler and perhaps more original doctrine seems to be that of the Marcosians, which taught that Christus who had left the Sophia and ascended into the Pleroma descended again on Jesus (the Σωτήρ or the *ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας*) at his baptism (Iren. i. 15, 3). The last notice given us by Irenaeus in this section (i. 11, 1) comes in quite abruptly. The Πνεῦμα ἅγιον is said to have proceeded from Ἀλήθεια [Epiphan. from Ἐκκλησία] *εἰς ἀνάκρισιν καὶ καρποφορίαν τῶν Αἰώνων* by invisibly entering into them, and through him they have borne as fruit the products (*τὰ φυτά*, Epiph.; *folia* = *τὰ φύλλα* old Lat. version) of Ἀλήθεια. With this may be compared the statement in the *Philosophumena* (vi. 31, p. 188) that Χριστός and Πνεῦμα ἅγιον were emanations from Νοῦς and Ἀλήθεια; only there the purpose of this new syzygy is said to be the *μόρφωσις* of the lower Sophia. According to Irenaeus (I. 2, 5) Χριστός and Πνεῦμα ἅγιον proceed from Μονογενής, the *σύζυγος* of Ἀλήθεια, and by them the Aeons are established. Christus teaches them the law of the syzygies and the limits of their knowledge, the Holy Ghost teaches them how to give thanks, and leads them into the true rest. But neither of these views will quite suit. One might conjecture that Πνεῦμα ἅγιον is here to be identified with Jesus as he who was sent to the aid of Sophia, and is also called Παράκλητος; but no parallel passage can be cited for such identification. Or one might compare the function here assigned to Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον with that of the Ὅρος. But the most probable interpretation is that which refers to the *πνεῦμα ἀγάπης*, which also proceeds from Ἀλήθεια, as the Γνῶσις proceeds from Ἐνθύμησις (the Σιγή), and united himself with the *πνεῦμα γνώσεως* as the Father is united with the Son, and Ἐνθύμησις with Γνῶσις (*Excerpt. ex Theod.* § 7).

If in these short and meagre notices Irenaeus has made use of some older authority (possibly that of Justin's Syntagma), the authority itself must probably have confounded the doctrines of Valentinus himself with the later opinions of his school. But we have yet another means of obtaining information as to the original teaching of Valentinus. The Excerpts in Clemens Alexandrinus taken from Theodotos and the Anatolic school contain a doctrine in §§ 1–42, which at any rate stands much nearer to the views of Valentinus than the detailed account of Ptolemaic doctrines which Irenaeus gives us in i. 1–8. We have here (in these Excerpts) a somewhat complete whole, differing in some important respects from the doctrinal system of the Italic school, and agreeing with that of Valentinus in this respect, that it knows of only one Sophia, whose offspring Christus leaving his mother, enters the Pleroma and sends down Jesus for the redemption of the forsaken One.

The doctrine of the Aeons stands as much behind the anthropological and ethical Problems in these Excerpts as it does in the Fragments. We find something about the Pleroma in an interpretation of the prologue of St. John's Gospel (*Excerpt.* §§ 6, 7). By the ἀρχή of St. John i. 1, in which the Logos "was," we must understand the Μονογενής "who is also called God" (the reading *ὁ μονογενὴς θεός* John i. 18 being followed). "The Logos was *ἐν ἀρχῇ*" means that he was in the Monogenes, in the Νοῦς and the Ἀλήθεια—the reference being to the syzygy of Λόγος and Ζωή, which is said to have proceeded from Νοῦς and Ἀλήθεια. The Logos is called God because he is in God, in the Νοῦς. But when it is said *ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν* the reference is to the Ζωή as *σύζυγος* of the Logos. The Unknown Father (*πατὴρ ἄγνωστος*) willed to be known to the Aeons. On knowing himself through his own Ἐνθύμησις, which was indeed the spirit of knowledge (*πνεῦμα γνώσεως*), he, by knowledge, made to emanate the Monogenes (Ἄγνωστος *οὖν ὁ πατὴρ ὢν ἠθέλησεν γνωσθῆναι τοῖς αἰῶσι, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐνθυμήσεως τῆς ἑαυτοῦ, ὡς ἂν ἑαυτὸν ἐγνωκὼς*

πνεῦμα γνώσεως οὔσης ἐν γνώσει προέβαλε τὸν μονογενῆ. (Bernays by reading ἐνώσει instead of γνώσει and interpunctuating after ἐγνωκώς and προέβαλε, elicits quite a different sense.) The Monogenes having then emanated from the Gnosis, *i.e.* the Enthymesis of the Father, is in himself Gnosis, *i.e.* Son, for it is through the *Son* that the Father is *known*.

The πνεῦμα ἀγάπης mingles itself with the πνεῦμα γνώσεως as the Father with the Son (*i.e.* the Monogenes or Νοῦς) and the Enthymesis with Ἀλήθεια, proceeding from the Aletheia as the Gnosis proceeds from the Enthymesis. The μονογενὴς υἱὸς, who abides in the bosom of the Father, emanates from the Father's bosom and thereby declares (ἐξηγεῖται) the Enthymesis through Gnosis to the Aeons. Having become visible on earth, he is no longer called by the Apostle Monogenes (simply) but ὡς μονογενής. For though remaining in himself one and the same, he is in the Creation called πρωτότοκος, and in the Pleroma Μονογενής, and appears in each locality as he can be comprehended there.

Now if we have here a specimen only of that wide-spread Valentinian Exegesis the like of which we find in Ptolemaeus (Iren. i. 8, 5), the Excerpts give us on the other hand from § 29 onwards a detailed and connected account. The Sigé (as the σύζυγος of the Supreme Father [l. τοῦ βυθοῦ instead of τοῦ βάθου] and mother of all his emanations is here called) is silent concerning what she is unable to utter of the Mysteries of the Inexpressible (τοῦ ἀῤῥήτου); but what she has comprehended that she declares to be incomprehensible (προσηγόρευσεν: the change proposed by Bernays προσαγορεύουσιν is unnecessary). But when the reserved and unapproachable Nature of the Father makes itself approachable, in order to His being comprehended by the Sigé, then (according to Theodotus) suffering enters into the Pleroma. In this way the Father Himself becomes capable of sympathy, for sympathy is a fellow-feeling for the suffering of another, and is therefore itself suffering (§ 30). Through the suffering of the Twelfth Aeon, the Sophia, suffering finds an entrance into the whole Pleroma, which according to them [l. κατ' αὐτούς] suffers in order to restore its suffering member. As afterwards this suffering of the Sophia is communicated to Jesus coming down for her help, and to the pneumatic σπέρματα taken up by Him, so are the Aeons also chastened by the same suffering and suffer too. The Sophia desired to comprehend that which lies beyond Gnosis (comprehension), and so involved herself in ignorance and formlessness (ἐν ἀγνωσίᾳ καὶ ἀμορφίᾳ ἐγένετο). And thus the Aeons themselves have learned that they exist by the grace of the Father, who Himself is ὄνομα ἀνωνόμαστον, and μόρφη and γνῶσις [l. ὅτι εἰσὶν χάριτι τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὅ ς ἐ σ τ ι ν ὄνομα ἀνωνόμαστον, μορφὴ καὶ γνῶσις]. In this way also the Pleroma regains its unity, each Aeon being possessed of its Pleroma, *i. e.* its σύζυγος (l. with Bernays τὴν σύζυγον), §§ 30–32.

The Sophia who has suffered for her longing after forbidden knowledge by a fall from the Pleroma, causes Christus to emanate from her own Ἔννοια (*i. e.* her remembrance of the higher world), as (so Theodotos calls him) an Image of the Pleroma. For not having emanated like the perfect Aeons from a Syzygy, but from the Sophia only, Christus is Himself, like the later offspring of the Sophia, a mere image (εἰκών). But being of pneumatic nature, he leaves this lower alien world, and mounts up to the Pleroma, where he mingles [l. ἐκράθη] with the rest of the Aeons, and specially with the Paraclete; and as the elect one and first born of this lower world is established as the Son, or receives the name of Son. Sophia seized with longing for the departed one, produces the Ἄρχων τῆς Οἰκονομίας, the Demiurge, or Topos, formed after the type of Christus, or (as is also said) after the type of the Father of all, or (as is said again) after the image of the Monogenes (cf. § 7). Being derived from the πάθος τῆς ἐπιθυμίας, he is of a lower psychical essence (διὸ καὶ ἥττων γίνεται, ὡς ἂν ἐκ πάθους τῆς ἐπιθυμίας συνεστώς). The mother herself, seeing his abruptness (τὴν ἀποτομίαν αὐτοῦ), is filled with dislike of this her offspring (§§ 31–33). To this production of the Demiurge and of the whole lower world must probably refer the observation (§ 31) that Sophia in her state of ignorance and formlessness produced a κένωμα γνώσεως, a mere σκιὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος (that is of the name of the Son). Who is meant by ὄνομα here, called also υἱός and μόρφη τῶν αἰώνων, is not quite clear; one naturally thinks first of the Christus, who is said to have emanated from the Sophia along with the σκιά, which is left behind in the κένωμα (cf. Iren. i. 11, 1). But more probably we should understand the Monogenes who gives form to the Aeons by imparting the Gnosis to them, and whose Name (ὄνομα) Christus as υἱόθετος receives (cf. § 26). The following words (§ 31) are also obscure: οὗτος τὸ κατάμερος ὄνομα τῶν αἰώνων ἀμέλει ἐστὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος. Bernays' conjectural reading: οὗτος τοι κατάπλεος ὢν ὄνομα κ.τ.λ. is certainly not the right one. Perhaps we should read οὕτως and explain it thus: even as the υἱός (as ὄνομα) is the μορφὴ τῶν αἰώνων, so the ὄνομα κατὰ μέρος τῶν αἰώνων (the special name belonging to each individual Aeon), is in fact τοῦ ὀνόματος, *i. e.* partakes of the ὄνομα.

From beneath the throne of Topos proceeds a stream of fire, which flows into the vacuum (τὸ κενὸν) of creation. This is Gehenna, which, though from the beginning of creation fire has flowed into it, is never full. Topos himself is fiery, and therefore hides his countenance behind a veil, that the sight of it may not destroy all things. The ἀρχάγγελος only, *i.e.* Jesus goes into his presence, as a type of which the high priest entered once a year within the veil (§ 38). Besides the Demiurge and the δεξιαὶ δυνάμεις (the Psychici), Sophia also produces left hand powers (the Hylici), which are left to be shapen by the Demiurge or Topos (§ 34; cf. Iren. i. 11, 1. The reading πρῶται cannot possibly be right). The Demiurge forms this lower world from the right and from the left, *i.e.* from the Psychical and from the Hylical. At the end of the work of creation he produces Adam, who had already been begotten in thought (§ 40). From Adam proceeds a twofold human race, the δίκαιοι (the Psychici) and "the others" (the Hylici), § 37. Sophia, on the other hand, after giving birth to Christus, and being left behind by him, produces no more anything perfect. Rather she keeps

back with herself the things which she was able (to have produced). This applies not merely to the angels of the Topos, but also to the κλητοί (the Pneumatici), whereas the ἐκλεκτοί, the ἀγγελικά who proceeded from the masculine principle the Logos, had already withdrawn themselves with him (§ 39, cf. 21 and 23). Here again the text is not sound. I read: ἡ μήτηρ προβαλοῦσα τὸν Χριστὸν ὁλόκληρον καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καταλειφθεῖσα τοῦ λοιποῦ οὐκ ἔτι οὐδὲν προέβαλε ὁλόκληρον, ἀλλὰ τὰ δυνατὰ παρ' αὐτῇ κατέσχεν, ὥστε καὶ τοῦ τόπου τὰ ἀγγελικὰ καὶ τῶν κλητῶν τὰ σπέρματα αὐτὴ προβαλοῦσα παρ' αὐτῇ κατέχει, τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν τῶν ἀγγελικῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄρρενος ἔτι πρότερον προβεβλημένων.

The distinction between the ἐκλεκτοί and the κλητοί, or between the masculine and feminine spirits, is defined more closely elsewhere. According to that definition the ἐκλεκτοί are the Angelic beings (τὰ ἀγγελικά), the κλητοί called also (as by Valentinus himself) τὸ διαφέρον πνεῦμα, τὰ διαφέροντα σπέρματα, are the spirits of the Pneumatici, who in their totality make up the 'Εκκλησία. The former proceed according to one theory from the Sophia (§ 21), according to another from the "Masculine," *i.e.* from the Logos (§ 39), but so probably from him as having the Sophia for his instrument. At the creation of man, but after the formation of his psychical body by the Demiurge a σπέρμα ἀῤῥενικόν, an efflux from the ἀγγελικόν, is infused during sleep by the Logos into the chosen soul, that it may not be an ὑστέρημα (*i.e.* subjected to the influence of this lower transitory world). This σπέρμα ἀῤῥενικόν leavens through and through, that which appeared about to separate, uniting body and soul, although these had been produced by the Sophia in a divided condition. But the deep sleep of Adam was that forgetfulness of the soul which held her together with the body, so that she might not be dissolved, until the Soter had deposited in her the pneumatic seed which went on glowing as a spark (σπινθήρ) [Read with Bernays: ὕπνος δ' ἦν 'Αδὰμ ἡ λήθη τῆς ψυχῆς ἣ συνεῖχε μὴ διαλυθῆναι ἕωσπερ τὸ πνευματικὸν σπέρμα ἐνέθηκε τῇ ψυχῇ ὁ σωτήρ.] This σπέρμα was an efflux of the ἀῤῥενικόν and the ἀγγελικόν (§ 2, comp. § 3). An operation of the Logos (with mediation of Sophia) is therefore here spoken of, which precedes the earthly manifestation of Jesus. As to the fate of Adam himself, the original creation of the Demiurge, and into whom the pneumatic seed had been deposited, nothing more is here told us. But we may venture to complete the defective account here by older narratives, in this way: the terrified Demiurge makes his creature again to disappear, the masculine σπέρμα deposited in it is carried upwards into paradise, the feminine σπέρμα is taken by him (l. with Bernays ἀράμενον) and through Eve transferred to the pneumatici (§ 21). According to the other account (§ 40) the emanation of the σπέρματα τῆς ἐκκλησίας does not take place till after the production of the Demiurge, who proceeds from the Sophia immediately after the departure of Christus as a fruit of her πάθος. Seeking aid she lifts up her eyes with a prayer for light. Contemporaneously with this emanate from the mother the σπέρματα ἐκκλησίας, and from the masculine principle the angels of these σπέρματα who are destined after their complete redemption to form syzygies with them. The angels therefore pray for the σπέρματα to which they belong, because without these (pneumatic ones) they cannot hope themselves to enter the Pleroma. They form with these pneumatic souls a spiritual unity by reason of their common origin (§§ 40, 35, 36, 22). They are the angels of "these little Ones who do always behold the face of their Father," the angels of "the elect" who will share their future inheritance and perfection with them (§ 23). The διαφέροντα σπέρματα or σπέρματα ἐκκλησίας are not like πάθη with whose dissolution the σπέρματα too would be dissolved, nor like the creations produced by the Sophia, but they are as children (ὡς τέκνα), otherwise when the creation was completed they would have been completed too. And therefore have they kinship with the light which Christus first made to come forth by his supplication to the Aeons, *i.e.* with Jesus. In him all σπέρματα which with him will enter into the Pleroma, are potentially (κατὰ δύναμιν) purified; and therefore we can rightly say that the ἐκκλησία was chosen from the foundation of the world (§ 41). The process of redemption is as follows. Christus having left his mother behind and outside the Pleroma implores on her behalf the assistance of the Aeons. In accordance then with their good pleasure (εὐδοκία) Jesus in whom the fulness of the Aeons dwelleth, issues forth to be the παράκλητος of the fallen Aeon (§§ 23, 31). He is also, as messenger of all the Aeons, called λόγος, ἄγγελος and ἀρχάγγελος (§§ 25, 35, 38). Passing over the Ὅρος which separates the Pleroma from the Κένωμα, he leads with him the angels τοῦ διαφέροντος σπέρματος, in order to redeem the σπέρμα, the pneumatic souls. He himself, as descending from the Pleroma, is possessed of the λύτρωσις. But the angels receive it in baptism for our sakes, through the communication of the ὄνομα of him descending in the baptism of Jesus. In reference to this baptism of the angels is interpreted the baptism for the dead of 1 Cor. xv. 29. By the "dead" are there meant the (feminine) souls which in this world are subject to death, that is the souls of the pneumatici, by the *living* we must understand the ἄῤῥενες or the angels who have no portion in this lower world. This vicarious baptism is that called by the Marcosians λύτρωσις ἀγγελική. With this are baptised all the pneumatici destined for an ultimate union with the angels; they are baptised into the same name as that in which the angel of every single pneumaticus has been baptised, in order not to be debarred by the Ὅρος or Σταυρός from entering into the Pleroma (§ 22).

The coming down of Jesus, or the paraclete, takes place so that he assumes a pneumatic body (σαρκίον) formed by the Sophia from the pneumatic seed, or, as (with special reference to Theodotus) it is elsewhere expressed, by investing himself with the Sophia and with the ἐκκλησία τῶν σπερμάτων τῶν διαφερόντων (*i.e.* the pneumatic humanity) as with a body (§ 1, 26). This body (τὸ σαρκίον) is the visible in Jesus, the invisible being the ὄνομα, the υἱὸς μονογενής, or the Logos. So then Jesus, the ἐκκλησία and the Sophia form together a powerful and perfect κρᾶσις τῶν σωμάτων

(§ 17) analogous to the parental κρᾶσις which produces offspring, or to the mingling of a body with the earth, or of wine with water, only that here the κρᾶσις is much easier inasmuch as it is really an intermingling of spirit with spirit. Upon this body the product of Sophia and inexactly called Jesus, the ὄνομα comes down at the baptism in the form of a dove (§§ 16. 22. 26); and it must be in reference to this body that it is said that Jesus also needed the λύτρωσις in order not to be hindered by the ἔννοια τοῦ ὑστερήματος (to which He had been in a certain way subjected on His issuing from the Sophia) in His mounting upwards into the Pleroma (§ 22). [Heinrici is mistaken in referring these words to Christus.] With regard to the suffering (passion) of Jesus but few hints are given. The σπέρματα whom Jesus has taken up into Himself share in this suffering, and thereby the whole universe (τὸ ὅλον καὶ τὸ πᾶν, both the Pleroma and this lower world) is drawn into sympathy (§ 31). In his passion he gives over to His Father the Sophia with the words, Luke xxiii. 46, in order to receive her again from Him that she be not kept back by the powers of the left hand [l. with Bernays ὑπὸ τῶν ἀριστέρων δυνάμεων]. With the same words He also commends into the Father's hands the whole pneumatic seed of the elect. [By the ἐκλεκτοί here we cannot understand, as at § 23, the ἀγγελικὰ ἀῤῥενικά, but only their associates the pneumatici; and must therefore assume a variable use of terms]. The passion of Jesus is also represented as a being divided in order to the reunion of the sundered parts. As Jesus is baptised to bring about the union of the pneumatici whose feminine souls are separated from their masculine consorts the angels, so also the indivisible must be divided in order that the pneumatici may be united to their angel consorts and so we, the many being made one, may all be commingled with the One who for our sakes has been divided (§ 36). [After ἐβαπτίσατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς we must place a stop.] What we are to understand by this "being divided" predicated of Jesus will be evident if we bear in mind that it is expressly mentioned (cf. § 1) how in His passion He gives up to the Father the pneumatic elements which on coming down to earth He had received from the Sophia (and from the ἐκκλησία), and had clothed Himself therewith as with a body, and so separates Himself from them for a time in order to receive them back again and to take them up with Himself into the Pleroma. But before this can take place Jesus παρακληθείς, i.e. the σαρκίον united with the paraclete, the pneumatic man Jesus, being risen again, takes His place at the right hand of the Demiurge in order to enable the whole pneumatic seed to enter the Pleroma (§ 38). We have in Paul the Apostle a type of the paraclete, being sent forth as preacher of the Resurrection immediately after the Lord's passion. For that reason he preached the Soter in two different ways [l. καθ' ἑκάτερον] according to men's different powers of comprehension. Now, for the sake of the ἀριστεροί, he preaches Him as born and suffering (γεννητὸν καὶ παθητόν) because they can only know this Christus and fear Him κατὰ τὸν τόπον τούτων [Bernays reads μετὰ τὸν Τόπον τοῦτον]; and now, for the sake of higher minds, he preaches Him pneumatically even as He is known by the δεξιοὶ ἄγγελοι, and as born of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin, i.e. as proceeding from the pneumatic world and from the Sophia. For the Lord manifests Himself to each one in a different way.

The further details of the work of redemption are given with special reference to that pneumatic seed which is to be redeemed. The descent of Jesus takes place (according to Theodotus) with an accompaniment of ἄγγελοι τοῦ διαφέροντος σπέρματος (§ 35). The Soter awakes the soul out of sleep and fans the σπινθήρ into flame. For this reason the elect seed which is quickened into life by the Logos, is called σπινθήρ, apple of the eye, mustard seed, and leaven, which united unto faith that which seemed to be divided [l. ἑνοποιοῦσαν]. After the resurrection he breathes the Spirit into the apostles, blows away the dust like ashes, but fans the σπινθήρ into life (§§ 1, 3). The enlightenment of the pneumatic seed is referred to in John i. 9 (The "light which lighteneth every man"). The humanity here spoken of is the σπέρμα διαφέρον. His coming into the world was an adorning Himself (εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἦλθεν τουτέστιν ἑαυτὸν ἐκόσμησεν: the play on the word κόσμος is untranslatable) by putting away from Him the beclouding and commingling πάθη (§ 41). It is thus that by the coming of Jesus down to earth, the separation is accomplished between believers and unbelievers. The instrument of this separation is the cross (Σταυρός) which is the sign of Horus (Ὅρος) within the Pleroma. As Horus divides this lower world from the Pleroma, so Stauros believers from unbelievers (l. τοὺς ἀπίστους τῶν πιστῶν). By "believers" here we are not to understand, as in later teaching, the psychici, but the pneumatici, the σπέρματα διαφέροντα. These it is whom Jesus carries by the sign (the Cross) upon his shoulders and into the Pleroma. Jesus therefore is called the "shoulders" of the seed as Christus is called their "head;" and therefore is it said, "He that taketh not up his cross and followeth me is not my brother." So Jesus took up his own body (to the cross), which being of pneumatic nature was consubstantial with the church (ὁμοούσιον τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ) (§ 42). The Demiurge and his associates (οἱ δεξιοί) before the coming (παρουσία) of Jesus into the world, knew the names of Jesus and of Christus (l. τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὰ ὀνόματα) but not the power of the sign (i.e. of cross) § 43. [l. ἀλλὰ τοῦ σημείου οὐκ ᾔδεσαν φασὶ τὴν δύναμιν. With the words immediately following in the same section (§ 43) —καὶ δόντος πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατρός— begins the piece taken from the Italian school]. In order to open the way for the pneumatici into the Pleroma, Jesus after His resurrection places Himself at the right hand of Topos (the demiurge) and pacifies his fiery nature (§ 38 of Iren. i. 30, 14, where precisely the same speculation is reported of the Ophites). But the apostles take their places in the twelve zodiacal circles, because as the natural birth proceeds from the zodiac, so regeneration (or new birth) from the apostles (§ 25). Along with the pneumatic σπέρματα Sophia also is brought into the Pleroma. The feminine σπέρματα (pneumatic human souls) are

united with their masculine consorts (the angels) and so they all enter together into the Pleroma. Therefore is it said in the Egyptian gospel, "The woman is transformed into the man and the church below into angels" (§ 21). When the mother with the Son and with the σπέρματα have entered the Pleroma, then will Topos take the place which is now taken by the Mother (§ 34). The psychici (otherwise called the Righteous) taking their way through creation (l. ἐν τῷ ἐκτισμένῳ and *not* with Bernays ἐκ πίστεως) remain behind with Topos, the rest (the Hylici) remain in the dark portion of creation (ἐν τῷ τοῦ σκότου ἐκτισμένῳ) with the ἀριστεροί, and there fall into the fire (§ 37).

The preceding survey shows that in the first forty-two paragraphs or sections of Clemens's Fragments from Theodotus, we really have a well connected and consistent doctrinal system. The scattered notices in §§ 1–28 fit in tolerably well into the dogmatic whole, and there is no more reason to doubt that we have here an account of the so-called Anatolic school, as that it also gives in substance the oldest form of the Valentinian system. When therefore it is added to the Title of these "Excerpts from Theodotus and the Anatolic school," that they are κατὰ τοὺς Οὐαλεντίνου χρόνους, the addition is perfectly justifiable. It is certainly an error when the title expressly assumes that all the excerpts belong to the Anatolic school (Ἐκ τῶν Θεοδότου καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας), but this mistake is not probably to be laid to the charge of Clemens himself. It seems however likely that the combination of the later account of the doctrines of the Italian school (§§ 42–65) with that of the older Anatolic system was Clemens's own work. We may even discover how he was led to make this combination. In § 44 we are told how the Son upon his coming is received by the Sophia. She sees his likeness to the light which has left her, and hastens to meet him with joy and adoration. But when she discovers the masculine angels by whom he is accompanied, she veils herself for shame. Now the later Italian document (which reappears also in Irenaeus, i. 4, 2) referred this Light by which Sophia had been deserted, to the Aeon Christus who he emanated from the Pleroma along with Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, in order to impart to the Κάτω Σοφία a μόρφωσις κατ' οὐσίαν, and after accomplishing this work had returned into the Pleroma. After which the Soter, at the instance of Christus, comes down to Sophia accompanied by his angels (cf. Iren. i. 2, 6; 4, 5; 5, 6; 7, 1), and imparts to her a μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν (*Exc. ex Theod.* § 45, cf. Iren. i. 4, 5). Clemens explained this in the sense of the simpler account of the Anatolic school, which he had himself been giving, and referred, therefore, Christus to the Soter of the Sophia, and the ἄγγελοι to the masculine seed which after the creation had been emanated along with the feminine seed at the instance of the Logos. But herein he made the serious mistake of overlooking that the Christus of the older school was a quite different character and performed a quite different part from the Christus of the later school. Again, whereas according to the first account *the work of redemption begins* with the descent of Jesus, the μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν (imparted to the lower Sophia) is, according to the second account, the *commencement of creation* (the elements of the universe being formed out of her πάθη separated and transmuted into earthly substances) and *the work of redemption* takes place *much later*. We must indeed allow that the obscure character of the latter account shows plainly that it is derived from an older and simpler source. According to Irenaeus (i. 4, 1; cf. 4, 5) the μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν imparted by the Soter to the lower Sophia, is preceded by the μόρφωσις κατ' οὐσίαν imparted to her by the Aeon Christus. It is however hard to say how these two μορφώσεις are to be distinguished the one from the other when the whole process of the world's formation from the πάθη of Sophia is said to proceed from the μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν.

The historical development of the Valentinian doctrine can be traced out with only approximate certainty, and in any case only imperfectly. The roots of the system are to be found in the old vulgar Gnosis. For even if the original dualistic foundation is repressed and concealed by a platonizing pantheism, it still gives evident tokens of its continued existence in the background. The ὕλη and "dark waters" into which the Ophitic Sophia sinks down (Iren. i. 30, 3), are here changed into the κένωμα or ὑστέρημα, which in antithesis to the πλήρωμα is simply an equivalent for the Platonic μὴ ὄν. But yet more when the Universe is no sooner formed than it divided itself into a right and a left, a psychical half, and a hylical. a demiurge and a cosmocrator, the dualistic foundation is no less evident than in the somewhat differently turned Ophitic doctrine which makes Jaldabaoth generate the Ophiomorphos by mirroring himself in the dregs of the ὕλη (Iren. i. 30, 5). The same is the case when the Demiurge is described as a θεὸς πύρινος (*Exc. ex Theod.* § 38, cf. *Philos.* vi. 32, p. 191, and compare what is said of the so-called Docetæ *Philos.* viii. 9, p. 265), which is not only a reminiscence of a well-known Old Testament representation, but also of the doctrines of the Syrian Gnosis. Compare, more especially, the teaching of Apelles concerning the ἄγγελος πύρινος, the "igneus praeses mali," who is now distinguished from and now identified with the God of the Jews (Tertullian, *de Carne Christi*, 8; *de Anima*, 23; *Philos.* vii. 38, p. 259). This original dualism appears also in the theories of later Valentinians, as in the piece contained in the *Dialog. de recta fide*, and erroneously ascribed to Valentinus himself.

The Valentinian doctrine of emanations is also of Oriental origin. If indeed we might venture to reckon Bardesanes himself among the Valentinians, the investigation into points of connection between them and the Ophitic gnosis might be carried much further. But the statement found in the *Philosophumena* (vi. 35), that Bardesanes was one of the heads of the Anatolic School is not confirmed by a comparison with other accounts. Yet, undoubtedly, the antithesis of a masculine and a feminine principle, which is perpetually recurring in the syzygies of the Valentinian Pleroma, and in ever varying forms, as also the notion of πληρώματα in contradistinction to εἰκόνες, indicates a connection with the ideas and conceptions of Aramaic paganism. From the Syrian gnosis moreover are derived

the Ἄνθρωπος προών, the names Ἀχαμώθ, Ἰαώ (Iren. i. 4, 1; 21, 3), and probably also the Aramaic formulae for prayer and conjuration which are found among Marcosians and other Valentinians. Valentinus, on the other hand, appears to have been the first who, under the influence of Platonic philosophy, found in the old Cosmogonic Myths a new and philosophic meaning. The mythical personages of the Valentinian Pleroma present the history of mind or spirit, which breaking forth from the primal silence of the hidden ground of all being in the form of the creative thought and will proceeds from its hiding-place to revelation. This self-development of the infinite appears to bring it under finite conditions of πάθος or suffering, which affect even the highest Pleroma, and threaten to destroy the primal harmony, unless the individual Aeons, in whom the infinite powers of spirit distribute themselves, can be once more established in their original order, and each restrained within his own limits. The same process which within the Pleroma is brought to rest by the action of Horus (Ὅρος, limit-maker) repeats itself at the lower stages and developments of existence. In the troubles of Sophia we find represented the history of the soul, which having forsaken her original home, and so lost her proper rank and purity, is visited now with innumerable sufferings, pangs of grief and unstilled longings, till deliverance is finally vouchsafed her from above. The origin of this Valentinian Sophia is also to be found in the Syrian gnosis. [SOPHIA.] She is here described as the overflow of light which the mother of life can no longer retain, the beam bursting forth on "the left side," which (like the light sparks of Saturninus' Pleroma) becomes the principle of all life and all formation in the ὕλη. With Valentinus also the Sophia appears as the formative principle in the visible universe: but with this old cosmogonic conception we find the platonic thoughts combined of the soul's fall, of her punitive suffering, of her reminiscences of the long lost home, and her final return thither.

Valentinus himself as well as the older Anatolic school represented in the excerpts of Clemens Alexandrinus knows but one Sophia, the twelfth (or thirtieth) Aeon of whose Fall and consequent sufferings the whole of this mundane creation is the issue. The same conception meets us again in the older source made use of by Hippolytus in the Syntagma, in Marcus (Iren. i. 18, 4; cf. 15, 3; 16, 1, 2; 17, 1; but otherwise 1, 16, 3) as well as in the second account given by Irenaeus (i. 2, 3). According to this last, Sophia after attempting the impossible gave birth after the manner of a woman, to an οὐσία ἄμορφος, on beholding which she is seized with fear and sorrow, with horror and despair, and strives in every way to hide what has happened. She turns at length to the Father in her penitent sorrow, and all the other Aeons make intercession for her. Meanwhile from the passions of Sophia (her ἄγνοια, λύπη, φόβος and ἔκπληξις) the material world is formed. The οὐσία ἄμορφος here is certainly not the lower Sophia, but the formless after-birth, the σκιά, which remains behind with the mother, when Christus her son, born in reminiscence of the higher world, has mounted up to the Pleroma.

The distinction made of a twofold Sophia, is the most important alteration in the original system taken in hand by a certain part of the Valentinian school. We are expressly informed of this doctrine as taught by Secundus, one of the oldest disciples of Valentinus (Iren. i. 11, 2), but elsewhere we find it only in documents of the Italian school. The Irenaeus' main account from source A relates first the history of the last Aeon Sophia. In overweening desire for immediate communion with the all-perfect Father, she separates herself from her σύζυγος, falls into a state of suffering, and would have been wholly dissolved in her longing if Horus had not delivered her from her suffering, reintroduced her into the Pleroma, and reunited her to her σύζυγος (Iren. i. 2, 2, cf. 2, 4; 3, 3). The purification of Sophia by Horus is thereby accomplished that her Ἐνθύμησις (Desire), together with the πάθος that has come upon her (σὺν τῷ ἐπιγινομένῳ πάθει), is separated from her (2, 4; 4, 1). This Ἐνθύμησις of the ἄνω Σοφία is the Ἀχαμώθ or κάτω Σοφία. It is described here, as in the doctrine of the ἔνιοι (2, 3), with which however this account is not otherwise to be confounded, as a formless being (ἄμορφος καὶ ἀνείδεος). It is indeed still of pneumatic essence and endowed with a certain natural longing after the upper world (the Αἰών), but, being unable to comprehend anything, it is formless, a mere weak feminine offspring, an ἔκτρωμα (compare also *Philos.* vi. 31, p. 188 sq.). Outside the region of light and the Pleroma she is driven about by an irresistible fire in plaees of shadow and emptiness (l. ἐν σκιᾶς καὶ κενώματος τόποις, cf. *Excerpt. ex Theod.* § 31), till the upper Christus takes pity upon her and imparts to her the μόρφωσις κατ' οὐσίαν (2, 4; 4, 1). Although this μόρφωσις κατ' οὐσίαν is expressly contrasted by Irenaeus with the μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν which has not yet taken place, it nevertheless from his own account appears to have consisted in an impartation of knowledge to Achamoth. Not till the upper Christus has again left her, does she come to the knowledge of her suffering and of her separation from the Pleroma, and is filled with longing after the better world, of which, since the coming of the Christus, a fragrant savour had remained with her. But her endeavour to mount upwards into the Pleroma finds a bar in the action of Horus, who keeps her back with the magical utterance Iao. Now then more than ever feeling herself left alone outside the Pleroma is she laid hold of by all manner of sufferings, sorrow, fear, desperation, ignorance, but also for the first time with an ἑτέρα διάθεσις of penitent conversion (ἐπιστροφή) to the Giver of Life. While then her mother (the first Sophia) obtains deliverance (ἑτεροίωσις τῶν πάθων) she (the ἔξω Σοφία) has experience of the opposite. From her πάθη issues this lower world. From her ἐπιστροφή comes the soul of the world (ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ κόσμου) and of the Demiurge, from her φόβος and λύπη the rest, from her tears the watery particles, from her smile the substance of light, from her λύπη and ἀπορία the corporeal elements of the universe (4, 1, 2).

This formation of the Universe is further designated as an opening of the μήτρα of Achamoth (3, 3).

The further process of the world's formation is depicted by Irenaeus from two accounts which supplement each other, the first that which he has been using hitherto (source A), a document of the Ptolemaic school; the second (source C) the writing used by Clemens also (*Excerpt. ex Theod.* §§ 43–65). The account given by C is the basis of what is found in Irenaeus from 4, 5 to 5, 5, but is frequently interrupted by insertions from A. Most of the account is given twice in different words and with slight modifications in detail. This is the case with the origination of the Demiurge, the formation of the Psychici and Hylici from the πάθη of the Sophia, the psychical Christus of the Demiurge, the constituent parts of the Soter who descends for the work of Redemption, and the like. Common to both accounts is it that the *μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν* of Achamoth or her deliverance from her πάθη is effected by the Soter or Paraclete, who on the intercession of Christus is sent forth from the Pleroma and with a company of his angels descends to her. From the psychical substance he forms the Demiurge, or the Hebdomad over which Achamoth as Ogdoad sits enthroned; from the hylical substance proceed the πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας, the Cosmocrator or Devil and the demons. (Following source A, Iren. 5, 1; following source C, *Exc. ex Theodot.* §§ 43–46 = Iren. 4, 5 down to *δεδημιουργηκέναι φάσκουσι* and 5, 2–3). We have here an echo of the old Ophite doctrine, the Demiurge appearing as a limited Being who knows of nothing higher than himself, but the Cosmocrator as an evil spirit who is possessed of that knowledge (Iren. 5, 4, cf. 30, 5). The formation of the various constituents of this lower world out of the πάθη of Achamoth is the work of the Demiurge acting as an instrument of the Sophia, while imagining that He himself is the Highest. The further details are with some insignificant modifications the same in both accounts (following source A Iren. 4, 2; 5, 1; following source C, *Exc. ex Theodot.* §§ 47–49 = Iren. 5, 4, where an interpolation from A repeatedly breaks the connexion). To the three original elements of the Universe, the Pneumatic, the Psychic, and the Hylic Elements, corresponds a threefold race of human beings, one by nature capable of salvation, another endowed with freedom of will, and a third by nature devoted to destruction. These three races or kinds of human beings are represented by the three sons of Adam, Seth, Abel, Cain (from A, Iren. 6, 1, 2; from C, *Exc. ex Theod.* §§ 50–57 = Iren. 5, 5; 7, 5). The pneumatic seed is secretly sown by the Sophia in the soul of Adam (*Exc. ex Theod.* § 53) and the masculine angels watch over the *σπέρματα* (*ibid.*). But in the main source A the origination of pneumatic souls from the impregnation of the Sophia by the Angels of the Soter is given with more detail. (Iren. 4, 5, last sentence; 5, 1; 6.) Essentially the same form of doctrine is that presented in the *Philosophumena* (vi. 31–34, pp. 188–192).

The doctrine of redemption is curiously modified in the Italian system. The older teaching of a Christus, son of the Sophia, who forsakes his mother in order to ascend into the Pleroma is attributed besides to Valentinus himself (Iren. 11, 1) and the Anatolic school, to Marcus also, according to whom Christus receives the place of the xiith Aeon within the Pleroma (Iren. 15, 3; see Hilgenfeld's remarks upon it, *l. c.* p. 374). But according to the source A, as used by Irenaeus, the new Syzygy of Christus and Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον takes the place of Christus, son of Sophia, having emanated from the Monogenes (the Νοῦς and Ἀλήθεια), after the restoration of the Upper Sophia, and the separation of Achamoth. According to the yet younger form which the doctrine takes in the *Philosophumena* the number of thirty Aeons is first made up by this fifteenth Syzygy (*Philos.* vi. 31, p. 188). The only peculiarity seems to be that in the account given by Irenaeus (from source A) the same functions are ascribed to the Aeon Christus as to the Ὅρος. He confirms and establishes the Aeons by teaching them the Law of Syzygy, and shewing them the impossibility of their knowing the Father, whereas the Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, on the other hand, teaches them how to thank and praise the Father of all (Iren. 2, 5, 6). It seems here evident that the new form in which Christus here appears is not part of the original arrangement of the system, and does not well fit in with it. This higher Christus it is, as we have seen, who imparts to the lower Sophia the *μόρφωσις κατ' οὐσίαν*, and immediately after returns into the Pleroma (Iren. 4, 1). Why the Christus leaves Achamoth so quickly after a half-accomplished work of Redemption can only be explained by supposing a transformation of the original doctrine. The *μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν* and the deliverance from the πάθη is imparted to the Achamoth through Soter, the Paraclete, or Jesus, who appears here also issuing forth as the common Product of the whole Pleroma. (From source A, Iren. 2, 6; 3, 1, 2, 4; 5, 1; from C, *Exc. ex Theodot.* §§ 43–45 = Iren. 4, 5). He is the general Framer of the Universe, who has formed all things δυνάμει; in his work he makes use of Achamoth and of the psychical Demiurge without his knowledge. (From source A, Iren. 5, 1; from C, *Exc. ex Theodot.* § 47 = Iren. 4, 5.) And so the pneumatic seed to which Achamoth gives birth is derived from the angels of the Soter, and comes down at his instance into the lower world (see above).

In this form of doctrine also it is the Soter, who at the end of all things comes down once more, to bring in the universal Redemption. But, whereas, according to Anatolic doctrine, he descends to earth invested with the Sophia and Ἐκκλησία as with a pneumatic body, so here he unites on coming down both psychical and pneumatic elements, being obliged to assume the firstfruits of all which he is minded to redeem. Thus from the Achamoth and from Ἐκκλησία, he takes the pneumatic elements and adds them to his own pneumatic essence, i.e. the ὄνομα, and from the Demiurge he takes the psychical. He unites himself with the psychical Christus of the Demiurge, and assumes ἀπὸ τῆς Οἰκονομίας a psychical body which has been prepared with exquisite art, in order to be seen and touched, and capable of suffering. Only from the ὕλη, which in itself is incapable of redemption, he assumes nothing. His descent on the psychical Christus takes place at the baptism; at the passion he is deserted, not only by the Soter, but also by the pneumatic element received from Achamoth (from source C, *Exc. ex Theod.* §§ 58–61). In the two accounts

given by Irenaeus, 6, 1, and 7, 2, the relation of the sources is not quite clear. As 7, 1 is derived from C, it would seem that the transition to A takes place at the words εἰσὶ δὲ λέγοντες. But this is not a suitable form of expression to denote his main source; and besides this, the points of contact with the excerpts are greater in 7, 2 than in 6, 1.

The notion of a psychical Christus who passes through Mary as water through a conduit (Iren. 7, 2), is to be found everywhere in the Italic school (*Philos.* vi. 35, p. 194 sq.). It assumes that the Demiurge who has fore-announced this his own Messiah by the Law and by the Prophets (cf. *Exc. ex Theodot.* § 59; Iren. 7, 2) is only a limited and not in any way a hostile Being. This last notion however is not peculiar to the Italian school. Among the Marcosians also we meet with the ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας, or the σωτὴρ ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας, who is also called the φαινόμενος Ἰησοῦς, on whom at his Baptism the Χριστός descends. The generation of this ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας, and his birth from Mary, is the work of Powers flowing forth in a wonderful manner from the Upper Tetrad. The place of the Logos is taken by the Angel Gabriel, that of Ζωή by the Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, that of Ἄνθρωπος by the δύναμις τοῦ ὑψίστου, that of Ἐκκλησία by the Virgin Mary (Iren. 15, 3, cf. 14, 6). The δύναμις τοῦ ὑψίστου is understood to mean the Demiurge in the Italian account as it appears in Pseudorigenes (*Philos.* vi. 35, p. 194; cf. *Exc. ex Theod.* § 60), but it is not made out that the Marcosians shared this view. Heracleon, on the other hand, makes the expression ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ refer to the imperfect and passible, and therefore psychical Body of the Redeemer (ap. Origen. in Ioann. tom. viii. 38).

Apart from this one point of difference the further process of the Work of Redemption is represented in the accounts which have come to us from the Italian school with the same features essentially as in those of the Anatolic school. During the Passion of the psychical Christus, the Soter withdraws himself from the σῶμα to give room for Death asserting its power. But the Body having died, and so Death having exercised its power over it [l. κρατήσαντος αὐτοῦ] the Soter sends down a ray of *his* power and drives away Death [read with Bernays ἀπήλασε] awakens the Body, and abolishes its πάθη (*Exc. ex Theod.* § 61). The psychical Christus takes then his place after the Resurrection at the Right Hand of the Demiurge (just as Jesus in the Anatolic doctrine) and there will remain till the end of the World (*Exc. ex Theodot.* § 62). In this interval the Pneumatici find rest along with their Mother in the Ogdoad, and wear till their perfecting their (psychic) souls as wedding garments: the other faithful souls (the Psychici) find their place along with the Demiurge. At the end of the World the Mother ascends up into the Pleroma along with her Pneumatici. She is there wedded with the Soter as her σύζυγος, and the Pneumatici with their Angels as Brides with their Bridegrooms. And so the great Marriage Supper is celebrated in the Marriage Chamber within the ὅρος. The Pneumatici obtain the vision of the Father, and having themselves become rational Aeons, they are now admitted to the rational and everlasting marriage joys of the celestial Syzygy. The Demiurge along with the faithful psychici moves up into the Ogdoad, and takes the place which the Mother has vacated. He is the guest who has been made ἀρχιτρίκλινος at the wedding banquet, the conductor of the Bride, the friend of the Bridegroom who stands without and rejoices when he hears the Bridegroom's voice (*Exc. ex Theod.* §§ 61–65. In § 63 a comma should be put after μητρί and ἐχόντων be read instead of ἔχοντες; in § 64 read πατρός instead of πνεύματος). Essentially the same are the accounts given by Irenaeus (from source A, 7, 4; 5; from C, 7, [illegible]), and in the *Philosophumena* (vi. 36, p. 195 sq.).

The doctrinal system contained in source A is, as we have already observed, that of the Ptolemaic school with which the account in source C is in thorough agreement. But the writing also made use of by Hippolytus, or whoever was the author of the *Philosophumena*, represents the Italian type of doctrine. If we except the differences already noted in the doctrine of the Aeons, and some other differences in terminology which have also been already mentioned, it differs from the sources A and C in only a few non-essential particulars. The Fragments of Heracleon moreover agree with the *Philosophumena* in all main points (cf. Hilgenfeld, *l. c.* pp. 472–505, for the proofs of this statement).

Compared with the older Anatolic Valentinianism, the Italian exhibits a richer and more developed Mythology. The sufferings of the lower Sophia are at bottom a mere repetition of those of the upper Sophia, the part played by the higher Christus is a copy of that of Horus. The Christology is also more artificially constructed. The oldest form of doctrine preserved by Marcus appears to have taught quite simply that Christus Son of Sophia, after mounting upwards into the Pleroma came down at his Baptism on the wondrously formed σάρκιον (product of the Sophia and Ἐκκλησία), the Man Jesus. The Anatolic doctrine which Irenaeus or his authority (Justin) here ascribes to Valentinus himself (*Haer.* i. 11, 1) already attributed the Work of Redemption no longer to Christus himself, but to the Soter, who at his request had been sent forth as a common fruit of the whole Pleroma, and who descended on Jesus, i.e. on the σάρκιον. The Italian school distinguished more clearly a threefold Christus: first the Aeon Christus, σύζυγος of Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, who emanated after the establishment of the Upper Sophia; second, the Soter, who is also called Christus, and was emanated as the common fruit of the Pleroma; third and last the psychic Christus of the Demiurge with whom Soter unites himself at his Baptism.

The centre of gravity of the whole system lies undoubtedly in its speculative interests. The names alone of the thirty Aeons are a proof of this. It deserves notice that the designations Νοῦς and Μονογενής applied to the first masculine principle emanating from the supreme Father do not seem to have been used by Valentinus himself. It was called simply Πατήρ or Ἄνθρωπος (υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου). Discussions like those of the Anatolic school (as reported by Clemens, *Exc. ex Theod.* §§ 6, 7) concerning the emanation of the Μονογενής from the Supreme

Father minister to that philosophical tendency which seeks to solve the old old question of the origination of all existence from primeval silence, by means of the "Eternal Thought." It is a genuinely speculative feature when, as here (*l.c.*), the knowledge of the Father through the Son is derived from a union of the Spirit of Love with the Spirit of Knowledge. Related to this is the theoretical exposition attributed by Irenaeus to the "Scientiores circa Ptolemaeum" (12, 1). According to this Bythos had two consorts, Ἔννοια and Θέλημα, from whom proceeded the Syzygy of Μονογενής and Ἀλήθεια. Then in the first place he conceived the thought of the emanations, and afterwards made the resolve to carry it out. The unknown authority in Pseudorigenes (the *Philosophumena*) makes love once more the final cause of the emanation of the Pleroma from the Fore-Father in his lonesomeness, with the beautiful words: ἀγάπη ἦν ὅλος, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγάπη, ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ τὸ ἠγαπημένον (*Phil.* vi. 29, p. 185).

In view of the origin of the doctrine of Valentinus, concerning the Aeons which we have found to be in the cosmogonic and astral powers of the old Syrian Gnosis, one cannot doubt that the Aeons were originally thought of as mythological personages and not as personified notions, although Tertullian (*adv. Valentin.* 4) would refer the former view to Ptolemaeus, and not Valentinus as its first author. The original form of the doctrine, therefore, is that which gives Σιγή or Ἔννοια to Βυθός as his consort. Another mode of conception regards the first principle as both male and female (hermaphrodite), even as the masculine and feminine members of the Syzygies of the Pleroma are again sometimes regarded as bisexual (Cf. Iren. 11, 5, with 1, 1 and Epiph. xxxi. 5). Just as in the religious systems of Hither Asia, might the Syzygy of the masculine and feminine principle coalesce in a bisexual being, without the original conception being abandoned. It has, on the other hand, a quite different signification when the first principle is raised above all sexual antithesis. So reports Irenaeus repeatedly (2, 4; 11, 5; cf. Epiph. xxxii. 7) concerning a portion of the Valentinians. According to them, the Father is above male and above female, or as it is said in the second passage οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἄζυγον λέγουσι μήτε ἄρρενα μήτε θήλειαν μήτε ὅλως ὄντα τι. Here, then, the Platonic or Pythagorean Monas takes the place of the bisexual First Principle. This form of doctrine is presented in the *Philosophumena* in contradiction to the older authorities as the proper doctrine of Valentinus and his disciples Heracleon and Ptolemaeus. The ἀρχὴ τῶν πάντων is here described as μονὰς ἀγέννητος, ἄφθαρτος, ἀκατάληπτος, ἀπερινόητος, γόνιμος (vi. 29, p. 184 sq.). Here, then, we have the speculative question concerning the Absolute answered in a similar way, as by the Basilidians, and as also by the Alexandrine fathers of the church, that, namely, the Absolute is the simple Monad, the One, raised above all quality and definition. Still more clearly appears the Pythagorean notion of the Μονάς in the teaching of that ἄλλος ἐπιφανὴς διδάσκαλος αὐτῶν, who is mentioned in the ancient source followed by Irenaeus in *Haer.* i. 11. According to him the highest principle is the μονότης, which is further designated as προαρχὴ προανεννόητος, ἄρρητός τε καὶ ἀκατονόμαστος. Along with this μονότης subsists another δύναμις, the ἑνότης. Both δυνάμεις are one. From them proceeds, even because they emanate nothing, the μονάς, an ἀρχὴ νοητὴ ἀγέννητός τε καὶ ἀόρατος. Along with the μονάς subsists a δύναμις co-essential with it, τὸ ἕν. We have then here the Pythagorean Tetractys, and from this all the other Aeons are supposed to emanate (Iren. i. 11, 3). The same exact doctrine reappears in the teaching of Marcus, who is probably the "illustrious teacher" alluded to (xv. 1). The Pythagoreism of the system has here degenerated into a symbolism of numbers, and letters spun out into infinity.

Others make an Ogdoad to precede Bythus, as the πρώτη καὶ ἀρχέγονος ὀγδοάς, whose single members represent the idea of the primal and unfathomable Being on all its sides: the first Tetrad is προαρχὴ ἀνεννόητος, ἄρρητος, ἀόρατος, the second is ἀρχὴ ἀκατάληπτος, ἀνονόμαστος, ἀγέννητος (Iren. i. 11, 5). How much this purely philosophical questioning occupied the school is evident from what Irenaeus tells us of those who would be more knowing than they. These do not make the first Ogdoad come forth by degrees, one Syzygy after another, but the προβολή of the three first pairs of Aeons from the Προπάτωρ and Ἔννοια takes place at one and the same moment. What the Fore-Father thought within Himself to emit (ἐνενοήθη προβαλεῖν) was hence called Father; because it was true, it was called Ἀλήθεια; because He willed to reveal Himself, it was called Ἄνθρωπος: and they whom He foreknew before causing them to emanate were called Ἐκκλησία. The man (Ἄνθρωπος) spake the word (τὸν λόγον)—which is, therefore, his only-begotten Son; the Logos, moreover, was followed by the Life. And thus the first Ogdoad was completed (Iren. i. 12, 3; ap. Epiph. xxxv. 1, where this party is called Kolarbasianians).

With the notion of the Syzygy Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία, as preceding that of Λόγος and Ζωή, is to be compared the order in which the unknown source made use of by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 5) reckons up the lists of the Aeons. Differently again the authority made use of in the *Philosophumena* makes Νοῦς and Ἀλήθεια the source from whence first Logos and Zoë, and then ten other Aeons proceed; from Logos and Zoë proceed again Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία, and after them twelve other Aeons (*Philos.* vi. 29 sq. p. 186 sq.). Of like sort is the controversial question mentioned by Irenaeus (i. 12, 4)—whether the Soter draws his origin from the twelve emanations which proceeded from Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία, or from the ten derived from Logos and Zoë, or whether merely from Χριστός and Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον. However unimportant such difference may appear, their explanation is to be found in the lively speculative interest which attached itself in Gnostic minds to the various forms of the inner divine life, and its various manifestations in the Pleroma. Secundus, himself the oldest of all Valentinus' disciples, set up a doctrine of his own concerning the relations of the different Aeons one to another. So in the first Ogdoad itself, he distinguished a Tetras δεξιά and a τετρὰς ἀριστερά, and called the one φῶς, the other σκότος (Iren. 11, 2, cf. Pseudo-tertull. 13). It is, indeed, quite possible that this statement, as it stands, is founded on error.

and one may venture to conjecture that what Secundus really meant was to distinguish an upper and a lower Tetrad, one within, the other outside the divine Pleroma. In this case his system of doctrine would approach very nearly to the old Syrian Dualism. But this is a point on which we can no longer decide with certainty.

A yet more widely different conception of the Valentinian doctrine of Aeons is found in the Fragment given by Epiphanius (xxxi. 5–6). Here, too, the speculative interest is manifest in the endeavour to follow up in detail the process of the emanation of individual Aeons within the Pleroma from the **Αὐτοπάτωρ**. But the whole description, bathed as it is in sensuous warmth, with its peculiar plays with numbers and its barbarous names for individual Aeons, appears to be merely a degenerate Marcosian form of Gnosis.

Finally, we have a quite peculiar transformation of the Valentinian system in the doctrine of the so-called Docetae, as preserved in the *Philosophumena* (viii. 8–11). From the **πρῶτος θεός** who is small as the seed of a fig-tree but infinite in power, proceed first of all three Aeons, which by the perfect number ten enlarge themselves to thirty Aeons; from these again proceed innumerable other bisexual Aeons. From these proceed an infinite multiplicity of Ideas, of which those of the third Aeon are expressed and shapen in the lower world of darkness as **φωτειναὶ χαρακτῆρες**. To prevent a further robbery of Light, the third Aeon forms a wall of partition between the upper and lower world. After his form the **πυροειδὴς θεός** comes into existence as the Creator of this lower world, having for his essence, Light changed into Fire. He holds in his keeping the sparks of light which have been congealed into souls, and compels them to transmigrate from one dark body into another, and exercises violence over them till the Soter appears, and puts an end to their transmigrations. For the formation of the Soter all the Aeons meet together in the middle Aeon, and so form a product of equal power with that of the fig-tree seed. The great task set before him in his work of Redemption is to bring back all the sparks of light which have sunk down into the material world, or all the Ideas which have congealed into human souls, to that particular Aeon from which each has originally proceeded. In order to become the Redeemer of all, he clothes himself with the ideas of all the Aeons; last of all the soul thus produced puts on a clothing of σάρξ, taken from the lower World of Darkness. The process of this Incarnation is precisely that described in the Gospel. When the Demiurge nails his own creature, the σάρξ, to the cross, the ψυχὴ of the σωτὴρ puts off this σάρξ, and clothes himself again, in order not to be found naked, with the σῶμα, which at his Baptism had been formed in the water to take the place of that σάρξ. Each soul comprehends that Jesus, who corresponds to her own nature, whom the eternal Monogenes has taken from the eternal places, and therewith clothed himself. And this is why so many sects or parties (αἱρέσεις) seek Jesus with contention, who is really kin to them all, and appears to each otherwise according to the different places in the spirit-world to which each belongs. Each party regards *that* Jesus who is its own kinsman and fellow-citizen as the only true one, and all the others as spurious. Those whose nature is derived from the inferior places in the spirit-world, are unable to discover these Ideas of the Saviour, which are above them, while the higher natures from the middle Decad, and the noblest Ogdoad, perceive and know Jesus, not only **ἐκ μέρους** but entire, and for that reason only are the perfect ones, while all others have only a partial knowledge.

The Platonic foundation of the Valentinian system is very perceptible in this its last offshoot though mixed up in a peculiar way with Oriental Dualism. At the same time these Docetae endeavour to reduce the metaphysical distinctions which they maintain, to merely gradual ones. No part of Christendom therefore is entirely excluded from the knowledge of the Redeemer, and participation in His Redemption: all, even those of the lower grades of the spirit-world, participate at least **ἐκ μέρους** in the Truth. The way in which all, and each according to his measure, attain to the knowledge of the truth, is, as in the Doctrine of the Church, *Faith*. Since the Redeemer's advent—so we read expressly—"Faith is announced for the Forgiveness of sins."

Beside working out philosophical problems, the disciples of Valentinus were much occupied with the endeavour to find traces of their Master's doctrine in Holy Scripture. The Excerpts of Clemens and abundant notices in Irenaeus give us information as to an allegorical method of scriptural exposition pursued with great zeal in the Valentinian schools. It is not limited to the Gospels or the Pauline Epistles but extends to the Old Testament, and attaches special significance to the history of creation in the book of Genesis. Valentinian expositors shew a special preference for the Gospel of St. John, and above all for its Prologue. Of those allegorical expositions have been preserved some belonging to the Anatolic school (*Exc. ex Theod.* §§ 6, 7) and others derived from Ptolemaeus (Iren. i. 8, 5). But before all we must make mention of the labours of Heracleon, of which Origen has preserved numerous specimens. From Heracleon proceeded the first known commentary on St. John's Gospel.

VI. *Literature.* — Valentinus occupies a distinguished place in all works on Gnosticism; so, after still older writers, in the works of Neander, Baur, Matter, Lipsius, Möller (*Geschichte der Kosmologie in der Christlichen Kirche*), and Mansel (*The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries*—a posthumous work, edited by Bishop Lightfoot); as well as in the Prolegomena of Harvey's edition of Irenaeus. The best Monograph is that by Heinrici (*die Valentinianische Gnosis und die Heilige Schrift*, Berlin, 1851), with which may be compared the Review by Lipsius (*Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*, 1873, pp. 174–186). The latest inquiries are those set forth by Hilgenfeld in two papers, in his *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (1880, pp. 280–300; 1883, pp. 356–360), and in his "*Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*," Leipzig, 1884 (pp. 283–316; 335–384; 461–522; 546–550). Compare also the Articles in this dictionary on Bardesanes, Colorbasus, Heracleon, Marcus, Ptolemaeus. [R. A. L.]

VALENTINUS (2), a bishop mentioned by Sulpicius Severus as in company with St. Martin when he was visiting Chartres. On a little dumb girl being brought by her father to the saint for cure, the father's prayer was supported by Valentinus and by Victricius, another bishop who was with them, and St. Martin complied (Sulp. Sev. *Dial.* iii. 2 in *Pat. Lat.* xx. 213). Valentinus is believed to have been bishop of Chartres c. 390, and Victricius, bishop of Rouen (Tillem. x. 333; *Gall. Chr.* viii. 1094). [C. H.]

VALENTINUS (3), a layman, in high official position at Constantinople, friendly to Chrysostom. Three letters of Chrysostom's to him are extant (*Epp.* 41, 116, 217). [E. V.]

VALENTINUS (4), bishop of Baiana, or Vaiana, a place of unknown site in Numidia, respected by the Donatists, who wished that their case might be heard in his presence at Ravenna, A.D. 406. (Aug. *Ep.* 88, 10.) He also joined in a letter to the Donatists, from the bishops assembled at Zerta, about the charge of partiality at the conference brought against Marcellinus the President. (*Ep.* 141.) He was present at the conference A.D. 411 (*Carth. Coll.* i. 57, 99), and also at the Council of Mileum A.D. 416, and at that of Carthage, A.D. 419, by which time he had become primate of Numidia, after the death of Silvanus. (*Ep.* 176, 182; Bruns, *Conc.* i. 156.) [URBANUS (of Sicca); XANTHIPPUS.] [H. W. P.]

VALENTINUS (5), abbat of a monastery at Adrumetum or Hadrumetum, capital of Byzacene. (*Dict. of Geog.* i. 1024). The troubles which disturbed this monastery A.D. 426 or 427, are briefly described above [FELIX (189) and FLORUS (12) Vol. II. 500, 546.] In his letter to St. Augustine Valentinus explains their origin, describes the restoration of peace, and begs his prayers for the welfare of the house, and his advice as to its regulation. (Aug. *Ep.* 214, 215, 216.) [H. W. P.]

VALENTINUS (6), abbat of St. Andrew's at Rome [VALENTIUS].

VALENTINUS (7), abbat, had allowed women to frequent his monastery, and also permitted his monks to be sponsors with women. Gregory the Great wrote to him in A.D. 594 forbidding both practices. He was perhaps the same as the priest Valentinus, who complained to Gregory the Great that monks of his monastery, whom he had excommunicated, fled to the diocese of Spoleto, and were allowed to receive communion there. He also complained that one of two slaves whom a deacon had manumitted on condition of their becoming monks in his monastery had left it. (*Epp.* iv. 42, ix. 37.) [F. D.]

VALENTIO (1), May 25, martyr with Pasicrates at Dorostorum (Silistria). He suffered under a president Maximus in the Diocletian persecution. His name occurs in the acts of Julius, *AA. Sincera*, ed. Ruinart, p. 616. These acts are plainly genuine according to the tests laid down by Le Blant, *Actes des Martyrs*, p. 121, and elsewhere in that work. The acts of Julius mention that Julius, when about to die, was asked by Hesychius, another soldier, to salute from him Valentio and Pasicrates, who had already suffered. [G. T. S.]

VALENTIO (2), bishop in Numidia. Crisconius, bishop of an adjoining see, complained to Gregory the Great that he had arbitrarily joined certain parishes of Crisconius's diocese to his own, and that he had also appropriated the property of Crisconius's predecessor. These complaints were referred by Gregory the Great to bishops Victor and Columbus for investigation, and, if proved, for redress. (*Epp.* viii. 28.) [F. D.]

VALENTIUS (VALENTIO, VALENTINUS), abbat, first of a monastery in the province of Valeria, and afterwards of Gregory the Great's own monastery at Rome, while Gregory the Great was a monk there, is his authority for the story of the sheep-stealer miraculously stopped as he passed a priest's grave, and for that of the two monks who were hanged by the Lombards, whose souls were heard singing after their murder. (*Dial.* i. 4, iii. 22, iv. 21.) He is commemorated on March 14th. [F. D.]

VALERIA (1), Ap. 28. [VITALIS (1).]

VALERIA (2), Christian daughter of Diocletian, compelled by her father to sacrifice to the gods (Lactant. *Mort. Persec.* cap. 15). She became the wife of the emperor Galerius, and in her widowhood was sought in marriage by Maximinus Daia. On her refusal to marry him she was banished, together with her mother Prisca (39, 40). After wandering for some time they were both apprehended at Thessalonica and put to death by order of Licinius (50, 51), their bodies being cast into the sea. (Tillem. v. 7, 24, 117, 180; A. J. Mason, *Persec. of Diocl.* 40, 121, &c.) [C. H.]

VALERIA FALCONIA PROBA. [FALCONIA.]

VALERIANA, martyr with Victoria and Fidentius, a bishop. They seem to have been numbered among the twenty martyrs who had a church at Hippo, whom Augustine praises in *Serm.* 325. August. in his *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8, tells a story of the effects of prayer to these twenty martyrs. [FLORENTIUS (2)]. [G. T. S.]

VALERIANUS (1), C. PUBLIUS LICINIUS, emperor, belonged to a noble family. He was born probably about A.D. 190, and filled all the offices of the state in regular succession. In A.D. 237 he was princeps senatus, and as such received the embassy from Africa, announcing the elevation of the Gordians to the empire (Vita *Gord.* c. 9). When Decius, shortly before his death, revived the office of censor [DECIUS], the senate, to whom the election had been left, unanimously chose Valerian, who was then in Thrace with the emperor.] He prudently declined so invidious an office, and the death of Decius, which followed immediately afterwards, put an end to the project. When Gallus heard that Aemilianus had been proclaimed emperor by the army in Moesia, he despatched Valerian to Gaul and Germany to collect troops (A.D. 253). Before the close of that year, Valerian was proclaimed emperor by the legions of Rhaetia and Noricum and associated his son Gallienus with him in that dignity. Meanwhile Aemilianus had marched on Italy, and Gallus and his son had been slain at Terni by their own troops, who went over to

their rival. This happened probably in February or March A.D. 254. Valerian then crossed the Alps, Aemilianus in his turn was slain by his soldiers at Spoleto (or, according to Victor, *de Caes.* c. 31, died of disease) three months after the death of Gallus, and in June or July Valerian was recognized as sole emperor, the senate also ratifying the elevation of Gallienus to the empire (Victor, *de Caes.* c. 32).[a]

The reigns of Valerian and his son were the most disastrous period in the history of Rome down to the time of Honorius. The empire seemed on the verge of dissolution. Not only was every frontier menaced by barbarian attacks, but even the interior provinces were invaded and ravaged. A German host entered Italy itself, and penetrated as far as Ravenna. The Franks, who now first appear under this name in history, assailed the Rhine frontier, and notwithstanding the efforts of Gallienus, who was sent there to command in person, forced a passage at several points, and after ravaging Gaul invaded Spain, where they stormed and sacked the capital Tarragona, and even Africa suffered from their attacks. In the West the Goths and their kindred tribes poured across the Danube into Illyricum and Macedonia. The great city of Thessalonica was besieged, and was with difficulty saved by the gallant defence of the inhabitants. The walls of Athens were rebuilt by the terrified citizens, and the Isthmus of Corinth fortified. The Boians, Goths, Carpi, and Burgundians, obtaining vessels from the inhabitants of the Crimea, ravaged the coasts of the Euxine. Trebizond was taken by them, probably in A.D. 259, and in the following year Bithynia was invaded, and Nicomedia, Nicaea, and Prusa were taken and burnt. Cyzicus was saved only by a freshet in the Rhyndacus. The Persians took Nisibis and Carrhae, and, led by the renegade Cyriades, even penetrated into Syria and captured Antioch (? A.D. 255). Worse even than all these wars was the great plague which had begun in the reign of Decius, and which raged for fifteen years (Zon. xii. 21).

To the other calamities of the reign was added the most terrible persecution the church ever experienced, except the final one under Diocletian and his colleagues. There are some curious points of resemblance between the events that preceded these persecutions. In the early part of his reign Valerian was exceedingly favourable to the Christians, and his palace, like that of Diocletian, was filled with believers. But in A.D. 257 a terrible change took place. Valerian fell more and more under the influence of the praetorian prefect Macrianus, an Egyptian, who was chief of the "magi" of that country. The same means that were used again half a century later in Diocletian's case were employed to incense Valerian against the Christians. Macrianus persuaded the emperor to have recourse to sacrifices of children, and other abominable means of forecasting the future, and attributed the failure of these unholy rites to the presence of the Christian members of the imperial household. (Compare DIOCLETIAN, Vol. I. 835.)

Under the influence of the favourite, Valerian issued an order, commanding that those who did not belong to the religion of Rome should at least render the outward signs of conformity to it under pain of exile. By the same edict, Christians were forbidden, under pain of death, to assemble for worship, or to enter their cemeteries. The cases of St. Cyprian (*Acta Procons.* c. 1, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* iii. 1499) and St. Dionysius of Alexandria (Eus. *H. E.* vii. 11) shew how uniform the procedure was under this edict. St. Cyprian was apparently the first to suffer in Africa, and the date of his exile (August A.D. 257) shews when the persecution began. His sentence was simple banishment, but a great number of African bishops, priests, and deacons, besides some of the laity, were sent to the mines, where they endured great hardships (S. Cypr. *Epp.* 77, 78, 79, 80 in *Patr. Lat.* iv. 414).

This edict was followed in A.D. 258 by a rescript of tremendous severity from Valerian, who, in the interval, had probably set out to the East to take the command against the Persians. (In the early part of the year he had held a council of war at Byzantium [Vopiscus, *Vit. Aureliani*, 13].) The punishment for the clergy of every grade—bishops, priests, and deacons—was death. Apparently in their case even recantation was unavailing. Senators, viri egregii, and knights were punished with degradation and confiscation of property. Death was the punishment if they refused to recant. Noble ladies were to forfeit their property and be exiled. Members of the imperial household suffered a similar forfeiture, and were to be sent in chains to work on the imperial possessions. It is remarkable that no mention is made of Christians in general, but only the clergy and the higher classes of the laity are included. The emperor's policy was apparently to strike at the leaders. The first victim of this rescript was pope Xystus. On August 6th he was found, in violation of the first edict, in a subterranean oratory in the cemetery of Praetextatus, and was put to death as he sat in his episcopal chair. Four of his deacons suffered with him. This was the beginning of a violent persecution at Rome (Cypr. *Ep.* 82) in which our days later the famous St. Lawrence followed his master. The news was brought to Cyprian by the messengers he had sent to Rome, who also informed him of the terms of the rescript, and that letters of similar purport had been sent by the emperor to the *praesides* of the provinces. Cyprian calmly awaited his fate, which was not long delayed. He was beheaded on September 14th. Both in Rome and Africa a great number of Christians suffered the fate of their leaders. The best proof of the violence of the persecution is the long vacancies of the sees of Rome and Carthage. The former remained vacant more than eleven months till the July after the death of Xystus, and the latter probably about the same time. In Spain, Fructuosus the bishop of Tarragona, with two of his deacons, were burnt alive in the amphitheatre (Jan. 21, A.D. 259). In Palestine the names of three martyrs are preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 12) who came before the governor and declared themselves Christians.

[a] The accounts of these events are exceedingly meagre and conflicting. The deaths of Gallus and Aemilianus and the elevation of Valerian are often placed in A.D. 253. The narrative in the text is based on Eckhel's dissertation, *Doctrina Numorum*, vii. 361.

A woman who was a follower of Marcion shared their fate.

But the reign of Valerian was not destined to be of long duration. Dionysius regards his persecution as lasting the forty-two months mentioned in the Apocalypse. After the council of Constantinople he had hastened to the East, and busied himself in rebuilding and restoring Antioch, which had suffered much from the Persians. At the news of the Gothic invasion of Bithynia, he marched into Cappadocia, but again retreated, either on account of the departure of the Goths, the Persian invasion, or the state of his army, in which the plague had broken out. His campaign against Sapor, the scene of which was the neighbourhood of Edessa, was disastrous. He found himself, it was said, through the treachery of Macrianus, in such a position that he could neither fight nor fly. He was taken prisoner, and passed the rest of his life in a miserable captivity, embittered by the insults of the Persian king. The most probable date of his capture is late in A.D. 260. How long he lived in captivity is unknown. Indeed the order of events throughout his reign is very doubtful, and the dates of nearly all of them are uncertain. Gallienus, immediately after his father's captivity, put a stop to the persecution, but it probably lasted in the East till the fall of Macrianus, who on Valerian's captivity had assumed the purple in A.D. 262. (Zos. i. 28–36; Zon. xii. 22, 23; Bernhardt, *Geschichte Roms von Valerian;* Tillemont, *Emp.* iii., *M.E.* iv. 1; Victor, *de Caes.* 32; *Epit.* 32; the life of Valerian in the Augustan history; Gibbon, c. 10, 16.) [F. D.]

VALERIANUS (2), Sept. 15, martyr with Marcellus, near Lyons, towards the close of 2nd cent. Their acts are rejected by Ruinart, though their fame is celebrated by Gregorius Turonensis (*de Gloria, MM.* lib. i. cap. 53, 54). [G. T. S.]

VALERIANUS (3) husband of St. Caecilia. For the story of his martyrdom (commemorated April 14) see Vol. I. p. 365. Here may be added the ingenious explanation given by the late bishop Fitzgerald, how St. Caecilia came to be regarded as the patron of music. Her Acts relate that although she had dedicated herself to a life of virginity she consented, in compliance with the urgency of her family, to go through the ceremony of marriage with Valerianus. She is described as steeling her heart against all the allurements to sensual pleasure on the occasion of the wedding festivities, and among these, special mention is made of the "symphonia instrumentorum" to which she refused to hearken; but "organis cantantibus die nuptiarum" she made melody in her heart to God, saying, "may my heart and body be undefiled." The necessities of the pictorial art demanded that each saint should be depicted with an appropriate symbol by which the spectator might recognise what saint was intended. Bishop Fitzgerald thought that as St. Lawrence was represented with his gridiron and St. Catherine with her wheel, so St. Caecilia was represented in early pictures with the organ prominent in her Acts; and that she was thence imagined to be a musician by those who did not understand that she was only represented with an organ in the same way that other saints are depicted with the instrument of torture by which they suffered.

We may certainly believe that Dryden's "drew an angel down" had its origin in a misunderstanding of pictures. The Acts relate that on her wedding night she told Valerianus that she was under the protection of an angel who would punish him if he did not respect her chastity, and whom he could see for himself if he would be baptised. This no doubt is the angel who appears in pictures of St. Caecilia, and there is no ground for the idea that the angel came down to listen to her music.

The Acts of St. Caecilia have been recently studied by Erbes (*Zeitschrift f. Kirchengeschichte,* ix. 1), who has given good reason for thinking that they are not earlier than the end of the 5th century. They not only exhibit a use of St. Augustine's work on the Trinity which appeared in A.D. 416, but coincidences in language, as well as in substance, make it probable that the whole story of Caecilia is derived from the story of Martinianus and Maxima told by Victor Vitensis I. 30. This would bring down the date of the Acts to about A.D. 490. The name of Caecilia is not found in earlier lists of Roman martyrs. Erbes remarks that the original day of commemoration of St. Caecilia was Sept. 16: the day Nov. 22 really commemorates the dedication of the church of St. Caecilia, which probably took place under Sixtus III. between 434 and 440. Erbes ingeniously supports the opinion that this, and not the church of St. Mary in Trastevere, was the church which as Lampridius tells (in his life of Alexander Severus, c. 49) was adjudged by that emperor to the Christians, in opposition to the rival claim of the Company of Victuallers, who desired to make a tavern of it. Concerning the neighbourhood of the burial-place of St. Caecilia in the catacombs to that of certain popes, Erbes holds that in the year 236 a suitable burial-place was being prepared for the body of Pontianus, then brought from Sardinia, as well as for that of Anteros who had died in Rome, that the site was furnished by the Caecilian family, and that in order to make room for the two bishops the body of Caecilia was moved to an adjacent side chamber. How Caecilia suffered martyrdom or whether she was a martyr at all, we have no authentic information. [G. S.]

VALERIANUS (4), ST., bishop of Aquileia, is first mentioned as present at the council of Rome in A.D. 371. (Theodoret, *H. E.* ii. 17.) He presided also at the council held in A.D. 381 in his own city against the Arian bishops Palladius and Secundinus, but took hardly any part in the discussion, in which St. Ambrose was the leader on the Catholic side. (*Gesta Conc. Aq.* in *Ambrosii Op.* ii. 786 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xvi. 9, 16.) He was also at the council of Rome in the following year (Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 9.) The date of his death is uncertain. He is commemorated on Nov. 27. But little is known of his life, but under his rule there grew up at Aquileia the society of remarkable persons, of whom Hieronymus became the most famous [HIERONYMUS (4), Vol. III. 30], and which he describes in his Chronicle (A.D. 378) as a company of the blessed. [F. D.]

VALERIANUS (5), addressed by Eucherius in a long letter on contempt of the world, the date of which is about A.D. 428. (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* iv. 711.) [G. W. D.]

VALERIANUS (6), bishop of Iconium, addressed by Cyril (*Ep.* 50 al. 44) in censure of the Nestorians. [C. H.]

VALERIANUS (7), ST., bishop of Cemele, thought to have been the Valerius, monk of Lérins, who was honoured as a bishop at Nice on July 24th. He is probably the Valerianus who subscribed at the council of Riez in 439 (Mansi, v. 1196), the Valerianus who occurs among the Gallic bishops in the letters which passed between them and pope Leo the Great in 450, 451, 452 (Leo, *Epp.* 66, 99, 102 in *Pat. Lat.* liv. 884, 966, 984), and the Valerianus present at the council of Arles under Ravennius in 455, supporting FAUSTUS (11) of Riez (Mansi, vii. 907). Under pope Leo the bishoprics of Cemele and Nice were united, and it seems likely that this was done while Valerianus held the see of Cemele (*Gall. Chr.* iii. 1271). He was the author of *Homiliae XX.* and *Epistola ad Monachos* (Galland. *Bibl.* t. x.; *Pat. Lat.* lii. 691). The first of his homilies, *De Bono Disciplinae*, was long ascribed to St. Augustine, and printed among his writings. On the strength of some expressions in his eleventh homily he has been acccused of semi-pelagianism, but Theophilus Raynaud has vindicated him in a treatise, *Apologia pro Valeriano*, accompanying the bishop's works. (Cave, i. 427; Ceillier, viii. 444, 605, x. 154; Dupin, i. 485, ed. 1723; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 328.) Migne's edition includes a *Vita* from Galland. [G. W. D.]

VALERIANUS (8), patrician, to whom pope Pelagius writes about PAULINUS of Aquileia and the other schismatic bishops of Istria and Venetia. The letter is almost identical word for word with those numbered 4 and 2 to Narses. (Pelagius, *Epp.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxix. 413, 397, 394.) Another fragment has been published by Theiner. (*Disq.* 203.) [F. D.]

VALERIANUS (9), advocate at Rome, father-in-law of Ammonius, who afterwards became a monk in Gregory the Great's monastery. (*Dial.* iv. 26.) [F. D.]

VALERIUS (1) (VALERIANUS), June 14, martyr with Rufinus at Soissons, in 287. Their *Passio* was composed in the ninth century by Paschasius Radbert. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Jun. ii. 284; Paschas. Radb. ed. Sirmond in *Pat. Lat.* cxx. 1489; Ceill. xii. 545.) Guérin (*Les Petits Boll.* vii. 5) mentions several small places near the Vesle in the diocese of Soissons as under their patronage. [C. H.]

VALERIUS (2), ST., I., first certain bishop of Saragossa and confessor, was arrested and brought to Valencia with his archdeacon, the famous ST. VINCENT, by order of DACIANUS, the praeses, probably in A.D. 304. After a long and rigorous imprisonment they were summoned before the praeses, and ordered to offer libations to the gods. Valerius, as he had an impediment in his speech, left the reply to St. Vincent. The praeses, enraged at St. Vincent's answer, sent Valerius into exile. Valerius was afterwards at the council of Elvira in May (?) A.D. 306. He is commemorated on Jan. 28 (*AA. SS.* Jan. ii. 394, 834; *Esp. Sag.* xxx. 101; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 21). [F. D.]

VALERIUS (3), vicar of Africa. [VERINUS.]

VALERIUS (4), a bishop addressed by Firmus, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia (*Ep.* 38 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxvii. 1507). [C. H.]

VALERIUS (5), bishop of Melza, a place mentioned by Pliny, and called by Ptolemy Meldita, in Proconsular Africa, between Tabraca and the river Bagradas (Plin. *H. N.* v. 4, 30 Ptol. iv. 3. 31) present at the council of Bagaia A.D. 394 (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 19 §§ 22, 53 § 59, iv. 4 § 5, *c. Gaud.* ii. 7, 7.) [H. W. P.]

VALERIUS (6), bishop of Hippo R. predecessor of Augustine, whom he had admitted to the priesthood at the earnest desire of the people, against Augustine's wish, expressed in a letter to Valerius, but in answer, as Valerius thought, to his own prayers. (Aug. *Ep.* 21; Possidius, *Vit. Aug.* 4, 5.) Contrary to African usage, but in accordance with that of the Eastern Church, Valerius caused Augustine to preach in his presence when he himself became unable to do so. When Valerius felt his own infirmities increase, fearful lest so able a man should be caught up to fill some other see, he sought and obtained the consent of the other bishops, but at first not that of Megalius of Calama, primate of Numidia, to ordain Augustine as a coadjutor to himself, contrary to the usual practice of the church, and to the express wish of Augustine, who refused on this ground to accept the office, though, as he said afterwards, he was not then aware of the canon of the council of Nicaea, that there should not be two bishops in the same place. (Conc. Nic. *can.* 8, Bruns, *Conc.* p. 16; Aug. *c. Petil* iii. 16, § 19, *c. Cresc.* iv. 64, § 79; *Brevic. Coll.* iii. 7, § 9.) But his objection was overruled by the earnest desire of all concerned, and by the instances adduced of similar practice, both in Africa and elsewhere (Aug. *Ep.* 31, 4; 213, 4.) Valerius, better acquainted with Greek than with Latin, was rejoiced to have one so able as Augustine, to teach and preach in the Latin language. He is spoken of in the highest terms by Augustine, by Possidius and by Paulinus of Nola. (Aug. *Ep.* 31, 4, 32; Possid. *Vit. Aug.* 5; Paulinus, *Ep.* 5.) After Augustine's appointment, Valerius gave him a piece of land for his monastery. (Aug. *Serm.* 355, 1, 2.) He died A.D. 396. (Aug. *Ep.* 33, 4.) A Donatist, Proculeianus, was bishop of that sect in Hippo during his lifetime. (Aug. *Ep.* 33; PROCULEIANUS.) [H. W. P.]

VALERIUS (7), count of Africa, a firm upholder of Catholic truth against heretical attack, who wrote to St. Augustine three letters, in return for which Augustine sent him the first book of his work *de Concupiscentia et gratia*. (Aug. *Ep.* 200.) Valerius had adopted the rule of conjugal continence, and of this Augustine expressed high approval. This was about A.D. 418 or 419. To this book Julian of Eclana replied in four books, in which he accused Augustine of denying the divine institution of marriage; and

of this work some one sent extracts to Valerius who was then at Ravenna, who caused them to be sent by Alypius to Augustine, in order that he might reply to them, which he did in his second book, about A.D. 423. The entire book by Julian was sent to Augustine by Claudius. (*Ep.* 207, 224; *c. duas Ep. Pelag.* i. 5, 9; *Retract.* ii. 53, 62.) On another occasion Augustine wrote to Valerius commending to him a bishop named Felix. (*Ep.* 206; *De Nuptiis et Concupisc.* i. 2, 2; ii. 1, 1; *c. Jul. resp.* i. praef.) [H. W. P.]

VALERIUS (8) II., (?) bishop of Saragossa, attended the first council of Saragossa in A.D. 380. The sees of the bishops are not given, but Valerius was probably the bishop of Saragossa, as from the allusion of Prudentius (*Peristeph.* iv. 79) it appears that several bishops of Saragossa had belonged to the Valerian house, just as at Seville we find several Sabini among the bishops. He is supposed to be the Valerianus to whom Prudentius dedicated his hymn on St. Hippolytus. (*Peristeph.* xi. 2.) (*Esp. Sag.* xxx. 122; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 124.) [F. D.]

VALERIUS (9), friend of Nilus, who addressed to him a letter on the duty of forgiving. (Nili *Epp.* ii. 313.) [I. G. S.]

VALERIUS (10), a presbyter of Antioch, who, with Castus, Cyriacus, and others, supported Chrysostom's cause against the intended bishop Porphyry, and addressed together with them by Chrysostom in consolatory letters (Chrys. *Epp.* 22, 62, 66, 107, 130, 222). See CASTUS. [E. V.]

VALERIUS (11) ST., July 5, first bishop of Conserans, about the finding of whose remains by Theodorus, one of his successors, a story is told by Gregory of Tours (*Glor. Conf.* c. 84). His period is doubtful (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. ii. 227; Tillem. x. 465; *Gall. Chr.* i. 86, 1123). [J. G.]

VALERIUS (12), an abbat of the Monasterium Rufianense who lived about the year 355, and produced several treatises, which are collected in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxxvii.; cf. Ceill. xi. p. 734. He wrote the life of S. Fructuosus, founder of his monastery. [FRUCTUOSUS (10).] [G. T. S.]

VALERY, ST. [WALARICUS.]

VALGIUS, an old man whose life was preserved in a wonderful manner in a shipwreck. In consequence of his deliverance, Valgius became a Christian, and was baptized under the name of Victor. (Paulinus, *Ep.* 49, and note 197.) [H. W. P.]

VALLAGAS, a presbyter of the church of Nisibis, who accompanied Domitianus, the oeconomus of the church of Constantinople, to Rome, conveying the particulars of the judicial proceedings of Optatus, the prefect, against Olympias, Pentadia, and the other friends of Chrysostom, charged with the conflagration of the church; as well as the complaints of the inhabitants of the monasteries of Mesopotamia who were being induced by force to abandon Chrysostom and recognise Porphyrius. (Pallad. p. 28.) [E. V.]

VANDRILLE, ST. [WANDREGISILUS.]

VANNES, ST. [VITONUS.]

VARARANES, son of Isdigerdes, and king of Persia in the earlier part of 5th cent. This prince persecuted the Christians with much violence till he was overthrown by the imperial forces and compelled to desist, about A.D. [illegible] (Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 18, 20). [G. T. S.]

VARIMADUS, an Arian, against whom was written the treatise *Contra Varimodum* bearing the name of Idatius Clarus, but believed to have been written by Vigilius bishop of Tapsus, among whose works it now appears (*Pat. Lat.* lxii. 351; Ceillier, x. 483). [C. H.]

VARNACHARIUS, VARNAHARIUS (WARNAHARIUS), presbyter at Langres, c. A.D. 615. As a scholar and a man of some eminence, he was applied to by St. Ceraunus, bishop of Paris, for the acts of the three Martyrs of Langres, Speusippus, Eleusippus, and Meleusippus. He provided these, and also sent the Acts of St. Desiderius, along with a letter, commendatory of the zeal of St. Ceraunus. These Acts were probably copied by this cleric and retouched, rather than composed by him, but we can draw no exact conclusion. They were given, in an altered form, by Surius (*Vit. SS.* i. 392), but in their original form in Boll. (*AA. SS.* Jan. ii. 44 sq. and Mai v. 246 sq.) and Migne (*Pat. Lat.* lxxx. 186 sq.) [ELASIPPUS] (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 630–1; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 524–5). [J. G.]

VEAU, ST. [VENERANDUS.]

VEDASTUS (VAAST, WAAST), **ST.**, first bishop of Arras and Cambray (circ. A.D. [illegible]), assisted in the conversion of Clovis. His biography, though the text is very corrupt, is of some value as a contribution to the history of the time. Born and reared in Aquitaine, in the country between Limoges and Périgueux, he left parents and home and wandered to Toul, where apparently he was ordained a priest. Clovis passing through after his victorious battle with the Alamanni in the heat of which he had called upon Clotilda's God, being now inclined towards Christianity, heard of Vedastus as a priest leading the religious life, and carried him with him to Rheims, where he and other members of his family were baptized by St. Remigius (A.D. 496). About four years later Remigius consecrated Vedastus bishop of Arras, to help on the conversion of the Franks. In this city he found paganism supreme, and the church neglected and dilapidated. After an episcopate of about forty years, during which he converted many to Christianity and extended his efforts to Cambray, he died on Feb. 6, on which day he is commemorated, and was buried in the cathedral church. St. Dominicus is the next name both at Arras and Cambray (*Gall. Christ.* iii. 2, [illegible]). The sees remained united for some time.

Vedastus's memory has been preserved in the name of the famous abbey of Saint-Vaast, the germ of which was constituted by a little cell of planks built by himself at a spot called Nobiliacum, on the brook Le Crinchon. He had desired to be buried there, but it was not till towards the close of the 7th century that one

of his successors, St. Autbertus, removed his body from the cathedral thither, and constructed the monastery. For the history of this foundation see *Gall. Christ.* iii. 373 sqq.

The rude style of the original life displeased later ages, and Alcuin undertook to write it afresh, but his version adds nothing to our knowledge. Both are to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. i. 792 sqq., together with a metrical epitaph by the same author and a voluminous narrative of the translations of the saint's body and the miracles ascribed to it. [S. A. B.]

VENANTIUS (1), African bishop, Syn. 4 Carth. sub Cyp. A.D. 252, *de Basilide*, Cyp. *Ep.* 67; 49th suffrage in *Sent. Epp.* Syn. Carth. vii. sub Cyp. *de Bap.* iii.; bishop of Thinisa (Thinissa, Tinnisa) in Prov. Proc. between Utica and Hippo Diarrhytus; famous for its martyr Felix, on whom Augustine preaches (Morcelli). No inscriptions. He is called Confessor in the later margin. Three other bishops known up to 5th century. [E. W. B.]

VENANTIUS (2) (VENANCUS), recluse, was elder brother of Honoratus, bishop of Arles [HONORATUS (10)]. Under the influence and instruction of Honoratus, he distributed all his goods to the poor, and set out on pilgrimage with him, but in passing through Greece he died at Methona, which is supposed to be on the coast of Messenia, c. A.D. 395 (Hilar. Arel. *Sermo de Vit. Honor.* c. 2). His feast is 30 May, and his life, by an anonymous author, is given by the Bollandists (Mai vii. 236 sq., with praev. comment., and see also *ib.* Jan. ii. 382–3). [J. G.]

VENANTIUS (3), ST., abbat of a monastery at Tours, which afterwards took his name, lived in the latter half of the 5th century. He was, according to Gregory of Tours, vir magnificae sanctitatis and possessed of wonder-making powers. His tomb, which Gregory knew, was also celebrated for the cures performed at it (Greg. Tur. *Vitae Patr.* cap. xvi., *Lib. de Glor. Conf.* xv.). Venantius is commemorated Oct. 13. For his mention in the martyrologies and the history of his relics see Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. vi. 211. [S. A. B.]

VENANTIUS (4), patrician of Palermo, was in A.D. 601 addressed by Gregory the Great. (*Epp.* xii. 4, 40, xiii. 15.) [F. D.]

VENANTIUS FORTUNATUS. [FORTUNATUS (17).]

VENANTIUS (5), bishop of Perugia. [ECDESIUS (2).]

VENANTIUS (6), a patrician of Syracuse, friend of Gregory the Great, before the latter became pope, had embraced and left the monastic life, and had married a wife named Italica, by whom he had two daughters, Barbara and Antonina. One of the first cares of Gregory on becoming pope was to write to Venantius and urge him to return to the monastery. Venantius refused to comply, but Gregory continued on friendly terms with him. Venantius subsequently quarrelled with Joannes, the bishop of Syracuse, because the latter had refused his offerings, and actually used violence towards him, for which conduct Gregory reproves him. Venantius died in A.D. 602, having steadily refused to resume the monastic life, and Gregory after his death took pains to protect the interests of his orphan daughters (*Epist.* lib. i. ind. ix. 34; lib. vi. ind. xiv. 43; lib. ix. ind. ii. 123; lib. xi. ind. iv. 30, 35, 36, 78, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 486, 850, 1056, 1143, 1147, 1218). There is no authority for the title of cancellarius sometimes given to Venantius. [F. D.]

VENANTIUS (7), Roman nobleman, was anxious to procure for himself a patent of ex-consulship, and had asked Gregory the Great to exert his influence in his favour, who accordingly wrote on his behalf to Honoratus, his apocrisiarius at Constantinople. (*Epp.* ii. 53.) [F. D.]

VENANTIUS (8), bishop of Luna. Seven letters are addressed to him by Gregory the Great (lib. iv. ind. xii, 21, lib. v. ind. xiii. 3, 7, lib. viii. ind. i. 4, lib. ix. ind. ii. 29, 34, lib. x. ind. iii. 44, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 690, 723, 728, 908, 967, 969, 1102). Of these the most important are the first, directing him to enforce the law which forbade Jews to have Christian slaves, Christian coloni, however, on estates of Jews to remain as before; the second, forbidding that clergy guilty of immorality should ever be restored to their office, and the fourth, giving the conditions as to ornaments and endowment, on which Gregory allowed a church to be consecrated. Venantius is Gregory's authority for four remarkable stories in the Dialogues (iii. 9, 10, 11, iv. 53, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 233, 414). He was perhaps the bishop deputed by Gregory the Great to investigate the complaints of bishop Theodorus against DEUSDEDIT (4) (*Ep.* xiii. 30). [F. D.]

VENERANDUS (VEAU), seventh bishop of Clermont, succeeded Artemius, c. 394. He is classed with other well-known bishops in Gaul by Paulinus, a presbyter, who is cited by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* ii. c. 13), and was possibly Paulinus bishop of Nola. Venerandus died c. A.D. 423, and was buried in the church dedicated to his memory (Greg. Tur. *De Glor. Conf.* cc. 35–7 in Migne, lxxi. 855 sq.; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 229). His feast is Jan. 18 (Boll. *AA. SS.* Jan. ii. 558). [J. G.]

VENERIUS (1), bishop of Milan, to whom Aurelius bishop of Carthage in June 401, a season of dearth, recommended that an envoy should be sent to ask his assistance to the African clergy (*Cod. Can. Afr. Ecc.* num. lvi. in Hard. i. 895; Hefel. *Counc.* i. 422). An epistle written by Chrysostom to pope Innocent was addressed likewise to Venerius (Pallad. *Dial.* cap. ii. *fin.* in *Pat. Gr.* xlvii. 12). Palladius (cap. iv. p. 15) mentions his having written to Chrysostom, and among Chrysostom's letters there is one (*Ep.* 182) addressed to Venerius in 406. Venerius is also praised in a poem of Ennodius (lib. ii. carm. 79). See also Ughelli (*Ital. Sac.* iv. 47) and Cappelletti (*Le Chiese d'Ital.* xi. 109, 301). [C. H.]

VENERIUS (2), fourth bishop of Marseilles, between Proculus and St. Eustasius (circ. A.D. 428–452), is said to have been a disciple of Cassianus in his monastery of St. Victor. The rivalry of the two sees of Arles and Marseilles

was so bitter that Venerius was charged with welcoming the assassin of Proculus, archbishop of Arles, and "rejoicing at his own brother's murder." The pope Caelestinus I., in a well-known letter written in 428, refers the matter to the bishops of the provinces of Vienne and Narbonne (*Epist.* iv. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* l. 435). Venerius, however, seems to have been undisturbed, as he is one of the prelates addressed a few years later by the same pope in his letter against the Semipelagians (*Epist.* xxi. *Patr. Lat.* l. 528), and later on he was a correspondent of St. Leo, (see Leo, *Epist.* xcix. cii. ciii. *Patr. Lat.* liv. 966, 984, 988). He is said also to have sat in the council of Arles, held in 451. It was at the bidding of Venerius that Musaeus, the priest of Marseilles, composed his lectionary and treatise on the Sacraments (Gennadius, *De Scriptor. Eccl.* lxxix., *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 1103). See *Gall. Christ.* i. 634; Ricard, *Les Evêques de Marseille*, 13, 14.) [S. A. B.]

VENERIUS (3), monk. [MAXENTIUS (4), p. 867 a.]

VENERIUS (4), bishop of Vibo, in Bruttii, is addressed with other bishops by Gregory the Great in A.D. 599, and the next year, with Stephanus, is appointed by him visitor of the churches of Taurianum and Turris, sede vacante. (*Epp.* ix. 48, x. 17.) [F. D.]

VENERIUS (5), apocryphal bishop of Cagliari, to whom two spurious letters, purporting to be from Gregory the Great, are addressed. (Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.* Sp. n. 268, 269; *Sardinia Sacra*, 81.) [F. D.]

VENNIANUS, according to St. Columbanus in his letter to pope Gregory the Great (*Epp.* ix. 127), inquired of Giltas what should be done in the case of monks who, from desire of a more ascetic life, left their monasteries against their abbat's will and retired to deserts. This Giltas may be GILDAS the author. [F. D.]

VENUSTIANI. [PATERNIANI.]

VENUSTUS. Mart. Carthage A.D. 250. See ARISTO. [E. W. B.]

VERA, a lady in the family of JULIANUS (106). Jerome in a letter to him (Ep. 118 § 7, *fin.*), mentions her eminent piety as supporting her under the trials of life, and counsels him to copy her example. (Ceillier, vii. 640.) [C. H.]

VERANUS (1), ST., fourth bishop of Vence in the 5th century, was a son of St. Eucherius, the famous bishop of Lyons, and Galla. With his brother Salonius he was educated at Lérins, and their father wrote for their instruction the *Instructionum Libri duo ad Salonium*, and the *Liber Formularum spiritalis intelligentiae ad Veranum*; EUCHERIUS (1). Both of the brothers became bishops (see Gennadius, *De Scriptor. Eccl.* lxiii. lxvii.; and cf. Salvianus, *Epp.* viii. ix., *Patr. Lat.* lvii. 168, 169); but there has been considerable discussion as to Veranus's see, some having maintained that he and his brother succeeded their father at Lyons. It seems probable, however, on the evidence of an ancient martyrology of Vence and a MS. of Lérins, that he may be assigned to Vence. The question is discussed in *Gall. Christ.* iii. 1212, iv. 24, and Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. iii. 547. As bishop, whatever his see may have been, he seems to have been in the confidence of the contemporary popes. A joint letter of himself, his brother, and a third bishop, to Leo, on the subject of Eutychianism, written in 451, is to be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 887. And Leo's successor, Hilary, delegated to him the task of composing several episcopal controversies in the south of Gaul (Hilarius, *Epp.* iv. xi., *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 20, 28). It is not certain whether he is the bishop of the same name who was at the council of Arles in 475. The year of his death is unknown. His day is Sept. 10. For a former abbey of his name in the diocese, see *Gall. Christ.* iii. 1234.

Veranus may have been part author of the Dialogue on the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, in which he and his brother appear as interlocutors, though the work is usually ascribed to Salonius alone (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liii. 967 sqq.; cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 435, 436, 476–478). [S. A. B.]

VERANUS (2) (vulg. URAIN), ST., 6th bishop of Cavaillon, was a man of some consequence, being twice employed on royal missions. The first date we have is 585, when he was at the second council of Mâcon. The next year Praetextatus, bishop of Rouen, was murdered in his church at the command, as was said, of Fredegund. Veranus, with two other bishops, was sent by king Guntram to examine into the matter, and, according to Gregory of Tours, boldly defied the queen (*Hist. Franc.* viii. 31). In 587 he was chosen to baptize Childebert's son Theodoric II. (*ibid.* ix. 4), and two years later he was one of the bishops summoned to deliberate on the scandalous outbreak of the nuns of St. Radegund's convent at Poitiers (*ibid.* ix. 41, CHRODIELDIS). Veranus is commemorated on Nov. 10 and 12, and on Oct. 19, on which day the Bollandists notice him; and he is honoured as the patron saint of Cavaillon. Gregory, to whom he was personally known (*De Mirac. S. Martini*, iii. 60), speaks with great reverence of his sanctity (*Hist. Franc.* ix. 4). A biography published by Labbe (*Nov. Bibl.* ii.), and repeated by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Oct. viii. 467 sqq.), makes him a native of the Gévaudan, but this work is of a very legendary character.

In Mansi (ix. 947, 48) is a *Sententia* on the subject of chastity in priests, spoken at some synod of about 584, which is attributed to Veranus (cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 357; Ceillier, xi. 322). His body is said to have been carried in later times to Gorgeau, in the diocese of Orleans, though another opinion is that it always remained at Cavaillon. (*Gall. Christ.* i. 941; Boll. p. 461 sqq.) [S. A. B.]

VERECUNDUS (1), a citizen of Milan and teacher of grammar, an intimate friend of St. Augustine. He became a Christian, after an illness of which he died, while Augustine was at Rome. (*Conf.* ix. 3; NEBRIDIUS.) [H. W. P.]

VERECUNDUS (2) (VERGUNDUS), d. 552. He was bishop of the Civitas Juncensis in Byzacena, and was summoned to Constantinople in 549, touching the question of the "Three Chapters." He died at Chalcedon, the year before

the second council of Constantinople. In the controversy on the "Three Chapters," he seems to have acted until his death with Virgilius, defending the works in question, and joining with Virgilius in his censure on Theodore of Caesarea and Menas of Constantinople. He joined with him also, it would appear, in his withdrawal to Chalcedon, and would probably have continued to act in concert with him had their union not been terminated by his death. Some part of the adverse judgment pronounced upon him by Isidorus Hispalensis may be due to the fact that he died a defender of works afterwards condemned; the expressions of Victor of Tunnunum perhaps are rendered more favourable by the same cause. There is certainly no reason to think, as Isidorus hints, that his poem "de Poenitentia" was intended as a lament over his own past heterodoxy. It is very probable that he is identical with the presbyter Verecundus who composed a commentary on the Ecclesiastical canticles, comprehending the songs of Miriam, Moses (from Deuteronomy), Azariah, Hezekiah, Habakkuk, and Deborah, the prayer of Manasseh and the thanksgiving of Jonah. The commentary is printed in the fourth volume of the *Spicilegium Solesmense*, with other works attributed to Verecundus. It is an explanation of the canticles according to the various modes of interpretation, though these are not always all given for every verse: in fact a full statement of them seems to be the exception. The commentary shows some philosophical learning and historical knowledge, and some illustrations are drawn from his own experience. His manner of referring to the Vandal persecution in Africa and the unsettled state of affairs seems to fix the date of this work before 534, when the persecution ended. The poems attributed to him, and also published in the *Spicilegium*, are as follows: (1) *Exhortatio Poenitendi*," (2) "*De satisfactione Poenitentiae*," (3) "*Crisias*."

The first of these, by its closing lines, seems to have been the first portion of a longer poem: and it is hard to believe that the second is really the continuation of it, though from its sense it might well be so. The metre of the two is entirely distinct, that of the first being extremely rude, and regardless of the quantity of syllables, while that of the second is more nearly normal. But as Pitra points out, the first of the poems is an example of a special style of versification, illustrated also by Commodianus, and not the result of mere barbarism, rude though it seems. The spirit of the two poems is alike: in both there is expressed a strong sense of the need of repentance, and an earnest anticipation of the Judgment. But the remark of Isidorus mentioned above ("lamentabili carmine propria delicta deplorat") seems unwarranted: the poems are, in their purpose, hortatory rather than penitential. The third poem, concerning the signs of the Judgment, is probably not by the same hand. It has much more artificiality, and much less earnest distinctness than either of the others.

A "*Breviarium Concilii Chalcedonensis*" drawn up so as to favour the supporters of the "Three Chapters" is also attributed to Verecundus. It is very possibly his; such a work would be less likely to have been composed after his death than in his lifetime, when preparations were being made for a general council on the question. But it may have been composed by a more extreme partisan, and issued under his name, by one who regarded him as a confessor, and wished to obtain the influence of his reputation. Pitra prints this also in the *Spicilegium*. [H. A. W.]

VERENA, virgin, martyr with St. Ursula. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 22 Jul. v. 187.) [J. G.]

VERGILIUS MARO, a Latin grammarian of the sixth or seventh century. The fragments of his works which remain are very important, as representing the Latin when it was fast merging into the modern languages. They are written in a very provincial dialect. They also illustrate the development of rhyming Latin poetry and of mediaeval Latin. Keil, *de Grammat. quibusdam, Lat. Inf. Aet.* Erlangae, 1868, p. 5; *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad.* 1881–82, t. xcix. p. 510, contains a long article on his *Epitomae* by Huemer. [G. T. S.]

VERGUNDUS. [See VERECUNDUS.]

VERIANUS (1), African bishop, Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. A.D. 252, Cyp. *Ep.* 57. [E. W. B.]

VERIANUS (2) (VERINIANUS), a layman of Nazianzen, a friend of Gregory Nazianzen, who having received some cause of offence from his son-in-law was anxious to bring about a divorce from his daughter, a matter in which Gregory refused to aid him (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 181 al. 145; Ceill. v. 256). [E. V.]

VERIMODUS. [See DARIUS, Vol. I. 789.] [H. W. P.]

VERINA, empress, wife of LEO I., and cousin to the wife of JULIUS NEPOS (Malchus), a person of great influence during the reign of her husband's successor, her son-in-law, Zeno. (Joh. Ant. in Müller, *Frag. Hist. Gr.* iv. 210, 211, 214, and *Hermes*, vi. 326.) Suidas (*s. v.* Βηρίνη) mentions two statues of her at Constantinople, one near the church of St. Agathonicus, and one near that of St. Barbara. (Tillemont, *Emp.* vi.) [F. D.]

VERINUS (VALERIUS), vicar of Africa, A.D. 321, to whom Constantine wrote about removing the prohibition against the Donatists to carry on their worship, issued after the acquittal of Caecilianus. (Aug. *Ep.* 141, 9; *Brevic. Coll.* i. 24, 42; *ad Don. post Coll.* 33, 56.) [H. W. P.]

VERONICA (ἡ αἱμοῤῥοοῦσα), July 12, the woman whom our Lord cured of the bloody issue (Matt. ix. 20). Concerning her Eusebius tells a very curious story (*H. E.* vii. 18). "But as we have mentioned this city (Caesarea Philippi or Paneas as the Phoenicians called it) I do not think it right to pass by a narrative that also deserves to be recorded for posterity. They say that the woman who had an issue of blood, mentioned by the evangelists, and who obtained deliverance from her affliction by our Saviour, was a native of this place, and that her house is shewn in this city, and the wonderful monuments of our Saviour's benefits to her are still remaining. At the gates of her house, on an elevated stone, stands a brazen image of a woman on a bended knee, with her hands stretched out before her,

like one entreating. Opposite to this there is another image of a man erect, of the same materials, decently clad in a mantle, and stretching out his hand to the woman. Before her feet, and on the same pedestal, there is a strange plant growing which, rising as high as the hem of the brazen garment, is a kind of antidote to all kinds of diseases. This statue, they say, is a statue of Jesus Christ, and it has remained even until our times, so that we ourselves saw it whilst tarrying in that city. Nor is it to be wondered at that those of the Gentiles who were anciently benefited by our Saviour should have done these things. Since we have also seen representations of the apostles Peter and Paul, and of Christ Himself still preserved in paintings; as it is probable that, according to a practice among the Gentiles, the ancients were accustomed to pay this kind of honour indiscriminately to those who were as saviours or deliverers to them." With regard to the subsequent history of this statue the authorities are conflicting. Eusebius tells us it was there in his time. Asterius, as quoted by Photius in *Bibliotheca*, Cod. 271, p. 1508, cf. Combefis. *Auct. Nov. Biblioth.* t. i. p. 235, et 262 sq., states that Maximinus overthrew it during the persecution A.D. 308–312, while Sozomen (*H. E.* v. 20) asserts that Julian removed it, substituting instead his own statue, which a thunderbolt soon after cut in twain, hurling the head and neck to the ground, where the historian says it still remained even in his time, bearing traces of the lightning's action. The fragments of the statue of Christ, which the populace had smashed, were carefully preserved in the church. J. Malalas (*Chronograph.* x. 306–308, in *Corp. Scriptt. Hist. Byzant.*), writing in the 7th century, tells us that Haemorrhoissa petitioned Herod, the murderer of John the Baptist, for leave to erect the statue. He gives us the very words of the petition, and relates that in his time the fragments of the statue were still preserved in the local church, and that he himself had seen a copy of the petition preserved by a certain Bassus, a convert from Judaism to Christianity. Gibbon, in chap. xlix. note 7, accepts the testimony of Eusebius to the existence of the statue, which he supposes may have been inscribed τῷ Σωτῆρι, τῷ εὐεργέτῃ, but he ridicules the idea that it could have been erected in honour of the Saviour by a woman whom the Gospels describe as poor. He thinks that Beausobre more reasonably conjectures the philosopher Apollonius or the emperor Vespasian; in the latter supposition the female is a city, a province, or perhaps the queen Berenice." Round the person of this woman legendary tradition flourished during and after the 4th century. Macarius Magnesius says she was princess of Edessa, and that her name was Veronica or Berenice (Macarii Magnet. ed. Blondel, Paris, 1876; Till. *Mém.* i. 20; *Hist. des Emp.* iv. 308), following whom Baronius (*Annal.* xxxi. 75) makes her rich and noble. Pseudo-Ambrosius (Serm. xlvi. in *App. Opp.* ed. Bened. p. 454) maintains she was Martha, the sister of Lazarus, while the gospel of Nicodemus introduces her under the name of Veronica as one of the witnesses in behalf of Christ at His trial by Pilate (Thilo, *Cod. Apocryph. Novi Test.* p. 560). In addition to the authorities already mentioned there may be consulted Joan. Damasc. *de Imag. Orat.* 3; Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* vii. 3; a long and learned note in Thilo, *l. c.*; Du Cange, *s. v.*; *Acta SS.* Boll. Jul. iii. 273–279; Alban-Butler, *Lives of the Saints*; Ceillier, vi. 308.)

[G. T. S.]

VERRES, bishop of Omboe. [SILVANUS (8).]

VERSE-WRITERS. Poetry, which in its lyric form is the natural outpouring of joy and in other forms is the attempt to express in the most appropriate words the truths which underlie the world of nature and of human action, has naturally found a congenial soil in Christianity, with its message of good-will to all men and of redemption of the universe. And so poetry has struck deeper and wider notes, whether in telling of the sympathy of man with nature, or the secrets of human life, or in pouring out the soul to God in Christian times than in any previous era. This is true of one side of Christian poetry from the earliest times: the lyric poetry of popular church use from the first formed to itself new metres and new methods, and rose far above all contemporary heathen lyric. Great themes like the nature of God and the work of Christ, became at once themes for joyous praise. In other forms of poetry it is less true during the period treated of in this Dictionary. Poetry, which should be the willing handmaid, is made the slave of religion; it could complain, as the soul does to the body in Synesius, ἀντὶ δὲ θήσσας γενόμαν δούλα. The poet is too much dominated by the dogmatic or apologetic purpose which he has to serve: like St. Cyprian, Disserit, eloquitur, narrat, docet, instruit, prophetat. (Prud. *Perist.* xiii. 101.) *Nature*, which had been prominent in Hebrew poetry, falls into the background for the time before the thought of God's work in humanity. Further, the poet has to use as his instrument, languages decaying, artificial and unnatural; and so, it is not till Christianity has emancipated the modern languages of Europe that Christian poetry reaches the level of Dante, of Shakspere, of Milton, or of Wordsworth. It will be best, therefore in this article to consider first the liturgical, and afterwards the more individual poetry.

A. *Liturgical Poetry.* The example of the Jewish Church (cf. St. Matt. xxvi. 30), and the natural expression of joy at the new gifts of the Spirit, produced hymns, psalms, and spiritual songs from the earliest times in the Christian assemblies (I. Cor. xiv. 26; Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16). The Old Testament Psalter doubtless supplied the main body of such songs; but in addition to this we have the Christian Canticles in St. Luke's Gospel, and probable traces of short hymns and expressions of praise embedded in the New Testament (cf. Acts iv. 24–30; Eph. v. 14; 1 Tim. iii. 16, vi. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 11–13; Rev. iv. 8, 9, xi. 15–17, xxi. 3–8).

In the 2nd century we find frequent allusions to such hymns. Antiphonal singing, which had been practised among the Jews (cf. *Philo de Vita Contempl.* 11), had already been introduced into the church of Antioch by the time of St. Ignatius, to whom it is sometimes attributed (Socrates, vi. 8, but cf. Theodoret. ii. 24; Bishop Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, i. p. 31). On his death the church sings hymns to God

ὑμνήσαντες τὸν Θεὸν τὸν δοτῆρα τῶν ἀγάθων καὶ μακαρίσαντες τὸν ἅγιον (Martyr. *Ign.* vii.; cf. *Ign. ad Rom.* ii.), words which summarize the chief characteristics of Greek hymnody. Hymns to God for His blessings in creation (Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 13); hymns to Christ as God (*Pliny*, x. 97; cf. Euseb. iii. 33, and v. 28); hymns to the Holy Spirit (Basil, *de Sp.* § 29), form a regular part of church worship (Origen, *c. Celsum* viii. 67; Sozomen, vi. 33), whether they were taken from Holy Scripture or composed anew (Tertullian, *de Orat.* 28; *Apol.* 39).

Very few relics of this body of hymns are extant; many poets sang before their historian arose. But to this century belongs, perhaps, the lyric hymn to Christ attributed to St. Clement of Alexandria. (This is metrical, but with strophes, but was never used in worship.) Probably also the φῶς ἱλαρὸν δόξης; the morning and evening hymn, and the grace found in the Apostolical Constitutions, vii. 48, 49; hymns of a loose rhythm, without any strophes, probably modelled upon the Hebrew Psalms.

In the 3rd century the martyrs in the Thebaid meet death with psalms and hymns (Eus. viii. 9), and the prevalence of such hymns is shown by the frequent use made of them by heretics to secure acceptance for their own opinions. This was the case with the Syriac hymns of the Ophites (Origen, *c. Celsum*, vi. 31), and of Bardesanes and Harmonius (Theodoret, iv. 29; Sozomen, iii. 16): with the hymns of Nepos in Egypt (Dionysius ap. Euseb. vii. 24), and rather later with those of Apollinaris at Antioch (Soz. vi. 25), of Paul of Samosata (Eus. vii. 30), and with those of the Arians in Alexandria and Constantinople (Socrates, i. 9, vi. 8, ᾠδὰς ἀντιφώνους, Ath. *c. Arian*, i. 4). One hymn of the Naassenes is preserved in Origen (Phil. v. 1), and also some corrupt translations of the Syriac hymns of the Ophites (*c. Celsum*, vi. 31). This use caused a reaction in the Church itself, and a canon (§ 59) was passed in the council of Laodicea (A.D. circ. 350), οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ λέγεσθαι, which at least insisted that all hymns should have church sanction. It is doubtful whether we have any extant hymns of this century. The interesting παρθένιον of *Methodius*—a bright Christian song in praise of virginity, with verses sung by one leader and a refrain taken up by the whole chorus—was composed not for church use, but to be sung at a banquet. It is, however, interesting both in its metre, and in the indication it gives of a larger amount of lyric song adapted for social life (comp. Sozomen, vi. 25, who says of the songs of Apollinaris that ἄνδρες τε παρὰ τοὺς πότους καὶ ἐν ἔργοις καὶ γύναικες παρὰ τοὺς ἱστοὺς τὰ αὐτοῦ μέλη ἔψαλλον · σπουδῆς γὰρ καὶ ἀνέσεως καὶ ἑορτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πρὸς τὸν ἑκάστον καιρὸν εἰδύλλια αὐτῷ πεπόνητο, πάντα εἰς εὐλογίαν Θεοῦ τένοντα).

The church, indeed, soon recovered from the reaction caused by this use of heretical hymns. The value of orthodox hymns was soon perceived; and the fourth century became one of the chief eras of hymnody. The sufferers in the late persecutions celebrate their deliverance with hymns and psalms (Eus. ix. 1). Under Julian the Antiochenes sing psalms at once in honour of their Christian martyr, and with satire on Paganism (Socr. iii. 18). St. Chrysostom composed orthodox hymns in rivalry of the Arians at Constantinople (Socrates, vi. 8; Sozomen, viii. 8). Of these, however, none are extant. The chief product of this century are the Syriac hymns of *Ephrem*, composed on the incidents of the life of our Lord and of the chief martyrs, and though not metrical, prepared for a regularly-trained choir (Sozomen, iii. 16; Theodoret, iv. 29).

This hymnody of the Eastern Church produced a similar development in the West, of which we must speak later. Contemporaneous with it are the lyrical poems of Synesius and Gregory of Nazianzus, but none of these (except perhaps the rhythmical poem of Gregory) were ever used in church services, though those of the latter probably influenced the later writers of church hymns. As we pass into the fifth century, we gain a firmer treading. The work of the councils had stereotyped the creed of the church, so that there was less danger of innovation in doctrine. The services of the church had become popular, so that there was a greater desire for a bright and attractive ritual (cf. Euseb. x. 3). In some quarters indeed, *e.g.* in the Egyptian monasteries, any change was resented as destroying the greater simplicity of ancient times (Christ and Paranikas, pp. xxx. xxxi.), but the change was very general; and the church services were expanded. The liturgies were enriched, *e.g.* by the addition of the Cherubic hymn, said to have been inserted by the orders of Justinian, and by the end of the sixth century at least, the two chief services, mattins and evensong, were arranged very much as at the present day. Hitherto these services had consisted of three parts, the chanting of psalms, generally with antiphonal chants, the reading of Scripture, and prayers. To these was added now an elaborate system of τροπάρια. These probably originated in the short doxologies and antiphons which had been common in the liturgy, and consisted of short stanzas interspersed in different parts of the services, sometimes between the different sections of a psalm, knitting together the Old and New Covenant by praise of the Incarnation, or commemorating the acts of the saint whose festival was being celebrated. Then these were developed into regular hymns, sung apart from the psalms, and were divided musically into αὐτόμελα, προσόμοια, and ἰδιόμελα, according as they were composed for a new tune, or for one already existing, or for one which was new, and never adapted to any other hymn subsequently. They were further divided by their subject-matter or by the position in the service into various kinds, such as καθίσματα, κοντάκια, μεγαλυνάρια, ἐξαποστειλάρια, ἑώθινα, στιχηρά, ἀπόστιχα, ἀπολύτικα, Θεοτοκία. They consist of short hymns, not metrical, but with a slight rhythmical similarity, the number of syllables being generally the same in each line, and one or two syllables in each being regularly accentuated. The names of two writers of τροπάρια are mentioned in the fifth century, Anthimus and Timocles: but the earliest extant τροπάριον that can be dated is that by Justinian in the sixth century. The seventh century was the most prolific: in it wrote Sophronius of Jerusalem, Sergius archbishop of Constantinople, Syriacus, Anastasius; at the end of it should probably be placed Romanus

and though with more doubt, Anatolius († 458, Neale, p. 3), Germanus and Ephraim of Caria; and in the 8th century St. Andrew bishop of Crete. Many of the κοντάκια run to great length, and give a dramatic account of scenes in the Gospel narratives. These, perhaps, were chanted at great imperial solemnities, as well as in festival services, and may have been the origin of the mysteries of the Middle Ages, and so of the Christian drama. The 8th century, however, marks a new departure in Greek hymnody. The Iconoclastic controversy and the inroads of the barbarians had stirred men's minds and led to frequent appeals for protection to the Blessed Virgin and to the saints. The τροπάρια are developed into more regular hymns — the canons — which entirely supplant them in the services. The origin of these canons was as follows. Originally the nine Bible Canticles had been sung throughout in mattins, with a short τροπάριον attached to each; then, for sake of brevity, only the first verse of each canticle was recited, each with its τροπάριον: then the place of both canticle and τροπάριον was taken by one connected hymn, consisting properly of nine odes (though the second ode was omitted except in Lent, perhaps from the sad tone of the second canticle). Each ode consisted of several strophes, though generally it was limited to three. The substance of the hymn consisted of a praise of the fact celebrated in the festival of the day, with an address of prayer or praise to the Virgin in the last ode. Besides these long full canons sung on Sundays and the greater festivals, there were shorter canons, called according to their length διῴδια, τριῴδια, τετραῴδια, for week days, for lesser festivals and for special services such as funerals. Three of the canons of John of Damascus are metrical; but all the rest are like the τροπάρια, rhythmical and accentual, and are generally also alphabetically arranged.

The two great writers of canons in the 8th century were *John* of Damascus, author of the greater part of the canons for Sundays: and his friend *Cosmas*, bishop of Maiuma, author of the greater number of canons for the chief festivals, canons which are more directly theological and less purely poetical than those of John. This is the golden age of Greek hymnody, and these writers are called μελῳδοί, as they composed their tunes as well as the words. Later writers adopted their tunes, and so are only called ὑμνογράφοι. The chief of these are Joseph Hymnographus and Theophanes Graptus in the ninth century; less famous writers were Theodorus Studites, Methodius, Casia, Photius in the same century, and the emperors Leo and Constantine in the tenth. By this time the hymns were collected into the service books, and very few were added after this date.

The chief centres of Greek hymnody were, then, Alexandria, Constantinople, Jerusalem and the neighbouring monasteries. The chief influences to which it is indebted, are (1) the spirit of Christian joy pouring itself forth in song; (2) the Hebrew Psalter throwing this song into the form of rhythmical parallelism; (3) the Syrian hymns, especially those of Ephrem Syrus, which supplied the impulse for Acrostichs, refrains, division of lines by the quantity of syllables. The practice of *rhyme*, which at one time prevailed in Greek hymns, may have come from Arabian influence, but it never secured a strong hold on Greek poetry and soon died out; (4) the influence of classical Greek lyric poetry supplying the division into strophes, and, to a certain extent, metrical form. The characteristics which are specially peculiar to it are (*a*) the bright wealth of praise; praise of God and praise of His saints, praise especially of the Virgin and prayer to her is the chief theme, poured forth so lavishly that it has been calculated that four-fifths of the Greek service-books consist of poetry; (*b*) theological precision and fulness; the praise is always based on the great facts of the Incarnation or the nature of the Godhead and is objective rather than the expression of individual feeling; (*c*) monotony arising from a constant repetition of the same truths; (*d*) great artificiality of arrangement; the acrostich system is found as early as Methodius, perhaps due to the influence of the Hebrew Psalter, or of Syrian Christian hymns; and reaches its climax in the metrical accentual acrostich canons of John, and in the poems of Elias Syncellus, in which each line of each verse is alphabetic.

Authorities. — *Daniel.* Thesaurus Hymnologicus: J. P. Pitra, *Hymnographie de l'Eglise Grecque*, Rome, 1867 (with an interesting account of previous works); and *Analecta Sacra* vol. i. Paris, 1876; but especially Christ et Paranikas, *Anthologia Graeca Carminum Christianorum;* with excellent introduction, and a good selection of hymns (Leipzig, 1871). Interesting articles will be found in *The Christian Remembrancer*, April, 1859. "Greek Hymnology:" Dr. Smith's *Dict. Christ. Antiq.* s.v. Hymns; a short monograph on the metre by A. Thierfelder, *De Christianorum Psalmis et hymnis*, Lipsiae, 1868; Meyer, *Anfang der Lat. und Griech. rythmischen Dichtung* (Munich, 1885). *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Nov. 1881 (an excellent summary of Pitra and Christ, with an account of the general tendencies of Greek hymnody by Jacobi); and some translations of Greek hymns in J. M. Neale's *Hymns of the Eastern Church* (4th edit. by S. G. Hatherley: London, 1882); and *Chatfield's* Songs and Hymns of earliest Greek Christian Poets: London, 1876.

Latin.—In the Western Church there was an equally striking development of Christian lyric poetry, seizing upon and stirring the very heart of the church and of the individual Christian (S. Aug. *Conf.* ix. 6). As in the East this lyric is the popular poetry. The Christian hymns are "the only true Roman lyric poetry." They seize on new metres and popular methods of accentuation and of rhyming, and are far simpler and more direct in their expression than other poetry (*e.g.* contrast the directness of the hymns of Venantius Fortunatus and Sedulius with the artificiality of their poems). But historically these hymns arise at a later date than in the East, and were later in reaching their climax, many of the greatest writers falling quite outside the scope of this Dictionary. It is not until the 4th century that we find any definite notice of hymn-writers or any extant hymns. The impulse to hymnody came then from contact with the Eastern, *i.e.* probably the Syrian, church; and from the same cause which had operated

there, the desire to find an antidote to growing heretical opinions. Hilary of Poictiers, during his banishment to Asia, collected many of the Greek hymns which he found in use there, translated some of them, and probably composed some of his own, and introduced the practice of hymn-singing into the Gallican Church to check the growth of Arianism. These hymns were contained in his *Liber Hymnorum*, but this has been lost. Daniel attributes seven extant hymns to him; but Kayser only admits his authorship in the case of four ["Lucis largitor Splendide," "Deus pater ingenitus;" "In matutinis surgimus;" "Jam meta noctis transiit"]; and even these four are suspected by Ebert. Possibly, we are to attribute to him the Latinising of the Gloria in Excelsis (K. p. 32). About the same date pope Damasus more thoroughly organised psalm-singing in the services of the church, and two hymns, in honour of St. Andrew and St. Agatha, are attributed to him, but on doubtful authority. St. Ambrose is the first writer to whom any of our extant Latin hymns can with certainty be attributed. We have his own statement that he purposely wrote hymns and introduced the practice of singing them in the church at Milan in the interests of orthodoxy (*Ep.* 21), and the authority of St. Augustine for saying that this was done in conscious imitation of the Eastern Church (*Conf.* ix. 6). The same authority attributes to him the authorship of four extant hymns—"Deus Creator Omnium," "Aeterne rerum conditor," "Jam surgit hora tertia," "Veni redemptor gentium." These are all written in the same metre, and so are some thirty or forty others, which were called Ambrosiani, but it is impossible to say whether any of them are written by him or only by later imitators. Contemporaneously with St. Ambrose, we have mention of Donatist hymns in honour of Donatus (Optat. iii. 3).

In the 5th century, we have the chief Lyric poet Prudentius; but as his poems were not written for church service, being too long and too didactic for that, they will be mentioned later. Extracts were, however, adapted from them, and used both in the Roman and Spanish services. An hymnarium is ascribed to Paulinus of Nola, but nothing is known of its character.

The alphabetic hymn of Sedulius belongs to this century, and also a large number of the anonymous "hymni Ambrosiani," and other hymns which are found incorporated in breviaries and monastic rules drawn up at the beginning of the next century mainly under the influence of St. Benedict (cf. Kayser, ii. cap. 13, iii. cap. xi.). To these should be added the "Te Deum Laudamus," a hymn formed from the language of the earlier Liturgies and of the Psalms, which may with great probability be ascribed to some Gallican writer in the first half of this century (*Ch. Qu. Review*, April, 1884). This is the only early Latin hymn which is unmetrical and based upon the rough parallelism of Hebrew and Greek hymnody.

In the 6th century we have the two hymns of *Elpis*, and several by *Ennodius* (though apparently not used in church); the famous hymns of Venantius Fortunatus, "Vexilla Regis prodeunt," and "Pange lingua gloriosi;" several hymns attributed to Gregory the Great, whose name is more important, however, as the organizer of the music and psalmody of the church. Lastly, in the 7th and 8th centuries, we have a few Latin hymns written by the Northern Christians, such as Bede, and Boniface, and Alcuin, and possibly even by Charlemagne himself, if the "Veni Creator Spiritus" is to be attributed to him. The great development of accentual hymns, and of prose sequences, lies outside our scope. Up to this point the chief influences which moulded Latin hymnody are—

(i.) The influence of the Eastern Church, suggesting the practice, and perhaps supplying models for translation.

(ii.) The classical Latin lyric poetry supplying the metres, strophes, and prosody. The iambic dimeter and trochaic esp. tetrameter catalectic remain the popular metres, with rare use of sapphic.

(iii.) The exigencies of popular expression and of chanting, which gradually substitute an accentual rhythm, emphasized by rhyme and alliteration, for the classical prosody. This change took place gradually, and owing to the uncertainty of the authorship of most of the hymns, it is difficult to speak with any certainty of the exact stages in the change. Apparently St. Ambrose preserves a classical metre, with correct prosody, with no attempt at rhyme, and no attention paid to the accent; in Sedulius there is a growing tendency to rhyme, and a carefulness to avoid conflict between accent and quantity, and a more frequent hiatus; in Fortunatus both these tendencies are more strongly marked still, though St. Gregory, who is mainly modelled on St. Ambrose, falls back on the more classical prosody. By the end of this time the number of metrical hymns with classical prosody still preponderates; but the tendencies to rhyme, to leonine lines, to alliteration, have all set in, and were destined soon to gain the upper hand. Such tendencies were more in sympathy with the early tendencies of the Celtic and Teutonic races, and found expression in the vernacular hymns and poems as well as in application to Latin.

The characteristics of this Latin hymnody are—

(i.) Its objective character: like the Greek it deals mainly with the praise of God, for the facts of Redemption, and the lives of the martyrs; but far less prominence is given to the Blessed Virgin than in the Eastern Church; in Mone, vol. ii. Marienlieder, there is not one which can certainly be placed in this period. The personal tone is commoner in the later hymnody of the Middle Ages.

(ii.) Its directness and simplicity, in contrast with the profuseness and artificiality of the Greek.

(iii.) Its moralizing and hortatory character.

Authorities.—Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus;* Mone, *Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters,* Freiburg, 1853–55; Kayser, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des ältesten Kirchen-hymnen*, Paderborn, 1881–86, a clear and careful account of the history, with elaborate exegesis of the chief hymns; Ebert, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1874; Huemer, *Untersuchung über die ält. lat.-christl. Rhythmen*, Vienna, 1879; Du Méril, *Poésies populaires Latines antérieures au xii. siècle*, Paris, 1843.

3. *Syrian.*—No notice of this subject would

be complete without referring to the large mass of Syrian poetry, especially as it seems to have given the impulse and the type to much both of Greek and Latin poetry. But the present writer can only do this shortly and at second-hand. We have already seen that to the church at Antioch has been attributed the introduction of antiphonal singing in liturgical worship, and consequently that it may have had an influence both upon Greek and upon Latin hymnody. But of the details of the early Syrian hymnody, there is very little historical information. From the first three centuries A.D. we have no relics extant, except the fragments of Gnostic hymns preserved in *Ephrem Syrus*. These are attributed by him to Bardesanes, and, if so, would date from the 2nd century; but more modern critics have assigned them to Harmodius, the son of Bardesanes, or even to later writers (*Christian Biography*, Vol. I. p. 252–254). They cannot be later than the 3rd century, and their chief importance lies in the impulse which they gave to Ephrem himself. Setting himself to counteract their Gnostic tendency, Ephrem wrote orthodox hymns, and used poetry for nearly every purpose. He used it for dogmatic treatises, for controversy, for history, for the praise of saints and hermits, for the exposition of Scripture, for description of the events in our Lord's life, as well as for metrical sermons, and for hymns for the services of the church (cf. Ephrem the Syrian, *Christian Biography*, Vol. II. pp. 139–141).

This century proved indeed the golden age of Syrian poetry. In addition to the works of Ephrem there remain three hymns by *S. Symeon* of Barsabae, preserved in the Nestorian offices; short songs in praise of martyrs by Maruthas, Rabulas, and Balaeus, as well as historical poems by Balaeus and Cyrillonas. In the first half of the 5th century, Isaac of Antioch (31, Vol. III. p. 296) followed the example of Ephrem, writing historical poems on the sack of Rome, the Ludi Saeculares, the earthquake at Antioch, &c., as well as composing many hymns and metrical discourses. At the same time Simeon the Cucita composed hymns of a new kind, which gave rise to a whole class of hymns, named Cucitae, from him; like the hymni Ambrosiani from St. Ambrose in the Western Church. Indeed the chief work of this century was the formation of the office books of the Nestorians, which seem to have received their permanent shape soon after the Nestorian controversy. In them the recitation of the Psalms occupies a prominent part, and they are supplemented by hymns (teshbuchthae) and by a kind of anthem (unithae), in which each strophe is preceded by an antiphon. The chief writer of these Nestorian hymns is Narses; others are preserved from this century by Barsauma, and Abraham and John of Bethrabba. In the 6th century come the very prolific writings of Jacobus of Sarug [JACOBUS (13) Vol. III.], consisting mainly of hymns to the Saints and the Blessed Virgin and of metrical homilies; there are also hymns by the Patriarch Marabbas and by Babaeus the elder; in the 7th by George bishop of Nisibis, and by Babaeus the younger. Beyond these there are few names to record in the period which falls within this Dictionary.

Authorities.—Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*, iii.; Assemann, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*; Bickell *Conspectus Rei Syrorum literariae*, Münster, 1871 (a most clear and excellent introduction); Badger, *The Nestorians and their Rituals*, London, 1852; and J. M. Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church*. Translations of some specimens will be found in German in Zingerle, *Die heilige Muse der Syrer*, Innsbruck, 1833; and in English in Burgess, *Select Metrical Hymns of Ephrem*, London, 1853.

Individual Poetry.—1. Greek. In this section of poetry, the relative proportion of Greek to Latin poets is reversed. The number of Greek poets is comparatively few. Perhaps it was that Greek poetry was more intimately connected with religion, than Roman had been, and therefore Christian writers were slow to use it for sacred purposes. Certainly the two chief literary centres in classical times, Athens and Alexandria, remained under the power of heathenism longer than the rest of the East, and very few new poetic centres arose. But even in heathen literature, poetry holds a very small place during these centuries and scarcely rises above the play of epigram or the seriousness of didactic treatises. The chief sources of poetic inspiration had died out and it was not being rekindled, as in the West, by contact with the fresh blood of the new races of the North and West of Europe. The first impulse to use poetry as a Christian instrument, seems to have come from imitation of the Jews. These latter had been accustomed ever since their contact with the Romans, to throw their future hopes of deliverance from their persecutors, and their warnings of the certainty of judgment into the form of prophetic utterances of the Sibyl; and Christian writers imitated this practice, from the first century until the fourth, soon after which the present collection seems to have received its present form. [SIBYLLINE BOOKS.] With this exception the only extant poems of the first three centuries are the metrical hymn to Christ, found in Clement of Alexandria, and perhaps written by him; and the rhythmical acrostich poem with regular refrain which is sung by the Virgins in the *Symposium* of Methodius. In the 4th century there is a great change. Christians no longer dread the heathen associations of poetic form, but are anxious to preserve it, and not to leave charms of style only to the heathen (v. Socrates, *H. E.* iii. 16, and Gregory Nazianzen, Εἰς τὰ ἔμμετρα, *Hist. Poems*, No. 39). Two results followed upon this. First, the attempt to put parts of the Bible into the classical metres, as illustrated by the work of the two Apollinarii at Laodicea. Here, too, there was a Jewish example to follow. Before the time of Clement of Alexandria, a Jew, Ezekiel, had written a tragedy on the subject of Moses. So now, under the stress of the Julian persecution, the two Apollinarii translated the whole of the Bible into Greek classical metres or Platonic dialogues, that Christian scholars might learn at once the classical forms and the Christian truths. Of this gigantic effort the only remains are a complete translation of the Psalms in hexameters of some merit, but of rather halting rhythm. Some editors have attributed to Apollinarius the Χριστὸς πάσχων, a quasi-Euripidean tragedy, which is found in some MSS. of Gregory Nazianzen and attributed

sometimes to him; but the metrical and linguistic peculiarities point to a much later date than either, and it has recently been assigned to Theodorus Prodromus in the 12th century (J. G. Brambs, *Dissert. Inaug.* Eichstädt, 1883, and *Christus Patiens.* Leipzig, 1885). But besides this pedantic use, poetry flowed in another and more natural channel. It became the true expression of human feeling, and reached the highest point which it touches in these centuries. We may pass by the romantic story of the *Ethiopica* of Heliodorus as written before he was a Christian (Socrates, *H. E.* v. 22), but the songs of Apollinarius are said to have been popular, and sung by men and women alike at work and at festival (Sozomen, vi. 25). Two poets meet us here, each characterized by much real feeling and power of expression. The first is Gregory of Nazianzus. Influenced perhaps by the example of the Syrian poems of Ephrem, and aiming, as he himself tells us, both at consolation for himself in his trials, and also to entice those who cared for poetical form, and not to leave the graces of style in the possession of Paganism, he uses poetry for almost every possible purpose. Theological, dogmatic, and moral treatises are found in hexameters, elegiacs, and iambics; historical accounts of his life and times in hexameters and iambics; satirical epigrams in iambics; epitaphs in elegiacs, and hymns in anacreontics; while he even mixes several metres together in forming memoriae technicae on the books of the Bible, the plagues of Egypt, &c. One of his poems is to be compared with the *Abecedarius* of St. Augustine, as ignoring quantity altogether and introducing a new verse-system, based upon the number of syllables and the stress of the accent (*vide infra*). Perhaps with Gregory is to be classed his friend Amphilochius, the bishop of Iconium, if he is the author of the "graphic and effective" *Iambi ad Seleucum.* The other great name is that of Synesius of Cyrenè, "the chief for true and natural gifts of all our Greek Christian Poets." He stands quite independent of Gregory, and probably did not know of his writings, as he calls himself the first Christian poet. Of his hymns some may have been written while he was still pagan; but the later are strongly Christian. They are anacreontic in metre, Doric in dialect and in simplicity of tone, full of lyrical melody: the lavish outpouring of a philosophical spirit in praise of the One Source of life and light, with frequent prayer for protection from evil and thanksgiving for past mercies.

The 5th century saw a short revival of Greek epic poetry in Egypt, which was used either for mythological stories or for historical poems. The Christian representative of this revival is Nonnus, who, after writing the *Dionysiaca*, probably as a pagan, paraphrased the whole of St. John's Gospel in elaborate and luxuriant style, in fluent and luscious hexameters. Meanwhile Constantinople was springing into a new poetical centre: an emperor led the hymns; an empress wrote poems; and court patronage stimulated and spoilt the rising poet (cf. Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 21–22). The empress Eudocia followed the lead of Apollinarius in translating large parts of the Old Testament into Greek hexameters, as well as composing *Centones Homerici;* she also celebrated in her poems the emperor's victories and the life of St. Cyprian. The last of these, and perhaps the *Centones Homerici*, are her only extant works.

In the sixth century the only poem preserved is that of another court-poet, the description of the Church of St. Sophia by Paulus Silentiarius in hexameters, with iambic prologue. Perhaps, too, the epigrams and sonnets of Agathias should be added—if, indeed, he were a Christian.

In the seventh century another court poet, George of Pisidia, writes an historical poem on the victories of Heraclius in correct iambics, and uses the same metre for dogmatic subjects and descriptions of the lives of the saints. A few spirited anacreontic hymns in honour of the facts of Christ's life, and of the mercies of God have come down to us from Sophronius of Jerusalem and his friend Maximus, *Theologus* (No. 23). But from this time onward we find little poetry except the liturgical hymns, and a few metrical *tours de force* like the acrostich hymns of Cosmas and John of Damascus.

The Greek poetry of this period is, then, indebted partly to Jewish influences, as in the Sibylline Books and the fondness for the acrostich form; partly, perhaps, to an impulse from Syrian Christian poetry; partly to the Greek classical models. Greece Proper contributes to it no poet; but the centres round which it clusters are Asia Minor, esp. Laodicea and Nazianzus, Egypt, and, at the end of the time, almost exclusively Constantinople. The metres used are few, and almost entirely classical; but in Methodius we have a rhythmical poem in strophes, with the quantities rather freely treated, which should be compared with the somewhat similar phenomena in the Latin poems of Commodian; and in some of the hymns of Gregory the influence of the accent over the old system of quantity is beginning to assert itself. The sources of inspiration are either the desire to teach the truth, whether in dogmatic controversy (*e. g.* in Gregory, George of Pisidia, &c.), or in explanation of the facts of the Bible (Apollinarius, Eudocia, Nonnus): or the desire to win others to a true life (Gregory, Amphilochius); or the desire to commemorate the beauties of Christian Art (Paulus Silentiarius) or the victories of Christian emperors and the lives of Christian saints (Eudocia, George); or, lastly, the more personal expression of gratitude to God for His glory and His mercies (Gregory, Synesius, Sophronius, Maximus).

Authorities.—The poems will be found in the large editions mentioned below; an anthology in Alzog's *Patrologie;* an account of the poets in Cave and in Bernhardy, *Grundriss der Griechischen Literatur;* and an interesting introduction to the study of them in Mrs. Browning's *Greek Christian Poets.*

2. *Latin.*—In Latin the quantity of poetry is greater than in Greek, though the quality is not much higher; Prudentius, and possibly Paulinus of Nola and Venantius Fortunatus, being the only poets who can be ranked with Synesius and Gregory of Nazianzus. Yet it is not till the third century that we find any poetry at all. The power of paganism remained stronger in the West than in the East, and Christians were therefore more suspicious of an

art which had served the cause of their antagonists; indeed, Rome itself produced very little poetry during the whole of this period. The main centres are Gaul, Spain, the North of Italy, and Africa in the earlier part; while in the later, Ireland and Great Britain take up and continue the old classical culture; Milan, Autun, Toulouse, Marseilles, Bordeaux, Carthage, and Bangor being the chief educational centres.

The authenticity of the poems attributed to Tertullian and St. Cyprian is so doubtful, that we must probably regard the poems of Commodianus as the earliest that have survived; originating either in Africa or in Syria. If so, the first impulse to Christian poetry comes from the missionary desire to instruct the ignorant and to defend them against error. "Instructiones" and "Carmen Apologeticum" are the titles of the earliest Christian poems; "perdoctus ignaros instruo verum" the motto of the first Christian poet. It is interesting also to note that the form already marks a change from classical metres. The lines have been generally regarded as based on accent; but Meyer (*ubi infra*) seems to have shown conclusively that they are based on quantity, which is roughly observed in the middle and at the end of the lines; but with that exception both quantity and accent are ignored, the mere number of syllables being the only guide. Further, there are traces of rhyme, and of constant acrostichs (in the "Instructiones"), and lines of the "Carmen Apologeticum" are grouped in couplets. All these changes are probably due to the influences of Eastern Semitic poetry, but they all contributed to make the poem serve a didactic purpose, by making it more easy to be learnt and remembered by ignorant people. Possibly also in this century is to be placed the elegiac "De Phoenice," attributed to Lactantius, an attempt to enlist heathen mythology in the service of Christian truth.

In the 4th century, poetry takes a freer range. Christianity has gained the upper hand. It can take the measure of its antagonist and learn from it; it can venture to appreciate and to use the culture and beauty of art, and to enlist them against heathenism. The poet writes to express freely his own feelings; his poetry is to win immortality for him (Juvencus, Preface, 25–31). But the missionary spirit also remains. The attempt to keep the masses from error is seen in the *Abecedarius* of St. Augustine: a warning against Donatist error in the form of a rhythmical poem, in which the laws of quantity are entirely ignored; the lines fall into two halves of about an equal number of syllables with a similar accent at the end of each half; rhyme is observed throughout the whole poem; the strophes are alphabetical, and divided by a refrain. But the missionary spirit directs itself mainly to the educated: *they* are to be won to Christ, and to attract them the Christian poet uses the forms of classical poetry. (cf. Sedulius, *C. P. I.* 1–35). Consequently the most characteristic work of this century is to put the message of the Bible into metrical form. Spain is the scene of the earliest attempt. Thus Juvencus composes "the first Christian Epic," a continuous narrative of the Gospel story in hexameters. Probably, too, he attempted the gigantic work of translating the whole of the Old Testament history, of which fragments remain containing the first Christian lyrics in the translation of the Old Testament Canticles. Similar attempts to translate parts of the Bible were made in the poems *De Sodoma* and *De Jona*, sometimes attributed to St. Cyprian or Tertullian; and with greater freedom and dramatic power in the *De fratribus septem Machabaeis*" attributed to Marius Victorinus. The didactic spirit reaches its climax in the *Cento Virgilianus* of Faltonia Proba, in which lines or half-lines of Virgil are pieced together in such a way as to convey the teaching of the Old and New Testaments in the form of a memoria technica. In the writings of pope Damasus we find a lighter kind of poetry used for epitaphs, inscriptions, poems on saints and martyrs, which was afterwards largely developed. By the end of the century, poetry is felt to be such a power that Prudentius forsakes his secular calling to devote himself to it, and in him early Latin Christian poetry reaches its highest point. Lyrical poetry becomes in his hands the vehicle of graphic description and of panegyric, especially in praise of the martyrs; and the hexameter is used for direct teaching, for controversy, and for apology; while in the *Psychomachia* we have the first specimen of the allegorical poetry, which had so strong an effect upon the imagination of the Middle Ages, and bore rich fruit in later literature.

In the 5th century the number of poets is unusually large, though none of them is equal in merit to Prudentius. Among them there emerges more clearly than before a distinction between two classes. On the one hand, there are those who use poetry almost as a plaything, certainly without any serious Christian purpose. Christianity has conquered classical paganism: pagan poetry practically ceased with Claudian: but Christianity, or at least some Christians, have taken up its forms, and we have so-called Christian poets whose tone is almost heathen, who dress up Christian truth in pagan phraseology, or who devote their poetry to purely secular subjects. Such had been in the last century Ausonius, whose religion is still a matter of doubt. Such were now Boethius, about whose faith there is equal doubt; Merobaudes, with his lavish panegyrics on the emperor; Ennodius, with his panegyrics and *vers de société*; Sidonius Apollinaris, whose instinct (unlike that of Prudentius) was, on becoming a bishop, to give up poetry: "Ne reus cantu petulantiore, sim reus actu" (*Ep.* ix. 16). Such was also a small group of African writers, whose short poems are preserved in the *Anthology* (cf. *Ebert*, p. 410).

On the other hand, there is still the class who devote poetry to the direct service of Christianity. The translation of the Bible is continued with a freer treatment and a greater fondness for mystical interpretation in the paraphrase of *Psalms* i. viii. cxxxvi. by Paulinus of Nola; the *Commentary on Genesis*, by Claudius Marius Victor; the *Carmen Paschale* of Sedulius; the *In Mosaicae historiae gestis* of Avitus. The *Hexaemeron* of Dracontius dwells on the mercies of God in creation and redemption; Christian apology is represented by Paulinus of Nola and the anonymous *Carmen de Providentia* (printed among St. Prosper's works), which

upholds a belief in God's Providence as against a fatalistic belief in astrology, in the face of the barbarian devastations of Gaul; Christian controversy by the *De Ingratis* of Prosper and the *Epigrammata ex sententiis Augustini*, written against Pelagianism; Christian exhortation in the *De Castitatis Laude* of Avitus, and the *Commonitorium* of Orientius. Satire appears in the *Epistola ad Salmonem* of Claudius Marius Victor; even an attempt at pastoral poetry in *Severus Sanctus*. The praise of the saints is found in Elpis, in Paulinus of Périgueux, and especially in the poems in honour of St. Felix by his pious and cultured namesake of Nola, which, with the autobiographical *Eucharisticon* of Paulinus of Pella, are perhaps the most interesting poems of this time. The tristichs of Elpidius are valuable as illustrations of the painting of the time.

In the 6th century there is little poetry, and its quality is inferior. The decay of classical literature was complete, and it survived only within the walls of the monasteries, whose inmates were too much occupied with the harder tasks of preaching to and civilising the barbarians. A test of the culture of the day may be found in the applause which greeted Arator when he recited publicly at Rome his versification of the Acts of the Apostles, a free translation full of mystical interpretation. A far higher level is reached in Gaul by Venantius Fortunatus, the versatile court-poet of Sigibert, and priest of the convent of Rhadagunda, whose poems deserve to rank next to those of Prudentius; whether for their variety, or for their metrical power, or for the insight which they give into the life of the time.

In the 7th and 8th centuries there is no real poetic inspiration apart from hymn-writing. We have fugitive pieces showing clever variety of metre by Eugenius in Spain. In the main, however, culture passes northward. Ireland contributes the poetical epistles of St. Columban; Wales, hymns of its monasteries, especially that of Bangor; England gives proof of the study and imitation of the classics in the *Aenigmata* and *De Laude Virginum* of St. Aldhelm, and the praises of the martyrs by Bede, and the short poems of Alcuin: Germany in the *Aenigmata* of St. Boniface. But for the time poetry was silent. The old classical inspiration was dead; the work of the Christian church was to convert and inspire the heart of the great nations which were to influence Europe. These were already trained by their bards to associate poetry with religion, and were destined to give to the germs laid in these centuries a far wider development.

In looking back upon the whole period we see that, like the Pagan poetry of the time, there is much that was artificial, pedantic, fanciful, imitative. Such especially were the poems of Merobaudes, Ennodius, Sidonius, and, partly, Venantius. But this was not all. There were genuine feelings which found their expression. Perhaps most marked of all, more marked than in Greece, was the genuine love of the new truth revealed. This prompted the desire to extend the truth to others, to robe it in the form which would make it most acceptable, whether to the ignorant (Commodian, St. Augustine) or to the educated (Juvencus, Sedulius, Prudentius, Marius Victorinus, Marius Victor, Paulinus, Avitus, Arator); or even to children (Faltonia Proba). This prompted also the desire to defend it in controversy (St. Augustine, Prudentius, Prosper, Paulinus). With other poets the inspiration came from admiration of the new *life*, now lived on earth. In a few there is a pathetic note of sadness at the shortness of life and its uncertainties (Paulinus of Nola, Eugenius, Columban); but, as a rule, the glory and brightness of life is celebrated. This evoked the praises of chastity (Avitus, Aldhelm); the panegyrics of the saints and martyrs (Damasus, Prudentius, Eugippius, the three Paulini, Bede); and, more rarely in this period, of the Blessed Virgin (Fortunatus). With others the mercies of God to the poet himself (Dracontius, Paulinus of Pella) are the source of inspiration; to others, the beauties of Christian painting or architecture, and numerous illustrations of these will be found in the poems of Prudentius, Elpidius, Paulinus of Nola, Eugenius, Venantius Fortunatus. The poems of the latter and of Dracontius are specially valuable to the historian for the light which they throw on the life of the time.

Of the various *kinds* of poetry, nearly all those which belonged to the old classical literature were adopted. Epic found its counterpart in the translations of the Bible and the longer lives of the saints; didactic in the moral and apologetic and controversial treatisee; lyric in the hymns to the saints, and the slighter fugitive pieces. Satire, though scarcely a separate class of poetry, found full scope in the derision poured upon the follies and immoralities of the heathen religion (cf. esp. Commodian and Prudentius). Only the drama is wanting. Tragedy and comedy had both practically ceased in classical Latin literature; and Christian instinct had not developed them afresh. The most original developments of the time are the half-epic use of lyric for description of the lives of the saints by Prudentius, and his introduction of the allegorical poem. And these various poems did not pass away. Side by side with classical authors they were regularly studied and commented on in the monastic schools. Venantius Fortunatus boasts of the long roll of Christian poets, including Juvencus, Sedulius, Orientius, Prudentius, Paulinus, Arator, Alcimus (*De Vita S. Martin*, i. 15–25); and the number of glosses in the MSS. bears witness to their study. Consequently students have traced the influence—often indeed remote, yet probably quite real—of the poetic renderings of the Bible upon the *Heliand* and the *Harmony of the Gospels* by Otfried; of the lyrics of Prudentius upon mediaeval ballads; of the description of God's plans of creation and redemption by Avitus upon Milton's "Paradise Lost"; of the vivid description of the rewards of the good and the punishment of the wicked by Prudentius (Hamartigeneia) upon Dante's *Divina Commedia*; of the *Psychomachia* upon the allegorical literature which culminates in Spenser and Bunyan.

A similar influence may be found in the *style* of these early poets. In that, there are two tendencies. (*a*) On the one hand, there is the careful imitation of the best classical writers, of

Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, &c., such as is found in Juvencus, Prudentius, Paulinus, Fortunatus. The prosody is indeed often but slackly observed: there is, as in most periods of decadence, a fondness for archaisms, a redundancy of epithets, a fanciful formation of compound words; there is much that is artificial in the mere form, such as the mixture of different metres in one poem (Paulinus, Eugenius); the practice of epanalepsis (Sedulius, Fortunatus); the introduction of acrostichs and alphabetic poems (Amoenus, Sedulius, Eugenius, &c.); but yet with all this artificiality the imitation of classical models does preserve a classical simplicity to some extent. A comparison of the prose and poetry of the same writers (*e.g.* of Avitus or Sedulius) will show that the poetry is the less turgid and artificial of the two.

(*b*) Side by side with this imitation, a new tendency arises in a more popular direction. To this tendency may perhaps be partly due the frequency of alphabetic poems and acrostichs mentioned above, as they would serve as helps to the memory: to it also is due the growing fondness for alliteration (Fortunatus, Aldhelm, Boniface) and for rhyme (St. Augustine, &c.). But the most important point is the growth of an entirely new system of poetry, which substitutes for the old "quantity" a method, based upon the number of syllables, combined with accentual stress on a few important parts of the line (Commodian, St. Augustine, &c.). The origin of this change was complex. It was due, doubtless, to the fact that the old classical pronunciation of Latin was much corrupted in the mouths of the barbarians who spoke it, so that a poem based on classical prosody became less and less to correspond with the pronunciation of daily life. St. Augustine directly gives this as his reason for adopting his new method, "ne me necessitas metrica ad aliqua verba quae vulgo minus sunt usitata compelleret" (*Retr.* i. 20). Possibly, too, like other points, such as alliteration and rhyme, this change corresponded with tendencies in the songs of the Northern races; but probably the main cause is to be found in Eastern Semitic influences; for a similar development took place almost exactly contemporaneously in Greece, where these other reasons do not operate; and nearly all the tendencies which mark it find parallels either in the Hebrew poetry of the Old Testament or in the Christian hymns of the Syrian Church. Within this period the tendencies are not fully developed; further influence from the Greek Church in later centuries contributed to that development, and to the great lyrical outburst of hymns and sequences which marked the Middle Ages (v. esp. Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry* (Introduction); and Meyer, *ubi infra*).

Authorities.—The poems referred to will be found in the large editions of Aldus, Fabricius, Gallandi, Migne (with most useful indices in vol. ccxxi. pp. 70-91); a few of them in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*. Accounts of the writers in Funcius, *De Vegeta Lat. linguae senectute*, capp. iii. and xi.; in Cave, *Script. Eccles.*, Oxf., 1740; and especially in Bähr, *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, vol. iv. Carlsruhe, 1872; Teuffel, *History of Roman Literature*, London, 1873; and Ebert, *Geschichte der Christlich-Lateinischen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1874. Good discussions of metrical question in Trench's *Sacred Latin Poetry* (Introduction), and in G. Meyer's *Anfang und Ursprung der Lat. und Griech. rythmischen Dichtung*, Munich, 1885; Munro in *Transactions of Cambr. Phil. Society*, vol. x. A short anthology in J. Alzog's *Patrologie, ad fin.*, Freiburg, 1876.

A full account of previous literature will be found in Bähr, pp. 16—21. [W. L.]

VERULUS, bishop of Rusiccade, the port of Cirta and a Colonia, called in later MSS. "martyr de schismaticis," appears in Roman martyrologies on ix. Kal. Mart., but erroneously referred to Vandal persecutions (see Morcelli); suffr. 70, Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. *de Bap.* iii. [E. W. B.]

VERUS (1), bishop of Vienne, present at the council of Arles, A.D. 314. (Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iv. 95.) [H. W. P.]

VERUS (2), addressed by Salvianus of Marseilles (*Ep.* 7 in *Pat. Lat.* liii. 167; Ceill. x. 377). [C. H.]

VERUS (3), eighth bishop of Tours, was consecrated about 498, and, like his predecessor Volusianus, was driven into exile by the Goths on suspicion of being favourable to Clovis, whose orthodoxy commended him to the Catholic clergy. According to Gregory of Tours he sat eleven years and eight days (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 26, x. 31). But the authors of the *Gallia Christiana* (xiv. 16) shew good reason for suspecting an error, probably clerical, in this statement, and would substitute six for eleven. He was succeeded in the see by Licinius, and after his deposition was represented by a deacon at the council of Agde in 506 (Mansi, viii. 338). He died in exile, leaving his goods in part to the churches (Greg. Tur. *ibid.*). [S. A. B.]

VERUS (4), bishop of Orange some time between 475 and 517, author of a life of his predecessor EUTROPIUS (*Gall. Chr.* i. 767; Boll. *Acta SS.* 27 Mai. vi. 693; *Hist. Litt. Franc.* ii. 663). [C. H.]

VERUS (5), seventh bishop of Rodez, between St. Deus-dedit I. and Aredius, was the recipient of one of the three extant letters of St. Sulpicius of Bourges (*Epist.* 2, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 593), and was the writer of two to St. Desiderius of Cahors (St. Desiderius, *Epist.* ii. 16, 19; *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 263, 265). His signature is also found in a fragment published by Mabillon, supposed to be part of a privilegium of St. Faro for the monastery of the Holy Cross, which afterwards bore the latter's name (see *Gall. Christ.* i. 201). He was one of the prelates enumerated by Flodoard as present at the council of Rheims in 625 (*Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 5, *Patr. Lat.* cxxxv. 102). [S. A. B.]

VESPASIANUS, TITUS FLAVIUS, emperor July 1, A.D. 69–June 24, A.D. 79, and his son TITUS, emperor June 24, A.D. 79–Sept. 13, A.D. 81. As a great part of the imperial power was exercised by Titus during his father's reign, of which his own short reign may be regarded as the continuation, it seems convenient to treat them together. The influence of these princes on Christianity was wholly indirect.

The destruction of Jerusalem and the temple tended to hasten the complete separation of Judaism and Christianity. This distinction, however, had not as yet become apparent to the Roman authorities, and as far as they had any knowledge of the existence of Christians, they still regarded them as one of the various sects into which the Jews were divided. As such on the one hand they shared the protection Judaism enjoyed as a *religio licita*, while on the other they had to pay the half-shekel, originally levied for the temple, to the service of the temple of Jupiter on the capitol, to which it had been transferred (Dion lxvi. 7; Jos. *B. J.* vii. 6), a tribute which must have offended the consciences of many, and might be made an engine of oppression (Suet. *Dom.* 12). The fact that the Christians had taken no part in the Jewish war of independence, and had withdrawn from Jerusalem before the siege, would have distinguished them favourably in Roman eyes from the other Jewish sects with which they were confounded. The reversal of the sentences on treason in the cases of all who had been convicted of ἀσέβεια in the reign of Nero and his three successors, and the prohibition of prosecutions on such a charge for the future (Dion lxvi. 9), which was one of the first acts of Vespasian's reign, an example in which he was followed by Titus (Dion lxvi. 19), must also have been very favourable to the Christians. Consistently with these circumstances a long and almost unbroken chain of Christian authorities bear witness to the favourable condition of Christianity under these emperors. Melito of Sardis, writing in the reign of M. Aurelius (Eus. *H. E.* iv. 26), knows of no imperial persecutors except Nero and Domitian. Tertullian (*Apol.* 5) expressly denies that Vespasian was a persecutor. Lactantius (*Mortes* 2, 3) in like manner knows of no persecution between Nero and Domitian. Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 17) expressly asserts that Vespasian did no harm to the Christians. It is not till we reach Hilary of Poitiers, writing after A.D. 360, that we come to any charge of persecution against Vespasian. In a rhetorical passage (*Contra Arianos* 3 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* x. 611), contrary to all previous Christian testimony, he couples Vespasian with Nero and Decius. Sulpicius Severus (*H. E.* ii. 30 in *Patr. Lat.* xx. 146), in a passage, whose style suggests it was borrowed from one of the lost books of Tacitus, states that the motive of Titus in destroying the temple was to abolish not only Judaism but Christianity, but he does not mention any hostile act on the part of Vespasian or his son against the Christians.

Besides Gaudentius, who is only known by a forged inscription (Aubé, i. 142), the only martyrs ascribed to the reign of Vespasian are Linus and Apollinaris, the bishops of Rome and Ravenna, and Leontius, Hypatius, and Theodulus, soldiers of Tripoli in Phoenicia. The last three names, like that of Gaudentius, according to De Rossi, quoted by Aubé, indicate a date later than the 3rd century, and the only authority for placing their martyrdom in the reign of Vespasian is their Acts, which are of later date, and, contrary to the early Christian testimony above cited, represent Vespasian as issuing edicts against the Christians, and directing a persecution (*AA. SS.* Jun. iii. 555, 561). As for Linus, there is no early authority for his martyrdom. The only martyr among the Roman bishops known to Irenaeus (in Eus. *H. E.* v. 5) is Telesphorus, nor does Linus appear as a martyr before a catalogue of the time of pope Hormisdas or the early part of the 6th century (Lipsius, *Chron. der röm. Bisch.* 78). As for St. Apollinaris, he is first mentioned by his successor Peter Chrysologus in the 5th century, who knows him only as a confessor and not as a martyr (*Serm.* 128 in *Patr. Lat.* lii. 552), and the only authority for placing him in the reign of Vespasian is his Acts and the martyrologies that follow them, which Tillemont (*M. E.* ii. 103, 518) and Görres (526) consider to be spurious. We may therefore conclude that the reigns of the first two Flavian emperors were a period of tranquillity for the church. The chief authorities for the general history of these emperors are Tacitus, *Hist.* ii.–v.; Suetonius; Dion lxv. 8–lxvi.; Josephus, *B. J.*; Merivale, c. lvii.–lx.; Tillemont, *Emp.* i. ii.; and for their relation to the church Tillemont, *M. E.* ii. 102, 152, 555; Aubé, *Hist. des Persec.* c. 4; Görres, *Zeitsch. für wissent. Theol.* xxi. 492. M. Double in his recent work on Titus (*L'Empereur Titus*) ingeniously maintains that, contrary to the received opinion, he was in reality a monster of wickedness. [F. D.]

VESTIANA, a lady, an inmate of the female monastery conducted by Macrina, who related to Gregory Nyssen the circumstances of his sister's miraculous cure (Greg. Nyss. *Vit. S. Macr.* p. 199). She is identified by Baronius, without sufficient grounds, with the lady who, to avoid an unwelcome marriage, took refuge at the altar of Basil's church (Basilius of Caesarea, D. C. B. vol. i. p. 290; Baron, *Annal.* 370, § 64; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* ix. 667, 6). [E. V.]

VETRANIO (1), a pretender to the empire set up by the military at Sirmium in Illyricum about A.D. 351. (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 25, 28; *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.*) [G. T. S.]

VETRANIO (2), bishop of all Scythia about A.D. 378. He boldly reproved the emperor Valens for his persecution of the orthodox party. (Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 35.) [G. T. S.]

VETTIUS EPAGATHUS. In the early persecutions, the Christians felt it to be a gross injustice that a man should be put to death merely because he acknowledged himself to be a Christian, and without any investigation whether there was anything contrary to morality or piety in the Christian doctrines or practices. It not unfrequently happened [see LUCIUS (14)] that a bystander at a trial would press on the judge the necessity of such an investigation, whereupon the magistrate would say, I think you must be a Christian also yourself, and on the advocate's confessing that he was, would send him to share the fate of those whom he had attempted to defend. This befel Vettius Epagathus, a distinguished Christian citizen of Lyons in the persecution of the year 177. He came forward as the advocate of the Christians first apprehended, and in consequence was himself "taken up unto the lot of the martyrs." The word "martyr," as at first used, did not necessarily imply that he who bore witness for Christ sealed his testi-

mony by death; and Renan (*Marc Aurèle* p. 307) is of opinion that Vettius had "only the merits of martyrdom without the reality." His reasons are that no mention is made of Vettius in the subsequent narration of the sufferings of Christians tortured in the amphitheatre, and, what he thinks decisive, that the epistle of the churches says of Vettius that "he was *and is* a genuine disciple of Christ, following the Lamb whithersoever he goeth." But the addition "following the Lamb, etc." indicates that the "is" does not refer to the life of Vettius in this world, but rather to that which he enjoyed in company with Christ. Vettius was probably a Roman citizen, and as such was simply beheaded instead of undergoing the tortures of the amphitheatre. [G. S.]

VIATRIX, July 29 (alias BEATRIX), sister to the martyr FAUSTINUS (25). She is called Beatrix in the *Martyrologies*. De Rossi, in his *Bullet.* 1883, p. 144. Cf. 1866, p. 53; 1868, p. 25, 48, 87; 1874, 118; and in his *Rom. Sott.* t. iii. has shown that her name was Viatrix. Her story is told under Faustinus. [G. T. S.]

VICTOR (1), bishop of Rome after Eleutherus, in the reigns of Commodus and Severus. His dates are variously given in the ancient records. The Liberian Catalogue assigns him an episcopate of nine years two months and ten days, the Felician of ten years and the same number of months and days, giving the consuls of A.D. 186 and A.D. 197 as those of his first and last years. The Eusebian Chronicle assigns him twelve years, ending A.D. 198 or 199; Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 28) ten years, and says that Zephyrinus succeeded him about the ninth year of Severus, *i.e.* A.D. 202. Lipsius (*Chron. der röm. Bischof.*) supposes his episcopate to have been from A.D. 189 to A.D. 198 or 199. Soon probably after his accession he excommunicated Theodotus of Byzantium (ὁ σκυτεύς), who had come to Rome, and taught that Christ was a mere man (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 28; cf. Epiphan. *Haeres.* liv. 1). Eusebius in the passage referred to is quoting from an opponent of the sect of Artemon, who afterwards under pope Zephyrinus maintained a similar heresy. It appears from the quotation that the Artemonites alleged all the bishops of Rome before Zephyrinus to have held the same views with themselves; and the allegation is refuted by the fact of Victor, the predecessor of Zephyrinus, having excommunicated Theodotus, "the founder and father of the God-denying apostasy." Montanism also was rife in Asia Minor during the reign of Victor, who is supposed by some to have been the bishop of Rome alluded to by Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.* c. 1) as having issued letters of peace in favour of its upholders, though afterwards persuaded by Praxeas to revoke his approval. But others think it more probable that Eleutherus was the bishop referred to. [ELEUTHERUS (11).] See, however, MONTANUS, p. 940 *b*.

The most memorable action of Victor was with regard to the Asiatics on the Easter question. They still persisted in what is called the Quartodeciman usage, for which they pleaded the authority of St. John, of keeping their *Pasch* on the 14th of Nisan, on whatever day of the week it fell. So far, intercommunion between them and the church of Rome had not been broken on this account. The Roman bishop Anicetus had (c. 160) communicated with St. Polycarp of Smyrna, when the latter was at Rome, and parted from him peaceably, though each upheld the tradition of his own church. In the time of Victor the usage of the Asiatics in which, according to Eusebius, they stood alone among all the churches of Christendom, had attracted general attention. Synods were held on the subject in various parts—in Palestine under Theophilus of Caesarea and Narcissus of Jerusalem, in Pontus under Palmas, in Gaul under Irenaeus, at Corinth under its bishop Bacchillus, at Osdroene in Mesopotamia, and elsewhere, by all of which synodical letters were issued, unanimous in disapproval of the Asiatic custom, and in declaring that "on the Lord's Day only the mystery of the resurrection of the Lord from the dead was accomplished, and that on that day only we keep the close of the paschal fast" (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23). But the general feeling was that the retention of their own tradition by the Asiatics was no sufficient ground for breaking off communion with them. Victor alone was intolerant of difference. He had issued a letter in behalf of the Roman church to the like effect with those of the synods held elsewhere. What Eusebius says of it is: "And of those at Rome there is in like manner another, indicating bishop Victor (ἐπίσκοπον Βίκτορα δηλοῦσα)." From the reply to it we may conclude it to have been peremptory in its requirement of compliance. This reply was from Polycrates bishop of Ephesus, as head of the Asiatic churches, who, at Victor's desire, had convened an assembly of bishops who concurred with him in his rejoinder. In it he resolutely upholds the Asiatic tradition; he supports it by the authority of "great lights" who slept in Asia awaiting the resurrection: of Philip the apostle, who, with his two aged virgin daughters, was buried at Hierapolis; another saintly daughter of his who lay at Ephesus; of St. John ("who lay on the Lord's bosom, and became a priest wearing the *petalon*"), also at rest at Ephesus; of Polycrates of Smyrna, bishop and martyr; of Thraseas of Eumenia, also bishop and martyr, who slept at Smyrna. After naming others after them, who had all kept the fourteenth day according to the Gospel, he speaks also of seven of his own kinsmen, all bishops, before himself, who had maintained the same usage. He adds, "I therefore, having been for five-and-sixty years in the Lord, and having conferred with the brethren from the whole world, and having perused all the Holy Scripture, am not scared with those who are panic-stricken. For those who are greater than I have said, 'It is right to obey God rather than men.'" After receiving this reply, Victor endeavoured to induce the church at large to excommunicate the Asiatics, but failed in his attempt. Whether he himself, notwithstanding this failure, renounced communion with them on the part of the Roman church is not clear from the language of Eusebius. Socrates (*H. E.* v. 22) says he did; and that this was the case is probable, though Eusebius speaks only of his endeavour to cut them off as heterodox from the "common unity," and of his letters with a view to this end. Jerome also (*de vir. illustr.* c.

speaks only of his desire to have them generally condemned: "Siquidem Victor multos Asiae et Orientis episcopos, qui decima quarta luna cum Judaeis Pascha celebrabant, damnandos crediderat. In qua sententia hi qui discrepabant ab illis non dederunt manus." At any rate it is evident that the judgment of the bishop of Rome did not in that age carry any irresistible weight with other churches. For Eusebius expressly tells us that "these things did not please all the bishops;" that they exhorted him in return to "mind the things of unity and of love towards his neighbours;" and that they wrote "sharply assailing Victor." He cites a letter sent on the occasion to Victor by Irenaeus, who, though holding with him on the question at issue, exhorted him in the name of a synod of the church of Gaul "that he should not cut off whole churches of God for preserving the tradition of an ancient custom." He reminds him that churches have long differed on other points of usage as well as this without interruption of communion:—"not only about the day is the controversy, but also about the very mode of the fast preceding it. For some think that they ought to fast for one day, some for two, some for more; while some make forty hours of day and night the measure of their fast." Such variety, he says, was of long standing, having originated with persons of influence who (it might be wrongly) had handed down different usages. "And nevertheless all these were at peace, and we are at peace with one another, and the diversity of the fast establishes the unanimity of faith." Lastly, he cites "the elders before Soter," chiefs of the Roman church, who had been at peace with those from other dioceses who differed from them in the matter at issue; and especially Anicetus, who, though unable to persuade the blessed Polycarp to give up the custom which, "with John, the disciple of our Lord, and the other apostles with whom John lived," he had always observed, and, though himself not persuaded to renounce the custom of the elders in his own church, had still honourably accorded the Eucharist in the church to Polycarp, and parted from him in peace (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24). Jerome (*de vir. illustr.* c. 35) alludes to several letters written by Irenaeus to the same purpose: "Feruntur ejus et aliae epistolae ad Victorem episcopum Romanum de quaestione Paschae epistolae, in quibus commonet eum non facile debere unitatem collegii scindere." The sentiments of Irenaeus (whose name, as Eusebius observes, corresponded with his character of peacemaker) appear elsewhere when he says, probably with reference to Victor's attitude in this dispute, "The apostles ordered that we should not judge any one in meat or in drink, or in respect of a feast, or new moon, or sabbaths. Whence then are these contentions? Whence these divisions? We keep the feast, but in the leaven of malice and wickedness, rending asunder the church of God; we keep external things that we may cast away the better things of faith and love. These are the feasts and fasts which we have heard from the prophets are pleasing to the Lord." (Iren. *Frag.* iii. ed. Pfaff.) The Quartodecimans after these conflicts seem to have maintained their usage undisturbed till the council of Nice, which enjoined its discontinuance. It is true that the Asiatics themselves appear from Constantine's letter after the council to have already conformed to the general usage, which he speaks of as disregarded only by some Easterns not specified, but observed in the Asiatic diocese.[a] Athanasius also (*de syn.* c. 5) says that one reason for summoning the council of Nice was that "those from Syria, Cilicia, and Mesopotamia kept the *Pascha* with the Jews," but he does not mention the Asiatics as then doing so. If, then, the Asiatics had by this time conformed, it would seem, if Eusebius is to be trusted, that others had adopted their usage after Victor's denunciations; for, while he says that in Victor's time the Asiatics stood alone with respect to it among the churches of all the rest of the world (*H. E.* v. 23), he speaks of synods having condemned it in Palestine and at Osdroene, which was in Mesopotamia, whereas Athanasius refers to both Syria and Mesopotamia as maintaining it. The usage may have prevailed more extensively from the first than Eusebius was aware of, and notwithstanding what he says; and that this was the case is implied by Jerome, who speaks of "multos Asiae *et Orientis* episcopos" as implicated in it; or it may be that the action of Victor in the matter had the effect of rather spreading than checking it, and that some of those who adopted it from the Asiatics retained it longer than they. At any rate it is evident that the intolerance of Victor neither won general approval nor effected his intended purpose.

Victor is mentioned by St. Jerome (*de vir. illustr.* c. 34) as the writer of a treatise on the Easter question and other works. Four spurious epistles are assigned to him, addressed to Theophilus of Alexandria, to the Africans, to Desiderius of Vienne, and to a bishop Paracodas, the leading subjects being Easter, and the authority of the Roman see. He is said in the *Liber Pontificalis* to have been an African and the son of Felix; to have ordained that in case of necessity converts might be baptized anywhere—in a river, in the sea, in a fountain, or in a lake; to have summoned Theophilus bishop of Alexandria[b] to a council at Rome at which the time for keeping Easter was ordained; to have suffered martyrdom; and to have been buried beside the body of St. Peter on the Vatican. He is commemorated in the Roman martyrology on the 28th of July as pope and martyr. There is no evidence of his martyrdom beyond the tradition which, contrary to the testimony of Irenaeus, assigns that honour to all the early Roman bishops. [J. B—y.]

VICTOR (2), African bishop on committee *de Virgg. subintroductis*, A.D. 249, Cyp. *Ep.* iv. [E. W. B.]

---

[a] "Nonnulli qui ad Orientem habitant non admitunt." . . . "Ut quod in urbe Roma, in Italia, in Africa, in Aegypto, in Hispania, Gallia et Britannica, in Libya, in universa Graecia, in dioecesi *Asiatica* et Pontica, in Cilicia denique, una et consentienti sententia conservatur, hoc etiam vestra prudentia libenter approbet." (Constant. Ep. in Gelasii *Hist.* l. ii. c. 36; Labbe, vol. ii. p. 275; Euseb. in *V. C.* iii. 19.)

[b] Theophilus of Caesarea, mentioned by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 22) as the contemporary bishop of that sec, may be intended. But Eusebius makes no mention of his having attended a Roman council.

VICTOR (3) The same (African bishop) on Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 3, *de Pace danda*, A.D. 252, Cyp. *Ep.* iv. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (4) (? the same as (2), or (3)). Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 4, *de Basilide*, A.D. 254, Cyp. *Ep.* 67. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (5) (? the same as (2), or (3)). Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 5, *de Bapt.* i. A.D. 255, Cyp. *Ep.* 70. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (6). The above apparently distinct from Victor, bishop of Assurae, *ab Assuras*, in Prov. Proc. Colonia Julia Assuras, mentioned several times by Augustine, hod. *Zanfûr*, and the plain near it *B'hairt Essers*. Seven other bishops in Morcelli before 5th century. See FORTUNATIANUS (1). In A.D. 253 Victor had not yet succeeded EPICTETUS, but was bishop before A.D. 255 (6 ?) in Syn. *de Bapt.* iii. *Sent.* 68. He is distinguished as a "confessor" in the late margin of the list. But if this note is intended to refer to the confessor bishop addressed in *Ep.* 76, and replying in *Ep.* 77, one would think it a mistake for a Numidian Victor, as all the names capable of identification are Numidian. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (7), bishop of Octavum, Octabum, Octanu H., in Numidia, near Cirta, in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. *de Bap.* iii. *Sent.* 78, then recently appointed [VICTOR (3)]; probably the same as the Numidian bishop addressed in Cyp. *Ep.* 62 [see JANUARIUS (1)]; and in *Ep.* 70 (Syn. *de Bap.* i.), a confessor in the mines, *Ep.* 76 and 77. See NEMESIANUS (1). [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (8), another Victor, a Numidian bishop addressed in same *Ep.* 70 [see VICTOR (3)], who cannot be distinctly separated from 3. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (9), bishop of Gor (Gorbuda H.) in Prov. Proc. (? same as *Coreva*, on road from Carthage to Sufetula, Morcelli); 7 Syn. Carth. *de Bap.* iii. *Sent.* 40. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (10), a lapsed African presbyter restored too early to communion as a layman. See FIDUS, Cyp. *Ep.* 64. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (11), African bishop associated with CALDONIUS, Cyp. *Ep.* 41, 42. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (12) appears, in the (spurious?) close of *Ep.* xiii., as companion of Cyprian in retirement, a lector made deacon, who sends a large sum with one of Cyprian's bounties to Carthage. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (13). Mart. Carthag. A.D. 250. See ARISTO. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (14), martyr of Marseilles, belongs to the Diocletian period about the close of the third century. The church dedicated to his memory at Marseilles is alluded to by St. Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* ix. 22 and *De Glor. Mart.* i. 77), which shows that by the end of the sixth century his name was well known. His *Acta* (Breviora and Longiora) are anonymous, though the longer has been attributed to St. Cassian. (Both the *Acta* were published, first by Bosquet, *Hist. Eccl. Gall.* ii. 127 sq.; also with *Miracula* in eight chapters, by Boll. *A. SS.* Jul. v. 142 sq.; the longer alone is given by Ruinart, *Acta Mart.* 333 sq., ed. 1859). According to the Acts, Victor was an officer in the Roman army when Maximian came to Marseilles to persecute the church. Victor employed his nights in visiting and encouraging the Christians, until he himself was arrested and brought before the emperor. He was cruelly tortured, but in the prison converted his keepers, and was at last martyred. His most famous monument is the church and monastery of St. Victor, built at Marseilles by St. Cassian [CASSIANUS (11) JOHANNES], and given afterwards to the Benedictines. His feast is 21st July. [J. G.]

VICTOR (15), bishop of Garba, a town of uncertain site in Numidia, present at the meeting at Cirta A.D. 305, and one of those who gave their opinion that the acts done during the persecution, like those of Secundus of Tigisis, should be left to the judgment of God (Opt. i. 14; Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 27–30). He was afterwards sent to preside over the small Donatist community (paucos erraticos) at Rome, where he is described by Optatus as "pastor sine grege, episcopus sine populo." (Opt. ii. 4.) [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (16), martyr at Gerona in Spain in the persecution of Diocletian. [ORONTIUS (1).] [C. H.]

VICTOR (17), one of the friends of Theodotus bishop of Ancyra and his companion in martyrdom. [THEODOTUS (9).] (Mason, *Persec. of Diocl.* 358.) [C. H.]

VICTOR (18), Donatist bishop of Russiocada in Numidia, a town (Sgigata) near the sea-coast and the river Thapsus, called a colony in Peut. Tab., between Hippo and Chulli. (Vib. Seq. *flum.* Ant. *Itin.* 5, 3; 19, 2, Mela. i. 7; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 45.) He was one of those who met at Cirta, A.D. 305, to elect a bishop, and was there taxed by Secundus of Tigisis with having surrendered a book of the gospels during the persecution. He did not deny that under compulsion he had thrown it into the fire; but hoped that he might be pardoned. [SECUNDUS OF Tigisis.] (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 27, 30; Opt. i. 13; *Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. p. 176, ed. Oberthür, p. 170 ed. Dupin.) [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (19), bishop of Utica, and (20) bishop of a place in Numidia called Legisvolumini, present at the council of Arles, A.D. 314 (Routh. *Rel. Sacr.* iv. 95). [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (21), a professor of Roman literature, but of Moorish origin, brought forward as a witness at the enquiry under Zenophilus, A.D. 320, and accused by Nundinarius with "tradition" in his own person and of knowledge of the guilt of Silvanus. Victor however denied that he was present, or that he had any knowledge of the act attributed to Silvanus, but the judge decided that his evidence tended to convict Silvanus (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 29–33; *Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. p. 168–179 Oberthür, p. 167–170 Dupin.) [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (22), a fuller by trade, who gave 20 *folles* to Silvanus in order to be admitted to the order of presbyters (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 19–33;

Mon. Vet. Don. iv. pp. 172–179 Oberthür, 169-70 Dupin). [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (**23**), son of Samsuricus, a grave-digger (fossor) and worker (artifex) probably in gold and silver, deposed before Zenophilus that he had heard from Silvanus himself a confession of his act of surrender. He seems to have been a candidate for the episcopate when Silvanus was appointed (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 29–33: *Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. pp. 170–178 Oberthür, pp. 168–170 Dupin). [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (**24**), one of the Numidian bishops addressed by Constantine, A.D. 330. (*Mon. Vet. Don.* xxvi. p. 215 Oberthür, p. 189 Dupin.) [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (**25**), a distinguished general under Valens, a man of high character, consul in A.D. 369 an orthodox Christian who felt a high regard and esteem for Basil, whom he reproached for not writing to him more frequently. Basil excuses his silence on the ground of his unwillingness to trouble one of so exalted a station with many letters, but promises amendment, and thanks him for the services rendered by him to the church. (Basil, *Ep.* 152 [374].) In another letter Basil thanks Victor for continuing to honour him with his letters, and for not allowing his regard to be affected by calumnious reports (*Ep.* 153 [428]). Gregory Nazianzen also wrote to Victor in 382 to excuse himself from attending the council which Theodosius was then proposing to summon, and begging him to use his powerful influence to extinguish the flames of discord which were threatening to consume the church (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 133). In another letter he commends to him an accomplished young friend Hyperechius (*Ep.* 134). In 378 he united with TRAJANUS (2), Arintheus and other generals in remonstrating with Valens on his Arian impiety (Theod. *H. E.* iv. 30 al. 33). [E. V.]

VICTOR (**26**), bishop of Abziris, Abdira, or Audira (Plin. v. 4, 30; Ptol. iv. 3, 34), present at the Council of Carthage, A.D. 390. (Bruns. *Conc.* i. 117, 121.) [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (**27**), bishop of Putput, a town of the Proconsular Province of Africa (Hammamats), on the way to Hadrumetum, Ant. *Itin.* 52, 4, present at the second Council of Carthage, Bruns. *Conc.* i. 117. [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (**28**), a eunuch of infamous character, made bishop of Ephesus by the enemies of Chrysostom in the place of the deposed Heraclides (Pallad. p. 140). [E. V.]

VICTOR (**29**), bishop of Liberta, a place of unknown site in the proconsular province of Africa, present at Carth. Conf. A.D. 411 (*Carth. Coll.* i. 116). (**30**), bishop of Hippo Diarrhytus, one of the keepers of the documents on the Donatist side at the Carth. conference A.D. 411 (*Carth. Coll.* i. 132, 139). (**31**), the name of two bishops present at the Council of Carthage A.D. 412, and of one present at that of Mileum A.D. 416 (Aug. *Ep.* 175–6, 181). [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (**32**), brother of Nebridius, of whom Augustine, in urging him to live with him says, that if Nebridius consents, his mother will still have Victor to live with her (Aug. *Ep.* i. iv.). [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (**33**), a Donatist presbyter of Hippo R. about whom, in a letter to Eusebius, Augustine enquires (Aug. *Ep.* 34–35). [EUSEBIUS (135), Vol. II. 330. PROCULEIANUS.] [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (**34**), a bishop of Mauretania Caesariensis, who having committed an offence, was forbidden by St. Augustine to communicate outside of his own diocese. The case is mentioned by Augustine in a letter to pope Celestine concerning the case, one of a similar kind, of Antonius, bishop of Fussala (Aug. *Ep.* 208–9; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 71. URBANUS of Sicca). [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (**35**), solitary of Egypt, friend and follower of Cyrillus of Alexandria, was accused by the Nestorians of many crimes before the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, but honourably acquitted (Cyrill. Alex. *Apolog. ad Theodos. s. f.*). [J. G.]

VICTOR (**36**), accuser of Cyril. [SOPHRONAS.]

VICTOR (**37**), a disciple of St. Martin and one of the religious brotherhood under Sulpicius Severus (Paulin. Nol. *Epp.* 23, 29). [C. H.]

VICTOR (**38**), bishop of Martyrites in Africa, published a revised edition of Cassian's conferences with the doubtful points omitted or corrected. It is not now extant. It is mentioned by Cassiodorus in his *Inst. Div. Litt.* cap. xxix. [G. T. S.]

VICTOR (**39**) (VICTORIUS, VICTORINUS), CLAUDIUS MARIUS, the author of three books in hexameter verse, containing the narrative of the Book of Genesis down to the destruction of the Cities of the Plain, and also of a letter to "Salmon," or Solomon, an abbat, in hexameter verse, on the corrupt manners of his time. He is probably to be identified with the Victorius, or Victorinus, mentioned by Gennadius (*De Vir. Ill.* 60) as a rhetorician of Marseilles, who died "Theodosio et Valentiano regnantibus" (*i.e.* 425–50), and who addressed to his son Aetherius a commentary on Genesis. Gennadius says "a principio libri *usque ad obitum patriarchae Abrahae* tres diversos edidit libros." This, indeed, does not accurately describe the work which we have under the name of Cl. M. Victor. But it is to be noted that there is a diversity of reading in the passage of Gennadius. In Erasmus's edition of St. Jerome, the passage stands "*quatuor versuum* edidit libros." If this be the right reading, it seems almost certain that the three books we now have of Cl. M. Victor, ending as they now do at a point which seems to call for some explanation, are the first three books of those mentioned by Gennadius, and that a fourth book, now lost, carried on the narrative to Abraham's death, where a natural halting place for the work is presented. This hypothesis answers one of the reasons which Teuffel assigns for doubting the identity of Cl. M. Victor with the Victorius of Gennadius (Teuffel, ii. 457), and possibly the objection he alleges from the absence of a dedication to Aetherius may be met by the same argument.

Aetherius may have been addressed, not at the beginning, but at the end of the work, in which case the address to him would have probably shared the fate of the fourth book, even if it did not form part of it. His third objection, that the Victorius of Gennadius, being a native of Marseilles, would probably have shown more traces of semi-Pelagianism than are discoverable in Victor's work, may be an objection, if we assume that all the people of Marseilles were semi-Pelagian in the first half of the 5th century. But the writer of the books which bear the name of Victor, while he is certainly not a Pelagian, does not go into the opposite extreme, and there is nothing in his work which would absolutely exclude or contradict semi-Pelagianism. The three books inscribed as the work of Victor correspond very well with what Gennadius says of the character of the work of Victorius; they are written in a pious and Christian spirit, but without depth or great force of treatment. They are in fact, for the most part, a paraphrase in verse of the portion of the book of Genesis to which they correspond. There are but few reflections, and the narrative, with one or two exceptions, keeps closely to that of Scripture. The most notable variation is the introduction of a prayer by Adam on his expulsion from Paradise, which is followed by a strange episode. The serpent is discerned by Eve, who urges Adam to take vengeance on him. In assailing him with stones, a spark is struck from a flint, which sets fire to the wood in which Adam and Eve had taken shelter, and they are threatened with destruction. This mishap, however, is the means of revealing to them metals, forced from the ground by the heat, and of preparing the earth, by the action of the fire, for the production of corn.

The style of the poem and its language are in no way remarkable; its versification is for the most part tolerable, but there are one or two instances of disregard for the normal quantities of syllables.

The Epistle to Salomon is a poem of about 100 hexameters, and is more original, though not of any special interest. The vices especially blamed are, in men, a desire for gain, and a desire to search unduly into the secrets of nature known only to God; in women, immoderate love of personal adornment, leading to extravagance in dress. From the closing words it would seem that it either was, or was intended to be, one of a series of epistles. Its date would seem to be about 450. It may be added, that if Victor and the Victorius, or Victorinus of Marseilles, mentioned by Gennadius, are one, he is probably not to be identified with the poet Victorius mentioned by Sidonius in the last letter of the fifth book of his Epistles; for that epistle is written to the nephews *and heirs* of Victorius, who is therefore not likely to be the same as the father of Aetherius. The *Comment. in Genesin* and *Epistola ad Salmonem* are to be found in de la Bigne's *Bibl. Patr.* viii. 278, and Appendix; they are also in Maittaires' *Corpus Poetarum Lat.* ii. 1567. [H. A. W.]

VICTOR (40), bishop of Cartenna about the middle of the fifth century. He was a zealous opponent of the Arians during the Vandal persecution. Gennadius (*de Viris Illust.* cap. 77) attributes to him several works (none of which is now extant),—specially one against the Arian heresy, which was presented to Genseric; a treatise on the Repentance of the Publican (identified by some with a treatise found in St. Ambrose, *Opp.* ed. Migne, *P. L.* t. xvii. col. 971); together with some devotional works and homilies (Ceill. x. 468). [G. T. S.]

VICTOR (41), bishop of Donaghmoyne, co. Monaghan, said to have been an unwilling convert of St. Patrick, but full of zeal when converted (Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 95, c. 139, 151, c. 1[illegible] 266, and *Acta SS.* 424; Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. [illegible] iii. 723). As Victor is not an Irish name, Colgan (*Tr. Th.* 115, n. 47) thinks it may be a translation of Buaidhbheo. [BUAIDHBHEO.] [J. G.]

VICTOR (42), quaestor under Anthemius (467-472). Sidonius Apollinaris, in a poem addressed to the emperor, speaks of him as his own master in the art of poetry. This reference has been interpreted, perhaps unwarrantably, to imply that Victor was actually a teacher of the subject:—it probably means nothing more than a compliment to the poetical powers of an officer in favour with the emperor. Except for Sidonius's passing mention of Victor, he is unknown. [H. A. W.]

VICTOR of Mans. [VICTURIUS.]

VICTOR (43), bishop, addressed by pope Gelasius I. (in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 100, 154). Victor had by the pope's advice discontinued the processions from the basilica of St. Agatha on the estate of Caclanum, because Petrus, the owner of the estate, had appropriated the revenues of the basilica. The pope directs him to resume the processions, as Petrus had now made a satisfactory arrangement. By the second letter the pope permitted Victor to ordain acolytes or sub-deacons as priests, if his deacons declined to take priest's orders. A third letter (*Patr. Lat.* lix. 143) addressed to Victor and some other bishops deals with the case of an alleged violation of sanctuary at Beneventum. [F. D.]

VICTOR (44) VITENSIS, a North African bishop and writer of the latter half of the fifth century. The known facts of his life are very few. He was called Vitensis either after the see over which he presided (Ebert), or after the place where he was born (Auler). Of the year of his birth we have no information, but as he seems to have been numbered amongst the clergy of the church of Carthage about the year 455, he may have been born about the year 430. His *Historia Persecutionis Provinciae Africanae* is very interesting because he seems to have been an eye-witness of the Vandal persecution for more than thirty years, though he also seems to have escaped any serious inconvenience on his own part. He was actively employed by Eugenius, metropolitan of Carthage, in the year 483. Hunneric banished in the earlier part of that year 4966 bishops and clergy of every rank. Victor was used by Eugenius to look after the more aged and infirm of the bishops, and tells us in lib. ii. 8 how cruelly Felix of Abbir Major, bishop for forty-four years, was treated. [FELIX (17.)] He was paralytic and unable to speak. Victor strove to obtain permission from the Vandal monarch for Felix to

remain in Carthage as he was in a dying condition and unable to bear the journey. The king in a rage ordered that "if he can not sit on an animal, let him be carried bound between two untamed oxen." The History of Victor is very useful, not only for the view it gives us of the religion of the Vandals, but also for other reasons. It tells us many particulars about Carthage, and its churches, their names and dedications, as those of Perpetua and Felicitas, of Celerina and the Scillitans (i. 3). It shows the persistence of Paganism at Carthage, and mentions the temples of Memory and of Coelestis as existing till the Vandals levelled them after their capture of Carthage. This temple of Coelestis deserves special notice. Victor's present text (i. 3) refers to it as "Aedem Memoriae et viam quam Coelestis vocitabant, funditus deleverunt." Eyssenhardt in Hermes t. 11 (1867), p. 319, suggested a reading "unam" for "viam," which makes good sense of the passage. The Temple of Coelestis existed, as we know, in Augustine's time, who describes in his *De Civ. Dei*, lib. ii. capp. 4, 26 (cf. Tertull. *Apol.* c. 24), the impure rites there performed. The site of this temple at Carthage has lately been elaborately discussed by M. A. Castan in a Mém. in the *Comptes Rendus de l'Acad. des Inscript.* t. xiii. (1885), pp. 118–132, where all the references to its cult are collected out of classical and patristic sources. Victor's History is useful too for glimpses of North African ritual. In lib. ii. 17 we have an account of the healing of a blind man, named Felix, by the hands of Eugenius, bishop of Carthage. In that chapter he describes the ritual of the feast of Epiphany, while there are frequent references to the singing of hymns or psalms at funerals. The History relates some curious miracles with great precision. The most notable are that of Felix just mentioned, and another which has given occasion for much controversy, in which Gibbon has taken part. The story is told by Victor in *Hist.* lib. v. 6. The inhabitants of Tipasa refused to hold communion with the Arian bishop. Hunneric sent a military count, who collected them all into the forum and cut out their tongues by the roots, notwithstanding which they all retained the power of speech. This remarkable fact has been discussed by Gibbon, cap. xxxvii., by Middleton in his *Free Inquiry*, p. 313–316, and by many others. See article on HUNNERIC in Vol. III. p. 181, where the evidence for it is fully discussed. The History of Victor is usually divided into five books, the first of which tells of the persecution of Genseric, from the conquest of Africa by the Vandals in 429 till Genseric's death in 477. The second, fourth, and fifth deal with the persecution of Hunneric, A.D. 477–484, while the third book contains the confession of faith drawn up by Eugenius of Carthage, and presented to Hunneric at the Conference of 484 (cf. Gennadius *de Vir. Illust.* num. 97). The third book or the Confession is notable because the celebrated text I. John v. 7, concerning the three Heavenly witnesses first appears there (lib. iii. 11). (See on this point Porson's letter to Travis, and Gibbon's notes on cap. xxxvii.). The life and works of Victor have been the subject of much modern German criticism, which has not however added a great deal to our knowledge, the points discussed being far too minute for general interest. The student of such discussions may refer to Papencordt's *Geschichte der Vandal. Herrschaft in Afrika*, Berlin, 1837, pp. 366–370; Ebert's *Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande*, Leipzig, 1874, t. i. 433–436, who fixes the date of the composition of the History about 486; and Teuffel's *Hist. of Roman Literature*, trans. by Wagner, t. ii. p. 509. The latest piece of criticism is a very elaborate one. It is contained in A. Schaefer's *Historische Untersuchungen*, Bonn, 1882, where Aug. Auler contributes (pp. 253-275) an article in which he maintains, with much learning and acuteness, that Victor was born in Vita, that his see is unknown, that he was consecrated bishop after the persecution, that he wrote his history before 487, and that this History is a piece of tendency-writing and untrustworthy. Like a true German he cannot recognise in the action of Genseric against the Catholic party anything but a legitimate measure of state repression, like Prince Bismarck's Cultur-Kampf. The bibliography of Victor is given down to date in Potthast's *Bibliotheca*, *s. v.* p. 561. The best of the older editions of the History is that of Ruinart, which has been reprinted, with its elaborate dissertations, in Migne's *P. L.* lviii. The History has been at least three times republished within the last thirteen years, by Hurter at Innsbruck in 1873, among the *Opuscula Selecta SS. PP.*; by C. Halmius in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Auct. Antiquiss. t. iii. pars prior, Berol. 1879; and lastly by Michael Petschenig in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptt. Ecclesiast. Lat.* t. vii. Vindob. 1881, with which may be compared an elaborate account of the manuscript authority for the text by the same writer, *Ueberlieferung des Victor von Vita, Sitzungsber. d. Kais. Akad. d. Wissensch. in Wien, phil.-hist. Classe*, t. xcvi., p. 637 sqq. Petschenig abandons the old division of the text, dating from Chifflet in the 17th century. He divides it into three books, treating the Confession of Faith as an appendix to the second, and uniting the fourth and fifth into one. At the end of all the editions will be found the *Passio Septem Monachorum* and the *Notitia Prov. et Civit. Africae*, the authorship of which is uncertain; the latter is a valuable document for the geography and ecclesiastical arrangements of North Africa. Ceill. (x. 448–465) gives a full analysis of Victor's History. He also appends a complete bibliography, where he says that the History was translated into French in 1563 and again in 1664, and was published in English in 1605. [G. T. S.]

VICTOR (45), primate of the Byzacene province in 508, by whom Fulgentius of Ruspe was consecrated [FULGENTIUS (3) in Vol. II. p. 578]. (Ceill. xi. 5.) [G. T. S.]

VICTOR, of Grenoble. [VICTURINUS.]

VICTOR (46), one who induced Fulgentius of Ruspe to write against the discourse of Fastidiosus, and to whom Fulgentius addressed his refutation of that work (Fulgent. Rusp. *Cont. Serm. Fastidiosi* in *Pat. Lat.* lxv. 507; Ceillier, xi. 34, 35). [C. H.]

VICTOR (47), bishop of Capua, apart from his writings is known only by his epitaph, which

states that he died in April A.D. 554, after an episcopate of about thirteen years from February A.D. 541. He is commemorated October 17, (Ughelli, vi. 306).

Writings.—I. He is best known from his connection with the *Codex Fuldensis* (F), after the *C. Amiatinus* the most ancient and valuable MS. of the Vulgate, which was transcribed by his direction, and afterwards corrected by him. The MS. is remarkable for containing the Gospels in the form of a Harmony. In his preface he relates that a MS. without a title had come into his hands containing a single gospel composed of the four. Inquiring into its authorship, he concludes, though with some doubt, that it was identical with the work of TATIANUS, which by a blunder he calls *Diapente* instead of *Diatessaron.* Till recently so little was known of the Diatessaron that it was impossible to say if Victor was right, but on the whole it was generally supposed that he was not. It was known that the Diatessaron began with St. John i. 1, whereas F. begins with the preface from St. Luke. But Mösinger's edition in 1876 of Aucher's Latin translation of the Armenian version of EPHRAIM (4) Syrus' Commentary on the Diatessaron (E), followed by Zahn's work (*Forschungen zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons,* i.) (Z) now makes it possible to know with tolerable accuracy the contents and arrangement of the Diatessaron, and to see that it is plainly the archetype of the Harmony in F. It must be remembered that the silence of E is insufficient to prove the absence in T of a particular passage, so that passages existing in F may also have existed in T, though unnoticed in E, and E may also not always follow the exact order in which connected passages occurred in T.

At the outset two apparent discrepancies present themselves. T begins with St. John i. 1, F with St. Luke i. 1–4, and contains the genealogy from St. Matt. supplemented with part of that from St. Luke, whereas it is expressly stated that T contained no genealogy. But the index of F shows that these are accretions which did not exist in the original form of F. In it c. i. is *In principio Verbum,* with no reference to the preface from St. Luke, and c. v. is *De generationem* (*sic*) *vel nativitate Christi,* which in like manner refers only to the last half of § 5. Removing the preface and genealogy, §§ 1–11 of F, which go down to the return from Egypt, correspond with T, the teaching in the Temple, § 12, is preceded in T by St. John i. 6–28, and followed by the mission of the Baptist, which are both blended into § 13 of F. Then in both follow the baptism of our Lord, the temptation, and the call of Andrew, Peter, Philip, and Nathanael. Then comes a considerable divergence. In F the order is:—

§ 18. Reading in the Synagogue.
§ 19. The calling of Simon and Andrew, James and John.
§ 20. The call of Matthew.
§ 21. *Journey to Judaea—Baptizing—Return to Galilee (John iii. 22—end, iv. 1–3).
§ 22. Residence at Capernaum (Matt. iv. 12–16).
§ 23. **Preaching in Galilee—Appointment of the Twelve Apostles—Beginning of Sermon on the Mount.**
§§ 24–44. **Sermon on the Mount.**
§ 45. **Mission of the Twelve Apostles.**
§ 46. **Marriage in Cana.**
§ 47. **Healing the Leper on coming down from the Mountain.**

In T on the other hand the marriage in Cana comes first, happening the third day after the temptation (E 56), then followed the journey to and return from Judaea, the call of the Apostles and of *James* the publican and the healing of the paralytic succeeded, in what order is uncertain, and then came the plucking of the ears on the Sabbath, which is § 69 in F. Apparently however this section was elsewhere in the original form of F, or was omitted, as it is omitted in the index. Then in T follows the Sermon on the Mount, and the order of F and T are the same for the next few sections, from § 48, healing the centurion's servant, to § 54, healing the demoniac among the Gerasenes, except that nothing in T, as far as we know, corresponded to §§ 49, 51 of F, the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, and the healing the sick at even, § 50 being the raising the widow's son at Nain. Then § 55 is the healing the paralytic, already related in T; § 56 healing the Ruler's son, omitted in T, probably identified with the healing of the centurion's servant; § 57 call of Levi, probably previously related in T as the call of James; §§ 58–60 come later in T, while § 61, the raising of Jairus's daughter, in T follows § 54. The next sections in F are:—

§ 62. The healing of two blind men and a demoniac (Mark ix. 26–33).
§ 63. The Pharisees saying, "He casteth out devils through Beelzebub."
§ 64. Martha and Mary.
§ 65. The mission of his disciples by the Baptist.
§ 66. The denunciation of Chorazin and Bethsaida.
§ 67. The return of the Apostles.
§ 68. The sending of the 70 (72).
§ 69. The disciples pluck the ears on the Sabbath.
§ 70. The healing the man with the withered hand.
§ 71. The prayer on the mountain.

Of these there is no trace of 62, 66, 67, 70 and 71 in E; 69 in T immediately precedes the Sermon on the Mount. It is omitted, as already mentioned, in the index of F. The order of the parallels in T to the other sections apparently was § 54 followed by § 61, then came §§ 64, 65, 63; then the supper in Simon the Pharisee's house (Luke vii. 36–50), which in F comes long afterwards, § 138, Mary the sister of Lazarus being identified with "the woman that was a sinner"; then § 68, and then the omitted §§ 58–60. From § 72, the parable of the sower, to § 94, the tribute money, F and T run parallel except that in the latter there is no trace of four sections of F, and that the healing of the leper, § 47 in F, in T comes between § 88, the Woman of Samaria, and § 89 the Pool of Bethesda. Further, F omits the healing of the blind man (Mark viii. 22), which in T followed § 89, where F inserts the feeding of the 4000. Then follows another divergence. In F the order is:—

§ 95. The dispute among the disciples which of them should be the greater.
§ 96. The disciples rebuked for forbidding one casting out devils in our Lord's name.

* This section is omitted in index. Whether it existed in this place when the index was made or whether the omission is a slip, *quære.*

§ 69. Parable of the lost sheep and the lost piece of money.
§ 98. Parable of the Prodigal son.
§ 99. The question of Peter, "How oft shall my brother sin against me"?
§ 100. Parable of the unmerciful servant.
§ 101. The question and answer about divorce.
§ 102. Blessing little children.
§ 103. The Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, and the parable of the barren fig tree.
§ 104. Healing of the woman with an infirmity of eighteen years.
§ 105. The feast of tabernacles (John vii. 2-30).
§ 106. The parable of the foolish rich man (Luke xii. 13).

In T., apparently, the order (which is difficult to determine, E being here very meagre) was 101, 97, 98, 96, 99, 100, 103, 105, 106, omitting 95, 102, 104. They may, however, have existed in T, as the only trace of 106 in E (ad *judicem* dives venit, p. 168, referring to "Who made me a *judge* or a divider over you?") is so slight as to be overlooked by Zahn. Here again the index and text of F are at variance, probably showing that the order of the archetype has been disturbed, 104 and 105 there preceding 103, and the headings of 96, 97 being repeated instead of those of 106, 107. From this point the order of T, as far as it can be traced, corresponds to the end with that of F, except that in F the parable of the unjust steward, § 109, which in T follows that of the prodigal son, is placed between that of Lazarus and Dives, and the vineyard; that in F the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, § 117, comes between the miracle of Bartimaeus and the cleansing of the Temple, thus being thrown back to the autumn before the final Passover instead of following, as in T, the anointing at Bethany, and that, as already noticed, § 138 combines the supper in Simon the Pharisee's house with the anointing.

Besides the correspondence in the order of the sections, which was apparently closer in the original form of F, there are other remarkable coincidences. For instance, it would scarcely have occurred to two independent harmonists to make the journey through Samaria (John iv. 4) one from Galilee to Judaea instead of from Judaea to Galilee, the first three verses having been previously used by both (F, § 22, T, § 13) to describe the return to Galilee after the second visit to Judaea, to place the conversation with Nicodemus after the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, or to insert Herod's threats (Luke xiii. 31) between the Transfiguration and the healing of the demoniac. Again, in both (F, § 105, T, § 52) the first part of the account of the Feast of Tabernacles (John vii. 2-31) is torn from its context and inserted among a mass of matter similar in both, while the rest of the chapter begins the long extract which in both runs without a break to the end of chapter xi., the *pericope adulterae*, which is naturally wanting in T, being in F placed most awkwardly after the discourse with Nicodemus, and the mention of the Feast of the Dedication (John x. 22-42) being omitted in T, whose scheme it would disagree with. The one important difference between the later parts of F and T is that the compiler of T boldly severs the cleansing of the Temple from the triumphal entry into Jerusalem and places it at the penultimate visit, while F is not so bold, and thus places the triumphal entry not before the final passover, but before the penultimate visit. In both, however, the narrative of the cleansing is followed immediately by the parable of the Pharisee and the publican. Even the variations of F show its want of originality. For instance, the marriage at Cana has been displaced. The notice that it was the beginning of miracles is inconsistent with its following the miraculous draught of fishes (§ 19); in its present place it immediately follows the sending of the disciples, who notwithstanding are present at it, and again the next paragraph begins abruptly "When he had come down from the mountain."

We may therefore conclude that the archetype of F was formed by taking T and substituting for each Syriac fragment in Tatian's Mosaic the corresponding fragment from the Vulgate, the adapter occasionally altering the order and inserting passages missing in T where he found a convenient opportunity. The discrepancies between the index and text in F show that it underwent further changes after assuming a Latin shape, but it is impossible to say how far the differences between it and T proceed from such subsequent alterations or are due to the original adapter. The date of the adaptation is uncertain, the limits being A.D. 383, the date of the Vulgate being brought out, and A.D. 545, the date of F. The discrepancies between index and text show that it must have been considerably before the inferior limit, while on the other hand it must have been made after the version had become well-known and popular, which was not till long after it appeared. On the whole, therefore, the most probable date seems to be midway between the limits, or the second half of the fifth century, say about A.D. 470. The notices in Gennadius (*de Vir. Ill.*), who wrote during this period, collected by Zahn (312, 313), show that either he was himself a Syriac scholar or was acquainted with one, and at that time pilgrimages from the West to Egypt and the Holy Land were frequent. To substitute in Tatian's Mosaic the proper fragments of the Vulgate would require a much less thorough knowledge of Syriac than an independent translation would imply.

F also contains the rest of the New Testament with the Epistle to the Laodiceans in the following order: the Pauline Epistles (the Philippians being followed by 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Colossians, Laodiceans, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews), the Acts, the seven Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse, the whole concluding with the verses of pope Damasus on St. Paul. To each book, except the Laodiceans, is prefixed a "brevis" or table of headings, and to each of the Pauline Epistles except the Hebrews, to the Acts and to the Apocalypse, a short preface. In addition there are prefixed to the Pauline Epistles a table of lessons from them, a general preface or argument of them, a long special argument of the Romans, and a concordance of the Epistles giving references to the various passages which treat of each particular doctrine. To the Acts is prefixed an account of the burial-places of the Apostles. There is a short general preface to the seven Catholic Epistles, and also the remarkable preface purporting to be St. Jerome's, which contains the

accusation, referred to by Westcott and Hort (*G. T. ii. Notes on Select Readings*, 105), against the Latin translators of omitting the "Patris Filii et Spiritus testimonium" in 1 John v. 7, 8, while the text itself is free from the interpolation. Besides this there are other places where, as in the Gospel, the text and supplementary matter no longer correspond exactly, showing that changes have occurred since the former was composed. For instance, the General Argument to the Pauline Epistles reckons but fourteen in all, including the Hebrews, and therefore excluding that to the Laodiceans, though it stands in the text. Again, the preface to the Colossians, "Colossenses et hii sicut Laodicienses sunt Asiani," must have been written when the Laodiceans preceded the Colossians, but the transposition might perhaps be due to Victor himself.

The whole MS. was carefully revised and corrected by Victor, in whose hand are three notes, one at the end of the Acts, and two at the end of the Apocalypse, respectively recording that he had finished reading the MS. on May 2 A.D. 546, April 19 A.D. 546, and a second time on April 12 A.D. 547. In the same hand are occasional glosses, the most remarkable being the explanation of the number of the beast in the Revelation as Teitan. The MS. was edited in 1868 by E. Ranke, whose preface gives a full description of it and its history, and the Harmony only is printed in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxviii. 255.

II. Victor was the author of several Commentaries on the Old and New Testament, partly consisting of extracts from various fathers, and partly original. Pitra (*Spic. Sol.* i.) has edited fragments of some on the Old Testament, contained in an *Expositio in Heptateuchum*, by Joannes Diaconus. The first, entitled *Responsions*, contained extracts ascribed (erroneously according to Lightfoot, *Ap. F.* Part II. ii. (1) 1002), by Victor to Polycarp, of which two are given by Pitra (p. 266) and five more (reprinted by Lightfoot, *ubi supra*), were printed by Feuardent in his notes on Irenaeus from a catena on the Gospels now lost. Another work is the *Reticulus*, or *On Noah's Ark* (p. 287), containing an extraordinary calculation to show that its dimensions typify the number of years in the life of our Lord. Many other quotations from unnamed works of Victor occur in the Catena, containing extracts from various other writers, including quotations from four works of Origen, otherwise unknown. On the New Testament he wrote a Commentary, eleven fragments of which preserved in the *Collections* of Smaragdus are collected by Pitra (*Patr. Lat.* cii. 1124), according to whom a St. Germain MS. of Rabanus Maurus's *Commentary on St. Matthew* marks numerous passages as derived from Victor. Perhaps the most curious is the reason for the change of name from Saul to Paul, as if from παῦλα, because he ceased to persecute. Another, "Principem hujus saeculi latuerunt ista tria mysteria, id est, virginitas, partus, et passio," comes mediately or immediately from Ignatius (*Eph.* 19, see Lightfoot, *Ap. F.* Part II. ii. (1) 76.) Fragments of *Capitula de Resurrectione Domini* are given in *Spic. Sol.* i. (liv. lix. lxii. lxiv.), in which Victor among other matters touches on the difficulties in the genealogy found in St. Matthew, and the discrepancy between St. Mark and St. John as to the hour of the Crucifixion. Of the last he gives first the explanation of Eusebius in *Quaestiones ad Marinum*, and then one of his own.

III. Victor's most celebrated work was that on the Paschal Cycle mentioned by several chroniclers and praised by Bede (*De Rat. Temp.* 51), whose two extracts are given in *Patr. Lat.* lxviii. 1097, xc. 502. The rest of the work was supposed to be lost till considerable extracts from it contained in the above mentioned *Catena* of Joannes Diaconus were published in the *Spic. Solesm.* (i. 296). It was written about A.D. 550, to controvert the Paschal Cycle of VICTORIUS, according to which Easter Day would have fallen in that year on April 17, while Victor considered that April 24 was the correct day, in accordance with the Alexandrine computation which he defends. In fact, after 5 metonic periods the discrepancy of A.D. 455, which was the cause of the composition of the Cycle of Victorius, had recurred. The new fragments do not add much to our knowledge of Victor's arguments. It should be noticed that by "Mensis Martius," and "Mensis Aprilis secundum Alexandrinos" he means the Egyptian months Phamenoth and Pharmuthi, beginning on February 25, and March 27 respectively. He places the beginning of the world at the vernal equinox for much the same reasons as Virgil in the Georgics, and observes that the darkness at the Crucifixion must have been miraculous, as a total eclipse could occur only at new moon. Several curious explanations of the mystical properties of numbers, resembling that already mentioned, are given. [F. D.]

VICTOR (48) TUNUNENSIS, an African bishop and chronicler of the sixth century. He was also a zealous supporter of the *Three Chapters*, for whose sake he endured much persecution after A.D. 556 and till his death about 567, both in his own province and in Egypt. He wrote a *Chronicle* which began at the Creation of the world and ended at the second year of the reign of Justinus II. A.D. 566. We have now only the portion which comprises 444–566. The Chronicle, as we have it, deals almost exclusively with the history of the Eutychian heresy and the controversy about the *Three Chapters*. He also gives details about the Vandal persecution, the memory of which must have been still fresh in his youth, and various wonderful stories telling against Arianism as that of an Arian bishop who dared to change the baptismal formula, saying "Barbas baptizes thee in the name of the Father, through the Son, and in the Holy Ghost," whereupon the baptismal water disappeared out of the font and the vessel itself was smashed. The Catechumen immediately resorted to the Catholic church for the reception of the sacrament. The Chronicle is very useful for illustrations of the social and religious life of Cent. vi. Canisius first printed it in 1600. It is reprinted in Migne's *Patr. Lat.* t. lxviii. with Galland's preface. Cf. Isid. *de Vir. Illust.* cap. 38; Cave's *Hist. Lit.* i. ...; Hodgkins, *Invaders of Italy*, iii. 35 and passim, quotes the Chronicle. A work on Penance included among the works of St. Ambrose is attributed to Victor; Ceill. v. 512, x. 46... 302. [G. T. S.]

VICTOR (49), bishop of Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux, succeeded Heraclius, but we do not know the year of his accession; it was after A.D. 541. From Sagittarius, bishop of Gap, and Salonius, bishop of Embrun, he received much persecution. [SAGITTARIUS.] He was present and subscribed at the council of Paris, A.D. 573 (Labbe, *Conc.* v. 920), and signed the synodical letter to king Sigebert (*Ib.* v. 922): he was at the council of Mâcon, A.D. 581 (*Ib.* v. 971). The date of his death is unknown (*Gall. Christ.* i. 707). [J. G.]

VICTOR (50), bishop of Palermo, is summoned to Rome by Gregory the Great in the first year of his pontificate, A.D. 591. Two years later the abbot Marinianus and the notary Benenatus are commissioned to inquire into his conduct to one Bonifacius. In A.D. 599 the Jews of Rome complained to Gregory that Victor had forcibly seized some synagogues at Palermo. Gregory at first ordered them to be restored, but, it appearing they had been already consecrated, ordered Victor to pay a price for them to be fixed by arbitration. The MSS. and other things belonging to the synagogues which had been carried away were to be restored. Three other letters of Gregory are addressed to Victor (lib. i. ind. ix. 72, lib, iii. ind xi. 27, lib. viii. ind. i. 25, lib. ix. ind. ii. 55, lib. v. ind. xiii. 6, lib. vi. ind. xiv. 42, lib. ix. ind. ii. 92, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 526, 624, 927, 993, 727, 850, 1018). [F. D.]

VICTOR (51), bishop of Phausiana or Fasiana in Sardinia, was appointed in consequence of Gregory the Great's remonstrances, after the see had been long vacant. In A.D. 599 he is addressed with the other five suffragans of Sardinia [VINCENTIUS (18)]. He was successful in the missionary work for which he was appointed among the heathen Barbaricines [VITALIS (13)] and others. For his complaints of the officials see INNOCENTIUS (37). (*Epp.* iv. 29, ix. 8, xi. 5, 22.) [F. D.]

VICTOR (52), primate of Numidia. Two letters of Gregory the Great are addressed to him and Columbus, another Numidian bishop, jointly, and a third to him alone, a separate letter being written to Columbus on the same business, in A.D. 594, 598, and 602. The first relates to the measures to be taken to check the recent increase of Donatism, the second to the complaints made by bishop VALENTIO, and a third to those against PAULINUS (19). (*Epp.* iv. 35, viii. 28, xii. 29.) [F. D.]

VICTOR (53), ST., presbyter in Champagne in the 6th or 7th century, was, according to his anonymous biographer, sprung from a noble family of Troyes. He entered the ranks of the clergy, and lived the solitary life somewhere in that country, perhaps at Archiacum (Arcis-sur-Aube). The place of his burial, "in loco amoeno," is also uncertain. The day of his death and commemoration is given as Feb. 26. The biography published by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 665–67) has neither name nor date, though they consider it ancient. His supposed relics were transferred in the 9th century to the monastery of Moutier-Ramey; and in the 12th century, Bernard of Clairvaux, being asked by the abbat of Moutier-Ramey to compose an office in honour of Victor, wrote a discourse and hymn still existing (*ibid.* 664, 667, 668; Ceillier, xiv. 458). [S. A. B.]

VICTOR (54), elected bishop of Carthage July 16, 646. He at once sent a synodical letter to pope Theodore, announcing his election and declaring against the Monothelite heresy (Mansi, x. 943; Hefele, sec. 304; Ceill. xii. 925). [G. T. S.]

VICTORIA (1), wife of presbyter FELIX (228), Cyp. *Ep.* 24. [E. W. B.]

VICTORIA (2), martyr in Numidia in the persecution of Diocletian. [FORTUNATIANUS (13); DATIVUS (3).] [C. H.]

VICTORIA (3). [TWENTY MARTYRS.]

VICTORIA (4), confessor of Culusitana in Proconsular Africa under Hunneric. (Vict. Vit. *Persec. Vandal.* lib. v. 3.) [C. H.]

VICTORIANUS (1), bishop of Carcabia, or Carcavia, a place of unknown site in Byzacene, present at the council of Cabarsussum in 393, and one of the twelve ordainers of Maximianus, condemned by the council of Bagaia (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 19 § 22, 53 § 59, iv. 4 § 5, 13 § 15, *c. Gaud.* ii. 77, *Ep.* 108, 115) [MAXIMIANUS (2), Vol. III. p. 869]. [H. W. P.]

VICTORIANUS (2), bishop of Musti, to which Turris, or Turis, seems to have been joined. He was opposed at Carth. Conference A.D. 411 by Felicianus, Donatist bishop of Musti, and Donatus of Turis, who does not appear to have been present. (*Carth. Coll.* i. 121, 134; Aug. *Brevic. Coll.* i. 12.) A bishop of this name attended the council of Carthage A.D. 401 (Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 10). [H. W. P.]

VICTORIANUS (3), a presbyter who wrote to St. Augustine for advice as to his conduct during the danger of barbarian invasion. He replied to him, pointing out (1) the general prevalence of the danger from which not either Italy, Gaul, or Spain, and even scarcely any part of the world was exempt; for even in the Egyptian desert some monasteries had been attacked. But in Africa the outrages of the Circumcellions were equal to those of the barbarians; for not only did they lay waste property, and inflict grievous bodily injuries, but they also compelled many to submit to rebaptism. 2. He ought to remember how all this had been foretold in Scripture, especially by our Lord, and also in the books of Daniel, Ezekiel, and Maccabees, and in the writings of St. Paul. If the question of desert be entertained, no one could deserve their punishment less than the three "children," or than Daniel himself; yet he was forward to confess his own sins, and those of his countrymen, and to acknowledge that both he and they had deserved what befel them. He exhorts Victorianus to teach his people not to murmur against God; that after all people must die in some way or other; and that a long illness is more distressing than a sudden death. The worst case is that of virgins dedicated to God; yet even instances are known, as that of the daughter of Severus

in which women carried off by barbarians, have been restored through the prayers of their friends. He ought therefore to pray and urge others to do so also; either that such women may not suffer violence, or that if it be suffered, it may not be imputed to them as sin. Purity resides not in the body, but in the soul. He therefore exhorts him to study Scripture carefully (Aug. *Ep.* 111.). [H. W. P.]

VICTORIANUS (4), a magistrate or "proconsul" of Carthage, under the Vandal domination, martyred under Hunneric for refusing to join the Arians (Victor. Vit. *Persec. Vandal.* lib. v. 4). [C. H.]

VICTORIANUS (5), priest. [SABINUS (14).]

VICTORICUS (1), twenty-sixth bishop in Conc. Carth. ii. *de Pace*, Cyp. *Ep.* 57; thirty-fifth in iv. *de Basilide*, Cyp. *Ep.* 70; twenty-fifth in vii. *de Bap. Haer.* iii.; *Sentt. Epp.*, bishop of Thabraca in Numidia Proc., now Tabarka and Cap Roux, on river Tusca, a colony; its forests (Juv. 10, 194). Its port is now Ea Calle (Mommsen, p. 513). Its bishops at Conc. Carth. A.D. 388, and Coll. Carth. A.D. 411 (Morcelli). [E. W. B.]

VICTORICUS (2), disciple of St. Cyprian, martyred with Lucius, Montanus, and others. [FLAVIANUS (27).] (Tillem. iv. 206, 647.) [C. H.]

VICTORICUS (3), disciple of St. Patrick in Tirechan's list (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 378 n. [22]); probably the man seen in S. Patrick's vision bearing innumerable letters, and specially the one with "Vox Hibernicorum" as related in St. Patrick's *Confession* (*Book of Armagh*, f. 24). [J. G.]

VICTORINUS (1). The tract against heresies by Pseudo-Tertullian closes with the notice of the heresy of Praxeas "quam Victorinus corroborare curavit." It has been suspected, and apparently with reason, that there is here a corruption of reading, and that under "Victorinus" the name of a Roman bishop is concealed. Those who suppose that Victor was the bishop referred to by Tertullian (*adv. Prax.* cap. 1) believe that Victor is also the person here intended. In the article MONTANISM (Vol. III. p. 941 *a.*) it has been contended that rather Zephyrinus is meant. Oehler (Tertullian ii. 765) makes a conjecture as to the possible origin of the corruption. [G. S.]

VICTORINUS (2). Mart. Carthag. A.D. 250. See ARISTO. [E. W. B.]

VICTORINUS (3), martyr in Egypt from Corinth with NICEPHORUS (2) under Numerian, c. 284. [C. H.]

VICTORINUS (4), ST., of Pettau, bishop and martyr. This saint appears to have been by birth a Greek, and was (according to the repeated statement of Cassiodorus) a rhetorician by profession before he became bishop of Pettau (Petavio), in Upper Pannonia. He is believed to have suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Diocletian. St. Jerome (who is the chief authority concerning him), mentions him several times, and even where his criticisms are adverse, with words which show respect. He enumerates among his works (*Catal. Script. Eccles.* 74), commentaries on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Habakkuk, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, the Gospel according to St. Matthew, and the Apocalypse, besides a treatise "adversus omnes haereses." He says, however, in the same place, that he knew less Latin than Greek "unde opera ejus, grandia sensibus, viliora videntur compositione verborum." Elsewhere, he seems to criticize him in a more disparaging way, as in the epistle to Magnus (tom. iv. p. 65), "Victorino martyri licet desit eruditio, non tamen deest eruditionis voluntas;" and in the second epistle to Paulinus (tom. iv. p. 567), "Inclyte Victorinus martyrio coronatus, quod intelligit, eloqui non potest." He occasionally cites the opinion of Victorinus, both in his own Commentaries (*in Eccles.* iv. 13; *in Ezech.* xxvi.) and elsewhere, but he considered him to have been affected by the opinions of the Chiliasts or Millenarians (see *Catal. Script.* 18, and the passage cited from the Commentary on Ezekiel), and he also states that he borrowed extensively from Origen. Still, when he mentions him in the character of a translator of Origen, he mentions him in such company as that of St. Hilary and St. Ambrose, speaking of them collectively as "quasi columnas ecclesiae" (*Apol. adv. Ruf.* tom. iv. p. 351; *de Error. Origen.* tom. iv. p. 346). It may have been in consequence of his Millenarian tendencies, or of his relations to Origen, that his works were classed as "apocrypha" in the "Decretum de libris recipiendis," which Baronius (ad ann. 303) erroneously refers to a synod held under Gelasius.

Of the works of St. Victorinus little or nothing is left: nothing, indeed, which can be attributed to him with any certainty. The poems which have had his name attached to them are attributed to him without any authority better than that of Bede: while the two lines quoted by Bede as the work of Victorinus were clearly written by some one who had a tolerable knowledge of Latin.

The scholia on the Apocalypse published in La Bigne's *Bibl. Patr.* i. 1245, answer well enough to what Cassiodorus (*de Inst. Div. Lit.* 9, p. 544, ed. Bened.) tells us of the Commentary of Victorinus on that book: that it was a collection of notes on difficult passages. But these notes oppose the Millenarian opinion, and cite Theodore, the ecclesiastical historian of Justinian's reign. Hence, even if the body of them be the work of St. Victorinus (which is quite uncertain), they must be seriously interpolated. So with the "Scholia of Victorinus on the Apocalypse" in Gallandius, *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. iv. The two, as Routh remarks (*Rel. Sacr.* iii. 482), are closely akin, and each may be emended from the other, while the resemblances to the fragment next to be mentioned make it probable that they are by the same author. But the explanation of the "number of the beast" by the name of Genseric, given in the scholia in Gallandius, shows that there also have been revised, at least, by a later hand than that of St. Victorinus.

A fragment, "de fabrica mundi," was edited by Cave (*Script. Eccles. Hist.* i. 148) from a Lambeth MS., and has been re-edited by Routh with other fragments extracted from St. Jerome

and notes (*Rel. Sacr.* tom. iii. pp. 453 et sqq.). This fragment seems to satisfy the conditions of a composition of St. Victorinus as described by St. Jerome in everything but its intrinsic value. It is obscure; it is the work of an author who did not know Latin (for, even allowing for the corrupt state of the MS., the Latin of the writer is singularly bad); and it may be taken to favour the Millenarian opinions. But it is difficult to suppose that this fragment is really the work of an author whom St. Jerome classed with St. Hilary and St. Ambrose, indeed, if it is a fair specimen of the work of which it once formed a part, the loss of the rest can hardly be matter of regret. It is possible that it may be a portion of the commentary on Genesis, but it is perhaps more probable that both this fragment and the scholia on the Apocalypse are the work of another Victorinus, and that all the works of the bishop of Pettau have been lost.

[H. A. W.]

VICTORINUS (5), a Numidian bishop mentioned in the letter of Constantine A.D 330 (*Mon. Vet. Don.* xxvi. p. 215 Oberthür, p. 189 Dupin).

[H. W. P.]

VICTORINUS (6), called CAIUS MARIUS (by Jerome, *Commentary on Galatians*, *Proleg.*), and also MARIUS FABIUS (in MS. of his commentary on Cicero and elsewhere, see Suringar, *Historia Scholiast. Lat.* p. 153, note): known also as AFER, from the country of his birth, is to be distinguished from two Christian writers called Victorinus, mentioned by Gennadius (*de Scriptor. Eccl.* capp. 60 and 88), as well of course as from Victorinus of Petau, the commentator on the Apocalypse, and also from the Grammatical writers Victorinus Maximus and Quintus Fabius Laurentius Victorinus (see Launoy, Opp. tom. ii. P. 1, pp. 645 sq. *De quinque illustribus Victorinis*, and J. E. B. Mayor's *Clue to Latin Literature*, pp. 172–3). He was a celebrated nan of letters and rhetorician in Rome in the niddle of the 4th century. "Victorinus rhetor ·t Donatus grammaticus Romae insignes habenur," says Jerome, in his "Chronicon" for the ear 358. He had the instruction of the most istinguished classes, and was altogether in such igh reputation that a statue was erected in his onour in the forum of Trajan. (S. Augustine, 'onfessions, viii. 2, "doctissimus senex et omnium beralium doctrinarum peritissimus quique phisophorum tam multa et legerat et dijudiaverat et dilucidaverat, doctor tot nobilium natorum qui etiam ob insigne praeclari magisrii statuam in Romano Foro meruerat et acceerat," Jerome *Chronicon*, *ut supr.* and Boethius, *Topica Cic. Commentar. ad init.* "Victorinus urimae in disserendo notitiae.")

Among his writings belonging to the preristian period of his life, there remain to us,

An "Ars grammatica," of which very little original (see Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, vol. vi. aef. pp. xv.-xvii., and C. Thiemann, *Jahrb. für* ass. *Philologie*, vol. 107, pp. 429–432).

2. A little treatise "*de Metris Horatianis*" eil, vol. vi. *praef.* pp. xvii, xviii).

3. A commentary on Cicero's treatise on etoric "*de Inventione*" (Suringar, *Hist. Crit.* hol. *Lat.* pp. 155–161). It is printed in elli's *Cicero*, vol. v. (Turin, 1833). It was itten when he was in close relation to Christianity, if not after he became a Christian. (See B. I. p. 59, l. 42, Orelli.)

This appears to be all that remains to us of this period of his life, and in regard to his grammatical and metrical works, there is great difficulty in distinguishing what belongs to him from the work of other authors of the same name. Indeed, from every point of view, and in every stage of his life, this author presents almost insuperable difficulties to his commentators.[a]

There is nothing in these remains to account for his celebrity, and his commentary on Cicero presents anticipations of the intense obscurity of his later theological writings.

Besides these works we hear of others which have perished.

1. Translations of writings of the Platonists. (Aug. *Conf.* viii. 2.) His later theological works assure us of his familiarity with the philosophy of the Neo-Platonist Schools.

2. Other commentaries on Cicero. (See Suringar, *op. cit.* pp. 156–160, for further references.)

3. A translation of Porphyry's *Isagoge*, employed by Boethius (Isidorus, *Etymol.* (*al. Origines*) ii. 25, § 9).

4. Logical works, *De syllogismis hypotheticis* and *De divisione definitionum.* (Isidor. *Etymol.* ii. 28, § 25 and 29. For further references to these works, see Prantl, *Gesch. der Logik*, i. pp. 661, 662.)

Victorinus' conversion is the subject of the well-known narrative in St. Augustine's *Confessions.* (B. viii. capp. 2–5.) In extreme old age the zealous study of scripture and Christian literature[b] brought him to the conviction of the truth of the Christian religion. He told Simplician, afterwards bishop of Milan, that he was a Christian, and when Simplician refused to regard him as such till he saw him "in the church," asked him in banter "whether walls, then, make Christians"? —a characteristic question from one disposed to regard Christianity rather as another school of philosophy than as a social organization. The fear of his friends, however, which kept him from making profession of his faith, was removed by further meditation, and after being enrolled as a catechumen for a short time, he was baptized, and by his own deliberate choice made his preliminary profession of faith with the utmost publicity. St. Augustine gives us a vivid account of the excitement and joy his conversion caused in Christian circles at Rome.

The date of his conversion is uncertain. It was at least before the end of the reign of Constantius, A.D. 361 (vid. subter). But he continued to teach rhetoric, etc., in Rome till the year 362, when Julian's edict forbidding Christians to be public teachers made his position inconsistent with his religious convictions. (Aug. *Conf.* l.c.) Then "choosing rather to give over the wordy school than God's Word," he withdrew, and as St. Jerome emphasizes the great age which he

[a] See a pathetic complaint of a 16th century editor, quoted by Keil (vol. vi. praef. p. x.), "Torsit pro exiguitate sua hic nos Victorinus satis misere."

[b] He seems to speak of himself (*ad Justin. Manich.* init.) as one "qui multa lectione, continui laboris indefessis vigiliis, tenuerit quid ad fidem legis debeat confiteri."

had attained before his conversion, it is not surprising that we should hear nothing more of him. He lived, however, long enough to write a number of Christian treatises and commentaries, and it is even possible that Jerome alludes to him as still alive on the breaking out of the disputes connected with the name of Jovinian in 382. (See *Prolegomena* to Victorinus in Migne's *Patrolog. Lat.* vol. viii. p. 994, for reference and question of reading.)

The following is a list and brief notice of his Christian writings. (For further information on editions, etc., the *Prolegomena* in Migne's edition can be consulted):—

1. The Anti-Arian treatise, "Liber de generatione Verbi Divini" written in reply to the "Liber de Generatione Divina" addressed to Victorinus by Candidus the Arian.

2. The long work "Adversus Arium," in four books, elicited by Candidus's brief rejoinder to the former treatise. [See CANDIDUS (4).] The second book of his treatise alludes to Constantius as still emperor (B. ii. cap. 9). It must have been written therefore not later than 361. The first book (cap. 28), according to the better reading (see Migne's *Prolegomena*, § 7), speaks of the Nicene Council as having occurred "forty years before" (ante xl. annos"), and should have been written, therefore, about 365. It is possible the first book may have been actually written after the second, or the expression may be simply inexact.

3. The "De ὁμοουσίῳ recipiendo," a summary of the last-named work.

4. Three "Hymns" on the subject of the Trinity which have not even the claims to rhythmical structure possessed by St. Augustine's "*Psalmus contra partem Donati.*" They consist mainly of formulas and prayers intended to elucidate the relations of the Trinity. On the contents of the above writings, enough will be said below.

5. Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, Philippians, and Ephesians.

Without having much continuous merit as commentaries (see Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 227), these writings contain a great number of points of doctrinal interest to be noticed below. They are probably the first Latin commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles. (See Jerome, *Commentar. in Gal. Prologus.*)

6. An anti-Manichaean treatise which may with reasonable certainty be ascribed to Victorinus (Migne, *Prolegomena*, § 3), entitled by Sirmond, who first edited it in 1630, "Ad Justinum Manichaeum contra duo principia Manichaeorum et de vera carne Christi." It is the first treatise against the Manichaeans which exists, and insists with considerable insight on the inconsistencies of their dualism.[c]

7. A little treatise of a very strange character, edited by Sirmond in company with (6), and entitled "De Verbis Scripturae *Factum est vespere et mane dies unus.*"[d]

Besides these we may notice the *De Physicis*, ascribed to our author by Cardinal Mai (see his remarks in Migne prefixed to the treatise, p. 1295). It is a plainly and ably-written treatise on the Creation, Fall, and Recovery of Man. But the style does not suggest the authorship of Victorinus, and the character of the quotations from the New Testament seems also to argue a different author (see below, p. 24, note w). Again, there is a poem on the Maccabees sometimes, but certainly erroneously, ascribed to Victorinus (see under *Hilary of Arles* [HILARIUS (17), p. 71], and correct reference in JULIANUS, p. 504).

We have some allusions in his extant works to others which have perished, *e.g.* on Eph. iv. 10 (lib. ii. *init.*) there is an allusion to a commentary on the Corinthians. Cardinal Mai refers to a commentary on Leviticus by Victorinus extant in the Vatican (see Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés*, vol. iv. p. 328, note 2).

All these writings of Victorinus (with the exception of the commentaries which make a nearer approach to lucidity) are intensely obscure. It is matter of astonishment that one who had Victorinus' reputation as a rhetorician should have been so wholly incapable of giving clear expression to his thoughts. His intense obscurity in treating theological subjects of themselves recondite, aggravated by the extremely corrupt condition of the text as hitherto edited,[e] the barbarous mixture of Greek and bad Latin in which he often writes, his prolixity and his repetitions, have been the causes of his being ignored more than is at all justified by his substantial merits. He has wearied the very few people who have tried to read him beyond their patience, and they have almost wholly missed his significance. Those who have read him have mostly done nothing but complain of him. "He wrote," says Jerome, "in a dialectical style some very obscure books, intelligible only to the learned" (*De Vir. Illustr.* ci.). He condemns him, moreover, as a man so occupied in secular literature as to have ignored Holy Scripture (*Epist. ad Galat. Prologus*), a judgment reversed by Augustine (*Confessions*, viii. 2) and the evidence of his works. Petavius, besides accusing him of an heretical tendency,[f] matches him with Heraclitus as ὁ σκοτεινός, and condemned him as "incommode balbutientem" (*De Trin.* i. v. § 8). Such commentators as he has had show scant patience with him (see Migne's edition, p. 1179, note 3; 1245, note 3; [illegible] note 4). He is "obscurissimus," "barbarus," "ferreus." Tillemont would not trouble himself to search his works (*Mém. Eccl.* vol. x. p. [illegible] l. 4). Ceillier (*Auteurs Sacrés*) commends him with an utter want of appreciation of his peculiar position. Dorner ignores him. But there is one notable exception to these severe judgments on Victorinus' style and matter [illegible]

---

[c] It is, however, curious to find a Christian appealing to *Roman pride against an Oriental "sacrilege"* (a Persico vel Armeniorum sacrilegio), cap. 16.

[d] It seems, in asserting the *substantiality of darkness* (cap. 2), to contradict the previous treatise (cap. 10).

[e] A great number of corrections of the text can be made by any reader, e.g. *Adv. Ar.* i. cap. xxiii. (p. [illegible] in Migne, 7th line from bottom) ὁμοουσίῳ for [illegible] cap. xliv. (17th line from bottom of p. 1074), "recipientia virtutem," for "recipienda, virtutem," cap. xlix. [illegible] *nullam* for *unam*. [A better text exists in a hitherto unedited MS. (No. 1684, Phillips' Library, Cheltenham) of the 10th or 11th century. It has been used for this article.]

[f] He is ably defended against Petavius's careless denunciation by the Ballerini, *Dissertationes de S. Leone* ii. cap. 1, § 8. Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* vol. xi. p. 111.

these ignorings of his significance. Thomassin, whose theological judgment is a weighty one, speaks of him as a man "inferior to none in the profundity of his insight into the inmost mysteries" of the Divine Being, and the relation of the Persons of the Trinity to one another (*De Incarn. Verbi*, B. ii. cap. i. § 6).

This judgment will put us on the right lines for estimating his position and his powers. He has no special merits as a commentator, nor the capacities of a dogmatic theologian in the ordinary sense. He does not manipulate skilfully the stock anti-Arian arguments. He combats, in general as badly as possible, the objection to the ὁμοούσιος, on the ground of its being an unscriptural term (*Adv. Ar.* i. 30, p. 1063 B.C.[g]; and ii. 8, 9, pp. 1094–5). He has none of the controversial power and vividness of an Athanasius or an Augustine.[h] Almost all his importance lies in his metaphysical and speculative capacities, and in his belief in the power of the intellect to give a rational presentation of the Trinitarian Creed, etc. He does indeed feel the danger of such speculation. "It is madness," he says (*Adv. Justin.* 2, 1000 C), "to suppose that while we are almost unknown to ourselves, we should have either the capacity or the leave to investigate what lies beyond ourselves and the world." He rebukes Candidus for writing about God "tam audenter." He would have him keep himself to the Scripture.[i] "Magnam tuam intelligentiam quis fascinavit?" he asks. "De Deo dicere, supra hominem audacia est" (*De Gen.* i. p. 1019, C, D). He ends his own first answer to Candidus with a striking prayer to God to forgive his sin involved in writing about God (*De Gen.* ad fin.). But the "fascination" of such subjects he feels himself to the full, and, on the whole, he is sure that they are within the power of the illuminated Christian intellect. "Lift up thyself, my spirit," he cries, "and recognise that to understand God is difficult, but not beyond hope." (*Adv. Ar.* iii. 6, 1102 D.)

The special character of his theology may be further explained by two epithets. 1. Though post-Nicene in date, it is *ante-Nicene* in character.[j] The doctrine of the subordination of the Son is emphasized by him, and this very subordination doctrine is used against Arianism without the least suspicion of its being itself open to the charge of any Arianizing tendency. He sees, as boldly as the earlier theologians, anticipations of the Incarnation in the Theophanies of the Old Testament (*Adv. Ar.* iv. 32, 1136 C). He retains the ante-Nicene interpretations of crucial texts—"My Father is greater than I" (St. John xiv. 28), etc. "What has come into being in Him was life" (St. John i. 3).[k] He keeps the functions of the Incarnate in the closest possible relation to the Cosmic function of the Pre-Incarnate Word.

2. His theology is *Neo-Platonist* in tone. Here we get to the really special interest attaching to Victorinus' works. He had grown old before his conversion in the Neo-Platonist schools. When he was converted, he applied many principles of the Plotinian philosophy to the elucidation of the Christian mysteries. His importance in this respect has been entirely overlooked in the history of theology. He preceded the Pseudo-Dionysius. He anticipated a great deal that appears in Scotus Erigena. If he is sometimes more Neo-Platonist than Christian, this is no doubt due in part to his mind having lost the flexibility of youth and middle age before he applied himself to Christian theology.

Here shall be given—

I. A summary of his theological system.

II. An estimate of its relation to Neo-Platonism.

III. A specification of further points in his theology which demand notice.

IV. A notice of his importance in relation to the ante-Hieronymian versions of the Latin Bible.

1. The following is a summarized statement of his mode of conceiving the relations of the Trinity and the processes of creation and redemption.

Candidus had objected to the orthodox doctrine that in asserting *generation* in God, it asserted *change* ("omnis generatio per mutationem est"), and thus contradicted the essential idea of God; further, he had contended that the idea of a "genitus Deus ex prae-existente substantia" is in contradiction to the "simplicity" of the Divine substance. Dwelling on ideas such as these of the Divine immutability and simplicity, he believed himself, in fighting against the Catholic doctrine, to be contending for the dignity of God, "the infinite, the incomprehensible, the unknowable, the invisible, the unchangeable" (Candidi Arian. *Lib. de Gen. Div.* 1–3; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* viii. 1015).[1] To this Victorinus's reply is central and final. Your transcendent and immutable God is so conceived that He can come into no possible relation to anything beyond Himself. To become a creator at a certain moment in time—to act in creation, as much involves *change* as the act of generation. If you admit, as you must, that God can create without change, you must admit equally that he can generate. You have admitted a "motus" which is not "mutatio" (*De Gen.* 30, 1035, A B). But this proceeding forth of God in the action of creation is only not a "change" in the Divine Essence, because it has its origin and ground there. It has been the eternal being of God to proceed forth, to move, to live. This eternal motion, eternal transition in God, it is that we, speaking in the necessarily inadequate terms of

---

[g] These references are to the pages or columns of the 8th volume of Migne's *Patrologia*.

[h] We may, however, notice that he states vigorously, and for the first time, the dilemma based on Christ's claim of union with the Father. "Hoc dicens Deus fuit, mentitus non est: si autem mentitus est, non opus Dei omnimodis perfectum." *De Gener.* i. 1020 C.

[i] He uses here the ordinary Christian language about the authority of Scripture: but cf. *Adv. Ar.* ii. 3, 1091 C.

[j] Dr. Newman refers to him in this connection. See *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical*, pp. 247, seq.

[k] See on St. John xiv. 28 (*Adv. Ar.* i. 13, p. 1047 C). "*Major Pater* quod ipse dedit ipsi omnia et causa est ipsi Filio ut sit, et isto modo sit." "Filius ut esset, accepit," cf. his comment on Philipp. iii. 21 (p. 1227, A B), with reference to 1 Cor. xv. 28 (the subjection of the Son)—a very ambiguous passage, but of great interest. "Verbum subditum est Deo, est enim Deus potentior. Ille est qui mittit. Hic qui mittitur. Hic per quem operatio est, Ille operator." Cf. his interpretation of Gabriel's Message to the Blessed Virgin, *Adv. Ar.* i. 58, p. 1054 D; and on St. John i. 3, 4, *Adv. Ar.* i. 4, p. 1042 B, etc.

[1] This little treatise concludes with an interesting statement of the position of the Arian Christ, cap. 10, 11.

"esse" of God is equivalent to "moveri," "et moveri ipsum quod est esse.")

This fact Victorinus endeavours to express with certainly wearisome reiteration, in a great variety of formulas. But again and again he emphasizes, as a fact which is to be received on faith and then recognised by reason,[n] that whatever the feebleness of human language may suggest (and he uses it himself sometimes very unguardedly, even once using the word "junior" of the Son), the process is utterly out of all conditions of time or succession. It belongs to the eternal law of the Divine Being.[o] (Cf. *Adv. Arium*, i. 34, 1066 D, "semper generans generatio:" iv. 21, 1128 C, "sine tempore hoc accipi;" *Hymn*, i. 1141 C, "re prius, non tempore;" cf. *De Gen.* 20, 21, 22. For careless language see *Adv. Ar.* i. 20, 1053 D, again "creatus" of the Son; *Hymn.* iii. 1144 C.)

This "generatio" is expressed not most frequently, but perhaps in such a way as to afford the best starting-point in exposition, as the eternal utterance of the Divine Will, moving eternally into actuality: the will of God not for one instant failing of its absolutely self-adequate effect. "Every act of will is the progeny of that which wills." Thus of the Father's will, the Word or Son is the summary or universal effect. Eternally He issued forth (prosiliit), the eternal manifestation of the Father's self; one with the Father. "The Father is God, and the Son is His will, both one, not by union, but by simplicity of essence, the will proceeding forth into actualized capacity (in potentiam actuosam), but not withdrawing from the Father's own substance and identical motion" (*Adv. Ar.* i. 31–32, 1064 A B C). "If anyone thinks deeply on this he will find that God and His will are inseparable, and yet in a way separable. . . . The conceived will issues and is expressed by a sort of mental birth. For the thoughts of the mind are, as it were, the offspring of the mind. Thus as God in his universal thought has but one will, therefore one and only begotten is the Son. He thought not one thing first and then another." The eternal act of thought or will has one eternal Object (*in Epist. ad Ephes.* i. 1. 1236 B.C). Thus the generation of the Son is, according to Victorinus, "non a necessitate naturae sed voluntate Patris. Ipse se ipsum circumterminavit" (*Adv. Ar.* i. 31).[p]

Father eternally wills, so the Father eternally knows, Himself in the Son. The Divine knowledge, like the Divine will, must have its adequate object. God knows Himself in the Son; for the Son is the expression of His own being. The Son is thus the "forma" of God and His limitation. This is a thought which constantly recurs. It is not that God is limited from outside, but that the infinite and the indeterminate in expressing Himself, limits or conditions Himself. He knows Himself in the Logos or determinate, definite Utterance; and thus the unconditioned, the absolute, the Father, limits or conditions Himself in that eternal utterance by which He knows Himself. Knowledge is thus conceived of as limitation or form; it is an eternal abiding relation of subject and object. Once for all the Father knows Himself as what He is in the Son. The Son is thus an object of knowledge both distinct from the Father (foris) and one with the Father—distinct from Him because the object of knowledge stands over against the subject; one with Him because He is the Father's own essence, and in knowing Him the Father knows Himself. This is constantly expressed. In all acts of knowledge there is an "alteritas nata"—"Cognoscentia foris est ab illo quod cupit cognoscere," but yet there is a unity of the knowing and the known; so when the Divine Being eternally moves out to the knowledge of Himself, there is the same distinction and unity. "In isto, sine intellectu temporis, tempore . . . est alteritas nata, cito in identitatem revenit" (*Adv. Ar.* i. 57, 58. 1083 D, etc.). Thus the "intelligentia" which is the Son, proceeds from and is one with the "esse," which is the Father (*Adv. Arium*, iii. 4. 1102 A, etc.). For all this conception of the Son as *knowledge* or "forma," a multitude of references can be given (*Hymn.* iii. 1145 A; *Adv. Ar.* i. 53. 1081 D; iv. 11, 1121 A; iv. 19. 1127 B.C). The Father is "incognitus," "interminatus," considered (as He cannot be) in Himself,—the Son "imponit terminum," "definit," etc. He is both "definitus et definitor" iv. 19. 20, etc. See also St. Irenæus *c. Hæres.* B. iv. 4 § 2 Immensus Pater in Filio mensuratus: Mensura Patris Filius. Cf. Synesius Hymn iii. (to the Son) *ὅρος εἶ φυσίων, τᾶς τεκτοίσας καὶ τικτομένας.* Cf. Hymn v. *ὦ πατρὸς μορφά.*

It is only stating this same principle in broader terms to say that the Son is to the Father as effect to cause (*Adv. Arium*, iv. 3, 1115 A), that is to say, He is the revelation of all the Father is. What the Father *is*, the Son *expresses*, *exhibits*, *manifests*. As outward intelligence and life express our inner being, so the Father, the inner being, is expressed in the Son. The Father is the *esse*, the *vivens*, the Son the *Vita*, the actualized life. (*Adv. Arium*, i. 32, 42.) Substance can only be known by its manifestations in life (iii. 11, 1107 B.) The Father is the "motio," the Son the "motus." What the Father is inwardly (in abscondito) the Son is outwardly (foris). He is the "substantia quaedam subsistens in qua apparet et demonstratur quod occultum et velatum est in alio." The Father is "silentium," "cessatio," "quies." The Son is the "progressio, quod non dimittens unde pro-

---

[m] *Adv. Ar.* ii. 3, 1091 A, circa prima et summa verba deficiunt; cf. *de Gen.* 28, 1033 D, 1034 A, we have no celestial language: accordingly "a nostris actionibus nominamus; actiones Dei, existente tamen illo super omnia."

[n] *Ad Ephes.* iii. 18, 1269, C, "Ordo est ut prior fides sit: qui enim credit is ad scientiam venit."

[o] All life is a *now.* "Non enim vivimus praeteritum aut vivimus futurum, sed semper praesenti utimur." In this respect our life is an "imago aeternitatis," quae "semper per praesentiam habet omnia et haec semper." (*Adv. Ar.* iv. 15, 1124 A.)

[p] See on this question Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, p. 24, note 6; Newman's *Arians*, cap. ii. § 4; Athanasius' *Treatises against Arianism* (Library of Fathers), references in Index under head of "Will." Athanasius would not necessarily have condemned the expression in this context.

greditur, magis est apparentia." Thus in the broadest sense He is the utterance of the Father. (*Adv. Arium*, i. 52, 1081; iii. 7, 1103 D. Cf. Irenæus iv. 6 § 6: Invisibile Filii Pater, Visibile Patris Filius.) This again is frequently expressed by describing the life of God as the eternal actualizing of what is potential. All things are potentially in the Father, actually in the Son. The Son is the "image" of the Father, because He does not, like a creature, express the Father's power or wisdom, but expresses, actualizes the Father's self. (Cf. *Adv. Arium*, i. 19, etc. "Quod est esse, Pater est: quod species, Filius: esse autem speciei imago est ejus quod est esse," "imago substantia est cujus et in qua est imago .... in declarationem intus potentiae. Hinc Pater Qui intus: filius qui foris.") It is only this same idea which Victorinus expresses in the phrase the Father is to the Son as ὁ μὴ ὤν to ὁ ὤν. The Father is ὁ μὴ ὤν in the one of the four possible senses[q] of the "not being" (*De Gen.* 3): He is the super-essential, the transcendent: that which is prior to all substantialization. This idea finds a great variety of expressions. He is the προών or προόν, the "prae-principium," the "prae-causa," "ante omnem existentialitatem," the "supra-universale," the "prae-existentia potius quam existentia"—not through lack of anything but by absolute transcendental priority of being. (*Adv. Arium*, iv. 19, 1127 B; iv. 23, 1129 D; i. 37, 1069 A; i. 39, 1070 B. This thought occupies a great part of the *Liber de Gen*; cf. Newman's *Arians*, c. ii. § 4, p. 191.) The Son, on the other hand, is the "existentia"[r] (actualized existence), the "universale," the "principium," etc. All this only expresses the idea which is the essence of Victorinus' thought, the idea of the Son as that in which the supreme, the unconditioned Father finds His conditioning form or realization.[s] So utterly essential is He to the Being of God, that nothing can be so untrue as to describe Him as created. It were better even to deny Him begotten than to assert Him created (*de Gen.* 17, 1030 A). He is the "actio," the Father is the Being: and Perfect Being involves perfect action: "In eo quod est, inest et operari." "Generatur agere ab eo quod est esse." Action involves being and being action. The Father and the Son are one. "Unum ergo et simplex ista duo" (*De Gen.* 22). In this conception of the relation of the Son to the Father is involved at once His absolute consubstantiality and His absolute subordination. "The Father is greater" than the Son, not in virtue of having or being anything which the Son is or has not, but as He that gives is prior to Him that receives. "The Son has Life," not as a creature but "in Himself." He has it as the Father has it, but "He has received from the Father what He has, and is" (*Adv. Arium*, i. 42, vide supra, p. 15, note k). Thus he is said to be "subditus." The Father is even said to be "potentior" (*Epist. ad Philipp.* 1227 A) as He who sends commands, works, is to Him who is sent, and through whom He works. He is again described as "beatior," though the Son is "totus Deus," like the Father, and "equal in substance and power and dignity." (*Adv. Arium*, i. 13, 1047 C.) Thus the Λόγος is often spoken of as "ministering" to the Father, even in virtue of being that "subsistent Life through whom all things live" (*Adv. Arium*, i. 52, 1080 C; iv. 8, 1118 C).

The passages[t] in which the distinction between the ἐνδιάθετος and the προφορικὸς Λόγος are implied are not many or emphatic in Victorinus. He holds it in no such emphatic sense as Tertullian. The Son is eternally Son and self-subsistent. That "effulgentia" "Filietas" is out of all time, absolute (*Adv. Arium*, i. 27, 1060 D). "Catholica disciplina dicit et semper fuisse Patrem et semper Filium" (*Ad Phil.* 1210 A). Yet Victorinus admits there is a sense in which he may be called "maxime filius" in Humanity (1061 A), and speaks of Him as getting the name of Son, the "Name above every Name," only in His Incarnate exaltation (*Ad Philipp.* 1210 C D, ita ut tantum nomen accesserit, res eadem fuerit).

Victorinus's thought expresses itself thus naturally in the doctrine of the generation of the Son and His co-essential equality with the Father. But his thought does not so easily adapt itself to formulas which express the Being, Procession and Substantiality of the Holy Ghost. He intends to be perfectly orthodox. He accepts the Faith, even though he finds it difficult to formulate. The Holy Ghost then proceeds very emphatically in his teaching "from the Father *and* the Son." "Sicut a gremio Patris et in gremio, Filius; sic a ventre Filii Spiritus; ὁμοούσιον ergo tres; et idcirco in omnibus Unus Deus." Again: "Ex Filio Spiritus Sanctus, sicut ex Deo Filius conrationaliter, et Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre." Again: "A filio habet quod est" (*Adv. Arium*, i. 8, 12, 13, 16, 1044 C, 1046 D, 1048 A, 1050 C). Elsewhere he says of the Holy Spirit that "Ex Deo Patre omnia habet, τῷ Λόγῳ, hoc est Jesu Christo tradente illi omnia quae habet a Patre" (*Adv. Arium*, i. 47, 1077 B, cf. iii. 8, 1105, A, B, and iii. 15, 1111 B). Once again He is "a Patre per Christum et in Christo" (*Adv. Arium*, iv. 33, 1138 A). Thus the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son: He is subsequent in order to the Son. On the other hand, as "Spirit of the Father" there is a sense in which He precedes the Son; that is to say He, as that which God is—Spirit, is that in which the Father begets the Son. He conveys the Father's Life to the Son. He is the "progressus," as well as the "regressus" of God: and thus in one passage He is mysteriously described as "the Mother of Jesus" in His eternal life.[u] But the passage is

---

q *Vide infra*, p. 20 note d and p. 22 note m.

r This is by no means strictly adhered to, e.g. *adv. Arium*, iii. 18: 1113 C. The Father is described as "*actualis existentia*," "*substantialitas*." The Son is "*actus existentialis*."

s It must surely be regarded as very remarkable that the Divine relation of *love* finds almost no expression in Victorinus.

t Quoted by Dr. Newman; see "*Tracts*," quoted above, p. 15.

u Also apparently in the flesh: "et supra *et deorsum*," 1084, C D. This strange expression receives, when viewed in its context, some elucidation from passages in Victorinus's contemporary, Hilary of Poitiers. See Dorner, *Person of Christ* (Clark's edition), vol. ii. pp. 403–405. The Word (the "Virtus altissimi") and the Spirit produce in conjunction the human nature.

apparently intentionally veiled in obscurity[v] (*Adv. Ar.* i. 16, 1050 C; i. 58, 1084 C).

In all this the distinction of Son and Spirit is carefully maintained, but yet the essential duality which is in God—the distinction of that which is, from that which proceeds forth—the distinction expressed in all the antitheses referred to above, is clearer to Victorinus than the Trinity of relations. The Son and the Spirit seem to him more utterly one than the Father and the Son. They are "existentiae duae," but they proceed forth "in uno motu" and that "motus" *is* the Son: so that the Spirit is as it were, contained in the Son (*Adv. Ar.* iii. 8, 1105 A).

Thus Victorinus sometimes speaks as if the Spirit were the Son in another aspect (he even says "idem ipse et Christus et Spiritus Sanctus," see *Adv. Arium*, iii. 18, 1113 D and i. 59, 1085 B). He has also a subtle mode of speaking of the Spirit as the "*Λόγος* in occulto," and Christ Incarnate as the "*Λόγος* in manifesto;" Logos and Spiritus being used interchangeably;[w] or again Christ is the "Spiritus apertus," the Spirit the "Spiritus occultus" (*Adv. Ar.* iii. 14, 1109 B C). Again the Spirit is the "interior Christi virtus" (iv. 17, 1125 C) in whom Christ is present (1109 C). The confusion seems to spring from the use of "Spiritus" as meaning the Divine Nature. But in intention and generally the two persons are kept distinct. If Christ is the "vox," the Spirit is the "vox vocis" (*Adv. Arium*, iii. 16, 1111 C, i. 13, 1048 A), or again, as the Son is Life the Spirit is Knowledge ("vivere quidem Christus, intelligere Spiritus," *Adv. Arium*, 1, 13, 1048 B), or again the relations of the Trinity are expressed in formulas such as these: "visio, videre, discernere:" "esse, vivere, intelligere," expressing three stages of a great act (*Adv. Arium*, iii. 4, 5; the latter chapter should be studied).

Again, Victorinus is the first theologian to speak of the Spirit as the principle of unity in the Godhead, the bond or "copula" of the eternal Trinity, completing the perfect circle of the Divine Being, the return of God upon Himself. (*Adv. Ar.* i. 60, 1085, C, D, "sphaera," "circularis motus." Hymn 1, ad init. et fin. Hymn iii. 1144 A, "status, progressio, regressus." See also a passage somewhat more Platonic than Christian, *Adv. Ar.* i. 51, 1080 A.)

On His work in the Incarnation his language is clear (*Adv. Arium*, iii. 18, 1113 C, D), "ex ipso concipitur Christus in carne; ex ipso sanctificatur in baptismo Christus in carne; ipse est in Christo qui in carne; ipse datur Apostolis a Christo qui in carne."

In stating the doctrine of the Trinity in general, Victorinus insists with endless reiteration on the circuminsession of the Three Persons, —"omnes in alternis existentes, et semper simul *ὁμοούσιοι* divina affectione, secundum actionem (tantummodo) subsistentiam propriam habentes:" "uterque in utroque" (*Adv. Ar.* i. 15, 16, 1050 A, C, cf. iii. 9, 10). They are *one* with a unity which transcends number—"*ante* unum quod est in numero, plane simplex": "unde et Pater et Filius et Spiritus non solum unum, sed et unus Deus" (*Adv. Ar.* iii. 1, 1098 D). Yet in the unity there is a distinction of the Three which to Victorinus seems not adequately *expressed* by the phrase "tres personae." *He* would render the Greek *ὑποστάσεις* by the *Latin subsistentiae*, and speak of *tres subsistentiae de* (or "*ex*") *una substantia*, or say that "Ipsum *quod* est esse, subsistit tripliciter"[x] (*Adv. Ar. i. 41*, ii. 4, iii. 4, 1072 A, 1092 D, 1101 D). We have in the hymns a number of formulae of the Trinity, but it must be admitted that Victorinus lets himself play with language in a way which brings him now and again perilously near to nonsense. The formulae of the third hymn will be found perhaps most suggestive.[y]

One quotation shall be given to conclude this subject, illustrating the completeness of Victorinus's Trinitarian Theology; the words are those concluding the four books against Arius—"Existit Christus sua existentia, et Spiritus Sanctus sua; sed ambo una substantia, ex quo omnes, id est tota Trinitas una, atque eodem modo juncto Patre cum Filio, Filioque cum Spiritu Sancto. Atque ista ratione Patre cum Spiritu Sancto per Christum juncto, singulis quidem existentibus, unum omnis Trinitas est, atque existit illud *ὁμοούσιος*, cum sit omnibus una eademque substantia. Haec nobis salus est, haec liberatio, haec totius hominis plena salvatio, sic Patrem omnipotentem Deum credere, sic Jesum Christum Filium, sic Spiritum Sanctum. Amen."

To pass from Victorinus's doctrine of the Trinity to his conception of the relation of God to Creation.

All things are conceived as pre-existing in God—potentially in the Father, actually in essence in the Son. In Him dwells all the fulness bodily, that is (according to Victorinus) in the Eternal Word dwells all existence substantially—*οὐσιωδῶς*. Whatever came into being subsequently in time, in Him was eternally Life. Thus the *Λόγος* is the "*Λόγος* of all things"—the universal Logos—the seed of all things, even in His Eternal Being, containing all things in Himself in archetypal reality. (*Adv. Ar.* i. 25, 1059 A; ii. 3, 1091 B; iii. 3, 1100 C. and iv. 4, 1116 C, where the Word is almost identified with the Platonic "ideas"; at least He contains the ideas in Himself, as "species" or "potentiae principales.")

It follows that the Son is very mainly considered as existing with a view to Creation. He exists as the "*Λόγος* of all that is" with a view to the being of whatever is ("ad id quod est esse iis quae sunt"). It is His essence to move, as it is the Father's to repose. And the "motus" in virtue of which He is, is still pressing outward, so to speak, from the "fontana vita" of

[v] The passage in the original is spoken of the Spirit in his special quality as "Intelligentia," vide subter, p. 19. The idea recurs in mystical writers.

[w] So the words "genitus," "procedens," are not kept strictly to the second and third Persons of the Trinity respectively. The Spirit is said once (*Adv. Arium*, iv. 33, 1138 A), to be "genitus," and the "processio" of the Son is frequently spoken of, e.g. i. 27, 1060 D; i. 14, 1048 B.

[x] The Son is spoken of as "Medius in Angelo [Angulo *Cheltenham MS.*] Trinitatis," *Adv. Ar.* i. 56, 1083 A.

[y] It must be admitted that a great number of passages in Victorinus bearing on the Trinity are really unintelligible, and not the most charitable belief in the corruption of the text can acquit him of reckless use of language.

the Father. The Son "festinat in actionem."[z] This is His "going forth"—His "proceeding forth" in Creation which culminates in "the extreme point of His going forth," the Incarnate Life. (*Adv. Ar.* i. 24, 1057 D, 1058 C. 33, 1066 C, 34 1067 A, 22 1056 C). He proceeds forth, then, or "descends" as a river of life distributing Life (spargens vitas) to all the countless forms of creation, according to the distributive energy and wisdom of the Holy Ghost, the "divider" or distributor of the gift of Life (*Adv. Ar.* i. 26, 1060 A Hymn. 1, 1141 D. iii. 1143 C). In thus "descending" the Son who in the Divine Nature is impassible, becomes passible in His relation to the lower forms of life.[a] All in Him is pure action, absolute energy, positive, unchangeable Life. But as the river of water is affected by the varying materials which form its bed and distribute its waters, so the Life of the Word is affected by the infinite varieties in the capacities of material and created beings to receive Life. He subjects Himself to their infirmities in condescending to their capacities.[b] For He Himself is their Life—the inner principle of their substantiation; He is "made all things" (effectus omnia) for in Him all things consist—"Insubstantiata sunt omnia ὄντα in Jesu, hoc est, ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ."[c] He is the Unity of Nature—which is one not as a heap of detached grains, but as a vitally coherent and united body, one with its head Christ, bound together by the chain of the life of God (*Adv. Ar.* i. 24, 1057 D; i. 25, 26, 1059 B; i. 44, 1074 C D; i. 45, 1075 B C. i. 47 1077 A B. iv. 31 1135 C D). This relation of Christ to Nature finds a number of expressions. He is its "elementum" and its "receptaculum"; its "habitaculum" and its "habitator;" even its "locus." He is the "unum totum" with which the universe in its manifoldness "clauditur et ambitur" (*Ad Justin.* 4, *Adv. Ar.* i. 25, 1059 A; i. 37, 1069 B).

All this, it must be said by anticipation, is somewhat Neo-Platonic in tone. What is to follow is almost pure and undiluted Neo-Platonism. Victorinus follows Neo-Platonic emanationism in even describing the process of Creation, as a drawing out of the Plenitude of God into a chain or gradation of existences. "Deus Jesus Spiritus νοῦς anima angeli et deinde corporalia omnia subministrata" (*Adv. Ar.* i. 25, 1059 B; i. 61, 1086 B C; iii. 11 1107 C D). He follows Neo-Platonism in his occasional conception of νοῦς and "anima" as substantial existences, the source of all particular minds and souls, through which God informed and animated the lower material world. He adopts the Neo-Platonic conception of "anima" as something capable of spiritualization, but not yet "spirit"—intermediate between spirit and matter. He follows Neo-Platonism in his conception of the "return of all things" into God. (*Adv. Ar.* iii. 1. 1098 B; iv. 11, 1121 A B; *de Gen.* 10, 1026 A B; *Adv. Ar.* iii. 3, 1100 C; Hymn 1. 1141 A; *ad Ephes.* i. 4, 1239 B. C.)

Once more Victorinus is simply Neo-Platonic in his conception of Matter and the material world. "Matter" has no existence independent of God; in itself it is "non-existent"[d]—an abstraction. But as created and fashioned and vitalized by God, to become the material world, it is both appreciated and depreciated.[e] It is appreciated as a true revelation of God (e.g. *ad Justin. Man.* 2). It is depreciated with the old philosophic depreciation and horror of the material which still clings to Victorinus, and militates against alike his grasp on the Incarnation and his clear assertion of Responsibility.

We shall see this in considering his Anthropology.[f]

Man is regarded as a mixed being, a spiritual anima (see *Ad Ephes.* 1, 4, 1239 C) merged in the corruption of matter. He calls the human race "animae seminatae saeclis" corrupted by the material darkness in which they are merged[g] (Hymn 1 1142 A; *Adv. Ar.* i. 26 1060 A; i. 62, 1087 B). Misled by this ineradicable misconception of material life, he thinks in a wholly Platonic and non-Christian spirit[h] of men as existing in an unfallen condition, in a premundane state of being, and being born into the corruption of material life at their natural birth.[i] Moral evil, from this point of view, must be physical and necessary. It is indeed the step to greater good—representing only the darkness by antagonism to which the soul rises to the true knowledge of the Light. For Christ the Word, Who is the source of all Life and its sustainer, pursues the degraded "anima" into the material abyss. He enters into the corruption of the material Life in order to redeem the fallen souls into their pristine purity of being; nay, not only to bring them back into what they were, but to advance them into what they never had known—the condition of spirit, the fellowship and partaking of God's spiritual being. All this is an undeniable element of Victorinus's teaching, occurring mostly in the course of his *Commentary on the Ephesians*, and lying side by side

[z] He is more properly "Creator" than the Father: "Creator non convenit Deo," *Ad Ephes.* 1266 A. But this is Platonism.

[a] In another sense, however, He is only "passible" in his humanity, *Adv. Ar.* i. 14, 1048 C; but *e contra*, iv. 31, 1136 A.

[b] "Pater Fili Fons, Filius ut flumen quod excurrit ex fonte. In fonte ut manens aqua et quieta est, pura immaculata sine scatendi specie, sibi occulto motu plenitudinem suam suggerens: item ut flumen motu apertiore per diversa discurrens, terrarum quas sulcat qualitatibus et afficitur, et quodammodo patitur, sic et filius aqua sua, suaque substantia quæ Patris est, semper purus, immaculatus, impassibilis, regionibus per quas discurrit, locisque vel supra-caelestibus vel caelestibus vel intracaelestibus nunc spumat ut occurrentibus saxis, quae sunt ex generibus animarum, campis quietus excurrit." 1135 C D. (*Cheltenham MS.*)

[c] Not "Consubstantial" with Him, as He is with the Father. (*Adv. Ar.* i. 26, 1059 B.C.)

[d] It is the μὴ ὂν in one of its four senses: the μὴ ὂν which is below all actual existence: as the Father is ὁ μὴ ὤν, who is above all actual existences and their source, *De Gen.* 4 and 10. In one passage he appears to deny the "creation of matter" as a positive substance, *Adv. Ar.* iv. 31, 1136 A.

[e] See on this double tendency in Neo-Platonism Zeller, *Phil. der Griechen*, part iii. div. 2, pp. 552 sq.

[f] His passages on the creation of man are sometimes unintelligibly obscure, e.g. *Adv. Ar.* i. 62.

[g] Satan and the demons, we should notice, are *material* (*Ad Ephes.* 1253 C).

[h] Which is, however, Neo-Platonic—not *Origenistic*, as has been suggested by Card. Mai.

[i] The material world is created for their probation (*ad Ephes.* i. 4, 1242 A).

unharmonized with a really Christian conception of the Incarnation and Grace.

[See mostly in *Commentary on Ephes.* 1240 A B, 1242 A, 1241 A B, 1258 B D, 1259 B, 1244 B C, 1243 C, 1276 B, 1254 B. The phrase "naturales filii ira" is expounded "secundum naturam carnis geniti et materiæ."]

The other main effect of Platonism upon Victorinus's anthropology is to produce a profound and unmitigated Predestinarianism. His ideology leads him (in the commentary on the Ephesians at least) to assert not only the pre-existence of the absolute "anima" in the Eternal Word, but also the pre-existence of all particular souls. All the history of the soul in its descent into matter, and its recovery therefrom through the Incarnate Christ, is only the development of the idea of the soul which pre-existed eternally, individually and substantially in the Mind and Will of God. (*Comment. in Ephes.* 1245 C, 1243 C, 1238 C, 1239 B, 1242 B. What exists in God's thought must exist substantially.)

But these Platonizing elements in the teaching of Victorinus do not occupy all the ground. They lie side by side with the stock conceptions of Christian truth, no less emphasized sometimes than the Platonic views. Thus the common view of sin and responsibility and the origin of evil in the corrupt choice of the free will is emphasized several times (e.g. *ad Justin. Man.* 16, 1008 B.[j]), and it would seem that, much as the mode of conceiving Redemption which Victorinus adopts would lead to Universalism, he is not a Universalist. (*In Ephes.* 1281 A. B; cf. 1282 C. D; 1286 B. C. On Universalism, see *ad Phil.* 1221 B, "universos, *sed qui sequerentur*"; *ad Ephes.* 1245 B, "non omnia restaurantur sed quae in Christo sunt"; cf. 1274 C, "quae salvari possent." This interprets such passages as 1252 C.)

Again, though on one occasion the view given of the Incarnation is vitiated by the notion of the essential corruption of matter (*Adv. Ar.* i. 58, 1084 C) in general the Incarnation teaching is strikingly sound, and repudiates by anticipation a good deal of fifth-century heresy. God the Son enters into conditions of real humanity. He takes human nature whole and complete into the unity of a single Person (it is an "acceptio carnis," not a proper "generation" of a person), and He lives, God in Manhood. ["*Deus in homine*" (homo = manhood) *Adv. Ar.* i. 14, 1048 D; i. 45, 1075 B; *in Philipp.* 1208 C, 1224 C. He however uses an Adoptionist phrase, *Adv. Ar.* i. 10, 1045 C.] The humanity which He takes is emphasized as universal ("universalis caro, universalis anima: in isto omnia universalia erant," *Adv. Ar.* iii. 3, 1101 A.).

Thus the Passion in which He suffers for man's redemption is universal, because He suffers as representative of the race He is to recreate. ("Quia Corpus Ille catholicum ad omnem hominem habuit, omne quod passus est catholicum fecit; id est, ut omnis caro in illo crucifixa sit." *Ad Phil.* 1196 D, 1221 B, and *Adv. Ar.* iii. 3, 1101 A.) The effect of Christ taking humanity is to make the whole of that which He assumed — soul and flesh — vital with new capacities of life. The "Word made flesh" makes the flesh He took to be life in Him who is the Life ("Omne quod Christus est vita aeterna est," etc., *Adv. Ar.* iv. 7, 1118 A; cf. language about Eucharist quoted below). And in this humanity—spirit, soul and body—which Christ took, He is glorified and exalted (*Adv. Ar.* iv. 7, 1118 B; cf. *ad Eph.* 1259 B "aeterna caro," "corporalis majestas"). Through it[k] He lives in His people, so that they become what He is, through Him. They become part of the Christ. The Church is Christ (*Ad Gal.* 1173 C. D.; cf. 1184 B.). And we are to be glorified, body and soul, in Christ (*Ad Philipp.* 1226 A. B., 1227 A: cf. *Ad Ephes.* 1255 B, "resurrectio Christi, resurrectio nostra").

It need only be added in this connection that Victorinus uses suggestive language about the sacraments and ministry of the Church, in relation to the communication to us of the life of Christ, e.g. (on baptism) *Ad Gal.* iii. 27, 1173 B. and 1184 B; *Ad Ephes.* v. 25, 1287 C: (on the Eucharist) *Adv. Ar.* ii. 8, 1094 C ("quod accipimus Corpus Christi est, ipse autem Christus, vita est . . . divitiae in Christo *corporaliter* habitant"; cf. *Adv. Ar.* i. 30, 1063 B. "Corpus ipsius Vita est, Corpus autem Panis." "Panis *ἐπιούσιος*," in the Lord's Prayer, is interpreted as "panis ex ipsa aut in ipsa Substantia, hoc est vitae panis," and referred to the Eucharist, and, in the same way, "populus *περιούσιος*" is given an Eucharistic reference, as meaning "populus circa Tuam Substantiam veniens." See quotation from old African Liturgy, p. 25: and (on ministry) *Ad Ephes.* iv. 12, 1275 C.

II. It has been pointed out above where Victorinus is allowing himself to retain Neo-Platonic ideas; it is necessary further to explain in what general relation his teaching stands to the Neo-Platonic system, because his chief claim upon the attention of students will be found to depend upon his having been the first systematically to convert the results of that system to the uses of Christian theology, and upon his having shown himself able in one or two cases to develop as against Arianism the really higher philosophical truth latent in Catholic doctrines.[l]

The idea of a being or beings mediating between the supreme God and the lower world was common to almost all the later schools of ancient philosophy. (See Zeller, pp. 219, 220.) Eusebius of Caesarea had already seen in this a common ground for philosophers and Christians. (See Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, p. 22. Cf. St. Athanasius *De Incarn.* cap. xli.) It appeared in Plotinus's theory of the *νοῦς* and anima, which with the One, the God, make up what is called "the Neo-Platonic Trinity." Now a good deal of Victorinus's language, in which he seeks to express the relation of the *Λόγος* to

[j] If the *De Physicis* is Victorinus's work, this would need saying more strongly. Free will is prominent there.

[k] Victorinus, however, in one place speaks as if Christ only metaphorically imparted His flesh to His people (*Ad Eph.* 1288 C), and he speaks of Christ's humanity as "totus spiritus factus" (*Ad Eph.* 1274 A).

[l] Of course it would be out of place here to give any general account of Neo-Platonism with a view to comparing it with Christian Theology. Far the best account of the Neo-Platonic system is that given by Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, part iii. div. iii., to which reference will be made in the text. There are many passages in Victorinus's writings where the meaning depends on allusions in detail to Neo-Platonic phraseology. These cannot be considered here.

the Father, is based on Plotinus's language about the relation of the νοῦς to the One.[m] But the νοῦς in Plotinus is (a) (like the Arian Λόγος) but the imperfect, inadequate image of the One, so that the One never realizes itself perfectly at all, and (b) its production out of the One is an irreconcileable contradiction. The one God is conceived of as impersonal, without will or consciousness or motion; it is abstract and lifeless; and it is only by bold contradiction that it can become productive or generate (see on this consciously realized contradiction, Zeller, pp. 496–498). To meet both these difficulties Christianity—at least Catholic, anti-Arian Christianity — supplies Victorinus with abundant material. Christianity takes up personality, will, love, motion into the inmost heart of the Divine Being, and thus as a Christian, Victorinus is able to fill the Neo-Platonic formulas with the powers of a new life. All lower transitions are possible because the eternal Being of the Supreme is an eternal[n] motion in Himself. Motion is not degradation; it is the life of God. Thus again that which is the eternal expression and image of God in Himself—the eternal product of His will—is not any imperfect or lower production, but the very co-equal and co-essential Word—eternally adequate to Him who is His source.[o]

Once again Victorinus's formula for the Trinity, the "status, progressio, regressus," is the reflex of a Neo-Platonic idea[p]—an idea first definitely formulated by Proclus but implied by Plotinus—the idea of all progress and development of life involving (1) the immanence of the caused in that which causes it, (2) the issuing of the caused out of that which causes it, (3) the return of the caused into that which causes it. This threefold relation of immanence, progress, return, the Neo-Platonist regarded as essential to the development and unity of life both in general and in detail (Zeller, pp. 787–789). This conception in its earlier stage Victorinus, whether consciously or not, adopts, and what new force it gains when it is seen to find its highest expression in the very life of God Himself! This threefold relation is seen to be the very being of God.[q] The Son is eternally abiding in the Father, eternally proceeding from the Father in His eternal Generation, and eternally pouring back into the bosom of the Father that which He receives, in that Holy Ghost, Who is Himself the life of Father and Son, the love and bond of the Holy Trinity.

It is in describing the relation of the Λόγος to the world, in His function as Creator, that, as we have seen, Victorinus allows himself to be too entirely moulded by Neo-Platonic ideas. On that enough has been said. His "development of the plenitude" (vide supra, p. 20), his pre-existing "anima" and "animae," his corporeal demons, his matter the seat of corruption—all these have their source in the Plotinian system, and are only very imperfectly adapted to Christianity (see Zeller, pp. 545–557, 570–575). We may wonder that he did not use, more emphatically than he did, an element of right-minded inconsistency in Neo-Platonism, and with that system emphasize the freedom of the will (Zeller, p. 585–587).

The above must suffice as a brief account of the relation to Neo-Platonism in which Victorinus stands. It will help us to recognize the "Divine preparation" for Christianity which was involved in the independent growth of the Neo-Platonic system—so many philosophic ideas needed for the intellectual presentation of Christianity being made ready to hand—and it will enable us to vindicate for Victorinus the credit of a pioneer in claiming for Christianity the products of philosophy. He is a pioneer whose name has well-nigh passed into undeserved oblivion.

III. There are a few characteristic points in Victorinus's teaching which do not stand in any connexion with Neo-Platonism, still deserving notice. He is an intensely ardent follower of St. Paul, devoted to St. Paul's strenuous assertion of justification by faith. Indeed, he uses very strongly solifidian language and (by anticipation) very strongly anti-Pelagian language. This element in his teaching is most remarkably emphatic in his commentaries, e.g. *ad Gal.* iii. 22, 1172; *ad Phil.* iii. 9, 1219 C D, "'*non meam justitiam*' tunc enim 'mea' est, vel nostra, cum moribus nostris justitiam Dei mereri nos putamus perfectam per mores. At non, inquit, hanc habens justitiam, sed quam? Illam ex fide. Non illam quae ex lege, quae in operibus est et carnali disciplina, sed hanc quæ ex Deo procedit 'justitia ex fide.'" Cf. *ad Phil.* iv. 9, 1231 A; *ad Ephes.* ii. 5, 1255 B. Cf. 1258 C: "non nostri laboris est, quod saepe moneo, ut nos solvamus; sed sola fides in Christum nobis salus est"; 1259 C: "nostrum pene jam nihil est nisi solum credere qui superavit omnia. Hoc est enim plena salvatio, Christum haec vicisse. Fidem in Christo habere, plenam fidem, nullus labor est, nulla difficultas, animi tantum voluntas est"; 1290 B; cf. 1290 D: "justitia non tantum valet quantum fides." Again on *grace*, see *ad Ephes.* i. 14, 1247 A, iii. 7 1264 B, *ad Phil.* ii. 13 "quia ipsum velle a Deo nobis operatur, fit ut ex Deo *et operationem et voluntatem habeamus.*"[r]

So strong is the solifidian tendency in Victorinus that it led him, like Luther, to a disparagement of St. James and a somewhat

[m] E.g. The One is the δύναμις, the νοῦς is the ἐνέργεια. The One is unlimited, formless. The νοῦς is limit, form. The νοῦς is the Image of the One: that in which the One realizes itself as knowledge, sight, etc. The One is transcendent—ἐπέκεινα γνώσεως, ἐπέκεινα οὐσίας. The νοῦς is οὐσία and γνῶσις. The expression for the Father in Victorinus, ὁ μὴ ὤν (which recurs in Scotus Erigena), must have been derived from the Plotinian school: it could hardly have been original in Victorinus. Yet it does not seem to be found in Plotinus's works and scarcely in Proclus. (See Zeller, p. 793, note 4, and the general substance of the notes, pp. 479–511.)

[n] The Neo-Platonist had recognized the eternity of the production of the νοῦς and even "anima." See Zeller, pp. 515, 516, 535. But it was outside God, His "overflow."

[o] Perhaps the fact of Victorinus saying nothing about *Love* as the Being of God is due to his being still too much dominated by the Pagan formulas.

[p] It is an exact equivalent of Proclus's later formula—the μονή, πρόοδος, ἐπιστροφή. See Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, vol. i. p. 350.

[q] The idea has still a Platonic flavour, however, in *Adv. Ar.* i. 51, 1080 A, where the expression "deficit a potentia Patris," is used of the Son's generation.

[r] With this strong grasp on man's helplessness in himself goes his intense and (in view of his own history) touching insistence on humility. *Ad Ephes.* 1193 B.

A B, cf. 1161 B, 1162 D.)[s]

It is worth while calling attention to the evidence, suggested by a good deal of Victorinus's theology, of a closer connexion than has been yet noticed between him and St. Augustine. His strong insistence in his Trinitarian Theology on the double Procession of the Holy Spirit—his conception of the Holy Spirit as the 'Bond' of the Blessed Trinity—his emphasis on the unity of Christ and His church—his strong predestinarianism[t]—his vehement assertion of the doctrines of grace—his assertion of the priority of faith to intelligence (p. 16, note n)—all these elements, important and unimportant, in Victorinus, reappear in St. Augustine, and it seems not at all improbable that the (hitherto unsuspected) influence of the writings of the old philosopher whose conversion stirred him so deeply, was a determining force upon the theology of St. Augustine.[u]

IV. A word must be said on the Latin text of the Bible used by Victorinus. No adequate use seems yet to have been made of the very large bulk of quotation which is to be found in his writings.

Sabatier[v] (*Bibl. Sacr. Lat. Versiones antiquae*, tom. iii. Remis 1749) makes occasional reference to him, but omits to notice at times his most remarkable quotations, and wrote before Cardinal Mai's publication of the Commentaries, etc.

Some specimens of his quotations, not noticed by Sabatier, may be given:—

St. John i. 1 is quoted as "Λόγος erat *circa* Deum," and it is added "Romani *apud* Deum dicunt," *Libri de Gen.* 20, 1030 C. Elsewhere he uses "*circa Deum*" and "*ad Deum*" (*Adv. Ar.* 1, 3). These do not seem to be merely his own renderings. ("Ad Deum" is noticed by Sabatier).

In Phil. ii. 30 (p. 1216) *exponens in incertum animam suam* is a better rendering than the Vulgate *tradens* and the St. Germain *parabolatus de anima sua.* Ibid. iii. 20 (p. 1225) he uses *Salutaris* for *Saviour*, a term not found in other authorities in this place. Cf. Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, p. 100, 1875. Ibid. iv. 3 (p. 1228) *unijuge* is a remarkable rendering of σύνζυγε.

... innotescant apud Deum. Et pax Dei quae habet omnem intellectum custodiat corda vestra, item corpora vestra in Jesu Christo."

St. Luke ii. 14: Pax in terra *hominibus boni decreti* (p. 1306).[w]

Ephes. iv. 14 (πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης), ad *remedium* erroris (p. 1276 B). This reading is found also in other authorities. Ibid. vi. 14, et *omnibus effectis* stare supports the correct reading of Jerome's text, et *omnibus perfectis* stare.

Titus ii. 14. Besides the version *populum abundantem* (p. 1094 D), a remarkable rendering of the word περιούσιον is given as occurring in a Eucharistic office ("the prayer of the oblation"), which he more than once refers to. (See *Adv. Ar.* 1, 30, 1063 B, and ii. 7, 1094 D.) It is as follows—"Munda tibi populum *circumvitalem* emulatorem bonorum operum, *circa tuam substantiam venientem*" (p. 1063 B, *vide supra*, p. 22). [C. G.]

VICTORINUS (7), an African bishop, but of what see unknown, who, after the death of the primate of Numidia, took upon himself to summon a council for the purpose of restraining the irregularities of Cresconius, bishop of Villa Regia, already censured by the council of Carthage, A.D. 401. He sent out a notice (Tractatoria) for this purpose, which reached Augustine late in the day on Nov. 9, but found him too much occupied by business to attend to it immediately. But he soon wrote to Victorinus, pointing out to him (1) that as the summons was addressed to the bishops of Mauretania, it ought to be sent to the primates of that province. (2) That the order in which the bishops of Numidia were named was incorrect, for that his own name was placed third on the list, whereas there were many bishops senior to him, who might be offended by this mistake. (3) That Xanthippus, bishop of Tagora, claimed the place of primate, and that if so, it was his duty to issue notices of this kind. Even if the question between him and Xanthippus could be arranged, the name of Xanthippus ought on no account to be omitted. (Aug. *Ep.* 59; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* ii. 10-11.) [H. W. P.]

VICTORINUS (8), a subdeacon of Malliana, Manliana, Maliana, or Miliana, a town of Mauretania Caesariensis, 16 miles from Tigara, on the slope of the Atlas mountain range (Ant. *Itin.* 18, 4; Ptol. iv. 2, 24; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 29). St. Augustine wrote to Deuterius, bishop probably of Caesariensis (Jol.), to inform him that he had convicted Victorinus both by evidence and by his own confession, of Manicheism. He adds that he had caused him to be banished from the city.

---

[s] It may be worth while noticing that Victorinus appears to speak as if the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin were an open question: "cum Virgo Maria sit *vel* fuerit,"—but that is perhaps laying too much stress on a word.

[t] Restrained in him, as in Augustine, by antagonism to Manichaeism, which forces him to assert free will in man.

[u] There are one or two contributions to the history of heresies, made by Victorinus, which it is worth while noticing. *Ad Gal.* i. 19, we have an account of a Judaizing or Ebionite sect called the "Symmachians"; see p. 1155 B and 1162 D. They made a point of the Apostolate of James, the Lord's brother. See also for heresies in regard to Christ's person an interesting passage, *Adv. Ar.* i. 45, 1075 B C; cf. i. 28, 1061 B C. He calls the definition of Nicaea "a wall and a defence," ii. 9, 1095 D. We notice also that he probably is the first to use "paganus" for the heathen. *De recip.* ὁμοουσίῳ, i.; *ad Gal.* 1158 C. For the origin of the term *godfather*, see *ad Gal.* 1184 B.

[v] Before whom Simon and Mill had made slight notice of him. See Migne, *Prolegomena*, p. 997.

[w] These words conclude a long quotation thoroughly independent of any known version. They occur in the *De Physicis*. Victorinus's authorship of the treatise seems, as has been said, on other grounds improbable. And where the same passage is quoted by Victorinus and in the *De Physicis*, the quotations do not tally. *De Phys.* c. 17, "Spiritus sanctus superveniet super te, et virtus altissimi obumbrabit te" (S. Luke i. 35), *Adv. Ar.* i. 56, "Spiritus sanctus adveniet in te et virtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi" (inumbrabit, cap. 58). But Victorinus again does not tally with himself.

and deprived him of his clerical office, but promised that he should be admitted to repentance if he consented to inform against other offenders in this way not only in Malliana but in the province at large (Aug. *Ep.* 236). [H. W. P.]

VICTORINUS, CL. M. (9), rhetor of Marseilles (Gennad.) and poet. [VICTOR (39).]

VICTORINUS (10) also called ÆMILIANUS, a monk belonging to the times of Gregory the Great, who in one of his homilies describes his remarkable penitence (*Homiliae in Evang.* hom. xxxiv. § 18 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxvi. 1257). [C. H.]

VICTORINUS (11), bishop of Tauromenium, died before A.D. 591, in which year Gregory the Great directs the subdeacon Petrus to assist his successor in recovering church property said to have been lost during his episcopate. (*Epp.* i. 73.) [F. D.]

VICTORIUS (1), proconsul of Asia, to whom Theodosius addressed an edict April 15th, A.D. 394, prohibiting consecrations of bishops or ordinations of priests by heretics (Theod. *Cod.* lib. xvi. tit. 5, leg. 22.) [G. T. S.]

VICTORIUS, of Le Mans. [VICTURIUS (1).]

VICTORIUS (2) of Aquitaine. During the pontificate of Leo the Great in A.D. 444 and A.D. 453 differences arose between the Western churches headed by Rome, and the Eastern headed by Alexandria as to the correct day for celebrating Easter. Pope LEO yielded on both occasions, but to avoid such disputes in future, directed his Archdeacon HILARIUS (18), who succeeded him, to investigate the question. Hilary then referred it to his friend Victorius, who was then at Rome, requesting him to investigate the causes of the discrepancy, and to letermine how the true date was to be found; and the latter in A.D. 457 drew up a cycle for the purpose of determining the date of Easter both in past and future years. Several such cycles had been previously used (see EASTER in DICT. OF CHRIST. ANT. i. 591) but Annianus, an Egyptian monk, a contemporary of Archbishop Theophilus (ob. A.D. 412), was apparently the irst to observe that, assuming the perfect ccuracy of the Metonic cycle of nineteen years, f it was multiplied by the Solar cycle of twenty-ight years, after which the same days of the ear recur on the same days of the week, a reat cycle of 532 years would be obtained, and each year of every successive period of this ycle Easter and all other feasts movable or nmovable would occur on the same day of the eek and month as in the corresponding year the preceding cycle. (Georgius Syncellus, p. 62, 63, Bonn edn.)

Victorius first treats in his preface of the uses of the discrepancy. The first is the fference of the cycles, of which he names three, e Western of eighty-four, the Cyrillian of nety-five, and that of Hippolytus of 112 years. e Western of eighty-four for instance at its piration gives the new moon more than a day o early, while the Calippic of seventy-six ars would not be a day wrong till rather ore than four periods or 304 years had expired. Another cause of confusion was that the additional day called the Saltus Lunae added to the Epact was inserted in different years in different cycles. A further cause of divergence was that, while the Latins made March 5th and April 3rd the limits between which inclusive the first day of the Paschal month might fall, and did not permit Easter to be earlier than the 16th day of the moon, thus making March 18th and April 16th the possible limits of the 14th day, and March 20th and April 23rd, the possible limits of Easter; Theophilus and the Alexandrians, on the contrary, made March 8th and April 5th their first day limits, March 21st and April 18th their 14th day limits, and March 22nd and April 25th their Easter limits, not hesitating if the full moon fell on a Saturday to keep Easter the next day, though it was only the 15th day of the moon.

The cycle of 532 years, consisting of twenty-eight Metonic or rather seven Calippic cycles, was adopted or independently discovered by Victorius. He began it with the year of the crucifixion, which he placed on the 26th March in the consulship of the two Gemini. As the year in which he composed his cycle, the consulship of Constantinus and Rufus, which corresponds with A.D. 457, was the 430th of his cycle, its first year corresponded with A.D. 28. He at one time intended to carry his cycle back to the creation, but to avoid delay contented himself with giving only one period. The table contains eight columns. The first, in which there are many mistakes, gives the names of the consuls, the second the year of the Victorian period, the third marks the Bissextile years, the fourth the day of the week on which January 1st falls, the fifth the Epact on January 1st, in which he notes the Saltus Lunae or addition of twelve instead of eleven days in the 16th of every nineteen-year period, the sixth gives the date of Easter, the seventh gives the moon's age at Easter, while the last, probably added by a later hand, gives the Indictions.

Victorius makes March 20th and April 16th his fourteen-day limits, but as he retained the Latin rule, that Easter could not be earlier than the sixteenth day of the moon, his earliest Easter limit was March 22nd, the same as the Alexandrians; but his latest fourteen-day limit being April 16th, while theirs was the 18th, his latest Easter limit was April 24th, while theirs was the 25th.

His cycle gives from two causes a double date for Easter. In the years eleven to sixteen inclusive of each nineteen-year cycle, it gives the same date for the fourteenth of the moon as the Alexandrians. If that date fell on a Saturday, the latter would keep Easter the next day; but the Latins not till the Sunday after, in order to avoid keeping it before the sixteenth of the moon. This occurs twenty-four times in the 532 years. Again in the tenth and eighteenth years of his nineteen-year cycle, where his moon is two days older than the Alexandrians, if its fourteenth day fell on a Friday, the Latins would keep Easter the next Sunday; but the fourteenth day of the Alexandrians' moon falling on the Latin Easter Sunday, they would keep their Easter a Sunday later. This would happen eight times in the 532 years. In these cases he left it to the pope to decide the day.

in Gaul. In A.D. 527, however, DIONYSIUS (19) published a new period of the Cyrillian ninety-five year cycle, which would terminate in A.D. 531; and VICTOR of Capua c. A.D. 550, wrote against Victorius's cycle and in favour of the Alexandrian method of computation. Victorius's cycle seems thereafter to have become disused in Italy, but it lingered to a much later date in parts of Gaul. It has been edited with elaborate dissertations by Bucherius, *De doctrina temporum*, where all notices of Victorius are collected. The only additional information they give is Gennadius's statement (*de Vir. Ill.* 88) that he was a native of Aquitaine. As Hilary addresses him as "Dilectissimus et honorabilis sanctus frater," he was probably in orders. A full account of his cycle is given by Ideler (*Handbuch der Chronologie*, ii. 275–285), who points out that what Dionysius did, was to continue the ninety-five year cycle, and that there is no evidence that he did anything to the Victorian cycle. The fact that his continuation of the Cyrillian cycle began in A.D. 532, which would be the first year of a new period of the Victorian cycle, if the latter commenced with the year of the birth of Christ, probably suggested the notion that he had thus altered the beginning of the Victorian cycle, and started a new period of it from A.D. 532. Victorius is by later writers sometimes called Victorinus and Victor, the last mistake again leading to confusion with his antagonist Victor of Capua.

[F. D.]

VICTORIUS (3), a poet of this name is mentioned by Sidonius Apollinaris in one of his letters (the last letter of Book v. of his epistles). The letter is addressed to the nephews of the poet, then apparently just deceased, and exhorts them to imitate their uncle's example. What the works of Victorius may have been is absolutely uncertain, though it is possible that some of his poems may be among those still extant, ascribed to poets of the names of Victorinus, or Victor, who are otherwise unknown.

[H. A. W.]

VICTORIUS (4), count or duke of Auvergne, was appointed by Euric, king of the Visigoths in Gaul, to have charge of seven states (civitates), and he built a large basilica at Auvergne (Sidon. Apoll. *Epp.* vii. 17; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 20, *Vit. Pat.* c. 3). In connection with the obsequies of St. Abraham, which he carried out, he is very highly spoken of by Sidonius, as an "amplissimus vir, quem jure saeculari patronum, jure ecclesiastico filium, excolo ut cliens, ut pater diligo" (Sidon. Apoll. *ut supr.*). But he closed his nine years' rule in Auvergne by some acts of intrigue and oppression, especially of violence against Eucherius the senator, and had to flee for safety to Rome. Following the same course there he was stoned to death in the 23rd year of Euric's reign (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 20, and *De Glor. Conf.* 33, and *De Glor. Mart.* i. 45). He flourished in the second of the 5th century (Boll. *AA. SS.* Jun. iii. 534–6). [J. G.]

VICTRICIUS, ST., eighth archbishop of Rouen, at the close of the 4th and beginning (Sulpic. Sev. *Dial.* iii. 2; Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. ii. 194) and St. Paulinus of Nola, to whose letters we owe some details of his life. He came "de extimo orbis" (Paulinus, *Epist.* xviii. 4, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 238, 39), which has been conjectured to be the country of Boulogne, or even Britain, and began life as a soldier, but quitted military service for conscience' sake, a desertion which entailed such maltreatment as nearly lost him his life (*ibid.* xviii. 7, col. 240, 41). He became bishop of Rouen sometime before 390, and occupied himself with the conversion of the heathen Morini and Nervii, occupying Flanders and Brabant, who may possibly at that early time have been within the limits of his diocese. From this task he was summoned in 394 or 395 to Britain, to assist the bishops there in re-establishing peace, probably in their contest with Pelagianism (Victricius, *Lib. de Laude SS.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 443). An accusation of heresy, as it seems (cf. Ceillier, viii. 76), brought him to Rome, at the close of 403, to defend himself before the pope (Paulinus, *Epist.* xxxvii. (36). Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 353). While there he received, in answer to his application for information, the famous letter of Innocent I. called the *Liber Regularum*, treating of various heads of ecclesiastical practice and discipline (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lvi. 519; see INNOCENTIUS (12), p. 244; Ceillier, vii. 507). The church at Rouen flourished under his care. The relics he obtained for it, the musical services which he instituted, and the devotion—under his guidance—of the virgins and widows, caused the city, hitherto unknown, to be spoken of with reverence in distant lands, and counted among cities famed for their sacred spots (Paulinus, *Ep.* xviii. § 5. *Patr. Lat.* col. 239). The date of his death is unknown; but from the fact that the letter written by Paulinus to St. Augustine in 409, omits the name of Victricius from its list of bishops, it has been argued that he was then dead (*Epist.* xlviii. col. 398). His day is Aug. 7. (For his life, see Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 437, 38; *Hist. Litt.* ii. 752–54; Le Brun in Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. ii. 192 sqq.; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 7.)

There is extant a treatise or sermon, it is not quite clear which, called the *Liber de Laude Sanctorum*, composed on the occasion of the receipt of some relics from St. Ambrose of Milan. It was formerly ascribed to St. Germanus of Auxerre (*Hist. Litt.* ii. 261, 750), but the discovery of a MS. at St. Gall, in the last century, made it clear that it belonged to Victricius (see the *Praefatio* of the abbé Lebeuf in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 437–442). It gives a few details of the condition of the church at Rouen, and makes mention of a church being built for the reception of the relics, possibly the one afterwards dedicated to St. Gervais (Migne, *ibid.* 443–458; *Hist. Litt.* ii. 750). Paulinus had perhaps read this document (*Epist.* xviii.). [S. A. B.]

VICTURINUS (1) (VICTOR), ST., bishop of Grenoble, a correspondent of St. Avitus, of Vienne. Whether churches and church furniture, which heretics had made use of, could again, by virtue of a fresh consecration, be made serviceable for the orthodox, to which Avitus replies in the negative (Avitus, *Epist.* vi.), and

as to the penalties to be inflicted in the case of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, which were very severe (*Epp.* xiv. xv. xvi.), are points on which he consulted and received replies from the archbishop. Victurinus is among the bishops present at the council of Agaunum, in 515, if it is to be accepted as genuine, and also at Epaon and Lyons in 517. [S. A. B.]

VICTURINUS (2), a bishop in Gaul, in the latter half of the 5th or beginning of the 6th century, who wrote to Ruricius, bishop of Limoges, begging aid for a man whose family, taken captive by barbarians, was held to ransom. We are ignorant of his see. The letter is published among those of Faustus of Riez. (Faust. *Epist.* xiii., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 863; Ceillier, x. 610.) [S. A. B.]

VICTURIUS (1) I. (VICTOR), **ST.**, fifth bishop of Le Mans, was, if his *Acta* are to be believed, consecrated by St. Martin of Tours (circ. A.D. 397). He had a wife named Maura, who thenceforth relinquished the world, and a son who followed him at Le Mans as Victurius II. His episcopate is said to have lasted 24 years, 7 months, and 13 days. He is commemorated Aug. 25 (Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. v. 140; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 341). [S. A. B.]

VICTURIUS (2) II. (VICTORIUS), **ST.**, sixth bishop of Le Mans, is said to have been the son of his predecessor St. Victurius I. and Maura, and to have been baptized and educated by St. Martin of Tours (Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. v. 146). In 451 he appears as subscribing the letter of the Gallic bishops to pope Leo on the subject of Eutychianism (Leo, *Epist.* xcix., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 966); and about two years later, in conjunction with his metropolitan, Eusebius of Tours, and another, he writes to the clergy of the third province of Lyons, denouncing the practice of appealing to kings and emperors to settle spiritual controversies (*ibid.* liv. 1239). The same year he was at the council of Angers, and in 461 at that of Tours. In 465 pope Hilary entrusted to him a commission, with other bishops, to settle a controversy as to jurisdiction between Ingenuus, archbishop of Embrun, and Auxanius, one of the bishops of his province, followed by another to compose disputes in the province of Arles (Hilarius, *Ep.* iv. xi., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 20, 28). His memory is preserved in the *De Gloria Confessorum* of Gregory of Tours, who attributes to his sanctity miraculous powers (lvi.). According to his *Acta* he died on the 1st of September (on which day he is commemorated) 490, after an episcopate of 41 years, 6 months, and 10 days (Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. i. 220; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 342). [S. A. B.]

VIGILANTIA, mother of the emperor Justinian I. [JUSTINIANUS (6).]

VIGILANTIUS (1), a presbyter of Comminges and Barcelona in the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century, known by his protests against the superstitious practices then creeping into the church. He was born about 370 at Calagurris, near Comminges (Convenae), which was a station on the great Roman road from Aquitaine to Spain (*Itinerarium Antonin.* quoted in Gilly's *Vigilantius*, p. 128). His father probably kept the statio or the place of refreshment there; and Vigilantius appears to have been brought up to the trade of innkeeper and wine seller. ("Iste Caupo Calagurritanus," Jer. *Cont. Vig.* 1). But he had from the first an inclination to learning; and Sulpicius Severus, who had estates in these parts, took him into his service. From him, probably, he received baptism; possibly he may have been the manager of his estates (Gilly, 133–4). What is certain is that in the year 395 he was sent with letters from Sulpicius to Paulinus, then recently settled at Nola, possibly he was the puer sent to Paulinus at Barcelona the year before (Paul. *Ep.* i. 11). By him he was treated as a friend. Paulinus speaks of him as Vigilantius noster (*Ep.* v. 11), and reports the care with which he had watched him during illness, and refused to let him depart till he was well. On his return to Severus, then living at Eluso in Gaul, he was ordained; and, having a desire for learning, and a wish to visit Jerusalem, he set forth by way of Nola. His father, it seems, had now died, since he was wealthy enough to have many notaries in his employ (Jerome, *Ep.* lxi. 4), and he was the proprietor of the inn at Convenae. (Jerome, *Ep.* lxi. 3, *Cont. Vig.* i.) Paulinus gave him a very honourable introduction to Jerome (Jer. *Ep.* lxi. 3), then living at Bethlehem; and he was received on his arrival there with great respect (Jerome, *Ep.* lviii. 11). He remained there a considerable time, staying partly with Jerome, but partly, it is supposed, with others, possibly with Rufinus (Jer. *Apol.* iii. 11), who, equally with Jerome, was known and honoured by Paulinus, but whose letters have not been preserved. At that time the schism between the monasteries of Bethlehem and the bishop of Jerusalem was at its height; and it is probable that it was in connexion with this that he had his first disagreement with Jerome (Jerome, *Ep.* lxi. 1; *Apol.* iii. 19). Origenism, which had caused the schism, and with which Vigilantius afterwards connected Jerome's name, was, no doubt, the subject of this disagreement. But Vigilantius was brought to confess that he had been in the wrong and to ask pardon for his fault (Jerome, *Ep.* lxi. end). He was an inmate of Jerome's monastery on the occasion of a tremendous storm with earthquake and eclipse, when all the monks thought the last day was coming, and Jerome records that he was in such terror that he sprung from his bed absolutely without clothing, and came out amongst the brethren in a condition which afterwards caused their derision (*Cont. Vig.* ii.). He was for a time favourably impressed by what he saw at Bethlehem, and on one occasion when Jerome was preaching upon the reality of the body at the resurrection, Vigilantius was so much struck by what he heard that he sprang up and with applause of hands and feet saluted Jerome as champion of orthodoxy (*Ep.* lxi. 3). But the extremes of asceticism, the corruption produced by indiscriminate almsgiving, and the violence, perhaps the insincerity, of Jerome's dealing with the question of Origen [HIERONYMUS, section *Origenism*] produced a reaction against Jerome. Vigilantius begged to be dismissed, and left in great haste (Jer. *Ep.* cix. 2), without giving any reason. He was the bearer of Jerome's reply to Paulinus at

He landed probably at Naples, and, after visiting Nola, went home by the land route. He stopped, however, on the way for a considerable time at various places, and the account he gave of what he had seen in the East, which was related to Jerome either by report or by some writing of Vigilantius to or about Jerome, provoked him to write a reply (Jerome, *Ep.* 61). In this he shows the same feeling which comes out more fully in his replies to Rufinus, that of a jealous sensitiveness for his own orthodox reputation; and it seems probable that Vigilantius had acted somewhat as Rufinus subsequently did, praising Jerome's learning, but thereby bringing him under the imputation of Origenism (*Cont. Ruf.* iii. 19). He had subscribed some document rather unwillingly (Jer. *Ep.* lxi. 1), perhaps a condemnation of Origenism, forming possibly part of the reconciliation between Jerome and Rufinus, which occurred soon afterwards; but continued, Jerome says, to preach in a sense contrary to the compact as Jerome understood it; and he quoted Jerome as agreeing to statements which Jerome himself regarded as heretical (Jerome, *Ep.* lxi. 1). He boasted, Jerome says, that he had overcome him in argument (*Ep.* lxi. 3), but this may imply no more than that he could not accept Jerome's judgment, and had held his own against him. Jerome treats him with contempt, declaring that he had never understood the points in dispute (*Ep.* lxi. 1), and that he should attain some elementary knowledge which would show him his own ignorance; but this was Jerome's manner in controversy. He quotes also (*Ib.* 4) a passage from a Commentary of Vigilantius upon Daniel, in which he makes the mountain from which the stone was cut out without hands to be the World and the Devil; an interpretation which Jerome speaks of as a blasphemy never to be pardoned until, as Origen holds, the Devil himself is pardoned; but such interpretations were common and can easily be matched in the Commentaries of Jerome himself. He speaks of him also as a man of uncouth speech (*Cont. Vig.* 3); yet he had evidently acquired the Greek language, for Jerome gives more Greek expressions in his letter to him than in any other letter; and Gennadius calls him "homo linguâ politus"; nor is it likely that a man who spent a large part of his fortune in the increase of literature (*Ib.* § 4) would be worthy of the contemptuous expression Ὄνῳ λύρα, which Jerome flings at him, or of having his name turned to Dormitantius.

The mention of the Cottian Alps as a place in which Vigilantius sojourned has led several writers, both Roman and Protestant, to connect the subsequent efforts for a religion freed from superstition made by Claude, bishop of Turin, and the Waldenses, with what may be called the Puritanism of Vigilantius (See Jonas Aurelianensis, quoted by Gilly, 484). The evidence is too slight to build upon; but Vigilantius must certainly be reckoned amongst those who raised an unavailing protest against a superstitious system destined to last till the Reformation. On his return to Gaul, he settled in his native country. Gennadius (*De Scr. Eccl.* c. 35) states that he at one time held a church in the

and Didier), and the messenger who took back Jerome's work against Vigilantius took at the same time his Commentary on Zachariah which was dedicated and sent to Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse, and his letter to Minervius and Alexander (119) who was presbyter of Toulouse, and the Commentary on Malachi dedicated to them.

The work of Vigilantius against superstitious practices was written about the year 403. We may presume that his intercourse with Severus, Paulinus and Jerome furnished the principal motives and materials for it. The fables told of St. Martin by Severus, the cult of St. Felix by Paulinus, the extreme asceticism recommended by the monk of Bethlehem, together with the crowds of persons maintained in idleness at Jerusalem by the mistaken almsgiving of the churches, are evidently present to his mind in making his protest. There were similar practices no doubt arising in a grosser form in his own neighbourhood among a population emerging from heathenism, which provoked his protest against the introduction of heathen ceremonial into Christian worship. The work is only known to us through the writings of Jerome, of whose unscrupulousness and violence in controversy we have many proofs. Nothing of the kind appears in the quotations from the book of Vigilantius, which, considering the extreme difficulty of his position in the rising flood of superstition, we must presume to have been a serious and faithful protest. It was not written hastily, under provocation, such as he may have felt in leaving Bethlehem, but after the lapse of six or seven years. His own bishop (Jerome, *Ep.* cix. 2) and several others in his neighbourhood (*Cont. Vig.* 2) approved his action, and he appears to have been appointed to a church in the diocese of Barcelona after the controversy had run its course (Gennad. *De Sc. Eccl.* 35).

The points against which he argues are four:—1. The superstitious reverence paid to the remains of holy men, which were carried round in the church assemblies in gold vessels or silken wrappings to be kissed, and the prayers in which their intercession was asked; 2. The late and frequent watchings at the basilicas of the martyrs, from which scandals constantly arose, the burning of numerous tapers, which was a heathen practice, the stress laid on the miracles performed at the shrines, which, Vigilius maintained, were of use only to unbelievers; 3. The sending of alms to Jerusalem, which might much better be given to the poor in each separate diocese, and generally the monkish habit of divesting oneself of possessions which should be administered as a trust by the possessor; and, fourthly, the special virtue attributed to the unmarried state. Vigilantius held that for the clergy especially to be married was an advantage to the church; and he looked upon the solitary life as a cowardly forsaking of responsibility.

The bishop of the diocese, who may possibly have been Exuperius of Toulouse [EXUPERIUS], since he is known to have had communications with the pope, Innocentius, about this time on points of discipline, strongly favoured the

views of Vigilantius, and they began to spread widely in Southern Gaul. The clergy who were fostering the practices impugned by him found their people imbibing his views, and two of them, Desiderius and Riparius, wrote to Jerome, representing the opinions of Vigilantius and asking for his advice. Jerome answered at once in a letter to Riparius (*Ep.* 109, ed. Vall.), which is one expressive of chagrin and indignation rather than one of sober argument. He begins by declaring that no adoration was paid to the martyrs, but that their relics were honoured as a means of worshipping God. The bodies of Jacob and of Moses were not held to be unclean. He breaks off, however, very soon, confessing that in a case of plain sacrilege he cannot speak patiently. He expresses his wonder that the bishop of the diocese should acquiesce in Vigilantius's madness. It was a case for such dealing as that of Peter with Ananias and Sapphira. He offered, however, to answer more fully if the work of Vigilantius itself were sent to him.

This offer was accepted. Through their friend Sisinnius, who was going to the East with alms for the Egyptian monks and the poor of Jerusalem, Riparius and Desiderius sent the book in the latter part of the year 406. (*Pref. to Comm. on Zach.*) Jerome gave little attention to the book at first, but finding Sisinnius obliged to leave Bethlehem in haste, he sat down and in one night's work wrote his treatise *Contra Vigilantium.* This treatise has less of reason and more of mere abuse than any which he wrote. The method followed throughout is to impute to his adversary extreme views, which it may certainly be assumed that he did not hold. If you deny that the bones and shrines of martyrs are to be honoured, you assert that they ought never to have become martyrs. Or, if you say it is desirable that the clergy should marry, you assert that no one should be ordained unless the bishop first sees the wife pregnant or the child in her arms. Jerome admits that the lighting of candles by day is undesirable, but defends the simple devotion of those who adopt the practice. As to the support of the poor at Jerusalem, he is content to quote the practice of St. Paul as if it were binding in the 5th century, though his letters to Paulinus (58, § 4) shows his bad opinion of the population at Jerusalem. In reference to the monastic life, he admits that it is a flying from the battle; but it is safer to run away than to fight with a chance of being beaten. "There can be no doubt," says Zöckler (*Hieronymus*, p. 310) "that Jerome wrote no treatise which, both as to the matters which he defended and as to its tone of hatred and of passion, was more unworthy of him, than this immoderately vehement apology for a superstitious idolizing of the creature and a ceremonial sanctity against a man who at least in the main was striving to uphold the standpoint of pure evangelical truth."

What effect was produced by this philippic at the time we do not know. It is possible that Exuperius, if Vigilantius was in his diocese, by degrees changed his mind towards him, and that it was on this account that he passed into the diocese of Barcelona, where Gennadius places him. He does not appear to have been treated as a heretic in his own day. Indeed Jerome in his *Apology* (iii. 19) expressly repels the imputation of having asserted that the character of Vigilantius had been stained by communion with heretics. But, as is seen by the sentence of Gelasius, quoted in the end of the article on Rufinus, the official leaders of the church came to reckon as enemies those whom Jerome had so treated, and Vigilantius came by degrees to be ranked among heretics. The sentence of Gennadius upon him is as follows (*De Sec. Eccl.* 35); "Vigilantius the presbyter, a Gaul by birth, held a church in the Spanish diocese of Barcelona. He wrote with a certain zeal for religion; but he was led astray by the praise of men, and presumed beyond his strength; and being a man of elegant speech but not trained in discerning the sense of the scriptures, he interpreted in a perverse manner the second vision of Daniel, and put forth other works of no value, which must be placed in the catalogue of heretical writings. He was answered by the blessed presbyter Jerome."

This judgment has lasted nearly down to our own time. In the year 1844, Dr. Gilly, Canon of Durham, published a work on "*Vigilantius and his Times*," (Seeleys), in which he brings together all the facts known about him, and shows the true significance of his protest by describing the life of Severus, Paulinus, and Jerome from their own writings. [W. H. F.]

VIGILANTIUS (2), one of the metropolitans of Illyricum addressed by pope Leo I. (*Ep.* 13) in 446 (*Pat. Lat.* liv. 663.) [C. H.]

VIGILIUS (1), a bishop to whom Celsus (otherwise unknown) dedicated his Latin translation of the Dialogue between Jason and Papiscus (*Pat. Lat.* vi. 49; Tillem. ii. 139). [C. H.]

VIGILIUS (2), bishop of Trent, martyr in A.D. 385, vid. for refs., *D. C. A.* [C. H.]

VIGILIUS (3), a deacon mentioned by Gennadius (*Scr. Eccl.* 51) as the author of a monastic rule, drawn from the Oriental monks "breviato et aperto sermone." Cave (i. 402) assigns his period as A.D. 420. What purports to be this rule is given by Holstein in his *Codex Regularum*, under the title *Regula Orientalis*, which may be seen likewise in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* li. 373; Ceillier (x. 472) has a notice of it. [C. H.]

VIGILIUS (4) THAPSENSIS, an African bishop, mentioned in the *Notitia* published at the end of the *Historia* of Victor Vitensis [VICTOR (44)], was present at the conference convened by the Vandal Hunneric in 484. He belonged to the Byzacene province, and was banished by the Vandal king. He seems then to have fled to Constantinople, where he wrote his works against Eutychianism and Arianism. He published one work alone under his own name, viz. his five books against Eutyches, in which he produces the usual arguments against the Eutychian system, and states them very clearly. An extremely good and copious analysis of this work will be found in Ceillier, x. 472–485. It is interesting as a specimen of fifth and sixth century controversy, and also as showing the evolution of thought among the Eutychians. The Eutychian party of his day had not quite completed or thought out their system. They had not fixed, for instance, on a date for the disappearance of Christ's human nature. A cen-

nature was swallowed up in the Divine. [ICONOCLASTAE, Vol. III. p. 203.] In the age of Vigilius this was a novel tenet, and found but few adherents, and he refers to it in his first book, as a view taught by some, not by all. In his fourth book he discusses the tome of St. Leo and the orthodoxy of the decrees of Chalcedon, in which he has some remarks important for liturgiology, on the form of the creed used at Rome. [See art. CREED, Vol. I. p. 708.] He defends St. Leo on the ground that he quoted the creed used in the Romish church from apostolic times. Vigilius wrote several works under various distinguished names. Thus Chifflet, who has published the best edition of his writings, attributes to Vigilius a dialogue in twelve books on the *Trinity*, printed among the works of St. Athanasius, a treatise against an Arian called Varimadus published under the name of Idacius Clarus, a book against Felicianus the Arian under that of St. Augustine; and two conferences, in which he represents Athanasius as disputing against Arius before a judge named Probus, who of course gives sentence against Arius. These conferences he published in two editions, one in two books, where Athanasius and Arius alone appear. Another in three books, in which Sabellius and Photinus are introduced in addition. His authorship of these conferences is absolutely certain, because in the fifth book of his work *Contra Eutych.* p. 58, he speaks of his argument "in eis libris quos adversus Sabellium, Photinum et Arianum sub nomine Athanasii, conscripsimus," Chifflet also ascribes to him a treatise against Palladius, an Arian bishop, printed among the works of St. Ambrose and of Gregory Naz, and also the acts of the Council of Aquileia found among the *Epistles* of St. Ambrose (*Epist.* S. Ambros, prima Classis). The Athanasian creed has also been attributed to him, chiefly on the ground that in the creed and in his treatise against Eutyches the same use is made of an argument derived from the constitution of Man. In both the union of two natures in man is brought forward as an explanation of the union of two natures in the one person of Jesus Christ. The works of Vigilius were published, with an elaborate commentary by Chifflet at Dijon in 1664, together with those of Victor Vitensis. This edition has been reprinted by Migne, *P. L.* t. lxii. [G. T. S.]

VIGILIUS (5), bishop of Rome, intruded into the see in the room of Silverius, A.D. 537, by Belisarius, acting under the orders of the empress Theodora. By birth a Roman of good position, being the son of one John, who had been consul, he had accompanied Agapetus as one of his deacons, when that pope went to Constantinople A.D. 536 and procured from Justinian the deposition and banishment of the Monophysite patriarch Anthimus, and the appointment of Mennas in his room. [See AGAPETUS.] The Monophysite party (called commonly at that time the Acephali[a]), who continued to [...] through whose contrivance Anthimus had been originally translated to Constantinople, and who continued to manage her orthodox husband, though he prided himself on being a theological autocrat. "Theodora," says Procopius (*Hist. arcan.*), "took upon herself to manage all things in the state; for she herself appointed both to magistracies and ecclesiastical offices, aiming at and continually keeping before her this one thing, that no honourable or good man should obtain any dignity, but only such as would be subservient to her commands." Agapetus having died in April, A.D. 536, when on the point of departing for Rome, she seems to have lost no time in securing, if possible, a subservient pope as his successor. According to Liberatus (*Breviarium*, c. 22), she sent for Vigilius, and promised him an order to Belisarius to get him ordained pope, and also a reward of seven *centenaria* of gold,[b] on condition of his secretly undertaking to disallow the council of Chalcedon, and to write to Anthimus, and also to Theodosius and Severus (former Monophysite patriarchs of Alexandria and Ephesus, who, like Anthimus, had been promoted by Theodora, but since deposed), confirming their faith. Vigilius (says the same authority) willingly complied, influenced "by the love of episcopacy and of gold," and thereupon proceeded to Rome, but found, on his arrival, Silverius already ordained. He then (it is further related) sought Belisarius, who was at Naples,[c] delivered him the order of the empress, and promised him two *centenaria* of gold in case of Silverius being removed and himself ordained. For an account of the subsequent proceedings at Rome to attain this end, the deposition, banishment, and death of Silverius, and the ordination of Vigilius by order of Belisarius, see art. on SILVERIUS.

Vigilius having been thus ordained in the year 537 (on the 22nd of November, according to the conclusion of Pagi; on the 25th of March, according to that of Mansi),[d] and the death of Silverius having been certainly not earlier than 20 June, A.D. 538, it is evident that for at least seven months his position was that of an unlawful antipope, his predecessor never having been canonically deposed. Nor is it easy to see how he ever became lawful pope at all, if it be true (as Bower contends, quoting many authorities) that ordination to a see canonically full was anciently accounted null and void. For the supposition of Baronius, that after the death of Silverius he resigned his usurped position, and was re-ordained, has not a shadow of historical evidence to rest on. However, as pope he was accepted, the deposition of bishops and the ordination of others in their room under imperial dictation being at that time, however irregular,

[a] They began to be so called when Peter Mongus accepted the see of Alexandria on the doctrinal basis of the emperor Zeno's *Henoticon*. Some of his followers then deserted him, and were called *Acephali*, as being a party without a head.

[b] "*Centenaria auri* in *Cod. Justin. lib.* 12, *tit.* 51, *leg.* 12, sunt centenae librae auri signati, ut contra *Dion. Gotofr.* et *Cujac.* ostendit *Salmas. ad Lamprid.* in *Alexand. Sev.* c. 39."—Facciolati.

[c] Liberatus says, at Ravenna. But see article on SILVERIUS.

[d] For discussion of probable dates, see Pagi in Baron. *ad an.* 536, cxx.; *ad an.* 538, vi.; and *ad an.* 555, vii.; with Mansi's notes.

common enough elsewhere; and the ancients seem to have dated his episcopate from the time of his intrusion into the see. For Anastasius gives as the duration of that of Silverius 1 year, 5 months and 11 days, which could only be on the supposition that it terminated with his deposition, while as the duration of that of Vigilius (who died A.D. 555) he gives 17 years, and some months and days, thus implying that it began in the year 537, when he was first ordained.

Through Antonina, the wife of Belisarius and the real accomplice and agent of the empress in the whole transaction, Vigilius sent without delay letters to Anthimus, Theodosius, and Severus, in fulfilment of his secret promise. He expressed therein his entire agreement with them in matters of faith, but charged them to keep his avowal in the dark, so that he might more easily accomplish what he had undertaken to do. He added a confession of his own faith, condemning the *Tome* of pope Leo (in which the orthodox doctrine of two Natures in Christ had been enunciated), and anathematizing Paul of Samosata, Diodorus[e] (of Tarsus), Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret, with all who agreed with them. Binius and Baronius, in their jealousy for the credit of the Roman see, dispute the genuineness of this letter, supposing it to have been forged by the Monophysite party. But no valid ground has been adduced for suspecting it. It is given by Liberatus and Victor Tunonensis, who were both contemporaries; and Facundus (*c. Mocianum*), also a contemporary, seemingly alludes to it.[f] Pagi (*Not. in* Baron. *ad an.* 538) meets at length and successfully the arguments of Baronius, alleging at the same time that the Roman see was not compromised, since Vigilius was not the true pope at the time of writing.

[e] In the extant editions of the letter the name here is Dioscorus, which Pagi, with good reason, supposes to have been an error of transcription for Diodorus. For Dioscorus of Alexandria, the supporter of Eutyches and the president of the Robber Council (*Latrocinium*), could not have been anathematized by Vigilius in the interests of Eutychianism along with Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret. But Diodorus of Tarsus, who with them had been accused of Nestorianism, and to whose school of thought the latter of these had belonged, was likely to have been associated with them by the Eutychian, or Monophysite, party. Further, the order in which the names occur suggests Diodorus, rather than Dioscorus; for the former came in point of time between Paul of Samosata and the other two, Dioscorus being of later date.

[f] Baronius cites, in proof of the spuriousness of the epistle, *Act* 15 *sextae synodi*—"Anathema sit libro qui dicitur Mennae ad Vigilium, et qui eum scripserunt sive finxerunt: anathema libellis qui dicuntur facti fuisse a Vigilio ad Justinianum et Theodoram divae memoriae." He supposes the latter anathema to refer to the letter before us. But the reference cannot be to it, since it is not addressed to Justinian and Theodora. Its inscription in the present (apparently corrupt) text of Liberatus is, "Dominis et Christis (*al.* Patribus) Vigilius." But Victor Tunonensis gives it thus,—"Dominis et in Christi Dei Salvatoris nostri caritate conjunctis fratribus, Theodosio, Anthemio, et Severo episcopis Vigilius episcopus." Baronius notes also the condemnation of Dioscorus in the letter (with respect to which see last note), as suggesting suspicion of forgery. But a forger would have been as unlikely as Vigilius himself to introduce such an obvious inconsistency.

In whatever way the circumstances were represented to Justinian, he was evidently kept in the dark about all these secret proceedings, since, after the death of Silverius, he wrote to Vigilius, sending a confession of his own faith, and recognizing him as pope without any suspicion of his orthodoxy. The letter was sent to Rome by a patrician and ex-consul Dominicus, the reply to it, dated 540, together with a letter addressed at the same time to the patriarch Mennas, being extant. In these letters Vigilius declares himself altogether orthodox, accepts the tome of Leo and the council of Chalcedon, and condemns by name Theodosius, Anthimus, and Severus, together with all abettors of the Eutychian heresy. Baronius adduces these letters as evidence against the genuineness of his alleged previous letter to the deposed patriarchs, and also as striking proofs of divine watchfulness over the apostolic see, in that even such a man as Vigilius is acknowledged to have been originally was guarded from countenancing heresy from the time of his becoming lawful pope. It is true that he backed out of his promise to the empress, which he had all along been so desirous should be kept a secret: but, though thus preserved from openly committing the see of Rome to Monophysite heresy, he cut in other respects but a sorry figure as an authority in matters of faith, as will appear below.

In the year 541 began at Constantinople the new theological disputes which led to the 2nd council of Constantinople (called the 5th oecumenical), in the course of which Vigilius came in conflict with the emperor, presenting a painful picture of vacillation and inconsistency. It is not easy to disentangle the skein of events at this juncture, when various parties were pulling the strings, and when the great Justinian himself, while he posed as a despotic theologian, was, notwithstanding his undoubted abilities, made a tool of by intriguers. The course of things, briefly stated, appears to have been as follows.

The controversy on the writings of Origen, which had been rife in Palestine in the fourth century, when Jerome had been resident at Bethlehem, had lately broken out afresh in the monasteries there. Peter, the patriarch of Jerusalem, who was opposed to the Origenists, sent two abbots to Constantinople, with a letter to the emperor, and extracts from Origen's writings, complaining of the commotions excited by the Origenistic party, and praying for their condemnation (*Vit. S. Sabae*). Pelagius, apocrisiarius of the Roman see at Constantinople, who had been himself in Palestine, was joined by these monks on his return, and supported their petition, having (as Liberatus informs us) his own private reasons for doing so. For two Origenistic abbats from Palestine, Domitian and Theodore Ascidas, were at that time resident at the court of Justinian, and had acquired great influence with him. The former the emperor had made bishop of Ancyra, and the latter of Caesarea in Cappadocia; but they still remained at Constantinople. It was to jealousy of Theodore Ascidas that Liberatus attributes the readiness of Pelagius to support the petition of the monks. Mennas, the patriarch, also joined him, being perhaps similarly influenced. The emperor, glad of the opportunity of dictating on a question of theo-

the patriarch to assemble the bishops and abbots then at Constantinople for the purpose of anathematizing him, his doctrine, and his followers, and to suffer no bishop or abbot to be thenceforth appointed except on condition of doing the same. The edict was to be sent also to all the other patriarchs, including Vigilius of Rome, who were all enjoined to receive it. There seems to have been no resistance to this imperial command; few probably out of Palestine cared enough about the matter to incur the risk of disobedience; but, if the purpose of Pelagius and Mennas had been to ruin Theodore Ascidas and Domitian, they were disappointed, for the latter signed the decrees of the synod which Mennas assembled, and retained their influence at court.

To them, Theodore and Domitian, the historians of the time attribute the moving of Justinian to take up the question of "the three Chapters,"—that further subject of controversy by which he long disturbed the church's peace. He was engaged, we are told, after his condemnation of Origen, in composing a treatise on the Incarnation in defence of the council of Chalcedon and in refutation of the Eutychians. Theodore and Domitian suggested to him at this juncture that he might better serve the cause of orthodoxy by procuring a condemnation of certain writers who had been accused of Nestorianism, but had been acquitted of the charge of heresy by the council of Chalcedon. These writers were Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas, the alleged author of a letter to one Maris, a Persian. It was represented to the emperor that, if these were now authoritatively condemned, and the council of Chalcedon freed from the imputation of having approved their errors, the Acephali would no longer refuse to accept that council. Theodore and Domitian were moved, it would seem, to offer this advice, partly in order to turn Justinian's thoughts into a new channel, and so diminish the risk of his discovering their own concealed Origenism; partly by way of reprisal on Pelagius and other Chalcedonists who had procured the condemnation of Origen; and partly because one at least of the writers in question, Theodore of Mopsuestia, was held to have written in opposition to the views of Origen. And they were abetted in their design, if not moved to it, by Theodora the empress, who welcomed the opportunity of covertly disparaging Chalcedon, and promoting measures against writers who had long been held in abhorrence by the Monophysite party which she favoured. It has been said above that Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret had been among those whom Vigilius had been by her required to condemn. The emperor, who had at heart the object so adroitly proposed to him, that of reconciling the Acephali to Chalcedon, and who was always only too glad of an opportunity of dogmatising, readily fell into the snare. The writings thus prepared for condemnation are knows as "the Three Chapters" (*tres capitula*). The imperial edict against them (*περὶ τριῶν κεφαλαίων*) was issued probably about A.D. 544, in which they, their deceased authors, and all defenders of them, were anathe-dendos sanctos patres qui in Chalcedonensi fuere concilio dixisse, anathema sit" (Facund. l. iv. c. 4). The edict itself has not been preserved, its purport being known only from fragments given by Facundus.[s] It was given to Mennas, as that against Origen had been, to be accepted within his jurisdiction, and sent to all the patriarchs to receive universal ecclesiastical sanction. Justinian acknowledged in theory the authority of the spiritualty in matters spiritual; but he took upon him to dictate to the spiritualty what doctrines they should approve or condemn, and to enforce compliance with his own views. He aimed at being an autocrat in church as well as state. But it was not so easy in this case as in the former one to secure compliance, the edict being regarded as disparaging the authority of the council of Chalcedon. Mennas at first refused his assent to it, but at length gave his acquiescence in writing, though still with the proviso that, if the Roman bishop should declare against it, his approval should be withdrawn. The other three patriarchs of the East also refused at first, but yielded to threats of deposition. The rest of the Eastern bishops followed their example, the few who still refused being in the end deposed and banished. But in the West, less accustomed to imperial despotism, there was more difficulty. Especially in North Africa, and in Illyria and Dalmatia, the bishops and clergy were resolute in their opposition. It was of course of the first importance for the emperor's purpose to win over Vigilius, who, from his antecedents, might have been expected to obey. But it did not prove so. Being now in possession of his see, he shewed, though inconsistently in the sequel, considerable independence of spirit, being probably influenced by the prevailing feeling at Rome, and in the West generally. He being himself, it may be supposed, no great theologian, his deacons, Anatolius and Pelagius, suspecting a plot of the Monophysite party, wrote to the learned deacon, Fulgentius Ferrandus of Carthage, requesting him to deliver an opinion on the subject after consultation with his bishop, or other competent persons. He replied to the effect that what the council of Chalcedon had approved ought not to be called in question, since the conclusions of all councils might be unsettled if this were done, that persons deceased were removed from the jurisdiction of human tribunals, and that what individuals had written, whether right or wrong, did not matter much, having no binding authority (Facundus, l. iv. c. 3). Thus supported and advised, Vigilius refused his assent to the emperor's edict, and was thereupon summoned peremptorily to Constantinople, and unwillingly obeyed the summons. Anastasius (*in Vit. Vigil.*) ascribes his going to Constantinople to the action of Theodora, on the ground of her being incensed against him for not fulfilling his promise to her about the revocation of Anthimus, and on the plea of accusations of homicide and cruelty

[s] A lengthy edict, beginning, "Scientes quod nihil aliud," given by Baronius as the original one (*ad an.* 546, xi.), appears to have been a subsequent production. See Pagi in Baron. *ad an.* 546.

made to her against him by the Roman people. The story continues that she thereupon sent one Anthemius, a scribe, with a charge to seize the pope, wherever found (unless it were in the basilica of St. Peter), under pain (as the empress swore by the living God) of being skinned alive; —that Vigilius was found and apprehended in the church of St. Caecilia, and at once carried on board ship in the Tiber;—and that the Roman populace threw stones after him as he departed, crying, "Famine and death go with thee." But, as all the contemporary writers speak only of his having been sent for by Justinian in the matter of the Three Chapters, little credit is due to the whole story thus told.

Vigilius sailed first to Sicily, where he was joined by Datius, bishop of Milan, a resolute opponent of the condemnation of the Three Chapters, and by an emissary from the patriarch of Antioch, and was apparently by them informed that Mennas, with his colleagues at Constantinople, had already condemned the writings, without waiting, as they had been expected to do, for the pope's arrival, and that Stephen (who had succeeded Pelagius as the pope's apocrisiarius), with others, had consequently withdrawn from the patriarch's communion. Thereupon he wrote from Sicily to Mennas, referring to the injunctions that had been sent by the emperor to himself to the effect that he should consult the peace of the church by compliance, and setting forth in reply that the peace of this world was not the same thing as the peace of Christ. And he further threatened to assert his authority on his arrival at Constantinople, unless what had been done amiss were amended (Facundus, l. iv. c. 3; and c. Mocianum). Arrived at Constantinople, accompanied by Datius (A.D. 547), he persevered for a time in the same attitude, renouncing communion with Mennas and his followers,—for four months, according to Theophanes (*Chron.* l. iv.). But, having been received, says the same authority, with flattering distinction by both emperor and empress, he was before long won over to remove the excommunication, and to give a secret promise to condemn the chapters (Occulta ejus ante judicium pollicitatio tenebatur, in qua se spopondit eadem capitula damnaturum. *Facund. c. Moc.*). In fulfilment of this promise he first presided over a synod, with the hope of inducing it to do what the emperor required. But meeting opposition there,—and especially from bishop Facundus of Ermiana, who requested leave to argue the question (Facundus himself tells the story), he suspended the proceedings, requiring the bishops separately to send to him their opinions in writing. Imperial officers were employed to hasten the preparation of the required replies, which were given in to Vigilius, and by him handed to the emperor. Seventy bishops were thus induced to declare for the condemnation of the chapters, including many who had previously refused to comply. Vigilius appears, from the detailed account of the proceedings given by the said Facundus (who is our main authority, and apparently quite trustworthy), to have been adroit in cajoling objectors by misrepresenting his own intentions in the matter. He represented to them that in merely handing these answers of the bishops to the emperor he threw all responsibility in the matter on him, and saved the see of Rome from complicity in disparagement of the council of Chalcedon. As if, says Facundus (*c. Mocianum*), he could not have burnt the answers or refused to take them, or condemned them by his own authority. But he did more than report to the emperor. He himself, in the next place, supported by these seventy signatories, issued the document known as his *Judicatum*, addressed to Mennas, and promulged on Easter Eve, A.D. 548 (*Ep.* Vigilii, *ad* Rustianum et Sebastianum). In it he condemned the Chapters, though disavowing any disparagement thereby of the council of Chalcedon. This *Judicatum* provoked serious opposition. At Constantinople Facundus continued resolute in his position, protesting against bishops who betrayed their trust to win favour with princes:—If (said he) God should now raise up an Ambrose, there would not fail to be a Theodosius. Vigilius' own deacons, Rusticus and Sebastianus, with others, declared against him, and renounced his communion; after which he wrote these two deacons a long vituperative letter, which is extant, deposing them from their office and excommunicating them. Elsewhere the bishops of Illyricum condemned the *Judicatum* in synod; those of North Africa did the same, and even formally excommunicated Vigilius, reserving him only the penance of the church (Vict. Tunon. *ad an.* 549, 550). Alarmed by the consequences of his act, Vigilius now recalled his *Judicatum*, and seems to have represented to the Westerns that he had issued it unwillingly, pleading also ignorance of the emperor's intentions; to which excuses Facundus replies that he could not plead unwillingness, since no severe persecution had been used to compel him; and that the plea of ignorance was inconsistent with that of unwillingness. He attributes his whole action to desire of court favour and position, as his earlier secret promise to Theodora had been due to ambition. He could not, however, undo what he had done, for the *Judicatum* was now known far and wide, Rusticus and Sebastianus having taken upon themselves to circulate copies of it, for doing which without his leave he severely reproves them in his letter to them that has been referred to. He seems to have wished so to manage matters as to be able to back out if necessary, throwing the onus of both the exaction and the promulgation of the *Judicatum* on the emperor. If any further proof were needed of his double dealing, we should have a signal one in the fact (if it be true) that, at the very time when he was thus trying to persuade the Westerns that he was on their side, he was induced by the emperor to take a secret oath before him to do all he could to bring about the condemnation of the Three Chapters. The oath said to have been thus taken, attested by Theodorus of Caesarea and the patrician Cethegus, present at the time of swearing, and dated the 23rd year of Justinian, is given among the Acts of the 7th session of the 5th council (Labbe, vol. vi. p. 194), and may have been produced then with other documents which were sent by the emperor to compromise Vigilius. There seems to be no sufficient reason to doubt its genuineness. In it he swore in the most solemn form to unite with the emperor to the utmost of his power to cause the chapters to be condemned and anathematized; to take no

clare to him whatever he might hear prejudicial to the faith or the republic with reference to these chapters as well as to other matters:—but all this on the understanding that the oath thus taken should be kept secret from all, and that the emperor, in consideration of his position, would not betray his person, and would also secure to him his honour and dignity, and the privileges of his see. Conduct like this at this juncture renders highly probable his alleged secret compact with Theodora, and his private letters to the Eutychian bishops, at the beginning of his reign, though, as has been seen above, Baronius and others are anxious to regard these charges as unproven. All was in keeping with his character. Probably he cared little himself about the theological matters in dispute, but he denied two things which were really inconsistent:—to keep well with his own clergy and the Western bishops generally, and to retain court favour. The result of his crooked policy was, as it was likely to be, that neither party trusted him, and that he got wrong with both.

In the same year in which the *Judicatum* was issued (A.D. 548) Theodora died, so that she was no longer at hand to instigate or manage the emperor. But he continued resolute in carrying out his project for the condemnation of the Three Chapters by full ecclesiastical authority. Vigilius, hampered by the repudiation of his *Judicatum* in the West, and by his own secret understanding with the emperor, would gladly have left the scene of action. In a letter to Aurelianus of Arles, in which he expresses himself as on the side of the Westerns, he says, "When the lord, my son, the most clement emperor shall (with the help of God who holds his heart) order me to return, as he has promised, I will send to you one who shall inform you accurately of all that has been here done." But his presence being required at Constantinople for the emperor's purpose, he was not allowed to go. The plan he now adopted was to persuade the emperor to summon the bishops, both of the East and West (including especially those of Africa and Illyricum who had shewn themselves so strongly opposed to the *Judicatum*) to a council at Constantinople, and in the meantime to take no further steps. Justinian, ever open to management, acted on his advice; but, though the obsequious Easterns of course obeyed the summons,[h] very few of the Westerns came at the time appointed;—a small number from Italy, two from Illyricum, but none from Africa. Justinian would have had Vigilius proceed at once with such bishops as were in Constantinople without waiting for the rest. Vigilius, who now shewed considerable spirit, refused to do so. Thereupon the emperor issued a new edict against the chapters, which he caused to be posted in the churches. Vigilius not only protested against this act as a violation of the agreement come to, but also called an efforts to procure a revocation of the edict till the episcopate of the West should have an opportunity of declaring its opinion, and in virtue of the authority of the apostolic see declared all excommunicated who should meanwhile sign or receive it. Datius of Milan, who was his firm supporter in these proceedings, also in a loud voice (*magna vociferatione*) declared all supporters of the edict to be separated from his own communion, and from that of the churches of Gaul, Burgundy, Spain, Liguria, Aemilia and Venetia (Vigil. *Ep. Encycl.* and *Ep. Cler. Ital. ad legat. Franc.*). The only Eastern bishop who supported the pope on the occasion seems to have been Zoilus of Alexandria, who was consequently deposed on the same day by the emperor. Vigilius and Datius, with good reason apprehending danger, took refuge in the basilica of St. Peter in Ormisda; and there the former drew up a letter ef excommunication against bishop Theodore Ascidas of Caesarea, whom he accused of being the main contriver of all the mischief,[i] and also against Mennas the patriarch, and all who had acted with them. But he did not at once promulge the sentence, in the hope (as he says in his encyclic letter above referred to) that the emperor would be moved to recall his edict. He committed it meanwhile to a trustworthy person, to be published in case of need arising through violence being offered to himself, or his own death ensuing. Justinian sent the praetor whose office it was to apprehend common malefactors, with an armed band, to seize the pope in his place of refuge. He fled to the altar of St. Sergius in the church, and clung to its columns, whence he was dragged violently by his feet, so that the altar would have been pulled down had it not been held up by the clergy present. But a mob assembling at the door of the church, rescued him. After this, an honourable embassy was sent to him, including Belisarius and Justin the emperor's nephew, who induced him on the security of an oath to return to the palace of Placidia. He complied, he says in his encyclic letter, only because he was told that he would be removed violently if he refused, not as being satisfied with the terms of the promise made to him, which was not what he demanded, but all that the emperor would allow. After thus leaving the church he complains of having been subjected to incredible annoyances, being visited repeatedly and pressed to conform to the emperor's will, while he in vain, both by word and writing, appealed to the oath that had been sworn to him that he should be left in peace if he would return to his palace. At length, finding that every egress from the house was guarded, and hearing from his bedchamber voices that filled him with alarm, he escaped by night, though in bad health, over a wall that was in course of construction, and reaching the shore, took boat for Chalcedon, and there sought the sanctuary of the church of St. Euphemia. This was two days before Christmas, A.D. 551.

No attempt was made to violate this sanctuary:

[h] "The Greek bishops have rich churches, and cannot bear to be suspended for two months from domination over ecclesiastical affairs. Wherefore, according to circumstances, and according to the will of princes, they consent without altercation to whatever is required of them." (*Letter of the Roman clergy to the legates of the Franks* A.D. 551. See Labbé, vol. v. p. 1397.)

[i] It was this Theodore, be it remembered, who was said to have been, with his colleague Domitian, the original instigator of the emperor in the matter of the Three Chapters.

its sanctity in public opinion, Justinian's own religious scruples, and a desire now to conciliate rather than to irritate, may have conspired to prevent any: and so the pope remained safe there, and in a position to dictate the terms on which he would take part in the forthcoming council. The same honourable embassy as before was sent to him to induce him to come out again under the security of a solemn oath. But he was resolute in remaining where he was till the edict against the chapters was revoked, and the whole question recognised as open till the council should have considered it. The emperor, in his anxiety to secure the pope's concurrence at the council, at length acceded to these conditions.

Theodore also (threatened with the excommucation, which was kept in readiness, though not yet formally promulged), Mennas, and other bishops, proffered him a profession of their faith, including full acceptance of the council of Chalcedon, and of the decrees of all preceding popes, assenting fully to the revocation of whatever had been so far issued against the Three Chapters, expressing regret for any ill-treatment to which Vigilius had been subjected, and apologizing for having at any time received into their communion any whom he had excommunicated or condemned (*Constitutum Vigilii*). Thus apparently triumphant for the time, and invested with the temporary dignity of firmness, Vigilius returned to Constantinople towards the end of the year 552, having been nearly a year in the sanctuary of St. Euphemia. Mennas had meanwhile died, and Eutychius, who had succeeded him, addressed to the pope a confession of faith and of agreement with the four councils and with the decrees of popes, similar to what had been offered to him by Mennas previously, with a respectful request that he would take the presidency of the forthcoming council. This letter was signed also by Apollinaris, who had been intruded in the room of Zoilus into the see of Alexandria, Domnus of Ephesus, Elias of Thessalonica, and other bishops. Vigilius replied in an extant letter to Eutychius, giving his assent. But he represented at the same time to the emperor the overwhelming preponderance of Eastern bishops who would be present at the council, and requested leave to convene a synod of Westerns, including the Africans, in some part of Italy, or at any rate in Sicily, which should in the first place deliberate on the subject of the Three Chapters, and send their report to the emperor. Unsuccessful in this request, he proposed that the emperor should summon to Constantinople a number of Western bishops, whose names he and his colleagues would submit for approval, for the purpose of such deliberation. But neither was this allowed. To a third proposal, that the matter should be determined by an equal number on both sides of the Western and Eastern bishops then present at Constantinople, Justinian assented: but, finding it very unacceptable to the Eastern bishops, who pleaded the comparatively small number of Westerns that had taken part in former general councils, and the fact that the Western bishops had been summoned as well as the Easterns, and might have been present if they had chosen, he summoned the council, as he had originally intended, to meet on the fifth of May, A.D. 553. On the appointed day the Easterns met, in number 165, under the presidency of Eutychius. Vigilius and the Westerns, though urged to come by a deputation from the emperor, kept aloof, assembling by themselves in the Placidian palace. A deputation, consisting of the three patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, with twenty Metropolitans, was sent to him from the council, at its first session, to request his attendance. He pleaded indisposition, but promised to send his answer the next day. The same deputation again waited on him at the time appointed, and received his promised answer, which was to the effect that he could not take part in proceedings where the Easterns, who were prejudiced on the matter in dispute, were in so large a majority. To their arguments and remonstrances he finally replied that in the space of twenty days he would send his judgment on the points at issue, alleging the weak state of his health as justifying so long a time for preparing it. This answer being reported to the council at its third session, it determined to wait no longer, and proceeded to an examination of the writings which it had been assembled to condemn, and, in obedience to the emperor's orders, in a spirit adverse to them from the first. Vigilius, meanwhile, in concert with the Westerns that were with him, prepared a document, known as his *Constitutum ad Imperatorem*. It was a very lengthy composition, addressed to the emperor. It begins with a recapitulation of the negociations before the opening of the council between himself and the emperor: it then quotes at great length, and refutes, extracts that had been made from the works of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and condemns the views expressed as heretical: but it proceeds to protest against the condemnation of Theodorus himself as a heretic after his death, since he had not been so condemned when alive and had died in communion with the church; and also against any such condemnation of Theodoret or of the letter of Ibas, both having been acquitted of heresy by the council of Chalcedon. Finally, the following judgment is authoritatively pronounced: "These things, therefore, having been settled by us with all caution and diligence .... we ordain and decree that it is lawful for no one pertaining to orders and dignities ecclesiastical to write, or promulge, or compose, or teach anything contrary to what we have in this present constitution asserted and ordained concerning the said Three Chapters, or to move any further question after this present definition. But if anything has been or shall be found to have been done said or written in the name of any one pertaining to orders and dignities ecclesiastical, or by any one whatever, in the matter of the same Three Chapters contrary to what we have here asserted and ordained, we in every way refute it by the authority of the apostolic see over which, by the grace of God, we preside." This *Constitutum*, dated 14 May, A.D. 553, was signed also by sixteen Western bishops, and by Theophanius, the archdeacon, and Pelagius and Peter, two deacons of Rome. It does not appear that the emperor transmitted it to the council: but he handed in, at the 7th session, on the 26th of May, a statement of what had previously passed between himself and Vigilius;—how the latter had once himself condemned the chapters, and

invited to the council and had refused to come. He sent also copies of sundry letters and other documents thus implicating the pope, and a direction to the council signed by himself that it should proceed with its work, without regard to Vigilius, and even remove his name from the diptychs of the church. The fathers obsequiously lauded the emperor's pious solicitude in defence of the faith, and in their two subsequent sessions proceeded to a definite sentence. Anathemas were pronounced against Theodorus of Mopsuestia, his person as well as his writings, and against all defenders of them; against the inculpated writings, but not the persons, of Theodoret and Ibas; and all who should contravene the decisions of the council, or continue to defend the condemned writings, were, if ecclesiastics, to be deprived, if monks or laymen, to be excommunicated.

The banishment of Vigilius, asserted by Anastasius, to the island of Proconnesus is doubtful. There is indeed no doubt that many bishops were both deposed and banished by the emperor. Liberatus makes the general statement, "quomodo consentientes episcopi in trium damnationem capitulorum muneribus ditabantur; vel non consentientes depositi in exilium missi sunt; vel aliqui fuga latitantes in angustiis felicem exitum susceperunt, quoniam nota sunt omnibus, puto nunc a me silenda." (*Breviar.* c. xxiv.) But neither he nor any contemporary author speak definitely of any banishment of Vigilius, which is therefore on the whole improbable. Banished or not, he did not long retain his firmness: for there is no doubt that he soon changed sides once more, assenting to and confirming the decrees of the council, and thus giving them at length the sanction of the Roman see. That he did this is indisputable, and, according to Evagrius (*lib.* iv. c. 34), in writing, ἐγγράφως; nor does there seem to be valid reason for doubting the genuineness of the two written documents in which his recantation is declared. The first of these is a letter to the patriarch Eutychius, first published by Peter de Marca from a MS. in the *Reg. Biblioth.* (1642) in Greek and Latin (*in diss. de decreto Papae Vigilii pro confirm. V. Syn.—in ejusd. diss. III. a Baluzio editis*, Paris, 1669.—given in Labbe, *Concil.* vol. vi. p. 239). The reasons that have been adduced for doubting it (as to which see J. Garner *in edit. Liberati, Dissert. de V. Syn.* c. 7), mainly resting on its contents;—"dicunt primo, in hacce decretali contineri plura, non contraria magis sedis apostolicae dignitati quam falsa et inepta;"—are no proofs that Vigilius did not write it.[j] In it he attributes his own former dissent from the views of his brethren, though he had really held the same faith with them, to the machinations of

[j] Peter de Marca (*Dissert. de Vigilii decreto.* See Labbe, vol. vi. p. 246) thus describes the MS. found by him in the Royal Library: "Volumen illud manuscriptum Graecum extat in bibliotheca regia, accurate descriptum a Leone Cinnomo, et ab eo repositum Constantinopoli in bibliotheca imperatoria, temporibus Michaelis Palaeologi, anno mundi 6784, seu anno Christi 1276. Amanuensis vero testatur a se transcriptum ex autographo quod in veteri bibliotheca ecclesiae Romanae asservabatur, calamo exaratum anno Christi 753. Quod ideo annotavi, ut de manuscripti codicis antiquitate et fide nullus esset dubitandi locus."

mind to perceive the truth. His desire all along having been to ascertain the truth, he need not be ashamed, he continues, to acknowledge former error, since even so distinguished a theologian and master of the Latin language as Augustine had corrected his own writings, and retracted his own words. He concludes thus:—"Wherefore we anathematize and condemn the aforesaid three impious chapters, i.e. the so-called epistle of Ibas to Maris the Persian, in which the above described wicked blasphemies are contained, and the impious Theodorus of Mopsuestia with his wicked writings, and what Theodoret impiously wrote. And whosoever at any time shall hold them to be received or deferred to, or shall ever endeavour to set aside this present condemnation, we condemn with the like anathema. But those who, preserving the true faith declared by the four synods aforesaid, have condemned or do condemn the said Three Chapters we hold as brethren and fellow priests. And whatever may have been promulged, or anywhere found, whether in my name or that of any persons whatever in defence of the said Three Chapters, by the authority of this present full constitution we declare null and void."

This letter is dated Dec. 8, A.D. 553, i.e. six months after the conclusion of the council. The other document above spoken of (dated Feb. 23, A.D. 554), was first published by Baluzius, in *Nov. Collect. Concil.* p. 1551, from an old MS. in the *Biblioth. Colbertin.* It is entitled "Constitutum Vigilii pro damnatione Trium Capitulorum" (given in Labbe, vol. vi. p. 239), being a lengthy production like the previous *Constitutum*, and much in the same style. It expresses entire agreement with the decisions of the council, and ends with the same declaration, word for word, as has been quoted above from the letter to Eutychius.

Justinian having thus attained his end, Vigilius was allowed to leave the imperial city for Rome, after a compelled absence of 7 years, having before his departure obtained from the emperor certain grants, privileges, and exemptions for the people of Rome and Italy (Baron. *ad an.* 554, ix, x, xi, xii). But he died on his way, at Syracuse according to Anastasius, from an attack of the stone. His successor, the deacon Pelagius, fell under suspicion of having hastened his end, with respect to which charge see art. on PELAGIUS I. The exact date of his death is not known: it was either towards the end of the year 554, or in the earlier part of 555.[k] His body was conveyed to Rome, and buried in the church of St. Marcellus on the Salarian Way.

Vigilius was evidently a man with no firmness of character or principle;—an exception in this respect to the majority of ancient popes, who usually maintained well the dignity and authority of the great Roman see against imperial despotism. The attempts of Baronius to vindicate his conduct after he had become lawful pope, though allowing him to have been a poor creature before, are pitiably unavailing. The man's character was of a piece throughout. He seems to have been ever ready to enter into

[k] For conjectures as to the date, see Pagi in Baron. *ad an.* 555, vii, and Mansi's note.

secret compacts with a view to position and court favour, to keep them dark, and break them if it proved convenient: and he trimmed and prevaricated through his whole career. His temporary firmness at Constantinople, when he was backed by his Western friends and hoped for a time to carry the day against the emperor, does him little credit in view of his speedy repudiation of all his solemn declarations. It is true that, in those evil times of intrigue and controversy, and under a theological despot like Justinian, the position of honest ecclesiastics was peculiarly difficult; but there were some who, unlike Vigilius, had views and principles of their own, which they maintained consistently, and were prepared to suffer for. As an authority on matters of faith in virtue of his occupancy of St. Peter's chair he proved an utter failure; for what he authoritatively in that capacity pronounced on one day he as authoritatively revoked on another; and he changed backwards and forwards as circumstances changed. But to his final submission to Justinian's will was due this important result; that the fifth council, the origin, the purpose, and the conduct of which have been seen to have had so little to commend them, came at last to be universally accepted, in the West as well as the East, as oecumenical and authoritative. For, though its anathemas against the dead and their writings were passed under imperial dictation in defiance of the pope and of the Western Church, Vigilius's eventual approval of them was endorsed by his successors, and thus led to the general acceptance of the Council in the end, though not without prolonged resistance in some parts of the West.

There is no lack of contemporary authority for the history that has been given above;—viz. the *Breviarium* of Liberatus, archdeacon of Carthage; the *Ecclesiastical History* of Evagrius; the *Chronicon* of Victor, bishop of Tununum; the *Pro Defensione Trium Capitulorum*, and the *Liber contra Mocianum* of Facundus, bishop of Ermiana; and the *Hist. bell. Goth.*, and the *Anecdota*, or *Historia arcana*, of Procopius. The writings of Facundus are peculiarly valuable in giving us an insight into the state of parties, and the course of events, in which he was himself implicated, having been, with Victor Tunonensis, a prominent opponent at Constantinople of the condemnation of the Three Chapters. We have also the letters written by Vigilius, which are of great historical value, and the Acts of the Fifth Council, with contemporary documents preserved among them. The letters of Vigilius which elucidate the foregoing history are—(1) Those written from Rome, before the controversy about the Three Chapters; viz. *Ep.* iv, ad Justinianum, and *Ep.* v. ad Mennam:—(2) Those written from Constantinople during the controversy; viz. *Ep.* ii. ad Valentinianum episcopum Tomitanum, *Ep.* xiii. Ad Aurelianum Arelatensem (both of which—the second with details—refer to his experience at Constantinople after his breach with the emperor), *Ep.* xiv. ad Rusticum et Sebastianum (his two deacons whom he excommunicated after the issue of his *Judicatum*), *Ep.* xv. (an encyclic, written during his conflict with the emperor, giving an account of his troubles), and *Ep.* xvi. Ad Eutychium (written in answer to the patriarch's letter of invitation to the council, which is also extant). We have also *Fragmentum damnationis Theodori episcopi Caesareae Cappadociae* (the excommunication of Theodore Ascidas, which, as has been related, was prepared, but not promulged), the *Constitutum de tribus capitulis* (sent to Justinian during the sitting of the council), and the second *Constitutum*, together with the letter to Eutychius (with respect to which see above), in which he finally condemned the chapters. Preserved also is *Epistola legatis Francorum ab Italiae Clericis directa*, a letter addressed by the Roman clergy to the legates of Theodebald, the king of the Franks, who were about to proceed to Constantinople (A.D. 551), in which letter the legates are informed of the state of things in the imperial city, and are requested to support the pope against the emperor. Extant also is a letter from the African bishop Pontianus to Justinian, written on receipt of the emperor's edict against the Three Chapters, in which the writer protests against the condemnation of dead men, and disturbance thereby of the church's peace, and expresses fear of a covert design in favour of Eutychian heresy. This bold but temperate and respectful letter is valuable, not only for its own merits, but also as expressing well and concisely the view taken from the first by the North African bishops on the matter in dispute.

The following letters of Vigilius himself, not so far alluded to, also remain:—*Epp.* ii, iii, written apparently during the life of Silverius. The first of these is to Profecturus, bishop of Bracara Augusta in Spain,—condemning the abstinence from meat of the Priscillianists, and the omission of *and* in the Doxology between "the Son" and "the Holy Ghost,"—allowing the reception into the church of returning penitents who had been re-baptized by Arians,—declaring unnecessary a second consecration of a re-built church, unless the altar had been removed,—forbidding any variation on any festivals in the canon itself of the mass,—and directing the excommunication of any who departed from the usual form of baptism in the name of the Holy Trinity. Appended in the received editions is a strong assertion of the supreme universal authority of the Roman see, in virtue of the special commission to St. Peter, whose name *Cephas* is interpreted as meaning *Head.* But this section of the letter, being absent from several MSS. (including that of the *Biblioth. Colbert.*) may be concluded to have been a later addition. *Ep.* iii. is to Caesarius of Arles, called forth by an inquiry of king Theodebert as to how one who had married his brother's wife was to be dealt with. The answer is that Caesarius may use his discretion in condoning the offence in consideration of the offender's penitence; but that the guilty parties must henceforth live in separate houses, and the king must forbid all such unions in future. *Epp.* vi, vii, viii, are to Auxanius of Arles on the occasion of the pall being sent to him after his accession, and the usual vicariate jurisdiction in Gaul assigned him; and *Ep.* ix. is to the bishops of Gaul on the same occasion with respect to him and his authority. *Epp.* x, xi, are to Aurelianus of Arles and the bishops of Gaul respectively, written when the former succeeded Auxanius in the see, and are of similar purport to those last mentioned. [J. B—y.]

VIGILIUS (6), twenty-first bishop of Auxerre, succeeded Palladius, A.D. 658, and con-

king, and been murdered in a wood at Scotia or Cotia (Boll. *A. SS.* Mart. ii. 71–2, from Ferrarius and Saussay; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 269; Vincent Belvac. *Spec. Hist.* xxiii. c. 126, ed. 1624). His feast is March 11, but some (*e.g.* Usuard and Saussay) give June 26. [J. G.]

VIGOR, seventh bishop of Bayeux, succeeded Contextus c. A.D. 514. He was born of noble and wealthy parents among the Atrebates, and flourished in the time of Childebert I., king of the Franks. He was educated in the monastery of St. Vedast at Arras, but leaving home and country he travelled westward with one companion to Bayeux, and settled first at an idolatrous village called Redeverus (Ravière). He died c. A.D. 537, and was buried at Bayeux, but his body was translated to Centoul. His feast is Nov. 1. His life is said to have been written by Paternus, bishop of Avranche (Surius, *Vit. SS.* xi. 23–5; Vincent Belvac. *Spec. Hist.* xxi. c. 39; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 348). Folcard. Sith. (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxlvii. 1179) wrote a short *Carmen de S. Vigore.* [J. G.]

VILLICUS, bishop of Metz, 543–568 (*Gall. Chr.* xiii. 688), addressed by Mappinius with much praise (*Pat. Lat.* lxviii. 43), and by Dynamius Patricius (lxxx. 25), who asks him to arrange his recall from exile. He is also eulogised in a poem of Venantius Fortunatus (lib. iii. carm. iv. in *P. L.* lxxxviii. 138). The Bollandists (17 Apr. ii. 476) place him among their praetermissi. [G. W. D.]

VIMINUS (VIMIUS), bishop in Scotland, placed by Camerarius (*De Scot. Fort.* 88, Jan. 18) in Fifeshire, and dated by King (*Kal.* Jan. 21) at A.D. 715 (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 142, 234). To him Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 637) ascribes *Lectura in Threnos* and *Meditationes in Psalterium.* He is possibly St. Finnian of Moville. [FINNIAN (2).] [J. G.]

VINCENTIUS (1), martyr A.D. 192. [EUSEBIUS (108).]

VINCENTIUS (2), African bishop in Syn. iv. Carth. sub Cyp. *de Basilide*, A.D. 254, Cyp. *Ep.* 67; bishop of Thibaris, Prov. Byz., thirty-seventh suffrage in Syn. vii. Carth. sub Cyp. *de Bap.* ii. A.D. 256. Probably, therefore, he was the bishop whose absence under the persecution is felt by the Thibaritans (*Ep.* 57). "Episcopos tractantes non audiat." The name of the city is found only in these two passages, and in the Collatio Carthag, A.D. 411. [E. W B.]

VINCENTIUS (3), deacon of Saragossa, one of the most famous martyrs in the persecution of Diocletian. Prudentius (*Peristeph.* v.) and certain Acta are the chief sources of information about him. A native of Saragossa, he was made archdeacon by bishop VALERIUS I. Arrested with his bishop, and brought to Valencia by DACIANUS, the praeses, probably in A.D. 304, after a long and rigorous imprisonment he unflinchingly endured the most horrible tortures. He is commemorated on Jan. 22. (*AA. SS.* Jan. ii. 393; Tillemont, *M. E.* v. 215;

VINCENTIUS (4), martyr of Gerona. [ORONTIUS (1).]

VINCENTIUS (5), bishop of Capua, for many years a prominent figure in the controversies of the 4th century, was probably the same as the priest Vincentius who was one of the two legates of pope Silvester to the council of Nice. He probably attended the council of Rome held by pope Julius in A.D. 341, and two years later was sent by him to Milan to induce the emperor Constans to convene the council of Sardica. He subscribes the Acts of this council, and was sent by it with Euphratas, bishop of Cologne, to persuade the Eastern emperor Constantius to recall the exiled bishops to their sees, a mission which proved successful (Ath. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 50, *Hist. Arian.* § 20 in *Patr. Gr.* xxv. 337, 716). After the Arian Constantius had by his victory over Magnentius become the master of the Roman world, Vincentius, with Marcellus another Campanian bishop, was sent to him at Arles by Liberius in A.D. 353, to obtain the assembling of a council at Aquileia. He was treated with such harshness that he was compelled to renounce communion with Athanasius [LIBERIUS (4) Vol. III. 718] (Ath. *ad Const.* 247, in *Patr. Gr.* xxv. 629). This was probably the extent of his error, though Liberius (Hil. *Frag.* vi. 677, in *Patr. Lat.* x. 688) speaks of it in graver terms. When the constancy of Liberius himself had given way, he wrote to Vincentius, asking him to convene the bishops of Campania and to write in their name to Constantius to procure his recall from exile (Hil. *supra* 682). Vincentius appears to have returned to the orthodox faith if he had ever left it, for at Ariminum he was one of the few who remained firm throughout (Damasi *Ep.* quoted by Theod. *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 17, in *Patr. Graec.* lxxxii. 1053). [F. D.]

VINCENTIUS (6), papal legate to the council of Nicaea; *vid.* preceding.

VINCENTIUS (7), second bishop of Digne and martyr, accompanied Marcellinus, bishop of Embrun from Africa [MARCELLINUS (2)], and was sent by him with Domninus [DOMNINUS (3)] into Gaul. When Domninus became bishop, Vincentius was only a deacon, but afterwards succeeded him, c. A.D. 374. Tillemont thinks he may have died about 407. His feast is 22 Jan. (Usuardus, *Mart.* 22 Jan.; Tillemont, *H. E.* vii. 561, 563, 780, viii. 557; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 1110). The *Gall. Christ.* (iii. 1110) says he was present at the Council of Valence, A.D. 374, but though a Vincentius is there named, and the name appears in the synodical letter (Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 904, 906), yet it may not have been that of the bishop of Digne (Tillemont, *H. E.* ii. 369). [J. G.]

VINCENTIUS (8), presbyter of Constantinople, but intimately attached to Jerome, through whose writings we hear of him throughout the last twenty years of the 4th century. Jerome became acquainted with him when he came to Constantinople in 380 to be under Gregory Nazianzen, and Vincentius from that time shared the interests and pursuits of

his friend. To him, with Gallienus, Jerome dedicated his translation of Eusebius's chronicle in the year 382. In the preface to the second part of that work Vincentius is not called presbyter, whereas afterwards he constantly bears that title, and it seems certain that he was a presbyter of the church of Constantinople (Jerome, *cont. Joan. Hieros.* c. 41). We may therefore suppose that he was ordained early in 382. But whether, like Jerome, he was ordained against his own will, or for some other reason, he never fulfilled the office of presbyter. Even when the ministry of a presbyter was specially needed in the monasteries at Bethlehem (394) the place, unoccupied by Jerome and Vincentius, had to be supplied by the irregular ordination of Paulinianus. That he knew both Greek and Latin is shown by the preface to the chronicle of Eusebius, where Jerome, writing to him in Latin, excuses his possible faults of translation by appealing to Vincentius's appreciation of the necessary difference between a translation and an original writing, as shown in the contrast between the LXX and the Greek Testament. The same dedication shows that he was interested in general history. He shared Jerome's admiration of Origen, then at its height, and asked him to translate all his works into Latin. This was an impossible task, but the preface to the translation of Origen's Commentary on Jeremiah and Ezekiel (date not fixed) shows Jerome's wish to translate as much as possible, not only of the commentaries, but even of the doctrinal works. In the year 382 Vincentius accompanied Jerome to Rome, but without intending to stay there. Jerome says (*Cont. Joan. Hieros.* c. 41) that Vincent had quitted Constantinople, as he had quitted Antioch, the place of his ordination, so that they might in solitude lament the sins of youth and invoke the mercy of Christ. We do not hear of him during Jerome's stay at Rome, but they left Rome together in 385, and settled with him at Bethlehem (*Cont. Ruf.* ii. 22). He shared not only Jerome's studies, but his asceticisim and his controversial antipathies. He was severe in his judgment upon Vigilantius (Jerome, *Ep.* lxi. 3, A.D. 396), and he co-operated eagerly in the subsequent condemnation of Origenism. In the year 396 or 397 he went to Rome, for what cause is unknown (*Cont. Ruf.* iii. 24). Rufinus, who came there some time after, looked on his presence there as in some way hostile to himself. This Jerome points out was unreasonable, since Rufinus had not reached Rome till two years after Vincentius; but no doubt, he took part in the proceedings against Origenism, in which Eusebius of Cremona and Jerome's Roman friends were actively engaged. On his return to Bethlehem in 400, he was full of the subject. All Rome and Italy he reported had been delivered; and his praise of Theophilus of Alexandria as having by his letter to the pope Anastasius procured this deliverance, is communicated to that prelate in Jerome's letter (*Ep.* 88, ed. Vall.) to him, the last mention of Vincentius which has come down to us.

[W. H. F.]

VINCENTIUS (9), a friend to whose letter, with some doubt as to its genuineness, St. Augustine replied at great length. He was the successor at Cartenna of Rogatus, during whose lifetime Augustine as a young man had known him at Carthage. In his reply Augustine defends repression, by legal means, of Donatists whose conduct is violent and vexatious; but he rejoices that some of the Circumcellions have returned to the church. Some remain in the Donatist persuasion from hereditary attachment only, but some are only to be restrained by fear of punishment. Friendship does not consist only in leniency, for it is better to show severity than to deceive by lenient treatment. His friend thinks that no compulsion should be used; but against this idea he brings forward instances both from Old Testament and New Testament. As to the Rogatists, they seem to be of a milder disposition than the Donatists, but they are like the animal deprived of claws and teeth, for their founder, Rogatus, was bitter in controversy. When they complain of the use of secular force, they are answered by the fact that Donatists who showed severity against the Maximianists and Rogatists, who had not yet separated from them, appealed to Julian for protection, as their forefathers had appealed to Constantine against Coecilianus. He then repeats some arguments on the question of the complicity of the church in individual and special acts, in order to shew that the question of compulsion turns, not on the act towards which it is exercised, but its quality, whether good or bad; and its good effects are seen in the return of many to the church. He entreats his friend to abandon his false opinions, and not with his obscure and scanty band of followers at Cartenna and a few other places, to oppose the Catholic Church. If the Donatists are not to be listened to, nor the Maximianists, how much less the Rogatists, a mere crumb cut off from the general body, and who can have no claim to be called the Church of Christ. But his friend fears lest imperial compulsion may give occasion to Jews and pagans to blaspheme; whereas they will rather scoff at their small numbers who can have no right to separate from the church. The sayings of Hilary about the prevalence of Arian opinions ought not to be perverted as if the church had adopted them; nor those of Cyprian about the disagreement between Peter and Paul as if they were canonical, and as if the latter did not maintain firmly the unity of the church, when, in his letter to Jubaianus he taught that in some cases those who had been baptized outside of the church should be received into it without re-baptism. Some have thought this opinion to have been ascribed falsely to Cyprian, an opinion in which Augustine does not agree; but thinks that he either afterwards corrected his opinion, or that his great charity covers this blot. He also quotes Tichonius, a Donatist, who condemned the false views of his own party. If he says who is Tichonius? he replies, the man whom Parmenian put down. Or suppose that his statement as to communing with the church was untrue, let him return to Cyprian. If the church is polluted by the guilt of individuals, it must have died out before Cyprian's time. The church does not re-baptize persons returning from Donatism, any more than Paul baptized disciples of John; but everyone who returns to the truth must do so through penitence (Aug. *Ep.* 93. TICHONIUS).

[H. W. P.]

VINCENTIUS (10), bishop of Culcitanum, Cullicitanum, or Culusitanum, a place in the proconsular province of Africa; but by Antoninus placed between Rusiccada and Hippo (*Ras Tchekidich*) called in *Peut. Tab.* Culusitani (Ant. *Itin.* 19, 4; see *Notit. Episc.* 33, and *Annot. ad Notitiam Africae*, in App. to Victor Vitensis, p. 285, ed. Migne). He is mentioned by Paullinus in his life of St. Ambrose as having been met by him at the house of Fortunatus a deacon, brother to Aurelius (Paull. *Vit. Ambr.* c. 54). He was one of the managers of the Carth. conference A.D. 411, on the Catholic side (Carth. Coll. i. 138). Previous to this he appears to have been joined with Fortunatianus of Sicca, in a mission to Honorius from the African church A.D. 407, to request that advocates may be appointed to support the causes of the church before the imperial tribunals; and that they may be allowed to have access to the private rooms of the judges (Bruns, *Conc.* i. 184; Conc. Afr. *Can.* 97). With Clarus and Tribunitianus he was chosen from the province of Carthage as a member of the judicial committee, consisting of three bishops from each province, to act on behalf of the African episcopate, A.D. 418 (Bruns, i. 194; Afr. Conc. *Can.* 127). He was also present at the council at which Faustinus appeared on behalf of pope Boniface, and at a council held at Carthage A.D. 419 (Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 148; iii. 34, 88). [H. W. P.]

VINCENTIUS (11) LIRINENSIS (SEU LERINSIS, VINCENT OF LERINS), ST., a distinguished presbyter of Gaul in the 5th century. Date of birth uncertain. Must have died in or before A.D. 450.

Name.—The name is one of a considerable class of names (common after the Christian epoch, but less usual in earlier Latinity), which are simply formed by the lengthening of an adjective, generally a participial adjective. Thus we have Crescens, Crescentius; Fulgens, Fulgentius; Vincens, Vincentius, and many more. Both the short and the lengthened forms were occasionally employed as proper names; *e.g.* Constans, Constantius. It is almost needless to notice the existence of a form still more prolonged in respect of quantity; *e.g.* Florentinus, Constantinus.

Authorities.—Gennadius, *Virorum Illustrium Catalogus* (cap. 64). [GENNADIUS.] References to himself and to his times in his chief (most probably his sole) work, the *Commonitorium.* Of the copious literature which has grown up around this treatise some notice will be found below.

Life.—Concerning the events of Vincent's life we are all but absolutely ignorant. He was a native of Gaul, possibly brother of St. Loup, bishop of Troyes [LUPUS (2)], and he himself informs us that he had for a considerable time been involved in the turmoils of worldly life, perhaps of warlike life, before his retirement into that harbour of religion, a monastery near a small town, itself remote from the stir of cities.[a] This was the monastery of Lerins (*Lerinum*), situated in the island of that name near Antibes, now known as *L'île de St. Honorat*, from the founder of this celebrated institution. [HONORATUS (10).] Here he wrote his *Adversus profanas omnium novitates Haereticorum Commonitorium*, almost three years (as he tells us in cap. 42 of the work itself) after the council of Ephesus, consequently in A.D. 434. The date of his decease is approximately fixed by Gennadius as falling within the joint reign of the emperors Theodosius and Valentinian; *i.e.* as has been already said, in or or about A.D. 450. His name occurs in the Roman Martyrology, where May 24th is given as the day of his death. It is not too much to assert that his name must be reckoned among those which have shed lustre on the retreat of Lerins, in company with those of Honoratus, Cassian, Eucherius and others. [HONORATUS (10 and 14). CASSIAN (11). EUCHERIUS (1).]

Writings.—It will be convenient to treat, in the first place, of works often ascribed to Vincent of Lerins, but of which the authorship is, to say the least, extremely doubtful. These are two. One is a tract, which was not generally known before its publication by Sirmond (Paris, 1643), entitled *Praedestinatus sive Praedestinatorum Haeresis et libri S. Augustino temere adscripti Refutatio.* The other must evidently have discussed the same subject, but it is only known to us by the reply of Prosper [PROSPER AQUITANUS], which will be found in the third part of the appendix to tom. x. of the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine, headed *Pro Augustini Doctrinâ Responsiones ad Capitula Objectionum Vincentianarum.*

The opinion that these two treatises are not only from the pen of one and the same author (which is highly probable), but that this author is Vincent of Lerins is supported, though with varying degrees of confidence, by names of considerable authority. Among foreign Protestants may be mentioned Vossius, Rivet, Daillé, Scherzer, and H. Schmidt (in Herzog's Cyclopaedia); among Roman Catholics, Jansen, Henri de Noris, Noel Alexandre, Pagi. The Louvain editors of St. Augustine (herein followed by the Benedictine editors) mention the identity, at any rate as regards the *Objectiones*, as an opinion held by some, without committing themselves to any decision. Canon Robertson, citing Pagi, seems to incline to the identification. On the other side stand Baronius, Labbe, Papebroch, Ceillier, Schönemann, Fabricius, the Bollandists, Migne, and Ramsay, and probably, by implication, Cassander and Casaubon; Tillemont is doubtful. Under such circumstances it is natural to abstain from dogmatising. But it is right, though with diffidence, to state the impression made on the writer's mind by the consideration of both the arguments and the authorities.

The arguments are (*a*) that the author of these tractates was named Vincent; (*b*) that their semi-Pelagian tone is not at variance with that of the *Commonitorium*; and (*c*) that the

---

[a] Dom Ceillier does not hesitate to speak of Vincent as having experienced the sad and varied trials *du siècle et de la guerre.* He may be right, but the Apostolic use of metaphors derived from the profession of a soldier is so frequent (Eph. vi. 13–17; 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7) that Vincent is probably taking a liberty with the word *militia*, which is authorised by Ovid and by Cicero, and which would [illegible] obviously suggest itself to a Christian writer. The [illegible] text favours this interpretation, "*quippe cum [illegible] diù variis ac tristibus secularis militiae [illegible] volveremur.*"

monastery of Lerins was a stronghold of semi-Pelagian teaching. To the present writer these reasonings do not appear to carry conviction.

As regards the name (*a*) it is enough to remark, that the name of Vincent was exceedingly common, especially in Gaul, during the 5th century; and that it is consequently impossible to lay much stress upon that circumstance. The presumed identity of tone between the *Objectiones* and the *Commonitorium* (*b*) will be noticed in our epitome of the latter work. Despite the ingenuity of many advocates for the identity of authorship, especially Natalis Alexander, and Schmidt, the writer is compelled to say *non liquet*. Thirdly (*c*), a monk of Lerins of this period was by no means necessarily a semi-Pelagian. St. Loup, bishop of Troyes [LUPUS (2)], was a monk of Lerins and probably own brother to Vincentius. Now this prelate, who accompanied St. Germain [GERMANUS (8)] to Britain on an anti-Pelagian mission, was never so much as suspected of the slightest semi-Pelagian tinge, and the Bollandists appeal with some force to the eulogies of Lerins by Eucherius, Sidonius, Caesarius, and other eminent divines, as evidence of the general orthodoxy of the monastery. It may be said that some of those who take the negative side, such as Baronius, are prejudiced. But it is no less true that some of the Jansenist writers, such as Noris, display a decided tendency to press everything against an author who cannot be reckoned among the thorough and unhesitating disciples of St. Augustine, and that they too approach the subject with a certain bias.

We now pass on to what is *universally* admitted to be the genuine and authentic production of Vincent. Although, for brevity's sake, it is usually known as the *Commonitorium;* its full title is that given above, namely, *Vincentii Lirinensis adversus Profanas omnium novitates Haereticorum Commonitorium.*

The importance and celebrity of this work seem to justify the insertion of a brief epitome of its contents, as indeed has been done by Dom Ceillier and others. In the form in which it has come down to us it extends, even in a duodecimo edition, to only 150 pages, and consists of 42 short chapters. *Peregrinus* (as Vincent called himself) begins by stating that he thought it might be useful and in accordance with Scriptural precepts (Deut. xxxii. 7; Prov. xxii. 17, iii. 1) to write down certain principles, which he had received from holy Fathers. It is needful for himself that he may repair the feebleness of memory. Time and place (Ephes. ii. 19; 1 St. Pet. ii. 21; Psalm xlv. [A.V. xlvi.] 11) are in his favour, the quiet of the monastery and his experience of life. He will try, *Domino praestante,* to recollect faithfully, and to write simply (*Praefat.*). His tests to discern the truth of the Catholic faith from heresy will be sought first in *the authority of the Divine law*, and next in *the tradition of the Catholic Church.* The second source of information would not be needed, had not all the leading heretics claimed the support of Holy Scripture (capp. i. ii.) We must hold that, which has been believed everywhere, always, by all (*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*); in other words we must follow *Universitatem, Antiquitatem, Consensionem;* understanding by the last the agreement of all, or almost all bishops and doctors (cap. ii.). A small portion of the church dissenting from the rest must be cut off like an unsound limb; nay, even a large portion if it does not abide by antiquity. Illustrations are afforded negatively by the history of Donatism and of Arianism; positively by the teaching of St. Ambrose and of other eminent confessors (capp. iv.–viii.). Antiquity was on the side of pope Stephen, bishop of the Apostolic see, and against the excellent Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, who desired to re-baptize heretics. True, the re-baptizers claim the sanction of the holy Cyprian; but to do so is behaving like Ham towards Noah, for on this point that pious martyr erred (capp. ix.–xi.). Apostolic warrant for what has been advanced may be found in St. Paul's writings, as in the epistles to Timothy and Titus (*passim*), to the Romans (xv. 17), and to the Galatians (i. 7–10). Those who would make accretions to the faith stand thereby condemned for all time. The Pelagians are such (capp. xii.–xiv.). Valentinus, Photinus, Apollinaris, and others, are similarly condemned by the warnings of Moses (Deut. xiii. 1–11). Even good gifts, such as those of Nestorius, or useful labours such as those of Apollinaris against Porphyry, cannot be pleaded against their novelties (capp. xv.–xvi.). It is desirable to explain with some comparative minuteness wherein consisted the respective heresies of Photinus, Apollinaris, and Nestorius, and the true doctrine of the church as opposed to theirs (capp. xvii.–xxii.).[b]

---

[b] The language of the *Commonitorium* in these chapters bears at times a marked resemblance to that of the Symbolum "*Quicunque,*" commonly called the creed of St. Athanasius. A few specimens only can be here set down, but the list might easily be enlarged.

Commonitorium Vincentii.	*Symbolum quod vulgi vocant Scti. Athanasii.*
Ecclesia verò Catholica . . . unam divinitatem in Trinitatis plenitudine et Trinitatis aequalitatem in unâ atque eâdem majestate veneratur. (Cap. xviii.)	Fides autem Catholica haec est: Ut unum Deum in Trinitate, et Trinitatem in Unitate, veneremur.
In Deo una substantia, sed tres personae: . . . quia scilicet alia est persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritûs sancti. (Cap. xix.)	Neque confundentes Personas: neque Substantiam separantes. Alia est enim Persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritûs Sancti.
Cum veritas dicat ex duabus substantiis unum esse Christum, . . . In Christo esse duas substantias, unam divinam, alteram humanam; unam ex patre, alteram ex matre. (Cap. xvii.)	Est ergò Fides recta, ut credamus et confiteamur: quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, Deus et Homo est; Deus est ex substantiâ Patris, ante saecula genitus: et Homo est ex substantiâ Matris, in saeculo natus: . . . Qui licet Deus sit et Homo: non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus . . . Unus omnino, non confusione substantiae: sed unitate Personae. Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo, ita Deus et homo unus est Christus.
Altera substantia divinitatis, altera humanitatis: sed tamen Deitas et humanitas non alter et alter, sed unus idemque Christus, unus idemque Filius Dei, et unius ejusdemque Christi et filii Dei una eademque persona. Sicut in homine aliud caro, et aliud anima; sed unus idemque homo, anima et caro. (Cap. xix.)	

[Unus

whose acute, profound and brilliant genius (fully recognised by imperial disciples and by the church at large) has not saved his writings from becoming a source of temptation; though it is just possible, as some think, that they may have been tampered with (cap. xxii.). Very similar must be the judgment passed upon Tertullian, of whom Hilary [of Poitiers] too truly said that "by his errors he had diminished the authority due to his approved writings" (cap. xxiv.). The true and genuine Catholic is he who loves Christ's body, the Church; who puts God's truth before all things, before the authority of any individual, before affection, genius, eloquence, or philosophy. Many who fall short of

Unus autem, non corruptibili nescio quâ divinitatis et humanitatis confusione, sed integrâ et singulari quâdam unitate personae. (Ib.) Non ergo alter Christus Deus, alter homo . . . non alter aequalis Patrii, alter minor Patre . . . sed unus idemque Christus Deus et homo (ib.)	Aequalis Patri secundum divinitatem: minor Patre secundum humanitatem.

These identities of expression are too close to be accidental. Three ways of accounting for them are conceivable. (1) That the Athanasian Creed was extant before the composition of the *Commonitorium*, and that Vincent simply interwove into his treatise expressions taken from the creed. (2) That Vincent was himself the author of the Athanasian Creed. (3) That the author or authors of the creed were well acquainted with Vincent's book and made free use of its language. Hypothesis (1) can scarcely be said to have any supporters, inasmuch as few, if any, of those who assign to this creed an early date would be prepared to maintain that by A.D. 453 it could have become so well known as that its language was likely to have been embodied in this manner into a controversial treatise. Of supposition (2) it can only be said that it is not absolutely impossible. Those portions of Waterland's essay which tend to show that the Athanasian Creed was a production of Southern Gaul in the fifth century are as applicable to St. Vincent of Lerins as to St. Hilary of Arles. But definite proof is wanting in either case. The last-named view (3) seems to the present writer the most probable. It accords well with the communication made by Dr. Caspari in 1876 to Dr. Schaff (*Hist. of Creeds of Christendom:* London, 1877, vol. i. p. 37, note). Caspari is inclined to trace this creed to the fifth century, and has found some symbols resembling it. It is also compatible with the ably-reasoned writings of Mr. Ommaney on this subject.

[Since the above was written, my friend Dr. Dowden (who first suggested to me the importance of instituting this inquiry) has called my attention to the latest remarks of Mr. Ommaney (*Early History of the Athanasian Creed:* London, 1880). In addition to the list of similarities independently collected above, Mr. O. points out the curious fact that the words '*perfectus Deus, perfectus homo*,' which occur in both the *Commonitorium* and the creed, "are not to be found in St. Augustine, though the sense which they express is abundantly taught by him; inasmuch as he uses the similar phrases '*totus Deus et totus homo*' and '*verus Deus et verus homo*" (pp. 287-9). Mr. Ommaney evidently considers that the case on behalf of St. Vincent's authorship is stronger than that which can be made out on behalf of any *single* Father, but that the point is still *sub-judice*.]

alike condemned by Holy Scripture, especially by St. Paul (1 Tim. vi.). The deposit is the talent of the Catholic faith, which the man of God must, like a spiritual Bezaleel, adorn, arrange and display to others, but not injure by novelties (capp. xxvi. xxvii.). Is there then to be no progress of religion (*profectus religionis*) in the Church of Christ? Certainly there is to be progress, but it must resemble the growth of the infant into manhood and maturity; a growth which, through all changes, preserves identity. The dogmas of the heavenly philosophy may by the operation of time be smoothed and polished. They may gain in the way of greater fulness of evidence, light and elucidation (*distinctionem*). but they must of necessity retain integrity, and all essential characteristics (capp. xxviii.-xxx.). Such has been the Church's task in the decrees of councils, which have simply aimed at adding clearness, vigour and zeal to what was believed, taught, and practised already (capp. xxx.-xxxii.). St. John, in his second epistle, is as emphatic as St. Paul against the teacher of false doctrine. Such an one cannot be encouraged without a virtual rejection of saints, confessors and martyrs; a rejection in short of the holy Church throughout the world. Pelagius (with his disciple Coelestius), Arius, Sabellius, Novatian, Simon Magus, agree in being introducers of novelties (capp. xxxiii. xxxiv.). The heretics use the Scriptures, but only in the way in which bitter potions are disguised for children by a previous taste of honey, or poisons labelled as healing medicines. The Saviour warned us against such perils in His words concerning the wolves in sheep's clothing. We must attend to his subsequent advice, *by their fruits ye shall know them*. His apostle too bids us beware of false apostles (2 Cor. xi. 13-15), the imitators of Satan, who transform themselves into angels of light. Their employment of Scripture resembles that of Satan in the Temptation of our Lord. They presume, in the teeth of the teaching of the Church, to claim a special illumination for their own small conventicle (capp. xxxv.-xxxvii.). Catholics must, as has been stated at the beginning of this treatise, apply to the interpretation of Scripture the texts of universality, antiquity, and consent. Where they can, let them adduce the decrees of general councils; where that cannot be done, the consistent rulings of great doctors. This is not meant to apply to small questions, but only to whatsoever affects the rule of faith. Inveterate heresies can generally be met by Holy Scripture alone, or by clear decisions of Oecumenical councils. New ones often present at first greater difficulty, and we must be careful to cite those Fathers only who lived and died in the faith, or who even suffered martyrdom for it. What all, or the majority clearly and perseveringly received, held and taught, let that be held as undoubted, certain and ratified. But any merely private opinion, even of a saint or martyr, must be put upon one side. This again agrees with the teaching addressed by St. Paul to the Corinthians and the Ephesians (1 Cor. xii. 27, 28, i. 10, xiv. 33, 36; Ephes. iv. 11). That Pelagian writer, Julian, neglected these cautions, and broke away from the sentiments of his col-

leagues. But it is time to give an illustration of the contrary course being happily pursued and the rule of the Church's faith being settled by the authority of a council. This topic, however, demands a fresh commencement (capp. xxxviii.–xl.).[e]

Here ends the first book of the *Commonitorium*. The second book, as Gennadius informs us, was for the most part lost, having been stolen from its author. Vincent has, however, provided us with a recapitulation of its substance, which occupies three additional chapters. We proceed to epitomise them in the same manner as the preceding ones.

The first of these (cap. xli.) simply re-states the main proposition of the earlier book. The author then, in order to show that his view is no offspring of private presumption, adduces the example of the council of Ephesus, which was held nearly three years before the time in which he is writing, in the consulship of Bassus and Antiochus. Great pains were taken to avoid an unfortunate issue, such as that of the council of Rimini (*Concil. Ariminense*); and the testmonies of martyrs, confessors and orthodox doctors, were considered by an assemblage of nearly two hundred bishops to prove Nestorius an irreligious impugner of Catholic truth, and Cyril to be in accordance with it. Amongst the saintly doctors who were present in person, or whose works were cited as authoritative, may be named Peter of Alexandria, Athanasius, Theophilus, Cyril, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, and his excellent brother, Gregory of Nyssa. The West was represented by letters of Felix and of Julius, bishops of Rome; the South by the evidence of Cyprian of Carthage; the North by that of Ambrose of Milan. The whole of the bishops, for the most part metropolitans, acted upon the principles maintained in this treatise and censured Nestorius for his unhallowed presumption,—that he was the first and only man who rightly understood the Scriptures. (xli.)

One element must be added, lest to all this weight anything seem lacking, namely, the authority of the apostolic see, which was illustrated by the twofold testimony of the reigning pope Xystus [Sixtus III.] and of his predecessor Coelestine. It was on the principles herein set forth that pope Sixtus condemned Nestorius; and Coelestine wrote in the same spirit to certain priests in Gaul who were fostering novelties. It is in fact an acceptance of the warning of St. Paul to Timothy to keep *the deposit* (1 Tim. vi. 20, R. V. margin) and to the Galatians, that he would be *anathema* who should preach to them any other gospel (Gal. i. 8). Justly upon these grounds are Pelagius and Coelestius as well as Nestorius condemned.[d] (Cap. xlii.)

It is time to give, from details, some general estimate of the work of Vincent; and it may safely be asserted that few theological books of such modest bulk, published within the period embraced in this Dictionary, have attracted so large a share of attention. Not only has it been included within all the best known collections of the works of the Fathers (as *e. g.* in the *Maxima Bibliotheca Patrum*, Lugduni, A.D. 1677; and in our own age, in that of Migne), but it has been repeatedly published separately in many lands, and not unfrequently translated. The following, though not an exhaustive list, will be found sufficient for ordinary purposes.

The earliest printed edition of the *Commonitorium* is to be found in the *Antidotum contra diversas omnium ferè saeculorum Haereses*, by J. Sichardus, fol. Basil, 1528. It has appeared separately, *cum commentario Costeri*, Antverpiae, 1560; Lugduni Batavorum, 1572; Coloniae Agrippinae, 1600; by Steph. Baluzius, Parisiis, 1663, 1669, 1684; and Augustae Vindelicorum, 1757. (This edition was reproduced also by Galland, *Bibliotheca Patrum* (tom. x.), fol. Venet. 1774.) Other single editions are those issued by Joann. Salinas, *Romae*, 1731; by Engelbert Klüppel, *Vindobonae*, 1809. Among these the editions by Baluzius and by Klüppel stand preeminent. Still more recent issues are those at Ingoldstadt, 1834; at Breslau, by Herzog, 1839; Lyons, by Grégoire and Collombet; at Oxford, by Dr. Pusey, 1838.

Evidence even more marked of its popularity may perhaps be found in the translations. These have been very numerous. Among them may be specified an Italian version published at Monreale in 1665; a French version (one of many such) dedicated to M. de Harlay, archbishop of Paris, 1686; German ones by Féder; Bamberg, 1795; and by Geiger, Lucerne, 1822. A Scottish translation, dedicated to Mary Queen of Scots, was issued by Knox's opponent, Ninian Winzeit, at Antwerp, in 1563;[e] and a com-

[e] "Both inclusive" must be understood at each of ur numberings of chapters.

[d] It must be owned that there is a certain amount of ifficulty, one may almost say mystery, connected with iese last two chapters. In the first place they introduce new element into the discussion, namely, the authority aimed for the Roman see. The author appears to asime that this authority will always be manifested on ie side of his great maxim of the *quod semper, quod bique, quod ab omnibus*, and makes no provision for ie possibility of a divergence between the teaching of ome and that of antiquity. Secondly, while the language ncerning Nestorius and his opponent Cyril is clear and emphatic, there does seem to be a certain degree of reticence about some of the opponents of Augustine, as, for instance, Julian. The name of Augustine himself is not even mentioned, and though it is true that equal silence is observed respecting Augustine's great contemporaries, Jerome and Chrysostom, still there was no especial reason for the introduction of their names, while the repeated mention of Pelagius would have rendered the introduction of the name of his chief opponent only natural.

It cannot be matter of surprise to find that this reticence is urged in favour of the view that Vincent was a semi-Pelagian, and that consequently he may have been the author of the *Objectiones*. But if Vincent's silence was only intended to express a doubt whether Augustine had not pressed his views concerning Original Sin and the cognate doctrines beyond what was warranted by the threefold text of universality of time, place, and numbers, it seems hardly fair to stigmatize as semi-Pelagian, sentiments held by so many divines of orthodox repute, from the 5th down to the 19th century. Erasmus in the famous preface to his edition of the works of St. Hilary, expressly asserts that in his time Augustine was thought in the ardour of his zeal against Pelagius to have left less scope for free agency than was now (*i.e.* circ. A.D. 1520) generally granted. For our own day, to say nothing of Arminian divines in the past, it may suffice to refer to the commentary of Mr. Beet on the Epistle to the Romans. (London, 1883, Fourth Edit.)

[e] "A richt goldin buke writtin in Latin about xi c ȝeris [years] passit and neulie translated in Scottis be Niniane Winzet a catholik Preist." (Original title.)

Further, the *Commonitorium* has gathered around itself a literature of its own. How far its leading principles have been accepted, either explicitly or implicitly, in the past; how far they made a line of demarcation between those who accepted and those who rejected the Reformation; to what extent they are available in the controversies between the various Christian communions, or in the contest between Christianity and unbelief;—these are questions which have all been keenly and ably discussed. To review these controversies would far exceed the limits of this work, but it seems right to call attention to one or two features of the debate, which have not received elsewhere the notice which they deserve.

It has been asserted that the *Commonitorium* lays down a broad line of demarcation between the Protestant and the Roman churches. This appears to be an over-statement. It is true that any Protestants, who regard the Bible as its own sole and all-sufficient witness and interpreter, must be inclined to set aside the work of Vincent as needless and superfluous, and hence perhaps its rejection by Rivet, Daillé, and other foreign Protestants. But this verdict has not, even on the continent of Europe, been an universal one. The Magdeburg Centuriators distinctly pronounce in its favour as a work of learning and acuteness; as a book which reveals and forcibly assails the frauds of heretics; which supplies a remedy and antidote against their poisons; which sets forth a weighty doctrine and displays knowledge of antiquity with skill and clearness in its treatment of Holy Scripture.[f] As regards England, the praise given by Casaubon to the principles of its Reformation, the challenge of Jewell, and a large *consensus* of 17th century divines, all rest, more or less explicitly, upon the famous *dictum* of Vincent,—which, indeed, derives considerable support from certain portions of the Prayer-Book, Articles, and Canons.[g]

It is, of course, equally true that Roman Catholic divines, especially at the epoch of the Reformation and long after, also professed to take their stand upon the principles asserted in the *Commonitorium*. The fact that Knox's opponent, Winzeit, published a translation of Vincent's treatise, as an aid to the Roman side of the controversy, is but one instance out of many that might be adduced.

There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of the Roman Catholic controversialists who thus acted. They were not in a position to judge the evidence on behalf of this and that portion of medieval doctrine and practice, and they appealed with confidence to such stores of learning editions of the works of the Fathers appeared, with honest and discriminating criticism applied to their writings. Not only was it seen how considerable a portion of their works, which had been long accepted as genuine and authentic, was in reality spurious, but it also became evident that while distinctively Roman tenets and practices received much support from the sermons and treatises relegated into the appendix of each volume, the case was widely different when reference had to be made to the genuine Patristic remains. In time a new school of Roman Catholic divines arose, of whom Father Petau (Petavius) may perhaps be considered the earliest, as he is certainly among the greatest. In our own age the process of development in the church of Rome has widened the breach between her teaching and the principles of Vincent of Lerins. The church which has set forth the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mother, not merely as a lawful opinion, but as a dogma, has, to all appearance, for ever broken with the maxim: *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.* And, indeed, the process of self-refutation, which Cardinal Newman has endeavoured to achieve in the notes to his reissue of his Anglican work on the *Via Media*,[h] seems to give up the Vincentian rule, and only to argue that Anglicanism, no less than Romanism, has failed to carry it out.

But even if it can be shown that there are some few cases of controversy between Christian bodies, to which it is difficult to apply the test of Vincent's maxim, its general value must still be pronounced to be very great. Most especially in the contest of belief with unbelief, its efficacy is deeply felt, inasmuch as both in faith and morals there still exists, despite of differences, a code which may fairly be called the Creed of Christendom: and that code is mainly based, even if sometimes unconsciously, upon the principles asserted in the *Commonitorium* of St. Vincent of Lerins. [J. G. C.]

VINCENTIUS (12), a monk of Lerins in the first half of the 5th century, a brother of St. Lupus of Troyes (Eucherius, *De Laude Eremi*, 42, *Patr. Lat.* l. 711), must be distinguished from his more famous namesake, the author, who was also a monk of Lerins (Ceillier, viii. 468), though some have identified them (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. vii. 59). [S. A. B.]

VINCENTIUS (13), a priest, a Gaul by birth; thought to be identical with Vincentius, a presbyter, who signed the decrees of the council of Riez in 439 on behalf of bishop Constantinus (Labbe, v. 1196.) Gennadius (*Pat. Lat.* lviii. 1104) speaks of him as well-versed in Scripture, learned, and eloquent, and author of a *Commentary on the Psalms*, part of which he had himself heard him read. This work is lost. It has been thought by some that he is the author of *The Objections*, defending the teaching of St. Augus-

[f] We have translated freely from the original, as cited by Natalis Alexander (*Hist. Eccles.* saeculum v. cap. v. art. xvii.). It may be well to subjoin a part of the passage:—"Scriptum esse eruditum et acutum; quodque Haereticorum fraudes clarè in apertum producat, detegat, atque egregiè impugnet...praesens valdè remedium, et antidotum, quasi contra eorundem venena ministret... elucet doctrinae ipsius magnitudo...in Scripturarum tractatione argutum, facilem et perspicuum."

[g] *E.g.* The positions of the creeds, the language of Article xx., and the canon urging preachers to interpret Holy Scripture in accordance with the general teaching of the Fathers.

[h] The original work was published in 1837, its author being then Fellow of Oriel College and Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford. The third edition, published in 1877, contains the notes from a Roman Catholic stand-point, which "I," says the author, "consider a refutation."

tine against which St. Prosper. wrote; cf. Baron. *Ann.* 434, xv. . . . xx.; *Hist. Litt. Franc.* vol. ii. p. 413; also Articles PROSPER (6), VINCENTIUS (11) LIRINENSIS in this Dictionary. [G. W. D.]

VINCENTIUS (14), addressed by Sidonius (*Ep.* 7), in a letter giving an account of Arvandus, a prefect of Gaul. While Sidonius was at Rome, A.D. 469, this Arvandus, his friend, was accused of peculation and treason. By the intercession of Sidonius his punishment was lessened. [R. J. K.]

VINCENTIUS (15), bishop of Saragossa, became an Arian in the reign of Leovigild, and submitted to re-baptism. It was against him that the treatise of SEVERUS of Malaga was written. (Isidorus, *Hist. Goth.*, *de Vir. Ill.* 43, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxiii. 1071, 1105; *Esp. Sag.* xxx. 129.) [F. D.]

VINCENTIUS (16) of Iviça. [LICINIANUS.]

VINCENTIUS (17) and Felicissimus, deacons of the church of Lamigia or Lamiggiga in Africa, brought before Gregory the Great various grave charges against their bishop. (*Epp.* i. 74.) [F. D.]

VINCENTIUS (18), addressed with five other bishops of Sardinia by Gregory the Great (*Epist.* lib. ix. ind. ii. 8, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 947). He directs them according to the ancient customs of Sardinia to ascertain from their metropolitan the date of Easter and not to leave the island without his permission. [F. D.]

VINCENTIUS (19), ST., July 14, Sep. 20 (MADELGARIUS, MAUGER), abbat of Haumont and Soignies. He was originally a count at the court of Dagobert, but on the persuasion of his wife Waldetrudis embraced the monastic life. Founding a monastery at Haumont on the Sambre, near Maubeuge, he became its first abbat; and when this grew famous and too public for him he founded another in a more retired spot at Soignies in Hainault and there passed the remainder of his life, dying c. 677 (Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Jul. iii. 668; Guérin, *Les Pet. Boll.* viii. 290). A full view of all the authorities may be seen in Chevalier, *Sources*, p. 2308. [C. H.]

VINCOMALUS (1), a deacon, married to his deceased wife's sister, and on that account the subject of a correspondence between his diocesan Victorius, bishop of Grenoble, and the metropolitan Avitus, bishop of Vienne, who directs the immediate separation of the offenders (*Pat. Lat.* lix. 252). [G. W. D.]

VINCOMALUS (2), was appointed defensor of the Roman church by Gregory the Great in March A.D. 595. He is therefore probably not the same as the Vincomalus whose widow is commended the next year by Gregory to the subdeacon Anthemius. (*Epp.* v. 29, vi. 38.) [F. D.]

VINCOMALUS (3), magister officiorum at Constantinople, who, though he had no special intimacy with Theodoret, on Marcianus becoming emperor in A.D. 450, lost no time in representing to him the injustice with which he had been treated by Theodosius, and procuring the remission of his sentence of exile. Theodoret testified his gratitude in a letter (Theod. *Ep.* 140). He took part in the council of Chalcedon (Labbe, iv. 555). Marcian's second edict, requiring the general acceptance of the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon, March 13, A.D. 452, was addressed, among other chief officers of state, to Vincomalus, who was then consul-designate (Labbe, iv. 843). [E. V.]

VINDEMIALIS (1), an African bishop, bearer of a letter to Augustine from Valerius, count of Africa (Aug. *Ep.* 200). [H. W. P.]

VINDEMIALIS (2), bishop of Capsa, martyred under Thrasamund king of the Vandals (Victor Vit. *Persec. Vandal.* in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 263 A, 272 C, 325 C, 400 C, 401 C). [C. H.]

VINDICIANUS, an eminent physician, mentioned by St. Augustine (Aug. *Ep.* 138, 3). [H. W. P.]

VINDICIANUS, eighth bishop of Cambrai and Arras, succeeded Autbertus c. 668. His *Vita* is given in Boll. *AA. SS. Mart.* ii. 75. He was born at Bullecurtium in Artesia c. A.D. 620, and educated under St. Eligius at Noyon and St. Autbertus at Cambrai. He was called by Amandus, bishop of Maestricht, to attest, with Amandus and Autbertus, Richtrudis's disposition of her goods before she entered her monastery, and was associated with Autbertus in administering the see of Cambrai; at that time he was present at the translation of the remains of SS. Vedastus and Furseus. On Autbertus's death Vindicianus was consecrated, finished the monastery of St. Vedast, sought to promote its interests, and subscribed the will of St. Amandus. When Theodoric III. succeeded Childeric II. in Neustria, and Ebroinus the mayor of the palace, and Leodegarius bishop of Autun, were carrying on their intrigues [LEODEGARIUS (2)], Vindicianus held a synod at Arras, and induced the king to make grants to the see. And after the violent deaths of these ambitious ministers he was able to bring the king to a form of penitence which issued in further grants to ecclesiastical purposes; by a personal visit to Rome, he induced pope Sergius I. to exempt the monastery of St. Vedast from the papal jurisdiction. He built many churches and monasteries during his episcopate of more than forty years at a time of constant trouble in the kingdom, and dying A.D. 712 of a fever at Brussels, he was buried in the church of St. Eligius near Arras. In the 10th century the relics were raised, and enshrined with great pomp in the presence of a vast assemblage by Fulbertus the bishop. His feast is 11th March (*Gall. Christ.* iii. 7). [J. G.]

VINNIANUS, bishop of Clonard while St. Columba was a deacon. (Reeves, *St. Adamnan.* 104; Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 649.) [FINNIAN (1)]. [J. G.]

VINNOCUS, bishop of Rath-Easpuic-Innic, where he and St. Patrick were contemporaries and friends (Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 27, c. 71, *et al.*). His place was in the north of co. Down, and Colgan identifies him with Uindic of Tuighneatha (Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 339, 379; Cotton, *Fast. Eccl. Hib.* iii. 252). [J. G.]

his earlier life. According to Gregory of Tours, his contemporary, on the death of Licerius, the twenty-third archbishop, Virgilius, who was abbat of Autun, was put in his place by the influence of Syagrius, bishop of that see, A.D. 588 (*Hist. Franc.* ix. 23), and this high authority has usually been followed (see *Gall. Christ.* i. 540; Gams, 493). The old catalogue of Arles, however, inserts a Paschasius between the two. It may be, as has been suggested, that the latter's tenure of office being very short escaped Gregory's notice (see Greg. Magn. *Epist.* i. 47, n., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 509). Again, the life extracted from an ancient MS. of the diocese, by Barralis Salerna, makes him a monk and abbat of Lérins, and has no mention of any abbacy at Autun (*Chronologia Lerinensis*, i. 87). As archbishop he was the recipient of several letters from Gregory the Great between the years 590 and 601. The occupant of the see of Arles was in some sense primate of France at this time, and, as such, Virgilius received from the pope the pallium and the papal vicegerentship in the kingdom of Childebert. "If any bishop desire to make a long journey, he must obtain your consent. If there shall arise any question of faith or other matter of difficulty, you are to assemble twelve bishops to discuss and decide it," are the pope's words (*Epist.* v. 53; see too 54 and 55). The other letters are mainly occupied with the suppression of simony and matters of discipline, and the mission of St. Augustine and his monks to England (*ibid.* i. 47, vi. 53, ix. 106, 111, 114, xi. 55, 68; cf. Ceillier, xi. 484 sqq.) St. Augustine himself was consecrated by Virgilius, and not, as incorrectly stated by Bede (*H. E.* i. 27), by Aetherius, who was bishop of Lyons, not Arles. Virgilius is said to have built the cathedral church of St. Stephen in the city, and that of St. Saviour and St. Honoratus outside the walls. According to the above-mentioned biography he died in the 127th year of his age, which would bring him down to 640, but we have no record of him after 601, and it is improbable that he lived later than 610. According to the same authority he was buried in the church of St. Saviour and St. Honoratus, which he had built himself. He was commemorated at Lérins March 5, and at Arles Oct. 7 or 10. His successor was Florianus. As to his cult see Boll. *Acta SS.* Mart. i. 399 sqq. For his life see *Gall. Christ.* i. 540, and Trichaud, *Hist. de l'Église d'Arles*, ii. 125–151; and i. 100 for an inscription in the cathedral attributed to him. [S. A. B.]

VIRGILIUS (2) (FEIRGHIL, FERGHIL, FERGAL), of Aghavoe and Salzburg, the Geometer. In the stream of missionaries that passed from Britain and Ireland to the continent in the fifth and following centuries, an honourable place must be assigned to St. Fergil as a divine, a philosopher, and a man of general learning. His Irish name was Ferghil or Fergal, which, as latinized, became Virgilius, the usual form of his name in connexion with Bavaria. Beyond the affirmation that he was of noble Irish descent, the Lives tell us nothing of his parentage, and the earliest traces of his history we find in the notices of his death in the *Annals of the Four Masters*:—of his episcopate;" and in the *Ann. Ult.*:—"A.D. 788, Feirgil Ab. Acaid boo mor," but Lanigan, with others, doubts the identity of the saint of Aghavoe and the bishop of Salzburg.

From Aghaboe, in Queen's County, Fergil is said to have gone to France before 746, and to have been kindly received by Pepin, then mayor of the palace under Childeric III. king of Austrasia. After being with Pepin for two years at Carisiacum, near Compiègne on the Oise, he proceeded to Bavaria, and was again kindly treated by duke Otilo, upon the recommendation of Pepin. There he became abbat of St. Peter's monastery in Salzburg. At that time, from motives probably of humility, he concealed the fact of his ordination for the space of about two years, and had a bishop "proprium episcopum" attached to his monastery for the performance of holy functions. (Messingham, *Flor. Insul. Sanct.* 331, col. 1; and see Todd, *St. Patrick*, 64–7, discussing the meaning and purpose of this concealment.) [DOBDA.] During his abbacy in Salzburg, the controversy seems to have arisen between him and St. Boniface, at first upon a theological question, and afterwards upon certain conclusions of science. St. Fergil had acknowledged as valid the baptisms of a priest who through ignorance had mutilated the words of administration; he refused also to re-baptize at the command of St. Boniface, in whose province Salzburg then lay. When the case was referred to the decision of pope Zachary (A.D. 741–752), the pontiff decided in favour of Fergil, and cautioned St. Boniface about his conduct in the matter. The feeling thus aroused between the two ecclesiastics does not appear to have been allowed to remain inactive, and St. Boniface soon found or took occasion again to denounce Fergil to the pope, on grounds apparently more or less personal. But that which gave St. Boniface the readiest and most fatal weapon against his opponent was the publication, by the latter, of a philosophical treatise regarding the rotundity of the earth, and thus the fact of there being antipodes. What gave plausibility to the accusation against the teaching of Fergil was the thought that two sides of the earth involved two different races of men, one of which, being not descended from Adam, would be free from the stain of original sin. And his ultimate acquittal was probably brought about by his being able to show that his speculations (based, possibly, on those of Martianus Capella of Madaura in Africa, who wrote in the 5th century) did not encroach in the least on the doctrine of original sin, or the unity of the human race. But at first it was like to go hard with the philosopher and mathematician, when Zachary issued the decretal, that if it was proved by his own confession that Fergil taught that there was another world, and people on the other side of the earth, a council should be summoned, and Fergil degraded from the priesthood, and expelled the church. Milder counsels, however, prevailed, after St. Boniface's martyrdom in A.D. 755, and when John, bishop of Salzburg, died, Fergil was appointed to take his place, and consecrated on the 13th of June, A.D. 766 or 767 (Todd, *St. Patrick*, 66, adopting the date given by Mabillon, *Acta SS.* tom. iv. 280; but Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 184, places it in

A.D. 756, and is very hard on those who follow the later date). At Salzburg he built a magnificent cathedral, which he dedicated to the memory of one of his predecessors, the famous St. Rupert or Rudbert, and thither transferred his relics. In the duties of his episcopal office he was specially careful, sending missionaries into the neighbouring heathen countries; one of his last official acts was to visit all his large diocese, and pay his long deferred visit to Carinthia. On his return he was seized with what at first appeared to be a mild sickness, and (though hardly in the thirtieth year of his episcopate, as said in the *Four Mast.*) calmly breathed his last on November 27, A.D. 789. Though he was acquitted at the time by the pope, the suspicion of heterodoxy clung to his memory, till it was finally purged by canonization by pope Gregory IX. in the year 1233. He was called Geometer and Solivagus, but for what special reason he received the latter appellation we do not hear. His life, written by St. Eberhard, his pupil and successor at Salzburg, is published by Canisius (*Lect. Ant.* tom. iii. pars ii. Basnage ed.), by Mabillon (*Acta SS. Ben.* sec. iii. pars. ii.) and by Messingham (*Florileg. Insul. Sanct.* 331–41). See further, on his life, Mabillon, *Ann. Bened.* tom. ii. lib. ii. A.D. 756, 785; Bonifacius, *Opera*, tom. ii. *Ep.* lxxi. p. 171 sq.; Ussher, *Syllog. Ep.* xvi. xvii. 462 sq.; Raynaldus, *Ann. Eccles.* tom. ii. 93, ed. Mansi, Lucae, 1747; Ware, *Ir. Writers*, by Harris, 49, giving his consecration in A.D. 767, and his death in A.D. 785 or 784; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 340, n. [c]; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* 314, 315, 327; *Journ. Kilken. Archaeol. Soc.* i. 222 n. [1]; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* viii. 300, giving an account of a very interesting silver crown-piece of Salzburg, now belonging to the Royal Irish Academy, and representing on the obverse the two patron saints of Salzburg, SS. Rupert and Ferghil. [J. G.]

VIRGNOUS, abbat of Iona. [FERGNA (1).]

VIRIGANTIUS, monk. Gregory the Great with difficulty compelled the palatinus Catellus to give him part of his mother's property. (*Epp.* iv. 47.) [F. D.]

VIRO, bishop of Dublin or Glasgow (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 459; Camerarius, *De Scot. Fort.* 138, May 8). [WIRO.] [J. G.]

VIRTIUS (al. BRITIUS), presbyter at Carthage, one of Cyprian's chief supporters in his absence (Cyp. *Ep.* 43), v. l. Britius. Fell would conclude that the three mentioned here were the only presbyters who remained faithful. But as one of them, Numidicus, was not a presbyter of Carthage at the time of Cyprian's retreat, and there are five persons mentioned whom Fell assigns to the party of Felicissimius, it would follow if Fell were right that there were but seven presbyters in Carthage at this time. This is not likely, since at Rome at the same time there were no less than forty-four presbyters (Euseb. vi. 43). [E. W. B.]

VITALIANI. [VITALIUS.]

VITALIANUS (1), a man of rank in Cappadocia and of a high religious profession, to whom Gregory Nazianzen addressed a poem in behalf of his two sons, Peter and Phocas, for whom he had conceived an unnatural aversion, and after their mother's death had driven them from his house and forced them to subsist on charity. The appeal is put by Gregory in the mouth of the elder son Peter. (Greg. Naz. *Carm.* 52, p. 121–126.) Baronius in defiance of all probability identifies Vitalianus with the husband of Gregory's sister Gorgonia (*Annal.* 389, § 51). [E. V.]

VITALIANUS (2), a senator addressed by Avitus, bishop of Vienne (*Ep.* 42 in *Pat. Lat.* lix. 259.) [C. H.]

VITALIANUS (3), magister militum, associated with IRENAEUS (21) in the emperor Justin's measures against Severus, the heretical patriarch of Antioch (Evag. iv. 4). Evagrius relates his treasonable designs and his violent end (iii. 43, iv. 3). [C. H.]

VITALIANUS (4) deposed priest of the diocese of Milan, was sent by Gregory the Great to Sicily to be kept in strict custody. (*Epp.* v. 4.) [F. D.]

VITALIANUS (5), bishop of Sipontum is early in A.D. 598 rebuked sharply by Gregory the Great for allowing the daughter of Tullianus to abandon her nun's dress, and is ordered with SERGIUS the defensor to place her under strict custody in a nunnery. In A.D. 600 he is directed with JOANNES (585) to investigate whether the bearer of the letter was free or not. He may be meant by the Vitulinus, bishop of Sipontum, whose signature appears to the probably spurious grant mentioned under PETRUS of Anagnia. (*Epp.* viii. 8, xi. 24, *App. ad S. Greg. Epp.* 4.) [F. D.]

VITALIANUS (6), bishop of Rome after Eugenius, ordained (probably) 30th July, A.D. 657, the see having been vacant one month and twenty-nine days (Anastasius). He was a native of Campania, the son of one Anastasius. The burning question of his day was the Monothelitic controversy. All the popes since its origin, except the first, Honorius, had stood out for the doctrine of two wills in Christ against the patriarchs of Constantinople, who were supported by the emperors; pope Martin especially, in the famous first Lateran Council, having condemned Monothelitism and the patriarchs who had maintained it, and having died in consequence with a martyr's halo round him [MARTINUS (1)]. The emperor Constans II. had indeed, under the advice of the patriarch Paul, evinced a desire to close the controversy by issuing the document called *The Type*, which prohibited all future discussion of the subject at issue on either side. But this attempt at compromise had proved as little acceptable at Rome as distinct assertion of heretical doctrine; and the *Type*, no less than the previous *Ecthesis* of Heraclius, had been condemned by the aforesaid Lateran Council. When Vitalianus became pope, Constans was still in power as emperor, having associated with himself his young son Constantine (called Pogonatus) A.D. 654. Peter had succeeded Pyrrhus (whom Rome had excommunicated) as patriarch. The relations between Rome and Constantinople, however strained, were still not such as to prevent the new pope from sending the customary announce-

confession appears to have been so worded as to give no offence: for the emperors sent him in return a book of the Gospels adorned with gold and jewels, while Peter replied to him in a letter which began, "The letter of your unanimous and holy fraternity has given birth in us to spiritual joy." However, neither the pope's letter nor the whole reply of the patriarch being extant, we do not know how the former had expressed himself with regard to doctrine. What further passed between them is known of only through reference to it in the sixth general council (*Actio* xiii.); from which it certainly appears that Peter had understood the pope, or affected to understand him, as assenting to the Monothelite position. That he had not really done so, but that, at the same time, he had not declared himself distinctly against it, may be concluded from a subsequent letter of Constantine Pogonatus to pope Donus, in which the emperor says that he had been urged by the then patriarch Theodore, and by Macarius of Theopolis, to cause the name of Vitalian to be erased from the diptychs at Constantinople, in which, along with that of pope Honorius, it still remained; but that he had refused to allow this to be done till he should be satisfied, through emissaries then expected from Rome, that the difference between the pope and the patriarchs had been of real importance. It thus seems to have been still a question at Constantinople what his doctrine really was. That, however, his name was afterwards erased, and thus that his views had not eventually satisfied the Monothelites, appears from the Acts of the sixth council (*Actio* viii.), at which petition was made to the emperor to restore the name. Still, orthodox as he may have always been, his reception of Constans, when the latter visited Rome A.D. 668, affords further evidence of his inclination to conciliation, rather than resolute dogmatism. His attitude in this respect might be due partly to deficiency of such courage and zeal as had been so notably evinced by pope Martin; or perhaps also to his entertaining a hope (which was justified by the final result under Pogonatus) of at length winning over the emperors, who were already disposed to compromise.

The visit of Constans to Rome was before his retirement to Syracuse, where he spent the latter part of his days. His reasons for leaving Constantinople, as gathered from the historians Theophanes, Cedrenus, Constantinus Manasses, and Zonaras, were the odium against him there because of his murder of his brother Theodosius and of the violence he had done to pope Martin and St. Maximus, and his own consequent mental misery. He used continually (says Cedrenus) to see visions of his brother (who is said to have been forcibly ordained deacon, and afterwards poisoned in the Eucharist) in a deacon's habit, offering him a cup full of blood, and saying, "Drink, brother." The same authority informs us that, on sailing from Constantinople, he turned round and spat against the city, and that he had a design of transferring the seat of the empire to Syracuse. But he had an intermediate design, not mentioned by the above annalists, viz., that of breaking the power of the Lombards in Italy. For, thither with an army, landed at Tarentum, besieged Beneventum, and after unsuccessful warfare against the Lombards, retired at last to Sicily, having first (as said above) visited Rome. Vitalian met him with his clergy, at a distance of six miles from the city, and seems to have received him with the utmost honour. Having arrived on Wednesday, 5th July, and on the same day paid his devotions and made an offering at St. Peter's, and having on Saturday done the same at the church of St. Mary ad Praesepe, the emperor made his grand entry, attended by his army, into St. Peter's on Sunday, being met by all the clergy carrying waxlights; mass was celebrated, and he offered at the altar a mantle of cloth of gold. On the following Saturday he bathed and dined at the Lateran palace, and again on Sunday attended mass at St. Peter's, where he took leave of the pope. His stay in Rome lasted twelve days, during which he had not been wholly occupied by devotional exercises; for he is said by Anastasius, with whom Paulus Diaconus agrees, to have removed all the brazen ornaments that were in the city, and even the brazen tiles from the roof of the Pantheon (then the Church of St. Mary ad Martyres), and to have sent the spoils to Constantinople. Baronius (*ad an.* 663, iii. *et seq.*) expresses surprise that a pope, now numbered among the saints, should have so cordially received and honoured the sacrilegious fratricide, and the ruthless persecutor of Martinus and Maximus, instead of closing the doors of the church against him, as canonical discipline required. He attributes such conduct to a wise and justifiable economy, exercised with the view of winning the heretical East to orthodoxy through the emperor; and he supposes the latter to have himself pretended to be orthodox, accounting further by this supposition for Vitalian having accepted a present from him at the commencement of his pontificate. But such a supposition has not the least historical ground: it is only resorted to by Baronius to save the credit of a pope.

To Vitalian England was indebted for the able and influential archbishop of Canterbury, Theodore, consecrated at Rome A.D. 668. [THEODORUS (7).]

Vitalian died in January (probably the 27th), A.D. 672, having held the see for about fourteen years and a half, and was buried in St. Peter's.

The only extant letters of Vitalian, except that to king Oswy, above referred to, and the alleged one given by William of Malmesbury, have reference to the case of John, bishop of Lappa in Crete, who had been deposed by Paul his metropolitan in synod, and appealed to Rome. Vitalian, in a synod assembled for the purpose, absolved the appellant, and commanded his restitution, on the ground—so far as appears from his letters—not so much of the merits of the charge against him (whatever it may have been) as of uncanonical procedure, in that the accused had been put in prison, had been required to find bail, and had been treated as guilty after his appeal to Rome. He wrote two letters to Paul the metropolitan on the subject, ordering John's restoration, and one also to Vaanus, the emperor's chamberlain and chartularius at Syracuse, and another to the bishop of

Syracuse, desiring them to enforce the appellant's restitution to the see. It would thus appear that the metropolitan and bishops of Crete were not ready of their own accord to submit to the pope's authority.

A more distinct case of insubordination was that of Maurus, archbishop of Ravenna. The bishops of this city, as being the seat of the exarchate, at this time claimed to be autocephalous, and were supported by the exarchs and emperors while Rome stood out against imperial authority with regard to Monothelitism. The aforesaid Maurus had, it seems, disregarded a summons to come to Rome and give an account of himself, and was thereupon excommunicated by Vitalian; he, in return, excommunicated the pope, and forbade the churches under his jurisdiction to pay allegiance to the see of Rome; and his degradation from the priesthood was consequently pronounced in a synod of bishops at Rome (Hieron. Rubeus, *Hist. Ravenn.* lib. iv. ann. 648, p. 172, ed. 1572). This position of independence was continued by Reparatus, the successor of Maurus, during the pontificate of pope Adeodatus, but was apparently given up by the following bishop Theodore under pope Donus (676–678). For Anastasius tells (*in Vit. Doni*) "Hujus temporibus ecclesia Ravennatum, quae se ab ecclesia Romana segregaverat causa autocephaliae, denuo se pristinae sedi Apostolicae subjugavit:"—and we find the name of Theodore of Ravenna among the signatories of a Roman council under the next pope Agatho. Under Leo II., who succeeded Agatho (683–684), an imperial rescript is further said to have been obtained for confirming the submission of Ravenna to Rome:—"Hujus temporibus percurrente divali jussione clementissimi Principis, restituta est Ecclesia Ravennatis sub ordinatione sedis apostolicae, defuncto archiepiscopo, qui electus fuit juxta antiquam consuetudinem in civitatem Romanam veniat ordinandus:—sed et ne Mauri quondam episcopi anniversitas celebretur: sed et typum autocephaliae, quem sibi elicuerant ad amputanda scandala sedis apostolicae, restituerunt" (Anastas. *in Vit. Leonis II.*). [J. B—y.]

VITALINUS, praised along with his brother Marianus by St. Ambrose (*Serm.* lxiii. 6). [C. H.]

VITALIS (1), ST., Apr. 28th, a reputed martyr of Ravenna, chiefly interesting us as the patron saint of the famous church of that city. [ECCLESIUS (1).] The fullest early notice of him (but quite legendary) occurs in Ado's *Martyrology*, while he is mentioned also by Usuard, the *Mart. Vet. Rom.*, the *Mart. Rom.*, Notker, and Wandelbert. Rubeus in his *Historia Ravennatum* (ed. 1572, p. 34) gives his story; Papebroch (Boll. *Acta SS.* 28 Apr. iii. 568) and Tillemont (ii. 75, 496) discuss the period, which Baronius (*Mart. Rom.*) considers as A.D. 171. The current legend however assigns him to the reign of Nero, makes him the father of GERVASIUS (1) and Protasius, and attributes his martyrdom to his having paid honour to the remains of the martyr URSICINUS (1). His wife, Valeria, commemorated on the same day, is said to have suffered at Milan. Papebroch mentions other churches dedicated to Vitalis, viz. at Rome, Faenza, Rimini, Como, Ferrara, Venice, Verona, in Italy, and at Jadera in Dalmatia. [C. H.]

VITALIS (2), reader, martyred with FELIX (174) in 303. (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* 355.) [C. H.]

VITALIS (3), martyr at Bologna with his master. [AGRICOLA.] (Tillem. v. 314.) [C. H.]

VITALIS (4), bishop of Antioch, 21st in succession, followed Tyrannus after the cessation of the persecution of Diocletian, c. A.D. 312 or 313. Entering on his episcopate amid the universal joy at the relaxation of the fiery trial which had been devastating the church, he signalized his entrance on office by commencing the rebuilding of the most ancient church in Antioch, which was specially dear to the Christians, as in Chrysostom's words "the mother of all the churches in the city," having been according to tradition founded by the apostles themselves (Theod. *H. E.* i. 3; Chrysost. *Homil. in Inscript. Act. Apostol.*), which on his death in A.D. 318 or 319, he left to be finished by his successor Philogonus. He was present at the councils of Ancyra, A.D. 314 (Labbe, i. 1475), and Neocaesarea, the date of which is uncertain (*ibid.* i. 1488), and signed the canons. Eutychius calls him Vitellius, and assigns him 6 years (p. 412) (Tillemont, *Mem. Eccles.* tom. vi. p. 194). [E. V.]

VITALIS, Apollinarist. [VITALIUS.]

VITALIS (5), a presbyter, perhaps of Aquitania, who wrote to Jerome in the year 398 to ask the solution of difficulties as to the early age at which some of the Jewish kings are said to have had children. Jerome admits that there are discrepancies as to these matters, but deprecates the wasting of time on such trivial questions. (*Ep.* 72, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

VITALIS (6), an archdeacon, bearer of a letter from the bishops of Macedonia to pope Innocent I. (Innoc. *Ep.* 17 al. 22 in *Pat. Lat.* xx. 526.) [C. H.]

VITALIS (7), a friend to whom Augustine wrote to reclaim him from Pelagianism. Vitalis had said that belief was not God's gift, but entirely in a man's own power. Having quoted Phil. ii. 15, Augustine asks him whether he thought it needful to pray for those to whom the gospel is preached or only to preach to them. The priest at the altar prays for those who are not converted, and for catechumens, and for the faithful that they may continue in the faith. How can Vitalis contradict the church, or despise the authority of a man so eminent in the African branch of it, as Cyprian in his treatise on the Lord's Prayer, or, to go higher still, that of the Apostle Paul (2 Cor. xiii. 7), or such passages as Ps. xxxvi. (xxxvii.) 23. If he says that a man is guided by God so long as by his own free will he walks in God's way, this is the same opinion which was condemned by Pelagius himself before the Eastern bishops. Grace is given, not according to man's desert, but previously to his will; if otherwise, there would be no need to pray for the conversion of unbelievers. Let him read the Lord's Prayer and Cyprian's treatise on it (c. 17). To pray in any other spirit is to pretend to pray,

if we do so to thank God for bringing us out of darkness (Col. i. 12) is a mockery. Men become Christians by free will, but, at the same time, by His grace. Children are redeemed, regenerated, not by their own free will; but this must be called into action afterwards by agreement with saving doctrine. The works of unbelievers, *e.g.* of illustrious Romans, being done without faith, cannot please God however much they may please men. It is the Mediator who enters into the strong man's house and binds him. Teaching is not grace, but grace makes teaching effectual (John vi. 68). We pray for the conversion of sinners; we pray, not that doctrine may be preached to them, but that their will may be changed. The faithful pray that they may persevere, carrying out the warning of 1 Cor. x. 12. The question as to the removal of Christians in early life, in order to prevent them from falling into sin, must be put aside for the present; our duty is to walk in true faith now.

Then follow twelve rules or principles opposed to the doctrine of Pelagius, of which the substance may be said to be that grace is given by God at His pleasure, not on account of man's desert whether in the case of children or adults. All, even children, will be judged for their works. Those who believe in God do so of their own free will. We pray for unbelievers, that they may be brought to believe; we thank God for those who have been so brought. In summing up what has been said, Augustine touches the argument drawn from 1 Tim. ii. 4, by showing that some infants die without baptism, and, on the other hand, the one drawn from 1 Cor. xv. 22, by showing that those who are saved are so in accordance with God's will, but that against his will none can be saved. As those who die in the Lord are blessed, the opinion that men will be judged according to their hypothetical conduct is absurd. To say that men believe with their own free will is not to deny free will, whereas those who oppose God's grace really do so. How can we thank God for what He has not done? or will Vitalis refuse to allow the church to pray for the conversion of infidels, as the priest does at the altar, or will he blame St. Paul for praying for the Jews? If he allows that prayer to God and thanksgiving are lawful, how can he deny that God's grace precedes man's will? (Aug. *Ep.* 217.) [H. W. P.]

VITALIS (8), a notary on the Catholic side at the conference A.D. 411 (Carth. Coll. i. 1. 132; ii. 1. iii. 1). [H. W. P.]

VITALIS (9), addressed along with TONANTIUS (1) by Capreolus. [C. H.]

VITALIS (10), bishop of Truentum or Tronto in Picenum, and, with Misenus, legate of Felix III. in A.D. 483, sent to Constantinople to procure the deposition of Peter Mongus. Overcome by imprisonment and threats, they were induced to go over to the side of Acacius, to join him in processions, to communicate with him and the heretical partisans of Peter Mongus, and to recite the name of the latter in the diptychs. They brought back a letter from Acacius to the pope the episcopate and excluded from communion till the church of Alexandria should receive a Catholic bishop. Vitalis died excommunicated between A.D. 492 and 495, but at a synod under pope Gelasius in the latter year Misenus was admitted to communion and restored to the episcopate on abjuring Eutychianism and anathematizing its chief supporters. [FELIX (3) III. and GELASIUS (1)] (Felicis III. *Epist.* 2, 6. 10; Liberatus 18, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 899, 921, 936, lxviii. 1028; Evag. *H. E.* iii. 20). [F. D.]

VITALIS (11), third abbat of M. Cassino after St. Benedict. (Paulus Diac. *Hist. Lang.* iv. 18.) [F. D.]

VITALIS (12), addressed as bishop of Ravenna, by Venantius Fortunatus, in two poems describing the church of St. Andrew and its consecration which Vitalis had built (*Miscell.* i. 1, 2, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 63). As no bishop of Ravenna of this name is otherwise known, the editor of Fortunatus conjectures he is the same as Maximianus, who was bishop from A.D. 546 to A.D. 553, and who restored the church of St. Andrew (Agnellus, *V. S. Maximiani* 4, in *Patr. Lat.* cvi. 608). [F. D.]

VITALIS (13), defensor of the Roman church at Cagliari in Sardinia. Four letters of Gregory the Great are addressed to him (lib. ix. ind. ii. 2, 64, lib. xi. ind. iv. 23, lib. xiv. ind. vii. 2, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* 940, 1000, 1135, 1303). In the first the case of Januarius, bishop of Cagliari, is referred to, who was accused of ploughing up the crops of a neighbour on a Sunday and removing his landmarks, and Vitalis is forbidden to take any commission on the money remitted by the pope for wheat purchased; in the second, he is forbidden to interfere with the bishop's jurisdiction over his clergy; in the third, he is told to assist in the purchase of Barbaricine slaves. The Barbaricines were the heathen descendants of a tribe transported to Sardinia by the Vandals, who lived by brigandage in the mountains near Cagliari. [F. D.]

VITALIUS (VITALIS), the most distinguished and influential of the disciples of Apollinaris, ordained by him bishop of his schismatical congregation at Antioch. Vitalius was a man of the highest character, much revered at Antioch for the sanctity of his life and his many virtues. He had been brought up in the orthodox faith, and after having spent some years as a layman was ordained presbyter by Meletius (Theod. *H. E.* v. 4; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 25). An unhappy jealousy of his fellow presbyter Flavian, whom he thought to be higher in Meletius's favour than himself, caused a breach between him and his bishop. Deprived of the wholesome guidance of Meletius, Vitalius fell under the influence of Apollinaris, whose intimate friend he became, and embraced his theological system. Tidings of his unsoundness in the faith having reached Rome, Vitalius made a journey thither (which may be placed in 375) to clear himself of the charges before pope Damasus, and to be received by him into communion. By the use of equivocal terms, and the production of a de-

claration of faith in which all crucial expressions were skilfully omitted he convinced Damasus of his orthodoxy. Damasus did not, however, receive him into communion, but as if he suspected that he was being imposed on he sent Vitalius back to Antioch with a letter to Paulinus, whom, during the Meletian schism, Rome and the Western Church recognised as the orthodox and canonical bishop of that see, remitting the whole matter to his decision, as one likely to be better informed on its true bearing than himself. He praised his caution, but recommended that it should not lead him to postpone too long the readmission of those of whose orthodoxy he had sufficient proof, on their signing the Nicene creed, and also making a declaration that the Son of God took on Him "entire Adam" with body, soul and sense. Those whom Paulinus admitted to communion would be received into communion with Rome (Labbe, *Concil.* ii. 864). Both of these requirements were satisfied by Vitalius, but with a secret reserve as to the interpretation of the words. Shortly after Vitalius had left Rome, Damasus, not quite easy in his mind as to his orthodoxy, despatched a second letter to Paulinus, containing a profession of faith, and a long string of anathematisms, which, without naming Apollinaris, condemned him and his doctrines, desiring Paulinus to require signature to them as the terms of being admitted into communion (Labbe, ii. 900, sq.; Theod. *H. E.* v. 11). These terms Vitalius refused to satisfy, and the breach between him and Paulinus became complete. Apollinaris ordained him bishop of his schismatical church, his holiness of life and pastoral zeal gathering a large number of followers, the successors of whom were still existing at Antioch under the name of Vitalians when Sozomen wrote (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 25). The unsoundness of Vitalius on the point on which Apollinaris diverged from the orthodox faith, did not prevent his being regarded with much esteem and affection by leaders on the orthodox side, with whom, this one point excepted, he completely agreed. On his return from Rome to Antioch, A.D. 375, he visited Gregory Nazianzen, by whom he was acknowledged as a beloved brother, whose soundness in the faith he entirely accepted, though subsequently when convinced of the real meaning of his ambiguous language he was forced to recall his approval (Greg. Naz. *Ep. ad Cledon.* ii. *Orat.* 52, tom. i. p. 746). It must have been very shortly after Vitalius's return to Antioch that Epiphanius, urged thereto by Basil (Bas. *Ep.* 258 [325]) visited Antioch for the purpose of healing the differences which were rending that unhappy church. Among those he met there he especially mentions "Vitalius the bishop," whom he speaks of in the highest terms as *εὐλαβέστατος τῷ βίῳ, καὶ τῇ καταστάσει καὶ τῇ πολιτείᾳ*, and earnestly besought him to reunite himself to the Catholic Church. Finding that the misunderstanding was chiefly a personal one, between him and Paulinus, each charging the other with unsoundness in the faith, Epiphanius invited them both to a conference. At first Vitalius's language appeared perfectly orthodox. He acknowledged as fully as Paulinus that Christ was perfect man with a human body and soul (ψυχή); but when pressed as to whether He also had a human mind (*νοῦς*) he denied it, stating that His divinity was to Him in its place. Neither party could persuade the other, and Epiphanius had to give up the hopeless attempt (Epiphan. lxxvii. c. 20–23). The schism of Vitalius added a third, or counting the Arians, a fourth church at Antioch, each denouncing the others. Meletius, Paulinus and Vitalius each claimed to be the orthodox bishop. The perplexity they created is graphically described by Jerome in his letters to pope Damasus (Hieron. *Ep.* 57, 58): "Whoever is united to the chair of Peter he regards as his own. But Meletius, Vitalius and Paulinus, each asserted that they clave to Damasus. He could believe it if every one said so. But now two must be liars, if not all three. He is equally ignorant of them all, 'non novi Vitalem; Meletium respuo, ignoro Paulinum,' and he begs the pope for his soul's sake to signify to him whom he is to communicate with" (Tillemont, *Mem. Ecclés.* vii. 617–622; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Div. 1, vol. ii. p. 386 ff, Clark's transl.). [E. V.]

VITELLIUS, an African Donatist writer mentioned by Gennadius (*Scr. Eccl.* 4). He flourished in the time of the emperor Constans, and so cir. A.D. 344. His works *De eo quod odio sint mundo servi Dei* (written against the Catholic party as persecutors). *Adversus Gentes, adversus Catholicos* (accusing them of being traditors) are not extant. (Cave, i. 209; Ceill. v. 105.) [C. H.]

VITONUS (VITONIUS), Nov. 9, bishop of Verdun, succeeded Firmus A.D. 502. His Life is given by Surius (*Vit. SS.* xi. 236) and Mabillon (*AA. SS. Ben.* vi. i. 496). The modern interest in St. Vitonus centres in the connection of his abbey with the Benedictines. He died A.D. 525 (Ceillier, xii. 833, xiii. 119). [J. G.]

VITUS (1) (GUY), **ST.**, June 15th, a youthful martyr in the persecution of Diocletian. He was the son of a pagan gentleman in Sicily, but had been secretly trained in Christianity by his nurse Crescentia and her husband Modestus. After the boy had encountered much cruel suffering they succeeded in carrying him over to Italy, where however they all three fell victims, either in Lucania or at Rome. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 15 Jun. iii. 491, ed. 1867.) For references to the Martyrologies, see *D. C. A.* VITUS (2). His *Passio*, composed in the sixth or the seventh century, was discovered at Rome in the ninth, and is of no authority. His relics are reputed to be at Corbey and at Prague. He is invoked against sudden death and hydrophobia (*Acta SS.* 15 Jun. iii. App. p. 21*), as well as against prolonged sleep and the complaint known as the Chorea or Dance of St. Vitus (Guérin, *Les Pet. Boll.* vii. 30). He is also, says Guérin, the patron of comedians and dancers. Two German medical writers, Gregory Horst and John Juncker, of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries respectively, relate how the malady came to take the name of St. Vitus, and the substance of their remarks, with references, may be read in Rees's *Encyclopedia*, *s.v.* Chorea. There sprang up, they say, in Germany in the seventeenth century, a superstitious belief that by presenting gifts to the image of St. Vitus,

through the following year. The saints two chapels at Ulm and Ravensberg became more especially noted for the annual resort of these dancing fanatics. The Dance of St. Vitus or St. Guy, thus gaining currency in speech, became a popular name for the well-known nervous disorder. [C. H.]

VITUS (2), bishop of Charrae (Haran). He was one of the signers of the letter of the Oriental prelates to the bishops of Italy and Gaul in 372 (Basil. *Ep.* 92 [69]). On the return of Sanctissimus from the west, Basil sent a letter by him to Vitus, expressing his respectful regard, and his desire to enjoy his society (*ibid. Ep.* 255 [314]). He was present at Constantinople in 381 (Labbe, ii. 955). Sozomen speaks of him as famous for his sanctity, and records that on his first interview with Constantine, the emperor stated that he had seen him frequently in visions, and that he had been bidden to obey all his counsels. (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 33; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 975.) [E. V.]

VIULANDUS. Gregory the Great requests the bishop of Ravenna to hear and determine without delay a suit between him and one of his deacons. (*Epp.* ii. 40.) [F. D.]

VIVENTIOLUS (1), a rhetorician who found fault with St. Avitus for pronouncing the second syllable of the word "potitur" long in a discourse pronounced at the dedication of a church at Lyons. Avitus replied, justifying himself, and stating that the shortening of the syllable by Virgil (*Æn.* iii. 56) was a case of poetic licence (Avitus, *Ep.* li. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 268; Ceillier, x. 562). [S. A. B.]

VIVENTIOLUS (2), ST. (VIVENTIUS), 24th bishop of Lyons. He spent the first part of his life at Condot in the monastery under Eugendus. In 510 he went to Lyons, and had a correspondence with Avitus, who thanks him for telling him of the illness of his brother Apollinarius, bishop of Lyons, and exhorts him to interest himself in settling the discords in the monastery at Condat, consequent on the death of Eugendus. Avitus also wishes him a higher post than that of head of a monastery—a 'Cathedra' instead of the 'sella,' which he had brought as a present to Avitus. (*Pat. Lat.* lix. 272.) In 516 Viventiolus assisted at the consecration of the monastery at Agaunum as bishop of Lyons, and a fragment of his oration on this occasion is preserved. (*Pat. Lat.* lxvii. 994; Labbe, iv. 1559.) In 517 he subscribed at Epaon, and wrote a 'tractoria epistola,' summoning the bishops to it (Labbe, iv. 1581; *Pat. Lat.* lxvii. 993). He also presided at the Council of Lyons 517. (Labbe, iv. 1585.) There are extant five letters of Avitus to him, some passages of which speak highly of his zeal and affection (*Pat. Lat.* lix.), and one of his to Avitus, inviting his presence at the Feast of St. Just (*Pat. Lat.* lix. 272).

His extant works cited above are in *Pat. Lat.* (lxvii. 994-6). Agobardus, in his work *De Jud. Sup.*, mentions works of his, but it is not known what these are. He makes the following non solum ipsius, sed et aliorum de eo scripta testantur." (*Pat. Lat.* civ. 82; *Hist. Litt. de la Fr.* iii. 94-95.) [G. W. D.]

VIVENTIUS of Lyons. [VIVENTIOLUS.]

VIVENTIUS, a bishop in France, and one of the three authors of the first book of the life of St. Caesarius of Arles. His coadjutors were St. Cyprian, bishop of Toulon, and Firminus, bishop of Usez. It was written immediately after Caesarius's death in 542, at the request of the abbess Caesaria, the younger, and her nuns (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxvii. 1001; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 238; Ceillier, xi. 128). From a letter of a priest, Messianus, to Viventius, first published by Mabillon, we learn that he was a bishop (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. vi. 60), but his see is unknown. [S. A. B.]

VIVIANDUS (BIBIANDUS, BIBIANUS, VIBIANUS), second bishop of Saintes, succeeded Eutropius, and has a meagre tradition. The *Vita, auctore anonymo*, given by the Boll. (*AA. SS.* Aug. vi. 461–2) is late, and makes him pupil and successor, instead of predecessor, of Ambrosius. According to the Life he was a native of Saintes; his mother was Maurela, a Christian: at the age of eleven he was placed under Ambrosius the bishop, passed through the ecclesiastical grades, and became his successor. He flourished c. A.D. 450, and his tomb at Saintes is mentioned by Gregory of Tours (*De Glor. Conf.* c. 58). He is usually known as Bibianus, and his feast is 28 Aug. (Surius, *Vit. SS.* viii. 318; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vi. 228; x. p. lvii.; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 1055). In *Append. ad Opera S. Germani Parisiensis*, there is given by Migne (*Pat. Lat.* lxxii. 430 sq.) *Epistula S. Augustini ad Sanctum Dei Bibianum Santonicae civitatis antestitem* (ex MS. Codice S. Petri Carnotensis). It purports to be in reply to a letter from Bibianus to St. Augustine of Hippo; the letter was sent through Trojanus, a deacon of Saintes, and the reply through Eugepius, a presbyter of Hippo; the subject relates to the observance of Advent, but the whole is probably fictitious. [J. G.]

VOCIUS, bishop of Lyons, present at the council of Arles A.D. 314 (Routh. *Rel. Sacr.* iv. 95). [H. W. P.]

VOCONIUS, bishop of Castellanum in Mauretania, c. 460, author of a work *Against Jews, Arians, and other Heretics*, and another *On the Sacraments* (Gennad. *Scr. Eccl.* 78) now lost. (Cave, i. 448; Ceill. x. 469.) [C. H.]

VODALIS (VODVAL, ST. VOUEL), Pictish priest, inclusus at St. Hildegarde's monastery of Soissons, died A.D. 720 (Innes, *Civ. and Eccl. Hist. Scot.* 318, Sp. Cl. Ed.). [J. G.]

VODINUS, 15th in the mythical list of British archbishops of London, as to which, see OBINUS and Stubbs's *Reg. Sac.* 152. He is said to have been slain in 436 (453 Stubbs), for forbidding Vortigern, king of Britain, to marry Hengist's daughter Rowenna (Godwin, *De Praesul.* 170, ed. 1743). [C. H.]

VOLAGESUS, bishop of Nisibis, succeeded James in 361. He is mentioned in the *Chronicle* of Dionysius in 363, and according to the *Chronicle* of Edessa he died in 396. He was the author of a graphic narrative of the siege and relief of Nisibis in Julian's Persian campaign. (*Chron. Paschal.* p. 291; Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* i. 18; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.*) [E. V.]

VOLCATIUS GALLICANUS, one of the writers of the Augustan History. He wrote the account of the usurper Avidius Cassius, A.D. 175, and dedicated it to Diocletian. It is remarkable for an extensive use of original correspondence. [SPARTIANUS.] Teuffel's *Hist. of Rom. Literat.* t. ii. p. 323, Eng. trans. [G. T. S.]

VOLOCUS, bishop. [FAELCHU (2).]

VOLUSIANUS (1), C. VIBIUS AFINIUS GALLUS VELDUMNIANUS, joint emperor with his father Gallus. At the end of A.D. 251 Gallus was proclaimed emperor after the defeat and death of Decius, which he is said to have caused by his treachery. He associated Volusian with himself in the empire, and, after making peace with the Goths on the shameful terms of allowing them to keep their prisoners and paying them tribute, the emperors proceeded to Rome. Their short reign was marked by the dreadful pestilence which began in Aethiopia and spread over the whole Roman world, and in which Hostilianus, the son of Decius, who had been associated with the Galli in the empire, died. By the care they bestowed on the funerals of the poorer classes in Rome they won, it is said, great popularity (Victor, *de Caes.*). Their numerous medals, bearing representations of Apollo and Juno, the deities of the sun and the air (Eckhel, vii. 357), support the statement of St. Cyprian (*Ep.* 55 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* iii. 805), that they issued an edict, ordering sacrifices to be offered everywhere to appease the wrath of the gods. By their refusal to obey the edict the Christians aroused the hatred of the populace. In Africa the cry of *Cyprianum ad leonem* was again raised, and the outbreak of a persecution worse than that of Decius was daily apprehended (*Ep.* 54 in *Patr. Lat.* iii. 855, 861). Fortunately these apprehensions were not realised. The only overt acts of persecution we certainly know of were confined to Rome. The outbreak was sudden (*Ep.* 58 in *Patr. Lat.* iii. 274), and Cornelius, the bishop of Rome, seems to have been specially singled out for attack. His flock rallied bravely round him, and some, who had fallen away in the Decian persecution, distinguished themselves by their firmness (*Ep.* 57 in *Patr. Lat.* iii. 832). Cornelius and some of his followers were banished to Centum Cellae, where he died, probably by a natural death, in June, A.D. 253. (See Lipsius, *Chron. der Röm. Bisch.* 207.) His successor Lucius was apparently elected in exile, but was soon allowed to return, the cessation of the persecution being probably due to the outbreak of the civil war. There is no clear proof that any severer punishment than exile was inflicted in this persecution. At least, this is the worst that is mentioned by the contemporary writers St. Cyprian and St. Dionysius of Alexandria (in Eus. *H. E.* vii. 1). In the summer of A.D. 253 Aemilianus, after gaining some successes over the Goths in Moesia, was proclaimed emperor by his soldiers, and towards the end of the year marched on Rome. Gallus and Volusian advanced to meet him, but their own troops mutinied, murdered them at Torni, and went over to their rival about the month of February, A.D. 254. [See VALERIANUS.] (Zos. i. 23-28; Zon. xii. 21; Tillemont, *Emp.* iii. 287, *M. E.* iii. 465, iv. 115; Gibbon, c. 10.) [F. D.]

VOLUSIANUS (2). A law of Constantius, dated April 30, A.D. 355, is addressed to him forbidding marriage with a brother's wife or a wife's sister, and bastardizing the issue of such marriages (*Cod. Theod.* iii. tit. xii. 2). In this law Volusianus is styled vicarius urbis, but this is probably a wrong reading, as in three laws of the same year he is styled Praefectus Praetorio (*Cod. Theod.* xi. tit. xxx. 26, tit. xxxiv. 2, tit. xxxvi. 12). [F. D.]

VOLUSIANUS (3), son of Albinus, and brother to Albina, and thus maternal uncle to her daughter Melania the younger (Photius, *Bibl.* 53, 19; and note ed. Bekker; Tillemont, xiv. 233, 747). His mother was a devout Christian, but her name is not known. He may have been the same as Caius Coeonius Rufus Volusianus, *praefectus urbi* in the time of Valentinian, who died A.D. 375. (Baronius, ann. 412, xvi. xvii.) At the time when Marcellinus went to Africa, the mother of Volusianus wrote to St. Augustine, entreating him to use his influence with him to become a Christian, and in reply to her appeal he wrote to him, exhorting him to study the Scriptures, not on account of their style, but their subject matter, and if he has questions to ask he offered to write to him, a method which he preferred to that of conversing with him (Aug. *Ep.* 132). Volusianus accepted this invitation, and related what had taken place at a meeting of his friends. After discussing various matters relating to poetry, metaphysics, and the like, one of the party asked where a Christian was to be found who could explain the mystery of the Saviour's birth in all its details, his life, and his actions. The party agreed to lay the matter before Augustine, as the man best qualified to explain it (*Ep.* 135). In the meantime Marcellinus, who visited Volusianus frequently at Carthage, and discussed with him the subject of Christianity, and to whom at the earnest request of his mother, Volusianus had shown the letter of Augustine, wrote to him about A.D. 412 to request him to reply to the question of Volusianus, and also to the objection raised by unbelievers that our Lord had performed no work greater than had been done by Apollonius of Tyana or by Apuleius. Volusianus had put the question that even if the Incarnation could be explained, how could the difference be explained between the sacrifices of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament, and how could both of them be consistent with God's unity of purpose. He asked also how some results of Christian doctrine could be reconciled with the principles of government and national economy, *e. g.* non-resistance to evil and to enemies, and submission to injustice, arbitrary aggression and the like. He trusts that an answer will be given to these questions which will do credit to the reputation of Augustine, especially in the

hesitate to declare himself satisfied (*Ep.* 136; Tillemont, xiii. 594). To the letter of Volusianus Augustine replies, 1. That the depth of Scripture is great, that men's minds are unwilling at first to conceive of bodies in any other light than as full grown and occupying definite space, but that God fills the universe without limitation of space. The senses are bound up in life, yet those of hearing and seeing, and even smell, have often a range beyond the body, and thus life may be said to exist at a distance from it. What then is the soul but a sense of the body, *i.e.* in the mind by which it looks at these things, for it does not judge of the senses by a sensation of the body, and yet we cannot believe that God took a body from his virgin mother while he did not depart from the bosom of the Father. The omnipresence of the Word resembles in some degree the human voice before a multitude; and thus the impregnation of the virgin mother is not incredible, for God is great, not in bulk but in energy. He who caused her womb to produce fruit passed through the closed door after the resurrection. Of this, not the first example of power, the reason is to be sought in the power of the agent. The Word took human form not, as He might have done in the form of an adult, but as an infant, in order to prove the reality of his human nature, which otherwise might have been doubted. In doing this He added the human to the divine nature; but this union of natures is not more wonderful than that of soul and body in man. Augustine then enlarges on the moral benefit arising from the truth, in leading men to the divine nature through the assistance of divine grace. As to the immortality of the soul, who is there that refuses to believe in it?

"But," says Volusianus, "the divinity of Christ was not apparent by any sufficient signs, for his miracles were after all only small works as regards God." Augustine grants that similar works have been performed by prophets and others, for how could His works be unlike those of His servants? But His incarnation, resurrection, and ascension, belong to Him alone. He then appeals to the preparation for His coming in Abraham and in the history of Israel, the law with its sacrifices and rites, and in prophecy, and to the subsequent fulfilment of all this in the progress of the church. He asks what precepts of philosophers are equal to the two great commandments, including as they do all public and private duty. Scripture contains plain precepts both for learned and unlearned people, but also deep mysteries which prevent man from despising the plain precepts. He invites Volusianus to ask questions, which he need not scruple to express at length. As to the Gospel being unsuited to state government, this notion must come from those who think that a state stands, not by strength of virtues, but by impunity of vices. God's mercy and grace do not desert men living by faith, whatever their sufferings in the world may be. He assures him of his prayers and trusts that they may be heard (*Ep.* 137). In a letter to Marcellinus Augustine mentions his having sent this letter (*Ep.* 139). In a letter to Evodius Augustine required for the birth of Christ of the Virgin, there need be no wonder at it. (b) That if a similar instance, it would be found to be not singular (*Ep.* 137, 2, 8). This argument, Evodius says, proves too much, for we can give no account of any birth at all, and therefore to say that the birth from the Virgin is not wonderful is to say no more than may be said of every birth, and to say that it is not without parallel, is only to repeat what we know about many instances of spontaneous generation in animals. In his reply to this letter, in which other questions besides these are treated, Augustine says, (a) That the birth was not without reason, but that the reason is not apparent to some to whom it seems wonderful, somewhat in the same way as our Lord marvelled at the centurion's faith because it was uncommon. As to (b) the instances adduced by Evodius are irrelevant, while the birth of Christ is unique in its circumstances, but not without parallel as an act of power (*Ep.* 161–162). It is plain that Augustine took great pains with his letter to Volusianus, and he refers to it in his Enchiridion addressed to Laurentius c. 34. In A.D. 420 or 421 an edict was issued by Constantine or Constantius, created Augustus by Honorius, to expel Coelestius from Rome, which was addressed to Volusianus, *praefectus urbi* (Photius, *Bibl.* 53, 14; Baronius, ann. 420, ii. iii). Notwithstanding the duty which he had to perform in this matter, it appears to have made no difference in his religious profession, but in A.D. 434, the year in which Proclus became archbishop of Constantinople, he appears, being then very ill, to have sent for his niece Melania to come to him to that city from Jerusalem, and there to have been persuaded by her to receive baptism from the archbishop. This is stated shortly by Photius in a passage expressing the common reading of the text, but which is not accepted by the editor, Bekker. It is related in greater fulness in one of the letters of Melania published by Symeon Metaphrastes, but which is extant only in the Latin version by Surius, given by Baronius, ann. 434, viii.–xi. The statement may be true, but there seems to be in the narrative some confusion of time and place, for Volusianus is represented as having been made *praefectus urbi* at Constantinople at that time, an office which he held at Rome thirteen or fourteen years before. Tillemont speaks doubtfully of the identity of the two persons, vol. xiii. 595. He is mentioned as a praefectus praetorio in an edict of Theodosius and Valentinian III. A.D. 429 (Ad Theod. xii. 6, 32), also as holding the same office in one from the same emperors dated Ravenna, June 10, 429 (Just. *Cod.* i. 14, 4; Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. p. 202).

[H. W. P.]

VOLUSIANUS (4) addressed by Firmus bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. (*Ep.* 25 in *Patr. Gr.* lxxvii. 1499.) [C. H.]

VOLUSIANUS (5), ST., seventh bishop of Tours, who succeeded his relative St. Perpetuus, A.D. 491, was of senatorial family, very rich, and holy in life. In the seventh year of his episcopate, he was driven into exile at Toulouse by the Goths, who suspected him of favouring the

died in exile after an episcopate of seven years and two months, and was succeeded by Verus (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 26, x. 31). A story not known to Gregory makes him die a martyr's death at a place called Patrosa, near Pamiers, in the year 500. His day is Jan. 18. (See Boll. Jan. ii. 194–5; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 14–15.)
[S. A. B.]

VOLVENTIUS, proconsul of Spain. [PRISCILLIANUS.]

VOUEL. [VODALIS (1).]

VULGANIUS (WULGAN), bishop and confessor, patron of Lens, dep. Pas-de-Calais, has a very uncertain tradition, but he appears to have been of Irish birth, and missionary in ancient Picardy or Belgic Gaul in the first half of the 7th century. His death was soon after the middle of that century. His relics were translated from Arras to Lens about the 11th century and his feast is Nov. 2. (Malbrancq, *De Mor.* ii. cc. 50 sq.; Molanus, *SS. Belg.* v. 253; O'Conor, *Ep. Nunc.* 149; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 162, 377, 797; Baring Gould, *Saints*, Nov. p. 59.) His connection with Canterbury is mythical, and so also with Scotland. [J. G.]

VUSCFREA, a son of Edwin, king of Northumbria, who was baptized by Paulinus, with Edwin and others, on Easter day, A.D. 627 (Beda, *H. E.* ii. 14). After his father's death, in A.D. 633, he was conveyed to Kent for safety, and was afterwards sent into France to be brought up at the friendly court of king Dagobert, where he died in his childhood. (*Id.* ii. 20.) [J. R.]

W

[Names commencing with W will sometimes be found under the initial V.

WAERMUND, bishop. (Kemble, *C. D.* 155.) [WEREMUND (2).]

WAIMERUS (VAIMERUS, WAGEMARUS, WEGEMARUS), twenty-first bishop of Troyes, comes before us first as duke of Champagne, when he was sent to take Autun: on the surrender of Leodegarius bishop of Autun, that prelate was handed over by Ebroin mayor of the palace, to Waimerus for torture and death [LEODEGARIUS (2)] (*Vita S. Leodegarii*, c. 12 sq.; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxiv. 1138 sq.), but according to one of the anonymous Lives of Leodegarius (*Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 359), Waimerus and his wife were converted by Leodegarius, who received a sum of money from his converts, and devoted it to charitable purposes. Through the influence of Ebroin Waimerus became bishop of Troyes, yet only to incur the suspicion and hatred of Ebroin, who had him strangled, or at least driven from his see, A.D. 678 (*Ib.* xcvi. 363–4). He could not have been bishop more than two or

WALARICUS (VALERY), ST., founder and first abbat of the monastery of Leuconaus, at the mouth of the Somme, which, with the adjacent town, took his name (Saint-Valery) in the 9th century. He died about 622, and his life was written about 660 by Raimbertus, or Ragimbertus, the second abbat after him. This life, as so often happened, being composed, as was thought, "nimis prolixo et simplici sermone," was rewritten to suit the taste of a later age, the 8th century (*Hist. Litt.* iii. 602) or the 11th century (Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. i. 14). The original has been lost, but the new version is preserved, the most correct edition being that of the *Acta SS.* (*ibid.* pp. 16–23).

Walaricus was born in Auvergne, where he fed his father's flocks and taught himself to read in the field. He became a monk in a neighbouring monastery, and a member of the clergy. He next migrated to a monastery at Auxerre, and thence repaired to St. Columban at Luxeuil. When the latter was banished in 610, he remained for a time with his successor St. Eustasius, but before long departed with one companion to the diocese of Amiens, where he begged from Clotaire a spot called Leuconaus, at the mouth of the Somme. Here a small community collected round him, though he lived apart in a solitary cell. His death is variously given as Dec. 12 and April 1, but he is commemorated the latter day. His grave becoming famous for its miracles, his successor St. Blitmundus built the monastery, afterwards known as St. Valery. For its history see *Gall. Christ.* x. 1231; and for the subsequent removals of Walaricus' body and attendant miracles, Boll. *ibid.* pp. 23–30; cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vii. 558. [S. A. B.]

WALBURGIS, ST., Feb. 25 (WALBURGA, WILBURGA, WALPURGA, WALTPURDE, WALPOUR, WARPURG, VAUBOURG, FALBOURG, GAUBURGE, PERCHE), abbess of Heidenheim, in the diocese of Eichstädt in Bavaria, the sister of Willibald and Wunebald. She was educated in the monastery of Wimburn under the abbess Tetta, with whom she was sent with Lioba and others into Germany at the request of Boniface, about A.D. 748. At first she remained under Lioba at Bischofsheim, but in or about 750 she was appointed abbess of the monastery founded by her brothers at Heidenheim, and there she died c. 780 (Boll. *Acta SS.* 25 Feb. iii. 516; *Pat. Lat.* cxxix. 866; Capgrave *N. L.* 293; Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 907; Butler, Feb. 25). For numerous other Lives see Potthast, *Biblioth. Hist.* ii. 929; Chevalier, *Sources Histor.* p. 2325. [C. H.]

WALDEBERTUS (WALBERT, VALBERT), ST., third abbat of Luxeuil, where he succeeded St. Eustasius, whose disciple he was, about 625. We have a 10th-century life of him, written by an abbat Adso, who either belonged to Luxeuil (Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai i. 277) or, as seems more probable, to Moutier-en-Der (Ceillier, xii. 887, 88). Though supposed to be based on an older account (cf. Boll. *ibid.* p. 275), it is of little value. First published by Mabillon, it is repeated by the Bol-

life (*ibid.* pp. 275-77). He was a Frank, born in the district of Meaux, who began life as a soldier, but becoming enamoured of the monastic existence, retired to Luxeuil, where in time he became abbat. This office he is said to have held for forty years, till he died, May 2, 665, when he was buried in the church of St. Martin, by his friend bishop Nicetius, probably Migetius of Besançon. His day is May 2. He is said to have been the founder of the monastery of Grandval, in the diocese of Basle, and to have been at the council of Rheims in 625 (Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 263; *Gall. Christ.* xv. 149), and to have introduced the rule of St. Benedict at Luxeuil, where it was observed side by side with that of Columban (Ceillier, xi. 617 sqq. and authorities there cited). His successor was Vindologus. [S. A. B.]

WALDETRUDIS, ST. (WALTRUDE, VAUTRUDE, VAUDRU), Apr. 9, abbess of Mons Castrilocus, sister of St. Aldegundis. After her husband count Madelgarius [VINCENTIUS (1)] had embraced the monastic life at Haumont, she, c. 656, took up her solitary abode in a cell at the above spot. In course of time other ladies resorted to her, and an important convent under her direction arose, around which grew up the city of Mons, the capital of Hainault. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 9 Apr. i. 831; Guérin, *Les Pet. Boll.* iv. 298; Butler, Apr. 9; other authorities in Chevalier's *Sources*, 2332.) [C. H.]

WALDHERE (WALDHERI, WALDHER), the fifth bishop of London, successor of St. Erkenwald (*M. H. B.* 617). His accession to the see is probably to be referred to the year 693, in which case he might be consecrated by archbishop Brihtwald as soon as he returned to England from Lyons. He was bishop when Sebbi, king of the East Saxons, determined to retire from the world, about 695; he conferred on him the religious habit, and by the king's special request stayed with him at his death. He also witnessed the miracle which occurred at his entombment (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 11). An interesting letter of Waldhere is extant, addressed to archbishop Brihtwald, and referred with some probability to the year 705. It concerns a projected meeting at Brentford, between the king of Wessex with his witan and the rulers of the East Saxons, to settle complaints about the protection of West Saxon exiles. Waldhere asks the advice of Brihtwald about attending the conference, and adds that he had absented himself from a recent meeting between Kenred, king of Mercia, and his bishops, because he did not know the wishes of the archbishop. We learn from it further that, in the year preceding, the synod of the province had determined not to communicate with the West Saxons because they had not obeyed the archbishop's judgment as to the ordination of bishops, that is, had not divided the great West Saxon diocese. (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 274, 275; *MS. Cotton*, Aug. ii. 18.) Waldhere's death must have occurred before the year 716, in which Ingwald, his successor, is present at Clovesho (*Councils*, &c. iii. 300). His name occurs in a charter of Suaebraed, king of the East Saxons, in which he, with Paegthath, by June 13, 704 (Kemble, *C. D.* no. 52). The grant to Peterborough by king Ethelred, attested by Theodore and Waldhere (Chr. S. *M. H. B.* 320; K. *C. D.* 990), is a forgery of the worst type. [S.]

WALDIPERT, presbyter. [PHILIPPUS (19).]

WALHSTOD (1), a monk of Lindisfarne, who had the privilege of waiting upon Cuthbert during his last illness at Farne in A.D. 685. It is said that he was cured by the saint of a bodily infirmity under which he had been labouring. (Beda, *Vita Cuthberti*, c. 38.) [J. R.]

WALHSTOD (2) (UALCHSTOD, UALHSTOD), fourth bishop of Hereford (*M. H. B.* 621). He is mentioned by Bede (*H. E.* v. 23) as bishop of the peoples who live beyond the Severn to the west (see also Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 542; Sim. Dun.; *ib.* 657; H. Hunt, *ib.* 726), at the time the historian closed his work, A.D. 731. As Torthere, his predecessor, was alive in 727, his appointment falls within those dates, and he must have been one of the last bishops consecrated by archbishop Brihtwald. Cuthbert, his successor at Hereford, was consecrated about the year 736 by Nothelm; Walhstod's episcopate must, therefore, have been very short. His name does not appear in charters, and his existence would have been known only from Bede's mention of him had not William of Malmesbury preserved the few lines of epitaph in which Cuthbert commemorated the names of his predecessors (*G. P.* iv. § 163), and another inscription on a cross which Walhstod began and Cuthbert himself completed:—

> "Haec veneranda crucis Christi veneranda sacratae
> Coeperat antistes venerandus nomine Walhstod
> Argenti atque auri fabricare monilibus amplis.
> Sed, quia cuncta cadunt mortalia tempore certo,
> Ipse opere in medio moriens e carne recessit.
> Ast ego successor praefati praesulis ipse
> Pontificis, tribuente Deo, qui munere fungor,
> Quique gero certum Cudbert de luce vocamen,
> Omissum implevi quod ceperat ordine pulchro."

These lines and the accompanying epitaph are, if genuine, two of the most interesting minor relics of eighth century history in England, besides charters and councils. [S.]

WALPURGA, abbess. [WALBURGIS.]

WAMBA, king of Spain, was elected notwithstanding his real or feigned reluctance, on the day of the death of his predecessor Reccesvinth (Sept. 1, A.D. 672) at Gerticos in the territory of Salamanca, where Reccesvinth had died. His anointing (the first instance of the ceremony in Spain) was deferred till he reached Toledo nineteen days later, where it was performed by bishop QUIRICUS.

The beginning of his reign was disturbed by a formidable rising in Septimania, probably because it, with the eastern part of the peninsula, had taken no part in the election, headed by Hilderic, Count of Nismes, GUMILDUS, bishop of Maguelonne, and abbat Ranimir. Aregius, bishop of Nismes, who refused to join, was handed over in chains by Hilderic to the custody of the Franks, while Ranimir was un-

the rebels, who proceeded to ravage the lands of the loyalists. Wamba at once despatched the dux Paulus to put down the revolt. That ambitious man however delayed on the way, won over to his side Ranosind and Hildigis, the dux and a Garding of the province of Tarragona, and by a sudden march made himself master of Narbonne, though bishop Argebad, who had heard of his designs, endeavoured to secure the town. He then threw off the mask, convoked an assembly, set the example of renouncing his allegiance to Wamba, and summoned his audience to elect another king. His confederate Ranosind then proposed Paulus himself, to whom all were made to swear allegiance. He easily induced Hilderic and his confederates to join him, and thus all Septimania and a considerable part of Tarraconensis, including Gerona and Barcelona, were united in rebellion. Paulus, after garrisoning the chief towns in his power, hired mercenaries from the Franks and Basques, the means for which he found by plundering the churches, and awaited the approach of summer to march into Spain. The sons of distinguished Franks were sent by the king to Paulus as hostages for the fulfilment of his treaty with him. Wamba was engaged in a campaign against the Basques when he received the news of the treason of Paulus, perhaps accompanied by his bombastic challenge. Without waiting to collect a larger army, he marched immediately against the rebels. After harrying the Basque country for seven days, and compelling them to pay tribute and give hostages, he marched through Calahorra and Huesca, on Barcelona and Gerona, which he recovered. After resting his army at the foot of the Pyrenees for two days he attacked in three divisions, the right by the coast road, the centre by the passes from Vich, and the left by Puigcerda. All were completely successful. Ranosind and Hildigis, who commanded the Frankish auxiliaries were taken prisoners by the central column, and bishop JACINCTUS, who tried to defend Puigcerda, shared the same fate. Wamba, after halting two days to concentrate, sent on a picked detachment accompanied by a fleet to Narbonne, where Witimir commanded for Paulus. On his refusal to surrender, Wamba's troops attacked the town and carried it by escalade after a three hours' fight. Beziers Agde and Maguelonne fell before Wamba's victorious march, bishop GUMILDUS flying from the last to Nismes, the last refuge of the rebels. After a night march Wamba's vanguard appeared before that city and assaulted it. The fight lasted all day with no decisive result, and Wamba sent during the night a reinforcement of 10,000 men. After the assault lasted another day, at six o'clock Wamba's troops forced an entrance. The remnant of the defenders took refuge in the amphitheatre, after slaying some of the assailants who had dispersed to plunder. Others turned their arms against each other, suspecting treachery. Paulus and his Spaniards in particular some believed had secured their own lives by betraying the city. In this scene of horror and confusion Paulus laid aside his royal robes and fled for refuge to the amphitheatre. By a strange coincidence it was the 1st of September, the anniversary of Wamba's camped four miles from the city, and obtained a promise to spare their lives. Paulus and twenty-six of his principal adherents were dragged from the vaults of the amphitheatre and led before the king with a multitude of Gauls and Franks. Immense treasures were also taken. The Franks and Saxons Wamba dismissed, the others were placed in strict custody. The portions of the treasure that had been taken from churches Wamba replaced, and ordered the dead to be buried, the damaged walls and gates of the town to be repaired, and restored to the townsmen what had been taken from them. On the third day after his victory Paulus was led in chains before the king, was obliged to place his neck under his foot and was sentenced to decalvation. To meet an alarm of a Frankish attack a camp was rapidly thrown up, and an actual invasion into the territory of Bozius under the duke Lupus was repelled by Wamba's rapid march five days after his victory. He then remained some time at Narbonne, provided for the government of the province, and expelled the Jews. He disbanded his army at Canaba and returned to Toledo six months after he had left it for his campaign against the Basques. He entered the city in triumph, Paulus and his accomplices being paraded with shaven heads, shorn beards, and bare feet, in attire of camel's hair, Paulus wearing in mockery a black leather crown. All their property was confiscated and they were thrown into prison, where they remained till the thirteenth council of Toledo in A.D. 683.

Wamba's attention had been directed by these events to the inadequacy of the national defence against invasion or rebellion, and on the 1st of November he promulgated two laws of great severity (*Liber Judicum*, x. (2), 8, 9). The first enacted that in case of invasion or rebellion everyone, whether cleric or layman, within 100 miles of the spot, whether he received a summons or otherwise heard of the event, was, with all his dependents to repair with all speed to where his presence was required. A bishop, priest or deacon who failed to perform his duty, if his property was insufficient to make good the mischief done by the enemy, was to be banished, while clerics in minor orders and laymen had their property confiscated, and were reduced to slavery. Absolute incapacity from illness was the only excuse. The second related to the case of those who when the king or a duke or count called out the militia of the kingdom, or of any district, failed to present themselves at the appointed day and place. Such a person, if a duke, count or garding was punished with forfeiture of all his property and banishment; if of inferior rank, with 200 stripes and decalvation and a fine of a pound of gold, and if he was unable to pay, with slavery. Illness, infancy, old age or the king's leave were the only excuses. Each person was to bring with him a tenth part of his slaves properly armed and equipped. Finally heavy penalties were imposed on any officer who for a bribe or otherwise excused any person under his jurisdiction from fulfilling the above-mentioned duties.

According to Isidorus Pacensis, Wamba, in the third year of his reign, further carried out his

later, attributes to him a great naval victory over the Saracens who had made a descent on Spain, the whole fleet of 270 ships being burnt. This late authority is perhaps confirmed by the fact, known from Julian, that Wamba possessed a navy.

The year A.D. 675 was marked by the meeting of two provincial councils, the third (and last) of Braga, and the eleventh of Toledo. The former assembled after September 1st. After reciting the creed they enacted eight canons, some of which give curious information as to the abuses prevalent in that part of Spain. They first prohibited using milk, or grapes instead of wine in the Eucharist, and also the practice of administering the bread dipped in the wine, and prescribed the use of the mixed chalice. The second forbade a priest to use the communion plate for secular purposes; the third ordered priests to wear stoles at mass; the fourth forbade the old abuse of clerics having women in their houses; the fifth forbade a singular practice. Some bishops on saints' days used to place relics, or, according to another interpretation, reserved fragments of consecrated bread on their necks, and then as being themselves the reliquary or ciborium have themselves carried in litters by deacons wearing albs. The sixth canon forbade bishops beating the inferior clergy, the seventh forbade simony, and the eighth forbade ecclesiastics to employ the church serfs on their own property instead of that of the church. The council of Toledo, which was a provincial one, met on November 7th. The bishops spent the first three days fasting in drawing up a confession of faith, which is prefixed to the canons. The first related to the order and decorum to be observed in a council; the second enjoined on bishops the duty of study and teaching; the third directed that a uniform ritual should be employed in the province; by the fourth priests who were at enmity with each other were forbidden to partake of the eucharist; the fifth regulated the punishment of criminal bishops. They were to pay out of their private property the fine imposed by law, and were subject in addition to excommunication for a fortnight. If their private property was insufficient, as they could not be sold as slaves, to prevent their using the church property to pay the fine, instead of the fine penance was imposed according to a certain scale, e. g. twenty days' penance was equivalent to a fine of ten solidi, and so in proportion. In particular a bishop who had seduced the wife, daughter, or other kinswoman of a magnate, was punished with degradation, banishment and excommunication till the end of his life. The same penalty was imposed on those who had committed murder or any crime against men and women of rank, the punishment for which in the case of a layman was retaliation or delivery to the person injured. The necessity for such legislation shows the low state of morality among the Spanish clergy. The sixth forbade priests to try cases involving loss of life or limb; the seventh forbade bishops to punish immoderately those subject to them; the eighth forbade selling the sacraments; the ninth imposed an oath on bishops before their persons before ordination that they would hold the Catholic faith and observe canonical obedience and pay due respect to their superiors; the eleventh dealt with the case of a person who in receiving the sacrament had taken the bread, but was from bodily infirmity unable to swallow it; the twelfth forbade delay in receiving a dying penitent; the thirteenth forbade priests possessed by demons to officiate; the fourteenth directed that a priest performing mass should if possible always be accompanied by a substitute in case of illness; while the fifteenth directed that a council should be held annually.

A further proof of the degraded condition of the superior clergy is the law enacted the following Christmas (*Liber Judicum* v. (1). 6) to check the rapacity of bishops. They were in the habit of seizing offerings made to the churches of their diocese, and either transferring them to their cathedrals, or appropriating them themselves, or giving them away. Recovery was barred by thirty years' prescription, but Wamba abolished this for the future, and also in cases where the 30 years had not been completed at the date of the law. A bishop unable to make satisfaction was to work out the deficiency on the principles of the above cited fifth canon. The bishop was to show to every priest before institution all documents in his possession relating to the property of the church to which he was instituted. Another law passed at the same time forbade manumitted slaves of the church who were not absolutely free, but whose status was that of serfdom to the church to which they had belonged, intermarrying with free persons.

The division of the dioceses of Spain, attributed to Wamba, which first appears in the *Codex Ovetensis*, written by Pelayo, bishop of Oviedo (A.D. 1101–1121) (the document and a critical examination thereof will be found in *Esp. Sag.* iv. 181–252), is a forgery of much later date, composed with the object of exalting the antiquity and dignity of the sees of Oviedo and Leon, but it appears by the fourth canon of the 12th council of Toledo, that Wamba erected certain new bishoprics, the positions of two of which are mentioned, namely, one in the monastery of Aquis, in the province of Merida, and another in a suburb of Toledo, in the church of St. Peter and St. Paul. These new sees were suppressed by the council.

The end of Wamba's reign did not correspond with its glorious commencement. His military reforms were no doubt felt oppressive by the magnates, and especially by the bishops, who were now for the first time obliged to render service, and they must also have been offended by his attempt to check their rapacity, and by his curtailing their sees in forming new ones. To his former panegyrist, JULIAN, who had become bishop of Toledo in January A.D. 680, the establishment of the suburban see above mentioned must have been particularly offensive. ERVIG availed himself of these materials to form a powerful conspiracy; a narcotic was administered to Wamba, and as he was supposed to be dying he was tonsured and dressed in the habit of a monk. When he came to his senses, he found resistance was in vain, and retired into

he monastery of Pampliega, after signing two locuments, one nominating Ervig as his sucessor, and the other directing Julian of Toledo o anoint him. Wamba's deposition took place n October 14th, 680. Wamba, like most deosed sovereigns, did not long survive his deposiion, as he died in the following year. Though he poison is first mentioned by Sebastian of alamanca (in *Esp. Sag.* xiii. 476), it naturally vould not have been noticed in the proceedings f the twelfth council, and Wamba's illness does ot appear to have been a natural one, and from he second canon of the twelfth council it ppears that he was unconscious when he assumed he monastic dress.

Authorities. The *Historia Wambae*, by JULIAN f Toledo, is a full and well written account of is first year, to which the *Judicium* drawn up y the same hand serves as a supplement. For he rest of the reign we have the *Acta* of hird council of Braga, and the eleventh and welfth of Toledo, the laws above referred to, nd the chronicles, meagre as usual, of Isiorus Pacensis, Sebastian of Salamanca, and the *'hron. Albeldense.* Modern notices of Wamba ill be found in Dahn, *die Könige der Germanen*, . 205, Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (2) 159, and 'elfferich, *Entstehung und Geschichte des Westothen-Rechts*, 185. [F. D.]

WANDO, twelfth abbat of Fontanelle (Saint-'andrille), in Normandy, entered the monastery bout the close of the 7th century, in the second ear of Hildebert, the fourth abbat, and added nsiderably to the lands of the community from is own possessions. In 716 St. Benignus, the en abbat, having incurred the displeasure of aginfredus, mayor of the palace in Neustria, as ejected from Fontanelle and Wando put in s place. But he retained the office for three ars only, after which he was exiled to Utrecht Charles Martel for assisting his patron Ragined. In the battle of Vincy Wando fought in rson, perhaps the first instance of the kind, d the defeated Raginfred escaped on his horse. 742, the office being vacant, the monks unaniously demanded Wando for abbat. He brought th him relics of St. Servatius, whose monastery d sheltered him in banishment, and built a urch at Fontanelle for their reception. After ven years he became blind from old age, and th his concurrence Austrulphus was chosen as successor. The annals of the monastery reunt the lands, the gold and silver plate, and pecially the numerous books with which he enhed the foundation. He was "amator ecclesiam semperque de lege Domini meditationem ere volebat." He was still alive in 756, but obably died about that year on April 11, on iich day the Bollandists mention him among praetermissi, since, though sometimes enled beatus, he appears never to have been mally commemorated (*Acta SS.* Apr. ii. 476). r his history see *Chartae Fontanellenses*, 3, 13; rtz, *Germania, Scriptor.* ii. 277, 286; *Gall. rist.* xi. 168, 171. [S. A. B.]

WANDREGISILUS (WANDO), **ST.**, founder d first abbat of the famous monastery of Fonelle in Normandy, called, in later times, after n (Saint-Wandrille or Vandrille). He was rn in the district of Verdun, his father, Walchisus, being a kinsman of Pippin the elder. Reared in the court of king Dagobert, where he held high office, and wedded, in obedience to his parents, about the year 629 he was taken with the desire of renouncing the world. He separated from his wife, and became a monk at Mons Falconis, in Champagne, but soon migrated to Elisang, where he built himself a cell and lived in the practice of austerities till about 635, when, with three followers, he crossed the Alps into Italy to visit Bobbio and Rome. On his return, the following year, he took up his abode as a monk at Romain-Moûtier in the Jura. Here he stayed some years, and then made his way to Rouen, where the archbishop St. Ouen ordained him to the priesthood. His wanderings came to an end when he resolved to found the monastery of Fontanelle, on a little tributary of the Seine, where he and his nephew St. Godo purchased, or received as a gift, a piece of land from Erchinoald, the mayor of the palace. Here he cleared the forest and built four churches, which Dado, or Audoenus (St. Ouen), archbishop of Rouen consecrated. The date of the foundation is given as March 1, 648. Godo went to Rome for relics and books. Three hundred monks soon gathered about him; and after an uneventful rule of 19 years 4 months and 21 days, Wandregisilus died July 22, 667, and was buried in one of the churches he had erected. His successor was Bainus.

The principal authority for his life is the biography of a monk, who had lived with him at Fontanelle and perhaps at Romain-Moûtier, and who asserts in his preface that what he writes he had either seen himself or heard from eyewitnesses. It was published by Labbe, and is also to be found in the collections of Mabillon and the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Jul. v. 265–271). It is a rude but genuine production. Another biography, also given by Mabillon and the Bollandists (*ibid.* pp. 272–281), purports to be contemporary; but in spite of the opinion of the older critics (Boll. *ibid.* p. 253; *Hist. Litt.* iii. 612), there is no doubt that it consists merely of interpolations into the former, and that the prefatory epistle to Lantbert, the contemporary archbishop of Lyons, is a forgery (see Roth, *Geschichte der Beneficialwesens*, p. 443; Pertz, *Scriptor.* ii. 271). The other authority is the *Gesta Abbatum Fontanellensium*, the records of the monastery, best given by Pertz (*Germania, Scriptores*, ii. 271 sqq.).

For the history of Fontanelle see the *Gesta* above referred to, and *Gall. Christ.* xi. 155. [S. A. B.]

WANINGUS (VANENG), **ST.**, founder of the monastery of Fécamp (A.D. 658) and patron of the monastery of Ham in Picardy, was one of the primi palatii of Clotaire III., and count or prefect of the district of Caux, a royal chase. About 648 he assisted St. Wandregisilus in the founding of Fontanelle, helped to endow it, and entrusted his son Desideratus to the abbat to be educated as a monk. About ten years later, after recovering from a dangerous illness, he built a nunnery in the valley of Fécamp, and a body of more than 300 nuns was soon collected, under an abbess, Childemarcha. Here St. Leger, expelled from his diocese and mutilated, was placed in his custody. The prisoner won his reverence, and was tenderly cared for by the

iv. 815, 816; *Vita S. Wandregisili*, iii. 16, Boll. *ibid.* Jul. v. 277; *Vita S. Leodegarii*, iii., Boll. *ibid.* Oct. i. 474, 475; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 201; Chr. Labbe, *Vie de Saint Vaneng*, ed. Michel Hardy, 1873.) [S. A. B.]

WAREMUND. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461.) [WEREMUND (2).] [C. H.]

WARIMBERTUS (GARIMBERT), twenty-third bishop of Soissons, was abbat of St. Médard, and succeeded Drausius, but apparently was an intruder, in the see of Soissons: he was accused of diverting the funds of the monastery to the purposes of the see, and the monks rebelled, but they were driven from the church where they had taken refuge and the bishop prevailed. He died c. A.D. 680 (*Gall. Christ.* ix. 338). [J. G.]

WARNEFRID. [PAULUS (70) DIACONUS.]

WARNULPHUS, said to have been one of the Irish missionaries who went to the continent in the 7th century. He was bishop, and died in his monastery at Condé about A.D. 640. His chief feast is Oct. 1; also Jan. 10, Mar. 27. (The chief authority is Molanus, *Nat. SS. Belg.* Oct. 1; see also Colgan, *Acta SS.* 50–1; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 163.) [J. G.]

WATTUS, king, attesting a charter of Nothelm, king of South Saxons, 692, and one of Nunna, king of the same, 725. (Kemble, *C. D.* 995, 1000.) [C. H.]

WENDELINUS, ST., a solitary in the district of Trèves in the 7th century. The Bollandists publish the oldest life out of four known to them, but even that is subsequent to the year 1417, and is but a meagre legendary narrative. The story is that he was "exortus Scotorum regione," *i.e.* probably an Irishman, who came to the country of Trèves and there herded swine and led the hermit's life. After his death he became famous for miracles, and especially for extinguishing a fire at Saarbrücken (*Acta SS.* Oct. ix. 348, 349). Late legend and untrustworthy documents make him the son of a king (*ibid.* 343, 344, 350). The first abbat of Theolegium (Tholey) was a Wendalinus, who died about 650 (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 561), but whether identical with this one or not cannot be said with certainty. The evidence for two of the name is collected by Heber, *Vorkarolingischen Christl. Glaubenshelden am Rhein*, p. 172 sqq. His day is Oct. 21. The town of St. Wendel probably takes its name from him. For his cult see Heber, *ibid.* [S. A. B.]

WEOHTHUN, bishop. [WIOTHUN.]

WERBURGA (1), queen of Kent. [WIHTRED.]

WERBURGA (2), the daughter of Wulfhere, king of Mercia, by his wife St. Eormenhild, the daughter of Earcombert, king of Kent, and Sexburga. She, like her mother and grandmother, was a devoted abbess. Florence of Worcester, to whom we owe the most ancient

to the office of abbess in some of the Mercian monasteries, in one of which, Trickingham, she died. Her body was removed from Trickingham to Heanbirig (Handbury) by her order, and buried there; where it was found incorrupt at the time of the Danish invasion (Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 534). The Ely historians have much more to tell about her (ed. Stewart, lib. i. cc. 17, 24, 36, 37). According to their account Sexburga, who had been abbess of Minster in Sheppey after her husband's death, removed to Ely, where she succeeded St. Etheldreda as abbess, and left Minster to Eormenhild her daughter. When Sexburga died, Eormenhild succeeded her at Ely, and left Minster to Werburga, who had, in the meanwhile, received Trickingham and Handbury from king Ethelred (cc. 24, 36). On Eormenhild's death, Werburga succeeded at Ely; she was, however, as Florence reported, buried at Handbury, about five miles from Repton, whence, according to later writers (Higden, *Poly. Chr.* Bromton, c. 810), in 875, when Burhred, king Mercia, was driven by the Danes from Repton, she was translated to Chester. The devotion of Werburga to her work is highly lauded by the Ely writer, and she seems very early to have had a reputation for working miracles.

The biography written by Gotselin (*AA. SS.* Feb. i. 387) adds little to our historical knowledge. It enlarges on Werburga's virtues, and records several of her miracles, but seems to have been written in ignorance of her later relations to Ely or Minster. One of her miracles was the driving of wild geese, which were damaging the village of Weedon, into a stable; in the morning the geese came running to her as if to ask leave to fly away. A greedy rustic kept back one of the flock; the rest came back to implore its release. No wild geese afterwards showed themselves on Werburga's land. On another occasion she miraculously caused the head of a steward, who was scourging a holy man named Ailnoth, to turn round on his shoulders: he was subsequently restored at the intercession of Werburga. (See also W. Malmesb. *G. P.* iv. § 123.)

According to this version of the legend Werburga was found incorrupt nine years after her death, in the reign of Ceolred, who died in 716; a fact which, if it rests on any basis of tradition, would prove her tenure of the abbacy at Ely to be very short. Gotselin does not mention her translation to Chester.

As her connexion with Chester is not the least important point of her history, it is curious to find great uncertainty as to the circumstances of the foundation of her abbey there. But there seems no reason to doubt that her relics were carried thither during the Danish troubles, and that her cultus may have survived during the century intervening before her church was endowed by Leofric about the year 1057 (*Mon. Angl.* ii. 370; W. Malmesb. *G. P.* iv. § 174; *G. R.* lib. ii. § 214). The church of St. Werburga, which up to the reformation was a Benedictine abbey, is now the cathedral of Chester; the old seat of the bishops of Lichfield, Chester, and Coventry, was at St. John's.

The renown of St. Werburga, considering how very little is known of her life, is so far spread as to justify us in believing that the Ely historians preserved some true traditions about her. Not only is the great church at Chester dedicated in her name, but at least eight churches in other parts of England are called after her. One of these, Hoo St. Werburgh, lies at no great distance from Sheppey; others are at Derby, Bristol, Warburton in Cheshire, Kingsley in Staffordshire, Blackwell in Derbyshire, Wenbury in Devonshire, Warbustow in Cornwall, and one in Dublin. The names of Werburgewic in Mercia (K. *C. D.* 78, 217) and Werburghingland in Thanet (Elmham, p. 19) may denote property which was either by dedication or inheritance connected with her, or with some other Werburga. The 3rd of February is St. Werburga's day; but William of Worcester (pp. 142, 165) assigns June 21 to St. Werburga of Chester, and February 3 to a saint of the same name unlocalized. On the connexion of Werburga with the legend of Wulfhad and Rufinus, see WULFHERE; as to the literature on St. Werburga, none of which is important, see Hardy, *Cat. Materials*, i. 421–423, and Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, February 3. A metrical life composed by Henry Bradshaw was printed by Pynson in 1521. [S.]

WERBURGA (3), wife of Ceolred, king of the Mercians. Her death is mentioned in the Chronicle as having taken place in 782 (*M. H. B.* 336), which is corrected by Simeon of Durham (*ib.* 666) to 783. As Ceolred died in 716 his widow must have survived him sixty-six years, and have been more than eighty years of age. Simeon describes her as "abbatissa," but does not fix her to any monastery. Possibly Bardney, which was the favourite house of Ethelred, her father-in-law, may have come into her hands as dower or inheritance. [S.]

WEREMUND (1) (WERMUND), the sixth bishop of Worcester, in the ancient lists (*M. H. B.* p. 622). He succeeded bishop Milred, who died in 775, according to Florence (*M. H. B.* 544), and died, according to the same authority, in 778 (*ib.* 545). The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle places Milred's death in 772, which may be adjusted two years according to the rule applicable to this portion of the annals (*ib.* 334). His name occurs in the attestation of a charter of Offa (Kemb. *C. D.* 120) assigned to the year 772, but corrected by the Indiction to 775, and another undated, but falling between 775 and 777 (*C. D.* 134). Nothing more is known of him. (Thomas, *Hist. Worcester*, pp. 17, 18). [S.]

WEREMUND (2) (WERMUND), the fourteenth bishop of Rochester (*M. H. B.* p. 616). He succeeded bishop Diora, who was alive in 781, and is last heard of in 803. His death, noted in the Chronicle (*M. H. B.* 547) in 802 probably took place in 804, when Beornmod succeeded. His episcopate coincides with the critical portion of Canterbury history which turns on the attempt of Offa to erect Lichfield into an archiepiscopal see. Weremund's first appearance is at the Legatine council, probably held at Chelsea in 787, the decrees of which he attests as "Waremundus episcopus," and in which possibly the division of the province of Canterbury was determined on (*Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461; Wilkins, i. 151). He attests another act of a council held at the same place in 789 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 465), and some grants of Offa made at the same time (*C. D.* 155, 156, 157), one of which (no. 155) is a grant to him of land for the enlargement of his monastery, and another a grant of land at Bromley, the very ancient possession of his see (no. 157). His name is attached to the doubtful charter of Offa, granted to St. Alban's in 793 (*ib.* 162) to a grant made at Clovesho in 794 (*ib.* 167), and to a spurious grant of Offa to Christ Church, Canterbury, in 795 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 485). He was present at the council of Clovesho in 803, in which the archbishopric of Lichfield was abolished, and attests two important acts of that assembly, which he attended with five priests and one deacon (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 542, 547; Kemble, *C. D.* 183, 1024). He was alive as late as October 12, 803; the profession of his successor, Beornmod, made to archbishop Ethelheard, who died in 805, may thus probably be referred to the year 804 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 550). [S.]

WERENBERT (WERENBERHT, WAERENBERHT), the seventh bishop of the Middle Angles at Leicester (*M. H. B.* 624). He succeeded Unwona, in or after the year 799, and his existence is traceable in charters to the year 814, his successor Hrethun appearing first in 816 (Kemble, *C. D.* 183, 184, 185, 186, 190, 191, 203, 206, 207, 1024). He was present at the council of Clovesho in 803, in which the archiepiscopate of Lichfield was abolished (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 547; Kemble, *C. D.* 1024), attesting the acts as "Legorensis civitatis episcopus," with four priests, abbats, and six other priests, one of whom was Beonna of Medeshamsted. He had a dispute at the same time with bishop Aldulf of Lichfield, which was settled in the council (*C. D.* 184; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 545). [S.]

WERMUND. (Kemble, *C. D.* 1018; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 518.) [WEREMUND (1).] [C. H.]

WERMUND. (Kemble, *C. D.* 159, 162; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 480.) [WEREMUND (2).] [C. H.]

WERNBRIHT. (Kemble, *C. D.* 1018; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 518.) [WERENBERT.] [C. H.]

WETHUN. (Kemble, *C. D.* 1012, 1015.) [WIOTHUN.] [C. H.]

WICTERPUS, bishop of Ratisbon and Augsburg, died 654. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 18 Apr. ii. 548.) See other authorities in Chevalier's *Sources*, p. 2341. [C. H.]

WIETHBERHT, a priest, who, along with the abbats Coengils and Ingeld, was addressed by the abbat Aldhun and the abbesses Cneuburga and Coenburga on a proposal for united prayer, 729–744 (Bonif. *Ep.* 46, ed. Jaffé; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 342). He was one of Boniface's missionaries to the Hessians and Saxons (*Ep.* 98), and Mabillon (*Acta SS., O.S.B.*, saec. iii. pt. i. p. 625) identifies him with Wigbert abbat of Fritzlar. [C. H.]

the pagan Frisians and Rathbedus or Ratbod their king. After two years of unavailing labour he returned to Ireland and continued his anchoretic life, while Egbert sent Willibrord and eleven others to renew the mission (Bed. *H. E.* v. 9). The year of Wigbert's mission was probably cir. 690. As to the region called by Bede Fresia, which Bede's editor Smith thought might be Holland, see Moberly's note on Bed. v. 10. [C. H.]

WIGBERT (2), abbat of Fritzlar, ob. c. 747, a coadjutor with St. Boniface in his German apostolate (Bonif. *Ep.* 64 in Jaffé, *Monum. Mog.* 183). His life by Servatus Lupus, c. 836, is given by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 13 Aug. iii. 133), and a manuscript of it is described by Hardy (*Desc. Cat.* i. 471). [C. H.]

WIGBERT (3), a priest, who on his return from Germany to Britain addressed two letters to Lullus archbishop of Mainz [755–786] (Jaffé, *Monum. Mogunt*, Epp. 136, 137). [C. H.]

WIGBERT (4) (WIGBERHT, WIGBRIGHT, WIBERT), the sixth bishop of Sherborne in the ancient lists (*M. H. B.* 620). He succeeded bishop Denefrith between 796 and 801, and may have been the bishop whose profession of obedience made at consecration to archbishop Ethelheard is still extant (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 529, 530). His name appears among the attestations of grants from 801 onwards (Kemb. *C. D.* n. 180, 183, 184, 190, 191, 197, 1024); and at the council of Clovesho in 803 he attended as Sciraburnensis ecclesiae episcopus, with three abbats (*ib.* 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 541–545). In this council he had a quarrel with bishop Alhmund of Winchester, which was settled (*C. D.* 184; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 545). In 812, according to the chronicle (*M. H. B.* p. 340), which should probably be read 814, he went to Rome with archbishop Wulfred. In that year he attests a charter of Kenulf (*C. D.* no. 207), probably after his return. In 816 he was at the council of Chelsea (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 579), and his name is attached to one of Kenulf's charters of the same year (*C. D.* no. 210). His successor, bishop Heahstan, appears as *electus* in 824, so it is possible that Wigbert survived until that year, but nothing more is known of him. [S.]

WIGBERT (5), presbyter, witnessing a charter of Deneberht, bishop of Worcester, c. 802, and another of Kenulf, king of Mercia in 814 (Kemble, *C. D.* 181, 206). [C. H.]

WIGBODUS (WIGBOLD or WIGBALDE), a writer of the time of Charlemagne, who composed a commentary, in the shape of a dialogue, on the first eight books of the Old Testament (Genesis to Ruth) out of patristic sources. He made considerable use of Junilius, a sixth-century writer who helped to circulate the opinions of Theodore of Mopsuestia in the West [JUNILIUS]. Junilius used the same dialogue form. Wigbod's work will be found in Migne *P. L.* t. xcvi. col. 1102 (cf. Martene's *Collect. Ampliss.* t. ix. p. 293; Ceill. xii. 149). It is useful as affording a convenient summary of

Lichfield, at the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803 (Kemble, *C. D.* 1024). [C. H.]

WIGHARD (1), a benefactor, who, according to a doubtful charter (Kemble, *C. D.* 13), dated October 672, bestowed forty "manentes" at Slaepi on the monastery of the abbess Bernguidi, who was abbess of Bath (*Monast. Anglic.* ii. 256). [C. H.]

WIGHARD (2), a priest of Canterbury, and one of the clergy of archbishop Deusdedit, who, on the death of that prelate, was selected by the kings, Egbert and Oswy, "with the election and consent of the church of the nation of the English," to be archbishop of Canterbury. He was sent to Rome for consecration, with strong recommendations and magnificent presents to pope Vitalian. He had time to inform Vitalian of his errand, but soon after, and before he could be consecrated, he and nearly all the companions of his mission died of pestilence (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 29; iv. 1; *Vitae Abb.* § 3). It is to be observed that Wighard is described by Bede in language that indicates that he was not a monk: he is characterised as a presbyter, a good man and fit for the episcopate, and as most learned in ecclesiastical discipline. His journey to Rome and his death belong to the latter half of 664. The see of Canterbury remained vacant until the consecration of Theodore in 668. [S.]

WIGHARD (3), a presbyter of the diocese of London, at the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803 (Kemble, *C. D.* 1024). [C. H.]

WIGHEARD, a presbyter at the council of Clovesho, Oct. 6, 803 (Kemble, *C. D.* 183; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 542); a presbyter of the diocese of Rochester at the same on Oct. 12, 803 (*C. D.* 1024; H. and S. 547); an abbat attesting a charter of Kenulf, king of Mercia, in 816 (*C. D.* 209). [C. H.]

WIGHEH (WIGHEAH, corruptly WIGHED), the eighth bishop of London, the successor of Ecgwulf, and predecessor of Eadbriht (*M. H. B.* 617). His name is attached to a charter of the year 772, in which Offa of Mercia grants land in Sussex to bishop Osa of Selsey (MS. Lambeth 1212, f. 387; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 402), a date which harmonises sufficiently well with his place in the list. Nothing whatever is known of him. [S.]

WIGMUND, abbat, at the council of Clovesho, in 794 (Kemble, *C. D.* 164, 167; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 484, 485); at another in 798 (*C. D.* 175; H. & S. 515); a presbyter abbat of the diocese of Leicester at the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803 (*C. D.* 185, 1024; H. & S. 544, 546), and attesting a charter of Kenulf, king of Mercia in 814 (*C. D.* 207). [C. H.]

WIGNOTH, a bishop, attesting the charter of Kenulf, king of Mercia, 811, for the foundation of the monastery of Winchelcomb. The see of Exeter is bracketed to him, but Haddan and Stubbs make him identical with Wigthen, of Winchester (Kemble, *C. D.* 197; H. & S. iii. 574, and note). [C. H.]

WIGTHEGN, presbyter of the diocese of Winchester at the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803 (Kemble, *C. D.* 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546). [C. H.]

WIGTHEN (WIGTHEIN, WIGTHEGN), the fourteenth bishop of Winchester (*M. H. B.* 619), coming between Alhmund, who is last heard of in 805, and Herefrith; and attesting charters from 811 to 828. His profession of obedience made to archbishop Wulfred on the occasion of his consecration is extant (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 569). He calls himself there "ad episcopalem sedem Wentanae civitatis electus." He was present at the council of Chelsea in 816 (*ib.* p. 579), and at a synod at Clovesho in 824 (*ib.* 593). In 825, or thereabouts, another bishop is found in Wessex, for whom it is somewhat difficult to account, Herefrith, who, likewise as elect of Winchester, makes profession to Wulfred, and who attests five charters of king Egbert between 825 and 833, which are also attested by Wigthen (Kemble, *C. D.* 1033–1039). All these charters are contained in the Codex Wintoniensis, which is open to some suspicion, but the coincidence of the names is justified by the chronicle, which, in giving an account of the battle of Carrum (sub. ann. 833) adds a note of the death of both Wigthen and Herefrith (*M. H. B.* 844). It may be conjectured either that Herefrith was ordained as coadjutor to Wigthen, of which there is no indication in the profession; or that there were two contemporaneous bishops in one city, which was to the last degree uncanonical; or that Wessex being in the process of subdivision into dioceses without fixed sees, as was clearly the case a few years later, two bishops might take their title from Winchester; or finally that the attestations of the charters are forged, and that Herefrith was consecrated and died after Wigthen's death, in the same year. [S.]

WIHTBALD, presbyter at the council of Clovesho in 716 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 300). [C. H.]

WIHTBERD, bishop, attesting a doubtful charter of Eadbert, king of Wessex, in 801 (Kemble, *C. D.* 178). [WIGBERT (4).] [C. H.]

WIHTBURGA, a daughter of Anna, king of the East Angles, sister of St. Etheldreda, and under her a nun at Ely. She was the reputed foundress of the monastery of Dereham. According to some of the MSS. of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the body of Wihtburga was found at Dereham in 798, fifty-five years after her death (*M. H. B.* 340; Flor. Wig., *ib.* 546). According to the tradition at Ely, Wihtburga was nursed at Holkham, where, in after years, a church was built in her honour and called Withburgstowe. On her father's death she became a nun at Dereham, about 20 miles from her home; having nothing to feed the workmen who were building her monastery, she had a vision of the Blessed Virgin, who directed her where to find two does, with whose milk she supported them. The profane reeve of the township hunted the does, but his horse ran away with him and his neck was broken. Wihtburga died on the 17th of March. If fifty-five years had elapsed when her remains were discovered in 798, she must have been at least ninety at the time of her death, as Anna died in 654. In 974 abbat Brihtnoth, on the 8th of July, removed her body to Ely, where he buried her with her sisters Etheldreda and Sexburga; and with them she was translated into the new church in 1106. At Dereham a spring of the purest water flowed from the ground where she was first buried; the well is still flowing. See Hardy, *Catalogue of Materials*, i. 264, 469, 470; *Mon. Angl.* ii. 176, 177; *AA. SS.* Bolland. March, vol. ii. p. 605. [S.]

WIHTHUN, abbat, subscribing a charter of Offa, king of Mercia, in 767 (Kemble, *C. D.* 116). [C. H.]

WIHTHUN (WIHTUN). (Kemble, *C. D.* 162, 183, 185; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 480, 542, 544.) [WIOTHUN.] [C. H.]

WIHTRED, king of Kent. He was a son of Egbert, who reigned from 664 to 673, and brother of Eadric, who, after reigning conjointly or in rivalry with Hlothere until 685, died in 686 or 687. [EGBERT, EADRIC.] Wihtred was probably very young when Eadric died, and for some years, as Bede reports, kings of doubtful authority and foreign birth exercised a divided authority in Kent. One of these was Webheard or Swebheard, who may with great probability be identified with Swefred, son of the East Saxon king Sebbi [SUEFRED], and with whom, in the year 692 (*Chr. S. M. H. B.* 323), Wihtred was contesting the kingdom; another may have been the somewhat shadowy Oswin, whose name appears in doubtful charters of St. Augustine's (Kemble, *C. D.* 10, 30) about the year 689. Although Theodore was alive until the year 690, nothing more is known of the internal condition of Kent; but we learn from the Chronicle that in 694 Wihtred succeeded in getting possession of the kingdom. His reign of thirty-four years must be calculated from an intermediate date, as his death is placed by Bede in 725 (*H. E.* v. 24). Elmham argues with some force that the true date is 691 (p. 287). The year 694 probably marks the time at which he got rid of his competitor, who may have retired into Essex on the death of king Sebbi. Kent was doubtless in dispute between Mercian and West Saxon influences; Swebheard, belonging to a family reigning, by sufferance of Mercia, in Essex, may have represented the Mercian, whilst Wihtred, after the peace with Ine in 694, purchased by the wergild paid for the death of Mul who perished in 687, being burned by the Kentish men [CAEDWALLA, INE], was probably supported by the West Saxon king with whom he had much in common. In any case, however, his accession to power coincided in time very nearly with the succession of archbishop Brihtwald, who was consecrated in 693, and came to Canterbury in September of that year.

There are several documentary monuments of Wihtred's reign, nearly all open to disputed questions. The first is a dated grant, made July 17, 694, by the king and his wife Kynigitha, conveying land in Thanet to the abbess Aebba (*C. D.* 37; Elmham, p. 288), which may be regarded as of questionable authenticity, espe-

cially if Kynigitha be regarded as a misnomer, Wihtred's known wives being Ethelburga and Werburga. Two years after this, in the fifth year of his reign, therefore in 696, the ninth indiction, Wihtred held a great witenagemot at Berghamstede or Bersted, near Maidstone, at which the archbishop and bishop Gebmund of Rochester were present. In this assembly, and by decree of the great men, twenty-eight articles were added to the customary code of Kentish law. These are preserved in the Textus Roffensis, and printed among the Ancient Laws, and also among the acts of English councils in the several editions (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 233 sq.). Most of them are concerned with church privileges and the enforcement of Christian morality; in particular, enactments are directed against illicit intercourse, the immorality of foreigners, neglect by priests of duty and good conduct, working on Sunday, offerings to devils, eating meat on fast days, theft, and receiving of stolen goods; other articles concern the protection of church rights, the emancipation of slaves, the credibility of clergy and laity in courts of justice, and the treatment of strangers. The general bearing of the enactments is good, and there is no excessive severity in any of them. Nearly at the same time we find a grant made by Wihtred to the abbess Mildrytha (K., *C. D.* 39), which, owing to the occurrence of Gebmund's name among the witnesses, has been unreasonably suspected of forgery.

The document, however, by which Wihtred is best known, is the famous *Privilegium Wihtredi*, over which much obscurity hangs, and the importance of which has been somewhat exaggerated. It occurs in several forms; the one most likely to be genuine is found in the Canterbury Cartulary (*MS. Lambeth*, 1212), and is a copy made as early as 1220 from an original *landboc* or title deed, in the treasury of the convent; an abridgment of this, with some variations that may be accidental, is found in the Canterbury MS. of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (*M. H. B.* 324), which must be at least a century and a half older than the Cartulary. Another form containing some impossible matter is found in later MSS. and Cartularies (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 238 sq.). According to the best text, Wihtred, at some date between 696 and 716, held a witenagemot of Kent at Baccanceld or Bapchild, near Sittingbourne, attended by archbishop Brihtwald, bishop Tobias of Rochester and others, clergy and laity, in which was discussed the condition of the church and of the monasteries of Kent. After a preamble, explaining the duty of respecting sacred property, Wihtred proceeds to enjoin on his successors and all laymen that they shall not take to themselves the *dominium* of any church founded by him or his ancestors; when a church falls vacant the bishop of the diocese is to choose and ordain, after an examination, a fit person for the place, and in the archbishop's diocese no abbat or abbess is to be appointed without his leave; it is the king's place to appoint secular magistrates; it is the archbishop's to nominate, qualify, and govern ecclesiastical officers, abbots, abbesses, priests, and deacons. This rule is established for the several ancient monasteries — Upmynster (possibly St. Peter's in Thanet, or St. Augustine's), Reculver, Southminster (Minster in Thanet), Dover, Folkestone, Lyminge, Sheppey and Hoo: all monasteries known to have been in existence at the date. An additional clause confers on the cathedrals of Canterbury and Rochester, with the above-mentioned monasteries, immunity from royal exactions and usurpations; and another imprecates a curse of excommunication on transgressors of the privilege. The act is attested by Wihtred, his wife Werburga, and son Alric, archbishop Brihtwald, bishop Tobias, five abbesses, and nine priests. The abstract given in the Chronicle agrees for the most part with this, but extends over bishops, as well as abbats, the authority recognised in the archbishop, and omits the final clauses and attestation. The corrupt form referred to above agrees with the Chronicle in including bishops under the archbishop's authority, omits the enumeration of the Kentish churches, and extends the view of the document to the whole of England, using the form Anglia in a way that is unknown for some long time to come.

It is impossible to say whether the first of these forms is itself genuine; but the document appears to have, in one form or other, served as a model for similar privilegia ascribed to Ine and Ethelbald (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 247). It was confirmed in a council held at Clovesho in 716 (*ib.* p. 300); and of this also a spurious form exists, purporting to be issued at Cilline in the twenty-eighth year of Wihtred (*ib.* p. 246, Elmham, pp. 295–297). If the confirmation at Clovesho be genuine, it must be regarded as the act of an ecclesiastical council of the province of Canterbury; and the fact that it is dated by the regnal year of Ethelbald, who was even then the strongest king in the land, may show that it was held under his auspices.

After this nothing is certainly known of Wihtred's history. He is the traditional founder of the church of St. Martin at Dover, which must have been built before the privilegium was issued. He appears in other charters besides those noted above; there is a grant by him and Ethelburga to St. Augustine's in 696 (K., *C. D.* 41), another to abbess Aebba at Haeg (? Hoo) in 697 (*ib.* 42), another to Lyminge (*ib.* 44; Elmham, p. 295). A charter, granting land to Lyminge, dated in the month of July, thirteenth indiction, may belong to the year 700 or 715 (K., *C. D.* 47), and appears to be the original of which the charter of 697 is a garbled copy or duplicate; the land granted in one copy is Wieghelmstune, in the other Pleghelmstune, and the names of the witnesses are identical. In 724 a grant of Ethelbert, the son of Wihtred, with his father's assent, is preserved by Elmham (K., *C. D.* 72).

In 725 Wihtred died. He was buried at St. Augustine's. His obit was kept there on the 23rd of April, and he was the last Kentish king buried there. Three names of his wives occur in the documents already referred to, Kynigitha, Werburga and Ethelburga. The evidence for the first is questionable; the name of Werburga rests on the authority of the privilegium; and unless it be a misreading of the name, Ethelburga, belongs to a second or even third wife. Ethelburga is mentioned as queen in the charters of 696 and 697. Wihtred had, according to the pedigrees, two sons, Ethelbert and Eadbert, the latter of whom is confounded with Eadbert

Praen [EADBERT]. We know of a third, Alric, from the *privilegium*, and that Alric was the son of Werburga; probably Ethelbert and Eadbert were sons of a former wife, Kynigitha or Ethelburga. [KENT, KINGS OF.] See Elmham, ed. Hardwick, 282–298; Thorn, ap. Twysden, cc. 1770–1771; 2208, 2209; Will. Malmesb. *Gr. R.* i. § 15. [S.]

WILESINDUS (VILESMUNDUS), bishop of Agde, stands between Georgius and eighth Primus. In A.D. 673, along with Ranosindus his brother, he was taken captive by Wamba at the seizure of Agde in the rebellion of the dux Paulus (Julianus Tol. *Hist. Rebell. Pauli* ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 805; *Gall. Christ.* vi. 669). [J. G.]

WILFRID (1), a name dear to the northern church. He was a native of Northumbria, and was born in 634. His parents were persons of wealth and station, and Wilfrid might have lived in riches and honour at home; but his father made a second marriage, and the boy experienced a stepmother's harshness. It was to escape from home that Wilfrid, perhaps, thought of devoting himself to a monastic life. When he was thirteen his new mother sent him to the Northumbrian court, equipping him and his comrades with arms and horses and rich attire. The boy was comely in person, and gracious in address, and soon won the favour of queen Eanfleda, who, in course of time, sent him to Lindisfarne under the charge of Cudda, an aged retainer of the king. At Lindisfarne Wilfrid's education made a rapid progress. He made himself acquainted with the Scottish discipline, and committed to memory the Psalter after Jerome's recension. After three years the desire to visit Rome came strongly upon the youthful student; and Eanfleda again befriended him, by sending him Romewards from Northumbria into Kent to her brother, king Erconbert. During his stay in Kent, he learned by heart the Psalter after the fifth edition of the Roman use. After a while, a proper companion was found to accompany him abroad in Benedict Biscop, himself one of the fathers of the Northumbrian church.

They started in 652 or 653, and halted at Lyons, the most venerable ecclesiastical establishment in France. In Annemundus, the bishop, Wilfrid found a kind friend, but one who certainly did not encourage the youth's religious aspirations, as he offered him his niece in marriage, and the government of a part of France, if he would stay with him at Lyons. The offer was in vain; and Wilfrid went on to Rome, where he became the pupil of Boniface, who taught him the rules and observances of the Roman ritual, and the proper way to observe Easter, and made him thoroughly acquainted with the language and interpretation of the Gospels. He was also introduced to the pope, and received his blessing. As he returned Wilfrid fulfilled a promise which he had made to Annemundus, and halted for three years at Lyons. He there received the tonsure after the Roman fashion, and devoted himself to the completion of his clerical education. Annemundus seems to have intended to make his favourite his heir; but this kindly purpose was frustrated by his own death in a persecution, of which Baldhild, widow of Clovis II., has the discredit, although some of her officials may more properly be charged with it. Wilfrid saw Annemundus die, and was preparing to follow his fate; but the executioners, when they heard that he was a Saxon from Britain, allowed him to depart. A long future was in store for him.

Wilfrid's home-coming to Northumbria was in 658, and he found that great changes had taken place during his absence. Oswy had made his son Alchfrid his deputy, or vice-regent, in Deira, and Alchfrid had been induced by Kenwalch, king of Wessex, to adopt the new views of discipline and ritual. The arrival, therefore, of Wilfrid, who had mastered the new system, at the northern court to which he had been previously attached, was an opportunity not to be lost. At Alchfrid's most urgent entreaty, Wilfrid became his friend and adviser, and, to bind him still closer to his side, Alchfrid gave him lands at Stanford for the establishment of a monastery. It is not clear where this place was; but John Wessington, the learned prior of Durham in the 15th century, claimed Wilfrid as the founder of the cell of Stamford in Lincolnshire. A more valuable gift from the prince to Wilfrid was the monastery at Ripon, which had been recently established. The monks, who held the Scottish views, retired northwards when Wilfrid became their abbat. He had, therefore, full and free room to put his views into practice. The Benedictine rule was then introduced at Ripon, and was soon in full working, Wilfrid directing everything for about five years, at the end of which he was admitted to the priesthood. This was done in the monastery of Ripon, at the request of Alchfrid, by Agilbert, a French bishop who had been officiating in Wessex, and was now on a visit to Northumbria.

The two rival parties were now face to face in Northumbria, and a collision, with some settlement of the matters in dispute, could not be long delayed. Wilfrid was bent on the introduction of Roman ritual and order, in opposition to the native use, and Alchfrid and the queen-mother were on his side, together with Agilbert and James the deacon, the still-surviving representative of the mission of Paulinus. On the other side, the leading part was taken by bishop Colman, with the tacit approval of king Oswy, and he had also the countenance of Cedd and Hilda. A conference, to discuss the points in dispute, was held at Whitby in 664. It is unnecessary to reproduce the well-known arguments which were adduced. Suffice it to say, that the majority of the assembly, to whose opinion Oswy himself seems to have inclined, thought that the Roman method of calculating Easter, which was made the *crux* of the debate, was the best. Bitterly disappointed at the result, Colman not only practically declined to accept the decision, which in the first instance he had promised to abide by, but also took the false tactical step of yielding the field to his adversaries, and withdrew with his monks from Northumbria.

Wilfrid was the spokesman at the conference for the reformers, and his victory was great. It may be concluded, however, that it was unexpected, as the party made no immediate attempt to supply Colman's place with a candidate of their own. Tuda succeeded him for a

while, but died soon after, and then the Roman party laid their plans and plucked up their courage. Who more worthy of the episcopate than Wilfrid, who had fought their battle? And so Wilfrid was chosen. But, true to his principles, he objected to receive consecration from the native bishops, whom he regarded as schismatics. The king therefore gave him leave to be consecrated abroad, and, with Alchfrid's help, he went into France to Agilbert, who had made him priest, and was now bishop of Paris. The consecration took place at Compiègne with much ceremony and pomp. Twelve bishops were present, and carried Wilfrid to the altar sitting in a golden chair.

Wilfrid, for one reason or another, spent a considerable time in France, and was slow in returning home. In 665, or perhaps in 666, he started for England. A storm caught the travellers in the Channel, and drove their vessel upon the coast of Sussex. The barbarous inhabitants of the country were wreckers, and claimed the ship and its contents as their lawful prize. The pagan priest was killed by a stone slung by one of the voyagers. This was the beginning of a sharp struggle, which ended in the returning tide floating the stranded ship, which then made its way into Sandwich.

Wilfrid soon found on his return to Northumbria that he had come back too late. His long absence had been remarked upon, not without some justice, and had revived the hopes and energies of the Scottish party. Alchfrid had been deprived of Deira for disloyalty to his father, and the great Celtic cross, which makes Bewcastle famous, was towering over his grave. Wilfrid's long absence not unreasonably was thought to indicate indifference or an intention to stay away. His great friendship with Alchfrid had probably done him no good. When he did return he found that Chad had been made bishop of Northumbria. This must have been a bitter disappointment to Wilfrid, but the *res arduae* did not disturb the calmness of his bearing. He turned aside to the abbey of Ripon, which belonged to him. From thence, as Northumbria was closed to him, he went into Mercia and Kent to do episcopal work. He hated idleness.

In 669 Theodore made his way into the north, and found Chad working in Northumbria. He detected his imperfect ordination, after the British fashion. The result of an interview was that Chad gave way, and Wilfrid stepped into his old position.

The kingdom of Oswy, over which Wilfrid now became the spiritual master, had grown considerably in size, and included a large part of the modern Scotland. The new bishop threw himself into his work with vast energy. During his stay in Kent he had renewed his studies in the Benedictine rule at Canterbury, and he now introduced it into the north wherever he had the chance. His work was chiefly missionary, preaching, baptizing, and increasing the numbers of his churches and clergy. Like all the early bishops, he never rested long in any one place. Gifts for religious purposes were heaped upon him, and the great showed their confidence by entrusting to him the education of their children.

The charms of ecclesiastical art exercised a strong influence on Wilfrid's own mind, and he availed himself of them with marked success to create and spread religious fervour and devotion. Taste was dead in Northumbria: to re-create and teach it by beautiful sights and sounds Wilfrid carried about with him a little troop of architects, masons, glaziers and painters, whilst Eddi and Eona, from Kent, instructed the rustics in Gregorian tones, the great delight of James the deacon among the hills and valleys of Richmondshire. Wilfrid's first efforts in church-building were directed towards restoration. He found the minster of York in great decay. The building which Edwin and Oswald had reared was probably of a somewhat humble character, and this had been neglected through the vicissitudes of the times, and the residence of the kings in other royal towns, especially in the north. Wilfrid found the minster with damaged roofs and open windows, fouled by birds, and filthy with neglect. He made a new roof of lead for it, and glazed the windows, making the walls whiter than snow, and redecorating and furnishing the altar. About this time king Oswy died, and Ecgfrid, his son, inherited his father's power, as well as his regard for Wilfrid. From Etheldreda, Ecgfrid's queen, Wilfrid received as a gift the little shire of Hexham on the Tyne. where, according to one of the old chroniclers of the place, there were the remains of a church built by ancient kings. Probably there had been a Roman settlement there which originated this statement. At Hexham Wilfrid constructed a church, and some of the underground portions of it still remain, which for its crypts and noble architecture above ground had no match on this side of the Alps. But it was for Ripon, his own domain, that Wilfrid's special labours were exerted. A new minster seems to have taken the place of the old. Eddi describes it as built of polished stone, towering into the sky, with porches above ground, and crypts for private devotion below. The vault, still called St. Wilfrid's needle, is the sole existing remnant of this once magnificent fane. Wilfrid gave also to this, his beloved church, a cross of gold, with a copy of the Gospels written in golden letters upon purple vellum, and enclosed in a jewelled case. A grand dedication-ceremonial was the fitting conclusion of all this magnificent outlay. Ecgfrid and his brother Alwin were present, with all the chief men of Northumbria, and a vast concourse of ecclesiastics and others of every degree. Before this illustrious assemblage, Wilfrid, himself the chief person in the scene, solemnly dedicated the altar with its coverings and vessels. Then, after the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, Wilfrid, turning round, and facing the crowd of worshippers, declared aloud what gifts had been made by kings and others to himself for God; enumerating also the sacred sites which had fallen into profane hands when the British priesthood had been driven out. Give them back to us was the lesson which he intended to teach. When the grand ceremony was complete, for three long days and nights there was feasting and high revelry for all that came.

This was the highest point of Wilfrid's greatness. Northumbria was seemingly at his feet. Whatever almost he wished for he had. Many

was at his command everywhere, and he scattered it abroad on the building and endowment of monasteries and churches. The number of his retainers and their splendid equipment rivalled royalty itself. Wilfrid's magnificence was really adopted not for personal gratification, but to impress the popular mind and to magnify his own office. But he was treading on dangerous ways, and there were many even then to criticise unfairly and make mischief.

With Oswy Wilfrid was latterly a great favourite; indeed it was that monarch's intention, had not death prevented it, to make a pilgrimage to Rome, taking Wilfrid as his companion and guide. With Ecgfrid, Oswy's son and successor, Wilfrid was for a long time equally popular. But in course of time the criticisms which were passed upon Wilfrid's almost regal state and bearing could not fail to affect the sovereign of Northumbria. Still there was something nearer home which affected him still more. Ecgfrid had married the princess Etheldreda, who had made a vow of perpetual virginity which ought properly to have debarred her from entering the estate of matrimony at all. To persuade her to give up her stern resolve the husband sought the assistance of Wilfrid, with many promises if he should succeed. It was useless. The influence of Wilfrid seems to have been thrown into the scale of the queen, and not of her husband; and at last, in 672, with her husband's unwilling consent, she took the veil in the nunnery of Coldingham from the hands of Wilfrid. The ill-paired couple were separated, and Ecgfrid soon filled Etheldreda's place with another consort, who had a special dislike to Wilfrid, which he cordially reciprocated.

At this crisis, when there was so much irritation and jealousy in Northumbria, Theodore of Canterbury was made the means of turning the sore into an angry, festering wound. The subdivision of the English dioceses was at this time Theodore's great aim and desire, and his scheme had everything to recommend it. But how was it to be carried out in the northern province as well as in the southern? The original plan of Gregory was that there should be two archbishops in England, seniority going by priority of election, and each being independent of the other. Theodore, however, might consider that, as Wilfrid had not received the pall, he had no claim to the privilege prescribed by Gregory—in fact, he might be regarded, for the time, as a suffragan of Canterbury. But there was still in the way the territorial jurisdiction of Ecgfrid, who was not a person to be trifled with. Theodore had been in the north before, and it was through his means really that Wilfrid had been restored to the see of which Chad had temporarily deprived him; but Theodore was acting then at the request of Oswy, and now, once more, the Northumbrian king was his friend. Nay, Ecgfrid was more than willing to receive him; and Theodore cleverly availed himself of the turmoil in the north to step in, at the king's invitation, and carry out his plan of subdivision. Not one word about all this seems to have been said to Wilfrid. Theodore, instead of one bishop in Northumbria, created Lindisfarne, Hexham, and Whitherne into sees, in addition to York. There is nothing to show that Wilfrid was opposed to the principle of subdivision, but he would wish, and very naturally, to carry it out himself. As it was, when he heard the news, he went to Ecgfrid and his guest and asked them why this subdivision of his diocese had been made without his consent. "We have no fault to find with thee," was the reply; "but we shall not change what we have done." What course was Wilfrid now to take? There was no tribunal in England to which he could have recourse for justice. He took, therefore, the bold step of appealing to Rome. In justification of this resolve, we must not forget what Rome had been doing during the last one hundred and fifty years and more for the evangelization of England. Was she to have no interest for the future in that country to which she had sent some of her best men, and to which she was desirous of giving a revised and orderly Christianity?

Wilfrid, with a goodly train of companions, proceeded at once to carry his resolve into execution. He crossed the sea for Neustria; but the hatred of his foes in England anticipated him. They prevailed upon Ebroin, the chief minister of Theodoric, king of Neustria, to arrest and plunder him. The intended victim was unharmed, but through a most remarkable coincidence Winfrid, late bishop of Lichfield, chanced to be travelling at that time in Neustria. The similarity of name misled Ebroin, and on Winfrid was wreaked the injury which was designed for Wilfrid. The bishop of York had been caught by a storm which drove him to the coast of Friesland. The hand of Providence was manifestly in the tempest. Wilfrid found in Friesland a race of heathens, to whose conversion he at once devoted himself, exerting in their behalf that extraordinary missionary spirit which was, if possible, his noblest characteristic. Adelgisus, the Frisian king, first fell under the spell of the Christian conqueror, and then his subjects, nobles and commons, were drawn in. Ebroin tried in vain to tempt Adelgisus to surrender his guest alive or dead. His proffered bribe was rejected, and the letter torn in pieces and flung contemptuously into the fire.

But Wilfrid could not tarry in Frisia. Passing on to Austrasia in 679, he found Dagobert the sovereign of the country whom he had already assisted in Northumbria. Dagobert would have made Wilfrid bishop of Strasburg, but he held back from that honour; and then, seeing that his guest was bent upon Rome, Dagobert sent Wilfrid on, richly gifted, under the guidance of bishop Deodatus, to Berchtar, king of the Lombards, at Pavia. He, too, had been tempted with bribes by Ebroin, and tempted in vain. Through Berchtar's kindness, Wilfrid and his suite were soon afterwards sent on to Rome. Agatho was then pope. Through a messenger of Theodore, named Coenwald, he had already been made acquainted with the controversy which brought Wilfrid to his court. The exile was treated with the utmost kindness. His petition was considered with little or no delay by a council summoned for that purpose, and its decision was in the petitioner's favour. Wilfrid was to be reinstated in his old position, and the intruding bishops were to be removed. When that was done, Wilfrid, with the assistance of a council, was to choose several suffragans to

was a practical victory for Wilfrid; but he did not start homewards at once. He spent some months at Rome, drinking in its many sights and sounds, visiting well-known shrines, and collecting relics which were always precious to him. And on Easter Tuesday, 680, he had the great honour of taking a conspicuous part in a preliminary council summoned to consider the question of the Monothelites; and there, as the representative of the English Church, he bore testimony to the orthodoxy of the Christian congregations in his native and distant land.

Wilfrid returned to Northumbria in triumph; but he soon found that his success at Rome ensured his defeat at home. He produced the papal bulls and mandate, and was at once charged with having procured them by unfair means. The appeal which he had made was regarded as a scandal and an act of rebellion. The very presence of the papal mandate in Northumbria was an encroachment upon national privileges and rights. The document in question was taken away from its bringer. The reliquary which its owner prized so much became the plaything of Ermenburga, the queen. Wilfrid himself was cast into prison at Bambrough. Ecgfrid then tried to make terms with his victim, offering to restore a portion of his lost position, if he would only recognise his authority and repudiate the documents which he had brought from Rome. Wilfrid would do neither the one thing nor the other, and, as a punishment, was transferred from Bambrough to Dunbar, where there was a more severe and exacting gaoler. Whilst he was there in custody the queen fell ill, and Ebba of Coldingham, the king's aunt, wrought so strongly upon her nephew's fears, by ascribing his wife's dangerous condition to the anger of heaven, that Wilfrid was released. The reliquary was restored, and the prisoner, longing for friendly sympathy and a freer air, left Northumbria at once for the south. Wilfrid got away; but he was unforgiven, and pursued with hatred and contumely. He tried to halt in Mercia, where Berthwald was prince, who gave him some land for the establishment of a monastery. But Ecgfrid, with his dominant power as over-lord, insisted upon Berthwald sending Wilfrid away, and so the exile passed on. He was equally unsuccessful in Wessex, the queen of that district being the sister of his old foe, Ermenburga. Heartsore and footsore, where was he to find rest? A heathen province happily gave him the repose which one Christian court after another had refused.

In 681 we find Wilfrid in heathen Sussex. Ethelwalch, indeed, the king, and his wife, had been baptized, and six Irish monks had made a settlement at Bosham; but their influence had not spread, and on every side there was the darkness of paganism. The very neighbourhood of heathenism aroused at once the charitable and missionary instincts of the exile to their old enthusiasm. He had come at a time when the physical condition of the natives was at its lowest point. A famine had desolated the country, and the miserable sufferers, unconscious of even the simplest arts of civilization, and of the most ordinary resources for the preservation and, grasping each other's hands, were throwing themselves from the cliffs to end their privations and existence in the sea. From the same ocean which had taken away the lives of their comrades, Wilfrid taught the survivors the way to preserve theirs. He bade them cast their nets into the sea—an unknown profession as yet on that coast—and the return was so bountiful that the hearts of the rescued were turned to their deliverer. Wilfrid had but four companions with him, showing how completely he had been severed from his friends, and on these five devolved the duty of instructing in the first principles of religion and then baptizing the poor creatures whom they had been sent to rescue. The day on which the baptism took place was signalized by the disappearance of the drought. As if to mark the day, the windows of heaven were at last opened, and greenery and gladness came back to the parched and long barren ground.

Ethelwalch might well be grateful to the deliverer who had come to his people. He gave Wilfrid a piece of land at Selsea, on which he erected a monastery, the site of which has long ago been swallowed up by the aggressive sea. He enfranchised also a large number of serfs whom the king had presented to him, giving them at the same time a better freedom in giving them Christianity. But this was not the only blessing which Wilfrid brought to that district. In 686 he acquired a strong influence over Cadwalla, who had become the master of Sussex. Cadwalla permitted his friend to act as a bishop in Wessex, and gave him a fourth part of the Isle of Wight, which he converted to Christianity. And Cadwalla himself, after a short interval of preparation, bowed his head under the same blessed yoke. It is wonderful to see how one dominant mind, swayed by the holiest impulses, can master in time all inferior natures in the cause of God. During the five years that Wilfrid spent in Sussex, he seemed to be so thoroughly occupied with his new and glorious work that the memory of his past reverses seemed to have no place in his mind. He obtained, indeed, from a new pope, Benedict II., in 684, a document which bore witness to his position and rights in the North. There is nothing else on the page of history to show that he ever then looked back with impatient regret on his lost see in Northumbria.

Wilfrid, however, was not to die in exile. What he had been doing so zealously in Sussex and Wessex must have been gratefully observed by Theodore, who sought at last a reconciliation and a meeting. Theodore was very old, and Wilfrid was ageing fast. They saw each other in London, and became friends. Eddi says that Theodore pressed upon Wilfrid the acceptance of the see of Canterbury, which he was himself so soon to vacate. But Wilfrid's longings were for Northumbria, and he begged Theodore to help him to return to it. He did not ask in vain. Theodore first tried to make Ethelred of Mercia and Wilfrid friends, and that reconciliation was easily effected. In Northumbria the way had become more easy by the death of Ecgfrid at Nechtansmere, and Theodore pleaded successfully with Aldfrid, who ruled in his

brother's place, in behalf of Wilfrid. In 686 Wilfrid once more entered Northumbria. But there must have been no little difficulty in arranging for the position that he was to occupy. The see of Hexham was vacant, and of that Wilfrid took possession at once, and upon the death of Cuthbert, not long after, he obtained Lindisfarne as well. But he gave up these two before long for York, accompanied by Ripon; a part only of what he previously enjoyed, but no inconsiderable part. Peace now reigned in the northern province for five years, and then the troubles were renewed. Wilfrid's temperament seemed to chafe at a long calm, and he who would do anything for those who gave way to him could not tolerate an equal or a competitor. A strife arose out of a claim which Wilfrid made for certain lands, &c., of which the minster of York had been deprived. He was anxious also to have Ripon altogether to himself, and to be set free from the responsibility of observing the regulations of Theodore. Failing to obtain from Aldfrid what he wished to have, he once more deserted Northumbria, and found a temporary home at the court of Mercia.

To settle these disputes, Aldfrid, in conjunction with Berthwald, the southern primate, and the larger portion of the English bishops, held a solemn council at a place called the Swine's Path, near Austerfield, on the borders of Yorkshire and Notts. Wilfrid was present by invitation, and the synod pressed upon him the acceptance of the regulations of Theodore. Wilfrid, perhaps indiscreetly, asked whether they ought to be of greater force than the orders of Agatho, Benedict, and Sergius. They then tried to induce him to place himself unreservedly at the decision of Berthwald. Wilfrid declined at once to take such a step in the dark. A threat was then uttered that, if he were not more compliant, they would deprive him of everything except his monastery of Ripon, and even there they would restrict him, like a proscribed person, to its precincts. This was too much for Wilfrid to bear, and in an indignant expostulation he entered into a detailed account of his services and wrongs. For the second time he appealed to Rome for justice. Aldfrid wished to throw him into prison as a punishment; but the bishops interfered, inasmuch as he had come to meet them with a kind of safe-conduct. He was then permitted to depart, and once more he turned his steps towards the Mercian court and the friendly Ethelred. Whilst he was there he consecrated two bishops, Oftfor, and Suidbert of Friesland.

Wilfrid now, for the third and last time, set out for Rome, paying a visit to archbishop Willibrord, in Friesland, by the way. He arrived in Rome in 704. The pope at that time was John VI., who gave an attentive ear to the pleas of the wanderer, whose case on this occasion seems to have been investigated with the serious care that befits a judicial inquiry. The result of it was that the decrees of the preceding popes in Wilfrid's behalf were upheld, and fresh letters were written to Ethelred, Aldfrid, and Berthwald, urging that justice should be done. Wilfrid, with the indifference of a man to whom the world had been somewhat harsh, was ready to spend the remainder of his days at Rome; but the pope urged him to go back. He set out therefore for home, carrying with him, in addition to the documents, various relics and precious objects to gladden his eyes in England, and to remind him of his last visit to the noble city from which they came.

On the journey Wilfrid was seized with a dangerous illness in France. He was threescore years and ten in age, a worried and a broken man. On reaching Meaux he fell into a kind of trance, which lasted four days and nights. When it passed away, the sufferer told his faithful companion, Acca, that the archangel Michael had been with him, and had told him that after four more years his earthly pilgrimage should come to an end.

The party reached England after an absence of some months. Berthwald was the first person approached, and he showed his obedience to the papal mandate by his readiness to make peace and be reconciled with Wilfrid. The exile then passed on into Mercia in quest of Ethelred. He found that his old friend was king no longer. The two met in the most affectionate manner at Bardney, where Ethrelred had become the abbot. Wilfrid now sent two messengers into Northumbria to acquaint Aldfrid with his return and to ask permission to approach him. But Aldfrid was inexorable. Some time after this, in December 705, Aldfrid died, expressing, as was said, his penitence for the harshness of his conduct. Eadulf now became king of Northumbria, and showed greater severity than Aldfrid. Wilfrid, seeking to return and hoping for a lenient answer, had stolen back to Ripon, but left it in haste on being told that if he stayed there for six days he and his companions should forfeit their lives. Within a few weeks another change came over this change-loving kingdom. Eadulf was in exile, and Osred, a young son of Aldfrid, reigned in his stead.

A synod or council was summoned to meet near the river Nidd, not very far from Ripon, to consider Wilfrid's case. Berthwald of Canterbury was there, with the youthful Osred. Wilfrid also was present, with the three prelates, Bosa, John, and Eadfrith, whom he would regard as intruders, and the abbess Elfleda. The chief speaker on this occasion was Berthwald, and to his earnest desire for peace the result arrived at was probably due. He explained to the unlettered audience the meaning of the documents from Rome which Wilfrid had brought. Wilfrid was either to be restored at once to his old position, or the disputants were to present themselves at Rome and abide by the decision of the papal court. The three bishops who would be affected by Wilfrid's restoration raised their voices in protest, and there seemed to be a probability of the verdict being given in their favour. This feeling was counteracted by the statements made by Elfleda and Bertfrid, that Aldfrid's opinions on the subject had changed as he drew near his end. This had great weight. A compromise was at last made, by which Ripon and Hexham were given back to Wilfrid, but not York. In bygone years Wilfrid would have disdained such a settlement as this; but he longed for peace now, and to be at home once more.

Hexham and Ripon were to the aged prelate very dear and familiar places. He went back

guished. He was at Hexham when he had a return of the attack of illness which brought him to death's door at Meaux, but he was permitted to recover from it. He now made himself ready for the great change. Travelling southwards, he came to Ripon; and there, in 709, he proceeded to make a testamentary disposition of his worldly substance. In the presence of chosen witnesses the glittering hoard was opened out and divided into four portions. One of these was for the churches of St. Mary and St. Paul at Rome, which he had hoped to give with his own hands. Another was for the poor. The third was given to the abbots of Hexham and Ripon for the use of their monasteries. The last was for his faithful servants and companions, who had lost much and risked all for his sake, as a last token of his gratitude and affection. After a few injunctions to the brethren at Ripon, over whom he designated Tathbert his successor, he gave them his blessing, and they parted, to meet no more in this world. Weak although he was, Wilfrid was anxious to see Mercia once more, having been invited thither by Coelred, the new king, and to Mercia he went. He made a careful examination of the religious houses in that district at Coelred's request, endeavouring to set everything in order whilst he was able to work. We should like to know more of what he did and said in those days. Tathbert seems to have been his chief companion, and it was probably at that time that Wilfrid, as they were riding, sketched out to him the picture of his earlier life, and its wonderful vicissitudes. He seems to have been on his visitatorial tour when in Oct. 709 he reached Oundle in Northamptonshire. Another of his old attacks seems then to have come upon him, and he succumbed to it. His remains were carried northwards and were interred at Ripon, his own beloved monastery, which had never cast him out.

In Wilfrid there were combined wonderful earnestness and energy, strong self-reliance, persuasiveness, ready wit and eloquence, great skill in originating and organising, with the power to create and retain the affections of a party. These were great gifts. Why was it, then, that his career was so frequently overclouded, and the result of his life's work apparently so small? This seems to have been mainly due to Wilfrid's impatience of the feelings and opinions of others. He, of all men, was most ignorant of the maxim that a man must often stoop to succeed and wait to win. When a person believes so thoroughly in himself as to put aside as of little account the views and sensibilities of others, he cannot be surprised if he fails. Half a foreigner in education and feeling, more almost than a foreigner as far as deference to the court of Rome went, he did not reckon with the sensitiveness of what may be called, if you like, national prejudices at home, and he made little or no allowance for the training and views of the native princes and prelates. To judge from the highly-coloured biographies of Wilfrid compiled by his friends and admirers, no one could have been so ungenerously and unjustly used. The case of his conduct aroused, and from the condemnatory silence in which Bede passes over some of the most striking incidents in his life. Wilfrid was a person who would have his own way or nothing; and the northern bishops, in particular, must have found him a most uncomfortable neighbour. Viewed as a reformer, when corruption and neglect are rife, a vigorous and stern man may possibly be best qualified, at all events, to initiate amendment. Undoubtedly Wilfrid did succeed by his resistless energy in giving the Roman system a foothold in the North which it had never acquired before. To Wilfrid the cause of Rome was the cause of God. But to gain a proper insight into the depth and fervour of Wilfrid's religious zeal, look at him when he was at work in a field where earthly competition was absent. The true nobility of his character shone out when he devoted his master-mind to the poorest and the most neglected of the human family. To those who were more on an equality with him in the social scale, to those who were half-educated and half-civilized, he might seem on many occasions to be a tyrant. To the lost heathen tribes in Friesland and Sussex he was akin to a god. Toil, time, anything, everything he could offer, was for them. He would have stayed with them, apparently, for many a long year, without a thought of the defeats which he had to turn into victories elsewhere. The conquest of sin and Satan was far dearer to him than the beating down and baffling of rude, half-civilized princes. Perhaps it was the utter submission, as well as the helplessness of the needy which made Wilfrid their untiring defender. It would have been better for him if he could have cast off the proud determination of the old Romans, and had been less determined, at whatever cost, to batter down the proud.

An epitaph in twenty hexameter lines was written for Wilfrid, and was set up over his tomb or shrine at Ripon. It may be found in Bede. Wilfrid became the patron saint of Ripon, and his feast day is still observed, although in a somewhat grotesque shape, in that little market town. His signet or seal was supposed to possess a peculiar power in curing cattle of the murrain. When the men of Ripon sent out a contingent to the wars, Wilfrid's banner floated over their heads. The minster of Ripon became one of the four mother churches of the diocese of York, and honour after honour was heaped upon it. King Athelstan gave it the privilege of sanctuary. There is nothing to connect the present fabric with Anglo-Saxon times except a crypt, called St. Wilfrid's needle. Archbishop Thomas gave a thousand pounds of silver to rebuild the church, and Roger, one of his immediate successors, did much also for it, and his work may still be seen. In mediaeval times Ripon was generally poor, and was frequently neglected. In earlier days the feeling of respect towards Wilfrid and his work was more keenly felt and manifested. Miracles were ascribed to him, his name was inserted in the Calendar, and many churches, especially in the North, were dedicated in his name. In the treasury of York there was one of Wilfrid's arms enclosed in

gold. In the side of one of them a crucifix was inserted.

There was some confusion in early times about Wilfrid's remains, Canterbury and Ripon both claiming to have them. The body was undoubtedly interred at Ripon in 709. In the preface to Frithegode's *Metrical Life of Wilfrid* it is stated that Odo, archbishop of Canterbury, translated Wilfrid's remains from Ripon to his cathedral church. This is re-affirmed by Eadmer, who says, however, that Odo, not wishing to deprive the place, which Wilfrid loved so much, of the whole of his remains, left some portions behind. Eadmer also says that Oswald, Odo's nephew, paid another visit to Ripon in quest of relics, and found the bones of Wilfrid II., the kinsman of the saint, which he carried off with him to Worcester. In opposition to these assertions we have the evidence derived from the very valuable and early Life of Oswald, written by some nameless author. That writer says that Oswald went to Ripon, "a reverentissimo viro Wilfridi celebriter constructam," and there discovered "praesulis beata membra." These he placed in a new shrine, and nothing is said about any removal to Worcester. These words clearly imply the writer's belief that the bones of St. Wilfrid were found. Indeed, Wilfrid II. was never canonized, and with good reason. It is not at all likely that Odo and Oswald would both visit Ripon on the same errand. Oswald seems to have gone to Ripon to pay honour to Wilfrid's remains, not to carry them off. It is quite possible that some portion of Wilfrid's bones may have strayed to Canterbury, just as one of his arms is said to have been preserved in the treasury at York. In 1226 archbishop Walter Gray made a formal translation of the saint's remains at Ripon. After this, no one seems to have denied to Ripon the possession of its great founder.

I. Wilfrid's Life, as might be expected, has been written more than once. His first biographer was Aedde, or Eddius (EDDIUS), a choirmaster from Kent, who joined himself to Wilfrid, and taught music in Northumbria. He wrote at Ripon, after Wilfrid's death, by the desire of Tathbert and Acca, two well-known friends of the saint; and from his own personal knowledge of Wilfrid, and his access to the official papers which he would find at Ripon, he had some qualifications for the task which he undertook. But Aedde wrote as a partisan, and his work is not only disfigured by occasional mistakes, but is diffuse and disappointing; at the same time we must remember that it is a most venerable monument of antiquity. Aedde wrote before Bede; and the only earlier historical work in the North that we are acquainted with is the *Anonymous Life of Cuthbert*, with which Aedde was familiar. The Life has been printed in Gale's *Scriptores*, i. pp. 38–90; Mabillon, *Acta Ord. S. Ben.*, ed. Venice, part i. 631–79; in the *Vitae quorundam Sanctorum*, ed. for the Caxton Society by Dr. Giles; and in *Memorials of the Church of York and its Archbishops*, ed. for the M. R. i. pp. 1–103.

II. The next biographer of Wilfrid is Frithegode, or Frithegodus, who was connected with Canterbury, and is said to have been tutor to Oswald, with sesquipedalia verba, many of which cannot be easily explained. Archbishop Odo wrote a preface to the poem, the object of which was to do honour to the saint, whose remains he is said to have brought from Ripon to Canterbury. The poem is printed, either entirely or in part, in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 50, &c.; Mabillon, *Acta Ord. S. Ben.* iii. part i. 150–175, iv. i. 679–80; Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, cxxxiii. 979 et seqq.; *Memorials of the Church of York*, &c. i. 146–159.

III. The third Life is that by Eadmer of Canterbury, which was intended to do honour to Wilfrid as one of the saints of Canterbury. Eadmer makes use of Bede and Frithegode, and writes, as usual, in an easy and pleasant style. This Life is printed by Mabillon, *Acta*, &c. ed. Venice, iii. 175–204; *Pat. Lat.*, clix. 710; *Memorials of the Church of York*, i. 161–237.

Two other biographical sketches of Wilfrid, of minor importance and derived from Eadmer, are printed in the *Memorials of the Church of York*, vol. i. Another Life, by Peter de Blois, used to be in the vestry of Ripon, but it has long ago disappeared.

A full description of all these writers, and of the various MSS., &c., of their works, may be found in the preface to the *Memorials of the Church of York*, vol. i.

A long account of Wilfrid is given in *Fasti Ebor.* vol. i., and, written with a fuller pen and with a broader range, in Dr. Bright's *Chapters of Early English History*. The subject is so thrashed out and winnowed in these two works that it is unnecessary to crowd this article with the references to authorities which will be found there. [J. R.]

WILFRID (2) (JUNIOR) was a cousin probably, or perhaps a nephew, of Wilfrid senior, bishop of York. He was a favourite pupil of John of Beverley, and became vice-domnus or abbat of the monastery or minster of York. In 718, when John was too old to work, he resigned his bishopric of York in Wilfrid's favour. There is little known about him. Alcuin, in his poem, mentions his munificent gifts to the minster, and his covering the altar and the crosses with plates of silver, gilt. He was also generous to other churches. The words of Alcuin seem to imply that Wilfrid was very popular and much beloved, but that he was a lover of hospitality and a man of the world. Alcuin's words are a quotation from Beda's letter to archbishop Ecgbert, and they show what Beda thought. In 732 Wilfrid resigned his see to Ecgbert, and spent, like his predecessor, the remainder of his life in religious retirement. The name of the monastery selected by him has not been preserved, but it was probably Ripon. Wilfrid died in 744 or 745, unless (as is probable) that date belongs to WILFRID (3). It was asserted afterwards that archbishop Odo, when he visited Ripon in quest of relics, carried off the bones, not of Wilfrid I., but of Wilfrid II. Eadmer, on the other hand, maintains that the bones of Wilfrid I. were taken away by Odo, and those of Wilfrid II. by Oswald, who enshrined them at Worcester. For a Life of Wilfrid, see *Fasti Ebor.* i. 92–4. [J. R.]

WILFRID (3), the fourth bishop of Worcester (*M. H. B.*, p. 622), succeeded St. Ecgwin in 717 or 718 [EGWIN]. He is mentioned by Bede (*H. E.* v. 23) as bishop of the Hwiccii, at the time the historian finished his work, and the year 745 is given in the continuation of Bede from Northumbrian sources as the date of his death (*M. H. B.* 288). Florence of Worcester, however, whose computations of the dates of the Worcester bishops are possibly more exact than those of his early annals in general, mentions 743 as the date of the appointment of Milred as his successor, and this seems to be confirmed by the evidence of charters. He is described as a man of eminently religious character, and said to have been elected before Ecgwin's death to succeed him. His episcopate falls entirely within the reign of Ethelbald of Mercia, whose grants he frequently attests. The series begins in 718, when he is found witnessing a grant of land at Daylesford by Ethelbald to his servant Begia for the erection of a monastery (Kemble, *C. D.* 69). In 736 he attests a grant in Husmere-on-the Stour to Cynibert (*ib.* no. 80); about the same time, in a synod held by archbishop Nothelm, he attests a decision touching an estate claimed by the abbess Hrotwari (*ib.* 82). Several of the Worcester charters, to which his name is attached, are uncertainly dated or not at all (K., *C. D.* 79, 83, 88, 89, 90).

One of his own grants is preserved (*ib.* 91) in which he bestows on a most reverent gesith named Leppa, five cassates on the river belonging to the metropolis of the Hwiccii, i.e. Wegrinancaestir or Worcester, on account of their ancient friendship. The grant is for the life of Leppa and his daughter Beage, with reversion to the episcopal see. In one of the undated charters Ethelbald, at Wilfrid's request, grants three cassates at Woodchester to St. Peter's church at Worcester, that church being still the cathedral, although the rival church of St. Mary, which ultimately supplanted it, was rising by its side. In the so-called privilege of Ethelbald (K., *C. D.* 87), purporting to be issued in a council at Clovesho in 742 (see Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 340–342), the name of Wilfrid occurs as a witness, and if such a council were really held, doubtless Wilfrid attended it; but the attestations are fabricated, whatever the charter itself may be. Wilfrid seems to have been a good husband to his church, but nothing more can be said to be known of him. He is said to have consecrated Eadburga and Eva successively abbesses of Gloucester. (*Mon. Angl.* i. 531; Thomas, Worcester, pp. 11–14; *Ang. Sacra.* i. 470.) [S.]

WILGEFORTIS (EUTROPIA, LIBERATA, LIBERATRIX, ONCOMMERA, ONTCOMMENA), virgin martyr, has a wide cultus on the Continent, as in Belgium, Spain, Portugal, and Italy, and is known under many names. There is a tale of her being given a beard to prevent her marriage, but her history is unknown, and we can scarcely hazard a guess as to the truth. Her feast is July 20 (Usuardus, *Mart. Auct.* 12 and 20 July; Boll. *A.SS.* Jul. v. 50 sq. giving an elaborate commentary). See also Guérin, *Les Pet. Boll.* ii. 95. [J. G.]

WILICARIUS (WILHARIUS, WILLIHARIUS, WULCHARIUS) bishop of Vienne, succeeded Austrebertus c. A.D. 742, but had soon to leave his see and find shelter in the monastery of Agaunum or St. Maurice in Valais, where he remained a number of years, perhaps till A.D. 752, but it is most difficult to fix his dates. When as bishop of Sitten or Sedun he attended the provincial council of Attigny A.D. 765, he signed as "Episcopus de monasterio S. Mauricii" (Labbe, *Conc.* vi. 1702). He acted as envoy between pope Paul I. and Pippin king of the Franks, A.D. 767 (Paulus I. *Epp.* i. 6, ii. 6: and Carol. Magn. *Opp.* I., iii. 43 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxix. 1146, 1183, and xcviii. 225–6), but appears to be quite different from Wulcharius the bishop whom Pippin was instructed by the pope to caution with regard to a consecration (Carol. Magn. *Opp.* I. iii. 19: Migne, xcviii. 168–9). Wilicarius had become archbishop of Sens in A.D. 769 and was at the Lateran council held by Stephen III.: also at the meeting at Carbona A.D. 771, and at the first council of Paderborn A.D. 777 (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 13). When the church of St. Peter at Rome was being built A.D. 780, and looked upon as a work specially belonging to the Franks, pope Adrian said that he depended upon "sanctissimus frater noster Wulcharius archiepiscopus" (Carol. Magn. *Opp.* I. iii. 67 in Migne, xcviii. 324–8) taking charge of the operations: and again for the consecration of the Spanish bishop Egila [EGILA (2)] the same pope in A.D. 782 appointed, as consecrator, "frater noster Wulcharius archiepiscopus provinciae Galliarum." But it is doubted, though chiefly on the score of age, whether the Wulcharius mentioned in the years 780 and 782 could be the Wilicarius driven from the see of Vienne about forty years before. As in A.D. 782 he need not have been much more than seventy years of age, probability seems to favour there being but one person. (On this question see Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xcviii. 326 n. 337 n. taking for the most part the negative side; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 13. 625, [illegible] undecided.) [J. G.]

WILLEGOD, reputed to have been the first abbat of St. Alban's (*Vitae xxiii Abbatum S. Albani*, a continuation of the *Vitae Duorum Offanorum*, p. 35, at the end of Matthew Paris' *Historia*, ed. Wats). According to the legendary account here given, the abbey was founded [illegible] annexed to the church upon the elevation [illegible] translation of the saint's relics, which occurrence is placed in 793 by one reading of the *A. S. C.* (*M. H. B.* 338, n. 24). The [illegible] above cited makes him to have died in 796, [illegible] months after Offa (*Monast. Anglic.* ii. [illegible] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 470 n.). [C. H.]

WILLEHAD (WILLEBAD), first bishop of Bremen, was born c. A.D. 730* in the [illegible] of Northumbria, of Anglo-Saxon parents. Educated in the school of earnest Christian enterprise that was evangelising northern [illegible] and sustained by such memories as [illegible] St. Boniface and St. Willibrord, he obtained [illegible] priesthood and then devoted himself [illegible] conversion of the Frisians and Saxons (Anskar, *Vit. S. Willeh.* c. 1, ed. Migne). Applying [illegible] and obtaining the leave of king [illegible] [ALCHRED], he crossed to Frisia c. A.D. [illegible] landed at "Docyncyrca, quod est in pago [illegible]

* St. Willehad's dates are generally accepted

sacred as the place of St. Boniface's recent martyrdom [BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINUS]. There he remained some time (multo tempore habitavit) and was heartily received, doing the work required in a small Christian community, surrounded by the heathen whom he had left Northumbria to teach. Eastward at a place called Humarcha, apparently near Groningen, and again southward near to Drente, he narrowly escaped with his life, and had to find refuge with Charles the Great (*Vit. S. Willeh.* cc. 2–5). Charles welcomed him to his court, and satisfied his zealous spirit by sending him to the Saxons living on the eastern borders of Frisia: he fixed his mission in A.D. 780 or 781, at a place called Wigmodia, supposed to lie between Verden and Bremen, and there he built churches and appointed clergy. But on the rebellion of Widikindus against Charles and his persecution of the Christians A.D. 782, St. Willehad took ship and sailing round the Frisian coast, passed through France and Lombardy to Rome, while a large number of his companions left at Wigmodia suffered martyrdom (*Vit. S. Will.* cc. 6, 7). Encouraged by pope Adrian I., he returned to France and lived for two years in the monastery founded by St. Willibrord at Epternac (Asternacha): he occupied himself there in writing and teaching, along with a few of his friends who had escaped from the massacres in Saxony. He then revisited the court of Charles, and at his desire returned to Wigmodia, where his preaching was more effectual than before: he restored the churches, appointed clergy, and crowned all by baptising Widikindus in the year of his return A.D. 785 (*Vit. S. Will.* c. 8; Hermannus Contr. *Chron.* A.D. 785). On Charles' return from Rome and holding a synod of bishops at Worms A.D. 787, he made St. Willehad be there on July 13 consecrated bishop, probably by the comprovincial bishops (Herzog, *Real-Enc.* xviii. 153), and afterwards liberally established him at Bremen with jurisdiction "super Wigmodiam et Laras, et Ruistri, et Asterga, necnon Nordendi ac Wanga" (*Vit. S. Will.* c. 8). He was zealous, as before, in organising his see, and in A.D. 789 on Nov. 1, dedicated the cathedral church at Bremen "sub invocatione S. Petri apostoli" (*Ib.* c. 9). But with this he closed his labours. Proceeding upon a visitation of his diocese, he became ill of fever at Pleccateshem (now Blexen, near Bremen) and died on Nov. 8, A.D. 789, after an episcopal rule of two years three months and twenty-six days: his body was laid in his cathedral at Bremen (*Ib.* cc. 9–11). His feast is Nov. 8. There is only one original authority for his Life, *Vita S. Willehadi Ep. Brem. primi*, auct. S. Anschario Ep. Brem.: this belongs to the middle of the ninth century, and was successively published by Surius, *Vit. SS.* xi. 207: next by Caesar *Trias Apost. Sept.*, Col. 1642: Mabillon, *A. SS. O.S.B.* iv. 364 sq.; Pertz, *Mon. Germ. Hist.* ii. 378 sq.; *Pat. Lat.* cxviii. 1013 sq. See also Adamus Bremensis, *Gest. Pont. Ham. Eccl.* c. 8 sq.; *Pat. Lat.* cxlvi. 466–9. The second part of the Life by Anschar is made up of accounts of miracles before and after Willehad's death. (On his general literature see Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 788–9; Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. pt. i. 492–3; Wright, *Brit.*

WILLIBALD, ST., July 7, traveller in the East and first bishop of Eichstädt in Bavaria, known from a Life, or *Odoeporicon* (i.e. Itinerary), compiled by an anonymous female relative and contemporary who describes herself as a sanctimonial of the monastery of Heidenheim. It was edited with annotations by Mabillon (*Acta SS. O.S.B.* saec. iii. pt. 2), and subsequently by the Bollandists (7 Jul. ii. 501, ed. 1867) with a copious commentary by Sollerius. In a somewhat indirect manner the nun makes Willibald to be "Saxonicae gentis," which must mean as Sollerius observes (p. 485) of the Anglo-Saxon race; for in the first place the same authoress, in her life of his brother Wunebald, makes the latter saint a kinsman of Boniface; and in the next, there are unmistakable English local names with which Willibald is connected; but it must be remarked that the geographical names of the *Odoeporicon* are frequently much disguised and corrupted. From the numerical and chronological elements of the narrative, it results that Willibald was born about A.D. 700. At the age of five he was placed in the monastery of "Waltheim," which Mabillon says must mean "Buswaltham in agro Wintonensi," i.e. Bishop's Waltham in Hampshire, and there he was nurtured under the abbat Egbalt or Egilwald. When grown up, i.e. cir. 720, he was seized with a desire of travelling, and in the summer he set out accompanied by his brother Wunebald and their father, whose name the nun does not give, but who in later writers is Richard, and even king Richard. The travellers started from places bearing English names easy to be identified. They embarked for instance at Hamelea Mutha (the Hamble mouth, and the Hamble flows down from the neighbourhood of Bishop's Waltham) near that mercimonium which was called Hambich (evidently Hamwich or Southampton). They entered the Sigona (Sequana, Seine) and arrived at Rotum (Rouen). They reached Lucca, where the father died. The brothers then proceeded to Rome and the *limina Apostolorum*. Wunebald went no further, but Willibald with two other companions extended his travels to the East proceeding through Italy and by way of Sicily, Ephesus, and Cyprus. They landed in Syria at Tharratas (Tartûs, north of Tripoli), and (the party being now increased) visited Emesa, Damascus, Nazareth, Cana, Mt. Tabor, Tiberias, Bethesda, Chorazin, Caesarea, Gilgal, Jericho, the monastery of St. Eustochium, which lay between Jericho and Jerusalem, the laura of St. Sabas (the locality of which is described), Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Gaza, Diospolis, Ptolemais, Sebaste, and a city named Thalamartha on the coast, where Mount Lebanon juts into the sea, and there they re-embark for the west. In all their journey the ecclesiastical antiquities and legends of the various places are recorded, as also the traditionary Biblical spots and the churches standing on them. Much is said of the holy places of Jerusalem. For Syrian and Palestinian geography in the eighth century the *Odoeporicon* is important, and as much of it as bears upon that subject is included in an English translation, with notes, in Thomas

Wright's *Early Travels in Palestine*, 1848. Arrived in Italy again, after seven years absence from Rome and ten from Britain, Willibald spent another ten years in the Benedictine monasteries of Monte Cassino, and then by desire of pope Gregory III. proceeded into Germany to co-operate with Boniface in his missionary labours. By Boniface he was admitted to the presbyterate, and twelve months afterwards, in his 41st year, was ordained bishop of Eichstädt. The latter event is computed by Sollerius to have occurred in 741 and Willibald's death in 786.

It has been disputed whether Willibald of the *Odoeporicon* is the same person as Willibald who wrote the *Life of Boniface*. The identity was always assumed until Henschen in the Bollandist account of Boniface (5 Jun. i. 405, ed. 1867) maintained the contrary from internal evidence. He rested his case chiefly on the fact that the author of the Life of Boniface calls himself in his prologue "presbyter." At the end of the life however is a paragraph headed "Conclusio Auctoris," containing the words "Ego Willibaldus Episcopus." This "Conclusio" is rejected by Henschen, but it is accepted by Mabillon in his edition of the *Life of Boniface* (*Acta SS. O.S.B.* saec. iii. par. 2, p. 1), and by Migne, who reprints Mabillon (*Pat. Lat.* lxxxix. 599). Mabillon defends the old opinion, meeting the objection of Willibald's styling himself presbyter by the circumstance, that the bishop of Eichstädt is similarly designated by Notker in his *Martyrology*, at the *Nones of June* (*Pat. Lat.* cxxxi. 1099). Wright (*Biog. Brit. Lit.* i. 345) considers that Henschen has sufficiently established his view. The question is further discussed in Fabric. *Bibl. Lat.* vi. 325; Ceill. xii. 46, 129; *Hist. Lit. de la Franc.* iv. 168. For an account of other Lives of Willibald, which are all founded on the *Odoeporicon*, see Hardy, *Des. Cat.* i. 478, 490. For numerous other authorities on the subject of Willibald, see Chevalier's *Sources*, p. 2344. [C. H.]

WILLIBRORD (WILLIBRODE, WILLBRORD, WILBROD, WILEBRODE, WILLEBRODE), archbishop of Utrecht, is one of the Anglo-Saxons who issued from the Northumbrian church, and he is usually designated the Apostle of the Frisians. He was born c. A.D. 658, before his father Wilgils or Wilgisus retired from the world and had his cell at the mouth of the Humber. He was educated at Ripon under St. Wilfrid, and at the age of twenty went over to Ireland for better religious instruction. The moving spirit there was St. Egbert [EGBERT (5)], who urged on the powerful effort that was being made to evangelise the north of Europe. Influenced accordingly, by the ardent missionary feeling around him, St. Willibrord at the age of thirty-two (Alcuin, *Vit. S. Will.* c. 5) set out with eleven companions and landed in Frisia, at the mouth of the Rhine, A.D. 690. Finding no encouragement among the Frisians themselves, he turned southward and presented himself before Pippin d'Heristal who had recently defeated Ratbod the duke or king of the Frisians, and was virtually ruler of the Franks, and soon also of the Frisians. With Pippin's support he took up his residence at Utrecht. But he first, according to the custom of the time, paid a visit to Rome for pope Sergius's approval to establishing the mission (Bede, *H. E.* v. 10, 11). On his return into Frisia with many relics for the dedication of churches where heathen temples had stood (*Ib.* v. 11), he set laboriously to work to propagate the Christian faith, and in A.D. 696 on the advice of Pippin, he went back to Rome for consecration at the hand of Sergius. This ceremony took place, Bede says (*Ib.* v. 11) in the church and on the feast (Nov. 22) of St. Cecilia the virgin, but according to Alcuin (*Vit. S. Will.* c. 7) in the church of St. Peter the Apostle. From Sergius he received the name of Clemens, which seems, however, to have never attached itself to him in history, and the pallium with the fullest authority, expressly stated (*Ib.* c. 7), to organize and administer the new see of Utrecht (which Bede called Wiltaburg). From Pippin he received at first, the citadel of the town and fullest support (Bede, *H. E.* v. 11): this grant of Utrecht seems to have been confirmed and probably extended by Charles Martel after Pippin's death A.D. 715, and Ratbod's A.D. 719.[a] Willibrord in Utrecht built the church of the Holy Saviour and repaired that of St. Martin: in his own see and province he taught, built churches, appointed presbyters in them, and bishops also for their special duties ("cooperatores . . . a quibus sacri baptismatis munera acciperet, et christianae religionis (regulas) edisceret," Alcuin, *Vit. S. Will.* c. 11: see also Bonifacius, *Ep.* 90). But extending his labours into the neighbouring country, St. Willibrord went northward among the Danes, and southward among the Franks, Alcuin telling of many miracles that attended his work: his labours were mostly devoted to overturning idolatry, and educating the young. His chief monastic foundation was that of Epternac, which he and the abbess Irmina established in the diocese of Treves [IRMINA]: it was richly endowed by Pippin and his queen Plectrudis, by Charles Martel, and by others, even before Willibrord's death. (See the *Diplomata, ad S. Willibrordum vel ab eo collata* in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxix. 535 sq.) The bishop himself was honoured to the time of his decease by the Mayors of the Palace, and when Pippin le Bref was presented for baptism Charles Martel his father invited St. Willibrord to be celebrant: he is said to have also predicted the future greatness of the infant he was baptizing (Alcuin, *Vit. S. Will.* c. 22). The friendship of the Mayor and prelate was probably cemented by finding that each could assist the other in the ends they were pursuing: St. Boniface of Mayence also, we find in alliance with his two neighbours and staying with St. Willibrord for three years [BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINENSIS] (Willibaldus, *Vit. S. Bonifacii*, c. 16: Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxix. 615). His activity was unceasing even to his old age, when he required to hand over his charge to a coadjutor (Bonifacius, *Ep.* 90). He retired to Epternac, died, and was

---

[a] This gives an easy and sufficient explanation of what seem to be opposing statements by Bede (v. c. 11) and Alcuin (*Vit. S. Will.* c. 12), as to Willibrord's patron and the donor of Utrecht. It may be also that Charles Martel gave greater peace and security in the country and thus allowed the better establishment of the see.

buried there. The description given of him by Alcuin is probably sufficiently accurate, "omni dignitate praeclarus, statura decens, vultu honorabilis, facie venustus, corde laetus, consilio sapiens, ore jucundus, moribus compositus, et in omni opere Dei strenuus" (*Vit. S. Will.* c. 23). The result of his work according to his contemporary St. Boniface (*Ep.* 90) was the conversion of most of the Frisians. Generally in the *Martyrologies* his feast is Nov. 7, as Migne's edition of Alcuin says his death took place on that day, but Mabillon's edition places his death on Nov. 6. The year of his decease is uncertain. His dates seem best to start from Bede's account that when he was writing his *Ecclesiastical History*, St. Willibrord was alive, a venerable old man, and having been 36 years a bishop (Bede, *H. E.* v. c. 11). Bede finished the work in A.D. 731, and thus St. Willibrord was not consecrated after A.D. 695, but perhaps earlier. St. Boniface, in laying a case of disputed jurisdiction over Utrecht before pope Stephen II. in A.D. 753 says definitely that St. Willibrord preached 50 years to the Frisian nation (S. Bonif. *Ep.* 90), and if the years be added to the date of his consecration he died A.D. 745 (Dr. Smith), but the words seem to suggest the landing in Frisia five or six years before as the *terminus a quo*, and thus the date of his death would be c. A.D. 740 (Mabillon). At his death "bis octena pius complevit lustra sacerdos" (Alcuin, *Vit. Metr. S. Will.* c. 24), and this gives his birth, as above, A.D. 658 or 657, and allows his age to be 32 or 33 in A.D. 690 when he landed in Frisia. He has probably left no literary remains, though Bale, Trithemius, and Tanner ascribe to his pen, *De sua peregrinatione* l. i.; *Ecclesiasticos Canones*, l. i.; *Homelias quoque et Epistolas plures* (Balaeus, *Scrip. Ill.* cent. ii. no. 5, p. 99, ed. 1559). As to his life the primary authorities are St. Boniface of Mayence's letter to pope Stephen (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxix. 787), and the account of Bede (*H.E.* v. 10, 11): next the *Diplomata Willibrordi* (Migne, lxxxix. 535 sq. with bibliographical notes). Alcuin wrote two Lives. (1) In prose, *Vita S. Willibrordi Ep. Traj.* auct. Albino Flacco seu Albino (first in Surius, *Vit. SS.* Nov. 7; Canisius, *Lect. Ant.* vi. 351 sq. ed. 1601–8, and *Ib.* ii. 460 sq. ed. Basnage 1725: Mabillon, *A. SS. O. S. B.* sec. iii. pt. i. 561 sq.: Migne, *Pat. Lat.* ci. 693. To this Life there is now usually attached Alcuin's *Homilia de Natali Willibrordi archiepiscopi*, first given in Canisius's edition 1601–8). (2) In verse, *Vita S. Willibrordi*, published with the prose Life, of which it is an abridgement, by Surius, Canisius, Mabillon, and Migne. There are other Lives, but they are only forms and abridgements of those named. [J. G.]

WINA, bishop. [WINI.]

WINBERT (WYNBERCHT), abbat of the monastery in which Winfrid, or St. Boniface, resided after leaving that of Adestancestre. It was in the diocese of Daniel, bishop of Winchester. Boniface, writing to Daniel between 732 and 745, speaks of him with great veneration as his old master, and desires that the book of the prophets which he left at his death may be sent to him. This volume Boniface describes as containing six prophets written in distinct and separate letters ("claris et absolutis litteris," and again "clarè discretis et absolutis litteris scriptis") as opposed to a small and cursive hand ("minutas litteras et connexas"), which taxed his defective eye-sight (Bonif. *Ep.* 55 in Jaffé, *Monum. Mogunt.* p. 160; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 345). Abbat Winbert formed one of the Wessex synod between 710 and 716, which sent Winfrid to consult archbishop Brihtwald, the others being the abbats Wintra of Tisbury, and Beorwald of Glastonbury (Willibald, *Vit. Bonif.* num. iv., *Mon. Mog.* 439; H. and S. iii. 296). His monastery is called Nhutscelle (Willib. num. ii. *Mon. Mog.* 435), and Nuiscelle (Othlo, *Vit. Bonif.* lib. i. c. 3 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxix. 638), and is frequently identified with Nursling or Nutshalling, the name of a modern parish five miles from Southampton on the Romsey road. It may be noted that the manor and appurtenances of Nutshalling were held by the monastery of Winchester in the time of Henry VIII. (*Monast. Anglic.* i. 217 and index). [C. H.]

WINEBAUDUS, ST., second abbat of St. Lupus (Saint-Loup), in the diocese of Troyes, was, according to his biography, born at Nogent-sur-Seine. Having entered the ranks of the clergy, he became famous for sanctity and an ascetic life, and attracted the notice of Gallomagnus, bishop of Troyes. As abbat of Saint-Loup, where he followed Audericus, he enjoyed the confidence of king Clotaire, and by his intercession is said to have obtained the restoration from exile of Lupus, archbishop of Sens, and the release of captives. He died about 620, and was succeeded by Theudecarius. His name appears in the later martyrologies on April 6, the supposed day of his death (Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. i. 572 sqq.; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 585). [S. A. B.]

WINEFRED (WENEFREDA, WENNVREWY, WINFREDA), Welsh saint in the 7th century, called also in Welsh GWENFREWI. Though her life is said to have been written by the contemporary monk Elerius [ELERIUS], yet we have no assured account earlier than that given about A.D. 1140 by Robert, prior of Shrewsbury, probably now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. There are three Lives which have been published, more or less complete, from the MSS.: (1) *Vita S. Wenefredae V. et M.*, abridged from Trin. Coll. Cant. MS. by Capgrave (*Nov. Leg. Ang'.* 297 sq.). (2) *Vita S. Wenefredae*, Auct. Rob. Salop, abridged and altered by Surius (*Vit. SS.* iv. 20, Nov. 3), from Brussels or Bodleian MS. (3) *Vita S. Winfrede*, published complete from the Cottonian MS. with Miracula, and English translation by Rees (*Camb. Br. SS.* 198, 515). English translations are also given by Caxton, 1484–5; by J. F. "permissu superiorum," 1635, being the Life supposed to be by Robert of Shrewsbury; and the same, with litanies and historical notes, by Bp. Fleetwood of St. Asaph's, 1713. A poetical *Holy Life and Death of S. Winefred*, York, 1743, was published by Thomas Gent, and about the end of the 15th or beginning of the 16th century Tudur Aled the poet is said to have composed an account of her life and miracles (Williams, *Em. Welsh.* 13); Cressy (*Ch. Hist. Brit.* xvi. 8, an. 1668) translates from Capgrave. Part of the legend is incorporated in the Welsh *Buchedd Beuno Sant*, and trans-

lated (Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 16–17, 303. For MS. and other authorities, see Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. pt. i. 179–84 and pt. ii. 910 App.; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 161; Nicholson, *English Hist. Libr.* 97, ed. 1736).

St. Winifred, the Welsh Gwenfrewi, was, according to the legendary lives, which cannot be traced farther back than the 12th century, the only daughter of Teuyth, Thewith or Temic ap Eliud, descended of princely parents, and residing in Tegengle in North Wales. To St. Beuno, to whom he had already given land for a church and residence, Teuyth gave his daughter for instruction in divine knowledge. But one day when she was left alone in the house, and her parents were at service in the church with St. Beuno, a youthful tyrant, named Caradoc ap Alauc or Alan, offered violence to her, and as she fled he overtook her near the church of St. Beuno, and severed her head from her body with his sword as she ran. Where her head first touched the ground, a spring issued from the ground, and is now known as St. Winifred's Well, at Holy Well in Flintshire, the most copious natural fountain in Britain. The further wonders of the reuniting of the head, &c., bespeak merely the mediaeval desire for the marvellous. She became abbess of the monastery at Gwytherin, and there her body rested beside SS. Cybi and Sannan till the 12th century, when the remains were translated to the church of St. Aegidius at Shrewsbury, and to the supposed fact of this translation we probably owe the whole legend. It is at least noticeable that the Domesday Book completed in 1086 mentions neither church, chapel, nor well of St. Winifred. Her usual date is the 7th century, and her chief feast that of her translation Nov. 3. (Camden, *Brit.* ii. 554 sq., ed. Gough; Pennant, *Tour in Wales*, 22 sq.; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 295–7; Baring-Gould, *Saints*, Nov. 3, p. 69 sq., seeking to give a natural explanation of the miraculous in the legend; Cressy, *Ch. Hist. Brit.* xvi. c. 8, explaining Bede, &c.) [J. G.]

WINFRID. [BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINENSIS.]

WINFRID, a priest and *vestiarius* in a cell of Lindisfarne described by Ethelwulf, q.v. [J. R.]

WINFRITH, the sixth bishop of the Mercian church (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 24; iv. 3, 5, 6). He was appointed by archbishop Theodore in 672 to succeed St. Chad. He had acted as deacon to his predecessor, and is described by Bede as a good and modest man. His diocese was the undivided Mercian kingdom, comprising Mercia proper, the Middle Angles, and the Lindisfari of modern Lincolnshire. The policy of Theodore was directed to the division of this great jurisdiction, and he probably selected Winfrith as one who had practical experience of the difficulty of managing it. In 673, at the council of Hertford, at which the proposal to increase the number of bishops was made and waived, Winfrith was present; possibly he opposed the design of the archbishop. Anyhow, very soon after he was charged with disobedience to Theodore and was summarily deposed, Saxulf being appointed to succeed him. He returned to the monastery "Ad Baruae" in Lindsey, which is spoken of as his own, and which must have been founded by Chad and Wulfhere (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 3). This is probably Barrow-in-Lindsey. There Winfrith ended his life in holy conversation. It is not probable that Bede, using such language concerning him, imputed to him a greater fault than the thwarting the policy of his superior. [S.]

WINI (WINA), bishop of the West Saxons (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 7. 28; iv. 12). He was appointed by king Coinwalch, when, having become tired or offended with Agilberht, he determined to divide his dominion into two dioceses. Agilbert had ruled, from Dorchester which was then in West Saxon territory, the whole West Saxon Church in succession to Birinus, from the year 650 to about 660 (*Chr. S. M. H. B.*, p. 317; Fl. Wig. *ib.* p. 531). Coinwalch, knowing only his native language, wished to have a native bishop and procured the consecration of Wina by some French bishops, allotting him as his see, Winchester, the chief town in the south of his dominions. It is not said that archbishop Deusdedit was consulted on the matter and possibly the arrangement may have been without his sanction. Agilbert in turn was offended with the king, quitted his diocese and left Dorchester open to Wina, who continued to be the only bishop in Wessex (Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.*, p. 619). In the attenuated condition of the episcopate after the plague, Wina was the only prelate left in the south, and to him accordingly St. Chad, when in 664 he was chosen to be bishop at York, applied for consecration. Wina was probably all the more ready to perform the ceremony, as Wilfrid, the rival of Chad, had gone to Agilbert for a similar purpose. He obtained the assistance of two British bishops and consecrated the new bishop, notwithstanding the very imperfect communion which subsisted between the churches on account of the Paschal Controversy. About three years later, Wina was expelled by Coinwalch from Wessex, and betook himself to Wulfhere, king of Mercia, whom, by a gift of money, he persuaded to allow him to undertake the charge of London, the East Saxon bishopric having been vacant since the death of Cedd in 664. Wina retained his position in London, even after the arrival and early reforms of Theodore, as long as he lived (Bede, *H. E.* [illegible] 7). Erkenwald, who was his successor, was not consecrated before 675, and Theodore was not likely to leave the see long vacant. It is, however, to be observed that Wina was not at the council of Hertford, held in 673, and that no attempt is said to have been made by him to recover his authority in Wessex. A tradition is preserved by Rudburn (*Ang. Sac.* i. 192) that he retired to Winchester as a penitent three years before his death.

The name of Wina is appended to the fabricated Peterborough notices in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (*M. H. B.* pp. 315, 316).

The two facts about Wina, that are important, are his simoniacal purchase of the see of London and his intercourse with the British bishops who were regarded as schismatical. The former shows that he was infected with the [illegible] common in the Gaulish church; the latter that he was careless of ecclesiastical order. He is the one unworthy bishop of the age of the Conversion. (See Wharton, de Episcopis Londinensibus, p. 15.) He is omitted in some of the manuscripts of the episcopal lists (*M. H. B.* [illegible] and that, according to Matthew Paris (i. [illegible]

WINNOCUS (WINOC), ST., first abbat of Wormhoult, in Flanders, at the close of the 7th and beginning of the 8th centuries, was, according to his biography, which is an 11th century production founded on earlier *Acta* (see *Prologus*, Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* iii. 1, p. 292), a native of Brittany, and, as is believed, of royal stock, being a nephew of St. Judocus (*ibid.* pp. 291, 292). With three companions he left his home for the country of the Morini, and after some time spent at the monastery of Sithin, was sent by St. Bertin, the abbat, to build and take charge of a monastery on an estate lately given by one Heremar. This foundation, which was known as Woromholtum, and dedicated to St. Martin, he ruled till his death (Nov. 6). It was destroyed by Northmen towards the close of the 9th century, and Winnoc's remains had to be removed to Bergues, of which town he is the patron, and where an abbey took his name (*ibid.* 296 sqq.; *Gall. Christ.* v. 325, 332, 333).

[S. A. B.]

WINTRA, a West Saxon abbat, who, with Wynbert of Nursling and Beorwald of Glastonbury, sent or conducted Boniface (Winfrid) to consult archbishop Brihtwald on some synodal matter (Willibald, *Vit. Sti. Bonif.* c. 4; *Monum. Moguntina*, ed. Jaffé, pp. 438–440). The biographer of St. Boniface calls him abbat of Dyssesburg, which enables us to identify him with Wintra, abbat of Tisbury, in Wiltshire, who, with his successor Egwald, is mentioned in a charter of the year 758 (Kemble, *C. D.* no. 104). From this it appears that king Coinred of Wessex had given 30 manentes, north of the brook Funtamel, to an abbat named Bectun, whose successor, named Catwali, had sold them to Wintra. A lawsuit followed between Egwald, the successor of Wintra, and Tidbald, the successor of Catwali, which is recorded by Kynehard, bishop of Winchester, in 759: the cause being compromised for a money payment, and the land assigned by king Cynewulf and the bishop to Tisbury.

[S.]

WINWALLUS (BEUNNOC, GALNUTIUS, GUENGALOCUS, GUINALUS, GUINGALOE, GUNOLO, GUNWALLUS, GWAROG, GWENHOLL, GWENNY, GWEUNO, GWIGUOLEU, GWINGALAIS, OUIGNOUALEY, VALOIS, VALVAIS, VENNOLE, VIGNEVALEY, VINGUAVALLY, WALOUAY, WALOWAY, WALOY, WINEBALDUS, WINGALOEUS, WONNOW, WYNOLATUS, WYNWALLOW), Armorican saint in the 5th century; commemorated March 3.

Several Lives are given, viz. by Capgrave (*Nov. Leg. Angl.* 312, 314), Surius (*De Prob. Sanct.* Mart. iii. 38–41), the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 3 Mar. i. 243–259). The saint is noticed in shorter form by Ussher (*Brit. Eccl. Ant.* v. 530–1) following Surius, Du Saussay (*Mart. Gall.* 136–7, Paris, 1637), and Malbrancq (*De Morinis*, i. 171 sq. Torn. 1639). For printed and MS. authorities, see Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. pt. i. 104; pt. ii. 915; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 157, 161; ii. 73, 86.

Winwallus, in England commonly called Winwaloe and Winwaloc, but in France more frequently Guennolé, has at least fifty known spellings of his name, the original form being appears to have early gone over to Armorica on the appearance of the Saxons on the Welsh borders. It was probably after the migration of Fracan and his wife Gwen, with their sons Guethenoc and Jacut, that Winwallus, and his sister Creirvie were born. This was at Ploufragan on the Gouet. Winwallus was carefully educated by his parents in the Christian faith. He early sought the conventual life, but they long refused consent. At last his father was admonished in a dream, and placed him under Budocus (or, as the Armoric legend says, Corentine), in the Isle of Laurels, now Isleverte. It is after this that his connexion with St. Patrick is usually placed (which some of the Lives reduce to nothing but a vision), and his residence in the laura on Tibidy. But Tibidy being too much exposed to wind and sea, he removed with his disciples to Landevennec, and founded his monastery on a rocky headland near the present Daoulas and Brest. The site he received from Gradlon or Grallon, Count of Cornouailles, and the Lives are full of stories of his ascetic austerities there, his many works of piety, and his miraculous powers, one of his disciples being Egbin or Ethbin [ETHBIN]. He appears to have died about the beginning of the 6th century, but the year is unfixed. He was buried in his own church at Landevennec (or, according to another form of the legend given by Ussher, at Tauracum or Tauriacum). When the Normans wasted the province and abbey, his body was removed to Flanders, and several towns claim the honour of having been a resting place for the body, or of now possessing relics, such as Montreuil-sur-Mer in Lower Picardy, of which he is patron, Blandinburg near Ghent, and St. Peter's in Ghent. In Britain he is patron of Wonastow (called also Llangwarog and St. Winwaloch), and of the chapels, now destroyed, Llandevenny, near Magor, and Llanwinny, Monmouthshire; also of Gunwall Wynnyton co. Cornwall, while Cressy suggests that we may find his name in Wenlock, Shropshire. Butler says he is titular saint of St. Guingualoe, a priory at Chateau du Loir, dependent on Marmoutier at Tours, and of several churches and parishes in France. At Landevennec, but of late date, tombs once existed for count Gradlon and St. Winwaloe (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 86 n. d). According to Baring-Gould, Winwaloe is represented in art vested as an abbat, with staff and bell, standing by the sea, and with the fish rising out of the water as if obeying the summons of his bell. Malbrancq (*De Mor.* i. 186) says that at Montreuil they preserve "St. Winwaloëi veram, ut aiunt, casulam, albam, stolam (Moran, *Ir. Saints*, 41 sq.; Lanigan, *Ch. Hist. Ir.* i. 493).

In the 9th century, the abbey became Benedictine, but was soon impoverished and ruined by the inroads of the Normans. In 1781 the "abbatialis mensa" was united to the see of Quimper (*Gall. Christ.* xiv. 893 sq.), and at the French revolution the valuable library and manuscripts of the abbey were destroyed or dispersed. The ruins of the abbey and church are still visible on the promontory of Landevennec, eastward of Daoulas.

[J. G.]

WIOTHUN (WEOTHUN, WIHTHUN), the ninth bishop of Selsey, coming between Tota and Ethelwulf (*M. H. B.*; p. 618). He succeeded to the see after the council of Chelsea in 787, and before that of 789, in which he attested a grant of Offa to Rochester (Kemble, *C. D.* 155). His name is attached to several charters between this date and 805; (Kemble, *C. D.* 116, 162, 172, 173, 175, 183, 185, 190, 191, 1020, 1023, 1024), some of which are spurious. He attended the great council of Clovesho in 803, with one abbat, three priests, and two other persons not specially described (K., *C. D.* 1024, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 547). Nothing is said of him by the historians, and the history of his diocese is very obscure; the Selsey charters, which are preserved, being all either corrupt or spurious. We learn, possibly, from one of them, that Wiohthun used his influence with Offa to obtain his confirmation of a grant made by Oslac, the ealdorman of Sussex, in the time of bishop Giselhere (K., *C. D.* 1012); and that he himself was the recipient of grants from an ealdorman Aldwulf (*ib.* 115, 116). The principal fact that is known about him is a dispute which he had with Kenulf of Mercia, touching land in Denton, which he claimed for Selsey, whilst Kenulf insisted that it belonged to Beadyngham. Wiothun succeeded in convincing Kenulf of his right; and the decision was confirmed in the council held at Chelsea in 801. (See Kemble, *C. D.* 1023; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 530, 531.) The dispute afterwards revived under the successors of the parties (Kem. *C. D.* 1034; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 606). [S.]

WISO, WITHSO. [CANDIDUS (16).]

WITTERIC (WITTIRIC) (the latter is the usual spelling in inscriptions and coins (Hübner, *Insc. Hisp. Chr.* n. 115; Heiss, *Mon. des Rois Vis.* 98)), king of Spain A.D. 603–610, is first heard of as a conspirator with bishop Sunna in the reign of RECCARED. Two years after Reccared's death he deposed and murdered his son Liuva II. He made war continually with the Byzantines, but his only success was the capture of Sagontia on the Guadalete. Theodoric, the king of Orleans and Burgundy, in A.D. 607 demanded his daughter Ermenberga in marriage, to which Witteric consented, on Theodoric's taking an oath never to repudiate her. By the machinations, however, of Theodoric's grandmother Brunichilde, and his sister Theodilana, the marriage was never consummated, and after a year the bride was sent back without her dowry. Witteric, indignant at the insult, formed a coalition against Theodoric with CLOTAIRE II. and THEODEBERT, the kings of Soissons and Austrasia, and the Lombard king Agilulf, but nothing came of it, probably in consequence of Witteric's death, who was murdered at a banquet early in A.D. 610. His reign is usually regarded as a reaction of the nobles against the ecclesiastical influence that prevailed under RECCARED, but there is no ground for the charge first found in Lucas of Tuy that he desired to restore Arianism (Isidorus, *Hist. Goth.*; Fredegarius, 30, 31, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 621; Gams, *Kirchg. von Sp.* ii. (2), 67; Dahn, *die Könige der Germanen*, v. 173). [F. D.]

WITTIZA, king of Spain, son of EGICA, *q. v.*, associated with him in the kingdom, afterwards anointed king, and then *de facto* sole king, his father being incapable from age or illness, and finally sole king *de jure* and *de facto* on his father's death. The Chronicle of Sebastian of Salamanca (flor. c. A.D. 880) is the earliest authority for his residence at Tuy during his father's lifetime. The accounts of Wittiza are curiously discordant, the earlier ones giving a favourable portrait of him, which as time goes on gets progressively darkened. According to the earliest, the continuation of Joh. Biclarensis and Isidorus Pacensis, written about A.D. 721 and 750, he was beloved by the people for his clement rule, he recalled the persons his father had banished, he restored the property he had confiscated, and burnt the bonds he had extorted. Except the obscure remark in connection with SINDERED, *q.v.*, these authors know nothing against Wittiza. The first germ of the later stories appears in the *Chron. Moissac.* (in Pertz, SS. i. 270), written c. A.D. 818, which charges him with licentiousness, and teaching the priests and the people to follow his example. The *Chron. Albeld.* (c. A.D. 880) only charges him with the murder of Fafila [PELAGIUS] "quadam occasione uxoris," without explaining whether it was Wittiza's or Fafila's wife, but Sebastian of Salamanca fully makes up for his contemporary's deficiencies. "Like horse and mule who have no understanding, he defiled himself with many wives and concubines, he commanded bishops, priests and deacons to have wives, to prevent the censure of the church he allowed no councils to meet, and locked up the canons." The monk of Silo (c. 1100) repeats and improves on this account. Finally Lucas of Tuy (c. 1236) adds the charge of disobeying the pope, and dismantling all the fortified cities in Spain with three exceptions, the last charge being sufficiently disproved by the various sieges mentioned in the narratives of the conquest. Probably all these fables sprang from the desire of the later chroniclers, who looked upon the conquest as a judgment, to discover or invent the sins which deserved such a punishment, and some relaxation of the laws enforcing the celibacy of the clergy may have supplied the germ.

In his reign, according to Roderic of Toledo, the eighteenth and last council of Toledo, the canons and subscriptions of which are lost, was held. For the close of his reign and the chronology, see RODERICUS. [F. D.]

WLEDIG (CUNEDDA). The title of Wledig or Gwledig, "prince" or "ruler," is applied to several Welsh chiefs, and occurs in the Mabinogion in the tale of Maxen Wledig: but it is sometimes specially attached to the name of Cunedda, the chief who was perhaps the first to take the lead in Gwynedd or North Wales, after the departure of the Romans. Our information about him comes mainly from two passages in Nennius. In § 14 it is said "Filii Liethan obtinuerunt in regione Demetorum et in aliis regionibus, id est Guir et Cetgueli, donec expulsi sunt a Cuneda et a filiis ejus ab omnibus Britannicis regionibus." The two districts named are probably Gower and Kydweli in Caermarthen. And again in § 62, "Mailcunus magnus rex apud Brittones regnabat, id est in regione Guenedotae quia atavus illius, id est Cunedag cum filiis suis, quorum numerus octo erat, venerat prius de

parte sinistrali, id est de regione quae vocatur Manau Guotodin, centum quadraginta sex annis antequam Mailcun regnaret, et Scottos cum ingentissima clade expulerunt ab istis regionibus, et nusquam reversi sunt iterum ad habitandum." As you were supposed to be facing East, the "right-hand land" (*Deheu*barth, compare *Des*mond in Ireland, and the *Deccan* in India) would mean South Wales, and the left-hand land from which Cunedda came to North Wales must be in north England. Manau Guotodin probably means the land of the Ottadini in Cumberland and the adjoining country. Now Maelgwyn or Mailcun was contemporary with the historian Gildas, and taking the usual date for Gildas in the middle of the sixth century, we get an approximate date for Cunedda.

Again, William of Malmesbury in his book on the antiquity of Glastonbury says, "Legitur in *antiquis Britonum gestis* quod a Boreali Britanniae parte venerunt in occidentem duodecim fratres, et tenuerunt plurimas regiones, Venedociam, Demetiam, Buthir (?Guthir), Kedweli, quas proavus eorum Cuneda tenuerat."

Disregarding the details, the main fact seems to be that a body of Cymric invaders from north England occupied North Wales. What population did they find there? W. B. Jones (afterwards bishop of St. David's) in his book *Vestiges of the Gael in Gwynedd*, published in 1851, argued that the previous population was Gaelic or Scotch—which in those early times means Irish, as the Scoti did not migrate across to the Argyleshire coast till 503. The Celts came into Europe in two successive waves of migration, the Gael, and the Cymry. The former were gradually pushed onward into Ireland, and it may be that Cunedda expelled the last remnant of them from North Wales, except those that may have remained as serfs. This is bishop Jones's view; the early accounts of the invasion of Britain by the Picts and Scots might imply that the Gael had only recently occupied the Welsh coast when they were driven out by Cunedda. But in any case, if we accept the account of the conquest by Cunedda and his family, it implies that the Cymry or Welsh proper now occupied North Wales for the first time, or at least had to recolonise and recymricise it. There is another curious question as to the country. Had it not, like South Britain, been Latinised during the three centuries of Roman rule? Even in the time of Giraldus Cambrensis (*Itin. Cambriae*, c. 5) enormous relics of the Roman rule still survived at such places as Caerleon—"palatia immensa aureis olim tectorum fastigiis Romanos fastus imitantia, . . . turrim giganteam, thermas insignes, templorum reliquias et loca theatralia muris egregiis partim adhuc extantibus . . . aquarum ductus hypogaeosque meatus . . . stuphas miro artificio consertas lateralibus quibusdam et praeangustis spiraculi viis occulte calorem exhalantibus." All the inscriptions in *Hübner's Collections* are in Latin—except that of course some of the proper names are Celtic—and a barbarous Latin may have survived the departure of the Romans; in fact Bede says Latin was still one of the languages spoken in Britain. The later Welsh bards know hardly anything about the Saxon conquest of South England, which would be natural if the natives talked Latin and not Welsh. What language did they talk at Uriconium (Wroxeter) on the Severn, when the English stormed the place? It may have been still some form of Latin. But all this is still very debatable ground.

When the later Welsh genealogists put together into pedigrees the names handed down by tradition or supplied by the guesses of antiquaries from the names of places (see Rice Rees' *Essay on the Welsh Saints*, 1836), they assigned to Cunedda twelve sons with names very different from those given by William of Malmesbury and evidently mere personifications of districts, such as Clwyd: while some of them are actually in the plural form. These districts include Anglesey, Carnarvon, Merioneth, Cardigan, with a portion at least of Denbighshire, Montgomeryshire and Radnorshire, and extend all along the coast from the Clwyd to the Teifi. Now in these same districts the word Gwyddel (i.e. Gael) occurs in many of the local names, e.g. in Porth y Gwyddel in Holyhead; Nant y Gwyddel, six miles west of Plinlimon in Cardiganshire. This seems to be a trace of the Gaelic occupation still surviving, and helps to show what districts were occupied by Cunedda's family, to which the kings and nobles of North Wales traced up their genealogies. It seems probable that the inhabitants of North and South Wales belong to two different tribes, speaking a different dialect: and throughout their history they have not been too friendly to each other. This feeling may date from the aggressive action of the house of Cunedda against the South. [C. W. B.]

WOLFHARD, abbat of Adestancestre, the monastery in which Winfrid or St. Boniface was educated (Willibald, *Vit. Bonif.* num. i. in Jaffé's *Monum. Mogunt.* p. 433). The date would be about 690. The first suggestion that Adestancestre might be Exeter, seems to have arisen from Edward Maihew in 1625 (*Congregationis Anglicanae Ordinis Benedicti Tropaea*, p. 42), writing "in Monasterio Adescancestrensi." Maihew does not name Exeter, but Mabillon, quoted by Jaffé as above, seems to infer that he meant by that spelling (if this is Maihew's passage which Mabillon has in view) to indicate that the true name of the place might be Ad-Iscamcastrum, the fortress on the Exe. Cressy in 1668 (*Church History of Brittany*, bk. 22, ch. 5, p. 558) adopts Exeter. The *Monast. Anglic.* ii. 513 considers Exeter doubtful. [C. H.]

WOR, WORR. [ALDWIN (2).]

WULFHARD, the thirteenth bishop of Hereford, successor of Utel, and predecessor of Beonna (*M. H. B.* 621). Utel is found subscribing charters as late as 799; Wulfhard appears in 801 (Kemble, *C. D.* 1020, 1023). The profession of faith and obedience made to Archbishop Ethelheard (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 528) seems to have been made at his consecration, although it does not preclude the supposition that he may have been consecrated by the archbishop of Lichfield, and submitted to Ethelheard after the decision in his favour. [ETHELHEARD.] In 803 Wulfhard attended the council of Clovesho with one abbat, three priests, one deacon, and another person (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546; Kemble, *C. D.* 1024). In the same council he had a dispute with Denebert, bishop

(K., *C. D.* 184; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 544, 545). Wulfhard attended another important council at Chelsea in 816, one of the few assemblies of the kind that issued canons (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 579). In 822 he was present at the witenagemot, at which Ceolwulf, king of Mercia, was consecrated (K., *C. D.* 216). Beonna, his successor, subscribes in 824. Wulfhard attests the Mercian charters with tolerable regularity during his whole episcopate (Kemble, *C. D.* 183, 184, 185, 186, 190, 191, 203, 204, 205, 207, 209, 210, 216, &c.). He is probably not identical with Wulfheard, the son of Cussa, who likewise had disputes with the see of Worcester (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 465, 541). [S.]

WULFHERE (Wulfheri), king of Mercia, 659—675. He was the second son of Penda and Kineswitha, and, after his father's death at Winwaedfield, was kept in concealment by the ealdormen friendly to his house, whose names were Immin, Eafha, and Eadbert (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 24). For full three years from 655 Mercia was under the rule of Oswy, king of Northumbria, who for one year allowed Peada to exercise a viceroyalty south of Trent, but after Peada's death in 656 retained the government in his own hands. After the expiration of the third year, in 658 or 659, the three ealdormen rose against Oswy and placed Wulfhere on the throne.

Wulfhere, it would seem, had been already baptized, and, as Peada was never regarded as king of the whole nation, is reckoned the first Christian king of Mercia. We are not told where he was converted, or where his years of concealment were spent. The legendary history of Stone (*Mon. Angl.* vi. 227) states that he was baptised by Finan. It may have been in Mercia itself, or in Kent whence he sought his wife, Eormenhild, the daughter of king Earcembert, and mother by him of Coinred and Werburga. Both his children must have been infants at the time of his death, and his marriage cannot have taken place very early in his reign.

The christianising of Mercia had been, since the death of Penda, proceeding under the influence of Oswy and the preaching of bishops Diuma and Cellach, with the northern missionaries whom Peada had invited. And notwithstanding the hostile attitude in which Wulfhere, by the circumstances of his accession, stood to Oswy, it was from the Northumbrian church alone at this juncture that spiritual help could be obtained. Wessex was even more hostile than Northumbria, and Kent, where the church was in a very attenuated condition, was cut off from Mercia by the only half-converted East Saxons, who also were under Oswy's influence. We are told that Cellach, the missionary bishop of Mercia, left his work and returned to Iona about the time of Wulfhere's accession: this may have been a result of the political change, but the Mercian king was obliged to procure a successor from Oswy's kingdom, Trumhere, the abbat of Gilling, who had to go for consecration to Oswy's bishop Finan, at Lindisfarne. Trumhere governed the Mercian church until about the year

Lichfield. Winfrith, who succeeded St. Chad about 672, seems to have resisted Theodore's proposal to divide Mercia into dioceses, and his deposition occurred in the year of Wulfhere's death.

Wulfhere is one of the traditional founders of the monastery of Medeshamstede; the probable circumstances of the foundation are detailed in our notice of Saxulf. Bede tells us that he founded a monastery at Barrow, "Ad Baruae," in Lindsey, for St. Chad (*H. E.* iv. 3). In conjunction with his brother Ethelred he founded another monastery for their sister Cyniburga, the wife of Alchfrith of Northumbria (Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 638), possibly at Caistor. Wulfhere's connexion with St. Peter's, Gloucester, which is said to have had for its first abbess his wife Eadburga, is more than problematical, and his foundation at Stone in Staffordshire is fabulous.

Wulfhere claims a high position in English history as a missionary king, although his missions are somewhat too closely connected with his designs of national aggrandisement. Mercia certainly became Christian during his reign. He persuaded Ethelwalch, king of the South Saxons, to be baptized, and gave him on the occasion the Isle of Wight and the province of the Meanwara, which he had just wrested from the West Saxons (Bede, *H. E.* 413). Under his influence bishop Jaruman attempted the re-conversion of the East Saxons, who had relapsed after the death of Cedd, and, although his sale of the see of London to Wina (Wini) is a blot on the integrity of his faith, he deserves on the whole the character of a benefactor.

He was a great, though not invariably successful warrior, and the dates and circumstances of his wars are well ascertained.

Oswy does not seem to have molested him after he was established in the kingdom. His arms were first turned against Wessex; in 661 he defeated Coinwalch at Posentesbyrig (Pontesbury in Shropshire?), and devastated the country as far as Ashdown. If the identification of Posentesbyrig with Pontesbury be right, Coinwalch must have invaded Mercia. Anyhow, Wulfhere's reprisals extended further than Berkshire, as he crossed Wessex and occupied the Isle of Wight and the district of the Meanwara in Hampshire (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 13; Chr. S. *M. H. B.* 317). Ethelwerd (*M. H. B.* 506), by mistake, reverses the history of this campaign, and supposes that Wulfhere was taken captive by Coinwalch. The humiliation of Coinwalch must have made him supreme in the south of England. The East Saxon princes held their territory under his supremacy (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 30), and Kent was under the rule of his brother-in-law. In the north he was less powerful, and towards the close of his reign seems to have lost the province of Lindsey after a defeat by Ecgfrith (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 12). In 675 he was again at war with Wessex, and fought a battle at Beadanhead (?) (Chr. s. *M. H. B.* 318.)

Wulfhere seems to have stood aloof, at least to some extent, from Theodore's plans of church organisation. He is not said to have joined in

the mission of Wighard to Rome, or in the proceedings at the council of Hertford. But he had in 669 requested the new archbishop to send him a bishop, and Chad was sent. Winfrith also, Chad's successor, was consecrated by Theodore (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 3). Probably Wulfhere supported Winfrith in his opposition to Theodore's project of sub-division.

Wulfhere died in 675 (Bede, *H. E.* v. 24), and was succeeded by Ethelred.

Fable has been more than ordinarily wanton in dealing with Wulfhere. The legendary history of the foundation of Stone in Staffordshire tells a marvellous piece of family history. According to this story Wulfhere, at his baptism, vowed to extirpate idolatry, and repeated the vow on his marriage: but at the persuasion of Werbod, one of Penda's counsellors, did not carry his vow into execution. Eormenhild, according to this account, had borne him two sons, Wulfhad and Rufinus, and a daughter, Werburga. Werbod demanded Werburga, when a child, for his wife. She refused him: her brothers maintained her in her refusal, and Werbod plotted their destruction. Wulfhad and Rufinus, who had been hitherto heathen, were converted and baptized by St. Chad, whom they invited to fix his habitation nearer to their father's city of Wulferescestria. He complied, and they continued to worship with him, concealing their intercourse under the pretence of hunting. Werbod discovered this, and informed Wulfhere, who insisted that they should renounce the faith; on their refusal he murdered them on the 24th of July. He was immediately seized by an evil spirit; an illness followed, then remorse and conversion. Eormenhild buried her sons, and the stones which were brought by pilgrims visiting their tomb gave name to the church which she founded over the place. Miracles were abundant; Eormenhild and Werburga became nuns; Wulfhere endowed a monastery at Stone, and Medeshamstede also was a part of the fruit of his repentance. The head of Wulfhad was taken to Rome for the purpose of promoting the canonization of the brothers. The bearer offered to go through fire with the relic, but the pope forbade this, and inserted the two names in the Kalendar of the Saints. On his way back the messenger deposited the head in the church of St. Laurence at Viterbo for a night, but in the morning it could not be removed, and was left there, working many miracles.

The story is devoid of any foundation, but the traditional history of Gloucester, which gives Wulfhere another wife besides Eormenhild, may have been an earlier coinage, and would show that there were some floating legends about him which are absolutely incompatible with genuine history. See *Mon. Angl.* vi. 226–230; i. 531. [S.]

WULFRAMNUS, ST., twenty-seventh archbishop of Sens, in the last quarter of the 7th century, retired before his death to the monastery of Fontanelle. His life at Sens was uneventful, but a supposed missionary expedition to the heathen Frieslanders has been the subject of much discussion. According to a biography, purporting to be by Jonas a contemporary monk of Fontanelle, and to be found in Surius (Nov. 20) and Mabillon (*Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* iii. 1, pp. 341–348), inspired to convert Friesland, he applied to Fontanelle for fellow-workers, with whom he sailed to that country. He met with considerable success, baptizing many of the people, and among them a son of the duke Radbod, who however died very shortly after. The father also, according to the story, was so won upon by his preaching that he consented to be baptized, and had even dipped one foot into the font, when it occurred to him to ask where his ancestors and predecessors were, whether in heaven or in hell. Wulfram answered that not having been baptized they were in hell. The duke then withdrew his foot, saying that he could not forego the company of those who went before him, to sit with a small band of poor men in the kingdom of heaven. Three days later he died unbaptized. Though there is nothing intrinsically improbable in the story, there are many difficulties, as has been pointed out by Adr. Kluit (*Hist. Crit. Comitat. Holland.* exc. 1. pp. 1–18) and Rettberg (*Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, ii. 514–517). First, the life is plainly interpolated, as the inconsistencies show, so much so, that while Mabillon hesitated (*ibid.* p. 340), the Bollandists refused to publish it, substituting a shorter version, which may be the original work of Jonas, and which, while retaining the mission to Friesland, omits the story of the duke (*Acta SS.* Mart. iii. 145). Further difficulties arise from the chronology, the duke having died in 719 and Wulfram in 695, and the silence of the other historians of the missions in Friesland. The accounts in Sigebertus Gemblacensis, the *Annales Xantenses* (Pertz, ii. 221), and the *Hollandiae Chronicon*, are plainly derived from the biography (Rettberg, p. 515). The interpolations and inconsistencies were probably the work of Harduinus, a priest of Fontanelle, who is known to have written a life of Wulfram towards the close of the 8th century (*Gest. Abb. Font.*, Pertz, ii. 292). But although the story is apocryphal, it is not impossible that Wulfram preached in Friesland, either as a coadjutor of Willebrord or on a separate mission of his own.

He died in 695 a monk at Fontanelle, and nine years later his remains were raised by the abbat Bainus (*Gest. Abb. Font.*, Pertz, ii. 276).

[S. A. B.]

WULFRED, the fifteenth archbishop of Canterbury, 805—832. He appears to have been a native of Kent and to have possessed considerable private estates in that kingdom. He had been archdeacon under his predecessor Ethelheard, and in that capacity attended on him at the great council of Clovesho in 803 (K., *C. D.* 1024, cf. 189); having attested charters with the same designation as early as 798 (K., *C. D.* 1018). He was probably the first English ecclesiastic who bore that title, which, however, would imply no more than that of the bishop's deacon found in earlier records.

Archbishop Ethelheard, who two years before his death had succeeded in vindicating the rights of Canterbury against the archbishopric of Lichfield, died on the 12th of May, 805. In August the same year, at a synod held at Acleah, Wulfred is described as sitting upon the archiepiscopal throne "ii. nunas sanctas agustas die Sabbati quo transfiguratus est Christus"; an early recognition of the feast of the Trans-

figuration, but apparently meaning either Saturday the 2nd or Monday the 4th of August (Kemble, *C. D.* 190). The day of his consecration is given in MS. Cleopatra E. 1 as July 21 (*Ang. Sac.* i. 790), but that day was not a Sunday in 805. As Wulfred does not attest the charter above referred to, and as almost all the other English bishops were present at the synod, it is very probable that he received consecration from them near to that date. Another charter (K., *C. D.* 196) places Aug. 1, 811 in his sixth year; the day may very well have been August 3 (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils,* iii. 557, 559). Cuthred, king of Kent, and Kenulf, of Mercia, were present at the synod; and it must be taken as certain that Wulfred attained his dignity with the full consent of the Mercian king, who had protected Ethelheard and reversed the measures of Offa. Wulfred received the pall from Rome the year after his consecration (A.D. 804 Chr. S. *M. H. B.* 341; to be corrected to 806), and there is a letter extant which has been supposed to have been written by the English bishops to Leo III. on the occasion. It contains, however, little that is of interest and may be wrongly referred to this date : (Haddan and Stubbs. *Councils,* iii. 561). For some few years, Wulfred enjoyed a peaceful authority in Kent. Cuthred, the Mercian viceroy, died in or about 807, and, after his death, there was little or no power to compete with Wulfred's: he coined his money without the name of any king; his coins bearing only his own name with *Dorobernia Civitas,* or the name of the moneyer (Hawkins, *English Silver Coinage,* p. 105). But from the time of Cuthred's death Wulfred's relations with Mercia probably became less settled, the next king, Baldred, not being so closely allied with the royal house of Mercia. In a letter of the year 808, pope Leo III., writing to Charles the Great, comments on the hostility between Kenulf and his archbishop (Jaffé, *Mon. Carol.* pp. 311-315). However, in 809 Wulfred had a grant of land at Beorham from Kenulf, attested by the nobles of Kent in a council at Canterbury (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils,* iii. 556); in 811 Kenulf sold land in West Kent to Wulfred, in a witenagemot at London (*ib.* 571), and at the dedication of the Church at Winchelcomb, both king and archbishop were present. Kenulf's hold on Kent was, however, becoming weaker; and Wulfred was able to manage some business that ordinarily would have gone before the king. In 810 in a synod at Aclea, a dispute concerning the will of the Kentish ealdorman Oswulf was settled by him (K., *C. D.* 256; H. and S. *Councils,* iii. 567).

In the year 813, Wulfred granted to the clergy of his cathedral a privilege, which throws a gleam of light on the character of that religious society. He was employed in renovating and restoring the monastic establishment and now allows the members of the body to have and enjoy the houses which they had constructed by their own labour, with a right of bequeathing them at their pleasure to inmates of the monastery, and on the understanding that they continue to frequent the dormitory and refectory according to the rule. They are especially forbidden to entertain guests at bed or board in their cells. The document shows that the rigour of monastic observance had much declined and that the clergy were in a state of discipline not far removed from that of the secular cathedrals of later times (K., *C. D.* 200; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 576).

The next year (*Chr. S.* 812, to be corrected to 814) Wulfred, in company with Wigbert of Sherborne visited Rome: "pro negotiis Anglicanae ecclesiae." He there found Leo III. still alive, and, having received the blessing of the pope, returned to England before December, in which month he attested a grant of Kenulf to bishop Denebert of Worcester (K., *C. D.* 203).

The year 816 is marked by the holding of a great ecclesiastical council at Celchyth, or Chelsea, in which Kenulf, with his ealdormen and others, was present with all the bishops of southern Britain. Eleven canons were enacted in this assembly, which is important as the last great synod held before the dark part of the ninth century set in. Of these, the first contained a declaration of the faith, the second prescribed the mode of consecrating churches: the third ordered the observance of the law of charity; the fourth regulated the election of abbats and abbesses; the fifth forbade the ministration of Scots; the sixth confirmed the jurisdiction of the bishops; the seventh provided for the preservation of title deeds; the eighth is directed against the perversion of holy persons and places from divine service; the ninth provided for the recording of synodal acts; the tenth for the funerals and administrations of bishops; the eleventh against the intrusion of bishops and priests into the sphere of other men's labours (*Councils,* &c. iii. 579-584). Wulfred attested a grant made to bishop Denebert by Kenulf in the same assembly (K., *C. D.* 210), and other similar acts of the year 817.

At this date, the friendship of Kenulf and Wulfred seems to have been finally broken off. Possibly the increasing power of Wessex, under Egbert, and the deeply ingrained love of independence which is traditionally characteristic of Kent, may have had something to do with it: or even the visit of Wulfred to Rome, or his friendship with the emperor.

The quarrel began by the seizure, on behalf of Kenulf, of the Kentish monasteries South Minster in Thanet and Reculver; in consequence of which, if the charters, which are the only evidence on the subject, are to be trusted, the whole nation (of Kent or Mercia?) was put under interdict. It lasted for six years, during which, several attempts at reconciliation were made. Kenulf complained to the pope (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 597), and there was even a talk of invoking the help of the emperor, as had been done in the northern province a few years before. The personal conflict ended at the death of Kenulf, and Wulfred, with many of the comprovincial bishops, took part in the consecration of Ceolwulf, who came to the throne, after the short and perhaps legendary reign of Kenelm, on the 17th of September, 822. Ceolwulf reigned only two years, and under his successor, Beornwulf, Kynethritha, the daughter of Kenulf, renewed the litigation, which was continued in synods held at Clovesho in 824 and 825, and was finally determined at the same place in the latter year. Kynethritha accepted four estates as full acquittance for her claims; a general reconciliation followed. The subject is extremely

obscure; we are not told on what grounds Kenulf regarded the Kentish monasteries as his patrimonial property, or enabled to determine the exact steps of the litigation. The documents will be found in the Collections of Councils (Wilkins, i. 172; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 587–604). They prove a good deal of synodal activity at the time, and suggest an undercurrent of jealousy between the king and the primate, possibly due to the increasing power of Egbert of Wessex, although there is, really, very little evidence of any intercourse between Egbert and Wulfred, except in Rochester and Canterbury charters of 828 and 830 (Kemble, *C. D.* 223, 224). In the synods, held to treat on the great dispute, other business was transacted, as appears from the charters of the time.

We hear hardly anything of Wulfred after the termination of the dispute. The Christ Church Cartulary, however, contains a charter (K., *C. D.* 225) which shows his affection for his cathedral church and family, and which may very probably have been one of his last acts. In this, he gives, for the good of his soul, to the devout family of Christ Church, a part of his patrimonial property at Sheldsford, near Eastry, after his own death, to be held as hereditary or allodial estate: they are to commemorate him with alms and masses; and the condition is attached that they are to confirm and keep unchanged all his acts and words, doing their best to improve on all that he had done for good. He gives, further, an estate, which Cynehard, the deacon [archdeacon, K., *C. D.* 224], had given him, and which Cynehard had received from Egbert and Ethelwulf after the conquest of Kent in 824, on the condition that every morning and evening, when the brethren go to the church of St. Peter to sing the usual service, they shall say pater noster for Cynehard's soul; another property, a court which the monk Dodda had held in the monastery, he also bestowed, for the souls of himself, Dodda and Cynehard, to be used at the pleasure of the family, either for internal improvement or for the refection of the citizens, or for the rest (requiescere) of sick priests or deacons. The act is attested by the archbishop, and confirmed by Ceolnoth, his successor, and a large number of priests, whose signatures seem to have been added on the occasion that would answer to the modern probate of the will. Among other points that are suggested by this charter, we may notice that it confirms the impression, arrived at from external history, that Wulfred acquiesced without difficulty in the transfer of Kent from Mercian to West Saxon domination. His own position was secure; a strong West Saxon ruler was better than a weak Mercian viceroy, or a divided body of Kentish lords.

A charter of Werhard, a kinsman of Wulfred (*C. D.* 230), is extant, in which, before his death, he returns to the cathedral monastery the lands which he had held by the archbishop's gift. He adds that Wulfred ordered masses to be said daily for all the benefactors of the convent, and left a dole of bread and cheese, or bacon, and a penny to 1200 poor people on his anniversary.

Wulfred's life was prolonged, as seems most probable, to the year 832. His death is placed in the Chronicle in 829, but this may be corrected, first by allowing for the two years error, and next by the existence of a charter (K., *C. D.* 227), in which he attests a grant of Wiglaf of Mercia dated August 28, 831. As his obit was kept on the 24th of March, and his successor consecrated in June, his death must be thrown on to another year 832. (See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 557, 558.)

Among the professions of obedience made by the bishops, at their consecration, to the primate and see of Canterbury, the following are extant, made to Wulfred, by Ethelnoth of London, Wigthegn of Winchester, Herewin of Lichfield, Hrethun of Leicester, Heabert of Worcester, Hunferth of Elmham, Ceolbert of London, Hereferth of Winchester, Humbert of Lichfield, and Eadulf of Hereford. (See *Councils*, &c. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 568–608.)

The principal council held by Wulfred was that of Chelsea in 816, already described; but there are sufficient traces of synodal action to warrant us in dating ecclesiastical assemblies, or councils, at Acle (Ockley), in 805 and 810, and at Clovesho in 824 and 825; besides important witenagemots at which the temporal matters concerning the clergy and church property might be settled, and of which we have traces in the many charters of the period. [S.]

WUNEBALDUS, Dec. 18 (WUNIBALDUS, WINEBALDUS), abbat of Heidenheim, was brother of Willibaldus and Walburgis. He accompanied Willibald to Rome A.D. 720 [WILLIBALD], where he stayed seven years: during that time or after it he paid a visit to Britain (*Vita S. Wunebaldi*, c. 5). Trithemius (*de Vir. Illust.* iii.) says that he became a monk at Monte Casino. On the invitation of his kinsman St. Boniface he proceeded to Germany, and was ordained a priest to labour in Thuringia. There he established seven churches or monasteries, and was treated with great honour by duke Otilo, who gave him a residence at Nordfisule. He paid a visit to St. Boniface, and then received from his brother Willibald the charge of the double monastery at Heidenheim, to which his sister Walburgis had also been invited from Britain (Canisius, *Lect. Antiq.* ii. pt. iii. 168 Antv. 1725). He died A.D. 761 at the age of 60 and in the 10th year of his abbacy (*Vita S. Wunebaldi*, written evidently by the same hand as the *Vita S. Willibaldi*, is in Surius *Vit. SS.* xii. 293; Mabillon, *AA. SS. O. S. B.* III. ii. 160, 173; Canisius, *Lect. Antiq.* ii. pt. i. 123. See also *Vita S. Willibaldi*, and notes in Boll. *AA. SS.* Jul. ii. 485 sq.; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 186–7; *Vita S. Walpurgis* in Canisius, *Lect. Antiq.* ii. pt. iii. 267 sq.). [J. G.]

X

XANTHIPPUS, bishop of Tagora, addressed by St. Augustine (Ep. 65, cf. Ant. *Itin.* 41, 6; Bruns. *Conc.* i. 180, 186). [H. W. P.]

XENAIAS, bishop. [PHILOXENUS.]

XYSTUS (SIXTUS), bishop of Rome after Stephanus for about one year, martyred under

the duration of his episcopate, the old catalogues are erroneous and conflicting, as in cases of other bishops of the same period. The Liberian gives him two years, eleven months, and six days; a duration inconsistent with the course of events, as known from the Cyprianic correspondence. But by rejecting the years as an interpolation, and retaining the months and days, we arrive at a probable conclusion, according to which his accession would be on August 31, 257. (See Lipsius, *Chronol. der Röm. Bischöfe.*)

His predecessor Stephanus had been at issue with Cyprian of Carthage on the question of the rebaptism of heretics, and had apparently broken off communion with the African as well as Asiatic churches for their resolute refusal to adopt the Roman usage of receiving those who had been baptized in heresy by imposition of hands only. [CYPRIANUS; STEPHANUS.] Under Xystus, who was of a more conciliatory disposition, though he upheld and continued the Roman usage, peace was restored. This appears from Pontius, the biographer of Cyprian, speaking of Xystus (intending doubtless a hit at Stephanus) as "bonus et pacificus sacerdos"; and from the letters of Dionysius of Alexandria, of which fragments are preserved by Eusebius. The latter writes to Xystus that he had sent to Stephanus, on his refusal to communicate with the Asiatics and Africans, "entreating him," and addresses his new correspondent in a way that shows that, though he knew him to hold the same views with his predecessor, he could reckon on his tolerance and sympathy (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 5–7).

Nothing remains to be told of this pacific pope except the circumstances of his martyrdom, which appear to have been as follows. The emperor Valerian, though at first tolerant towards the Christians, had already, before the accession of Xystus, forbidden their resort to the cemeteries, and visited them with banishment. Under the edict to this effect, Dionysius of Alexandria had been banished to Cephro, and Cyprian to Curubis. But in the middle of the year 258, when Valerian was arming for his Persian war, he sent a rescript to the Senate of much severer import; ordering bishops, priests, and deacons to be summarily executed; senators and other persons of rank to be visited with loss of dignity and goods, and, on their refusal to renounce Christianity, with death; matrons to be despoiled and exiled; and imperial officials (*Caesariani*) to be sent in chains to labour on the imperial domains (Cyprian, *Ep.* 80). Xystus fell an early victim to this rescript. He was found by the soldiers sent to seek him seated on his episcopal chair, in the cemetery of Praetextatus on the Appian Way, surrounded by members of his flock. As these endeavoured to protect him, he thrust himself forward lest they should suffer in his stead, and was thus beheaded. Several of his companions were also slain. His body was afterwards removed by the Christians to the usual place of burial of the bishops of that period, the neighbouring cemetery of Callistus, and there interred. His two deacons, Agapetus and Felicissimus, with others, were buried in the cemetery where they fell. This

"cum eo diacones quatuor;" and from the Damasine inscription in the papal crypt of the cemetery of Callistus, of which a few fragments have been found there by De Rossi, and which was originally as follows:

> "Tempore quo gladius secuit pia viscera matris
> Hic positus rector coelestia dona docebam.
> Adveniunt subito rapiant qui forte sedentem.
> Militibus missis populi nunc colla dedere:
> Mox sibi cognovit senior quis tollere vellet
> Palmam, seque suumque caput prior obtulit ipse,
> Impatiens feritas posset ne laedere quemquam,
> Ostendit Christus, reddit qui praemia vitae,
> Pastoris meritum. numerum gregis ipse tuetur."
> —(Gruter, 1173, 13.)

That these verses refer to Xystus, and not, as assumed in the Acts of St. Stephen, to his predecessor, is satisfactorily shown by Lipsius (*Chronol. der Röm. Bischöfe*). That he was buried there is expressly stated in the Liberian Catalogue of Martyrs, as well as all later authorities; and the statement is confirmed by numerous *graffiti* on the walls of the crypt in question, in which the name of Xystus is prominent. The line, "Hic positus," &c., may be taken to refer to the *cathedra* on which he had sat when found by the soldiers, which had been removed with his body to the papal crypt. For that the cemetery of Praetextatus was the real scene of his martyrdom is concluded from the ancient tradition to that effect, in accordance with which an oratory was afterwards built on the spot, "coemeterium ubi decollatus est Xystus"; and confirmed by representations of him and his chair in this cemetery, under one of which is the legend SVSTVS. One of these pictures represents him seated in his chair, a book in his hand, and a deacon standing by him. The tradition that his two deacons, Agapetus and Felicissimus, were buried there after martyrdom is supported by an inscription round the edge of one of the graves, ". . . mi refrigeri Januarius Agapetus Felicissimus" (Northcote, *Roma Sotteranea*, p. 79). The Roman Martyrology (Aug. 6) mentions four sub-deacons, Januarius, Magnus, Innocentius, and Stephanus, as also beheaded with their bishop and buried in this cemetery, while it rightly assigns that of Callistus as the resting-place of the bishop himself.

The circumstances of the martyrdom of Xystus are differently given in later accounts. St. Ambrose (*De Offic. Ministr.* i. 41) speaks of his having been led to his place of execution after a formal judgment, and gives a dialogue between him and his deacon Laurentius, in which the latter desires to die with his bishop, who consoles him by promising that he will follow him in three days with greater glory than his own. De Rossi reconciles this account with the conclusion, otherwise arrived at, as shown above, that he was beheaded in the cemetery itself, by supposing him to have been led thence to judgment, and brought back for execution. Lipsius rejects St. Ambrose's story as inconsistent with the inference from the Damasine inscription that he was beheaded at once on the spot without trial, and puts it down to the rhetorical colour-

ing evident in the whole style of the passage. Possibly, if the exact facts were more fully known, the accounts would not be irreconcilable. It is to be observed that the inscription does not state absolutely that he was executed immediately, though it conveys the impression of its having been so. Other accounts, later than that of Ambrose, say that he was thrown into prison, heard before "Decius and Valerian," and then beheaded on the hill on which the temple of Mars stood (Boll. *Acta Sanct.* Aug. ii. 140 sq.). Prudentius, in his hymn on St. Laurentius, refers to him as crucified:

> "Jam Xystus adfixus cruci
> Laurentium flentem videns
> Crucis sub ipso stipite."

Lipsius traces conjecturally this evident error to a misunderstanding of the lines in one of the Damasine inscriptions:

> "Hic crucis invictae comites pariterque ministri
> Pastoris sancti meritumque fidemque secuti."

Two spurious decretals are attributed to this pope; one to a bishop Gratus, the other to the Spanish churches, the main subject being the mode of procedure against accused clergy. There are two others given by Gratian.

[J. B—Y.]

XYSTUS (Sixtus or Sextus), **GNOMES or SENTENCES OF**, a collection of proverbs and precepts, moral and religious, extant in Latin and Syriac versions, of which the Greek original survives only in fragments.

I. The Latin Version is the work of Rufinus, who, as he tells us in the Prologue prefixed to it, made it for the use of his "religiosa filia Aproniana," sister of the person (no doubt his friend Apronianus) to whom the Prologue is addressed, entitling it *Annulus* (the Ring), as being intended for an *Encheiridion*, never to leave the hand of its possessor. He introduces it as the work of one Sextus [*al.* Sixtus], who, he says, was identified by tradition with Xystus [*al.* Sixtus] of Rome, bishop and martyr. Against this ascription of the authorship, Jerome protested with even more than his usual virulence; and though he twice (*Adv. Jovinian.* i. 49; *Comm. in Ezech.* vi. 18) quotes with approval a saying (231) from the *Sententiae* of Xystus [*al.* Sextus], in the latter place he affirms that the author was not the Roman martyr-bishop, but a Gentile philosopher, of the Pythagorean school. In two other passages (*Ep.* 233, *Ad Ctesiph.*; and *Comm. in Hierem.* iv. 22—his last work) he makes the same assertion, accompanying it with scurrilous abuse of Rufinus; and in both passages—especially the former, which was written against Pelagianism—he censures the teaching of the work concerning man's relation to God, and his perfectibility, as heresy borrowed from a heathen and foisted on Christian readers under the venerated name of a Christian martyr. Augustine, who in the treatise *De Nat. et Grat.* (64) had quoted three of the *Sentences* (36, 46, 60), on the authority of Pelagius, as sayings of "Sixtus [*al.* Xystus], bishop of Rome and martyr," and upheld their orthodoxy, subsequently altered his opinion because (*Retractt.* ii. 42) he had afterwards read that the book was composed by "Sextus, a philosopher, not by the Christian Xystus,"—Jerome, no doubt, being his authority. So likewise the condemnation pronounced against it in the *Decree* which bears the name of Gelasius (vii. 24)—"The Book of Proverbs composed by heretics and *entitled* (*praenotatus*) *by the name of Saint Xystus* is apocryphal." This is but an echo of the passage just referred to in Jerome's *Ep. ad Ctesiph.*: "Librum Sexti Pythagorei ... *nomine Xysti* martyris *praenotavit* ... unde et vos plurima contra ecclesiam usurpatis testimonia"—a statement which, it is to be observed, the author of the *Decree* perverts when he stigmatizes it as the composition of heretics.[a] The work, however, though discredited by censures so weighty and authoritative, has had sufficient vitality to survive in the form in which Rufinus made it known to Latin readers. An examination of its contents will satisfy the reader that it deserved to live, and that it is neither heathen nor heretical, but a body of ethical and theological truths, effectively conveyed in terse sentences, bearing traces unquestionable though not conspicuous of a Christian hand. And accordingly we are not surprised to find that its intrinsic merits enabled it to retain its hold on the mind of the Church, notwithstanding the Gelasian condemnation. Thus in the very numerous MSS. in which it is preserved, ranging in date from the sixth to the fifteenth century, it is almost invariably described as the work "Sixti *episcopi*" or "Sixti *papae*."[b] And it is cited in the sixth and seventh centuries as almost on a level with the Scriptures, in the Rule of St. Benedict (cvii. p. 199) and the anonymous *Rule* known as *Regula Magistri* (c. ix.). Later on, the use made of it likewise by the Pseudo-Isidore in the ninth century, who adopts many of its sentences in his forged *Decretal Epistles*, is a farther proof of the regard in which it was held. Indeed, Jerome himself, as above shown, admits its merit in two passages (the first of which, it is to be noted, was written before Rufinus had published his version)—denying only that it is the production of a Christian divine. But the argument by which he supports his judgment of its non-Christian character,—the absence of all mention of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and of the Apostles and Prophets,—is neither candid nor conclusive; and his failure to observe the Christian ideas and expressions which pervade it, if not wilful, convicts him of carelessness in examining the book, or of defect in critical judgment. In its very terminology there occur words not a few,—"the elect," "the faithful," "the word of God," "the world" (meaning not *the universe*, but the things of this present life),

---

[a] Isidore of Seville (*De Viris Ill.* i.) maintains that the work is not of heretical origin, but written by Xystus of Rome, and interpolated by heretics. But his opinion is of no weight, as he professedly rests it on the authority of the statement, afterwards retracted, of Augustine, *De Nat. et Gr.*

[b] A MS. in the British Museum of the thirteenth century seems to be the only one which describes the author as "Sextus *Pythagoricus*." Even in MSS. which (as that of St. John's Coll., Cambridge) prefix the condemnatory extract from Jerome (*in Ezech.*), the titles and colophons entitle him "*pope*" or "*martyr*."

lary of Christianity. Of the Gnomes (about 450 in all), the majority indeed belong to the common field of the higher theism and ethics, but in many the spirit and even the language of the Gospel is unmistakable. It is impossible to attribute to a heathen compiler a collection which opens with, "Fidelis homo electus homo est" (1); "Electus homo homo Dei est" (2); and follows up this beginning by such sentences as "Dubius in fide infidelis" (6); "Omne membrum corporis quod suadet te contra pudicitiam agere, abiciendum; melius est enim sine uno membro vivere quam cum eo puniri" (13, and to like effect 273); "Immortales tibi crede manere in judicio et honores et paenas" (14); "Quae saeculi sunt saeculo et quae Dei sunt Deo" (20), "Utere teipso velut templo Dei propter illud quod in te simile Dei" (35); "Male viventes cum e corpore excesserunt cruciabit malus daemon usque quo exigat ab eis etiam novissimum quadrantem" (39); "Vir castus et sine peccato potestatem accipiet a Deo esse filius Dei" (60); "Non cibi qui per os inferuntur polluunt hominem, sed ea quae ex malis actibus proferuntur" (110); "Verbositas non effugiet peccatum" (155); "Difficile est divitem salvari" (193); "Scito te adulterum esse etiam si cogitasti de adulterio" (233); "Fidelem te professus spopondisti pariter non peccare Deo" [surely a reference to the baptismal vow] (234); "Quae gratis accipis a Deo, praesta gratis" (242); "Ministrare aliis melius est quam ministrari ab aliis" (336); "Vestimentum putato esse animae corpus tuum, mundum igitur id serva" (346, and so 449). Yet the authority of Jerome has prevailed over this internal evidence so long and widely, that (contrary to the practice of the MSS., as stated above) most of the printed editions of the work, from the earliest (1502) down to a very recent date, have designated the author as a Pythagorean philosopher; and though included in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of De la Bigne of 1575, and that of 1589, and in all the more extensive patristic series of the following century, it has not been admitted into the recent *Patrologia* of Migne.[d] The scholars who accepted Jerome's judgment concerning its authorship no doubt supposed that the Christian thoughts and phrases, which they cannot have failed to observe in it, were due to the translator, adding or altering in order to give colour to the ascription of it to a Christian writer. The character of the collection—which consists of sentences not indeed absolutely unconnected, but though gathered according to their topics into groups, more or less definite, yet arranged according to no regular and consistent plan—readily lends itself to the interpolator or adapter; and it is probable, as will be shown, that Rufinus did something towards giving his version a more definitely Christian complexion than the original wore. But we can adduce direct proofs that the book contained a distinct Christian element having originated the account which made it the production of Xystus, bishop of Rome.

II. Of these proofs, one which of itself would be sufficient, is found in the existence of the independent SYRIAC VERSION, or rather versions. This fact was first made known by Assemani, who in his *Biblioth. Orient.* described a version (t. i. p. 429) which he found in a MS. now in the Vatican, and also called attention (t. iii. p. 48) to the mention of it in the *Catalogue* of Ebedjesus. This Syriac Xystus has since proved to be contained in some Nitrian MSS. now in the British Museum, and has been made accessible by Dr. de Lagarde's edition of it, founded on a collation of seven of these MSS., contained in his *Analecta Syriaca* of 1858 (pp. 2–31). It is in the form of a book in three parts, of which the *third* is a short and supplementary compilation of sentences, of little interest; the *second* is a translation meant to be complete, and evidently only imperfect through the casual mutilation of an early copy, of a collection substantially the same as that which Rufinus has made known to us; while the *first* is a quite distinct version of a selection of 131 of the sentences as we have them in their completer form, ranging from 6 to 433 of the version of Rufinus, and preserving the same order as in it. This first part is suitably headed "*Select Sayings* (ܡ̈ܠܐ ܓܒ̈ܝܬܐ) of Mar Xystus, bishop of Rome," while the other two are simply introduced as "The Second" and "The Third" "of Mar Xystus." Of these two versions it is probable that the one which stands as *First* Part (Syr. I.) is the earlier. It is on the whole rather more accurate than the *Second* (Syr. II.), less paraphrastic, and freer from the additions with which Syr. II. abounds. It may perhaps be regarded as a translation of a Greek compendium of extracts from the original work, for (as will be shown presently) there is evidence of the existence of such a compendium; but there exists also (in a MS. as early as the sixth century) a Latin compendium of the version of Rufinus, which fact suggests by analogy the supposition that Syr. I. may be a selection taken from a lost Syriac version of the entire collection. Or again, it may be a *florilegium* formed by a Syrian at once selecting and translating from the Greek. It is observable that some MSS. exhibit one or other of these two versions as a separate book; as (*e.g.*) Syr. I. stands alone in Add. 18817 (ninth century), and Syr. II. in 12160 (eighth century). Both versions are as independent of that of Rufinus as they of one another. Their variations from it are frequent; and in passages where the Greek has been preserved or can be conjecturally restored, it usually proves that the Latin is more accurate as well as closer to the original. Yet instances to the contrary are occasionally to be met with; and it is interesting to note that in both Syriac versions a few sentences are preserved which Rufinus does not give, though they survive elsewhere in Greek. It is farther to be observed that the Christian element of the work appears even more pronounced in its Syriac than in its Latin form. In both Syriac versions numerous

---

[c] It is to be noted, however, that Porphyry speaks of angels as spectators of men's conduct (*Ep. ad Marc.* 21).

[d] Yet Migne has given the *Encheiridion* ascribed to Nilus (*Patrol. Gr.* t. lxxix. p. 1279), which is merely that of Epictetus with a few Christian modifications.

nineteen sentences above cited from the Latin as examples of its Christian character, all but two (39 and 60) are found, some literally, some in an altered shape, in one or other Syriac version; five of them (6, 20, 155, 273, 336) in both. Hence it follows of course that the Christian element was present in the common original of these three versions; and moreover it appears that Rufinus did not indulge in the same licence of Christian colouring in his treatment of his author as the Syrian translators did. At the same time there are points at which a comparison of his rendering with theirs proves that he as well as they occasionally did the work of translation with a Christian bias. When we find "the faithful" in the Latin represented in the Syriac (Syr. II.) by "the wise," as in 247, or *vice versâ*, as in 436, we may safely infer that the original had ὁ σοφός; as in point of fact we know to be the case in 49, of which the Greek is preserved by Porphyry (*Ad Marc.* 11), Θεὸς μὲν δεῖται οὐδενὸς, σοφὸς δὲ μόνου Θεοῦ, where for σοφὸς the Latin has *fidelis*, and the Syriac (Syr. I.) ܐܝܢܐ ܕܡܗܝܡܢ ܒܗ ("he *who has faith* in Him"). So again in 402, for ἀρετὴ Rufinus gives *fides*, as does also Syr. II., while in Syr. I. we find ܝܕܥܬܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ("knowledge of truth"). The date of the Syriac versions is unknown, but they are probably older than the Latin. Of the existing MSS. which contain them in whole or part (more than twelve, not reckoning MSS. of extracts), three at least are of the sixth century. All appear to be derived from a common archetype, for all show (among minor variations) a close agreement of text, so far as they coincide in extent, even in passages that are clearly corrupt. Moreover they all differ from the Latin in the same extensive omission (ss. 44–77) in the earlier part of Book II., and in the transposition of a nearly equal quantity of matter (ss. 357, 359, 364–412) to a later part of that book; an imperfection which no doubt is to be explained by the loss of a leaf, and the consequent displacement of the conjugate leaf, of the archetype, which was therefore probably already an old MS. when the first copy was made. Further, it appears that the text of this ancient archetype had been arranged by some editor who, having fallen in with the two versions (Syr. I. and Syr. II.) already described, each bearing the name of Xystus,—and failing to perceive that though differing in wording they were in fact but two translations, one partial, the other complete, of the same original,—joined them together as First and Second Books of the *Sayings of Xystus*, completing his compilation by attaching to each a short appendix of such similar sentences as he could collect elsewhere, and subjoining a Third Book composed of like material.[e] It is clear that to […] of these versions a date later than 400. It follows therefore that these Syriac versions confirm the opinion that the "*Gnomes* of Xystus" was originally a Christian work; and their evidence is not merely of weight because of its antiquity, but moreover, as being certainly independent of that yielded by the Latin version, corroborates the latter, and is in turn corroborated by it. They prove moreover that the tradition which ascribes the *Gnomes* to a bishop of Rome prevailed in the East at an early date, and was not invented by Rufinus; who indeed records it, but expresses no opinion one way or the other concerning its truth.

III. The Greek Original must have been known to Jerome, for in the sentence which (as above mentioned) he twice quotes, he does not follow the rendering of Rufinus. Many sentences of it are to be found scattered through the early collections of Demophanes, Stobaeus, and others, as well as in later *florilegia* which are certainly Christian, such as the *Eclogae* of Maximus the Confessor (seventh century), and the compilations of Georgides and Antonius Melissa (eleventh or twelfth century). Most of these sentences reappear in the Latin; a few in the Syriac only: but some, noted by the Greek collectors as "of Sextus," appear to have escaped the translators. Much larger portions of it are embodied in an anonymous *Florilegium* of uncertain date, entitled Γνῶμαι Σοφῶν (published by Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, t. i. pp. 127–134), consisting of 93 sentences, of which no less than 59 are to be met with either in the Latin or the Syriac, 42 of them within the first 49, standing for the most part (often continuously) in the same order as that of Rufinus. About the same number appear also, with like order and continuity, in Porphyry's *Epistle to Marcella* (written circa 350), not as quotations, but interwoven into its substance. But the earliest known citations by name of the "*Gnomes* of Sextus," and in every respect the most important, occur a century before Porphyry, in the writings of Origen. These are so instructive that it is worth while to give them at length.

1. The first is found in his treatise *Against Celsus*, viii. 30 (p. 763); where, in refuting his adversary's assertion that Christians were forbidden to use flesh as food, he cites the authority

[e] As examples of the Christianizing amplifications of the Syriac versions, see s. 9, where Syr. I. (p. 2. 7) introduces the language of 1 Cor. ii. 15; and s. 271, where Syr. II. (20. 10) borrows from Gal. vi. 8. Sometimes, however, the Syriac additions are confirmed *aliunde*; as *e.g.* where Syr. I. (5. 15) prefixes to 270, "Count it great wisdom that a man should subdue his body," which sentence we find in Porphyry, *Ad Marc.* 34, Μεγάλη παιδεία ἄρχειν τοῦ σώματος (cp. Syr. II. 20. 16). In 177 Rufinus is unintelligible, but Syr. II. (17. 6) correctly renders the Greek, which is extant here also. Similar instances are Syr. I. 4. 6 and 7; Syr. II. 16. 17. In 178 Syr. I. (4. 15), with Rufinus, rightly renders ὑπονόου; against Syr. II. (17. 6), which may represent a reading ὑπονόει. So in 286 it may be that where Syr. II. (21. 6) gives "for beauty of *body*" where Rufinus has "proprio *ore*," the translator follows a misreading σώματι for στόματι. But the rendering (Syr. II. 13. 12) of κρηπὶς by "shoe," instead of "foundation" (86), is a mere blunder, and is a strange one, inasmuch as Syr. II. (26. 21) correctly translates the same word in 371. In at least one case (123) Syr. II. (14. 27) enables us to correct the Latin, *lex* for *lux*. A serious interpolation in the Latin (230), and a slight one shortly after (231), find no countenance from either Syriac. But in 61 and 62, where the only grave misrendering made by Rufinus occurs (*chorus* for χώρημα), both Syriac versions are wanting.

of our Lord (Matt. xv. 11, 17, 19), of the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 28), and of St. Paul (Rom. xiv. 15, 21; 1 Cor. viii. 13), and then proceeds, "And when I am on this topic, it is not without cogency (ἀπίθανον) that I should make mention of a very admirable sentence which also most Christians meet with, as it stands in the *Sentences* of Sextus (ᾗ καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀναγεγραμμένῃ ἐν ταῖς Σέξτου γνώμαις ἐντυγχάνουσιν), as follows: Ἐμψύχων χρῆσις μὲν ἀδιάφορον, ἀποχὴ δὲ λογικώτερον." This is s. 109 in Rufinus, "Animantium omnium usus quidem in cibis indifferens, abstinere vero rationabilius est." He then goes on to contrast the rule laid down for Christians on this subject in Acts xv., its limitations and its grounds, with the absolute prohibition against eating flesh which Pythagoras founded on the doctrine of the transmigration of human souls into the bodies of lower animals. Some scholars have understood Origen to refer here to Sextus as a heathen authority, and Heumann (*ap.* Harles' ed. of Fabricius' *Biblioth. Gr.* t. i. lib. ii. c. 13, p. 870) even asserts that he describes him as a Pythagorean. But this is not so; on the contrary, it is plain that Origen is contrasting the teaching of Sextus, who held that to eat flesh was ἀδιάφορον, with the Pythagorean doctrine, according to which it was an abomination tantamount to cannibalism. And it seems that the general drift of the passage is pretty nearly as follows: "I have adduced passages from the New Testament to show what are the Christian rules and principles touching the use of animal food; I have to add, as bearing on the same point, that a work also in the hands of most Christians pronounces that use to be a thing indifferent." If this be a fair representation of his meaning, it is not easy to avoid the conclusion that a book quoted thus to yield evidence on a matter of Christian teaching and usage—a book which "most Christians" (οἱ πολλοί, not merely *many*) knew familiarly—must have been a Christian work.

2. The second passage where Origen refers to Sextus is in his *Commentary on Matthew*, t. xv. 4, p. 654, where on the text Matt. xix. 12 he cites two of our *Sentences* as bearing on the interpretation of the saying, "There be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake." He holds it needful (he says) to discuss the subject, because he has met with (ἐντετύχοιμεν) some teachers who have wrought on ardent souls, stronger in faith than in reason, to act on a literal construction of that saying, and he thus proceeds, "Sextus in his *Gnomes*, a book current among many as approved (δοκίμῳ), says, Πᾶν μέρος τὸ ἀναπεῖθόν σε μὴ σωφρονεῖν, ῥῖψον· ἄμεινον γὰρ χωρὶς τοῦ μέρους ζῆν σωφρόνως, ἢ μετὰ τοῦ μέρους ὀλεθρίως [= Rufinus 13 (as above cited), 'Omne membrum corporis quod suadet te contra pudicitiam agere, abiciendum; melius est enim sine uno membro vivere quam cum eo puniri']. Then again, farther on in the same book, he gives a suggestion to the like effect when he says, Ἀνθρώπους ἴδοις ἂν ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ σώματος ἔχειν ἐρρωμένον ἀποκόπτοντας αὐτῶν καὶ ῥίπτοντας μέρη· πόσῳ βέλτιον ὑπὲρ τοῦ σωφρονεῖν; [= Rufinus 273, 'Solent homines abscidere aliqua membrorum suorum pro sanitate reliquorum; quanto id praestantius pro pudicitia fiet?']" He here distinctly classes Sextus as a writer held in repute among many Christians, as one of the teachers by whom enthusiastic spirits were in danger of being misled in this matter; a fact which surely leads, as before, to the conclusion that he knew him as a Christian writer. And Origen's citation of these two sentences, which carry on their face evidence of their Christian origin and of their author's knowledge of St. Matthew's Gospel, proves them to be no interpolation of Rufinus, but to belong to the Greek original which Rufinus had before him, and whence he translated them with substantial fidelity.[f]

Assuming then that the work which is known to us in the Latin and Syriac versions is substantially identical with that which Origen knew as familiarly current among Christians in his time, and that he regarded it as a Christian work, we may accept it on his authority as the production of a Christian author prior in date to him,—Sextus, Sixtus, or Xystus. Nor does this conclusion rest on Origen's opinion merely; but on the proof which lies in the fact that of the three sentences preserved by him, two bear such close affinity to the singular passage of the New Testament on which he quotes them as to exclude the possibility of heathen authorship. The work was therefore composed, or at least put into its present shape, before Origen's time, and is thus determined as belonging to the second century; and there is no direct evidence to prove that it ever existed in an earlier shape, in which the Christian sentences such as Origen found in it were not present. It is true indeed that, except the two sentences referred to, none of the fragments preserved in Greek has a distinctively Christian character; but it does not follow hence that the original Greek collection contained no sentences of such character. It is easy to understand that a thought or precept borrowed by Xystus from the Scriptures would be unlikely to attract the choice of a compiler of extracts, inasmuch as such thought or precept would already be familiar to his readers in the superior authority and force of its original form. It must however be admitted that the *Gnomes* as a whole savour more of Greek philosophy, and its exclusiveness, than of the world-wide Gospel.[g] But there is nothing improbable in the theory that we have here the work of a Christian writer of the early period specified, deeply imbued by early training in the tenets of that philosophy, possibly a recent convert to the faith of Christ, who has made for Christian use a collection of the best results of Gentile wisdom, modified more or less by an infusion of the spirit of the Gospel, and interspersed here and there with sentences founded on the Christian Scriptures. Such a combination of ethnic and evangelic teaching might naturally be suggested by the example of St. Paul, in his references to the moral and theistic principles [illegible]

[f] Both these sentences are found in Syr. II. (11. [illegible] 13), the latter also in Syr. I. (5. 18). It is interesting to observe how both Syriac translators modify the [illegible]ing words: Syr. I. so as to avoid, Syr. II. so as to [illegible] warning against, the dangerous suggestion it [illegible]

[g] The translators showed themselves conscious of [illegible] when they replaced ὁ σοφὸς by "the faithful." [illegible] character of the work is well brought out by the [illegible]mary of its topics in Gildemeister's edition.

the compilers of the later *florilegia*; as for example to Maximus, in whose *Eclogae* Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Demosthenes, Isocrates, and many others, appear intermixed with Solomon, Isaiah and the Son of Sirach, St. Matthew and St. Luke, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom. This practice (it is to be remarked in passing) renders it impossible to draw any inference, one way or the other, from the fact that sentences "of Sextus" are included (as has been above stated) in the collections of Maximus and other Christian compilers. In the *Parallels*, however, attributed to John Damascene (A. 24, p. 362), we find a sentence of Sextus placed among excerpts from Scripture and Christian writers so as to make it clear that the compiler regarded him as a Christian; as indeed he shows by entitling it Ζέξτου Ρωμ. [*sic*].

On the other hand, however, we have to account for the facts (already mentioned) that some of our *Gnomes* are found in the collections of Demophanes and of Stobaeus (though with no author's name attached), which are Gentile works, neither being of certain date, but the former at least admittedly pre-Christian; and also that they are largely and continuously incorporated not only in the Γνῶμαι Σοφῶν, probably a heathen, even a pre-Christian production, but in the *Epistle* of Porphyry, an author especially unlikely to borrow from a Christian source. It may be, however, that Porphyry having fallen in with the work was attracted by its Pythagorean character and philosophic value, and used it for the sake of its contents, most of which would, irrespectively of their origin, commend themselves to a theistic moralist such as he was. We may even conjecture that it was through Origen, whose pupil he had been in his youth, that he first became acquainted with it and learned its merits. Or, again, it may be that the "*Gnomes* of Sextus" known to Origen had for its basis an earlier, non-Christian, probably pre-Christian manual of Gnomes, chiefly Pythagorean, and that from this manual, not from Sextus, Porphyry borrowed.[h] This latter solution has the advantage of accounting likewise for the knowledge of our *Gnomes* which the early non-Christian compilers above mentioned appear to have possessed. In its favour we can adduce the parallel case of the adaptations to Christian use of the *Encheiridion* of Epictetus, one by a Paraphrast of (probably) the fifth century, another by a writer who passed his production as a work of Nilus.[i]

a Christian philosopher, freely working up heathen material with a leaven of the Gospel, for Christian use; or (*b*) an anthology, originally heathen, of philosophic sayings, worked over and interpolated at an early date by a Christian redactor. And these two theories really run into one, or at least approximate so closely as to be practically undistinguishable one from the other. If however we are to choose between them, the weight of argument seems to be distinctly in favour of the hypothesis that the book was originally Christian. The Christian element in it, though unquestionably present, is nowhere obtruded, and is to all appearance woven into the original texture, rather than wrought upon it or inserted in it in a process of rehandling such as the Syriac versions plainly betray. The method, however, pursued in the work seems to be not so much to impart a Christian tone to the maxims of Gentile wisdom embodied in it, as rather to intermix with them a selection of Christian maxims moulded into form and expression similar to theirs.

Whether Sextus (Sixtus or Xystus) is to be regarded as the name of the Christian author or redactor who gave the work its existing shape, or of the heathen philosopher who may be supposed to have supplied him with its basis, is a question hard to answer, but of little moment. In favour of the former opinion is the fact that the Christian anthologists quote it under the name of Sextus, whereas Porphyry and the heathen compilers use it without naming the author. The ascription of it to "Sextus a Pythagorean philosopher" originated apparently with Jerome (who no doubt took it from the entry in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius: see below), and, so far as it has prevailed, owes its acceptance to his authority. But while we may prefer to adopt the view which regards the *Gnomes* as the work of a second-century Christian named Sextus or Xystus (= Sixtus), it by no means follows that we are to accept the tradition mentioned by Rufinus, confirmed though it is by Syriac evidence, that he was Sixtus (either I. or II.), Bishop of Rome. The words of Rufinus, who speaks of "Xystus bishop and *martyr*," seem to point to Sixtus II., who certainly was a martyr; whereas there is no sufficient early evidence to show that Sixtus I. was entitled, and no reason to think that Rufinus believed him to be entitled, to that designation (see articles SIXTUS (2) I., XYSTUS II.). But our author could not be Sixtus II.; for that prelate was contemporary with and outlived Origen, who as we have seen quotes our *Gnomes* as already current and commonly read among Christians in his day; not to mention that the work is also apparently quoted (though not by name) still earlier by Clement of Alexandria. The theory which assigns them

[h] Against this supposition is the fact that Porphyry seems (*Ep. ad M.*, 34) to cite s. 273 which is founded on Matt. xix. 12 (see above). But the citation is doubtful. The language differs totally from that of Sextus (*ap.* Orig.), and the lesson suggested by Sextus (self-mutilation) is very different from Porphyry's, which is clearly suicide. The context and order also do not favour the opinion that the sentence is from Sextus.

[i] The former was first printed by Méric Casaubon (1659). The latter is usually appended to the works of Nilus. Most of the alterations made by the Paraphrast consist in substituting θεὸς for θεοί, ἀδελφὸς ἢ φίλος for παιδίον ἢ γύνη, and so forth. But we also find "the Apostles and martyrs," or "Paul," cited as examples in place of "Socrates," and "the Scriptures" instead of "the writings of Chrysippus;" and towards the end many chapters are boldly rewritten, and scriptural language is freely introduced. Though Christ is not named, we find "the Saviour and his Spirit" in the last section; and the closing quotation from the *Apology of Socrates* is blended with Matt. x. 28.

to Sixtus I. is a possible one, and has found advocates; yet it is hard to believe that if this be true, Origen should not have known it, or if he knew it should have omitted to designate the Sextus whom he quotes, as bishop of so great a church. Thus it appears that of the two Christian personages to whom the authorship has been attributed, one is out of the question, and the claims of the other, though possible, are not only not proved, but hardly probable. Yet the ninth-century fabricator of the *Decretals* apparently knew our *Gnomes* as the work of Sixtus I., for in his *Epistola I. Sixti I.* (Hinsch's edn., p. 107; cp. Angilr. iii.) he has had the skill to give something of verisimilitude to his forgery by introducing Sentences 6 and 166.

Still less successful are the attempts which have been made to identify the author as a heathen philosopher. It is true we find in Jerome's translation of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, under Ol. 195. 1 (=A.D. 1), the entry "Xystus [*al.* Sixtus] *Pythagoricus philosophus* agnoscitur;" and so in Syncellus, p. 252, **Σέξτος φιλόσοφος Πυθαγορικὸς ἤκμαζεν**, which no doubt preserves the name as written by Eusebius, and makes it probable that Jerome altered it with a view to the identification of this person as the Xystus (=Sixtus) of the *Gnomes*. But of this philosopher no other trace survives; and it is idle to conjecture, as Orelli does, that he may have been the author of the heathen work, on which the collection translated by Rufinus was based. Another person has been confidently upheld as the true claimant of the authorship by Gale (*Opuscula Mythol., Eth., Phys.*, 1671), followed by J. A. Fabricius, Mosheim, and many others,—Sextius, a Roman philosopher, extolled and often cited by Seneca, who describes him as combining Stoic with Pythagorean doctrine, and mentioned by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xviii. 28, 274) and Plutarch (*Prof. in Virt.* 5). He is recorded to have declined the offer of Julius Caesar to make him a senator, which fact implies that he was over twenty-five years of age in the year 43 B.C., and over seventy at the date assigned in the *Chronicon* for the prime of "Sextus the Pythagorean philosopher." We infer, therefore, that he is probably not the person described in these words by Eusebius, and apparently regarded by Jerome as the author of our *Gnomes*. All ancient authority is against the theory which attributes them to this Sextius; indeed the fact that it was never heard of until put forward by Gale in 1671 is almost sufficient to condemn it. It is hardly credible that a work, if originally put forward under a name so considerable as that of Sextius, extolled by a writer so widely read as Seneca, not only as a great thinker but as the founder of a school, could be transferred in popular acceptation from its true author to a Roman bishop. Besides, Origen, Rufinus, and Jerome alike name the author Xystus, Sixtus, or Sextus—never Sextius. The account, moreover, which Seneca gives of the philosophy of Sextius, that though conveyed in the Greek language it was Roman in morals, and though professedly Pythagorean partook largely of the Stoic ("Graecis verbis, *Romanis* moribus," *Ep.* lxxiii. 12; "vir licet neget *Stoicus*," *Ep.* lxiv. 2), ill suits the character of our *Gnomes*, which is distinctly Greek of the Pythagorean school modified by the infusion of Christian (certainly not of Stoic)[j] teaching. Again, a saying of Sextius preserved by Seneca, "*Jovem* plus non posse quam bonum virum" (*Ep.* lxxiv. 11), is alien from the pure theism of the *Gnomes*. And finally, the only sentence of the *Gnomes* which has an apparent resemblance to anything recorded of the teaching of Sextius, is really conclusive evidence that he cannot have composed them: it is the first of those cited by Origen (s. 109), which treats of the use of animal food. We learn from Seneca (*Ep.* cviii. 17), on the authority of his master Sotion, who was a pupil of Sextius, that Sextius abstained from animal food, not on the ground laid down by Pythagoras, namely the doctrine of metempsychosis,[k] but because it led to cruelty, self-indulgence, and injury to health. Knowing then that he thus trebly condemned the practice, we cannot suppose him to be the author of the Sentence in which it is pronounced to be "indifferent."

The view advanced by Ott (*Sprüche des Philos. Sextius*, 1863), who attempted to prove that the *Gnomes* are the work of the younger Sextius, son (as is supposed) of the elder, and successor as head of the Sextian school, seems to have found no supporter. It is hardly worth while to discuss or even mention this theory, inasmuch as absolutely nothing is known of this Sextius, whose very existence indeed is but a matter of conjectural, though probable, inference.

It is to be noted that Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 27; followed by Jerome, *De Viris Ill.* 50) names a Sextus as one of the Christian writers of the reign of Severus (193–211), and gives the title of his principal work, *On the Resurrection*. And we may here remark that Maximus, whose extracts from the *Gnomes* "of Sextus" have been above mentioned, in his *Scholia* on Dionysius the Areopagite (*De Myst. Theol.* c. [illegible] p. 238), adduces "Sextus the ecclesiastical philosopher" as having expressed an opinion concerning the Being of God to the same effect as that which he quotes from "Gregory the theologian," scil. *ὡς οὔτε ἡ θεότης οὔτε τὸ ἀγέννητον οὔτε ἡ πατρότης οὐσίαν σημαίνει Θεοῦ*. Nothing of this is found in the *Gnomes*, but the designation here applied to Sextus [illegible] describes a Christian writer trained in Gentile wisdom, such as the balance of probabilities inclines us to suppose their author to have been. And it may well be that other works of the same writer were known to Maximus. The *Catalogue* of Ebedjesu, classing him as a Greek writer of the fifth century, assigns to him, with the *Gnomes* ([illegible]), a Treatise "*Of [illegible] that love God.*"[l] An early MS. in the Brit[illegible]

---

[j] The Stoic doctrine that all sins are equal is condemned in s. 297; the lawfulness of suicide in [illegible]. Again, the *κόσμος* as regarded by the writer of the *Gnomes* (ss. 15, 20, &c.) is as remote as possible from the Stoic conception of the *κόσμος*.

[k] Zeller (*Philosophie der Griechen*, Period III. [illegible] 7, p. 681, n. 6; 3rd ed.) strangely misunderstands Seneca, when he represents him as stating [illegible] Sotion was the first to assign this reason for prohibiting animal food.

[l] Add. 14581 (sixth century) contains in Syriac [illegible] Discourse "*On the Perfection of the Path of the [illegible] of God*," also assigned to Xystus, but apparently [illegible] later hand (Wright, *Catal.*, p. 655).

Museum (Add. 14612, of sixth or seventh century) preserves extracts in Syriac from an "*Instruction* (ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ) of Mar Xystus, bishop of Rome"; and in another (12155, eighth century) we have portions of an *Epistle* of the same personage.

An "*Anaphora* of Xystus, bishop of Rome," is found in many MSS., was printed in the Maronite Missal at Rome, 1594, and is given by Renaudot (ii. p. 398) in Latin. Assemani, though accepting (iii. 48) Jerome's judgment concerning the *Gnomes* and Rufinus, inconsistently ascribes them (i. 429), with the *Anaphora*, to a fifth-century bishop, whom, against all the evidence, he supposes to have been a Syrian. As regards the *Gnomes*, this view is of course impossible. The *Anaphora* indeed is of the Syrian type; but there is no doubt that the Xystus whose name it bears was (as the MSS. testify) understood by the Syrian Church to be a Roman Pontiff. Thus we find Anaphorae "of Clement of Rome," "of Julius bishop of Rome": the reason being, as explained by a Syrian authority (ap. Assem. i. 430), that those prelates and others were believed to have left "canons and commandments" which were embodied in the many Syriac Anaphorae that bear their names. Accordingly, of all these Anaphorae that of Xystus alone bears the feature, which marks the "*General* Liturgy" of the Syrian use,—that the *Tersanctus* is said not only by the people *before*, but also by the priest *after*, consecration; which fact corresponds with the Roman record in the *Liber Pontificalis* (sixth century), that Xystus I. "constituit ut inter actionem *sacerdos incipiens* populum hymnum decantaret *Sanctus Sanctus Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth*" (pp. 56, 57, Duchesne's edn. 1886). This is a noteworthy coincidence, remarkably confirming the Syriac tradition which prefixes the name of Xystus to this Anaphora.

The best edition of the *Gnomes* is that of Gildemeister (1873), to which this article is largely indebted. It gives the only critical text of the version of Rufinus, with a Latin translation of the Syriac versions, and a collection of the remains of the original Greek, fuller than is elsewhere to be found. To this edition all the above references relate. In his Prolegomena he declines to commit himself to any definite judgment on the question of authorship, but he gives ample information concerning the work, especially its Latin form, including full particulars of the MSS. employed, fourteen in number, and of the printed editions. Of these latter, the earliest is that of Abstem (1502), now very rare; which was followed in 1507 by that of Champerius, usually accounted the *editio princeps*, and afterwards by several others within the sixteenth century. Among more recent editions the most important (besides those already mentioned) are those of Siber (1725), and of Orelli (in *Opusc. Gr.*, 1819, t. i. p. 244), both of whom assign the work to Sixtus II., the latter however attempting (Praef. p. xiv) to compromise between the claims of heathen and Christian authorship. The latest supporters of the view of Gale, who ascribed it to the elder Sextius, are De Lasteyrie, who has published a French version of the *Gnomes* with notes (1843), and Mullach, in his *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graec.* (1860). Of the historians of philosophy, Brucker (Period II. pt. 1, bk. i. c. 2, s. 2, §§ 3, 4) follows Gale and Fabricius against Siber on the side of Sextius; Ritter (t. iv. bk. xii. c. 3, p. 172) admits it as possible that he may have been the author of the original work, which he believes to have been recast by a Christian hand into the shape in which it reached Rufinus; Zeller (p. 679) holds it to be certainly a Christian work, but places it late in the second century, and conjectures that the writer meant his work for non-Christians as well as Christians, and therefore assumed the name of Sextus (not Sextius) the Pythagorean. Neander (*Hist.* vol. ii. p. 462, Bohn's transl.) advances a like opinion. (Cp. Eus. *H. E.* v. 27, above cited.) Ewald (*Hist. of Israel*, bk. viii. pt. ii. s. 3) is alone in the untenable opinion that in the Syriac, in its three books as given from the MSS. in Lagarde's text, we have the true and original form of the *Gnomes*, the production of "a Greek or Roman philosopher who has in this book become Christian," working on the basis of the Sermon on the Mount and the writings of St. James and St. John, and (in a less degree) of St. Paul; and this philosopher he confidently identifies with Xystus I., Bishop of Rome.

See the article SEXTUS PYTHAG. in the DICT. OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY. [J. Gw.]

Y

YFFI, son of Osfrid, and grandson of Edwin, king of Northumbria. He was baptized by Paulinus at York, on Easter day A.D. 627 (Beda, *H. E.* ii. 14). On the death of Edwin, in A.D. 633, he was taken to Kent, and thence was sent, for additional safety, to Dagobert, king of France, to be brought up in his court. He died there in his childhood. (*Ib.* ii. xx.) [J. R.]

YNYR GWENT, regulus of South Wales about the close of the 5th century. He married Madryn, daughter of Vortimer, by whom he became head of one of the holy families of Wales. He (or more probably his son Iddon) was patron of St. Tathai, to whom he gave a college at Caerwent, (Prof. Rees, *Welsh SS.* 132, 164, 233 sq.; W. J. Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 301, 580.) [J. G.]

YRIEIX (YRIER, AREDIUS, ARIDIUS, ARIDUS), abbat of the monastery of St. Yreix, near Limoges. The *Vita S. Aridii abbatis*, attributed to St. Gregory of Tours and coinciding with much that he says in the *Historia Francorum*, is probably the work of a monk of St. Yreix, but is fuller of references to miracles than to historical points: it appears to be based on St. Gregory's notes, and thus is valuable as a key to the composition of other medieval lives. Yrieix, whose name is latinised Aredius and Aridius, was born at Limoges, of noble parents

named Jucundus and Pelagia. At an early age he became an attendant, and at last chancellor at the court of Theodebert king of Austrasia. He there attracted the attention of Nicetius, bishop of Treves, and by him he was trained and raised to the priesthood (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* x. 29; *Vit. S. Arid.* cc. 1–5). He was Gregory's chief informant as to the facts in his memoir *de sancto Nicetio Treverorum episcopo* (Greg. Tur. *Vitae Patrum*, c. 17), and was an adviser of Guntramnus king of Burgundy (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* viii. 27). On hearing of his father's death he returned to Limoges to console his mother Pelagia, who devoted herself to a conventual life (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* x. 29, and *Lib. de Glor. Conf.* c. 104), while Yrieix, for the time, retired into solitude. He then returned, built the monastery of Atan, and gave himself up entirely to prayer, study, and active beneficence. His time was occupied for the most part in copying out books, which he distributed among the neighbouring churches and monasteries, and in giving alms to the poor: according to the *Vit. S. Arid.* he also aided them by numerous miracles. He showed a special devotion to St. Martin and his shrine, which he often visited (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* viii. 15; *De Mir. S. Mart.* ii. c. 39, iii. c. 24; *Vit. S. Arid.* c. 19 sq.), and he bequeathed to the monastery at Tours the possession of all his goods, monasteries, lands, &c. (The *Testamentum S. Aredii Abb. Attanensis*, published first by Mabillon, *Anal.* 208, and now by Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 1143 sq., is of singular interest: it is said to have been written in the eleventh year of Sigebert king of Austrasia, i.e. A.D. 572, by St. Yrieix for himself and his mother, and enters most minutely into the different forms of property belonging to the trust). St. Yrieix died A.D. 591, upwards of eighty years of age (*Vit. S. Arid.* c. 33), and was buried in the church of St. Hilary by his own arrangement (*ib.* c. 34): he seems to have outlived Fortunatus, who wrote an ode upon him (Ven. Fortunatus, *Misc.* v. c. 22 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxviii. 202, Duchesne, *Hist. Franc. Scrip.* i. 486). His feast is Aug. 25, and he has given his name to St. Yrieix in the province of Vienne Haute. (The primary authority is Gregorius Turonensis, *Hist. Franc.* x. c. 29, based on this is *Vita S. Aridii*, attributed to St. Gregory, and given by Mabillon, *A. SS.O. S. B.* i. 349 sq., by Boll. *A. SS.* Aug. v. 178 sq., and by Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 1119 sq. The Boll. *ib.* 182 sq. give also another Life from Mabillon, *Anal.* iv. 194 sq., based on the same material. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 364–5; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 324–5; Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 595, cc. 85–9.) [J. G.]

YSTYFFAN, a Welsh saint of the sixth century, son of Mawan, descended from Cadell Deyrnllug, and founder of Llanstyffan in Carmarthenshire and Llanstyffan in Radnorshire. He was bardic friend of St. Teilo, and supposed to be the author of some stanzas, entitled *Englynion Cain Cynnwyre* (*Achau y Saint*, ap. *Myv. Arch.* ii. 24, 56; Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 652; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 161, 251). He is probably Ystyffan, bishop of Margam, as represented in Iolo Morganwg's list. (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, 625.) [J. G.]

YVORES, Irish saint. [IBHAR.]

Z

ZABARDAS, duke of Sardinia. In A.D. 594, Gregory the Great wrote to him praising him for making it a condition of peace with the Barbaricines that they should become Christians, and asking him to help the missionaries he was sending there. (*Epp.* iv. 24.) [F. D.]

ZABDAS (ZAMDAS, ZEBEDAEUS, Eutychius; BAZAS), the thirty-seventh bishop of Jerusalem. According to Clinton (*Fast. Rom.* i. 343) he succeeded Hymenaeus in the 14th year of Diocletian, A.D. 298, and after having sat 2 years was followed by Hermon, A.D. 330. Later hagiologists in defiance of chronology and historical likelihood ascribe to Zabdas the conversion of St. Maurice and the Theban legion. He is commemorated as Zamdas in the Roman Martyrology, Feb. 19 (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32; *Chron. Euseb.*; *Chron. Hieron.*; Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, i. 343). [E. V.]

ZACCHAEUS (1) (otherwise ZACHARIAS), the fourth bishop of Jerusalem. The commencement of his episcopate is placed in the 14th year of Trajan, A.D. 112 (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 5; Epiphan. *Haer.* lxvi. 20. *Chron. Armen.* Euseb.) Eutychius (351) assigns seven years to his episcopate. [E. V.]

ZACCHAEUS (2), bishop of Caesarea, is named by the anonymous author of *Praedestinatus* (lib. i. cc. 11, 13; Migne, *Patrol.* liii. 591) as having passed an official condemnation on the Valentinians, and the Ptolemeites (a Valentinian sect). No such bishop of Caesarea however is named by Eusebius or any early writer. The legend that makes the publican of Jericho (Luke xix. 2–10) a bishop, found in the Clementines (*Hom.* ii. 1; *Recog.* iii. 65) seems to point to the same person, but is too late to be trustworthy. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 538.) [E. V.]

ZACCHAEUS (3), martyr in Palestine, on June 7, with Alphaeus in the persecution of Diocletian (Euseb. *Mart. Pal.* c. 1). In the *Menologium Graecorum*, Nov. 18, he is called a deacon of Gadara. The acts of these martyrs are printed by Assemani (279. n. 4). See also Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* [C. H.]

ZACCHAEUS (4), purveyor of the monastery of Tabenna, in 347, when Pachomius died, and mentioned in the life of Theodore the successor of Pachomius (Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Mai. [illegible] *Vit. Patrum*, lib. i. c. 29). [C. H.]

ZACCHAEUS (5). A treatise entitled *Consultationum Zacchaei Christiani et Apollonii Philosophi Libri Tres* is attributed to a monk named EVAGRIUS (14), who lived in the first twenty years of the 5th century. He was devoted to controversy, as he was also the author of the *Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani*, lately republished by Harnack in his *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, Bd. i. Hft. 3, Leipzig

1883, which he regards as based upon and reproducing the very words and arguments of the anti-Jewish literature of the 2nd century; and specially of the long lost *Altercatio Jasonis et Papisci* [ARISTO PELLAEUS]. The *Consultations* of Zacchaeus shows the style of argument used by Christian controversialists as against the Pagans of the 4th century. It is divided into three books. The first replies to the Pagan objections of Apollonius, the second expounds the doctrines, and the third the practice of the Christian religion. In these books we find various circumstances which help to fix the date of its composition. Thus the author refutes the various heresies which had arisen prior to his time. He mentions all the leading ones down to the Arians and Novatians, but makes no reference to those of the Pelagians or Nestorians. The pagan retorts on the Christian the adoration paid to the images of the emperors when pressed about the adoration paid to pagan idols. The Christian replies (i. 28) that the custom is a vicious one, and that the priests endeavour to repress it, but points out that the Christians do not adore the images with incense, nor place them on their altars to be worshipped; a point which Ceillier cleverly manages to misrepresent (viii. 428), as if Evagrius sanctioned instead of rejecting the adoration of images. He refers to the institutions of monasticism which were then rapidly extending in Gaul, and laments the threatening aspect of political affairs. There is a great deal of incidental information afforded in these dialogues concerning the internal condition, ritual, and usages of the church about the year 400. The third book treats of the subject of Antichrist and his expected appearance, which the writer regarded as then imminent. The *Consultations* will be found printed in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. xx. col. 1061, with D'Achery's learned dissertation prefixed. Ceillier (*l. c.*) gives a full analysis of it. [G. T. S.]

ZACCHAEUS (6), addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. epp. 397, 398). [C. H.]

ZACHARIAS (1), bishop of Pella in Palaestina Secunda. After the visit of St. Sabbas to Constantinople, who had been deputed by Peter, patriarch of Jerusalem, to lay before Justinian the impoverished condition of Palestine in consequence of the ravages of the Samaritans (*Vit. S. Sab.* c. 75), Zacharias was appointed by the emperor joint commissioner with Antonius of Ascalon to visit the ravaged districts, and to report to him on their condition, with liberty to remit the imperial taxes and to cause the sacred buildings destroyed by the Samaritans to be rebuilt at their expense, with assistance out of the imperial treasury (Fleury, livre 32, c. 29). He subscribed the condemnation of Anthimus in 536 (Labbe, v. 283). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 699.) [E. V.]

ZACHARIAS (2), surnamed SCHOLASTICUS, bishop of Mitylene, and an ecclesiastical writer of th 6th century. He studied philosophy at Alexandria, and civil law at Beyrout. He then became bishop of Mitylene, the capital of the island of Lesbos. He was present at the council of Constantinople held under Mennas A.D. 536, where Anthimus Severus and the other chiefs of the Acephali were condemned. He published the following works:—(1) A dialogue called *Ammonius*, wherein he discusses with a disciple of Ammonius, the Alexandrian philosopher, the doctrine of the eternity of the world. (2) A treatise against the Manicheans. (3) He is reckoned among the commentators upon Aristotle (Fabric. *Bib. Graeca*, ed. Harles, t. x. pp. 633–35. For his works see Migne, *P. G.* t. lxxxv. col. 1011). See next article. [G. T. S.]

ZACHARIAS (3), usually styled RHETOR, and described as bishop of Melitene, circ. 540, and author of an Ecclesiastical History in Syriac, extending from Constantine to the twentieth year of Justinian, the first part derived from Socrates, the second from Theodoret, and the third relating his own experience. Mai printed a fragment of it in his *Scriptt. Vet. Nov. Coll.* t. x. The entire work has been discovered among the Nitrian MSS. It is described in Wright's *Cat. Syr. MSS.* iii. 1046. It has been printed in twelve books in *Anecdota Syriaca*, t. iii., Leiden, 1870, by Land; who however has shown (Praef., pp. vii., xii.) that this Zacharias is identical with Zacharias of Mitylene, that he wrote in Greek, and that of the twelve books but five (iii.–vii.) are due to him. Wright (*l. c.* p. 1126) mentions two other tracts written by him—viz., A Life of Isaiah of Scete, and a narrative of the death of Theodosius, bishop of Jerusalem. See Assem. *B. O.* ii. 54–62. This history is often quoted by Evagrius, *H. E.* [G. T. S.]

ZACHARIAS (4), patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 609–629 (Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* ii. 558), who according to Theophanes, Anastasius, and the Chronicon Alexandrinum, succeeded Isaac in the seventh year of Phocas, A.D. 609. In the sixth year of his patriarchate, the devastating arms of Chosroes II. of Persia reached the walls of the Holy City, which fell after 18 days' siege, with a loss of 17,000 lives, more than double that number being led away as slaves. The conqueror also became possessed of the most sacred treasure of the Christian world, the wood of the true cross, which he took back with him into Persia as a magical talisman and Zacharias with it to be its keeper and chaplain. Modestus, abbot of the Monastery of St. Theodosius, was appointed vicar of the captive patriarch. After 14 years' captivity, Zacharias was set at liberty, and returning to Jerusalem, A.D. 628, with the hallowed relic, resumed his episcopal duties, which he continued to exercise till his death, which, according to the Greek Menaea, occurred Feb. 21, A.D. 629. Immediately after his arrival as prisoner in Persia, Zacharias addressed a letter to his "shepherdless flock," τῇ ἀποιμάντῳ ποίμνῃ, and to the other churches which had suffered from the inroad of Chosroes, and "the orphan children left in them." Zacharias describes himself as ποιμὴν ταπεινὸς ἔρημος αἰχμάλωτος Ζαχαρίας ἐλάχιστος. He draws a terrible picture of the moral condition of the remaining population of Jerusalem, whom he charges with luxury, avarice, and godless carelessness of life. He admonishes them that, so far from its being for any good deeds of their own that they were spared, God had rather been gracious to them as reprobates, to give them time for repentance and amendment of life. Let them profit by the warning, hear and fear and not forget God's terrible judgments which they had so unde-

and calls on them to stretch out a helping hand according to their ability, and concludes with a moving description of the captives, greyheaded men, widows, infants, all fellow prisoners, fellow slaves, deserving their compassion and their aid. This letter was first published by Combefis as an appendix to Chrysostom, *De educandis liberis* Par. 1655. It is to be found in the *Bibl. Patrum* ed. Lugd. xii. 984, and Migne, *Patrolog.* Ser. Graec. xvi. pars 2, pp. 3227–3234. (Fabr. *Bibl. Graec.* x. 635. Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 249.) [E. V.]

ZACHARIAS (5), bishop of Dora in Palestine in cent. viii. There is an epistle extant from Peter Mansur to Zacharias, concerning the Body and Blood of Christ in St. Joan. Damasc. opp. t. i. p. 655, Paris, 1712. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 580.) [G. T. S.]

ZACHARIAS (6), bishop of Rome, from Nov. 30, A.D. 741 to 14 March, A.D. 752: elected four days only after the death of his predecessor Gregory III. He was a Greek, and the son of one Polychronius (Anastas.). The circumstances of the time (see GREGORIUS III.) precluded any confirmation of the election by the Exarch of Ravenna; nor was this token of Rome's political subjection to the eastern emperors ever afterwards resumed. The old connection between Rome and Constantinople was not, however, so far theoretically broken. For Zacharias, after his accession, sent the customary synodical letters to the Constantinopolitan church, and emissaries to the emperor Constantinus. They found the imperial city in the possession of the usurper Artabasdus, but remained there till the emperor's restoration in the latter part of the year 743, when he sent for them, and granted to the pope, agreeably to his request made through them, the perpetual possession of certain lands called Nymphae and Noraias (Anastas. *in Vit.* Zach.). It will be seen below that Zacharias had meanwhile done the emperor good service in checking the Lombard king's intended invasion of the exarchate of Ravenna, which was still included in the empire.

Zacharias, on his accession to the see, found the affairs of Italy in a troubled state. Charles Martel, whose protection against the Lombards the previous pope had implored, and who had at length responded by sending an embassy to Rome, had died, Oct. 22. The Lombard king, Luitprand, who had retired from the Roman territory after the arrival of Charles Martel's emissaries, still retained the four cities (Ameria, Hortae, Polimartium, and Blera), seized by him therein; and he was preparing for another invasion. Recent events had been such as to incense him against the Romans: for Trasimund, the revolted duke of Spoletium, who, with the duke of Beneventum, had been protected against him by Gregory III., had, with aid of a Roman army, recovered his dukedom; but he had failed to fulfil his alleged promise to the pope who had aided him of recovering also for Rome the four cities aforesaid which were held by Luitprand. Zacharias, therefore, immediately after his accession, sent an embassy to the Lombard king, which obtained from him a promise to restore these four cities; but on condition, apparently, such aid was given, and the feudatory duke was compelled to surrender himself to the king. But the latter still delayed the restoration of the cities. Thereupon the pope, accompanied by a body of his clergy, went himself to Luitprand, who was still in the territory of the duchy of Spoletium, where he had received the submission of Trasimund. Anastasius gives a glowing account of the reception which the pope met with, and of the impression he made upon the Lombard king. An honourable escort, it is said, was sent to conduct him on his way, and the king himself came out from the city of Interamna (*Terni*) to meet him. There, after services in the church of St. Valentinus, the king, on the following Saturday, in a private interview, was so moved (we are told) by the pope's pious eloquence that he solemnly conceded to him, not only the four cities, but also the papal patrimony that had been seized in the Sabine territory, concluded a treaty of peace with the Roman duchy for twenty years, and granted also the liberation of the Roman prisoners that had been taken during previous hostilities. Subsequently, during the ordination of a bishop in the same church of St. Valentinus, at which the king was present, we are informed further that the sweetness of the pope's prayers was such as to move many of the Lombards to tears; and also that the pope one Sunday invited the king to dinner, and received him with such sweetness and hilarity of heart that the latter declared that he never remembered having been entertained so well. Zacharias, thus successful, returned to Rome, where with the assembled people he returned thanks to heaven, having visited and received possession of all the ceded cities on his way. But the peace thus made with Rome did not involve any cessation of Luitprand's designs against the exarchate generally. Accordingly in 743 he invaded it, took possession of the citadel of Caesena, not far from Ravenna, and prepared to besiege the latter city. The exarch Eutychius and the bishop John sent to implore the intervention of the pope, who at their request again sought an interview with Luitprand, in order to deter him from his purpose. He went first to Ravenna, whence, having been hailed there as a deliverer, he proceeded to Ticinum (*Pavia*), where the king then was. The pope's ambassadors, who had preceded him, Luitprand had refused to receive; but the pope himself, when he heard of his approach, he caused to be honourably escorted from the banks of the Po, and received him with distinction as before. The personal influence and pious persuasions of Zacharias were again successful, though it was not without difficulty (*post multam duritiam*, says Anastasius) that he obtained his request. At length the king consented to relinquish his designs against the exarchate, retaining only a third part of the territory of Caesena, as a security till ambassadors, sent to the emperor, should return. The arrival of Zacharias at Pavia was at the end of June, A.D. 743, and the final cession of the whole territory of Caesena was agreed to be made on the 1st of June in the following year; before which time Luitprand died; viz., in the January of 744. He was suc-

ceeded at first by his nephew Hildebrand, whom he had previously associated with himself in the kingdom; but this prince being unacceptable to the Lombards, they conspired against him, and elected Rachis, duke of Forum Julii (*Friuli*) as their king. To him Zacharias immediately sent an embassy, and obtained from him a confirmation of the treaty of peace for twenty years that had been concluded with Luitprand. Rachis, however, after observing it for four or five years, at length broke it by laying siege to Perusia (*Perugia*). Zacharias, trusting once more to his personal powers of persuasion, at once sought him there, with a company of clergy and notables, and induced him to raise the siege and give up the city into his hands. He effected still more: Rachis proved so amenable to his religious influence that he repaired to Rome, abdicated, and became a Benedictine monk in the monastery on Mount Cassino. His wife and daughters also accompanied him to Rome, and adopted the monastic life in a convent for nuns, which they themselves founded and endowed in the neighbourhood of Mount Cassino. Rachis was succeeded by his brother Aistulph, A.D. 749, to whom Zacharias immediately sent a legation, and obtained from him a confirmation of the treaty of peace for twenty years. How little Aistulph afterwards regarded this treaty will be seen under STEPHEN III. The recorded action and success of Zacharias in the transactions above described show his character as well as his capabilities in a very favourable light. He took prompt and effective measures to meet exigencies as they arose, and was ever ready to act personally, regardless of trouble or danger. Peculiarly striking was the power of his personal influence over the Lombard kings. It is true that Luitprand appears to have been a man neither headstrong nor violent, and open to religious influences; he had yielded previously to the personal remonstrances of Gregory II. when on the point of besieging Rome, and had treated that pope also with honour and deference. But neither the action nor the success of Gregory II. were on a par with those of Zacharias. The former had gone in person to the besieger's camp, when Rome was in immediate danger, and had succeeded so far as to save the holy city, but no more:—the latter, when not himself in immediate danger, and in one case when it was not the Roman duchy but the emperor's exarchate at Ravenna that was threatened, undertook long journeys to the Lombard kings whereever they might be, and induced them to relinquish their entire schemes of conquest. Zacharias must have been a man of great courage, faith, and self-reliance, to make such bold attempts; and there must also have been something peculiarly winning and persuasive in his character and bearing, over and above the authority and sacredness of his office, to produce such results as these. We may well believe that Anastasius is not merely indulging his habit of laudation of popes, when he describes him as "vir mitissimus, atque suavis, omnique bonitate ornatus, tardus ad irascendum, et velox ad miserandum, nulli malum pro malo reddens, neque vindictam secundum meritum tribuens, sed pius et misericors a tempore ordinationis suae omnibus factus." The mention made above of some of the warlike Lombards having been moved to tears by the very manner of his saying prayers in church may suggest one element of his personal influence over them; and it is further significant that Luitprand is said to have been not only deeply moved by his pious exhortations in private interviews, but also charmed with him as a pleasant host, when, gravity laid in due season aside, he was entertained by him at dinner.

The action of Zacharias, so far described, was of great historical importance. He was the means of saving the exarchate of Ravenna from becoming part of the Lombard kingdom; for it is evident that, but for him, the eastern emperor would have been powerless to retain it. Not less important, as the sequel shewed, were the relations he maintained with the kingdom of the Franks, his most memorable action in this regard being the sanction he gave to the deposition of Childeric, and to Pippin's consecration as king. The kings of the Merovingian dynasty, descended from Clovis, of whom Childeric was the last, had become effete puppets in the hands of the mayors of the palace, who were already kings *de facto*, though not *de jure*. Such had been notably the great Charles Martel: and such was his son Pippin, who, after the retirement of his brother Carloman to monastic life (of which hereafter), had become the sole ruler. With the concurrence of the magnates of the kingdom, he conceived the idea of deposing the useless puppet, and himself assuming the title and prerogatives of royalty, of which he already exercised the power. But it was considered necessary, or at any rate desirable, to get full ecclesiastical sanction for the change proposed. Accordingly, an embassy (consisting of Burchard, bishop of Würzburg, and Fulrad, abbat of St. Denys) was sent to pope Zacharias, to ask him whether it were lawful from a religious point of view. The question has been raised among controversialists as to whether this application implied an acknowledgment at that period of history of the pope's power to dispose of earthly kingdoms at his will, or whether he was only consulted, as the highest ecclesiastical authority, on a point of casuistry. There is nothing in the recorded terms of the application to support the first of these contentions; and possibly, even if Zacharias had refused his sanction, the thing would have been done. Still, there can be no reasonable doubt that Pippin and his Franks regarded the pope's sanction as carrying with it that of heaven, which they were sincerely anxious to obtain. The Franks, since the conversion of Clovis, had been Catholics in faith, and were accustomed to look up to the pope with peculiar reverence, as St. Peter's representative and the church's head. The recent work of St. Boniface in the kingdom, bearing as he did the pope's commission, himself devoted in his allegiance to him, and inculcating everywhere his supreme authority, would tend to strengthen the hold of the Roman see on the consciences of the Franks; and hence it was natural that Pippin, a devout believer in the religion he had been taught, should shrink from his contemplated step till he had been assured from Rome itself that he might take it without danger to his soul. Such appears to have been the meaning and purpose of the transaction. Eginhard, indeed (*Vit. Carol.*

as to the pope's power to dispose, of his own mere motion, of earthly thrones. The chronicler's purpose is to justify the change as not having been made without the sanction of the highest ecclesiastical authority. The reply of Zacharias being favourable, Childeric was sent into a monastery, having had his long hair, the token of royalty, cut off; and Pippin was formally elected as king, elevated on a shield, according to the custom of the race, and also anointed at Soissons by the Frank clergy;—by St. Boniface, according to some accounts, though this is doubtful. (See BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINENSIS.) The pope's action in thus sanctioning the usurpation of Pippin is not likely to offend any of the present day, except such as still believe in a divine right inherent in all kings of ancient dynasty. The Merovingian dynasty seems at that time to have outlived its usefulness, and its retention to have become a farce; and it was evidently best for the kingdom which desired it that the real rulers should be recognised as having the right to rule, and that the theory of allegiance to a useless shadow should cease. Nor is it fair to accuse Zacharias of having been actuated by interested motives. True it is that his action was politic: for it bound the Carlovingian kings more firmly than ever to the Roman see; and Pippin may be supposed to have been in a great measure moved by gratitude, when he afterwards rescued the exarchate from the Lombards, and bestowed it on St. Peter in the person of pope Stephen III. Zacharias may have foreseen some such possible result; but still, if his verdict was justifiable in itself, he should be allowed the credit of disinterested motives. He had shown previously no desire to usurp the rights of the emperor over the exarchate. He had saved it from being taken possession of by Luitprand, with no apparent design of alienating it from the emperor, to whom he had left it to hold it as he could. Nor are the popes before and after him to be justly reproached, as they are by some Protestant writers, for seeking or accepting dominion which belonged of right to the emperor, whose subjects they were. Gregory III. had indeed invited Charles Martel to come to the rescue, offering him the title of patrician of Rome, and the allegiance which had been in former times due to Constantinople; but this was when the only hope of rescue was from France, and when the emperor could or would do nothing for him. Stephen afterwards accepted gratefully from Pippin temporal dominion over territory that had been once the emperor's; but it was then no longer his. It had been wrested from him by the Lombard king, and then from him by Pippin; and, if it had been nominally restored to the emperor, he would have been powerless to retain it. These were the only two practical alternatives; that of the pope becoming a subject of the Lombard king, or that of his becoming a temporal potentate under the protection of the king of the Franks. And the popes are surely not to blame for preferring the latter alternative, whatever may be thought of the subsequent results of the "damnosa haereditas" thus acquired.

[illegible] with him the government of the kingdom ruling over Austrasia, Alamannia, and Thuringia) had resigned his dominion to his brother, and gone to Rome to devote himself to monastic life. His renunciation of the world was not due to any incapacity for the position he held (for he is said to have been an efficient ruler, and successful in war), but to religious aspirations, induced by his intercourse with St. Boniface, whom he had supported and aided in his work of evangelization, and whose disciple he had been. We are told (*in Vit. Bonifac.* lib. 1, c. 36, apud *Sur.* 10, 3, *die* 5 *Jun.*) that, before receiving instruction from the saint, "he had known little of the Christian religion, but that through his exhortations he so advanced in the fear and love of God that he learnt to administer alike wisely divine and human things, and became aware that secular powers profited nothing apart from the celebration of divine worship, to which the monastic life is joined." His conversion and retirement from the world illustrate the influence of St. Boniface in the kingdom of the Franks, and the increased reverence which would thence accrue towards the Roman See. According to Anastasius (*in Vit. Zachar.*) Carloman went first to Rome, where he offered himself to St. Peter, and was by pope Zacharias himself devoted to monastic life. Thence, according to the Frank annalists, he went in the first place to the monastery on mount Soracte, which he restored from the state of ruination to which it had been reduced by the Lombards, and remained there some years; but, being disturbed and annoyed by the visits of Frank nobles on their way to Rome, he escaped by night with only one companion, and knocked for admission at the door of the Benedictine monastery on mount Cassino without revealing his name, but representing himself as a homicide, and guilty of all manner of crimes, who craved a place of penitence. There he was for some time subjected to severe probation, as being an unknown novice of barbarian race, was sent to work in the kitchen, and beaten by the cook. At length his companion who had entered the convent with him, having retaliated on the cook by hitting him with all his force with a pestle, and having been called to account in consequence, revealed the unknown stranger's name and rank. The terrified monks fell down at his feet, imploring pardon; but he in return fell down at theirs, declaring that he was not Carloman, but a sinner and a homicide. After this, we are told, he was treated with great reverence, but continued to lead the life of a humble and obedient monk. (Eginhard, *in Vit. Car. Magn.*; Regino, *in Chron.* an. 576; Leo Ostiens. *in Chron. Cassin.* l. 1, c. 7.) For his subsequent journey to France in obedience to his abbat's orders, and his death in a monastery at Vienne, see under STEPHANUS III.

Many interesting letters, that passed between pope Zacharias and Boniface, remain, showing the close intercourse kept up between them. In 742 Boniface wrote to the new pope, professing his devout obedience to him, and his desire to maintain the unity of the church

under St. Peter's see; informing him also that he had constituted three sees in Germany (Würzburg, Buraburg, and Erfurt), and desiring the pope's confirmation of them. He also requested leave to assemble a synod, as he had been desired to do by Carloman, for correcting the grievous abuses of the church, and especially the immorality of the clergy, in the dominions of that prince. He asked further for permission to nominate (as he says he had been directed to do by Gregory III.) a successor to himself, to take his place after his own death. At the end of his letter he ventures to complain of the retention and allowance at Rome of certain pagan customs, the report of which impeded his own success, and which he therefore requests the pope to prohibit; and also of Frank bishops and priests who had been guilty of fornication and adultery resorting to Rome, and coming back with the pope's alleged licence to them to resume their ministry. To this letter Zacharias replied, according the requested sanction of the new sees and of the synod; forbidding Boniface to designate his own successor unless he should be on the point of death; promising to put a stop to the pagan rites at Rome; and bidding him give no credence to the immoral clergy who said they had got the pope's licence to officiate. Afterwards (probably A.D. 743) two letters were addressed by Zacharias to Boniface, one in August, the other in November; in the first of which he assents to the formation of three metropolitan sees in northern Gaul (at Rouen, Rheims, and Sens), desired by Boniface after a council that had been held under the auspices of both Pippin and Carloman; and he sends therewith three palls, with directions for their use. But in the second letter he expresses his extreme surprise that Boniface had subsequently applied for one pall only (viz. in behalf of Grimo, appointed to the see of Rouen), and had complained (this being presumably the reason why one only was asked for) of the simoniacal exaction of large sums of money for the granting of palls at Rome. In a later letter (not dated) Boniface attributes the failure of the promised application for the three palls, not to his own change of purpose, but to that of the Franks (meaning, we may suppose, Pippin and Carloman), who, he says, were still hesitating. Whether the cause of their hesitation was the alleged expense of procuring palls from Rome, or some other difficulties in the way, we are not told. Zacharias, in his reply to the first of the above mentioned letters, earnestly denies the existence of the abuse complained of. It may have been practised by his officials without his knowledge; for it is not likely that Boniface would have complained without ground. That it had existed previously appeared from its being said of Gregory I. that he had himself refused to accept any gifts in return for palls, and had also passed a decree in council, prohibiting the abuse in all future time. But it may have continued notwithstanding, whether with the personal connivance of the popes or not; and it is well known how it became in later times a large source of revenue to the Roman see. In this same letter Zacharias confirms to Boniface the jurisdiction given him by previous popes over all Bavaria, and extends it, to be exercised in the name of Rome, over the whole of Gaul (*Epp. Zachar.* iv. and v.) In the year 745 (this is the probable date: see Pagi, *critic.*, *ann.* 744, iv.) two notable heretical impostors, Aldebert, a Gaul, and Clemens, a Scot, who had been condemned and deprived by Boniface in a council held under Pippin and Carloman, were at his request condemned also in a council held by Zacharias at Rome. For an account of their errors and pretensions see ALDEBERT, and CLEMENS (4). Boniface, in his letter to the pope about them (see *Concil. Roman. II.*; Labbe, t. viii. p. 299), complains that they still continued to have a following, and to incense the people against himself, and prays that they may not only be condemned at Rome, but that Carloman should be directed by the apostolic see to put them in prison, and thus preclude their further intercourse with men. Zacharias did not comply with this latter request. They were only condemned, deprived, and excommunicated in the Roman synod, but with place allowed them for repentance (*ib.*, and *Ep. Zachar.* ix.). In a subsequent epistle (*Ep.* viii.) the pope directs Boniface to bring the case of these two heretics, who were evidently still at liberty, before a council about to be held, and deal with them according to the canons in concert with the prince, if they should be found penitent, but otherwise to send them to Rome for the judgment of the holy see. The main purpose of the council here referred to was to receive answers from the pope to certain questions on religious matters which had been referred to him by Pippin. The answers are arranged under twenty-seven heads, and contained in a letter addressed "ad Pippinum Majorem Domûs, itemque ad episcopos, abbates, et proceres Francorum." They relate to the powers of metropolitans, the dress of clergy and monks, the marriage of clerics, the discipline of monks and nuns, private chapels, unlawful marriages, adultery, and other kindred subjects.

In one instance of reference to Rome the pope decided against Boniface, though generally supporting him in all he did, and enjoining full obedience to him. A Bavarian priest, ignorant of Latin, had administered baptism with the words, "Baptizo in nomine Patria, et Filia, et Spiritua Sancta;" and Boniface had declared the Baptism invalid, and ordered the person to be baptized again. Two presbyters, Virgilius and Sidonius, who appear to have been in other respects hostile to Boniface, informed the pope, who thereupon wrote to Boniface forbidding repetition of the baptism, on the ground that a mere mistake in language, involving no heretical intention, did not invalidate the Sacrament (*Ep. Zach.* vi.). One of the complainants on this occasion, Virgilius, was afterwards himself accused of heresy by Boniface, who wrote to the pope on the subject. His heresy consisted in holding that there is another world, with sun and moon and other men, below the earth. The man had probably got hold of a more correct view of the solar system than was understood at the time; which view was construed into heresy. Zacharias (*Ep.* x.) directs Boniface to expel him from the church, if convicted of such tenets, and says that he had requested the Bavarian duke Otilo to send him to Rome to be examined. Various other questions, many of

by Boniface to Zacharias, and to have been replied to by the latter.

From one of the pope's letters (*Ep.* ix.) it appears that it had been proposed to make Cologne the metropolitan see of Boniface, and that the pope had confirmed this arrangement. But, some difficulties having arisen, he allowed him afterwards to remain at Mainz, which he constituted the metropolitan see of him and his successors, with jurisdiction over all Germany as legate of the apostolic see. He also allowed him at length to nominate a successor to himself, in consideration of his age and infirmity (*Epp.* x., xiii.). In another letter exemption for ever from all episcopal jurisdiction except that of Rome is granted to the Benedictine monastery of Fulda, which Boniface had founded, and to which he had expressed his desire to retire at last, and to be buried there.

Previous to the Roman synod assembled, as aforesaid, for entertaining the case of Adelbert and Clemens, one was held by Zacharias, A.D. 743, after his return from his visit to Luitprand at Pavia, at which canons were passed, directed against clerical irregularities and incestuous marriages. On the latter head it is observable, as also in repeated injunctions to Boniface and the Franks, that spiritual relationship, contracted by sponsorship in baptism, is insisted as a bar to intermarriage equally with consanguinity.

Zacharias is named by pope Hadrian (*Ep. ad Irenem et Constantin.*) as having, as well as other popes, remonstrated with the emperor Constantine Copronymus on the subject of image-worship. He is said by Anastasius to have restored and embellished the Lateran palace, to have offered various ornaments to St. Peter's and other churches, to have redeemed at his own cost Christian slaves who had been bought by Venetian merchants for sale in Africa, to have established, furnished, and devoted to the perpetual possession of the Roman see, several farms (called "domus cultae") in the papal patrimony, to have translated the Dialogues of Gregory I. into Greek, to have discovered in the Lateran palace a great treasure, viz. the head of St. George the Martyr, and also to have been bountiful in almsgiving, a lover and benefactor of the clergy, and in all respects kind, forgiving, and charitable. He died 14th March, A.D. 752, and was buried in the church of St. Peter. He is thus noticed as a saint in the Roman Martyrology: "Martii xv., Romae Natalis S. Zachariae Papae, qui Dei ecclesiam summa vigilantia gubernavit, et clarus meritis quievit in pace." [J. B—Y.]

ZACHARIAS (7), adopted son of Gegnoesius, the eminent Paulician teacher. At his father's death, in 745, he became his successor as leader of the sect, in the neighbourhood of Samosata, Mananalis, etc. (Phot. *c. Man.* i. 19; Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 30; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 345.) [M. B. C.]

ZACHARIAS (8), bishop of Edessa, originally a Stylite monk, who was dragged from his pillar and forcibly consecrated on the retirement

428; ii. 112, 114; Dionys. *Chron.*) [E. V.]

ZALLA, an Arian Goth in the time of Totila who put to death all the clergy or monks who fell into his hands. A peasant he was torturing to make him disclose where his property was concealed, exclaimed that he had committed it to St. Benedict. Zalla then bound his arms with thongs, and desired him to conduct him to the monastery, where they found the saint sitting reading outside. Zalla shouted to him to give up the peasant's property, whereupon St. Benedict lifted up his eyes, and at his glance the thongs fell off the peasant's arms. The terrified Zalla fell down at the saint's feet, and besought his prayers. The saint continued reading, but directed the monks to take in and refresh Zalla, and on his return warned him to desist from his cruelties in future. (Gregorius, *Dial.* ii. 31.) [F. D.]

ZEBENNUS, bishop of Eleutheropolis in Palaestina Prima, in the reign of Theodosius, to whom the graves of the prophets Habakkuk and Micah were said to have been made known by divine revelation (Soz. *H. E.* vii. 29). He attended the council at Diospolis against the Pelagians in 415 (Augustin. *c. Julian.* lib. i. c. 5; Labbe, ii. 1532) (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 639). [E. V.]

ZEBINAS (1), martyr. [GERMANUS (31).]

ZEBINAS (2), a celebrated solitary and ascetic of Syria, who according to the account received by Theodoret from those who had seen him, was accustomed to spend whole days and nights standing in prayer, supporting himself in his advancing years on a staff. He was also famous for his hospitality, and was regarded by the ascetics of his time as their father and master and the exemplar of all virtues. Zebinas was buried in the village of Citta, near his place of retirement, and a church was built over his grave. He had as disciples the famous ascetics Polychronius and Jacobus (Theod. *Hist. Relig.* c. xxiv.). [E. V.]

ZEBINUS (ZEBENNUS), the eleventh bishop of Antioch, succeeded Philetus, A.D. 229. He sat for nine years, and was followed by Babylas, A.D. 238 (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 24; Euseb. *Chron. Armen.*; Hieron. *Chron.*; Clinton, *Fast. Rom.*). [E. V.]

ZENAS, monk. [SERENUS (2).]

ZENO (1), soldier and confessor at Alexandria in the Decian persecution. [PTOLEMAEUS (1).] [C. H.]

ZENO (2) I., bishop of Tyre, successor to Paulinus. According to Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxix. § 4, p. 730), he was one of the bishops to whom Alexander of Alexandria wrote to warn them against Arius, when banished from Alexandria he was endeavouring to worm himself into the confidence of the Palestinian clergy. The succession of the bishops of Tyre at this epoch is uncertain, and cannot be determined satisfactorily. Tillemont seeks to solve the difficulty by inferring from Epiphanus's epithet, ἀρχαῖος

of "long standing" (Ζηνωνί τινι ἀρχαίῳ ἐν Τύρῳ), that Zeno had resigned his see through old age to Paulinus, as Narcissus had done to Alexander at Jerusalem (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* vi. 222, vii. 648). But unless the authority of the catalogues be discarded altogether, it is certain that Zeno was among the bishops at the council of Nicaea (Labbe, ii. 51). [E. V.]

ZENO (3) II., bishop of Tyre. He was ordained by Meletius to the see of Tyre, which was then filled by Diodorus, in violation of the canons, because the latter refused to withdraw from the communion of his rival patriarch, Paulinus; thus perpetuating and extending the unhappy Antiochene schism (Rufin. *H. E.* ii. 21; Facundus, lib. iv. c. 2). He attended the orthodox synod at Tyana in 365 (Labbe, ii. 837; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 12); that held by Meletius at Antioch in 379 (Holstein. *Vet. Rom. Eccl. Monum. Collect.* i. 176; Labbe, ii. 894); and the oecumenical synod at Constantinople in 381 (*ibid.* 955). In 372 he united with Basil and other leading eastern prelates in the memorial drawn up by Meletius to the bishops of the western church imploring their help in the struggle they were carrying on against heresy (Basil. *Ep.* 92 [69]; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 805; Tillemont, *Mem. Eccles.* viii. 367, 767, note xiii.; Ceillier, *Aut. Ecclés.* tom. vi.). [E. V.]

ZENO (4), a young man of Gaza, who with his brothers, Eusebius and Nestabis, was martyred by his heathen fellow-townsmen under circumstances of peculiar atrocity in the reign of Julian, c. 362. (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 9.) [E. V.]

ZENO (5), bishop of Majuma, the port of Gaza, at the close of the 4th century. He was the cousin of the three brothers, Eusebius, Nestabis and his namesake Zeno, who in the early part of the reign of Julian, c. 362, were martyred by their fellow townsmen. On the outbreak of the persecution Zeno fled to Anthedon, where, however, he was discovered, brutally scourged, and ejected from the city. He then returned to Majuma, where he remained concealed till the pagan fury was past. While there, a Christian woman brought to him the half-calcined bones of his martyred relatives, which she had collected with pious care. These, after he had been made bishop of Majuma in the reign of Theodosius, Zeno deposited beneath the altar of the basilica he erected outside the walls of the city, in which also he placed the relics of a confessor in the same persecution, Nestor by name, who had died of his ill-treatment at Zeno's house, to which he had been carried. Zeno embraced a celibate and ascetic life in his youth. He supported himself and ministered to the wants of others from his handicraft as a linen weaver, which he continued to exercise after he had obtained the episcopate. (Soz. *ibid.*) He lived to his hundredth year, reverenced by the other bishops of the province both for his age and his virtues. Sozomen, himself a native of a neighbouring village, bears personal testimony to his life of devotion, never absenting himself from the daily services of the church in spite of his advanced age, unless detained by sickness. He had a brother named Ajax, also a confessor, a married man, who, after becoming the father of three sons, embraced a life of continence, and became the parish priest of Sozomen's native village of Bethelia. (Soz. *H. E.* vii. 28.) [E. V.]

ZENO (6), eighth bishop and patron saint of Verona, is, it is almost certain, the same as the Zeno, who, according to St. Ambrose in his letter written about A.D. 386 to Syagrius, bishop of Verona, had received INDICIA into the order of consecrated virgins (Ambrosius, *Epp.* i. 5). This would place his episcopate a few years previously. He is praised in a sermon of Petronius, one of his successors, c. A.D. 412; finally, Gregory the Great (*Dial.* iii. 19), who styles him a martyr, narrates how he miraculously protected his church from an inundation of the Adige. He is sometimes placed in the reign of Gallienus, but the date above given is not only supported by better authority, but coincides with the indications given in his sermons, *e. g.* three (ii. 1–3) are directed against the Arians, who were powerful in North Italy in the second half of the fourth century; the author speaks of himself as living about 400 years after St. Paul (i. 5); he imitates Lactantius in several places (i. 3, 12, 16; ii. 2), and Hilary of Poitiers; one of the sermons (i. 14) was preached at the consecration of a new church; in another (i. 10) the mention made of the redemption of prisoners very probably refers to the great defeat of Valens in A.D. 378. The brothers Ballerini, from a minute examination of all these and other indications place his episcopate between A.D. 362 and 380.

The first edition of his ninety-three sermons, which is very rare, was published at Venice in 1508, and the second at Verona in 1586. As in this edition a number of sermons by other authors, which were at the end of the MSS. of Zeno's, were mixed up with the genuine ones, and the whole assigned to him, many, including Tillemont (*M. E.* iv. 585), doubted if any were really the work of Zeno. In 1739, the edition of the brothers Ballerini (reprinted in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xi.) appeared with elaborate Prolegomena, in which they prove the genuineness of the sermons, and discuss all the disputed questions relating to the date and life of Zeno. They are of opinion from his style, and his mention of the Mauritanian martyr Arcadius (ii. 18), that he came from Africa. His style is flowing, and he is fond of allegorical expressions. His Latin is good, and shows that he was acquainted with the classical writers. In particular he twice quotes the Sixth Aeneid.

Zeno is commemorated on April 12th, May 21st, and December 8th, the supposed dates of his death, his translation, and consecration; or, according to others, of the consecration of his basilica, that most glorious of all the churches of Verona. He is represented holding a fishing-rod, to which a fish is attached, in reference to the legend that he used to fish in the Adige. (*AA. SS.* Ap. ii. 69.) Canon Giuliari of Verona published in 1877 a short life of St. Zeno, in which he promises a new edition of the Sermons. [F. D.]

ZENO (7), a sea-captain, who brought letters to Jerome, probably from Aquitaine. He delivered those from Amabilis the bishop, but though he gave a message from Vitalis (q.v.), he did not deliver his letter. (Jerome, *Ep.* 72, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

θέλγειν, also (v. 448, 446) in praise of bishop Hermogenes; likewise — (9), a presbyter (i. 212, 216, 217, ii. 250, iii. 190); (10), a deacon (ii. 111); (11), a monk (iii. 408). [C. H.]

ZENO (12), a solitary in the neighbourhood of Antioch, visited by Theodoret when he was still a young reader of the church. Zeno was a native of Pontus, born of a wealthy family, who, adopting the military profession, had become a confidential officer under Valens, being entrusted with the transmission of the imperial despatches. Having been a hearer and convert of Basil the Great, on the death of Valens he threw aside his military insignia and betook himself to a rock-hewn tomb in the mountains above Antioch, where he practised the sternest asceticism. Theodoret gives a very pleasing narrative of his visit to the holy man in his mountain solitude. Every Lord's Day he repaired to the nearest church for public worship, hearing the word of God and partaking of the eucharist. When the Isaurian banditti ravaged the neighbourhood and murdered many male and female solitaries, Zeno was saved, as he believed, by special miracle in answer to his prayer. Being unable to distribute the whole of his property to the poor in his lifetime, in consequence of his nephews being under age, he made Alexander bishop of Antioch his executor for the purpose (Theod. *Hist. Relig.* cxii.). [E. V.]

ZENO (13), bishop of Curium in Cyprus, A.D. 430. He was present at the general council at Ephesus, where he defended the independence of the Cypriote church against the claims of Antioch. (Mansi, iv. 1465–1470; Hefele's *Councils*, t. iii. p. 72, Clark's edition.) [G. T. S.]

ZENO (14), magister militum, and consul in A.D. 448. Though unbaptized, and still a heathen, Theodoret wrote to congratulate him on his accession to the consulate in very laudatory terms. (Theod. *Ep.* 71.) He also wrote a consolatory letter to him on the death of an intimate friend who had been his companion in arms. (*Ep.* 65.) Zeno was in command in Syria at the time that Theodosius issued his mandate forbidding Theodoret to leave his diocese, the execution of which was committed to Zeno. (*Ep.* 80.) Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xv. 271, 272.) [E. V.]

ZENO (15), bishop of Seville, was granted vicariate authority by pope Simplicius (A.D. 468–483). Felix III. (A.D. 483–492) wrote commending to him one Terentianus, who was returning to Spain after a long visit to Italy. Terentianus had praised Zeno highly to Felix. (Simplicius, *Epp.* 1, Felix III., *Epp.* 8, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 35, 927; *Esp. Sag.* ix. 138; Gams, *Kirch. von Sp.* ii. (1), 415.) [F. D.]

ZENO (16), emperor of the East, A.D. 474–491. His secular history will be found in the DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY. In church history he is famous for the publication of the Henoticon [HENOTICON], and for the active part he took in the interminable disputes about Timotheus Aelurus, Timotheus Salo- their opponents. A full analysis of the letters addressed to him by popes Simplicius and Felix III. will be found in Ceillier, t. x. pp. 401–420. See also the articles upon the various names mentioned above. [G. T. S.]

ZENO (17), one of the four bishops mentioned under PHILIPPUS (16).

ZENO (18), bishop probably in Sicily, to whom Gregory the Great directed the deacon Cyprianus to give a thousand, or if necessary, two thousand bushels of wheat to relieve the poor of his city. (*Epp.* vi. 4.) [F. D.]

ZENO (19), doubtful bishop of Merida. Certain Latin verses, cited by Florez (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 223), describe the restoration of the bridge at Merida by Salla in the reign of king Erwig, and state he did so from his affection for "summus sacerdos Zeno." As Erwig abdicated in A.D. 687, and as Stephen was bishop of Merida in A.D. 684, and Maximus in A.D. 688, if Zeno was bishop at all, his episcopate must have been a very short one. [F. D.]

ZENOBIA, queen of Palmyra, famous for her magnificence, beauty, and wars with the Romans under Aurelian. Her secular history will be found in the DICTIONARY OF CLASSICAL BIOGRAPHY under the names Zenobia, Aurelianus, Herennianus, and Timolaus. Some additional information derived from lately discovered monuments will be found in Le Bas and Waddington, *Voy. Archéol.* iii. 603–606, where we learn (Ins. 2611) from a monument of the year A.D. 271, that her Shemitic name was Septimia Bathzebinah or the daughter of the Merchant, Zenobia being a Greek name used by the Greeks and Romans. She was probably of the family of Julius Aurelius Zenobius, whose *cursus honorum* is found *l. c.* Ins. 2598, and who filled important offices under Severus Alexander and Gordianus. The names of Zenobia and her son Wahballath appear frequently on milestones of military roads in Syria, proving that their dominion was regularly established and of long duration. Some Christian writers have maintained that she was a Jewess (cf. Jost. *Geschichte der Israel*, iv. 166; Milman's *History of the Jews*, iii. 175). She is famous in church history as the patron of the philosopher LONGINUS (5) and of the heretic PAUL of Samosata. Professor Robertson Smith has gathered up all the modern discoveries about Zenobia in his article on Palmyra in the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, to which may be added Alf. von Sallet's *Die Fürsten von Palmyra*, Berlin, 1866. [G. T. S.]

ZENOBIANA, a lady of wealth, rank, and high character, at Chalcis in Syria, one of those who erected oratories in honour of the local Saint MARCIANUS (3) while yet alive. (Theod. *Hist. Rel.* cap. 3.) [C. H.]

ZENOBIUS (1), bishop of Aegae in Cilicia Secunda, c. 285–304 (Gams), martyred in Diocletian's persecution. According to the Greek *Menaea* (Oct. 30), he was born at Aegae of

Christian parents named Theodorus and Thecla, and was raised to the episcopate of his native city. He is accredited with the miraculous cure of many persons given over by the physicians. When apprehended and brought before the prefect his sister Zenobia voluntarily joined herself to him. After being tortured he was beheaded (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 893; Baron. *Annal.* ad ann. 285). [E. V.]

ZENOBIUS (2), presbyter and martyr at Sidon during the Diocletian persecution. He must be distinguished from Zenobius of Aegea, Oct. 30, martyr with Zenobia his sister (*Mart. Rom.*). (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13.) [G. T. S.]

ZENOBIUS (3), surnamed GAZIRAEUS, deacon of the church of Edessa, and a disciple of St. Ephrem. He wrote against the Marcionites. (Ceillier, viii. 2.) [G. T. S.]

ZENOBIUS (4), a friend of Augustine, and a zealous student of moral philosophy, with whom Augustine held frequent communications on philosophical subjects. The treatise *de Ordine* is dedicated to Zenobius (Aug. *de Ord.* i. 1, 4; 7, 20; *Retract.* i. 3). A letter of his to Augustine of about the same date, A.D. 386, speaks of his anxiety to conclude their discussion and their mutual love for each other (*Ep.* 2). He appears afterwards to have been made *magister memoriae*, *i.e.* a keeper of public records (Aug. *Ep.* 117; Böcking, *Not. Dig.* i. 50; ii. 414). [H. W. P.]

ZENOBIUS (5), bishop of Zephyrium, in Cilicia Prima, one of the victims of Cyril's tyrannical determination to force his theological views on the recalcitrant oriental church. During the long struggle which followed the council of Ephesus Zenobius took his stand unflinchingly with the opposition party, headed by John of Antioch and Theodoret, maintaining his position even after the leaders were accepting overtures for peace. He joined Helladius of Tarsus, Matronianus of Pompeiopolis, and Cyril of Adana, in a letter to Alexander of Hierapolis, Theodoret, and other chiefs of the oriental party, expressing their full sympathy and that of the other bishops of Cilicia, with them in their distress, which they had desired to signify more formally by a synodical letter, but the near approach of Easter had prevented the synod being held (*Trag. Iren.* c. 130; Baluz 833).

In 434 Zenobius was present at the synod of Cilician prelates summoned at Tarsus by Helladius, for the purpose of accepting the concordat made between John of Antioch and Cyril, to which Helladius, deserting his party, had recently given in his adhesion (*ib.* 941). He however maintained his consistency, and wrote to his old friend, the uncompromising Alexander, who had been his guest on his return from the council of Ephesus, lamenting that with the exception of Meletius of Mopsuestia, who had been driven from his see by a military force, and himself, all the bishops of Cilicia had proved time-servers, and, consulting their own safety, had deserted the orthodox cause (*ib.* 876). His unyielding consistency caused his fall. He abdicated his see voluntarily, but the vengeance of his enemies yet unsatisfied secured his banishment to Tiberias, from which their untiring malice subsequently drove him (*ib.* 886; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 883). [E. V.]

ZENOBIUS (6), a lawyer and Monophysite heretic of Emesa in 6th cent., with whom the patriarch Ephraim had a controversy (cf. Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. ccxxviii.). [EPHRAIM (6).] [G. T. S.]

ZENODORUS, praised by St. Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 293) for his attachment to the writings of Chrysostom. [C. H.]

ZENODOTUS, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. ep. 203). [C. H.]

ZENONIS, wife of the usurping emperor Basiliscus (A.D. 475), instigated him to restore Timothy Aelurus and Peter the Fuller to the sees of Alexandria and Antioch, and to abrogate the decrees of the council of Chalcedon. She also used her influence to obtain the promotion of her paramour Armatus. When Zeno was restored in A.D. 476, she shared the fate of her husband; they were banished to Cappadocia, and starved to death there. (Theodorus Lector, i. 29, 36; Theophanes; Marcellinus; Candidus; Suidas, *s. v.* Ἀρμάτος.) [F. D.]

ZENOPHILUS, a Roman officer, holding the rank of Consularis of Numidia. He was a Christian, and presided at the inquiry ordered by Constantine into the case of Silvanus, A.D. 320, in which he decided against him. The record of the proceedings was fully extant in the time of Augustine, who quotes passages from it in his letter to Cresconius (*Ep.* 43, 17; 53, 4; *c. Cresc.* iii. 28, 32; 29, 33). Allusion to these, but without mention of Zenophilus, is made by Optatus, i. 14. A portion of the record still remains, and is printed in the appendix to the works of Optatus (*Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. p. 168, Oberthür, p. 167, Dupin). It was said by Cresconius that Silvanus was banished because he refused to communicate with Zenophilus and Ursacius (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 30, 34; SILVANUS; URSACIUS). [H. W. P.]

ZEPHYRINUS, bishop of Rome after Victor, under the emperors Septimius Severus and Caracalla. According to Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 28; vi. 21) his accession was in the ninth year of Severus (202), and his death in the first year of Elagabalus (218). But these dates are inconsistent with the duration assigned by Eusebius himself to his episcopate, viz. 18 entire years. The Liberian Catalogue gives it as 19 years, seven months and ten days, from 198 to 217. Lipsius, the recent investigator of the dates of the early popes, concludes it to have been either 18 or 19 years, from A.D. 198 or 199 to A.D. 217.

His reign was marked by serious disturbance in the church at Rome owing to doctrinal controversies and schism thence ensuing. Zephyrinus himself seems, from evidence that will appear below, to have been a man of no sufficient mark to take a personal lead at such a time, but to have been under the guidance of Callistus, a man of more practical ability than himself, who succeeded him as pope. This Callistus and his learned opponent Hippolytus, both of whom will be noticed presently, appear

to have been the leading spirits of the time at Rome.

The two notable heresies then occupying the attention of the church were Montanism and Monarchianism. Montanism arose in Phrygia (c. 150), where Montanus of Pepuza had declared that the Paraclete had imparted itself to him in order to give perfection to the church, two prophetesses also, Maximilla and Priscilla, being associated with him. His position was that the dispensation of Grace, being, like that of Nature, progressive, had not reached its completion through the manifestation of the Word in Christ, but that a further manifestation of the Paraclete was intended to come afterwards, and was now come. Under such supposed special inspiration the Montanists aimed at purer and more ascetic lives, and stricter discipline, than satisfied the church at large: ordinary Christians they called ψυχικοί, regarding themselves alone as πνευματικοί. But for the above peculiarities they held orthodox doctrine; and this circumstance, together with their inculcation of purity and the strictness of their lives, gained them at first considerable regard and countenance. Tertullian is well known as having been their most distinguished adherent and champion; and he states (*adv. Praxeam*, c. 1) that a bishop of Rome, whom he does not name, at one time gave credence to the claims of Montanus and his prophetesses, till induced by Praxeas, after his arrival at Rome, to condemn them. Whether the bishop thus referred to were Eleutherus or Victor (on which question opinions are divided), it follows that the see of Rome, when occupied by Zephyrinus, had already declared against Montanism. During his reign we read of Proclus as a leader of the sect at Rome, who was disputed against by one Caius, about whom little else is known, but whose *Dialogue*, a written account of the disputation, is referred to by Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 25; iii. 28, 31; vi. 20). See art. on CAIUS (2). Thus Zephyrinus, though no action of his in the matter is recorded, may certainly be concluded to have been no favourer of the Montanists:—but neither he nor Callistus, who succeeded him, are equally free from the imputation of having in some degree countenanced one school of the Monarchians, which the same Praxeas, who had influenced a former pope against Montanism, had himself introduced into Rome. Montanism and Monarchianism represented two opposite tendencies of thought and feeling. The former was the product of emotional enthusiasm, the latter of intellectual speculation, being grounded on the difficulty of comprehending the mystery of the Godhead in Christ. Those called by the general name of Monarchians, though differing widely in their views, agreed in denying a Divine personality in Christ distinct from that of the Father, being jealous for the Unity, and what was called the *Monarchy* of God. Those of one school were also called Patripassians, because their position was held to imply that in the sufferings of Christ the Father suffered. Supporting themselves by such texts as "I and my Father are one," "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," they taught that the one Godhead, not one Person thereof only, had become incarnate, the terms Father and Son with them denoting only the distinction between God in His Eternal Being, and God as manifested in Christ. Such views were obviously inconsistent with orthodox Trinitarian doctrine, and their outcome was the Sabellian heresy. Noetus, whose followers were called Noetians, had taught a doctrine of this kind in Smyrna, and had been excommunicated there c. 230: Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, had taught to the like effect, but had been brought round to orthodoxy by Origen at a council there in 244 (Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 33). Praxeas, who (as has been said above on the testimony of Tertullian) influenced the Roman see against Montanism, appears to have been the first to introduce this form of the heresy at Rome. For the same Tertullian says of him, "Iste primus ex Asia hoc genus perversitatis intulit Romanae humo, et alias inquietus.—Ita duo negocia diaboli Praxeas Romae procuravit; prophetiam expulit, et haeresim intulit; Paracletum fugavit, et Patrem crucifixit" (*adv. Praxeam*, c. 1). And if Tertullian is to be believed, the popes of the time supported Praxeas and his doctrine, rather than otherwise: for he says with regard to one of them (if indeed, as seems most probable, by Victorinus he means pope Victor), "Praxeas quidam haeresim introduxit, quam Victorinus corroborare curavit" (*De Praescript. haeres.*). And of Praxeas he says (*adv. Praxeam*), "Denique caverat pristinum doctor (i.e. Praxeas) de emendatione sua: et manet chirographum apud Psychicos, apud quos tunc gesta res est: exinde silentium." This seems to mean that Praxeas had given to the Catholics of Rome (called ψυχικοί by the Montanist Tertullian) a written exposition of his doctrine, which had satisfied them, so that no condemnation of it ensued (*exinde silentium*). In addition to the testimony of Tertullian (whose treatise against Praxeas, written in the time of Zephyrinus, has been supposed, not without reason, to have been directed against the reigning pope as much as against the original heresiarch) we have that of the work entitled "A Refutation of all Heresies," now generally attributed to Hippolytus. Of whom and of Callistus (spoken of above as the leading spirits at Rome in the time of Zephyrinus, the latter being his adviser and successor in the see) something must now be said. For a fuller account of them see CALLISTUS and HIPPOLYTUS (2) ROMANUS.

With respect to Hippolytus, it may be excused here to remind the reader that he was undoubtedly a learned writer of great note in his day;—referred to by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 20, 22), who gives a list of his works, and speaks of him as a bishop, though apparently ignorant of his see; by Jerome also (*Catal. Ep. ad Damasum* and *Comm. on S. Matth.*), who calls him "martyr;" by Theoderet, who quotes him several times, and speaks of him as "the holy Hippolytus, bishop and martyr;" by the Pseudo-Chrysostom, as "ὁ γλυκύτατος καὶ εὐνούστατος;" regarded in Eastern tradition as bishop of Rome; by pope Gelasius (*de duabus naturis*), as bishop of the metropolis of Arabia; and in later times as bishop of Portus Ostiensis. What his real ecclesiastical position was, is still open to discussion. The idea of his having been an Arabian bishop (unlikely in itself, since his scene of action was in Italy) was probably due to an erroneous inference from an expression of Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 20); that of his having been bishop of Portus

obvious, and against the idea of his having been a recognized anti-pope may be alleged the absence in the West of any tradition to this effect. Still it is probable that (as is supposed by Döllinger) he did actually preside as bishop over a community at Rome, which considered itself the true church, out of communion with the pope, after the accession of Callistus, and possibly also (though Döllinger does not think so) under his predecessor Zephyrinus. The reason for this supposition will appear below.

Among the works, anciently attributed to Hippolytus, was one "against all heresies," mentioned by both Eusebius and Jerome, and elsewhere quoted or referred to. Photius (*Cod.* 121) describes it as a book against 32 heresies, beginning with the Dositheans and ending with Noetus and the Noetians, purporting to be an abstract of discourses delivered by Irenaeus. It will be seen in the art. on HIPPOLYTUS that in the year 1842, Minoides Mynas brought to Paris from Mount Athos a 14th century MS. containing what was called a "refutation of all heresies," in ten books, which was published, A.D. 1851, by Miller for the University of Oxford, under the name of the *Philosophumena* of Origen, whose work it was supposed to be. It is now agreed that it cannot be the last work of Origen, and all modern authorities (except Lipsius, who still doubts) concur in regarding it as the work of Hippolytus.[a] It gives a curious insight into the state of the Roman Church under Zephyrinus and Callistus, and (if it is to be fully trusted) into the character and previous career of the latter of these two popes.

According to it, he had been originally the slave of one Carpophorus, a Christian of Caesar's household, and had the charge of a bank entrusted to him by his master. After a course of fraudulent dealing in this position of trust, he absconded, but was captured on board ship, after attempting suicide, and sent by his master to the *pistrinum.* Thence released on the false plea that, if he had his liberty, he would be able to collect money due to him so as to satisfy creditors, he was sent, after being scourged, to the mines in Sardinia, by Fuscianus, the Praefectus Urbi, for raising a riot in a Jewish synagogue. An amnesty having been granted by the emperor Commodus, at the instance of Marcia his concubine, to the Christians who had been condemned to the Sardinian mines, Callistus, though not on the list furnished by pope Victor, managed, by falling on his knees and crying, to get his dismissal with the rest, and so returned to Rome. The pope Victor was much displeased at his return, the charges against the man being recent and well known; but being of master Carpophorus was prepared to take, he sent him to Antium, supporting him there with a monthly allowance so as to get him out of the way. It might be that Victor, though he did not trust him, thought it right to protect one who had become in some sort a confessor, having been sent to the mines with other Christians.[b] Zephyrinus, however, the successor of Victor, seems to have had no misgivings about the man; for, on his succession, he recalled him to Rome, gave him some position of authority over the clergy, and "set him over the cemetery." Zephyrinus, himself, is described as an unlearned and ignorant man, as well as avaricious and open to bribes, and as being entirely managed by Callistus, who induced him, for his own purposes, to declare sometimes for the Patripassians and sometimes against them, though in the main supporting them; his object being to sow dissension among the brethren, and to curry favour with both parties, as to pave the way for his own election to the popedom, which was the object of his ambition. Hippolytus, meanwhile, the supposed writer of this account, represents himself as associated with the orthodox community at Rome, holding apart from and opposing the pope and his adviser, and being accused by them of being *ditheists.* Further, after the death of Zephyrinus, Hippolytus and his party appear in still more marked opposition to Callistus, who succeeded, apparently regarding themselves as the true church, and Callistus as but a pseudo-pope, or the mere head of a heretical school (*διδασκαλεῖον*).[c] Hence the probability, above referred to, that Hippolytus had been elected by his followers and regarded by them as the true bishop of the Roman church; a supposition which may account for the Eastern tradition to that effect, and for his name having been handed down in the West also as that of a bishop, though with no certain designation of the see he occupied. And he may possibly (though not so probably) have held this position even in the time of Zephyrinus, since he speaks of him as only "thinking that he governed the church" (*διέπειν νομίζοντος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*). This expression, however, may only imply that Zephyrinus was a puppet in the hands of Callistus. It is certainly somewhat remarkable, if Hippolytus was really an anti-pope, that no record of the fact has come down to us. But, on the other hand, he may not have sought recognition as bishop of Rome from other churches, so as to make the position he held notorious, and in Rome itself care may have been taken under subsequent popes to suppress lasting evidence of the true facts of the case. Nor may the circumstances of a separate community, having its own bishop, and claiming to be the true church, have been at that time so

[a] Dr. Newman, it is true (*Tracts, Theological and Ecclesiastical*), is unwilling to allow that the part of the book which depreciates Zephyrinus and Callistus, can have been written by Hippolytus. But his only reason is that he thinks it "simply incredible" that a divine so singularly honoured, whose name no breath of ecclesiastical censure has ever even dimmed, could be the author of "that malignant libel on his contemporary popes." He grants that that portion of the work which relates to the Holy Trinity closely resembles the works of Hippolytus in style and in teaching.

[b] The account of his adventures is thus introduced; observe the vein of irony:—Οὗτος ἐμαρτύρησε ἐπὶ Φυσκιακοῦ ἐπάρχου ὄντος Ῥώμης. Ὁ δὲ τρόπος τῆς αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίας τοιόσδε ἦν.

[c] *Οὕτω μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Ζεφυρίνου τελιυτὴν νομίζων τετυτηχέναι οὗ ἐθηρᾶτο* (ix. 12).—*Τοιαῦτα ὁ γόης τολμήσας συνεστήσατο διδασκαλεῖον κατὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας οὕτως διδάξας* (*ib.*).—*Τινὲς δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ καταγνώσει ἔκβλητοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὑφ' ἡμῶν γενόμενοι, προσχωρήσαντες αὐτοῖς, ἐπλήθυναν τὸ διδασκαλεῖον αὐτοῦ* (*ib.*).

had also for a short time its own bishop, though we should have known nothing of the fact but for a quotation from an unnamed writer, preserved by Eusebius. In any case the picture of the Roman church during the episcopate of Zephyrinus, as given in the work from which the above account is taken, discloses a state of discord and disruption of which we should have had no idea from the records of historians. It does not, indeed, necessarily follow that the picture is not somewhat overcoloured under the influence of *odium theologicum*, or that Callistus was the unprincipled adventurer, or Zephyrinus altogether the greedy and ignorant tool, that the writer describes. Dr. Döllinger (*Hippolyt. und Callist.*), who attributes the whole work to Hippolytus, takes this view. While he earnestly defends Callistus against the libel on his character, which, however, he allows may have had some ground, he at the same time acquits Hippolytus of wilful misrepresentation. He supposes the latter to have been partly misled by false reports and partly influenced by prejudice, being himself a strict maintainer of ancient discipline, while Callistus was a liberal. It is difficult, however, to acquit the writer of deliberate and malignant slander unless the picture given of the popes was, in the main, a true one. There remains the idea of Dr. Newman, which has been referred to in a note, that "the libellous matter which has got a place in," the *Elenchus* of Hippolytus, was not his; an idea for which there is no foundation beyond the supposed difficulty of believing it to be his. And, if Hippolytus was the writer, it is to be remembered that he, himself, was undoubtedly a divine of great learning and repute, superior in this respect to his rivals, and that he seems to have left a name without reproach behind him. All three (as is the case with some others who are known to have been bitterly at variance during life) are now together in the Calendar of Saints.

With regard to Zephyrinus's alleged countenance, under the advice of Callistus, of Patripassian heresy, it may be observed that it is no serious charge even against popes (except in the minds of those who maintain their infallibility), that on so difficult and mysterious a subject, the first broached, they did not see their way to a definite judgment. And it is to be remembered that Callistus, after his accession, distinctly condemned Sabellianism.

Zephyrinus is further accused of undue laxity in matters of discipline, which is said by the writer of the *Elenchus* to have been carried to a greater, and even scandalous, extent by Callistus after his accession to the popedom. As to Zephyrinus, our informant is Tertullian, who, writing in his time, speaks indignantly of a papal edict, which allowed admission of adulterers, after penance, to communion. According to the ancient discipline of the Church, Christians who had been guilty of grievous sins, including adultery, were excommunicated till the hour of death. Zephyrinus appears to have ordered that adulterers might be readmitted to communion, after penance done, though still excluding, as of old, idolaters and murderers. Tertullian expresses himself thus:—"Audio fornicationis delicta poenitentia functis dimitto. O edictum cui ascribi non poterit bonum factum! . . . . Sed hoc in ecclesia legitur, et in ecclesia pronunciatur, et virgo est. Absit absit a sponsa Christi tale praeconium! . . . Adsistit idololatres, adsistit homicida, in medio eorum adsistit et moechus. Pariter de poenitentiae officio sedent, in sacco et cinere inhorrescunt, eodem fletu gemiscunt, eisdem precibus ambiunt, eisdem genibus exorant, eandem invocant matrem. Quid agis mollissima et humanissima disciplina? Aut omnibus eis hoc esse debebis (beati enim pacifici), aut si non omnibus, nostra esse. Idololatrem quidem et homicidam semel damnas, moechum vero de medio excipis? Idololatrae successorem, homicidae antecessorem, utriusque collegam?" The rigorous views of Tertullian, as a Montanist, account for the indignant language. Dr. Döllinger (*Hippol. und Callist.*) conceives that the opening by Zephyrinus of the door of reconciliation to adulterers after penance was only a wise relaxation of old discipline, which was too severe for the times. And when Callistus, after his accession, extended such relaxation to sinners of all kinds, and was so bitterly accused by Hippolytus of encouraging general immorality, Dr. Döllinger further supposes that the pope might be justified, though Hippolytus, as an ecclesiastical conservative, was shocked at any relaxation of ancient discipline to meet the needs of the day, while the prejudice against Callistus personally predisposed him to overstate the case.

Apart from the Patripassians there was another school of Monarchians, who escaped the difficulty of conceiving a distinct Divine Personality in Christ by regarding Him as human only, though conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin. This school also existed at Rome in the time of Zephyrinus, adding to the discord; but it is certain that the Roman see gave it no support. On the contrary, when one Theodotus (called ὁ σκυτεύς) had come from Byzantium to Rome declaring Christ to have been a mere man, he had been excommunicated by pope Victor (Euseb. v. 28; Tertullian, *de praescript. haer.*). Another Theodotus also (called ὁ τραπεζίτης), a disciple of the first, who taught at Rome in the time of Zephyrinus that Christ, though conceived by the Holy Ghost, had been a mere man, and even inferior to Melchizedek, had his sect apart, and out of communion with the church (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 28; Tertull. *de praescript.*): and Eusebius (*loc. cit.*), quoting from an unnamed writer of the time, tells a story of Natalius, who had been a confessor for the faith, having been persuaded by Theodotus and by his colleague Asclepiodotus to be made bishop of their sect, of his having been subse-

[d] It has been questioned whether the *Pontifex* here referred to was the Roman bishop: but it cannot well have been any one else. Baronius cites the lofty titles assigned to him as proof of his then recognised supremacy over the whole church. But the vein of sarcasm in the passage is obvious. It shows only what the popes asserted of themselves; not what others thought of them.

quently warned in dreams and chastised by angels, and having at length thrown himself in sackcloth and ashes with many tears at the feet of Zephyrinus, and been thereupon received into communion. Another of the same school, Artemon or Artemas, taught also at Rome under Zephyrinus, and apart from his communion. This man alleged that his own doctrine was that which the Apostles had held and handed down, and which had been accepted by the Roman see itself till pope Victor's time, Zephyrinus having been the first to falsify the ancient creed. To this bold assertion his opponents replied that the fact of Victor having excommunicated the elder Theodotus, who was "the leader and father of this God-denying apostasy," was proof that the doctrine of Artemon had not in former times been that of the Roman church. (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 28; cf. Epiphan. *Haer.* lxv. 1, 4; Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* ii. 4; Photius, *Biblioth.* 48.) Possibly Artemon's views differed in some particulars from those of the elder Theodotus, was to give some colour to his allegation. But doubtless their general complexion was the same. During the episcopate of Zephyrinus the emperor Severus, A.D. 202, issued an edict which forbade any person to become a Jew or a Christian (Aelii Spartiani Severus, c. 17), which was probably interpreted so as to include existing converts; for in some parts it was followed by severe persecution, especially in Alexandria; so much so that it was thought by some to denote the coming of Antichrist (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 1, 7). But there is no record of the church at Rome having suffered under it. Tertullian informs us (*ad Scapulam*) that Severus himself was favourably disposed to the Christians, having been cured by means of oil by Proculus, a Christian, whom he kept with him in his palace till the time of his death; also that his son Caracalla had been brought up on Christian milk, meaning that he had had a Christian nurse; also that knowing many distinguished ladies as well as men to be of that sect, Severus not only did not molest them, but testified in their favour, and opposed the popular rage against them. Hence there is no reason to suppose that Zephyrinus or the Christians at Rome in his time were molested by persecution.

Some time during this episcopate we are informed by Eusebius that Origen paid a short visit to Rome, having, as he himself expressed it, "prayed to see the most ancient church of the Romans"[e] (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14); but there is no record of what passed between him and the pope on that occasion.

It has been mentioned above that when Zephyrinus brought Callistus back to Rome, he is said, in the work ascribed to Hippolytus, to have put him over "the cemetery" (εἰς τὸ κοιμητήριον κατέστησεν). The expression seems to imply that this was some one cemetery common to the Roman Christians. There had been Christian cemeteries earlier than that which (as will appear below) seems to be here referred to; some being perhaps those of private families in position. They were liable to attack, mainly, it would seem, because of their being used for secret Christian worship. The emperor Valerian, *e.g.*, in 257 issued on this ground an edict against Christian cemeteries. It is conjectured with great probability by De Rossi that after the death of pope Victor (who is the last pope said to have been buried beside St. Peter on the Vatican) the Roman Christians had availed themselves of the protection afforded by law to certain *collegia*, or corporate bodies, if represented by a syndic, in whose name the property might be held, and business transacted; and that Zephyrinus, having obtained possession of a piece of ground, had made it over to the church for a common place of burial in the hands of a *collegium* of which Callistus was the syndic. Such confraternities for the burial of their members were common at Rome. Callistus, having been a man of business, and probably of good practical ability, may have commended himself to the pope as well suited for this office; and it is not unlikely that he occupied the position of an archdeacon also, being said by Hippolytus (as we have seen above) to have been placed in some capacity over the clergy. The situation of this cemetery was doubtless that of the one known as the Cemetery of S. Callistus on the Appian Way, in which thirteen out of eighteen popes from Zephyrinus to Sylvester were buried, and which has been lately excavated by De Rossi with such interesting results of discovery.[f] Zephyrinus himself is said (*Catal. Felic.*) to have been buried "in cimiterio suo juxta cimiterium via Appia"; *i.e.* apparently not in "the cemetery" itself, but in one of his own adjoining it. Lipsius explains by supposing that the cemetery here called that of Zephyrinus was the one which he had himself acquired, and that, Callistus having greatly added to it, the larger extension was afterwards called "the cemetery." It may be observed here that this was quite distinct, and far apart, from the cemetery of Calepodius on the Via Aurelia, which in after years was sometimes called "ad sanctum Callistum," Callistus himself having been buried there, and a basilica to his memory having been erected there: for it is said of pope Julius (d. 352) in the *Catal. Liber.* that he built "basilicam in via Aurelia mil. iii. ad Calistum."

Zephyrinus is said in *Catalog. Felic.* to have ordered that no cleric of any order should be ordained except in the presence of the clergy and faithful laity, and to have made a constitution, the purport of which, as it stands now in the texts of *Cat. Fel.* it is not easy to understand, but which is given in the *Lib. Pontif.* (*Vit. S. Zephyr.*) as meaning that "the ministers should carry patens of glass in the church before the priests when the bishop celebrated masses, and that the priests should stand in attendance while masses were thus celebrated." There is other conclusive evidence that anciently, and to a date considerably later than that of Zephy-

---

[e] καὶ αὐτός που γράφει λέγων, Εὐξάμενος τὴν ἀρχαιοτάτην Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίαν ἰδεῖν

[f] De Rossi supposes that the ground, already containing the sepulchral crypt of the Caecilian family, was given to Zephyrinus for the church by that family, which had become a Christian one. He conceives that the crypt called that of S. Caecilia, which adjoins and opens into the papal crypt, was the original one, previously existing, though afterwards enlarged, and that the papal and other surrounding crypts were added after it came into the possession of the church. See some notice of this conjecture in this Art. on URBAN I

Zephyrinus is commemorated as a martyr; "Aug. 26. Romae S. Zephyrinus Papae et martyris." (*Martyr. Rom.*) There is no ground for supposing him to have been one. Two spurious epistles have been assigned to him. (See Labbe.) [J. B—Y.]

ZETUS succeeded EVARISTUS when removed from his see, Cyp. *Ep.* 50; see Routh, R. S. vol. iii., p. 36. (Fell without authority reads *succensorem*, and proposes to read *succussorem* for the perfectly simple *successorem*, which he apparently did not see was to be referred to Zetus.) [E. W. B.]

ZEUZIUS, an African bishop, addressed by Constantine A.D. 330 (*Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 215 Ob., p. 189 Dupin). [H. W. P.]

ZITTANUS, magister militum in Sicily, wrote to Gregory the Great in Greek, complaining that certain religious foundations refused to pay taxes on their property. Gregory in May A.D. 600 wrote admitting the justice of the claim, and stating that he had written to Fantinus the defensor about it. (*Epp.* x. 27.) [F. D.]

ZOARAS (1), a Syrian martyr of uncertain date, in whose honour a church was erected at Amida, giving a name to a gate of the city. The church was in being in A.D. 503, and also in A.D. 650, when Simeon, bishop of Edessa, was buried in it. (Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* i. 117; 425, 558; ii. 226, note 2.) [E. V.]

ZOARAS (2), a turbulent Monophysite Syrian monk, of the 6th century (Ζωορᾶς τις Σύρος), a contemporary and zealous adherent of Severus, associated with him and Peter of Apamea, in the petitions of the orthodox clergy of Syria, presented to the council of Constantinople under Mennas, A.D. 536, as leaders of the Monophysite heresy, and condemned with them by the synod. The Syriac form of his name, according to Prof. Wright, is ܙܥܘܪܐ *Zĕûrô*, or according to the eastern pronunciation of the Nestorians, *Zĕôrâ*, meaning "small in stature." We learn from his biography given by Land (*Anecdot. Syr.* ii. 12–22) that the "blessed Zoaras," as he is called, was a disciple of Habib, "small indeed of stature, but in mind high above high things." He became a Stylite, and made himself a pillar, on which he remained for some years. On being driven from it by the orthodox party (the "Synodites") he started for Constantinople, accompanied by ten of his monks, to make a personal complaint to Justinian of the persecutions of his co-religionists, "the supporters of the true faith." Hostile letters from the orthodox bishops and clergy had preceded him. On his arrival a local synod was hastily summoned by Justinian to give him audience. Zoaras spoke with calmness, and uncompromisingly denounced "the accursed council of Chalcedon." This greatly irritated Justinian, who rebuked him for his presumption. On this Zoaras fired up, and in no measured terms denounced the emperor for his support of heresy, declaring that if he needed a sign he should

monastery in the suburb of Sykas (cf. Stabo, vii. 319) was assigned as a residence to Zoaras and his followers by the emperor, where he lived quietly, exercising great liberality (p. 21). The embassage of Agapetus, patriarch of Rome, "of evil memory," with whom Zoaras held a very stormy encounter (p. 17), which resulted in the deposition of the patriarch Anthimus as a concealed Monophysite, and the appointment of Mennas, A.D. 536, caused an outbreak of orthodox fury against Zoaras and his followers. In the various "libelli" presented to the synod under Mennas he and his heresy are denounced in no measured terms. He is described as ἀλόγιστος, πλήρης πάσης ἀνοίας καὶ μανίας, a leader of the Acephali, in their impious design of throwing the church of God into confusion, who had learned from Eutyches and Dioscorus to anathematize the holy fathers (Labbe, v. 108). Zoaras had been already condemned and excommunicated by Anthimus's predecessor Epiphanius (*ibid.* 251). Mennas and his synod repeated the condemnation, describing him as one equally incapable of understanding any sacred doctrine and of performing any reasonable action, using his hypocrisy as a bait to the unwary and a cloak for covetousness (*ibid.* 253). The sentence was confirmed by Justinian, who banished Zoaras from the imperial city and its vicinity, and from all the chief cities of the empire, charging him to live in solitude (*ibid.* 267). According to the biography in Land, however, probably under the influence of Theodora, Justinian used entreaties to induce Zoaras and his followers to leave Constantinople (this may have been at an earlier period), and assigned him a monastery in Thrace, named Dokos, thirty miles away, as his residence. Here, too, Theodorus, the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, was living and propagating his doctrines. The length of Zoaras' residence here is uncertain. After a time he left Thrace, and at the interval of some years died, leaving as his successor his disciple, the presbyter Ananias. (Asseman. *Bibl. Or.* ii. 58, 235; Land, *Anecdot. Syr.* ii. 12–22; Bar. Heb. *Chronicon Eccles.* ed. Abbeloos, i. pp. 206–208; Labbe, v. 108, 254, 267.) [E. V.]

ZOCOMUS (Ζόκομος), a Saracen chief in Egypt in the middle of the 4th century, who being childless consulted a famous monk of the neighbouring desert in his affliction. The father having prayed for him assured him that if he would believe in Christ his desire should be gratified. Zocomus complied, and a son was born to him, the result being that he and his whole tribe adopted the Christian faith and were baptized (Soz. vi. 39). [C. H.]

ZOILUS (1), bishop of Larissa in Syria Secunda, a semi-Arian, who united himself to the Acacians at Seleucia and signed their profession of faith (Epiphan. *Haer.* lxxiii., no. 26). We find him however uniting himself with the orthodox party on the accession of Jovian, and signing the letter to the emperor drawn up by them at Antioch in 363 (Socr. *H. E.* iii. 21; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 4; Labbe, ii. 828; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 917). [E. V.]

ZOILUS (2), a correspondent of Basil, who having apologized for writing, Basil replies that he hopes that he will send him as many letters as he can, as they are a great delight to him. The severity of the disease under which he is labouring is greater than can be described or even believed. He prays that God may give him strength to bear what He sends for his good. (Basil, *Ep.* 194 [368].) [E. V.]

ZOILUS (3), a presbyter addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. 168, 169) on John xv. 1, xix. 34, Prov. ix. 5, Acts ii. 13, Is. i. 22. [C. H.]

ZOILUS (4), a disciple of ARSENIUS. He and his fellow disciple Alexander were with their master at his death and received his last instructions (*Vitae Patrum*, lib. v. libell. xv. 9). [C. H.]

ZOILUS (5), patriarch of Alexandria, appointed by synod of Gaza A.D. 542 as successor to Paul deposed by it. Zoilus was deposed A.D. 551. He joined in the condemnation of Origen pronounced A.D. 543. (Le Quien, ii. xvi. 435; *AA. SS.* Boll. Jun. v. 66.) [G. T. S.]

ZOIS. [SATURNINUS (11).]

ZOSARIUS, a tribune addressed by Nilus in his Epistles, lib. i. *Epp.* 55–58, in Migne, *P. G.* t. lxxix. col. 107. These letters are interesting for two reasons: first as showing the method of scriptural exegesis followed by Nilus (the first letter begins with a quotation from Isaiah i. 5–7, of which Nilus makes a curious application); and secondly, as illustrating the state of the Jewish controversy in the 5th century. Zosarius had been assailed by Jews who tried to convert him. Nilus replied by pointing to the state of Palestine as fulfilling the words and threats of Isaiah. The Jews when they committed idolatry were exiled into Babylon, but only for seventy years, and even then they enjoyed the ministry of the prophets Ezekiel and Daniel. When, however, they murdered the Son of God, their exile lasted for five hundred years, and they had no prophets. [G. T. S.]

ZOSIMAS (SOSIMAS), an anchorite in Palestine, of uncertain date. The narrative of his converting St. Maria of Egypt, given by Rosweyd as from the pen of Sophronius, bishop of Jerusalem, and translated by Paulus Diaconus, is apocryphal (Rosw. *Vitae Patrum*, pp. 381, etc. See MARIA (4) in this dictionary). [I. G. S.]

ZOSIMUS (1), bishop of Tharassa, in Numidia, which is given in Notit, but otherwise unknown by geographers (Morcelli) or inscriptions; fifty-sixth suffrage in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. [E. W. B.]

ZOSIMUS (2), bishop of Naples, appointed bishop by the emperor Constantius, the Catholic bishop Maximus being deprived and banished. Maximus sent from exile a written sentence of condemnation against the intruder. When LUCIFER of Cagliari passed through to Naples he refused to receive Zosimus, who in the mean time had become a Catholic, and declared he should be deprived by the special judgment of God of the bishopric he wrongfully held. Soon afterwards, when Zosimus was performing service, his tongue suddenly protruded, and he could not draw it in again. When he left the church he recovered power over it, and the same thing happened regularly whenever he entered a church. Recognizing that the sentence of the two bishops was thus fulfilled, he resigned his bishopric, and passed the rest of his life in penitence. The whole story rests only on the suspicious testimony of Faustinus and Marcellinus, the zealous Luciferians (*Libellus Precum* 16, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiii. 95; Tillemont, *M. E.* vi. 391). [F. D.]

ZOSIMUS (3), a person addressed in numerous epistles by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. epp. 22, 61, 118, 128, &c.); a presbyter addressed in very many (ii. 28, 44, 59, 65, 75); a bibliophorus in one (iii. 86). [C. H.]

ZOSIMUS (4), bishop of Rome after Innocent I., from 18th March, A.D. 417, to 25th December, A.D. 418, under Honorius as the western, and Theodorus II. as the eastern emperor. That his ordination was on the 18th of March is concluded from the fact that, Innocent having died on the 12th of that month, Zosimus is spoken of by Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybaeum, in a letter to St. Leo, as having been pope at the time of Easter in the same year, of which the proper day was the 22nd of March, though it was erroneously kept on the 25th; and, popes having been usually ordained on Sundays, it follows that the only Sunday intervening between the 12th and the 22nd, viz. the 18th day of the month, was the day of his ordination. (See Pagi in Baron. ad ann. 417; xvii, xxi, lxxv;) vii. Kal. Jan. (*Dec.* 26) is given as the day of his burial in the *Lib. Pontif.*

Though the episcopate of Zosimus was of short duration, it was full of important action, and therefore memorable. It fell to his lot to entertain and give the final verdict of the Roman see on the burning question of the day, Pelagianism; and also to adjudicate on the less important, yet still long disputed, question of the jurisdiction of the see of Arles in the church of Gaul. These two questions, and the commencement of that of the African Apiarius, are what mark his episcopate. In the first he lies under the imputation of having for some time favoured the heresy which he at length condemned; with what justice will appear as we proceed.

The stage at which the Pelagian controversy had arrived when Zosimus became pope was as follows: Coelestius, accused by Paulinus, a deacon, had been condemned at Carthage under the bishop of that see, Aurelius, A.D. 412. Pelagius, accused by two Gallican bishops, Heros and Lazarus, had been acquitted at the synod of Diospolis in Palestine, but condemned along with Coelestius by councils at Carthage, and at Milevis in Numidia, A.D. 416, the great Augustine of Hippo being the leading and most influential opponent of the heresiarchs: letters from these councils had been sent to pope Innocent, seeking his concurrence in the condemnation, but expressed in terms that seem to imply some uncertainty as to what his action would be: but he had in his reply strongly condemned Pelagianism (INNOCENTIUS I.). Coelestius having

to Rome, A.D. 417, hoping for the support of Zosimus, who had succeeded to the Roman see. It is to be observed that Atticus, when he expelled Coelestius, had written letters about him to Asia, Carthage and Thessalonica, but not to Rome; this omission being accounted for by the fact that the churches of Rome and Constantinople were not at that time in full communion with each other, owing to the name of John Chrysostom not having been restored to the diptychs of the latter church. On the other hand, Zosimus had before him, when Coelestius appealed to him, letters that had been addressed by Pelagius to pope Innocent, but not received by him before his death. These letters had by no means satisfied St. Augustine (*de Peccat. Orig.* c. 17, 21; *de Grat.* x. 30, 31); but he describes them as being expressed so as to evade the main points at issue, and they may have seemed a sufficient exculpation to the pope, less sharp-sighted than the great African controversialist in detecting heresy, and, as it would seem, less ready to find fault with it in this case. Thus Zosimus was already disposed to receive Coelestius with favour, while the independent action of the African bishops in the time of Innocent may have further inclined him to give the condemned persons a chance of clearing themselves. Coelestius appeared before him in the church of St. Clement; he presented his defence of himself; he was questioned as to whether he spoke sincerely, and as to whether he assented to what pope Innocent had written to the African bishops against the heresies imputed to him and Pelagius; and this Augustine tells us he did, but refused to condemn the alleged errors imputed to him in the *libellus* of Paulinus (his original accuser at Carthage, A.D. 412), which had been sent to Rome. He further, according to Augustine, desired the pope's correction of any error through ignorance that he might have been guilty of; "Si forte (ut hominibus) quispiam ignorantiae error obrepserit vestra sententia corrigatur" (Aug. *de Pecc. Or.* c. 607). The result was that Zosimus took up his cause, as of one who had been unfairly and improperly condemned. He wrote accordingly to this effect to Aurelius and the African bishops, desiring them to send persons to Rome to convict the accused of heresy, or to hold him innocent. In the same letter he inveighs against the two Gallican bishops, Heros and Lazarus, who had been the accusers of Coelestius, and pronounces them to be suspended and excommunicated on the ground of their previous lives and characters, of which Coelestius himself had probably told him; and he further complains of the unfairness of the recent proceedings at Carthage, in that neither these two accusers nor the accused had been present at the council; the latter having been condemned unheard at the instance of absent calumniators. [On Heros and Lazarus see Article under their names.] It does not seem to have occurred to him, when he thus wrote, that he was himself condemning absent persons on the testimony (it may be supposed) of a witness likely to be prejudiced against them. After this Zosimus wrote a second time to

Pelagius himself. These last had entirely satisfied him of the writer's orthodoxy; they had been publicly read at Rome, and received (says Zosimus) with universal joy; and thereupon, as has been said, Zosimus wrote again to Carthage, declaring Pelagius as well as Coelestius to have fully vindicated themselves against the calumnious accusations as those "whirlwinds and storms of the Church," Heros and Lazarus; to have been condemned by unjust judges; and to be still in the church's communion. He sent with his letter copies of those which he had received from Pelagius. Fragments of these letters, no longer extant entire, are cited by Augustine as being so framed (as his former letter to Innocent had been) as to seem orthodox by evading the real question. Of the letter of Pelagius to pope Innocent a copy is given by Baronius from an old Codex in the Vatican. In it, after repudiation of earlier heresies of which the writer had not been accused, he thus touches on the points at issue: "We confess that the will is free, but so that we always need the help of God, and we condemn those who say with the Manichaeans that man cannot avoid sin, as well as those who assert with Jovinian that man cannot sin;" and he concludes thus: "This is the faith, most blessed pope, which we always have held and hold, in which if anything has been perchance expressed unskilfully or incautiously, we desire correction from thee, who holdest both the faith and the see of Peter. But, if this our confession is approved by the judgment of thy apostolate, then whoever shall wish to asperse me will prove himself to be unskilled, or malevolent, or even not a Catholic, but not me to be a heretic." In his letters to Zosimus he is quoted by Augustine as further repudiating the charge of denying baptism to infants in the same form in which it was administered to adults, or of promising the kingdom of heaven apart from Christ's redemption (Aug. *de Grat. Chr.* 32, &c.; *de Pecc. Or.* 20). It is evident that, as Augustine contended, the real points of the controversy between himself and the Pelagians were untouched in a confession of this kind: there was no definition of what was meant by the divine aid required by man, or of the purposes for which it was required; and it was left uncertain whether or not it was for the remission of original sin that infant baptism was needful. It is difficult to suppose Zosimus to have been so ignorant as not to perceive this, when he declared Coelestius and Pelagius orthodox. It is more probable that he was willing to accept what they did acknowledge as sufficient, leaving the difficult and mysterious questions of grace and free will undefined by authority. Such an attitude appears in the course of his first letter to the Africans, where he says, "Ipsum sane Coelestium et quoscunque qui eo tempore et diversis regionibus aderant sacerdotes admonui, has tendiculas quaestionum et inepta certamina, quae non edificant sed magis destruunt, ex illa curiositatis contagione profluere, dum unusquisque ingenio suo et intemperanti eloquentia suprascripta abutitur."

If this were so, modern theologians of the liberal school may be inclined to approve

rather than censure the action of Zosimus at this period of his career, though it certainly cannot be justified by any who regard Pelagianism as a heresy of vital importance, rightly condemned by the church. For Zosimus must have either been culpably ignorant and unappreciative of the gist of the pending controversy, or, if he understood it, allowed the Pelagian position to be orthodox. Indeed, according to Augustine (*de Pecc. Or.* c. 5, 6) Coelestius, in his defence at Rome, had not even attempted to disguise his denial of inherited guilt; having in his *libellus*, after allowing that infants must be baptized for conferring grace to aid their natural weakness, added further, "In remissionem autem peccatorum baptizandos infantes non idcirco dicimus ut peccatum ex traduce firmare videamur, quod longe a Catholico sensu alienum est; quia peccatum non cum homine nascitur quod postmodum exercetur ab homine, quia non naturae delictum sed voluntatis esse demonstratur... Et hoc praemunire necessarium est, ne per mysterii occasionem ad Creatoris injuriam malum antequam fiat ab homine trudi dicatur homini per naturam." He is not said to have retracted this emphatic statement, or to have been asked to do so; and if so, Zosimus accepted it. The view that has been taken in the pope's defence, namely, that he did not acquit the heresiarchs, but only suspended judgment till they should have a fair hearing in the presence of their accusers, is inconsistent with the obvious drift of his letters to the Africans, and especially of the second. He says in it, speaking of Pelagius and his followers, "Tales etiam absolutae fidei infamari potuisse? Estne ullus locus in quo Dei gratia vel adjutorium praetermissum est? Quod quisquis potest praeter eandem vel mente concipere, nec illi supernae sententiae subjectus quae de sancto Spiritu lata est, quod neque hic neque in futuro venia vel remissione donetur?" Inconsistent also with these letters is the view put forward by Augustine in his anxiety to excuse the pope, namely, that the latter acquitted Pelagius and Coelestius, not as being ignorant of or excusing their errors, but as accepting their expressed willingness to correct them if they were in the wrong. (See Baron. *ad ann.* 418, vi.)[a]

As was to be expected, Pelagius and Coelestius were and are still accused of having endeavoured to impose upon the pope by artful and dishonest statements of their views. It is more charitable, and probably more correct, to suppose that all they meant to say was this: "So far we agree with our opponents. Is this confession of our faith enough to satisfy you?" That this was the case with Coelestius, in his defence at Rome, certainly appears from Augustine's above-cited extracts from his *libellus*.

By the same messenger (a subdeacon, Basilicus) by whom Zosimus sent his second letter to the bishops at Carthage, he summoned also Paulinus, the original accuser of Coelestius, to repair to Rome. The *libellus* of this Paulinus had been before the pope at the hearing of Coelestius, and the latter had retorted on him the charge of heresy; neither he nor any other accusers had come to Rome, as invited, to make good their accusations; and so Zosimus now summoned him to give an account of himself. But he respectfully refused to go, saying that there was no need; and he assumes in his reply, which is extant, that the pope's verdict had already been on his side, in that Coelestius had been called upon at Rome, however in vain, to condemn the heresies which he, Paulinus, had charged him with. Aurelius also, and the other African bishops, remained resolute in their position. Several letters, no longer extant, appear to have passed between them and Zosimus, alluded to by Augustine (*contra duas Ep. Pelag. l.* 2, *c.* 3), and by Zosimus himself in his letter to be next cited. Early in the year 418 they held a council of 214 bishops at Carthage, in which they confirmed their condemnation of Pelagius and Coelestius, and declared, with regard to Rome, that they must hold the verdict of Innocent against the heresiarchs to be still in force, unless the latter should recant. The decrees of this council were sent to Zosimus; and he in his extant reply, dated 21st of March 418, begins by a lengthy and high-flown assertion of the authority of the Roman see inherited from St. Peter, which was such, he says, that none might dare to dispute its judgment. Still he declares himself willing to consult his brethren, though not as being ignorant of what ought to be done, or requiring their concurrence. With respect to Coelestius who had appealed to him, he had thought that in former letters he had sufficiently explained the state of the case; but, being informed now that he was considered to have approved him in all respects, he says that his meaning had been misunderstood:—he had only desired to decide nothing rashly; the matter remained as it was, still unsettled; and he had taken no further step with respect to it since the Africans had last heard from him. If he had written at first in this strain, the plea might here be better made out for him that he had only suspended judgment: but the difference between the tone of this letter and that of his former ones is evident. He seems now to be at length aware that he had acted with something of the rashness which he deprecates, while his grand words about his own independent authority as pope, seem meant as a protest against the idea that he is yielding to the Africans, as was in fact the case.

On the 1st of May in the same year, a plenary council representing all Africa, met at Carthage (subsequent, it would seem, to the previous one, the letters from which Zosimus had replied to as above), which passed nine doctrinal canons condemning in detail all the distinctive doctrines of Pelagianism. About the same time the emperor Honorius, moved apparently by the African bishops, issued from Ravenna a Rescript, dated 30th of April 418, and addressed to

[a] Augustine's words are:—"Sed cum hoc Coelestius in suo libello posuisset inter alia duntaxat, de quibus se adhuc dubitare et instrui velle confessus est, in homine acerrimi ingenii qui profecto, si corrigeretur, plurimis profuisset, voluntas emendationis, non falsitas dogmatis approbata est. Et propterea libellus ejus Catholicus dictus est, quia et hoc Catholicae mentis est, si qua forte aliter sapit quam veritas exigit, non ea certissime definire, sed detecta et demonstrata respuere" (*Ad Bonif. c. ep. Pelag.* l. r. c. 3). He wrote thus in reply to the charge of prevarication made afterwards by Julianus the Pelagian against the Roman bishop, in that he had finally condemned what he had once approved.

adherents to be banished. Zosimus now summoned Coelestius to appear again before him; but the latter escaped from Rome; whereupon the pope at last issued a letter, called by Mercator *Epistola Tractoria*, condemning him and the Pelagian heresy (Marius Mercator, *in Commonitor.*; August. l. 2. *ad Bonifac.* c. 3). This document has not been preserved; but Augustine gives us intimation of its drift (*de Peccat. Orig.* 25; *Ep.* 190, 23). It entered into the whole doctrine of Redemption, which Pelagius and Coelestius were declared to have contravened, but it allowed them the position of penitents in case of their recanting. Baronius, Norisius, Garnier, and others, suppose that this *Tractoria* was issued before the plenary African council and the rescript of the emperor, and that the latter was issued in consequence of it, and at the pope's instigation. Tillemont (t. xiii. pp. 738, 739) proves the contrary. That Honorius issued his edict at the instance of the pope is unlikely, from the mere fact that the pope is in no way referred to in it; and further in a letter addressed in the following year to Aurelius of Carthage (given by Baron. A.D. 419, lvii.) the emperor, alluding to his rescript, speaks of it as issued in deference to the judgment, not of the pope, but of Aurelius; "In quo secuta est clementia nostra judicium sanctitatis tuae." Further, Augustine (*c. duas ep. Pelag.* ii. c. 3) speaks of Julianus the Pelagian reproaching the Roman clergy with having at length condemned Pelagianism under the influence of fear inspired by the emperor's edict: Eos *jussionis terrore perculsos* non erubuisse praevaricationis crimen admittere, ut contra priorem sententiam suam, qua gestis catholico dogmati adfuerant, postea pronuntiarent malam hominum esse naturam."

The *Tractoria* was sent to all parts of the church, and was generally accepted and subscribed, except by nineteen bishops of Italy, headed by Julianus, bishop of Œlanum in Campania, who became thenceforth the chief representative of Pelagianism. Julianus wrote two letters of remonstrance to Zosimus in behalf of himself and his friends, and appealed to a general council;—which demand was successfully resisted by Augustine and the Count Valerian. They were deposed by Zosimus, and banished by the emperor. Some are said to have consequently recanted, but not Julianus (Mar. Merc., *Commonit.* c. 3; Aug. c. *Julian.* i. 13; iii. 5; c. *duas ep. Pel.* iv. 34, &c.)

The celebrated case of Apiarius in the year 418 affords evidence, in addition to what has appeared above, of the relations at that time between the African church and the see of Rome. Apiarius was a priest of Mauritania, who, having been excommunicated by his bishop, Urbanus of Sicca, appealed to Zosimus. The latter ordered the restoration of Apiarius, but was not obeyed by the bishop of Sicca, the pope's jurisdiction in the matter being disputed by the Africans. He then deputed Faustinus, bishop of Potentia, with two presbyters, charged with a *Commonitorium*, to go to Carthage in his name. They attended a council there, prepared to pronounce the excommunication of Urbanus, and alleging the pope's authority in the matter on the ground of the the alleged Nicene canon was quoted. But this canon was not known in Africa as among those of Nice, and the case was adjourned till inquiry should be made; and in the meantime Apiarius was restored to the office of priesthood, but forbidden to officiate in the church of Sicca. For further proceedings in the matter after the death of Zosimus see COELESTINUS I. The canon quoted by Zosimus as Nicene was in fact one of Sardica, with respect to which see under JULIUS (5). The Sardican canons continued to be quoted by subsequent popes—Boniface, Coelestinus, Innocent I., Leo I.—as Nicene, though it had been proved that they were not so, Zosimus, in the case before us, having been the first thus to quote them. He at least is not of necessity to be charged with dishonesty for doing so, since it is not unlikely that the Sardican canons were preserved at Rome as an appendage to those of Nice, and were regarded there as forming part of them.

Zosimus is further memorable for his adjudication on the question of the jurisdiction of the see of Arles in Gaul, and for some of the Gallic bishops having been as little ready as the Africans were to submit to his authority. Patroclus had become the metropolitan of Arles. He had been elected and ordained A.D. 412, on the expulsion by the people of the former metropolitan, Heros—the Gallican bishop, above named, who subsequently, with Lazarus, accused Pelagius of heresy in Palestine and Africa. Hence Zosimus, who as aforesaid, acted and expressed himself so strongly against Heros and Lazarus, was likely to be predisposed to support Patroclus. There had been a long rivalry and struggle for jurisdiction between the two ancient sees of Arles and Vienne. A recent synod at Turin had decided against the claim of Arles to general jurisdiction over other provinces.[b] Consequently other Metropolitans—Simplicius of Vienne, Hilarius of Narbonne, and Proculus of Marseilles—had claimed the right of ordaining bishops in their respective provinces independently; and, notably, Proculus, acting on the powers assigned him by the Turin synod as Metropolitan of Narbonensis Secunda, had ordained Lazarus (the friend and

---

[b] "Illud deinde inter episcopos urbium Arelatensis et Viennensis, qui de primatus apud nos honore certabant, a S. Synodo definitum est, ut qui ex eis approbaverit suam civitatem esse metropolim, is totius provinciae honorum primatus obtineat" (*Conc. Taurinense, can.* 2). The Turin synod which passed this canon, assigned by Baronius to the year 397, is said by Gieseler to have been held A.D. 491, and therefore long after the time of Zosimus. But it may express correctly the principle on which the earlier synod, referred to in the text, had gone; namely, that of following in ecclesiastical arrangement the political divisions of the empire. This principle had prevailed in the East, and had in fact been that on which metropolite and patriarchal jurisdiction seems to have been at first assigned to certain cities. But the popes had often protested against it, as for instance in their maintenance of their own jurisdiction over the Illyrian provinces, after their transference to the Eastern empire, and their opposition to the claims of Constantinople, made on the mere ground of its being the imperial city. In opposition to this principle a special jurisdiction was claimed for Arles on the ground of its ecclesiastical origin.

associate of Heros) to the see of Aquae Sextiae (*Aix*). This was of course likely to be peculiarly displeasing to Zosimus. Patroclus appealed to him (A.D. 417), and he at once wrote to the bishops of Gaul, and also to Aurelius of Carthage, and to the rest of the African as well as to the Spanish bishops, asserting the authority of the bishop of Arles over the provinces of Vienne, and Narbonensis Prima and Secunda, and declaring all who should ordain bishops, or be ordained, within those provinces without his concurrence, to be degraded from the priesthood. In his letter to the bishops of Gaul he further requires that ecclesiastics of all orders from any part of Gaul whatever, proceeding to Rome, or to any other part of the world, should not be received without letters commendatory (*formatae*) from the Metropolitan of Arles. But this last privilege of the see he rests not on ancient right, but on the personal merits of Patroclus; "Hoc autem privilegium Formatarum S. Patroclo, fratri et coepiscopo nostro, meritorum ejus speciali contemplatione concessimus." The jurisdiction of Arles over the above-named provinces he rests on ancient right, derived from Trophimus having been sent from Rome as first bishop of the see, and all Gaul having received the stream of faith from that fountain. With respect to this allegation about Trophimus it may be observed that Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* i. 28), referring to *Passio S. Saturnini Episc. Tolos.*, speaks of seven missionary bishops, including Trophimus, who founded the see of Arles, having been sent from Rome to Gaul, "Decio et Grato consulibus," *i.e.* A.D. 250. But the see of Arles must have existed before the date assigned, since it appears from Cyprian (*Ep.* vi. 7) that in 254 Marcion had long been bishop of it. There may possibly have been some Trophimus of an earlier date who had been sent from Rome to Arles; but, if so, nothing is known about him. Zosimus is sometimes quoted as having identified this Trophimus with Trophimus the Ephesian (Acts xx. 4; xxi. 29; 2 Tim. iv. 20); but his letters contain nothing to this effect, though such may have been the current tradition. In like manner St. Dionysius, mentioned by St. Gregory of Tours as one of the seven bishops sent at the same time with Trophimus into Gaul, was traditionally identified with the Areopagite.

Zosimus wrote also to the bishops of the provinces Viennensis and Narbonensis Secunda, disallowing the independent authority conceded to the metropolitans of those provinces by the Turin synod; to Hilarius of Narbonne, the metropolitan of Narbonensis Prima, forbidding him to ordain bishops independently of Arles, declaring all whom he should so ordain excommunicate, and threatening him with the same sentence; and also to Patroclus, confirming to him the alleged ancient rights of his see, together with the privilege, above mentioned, of alone giving *Firmatae* to ecclesiastics from all parts of Gaul. Simplicius of Vienne so far deferred to the pope's authority as to send a legate to him; and Zosimus, in a letter to him, dated 1 Oct. in the same year (417), allowed him, for the sake of peace, to go on for the present ordaining bishops in the neighbouring cities of the province in accordance with the order of the Turin synod. No such deference to Rome was shown by Proculus of Marseilles, who continued to ordain, though the pope had pronounced his deposition. Tumults ensued at Marseilles, where there seem to have been two parties. Consequently in the following year (418) Zosimus wrote to the clergy and people there, warning them to oppose the attempts of Proculus, and to submit to Patroclus; and to Patroclus himself, enjoining him to assert his authority. Notwithstanding all this, Proculus maintained his position as bishop of Marseilles, and metropolitan of Narbonensis Secunda. With regard to the personal merits of Patroclus and Proculus, Baronius finds himself compelled to confess that the pope was deceived in his estimate and support of the former, who was himself an intruder in the see of Arles, and who bore a bad character. Prosper (*Chron.*) speaks of him as one who "infami mercatu sacerdotia venditare ausus est." Proculus, on the contrary, is commended by St. Jerome (*Ep.* 4) as "a holy man." The question of the jurisdiction of Arles, by no means settled (as has been seen) by Zosimus, long continued to be a bone of contention in Gaul, as will be seen in the lives of many subsequent popes. Zosimus died soon after writing the letters last mentioned, and was buried, according to the *Lib. Pontif.*, on the 26th of December, "via Tiburtina juxta corpus beati Laurentii martyris."

In the *Martyrolog. Rom.* he is noticed thus; Dec. 26, "Ibidem (sc. Romae) Zosimi papae et confessoris," with this note appended, "De eodem Beda; sed per errorem confusus habetur cum alio Zosimo, de quo idem *supra* 15 Kal. Januarii." The blunder appears to have been Baronius's, not Bede's. In Bede's Martyrology had been found, "xv. Kal. Jan., S. Zosimus martyr, qui pro confessione fidei passus est." The reference was to an early martyr of that name, who is mentioned by St. Polycarp. Some transcriber having ignorantly confused him with pope Zosimus, Baronius, in revising the Roman Martyrology, perpetuated the error, making two saints out of one.

The main authorities for his life, as above given, are his own letters and other documents, to be found in Baronius and Labbe, the works of St. Augustine, and Prosper (*Chron.*).

[J. B—y.]

ZOSIMUS (5), one of the Byzantine historians, and worthy of particular attention, not only owing to his general merits as a writer of history, but because, as a heathen and bitterly opposed to Christianity, he gives us the heathen view of the causes of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire.

There is considerable uncertainty as to the date at which Zosimus flourished, some authors assigning him to the time of Honorius at the close of the 4th century (he succeeded his father A.D. 395), and others to that of Anastasius at the close of the 5th (he reigned from A.D. 491 to A.D. 518). The probability is that the first of these dates is too early, the second too late, and that Zosimus belongs to the first half of the 5th century. This is the conclusion come to by Cave, who speaks of him as flourishing A.D. 425 (*Hist. Lit.* p. 302). Reitemeier on the other hand, proceeding upon what he takes to be the evidence afforded by his own writings, places him as late as A.D. 470 (*Disquis. in Corpus Ser.*

much at least is certain, that he lived in the decline of the empire, and that it was the melancholy spectacle of its decay and ruin which led him to make the effort to discover the causes, and to commemorate the particulars, of so great a fall. The place of his birth is unknown, but he had fixed his residence at Constantinople, where he would seem to have held the position of a *Comes* and *Exadvocatus Fisci*. The office appears to have been connected either with the government of the city, or the administration of the royal revenues. In his work, *De Aed.* iii. 1, he tells us himself that the ruler of a province was called a *Comes*. Although a heathen, Zosimus was not a polytheist, for in one passage at least of his history, when referring to an oracle which had predicted the greatness of Old Byzantium, he speaks of the Deity in highly worthy terms. "Let no one think," he says, "that because a long period passed before the prediction was fulfilled it must refer to something else, for all time is short to the Divine Being who always is and shall be" (ii. 37). He paid honour, however, to the heathen religious rites, honouring them as rites which had come down from former generations (v. 23), complaining of the attempts of various emperors to extinguish them (ii. 29, iv. 59), lamenting the fact that the oracles of the gods were no longer listened to (i. 57), and finding in the abandonment of the old religion one main cause of the decline of the empire (iv. 59). At the same time he ridicules Christianity as an unreasonable conglomerate, ἄλογος συγκατάθεσις (iv. 59), sneers at Christian soldiers as only able to pray (iii. 2, iv. 23), and welcomes any opportunity of giving the most false representations of the Christian faith (ii. 29, iv. 59). A historian of such a spirit can hardly be relied on for an account of the events of a time when the old superstitions which he venerated were compelled to yield to the advancing power of a religion which he abhorred; and even his admirers are constrained to admit, that he is not to be trusted where his prejudices on religious matters come into play. Reitemeier, who defends him on the whole, allows that he was too partial to the heathen, too unjust to Christians (*Disquis.* p. 26); and Gibbon speaks of his "passion and prejudice," of his "ignorant and malicious suggestions," and of the "malcontent insinuations of the heathen Zosimus" (chaps. xvii. xx.). His accounts of the conversion of Constantine, and of the character of Theodosius (ii. 29, iv. 26–33), are in this respect particularly worthy of notice. To the former, as well as to many other of his most scandalous charges against that emperor, Evagrius replied in the fiercest language, addressing him as a "wicked spirit and fiend of hell" (iii. 41); and for the latter he has been condemned by Gibbon in milder but hardly less emphatic language (chap. xxvii.). De Broglie refers, for a full refutation of the story regarding the conversion of Constantine, to the *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscrip.* 49, p. 470, etc.

From all that has been said, the inference must not be hastily drawn that Zosimus is, as a historian, unworthy of our regard. On the interesting, as showing us the light in which they were regarded by the more intelligent of the heathen; nor are they always wanting in truth and forcibleness of statement. His description of the monks, for example, who so often troubled both the empire and the church, is an important counterpoise to the exaggerated estimate always formed of them by the professed ecclesiastical historians of the age. "They forswear lawful marriages, and fill their institutions both in cities and villages with unmarried men who are of no service either for war or for any work useful to the state, except that, making progress from their beginning to the present day, they have taken possession of a great part of the land, and that, on pretence of sharing everything with the poor, they reduce, so to speak, all to poverty" (v. 23). At the same time the exposure that he makes of the tyranny and crimes of several of the first Christian emperors cannot be set aside as inconsistent with the probabilities of the case. In any descriptions given by him of such things he has said nothing even approaching in severity the accounts that have come down to us from other sources, while we cannot forget that other historians, to whom we owe our knowledge of the persons of whom he speaks,—Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Philostorgius, and Evagrius—were naturally predisposed to conceal the vices, and to exaggerate the virtues of those who, in their public capacity, were defenders of the faith. In estimating, too, the value of Zosimus as a historian, it must be borne in mind that he treats more largely of civil affairs than these others had done, and that we owe to him many facts connected with the condition of the military, their degeneracy, exactions, and dissoluteness, which they passed over in silence, but which other historians have acknowledged to have contributed in no slight degree to the fall of the empire.

There seems indeed no sufficient ground to ascribe intentional bad faith to the history before us. That the writer was mistaken in many of his conclusions, and especially in those relating to the influence of Christianity, is unquestionable. That he occasionally gave too easy credence to unfounded statements is not less so; but it has never been proved that he wilfully perverted facts for the sake of establishing any theory that he held.

Zosimus is not to be considered in all respects as an original historian. It is probable that he would have exhibited more originality had he, according to his intention, been able to bring his history down to his own time. It closes, however, with the year A.D. 410. Either he had been hindered by death from prosecuting it further, or some portions of it have been lost. He is thus occupied throughout it all with events previous to his own day, and in relating these he seems rather to epitomize works of predecessors in the same field than to write original narrative. Reitemeier finds that in the first part of his history he followed the *Synopsis* of Denippus, in the middle and larger part the *Chronicon* of Eunapius, and in the last part the *Silva* of Olympiodorus (Disquis. p. 35). Photius

also charges him with extensive copying of Eunapius (comp. Fabricius, vi. p. 232, note). It seems to have been his admiration of Polybius that led him to write. That historian had described the rise of the Roman Empire, and Zosimus, beholding everywhere around him its majestic ruins, would describe its fall. Nor will he merely describe the phenomena: he proposes also to investigate their causes. He begins, accordingly, with the reign of Augustus, and, passing hastily over the time which intervened till the accession of Constantine, he occupies himself mainly with the reigns of that emperor and his successors. His theory upon the fall of the Roman Empire may be summed up in the following particulars:—The change of government to its imperial form (i. 5); the removal of the soldiery into cities where they were debased by luxury and vice (ii. 34); the iniquitous exactions of successive emperors (ii. 38, iv. 28, 29, 41, v. 12); above all, the casting aside of the old religion, and the neglect of the responses of the oracles (i. 57). There can be little doubt that he regarded this last cause as the most important, so frequently does he allude to it (ii. 7, iv. 37, 59, v. 38, etc.). He expresses what was often thought and said at the time, and it is not a little interesting to think that to the view thus taken we owe, in no small degree, the production of Augustine's immortal work, *De Civitate Dei*.

The style of the history of Zosimus has been praised by Photius as concise, perspicuous, pure, and, though not adorned by many figures, yet by no means devoid of sweetness (*Cod.* 98). Heyne has praised it in exactly similar terms (*Corp. Ser. H. B.*, *Zosimus*, p. 16). These commendations are deserved. Zosimus is in a great measure free from the ambitious periods of most of the historians of his age. His narrative is circumstantial, but clear. His language is well chosen, and often in a high degree nervous and antithetical. He was not free from superstition; and the fact that a historian, generally so calm and so far removed from the credulity of his day, should have put his faith in oracles, and should have recorded without hesitation appearances of Minerva and Achilles to Alaric, together with various other miracles (see them in Fabricius, vi. p. 610), may show us how deep-seated such ideas were in the minds of his contemporaries, and may help to prove that the Christian belief in visions and miracles then prevailing was not inconsistent with sobriety of judgment and sound principles of criticism in other matters.

The history of Zosimus embraces the period between Augustus and A.D. 410. It may be consulted for the lives and actions of the emperors between these dates, more especially for those of Constantine, Constantius, Theodosius the elder, Honorius and Arcadius; for accounts of the Huns, Alamanni, Scythians, Goths, and minor barbarous tribes; for the war in Africa in the time of Honorius, the campaign of Alaric in Italy, and the taking of Rome; for the right of asylum in Christian churches, and the changes introduced into the army; for an important description of Byzantium, old and new, and of Britain; and finally, among many other points which it is unnecessary to notice, for an account of the secular games to which, celebrated only once in 110 years, the people were summoned with the stirring, yet solemn, cry—*quos nec spectavit quisquam nec spectaturus est.* In addition to these things, some of the ancient oracles will be found preserved by Zosimus.

An edition of the history of Zosimus in Greek and Latin, with notes by Sylburgius, was published at Frankfort in 1590, and was followed by a similar edition at Oxford in 1672. The best edition is that of Reitemeier, in Greek and Latin, with the notes of Heyne, which appeared at Leipsic in 1784, after which Bekker published one in Greek and Latin, with the notes of Reitemeier, at Bonn, in 1837. [W. M.]

ZOTICUS (1), bishop of Comana, in Pamphylia Prima, stated by an anonymous anti-Montanist writer, also by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 18), as also by Apollonius (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18), to have proposed to exorcise the Montanist prophetess, Maximilla, when first she came forward at Pepuza, but not to have been permitted by the other Montanists to offer her this indignity. [G. S.]

ZOTICUS (2), bishop of Quintianum, according to Dupin, a town in the Tyrol, present at the council at Rome, A.D. 313 (Opt. i. 23). [H. W. P.]

ZOTION, deacon. [SOTION.]

ZUMURUS, or Zucius, a priest who neglected to carry a message to the bishop of Uzalis about the relics of St. Stephen, and received, it was said, a blow from an unseen hand by way of rebuke (Aug. *de Mirac. S. Steph.* vol. vii. app. p. 858, ed. Migne). [H. W. P.]

ZUNTFREDUS (SUNIFREDUS), thirteenth archbishop of Narbonne, in the last quarter of the 7th century. He was represented at the thirteenth and fourteenth councils of Toledo in 683 and 684, and was present in person at the fifteenth in 688. There is extant a letter addressed to him by Idalius, bishop of Barcelona, which accompanied the gift of a copy of the *Prognosticum Futuri Saeculi* of Julian of Toledo (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcvi. 818). After Zuntfredus there is an interval of about eighty years in the archbishops of Narbonne, the see being in the hands of the Saracens (*Gall. Christ.* vi. 14). [S. A. B.]

LONDON: PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.